

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

WEDNESDAY, June 15, 1898.

The House met at 10 o'clock a. m., and was called to order by Mr. DALZELL as Speaker pro tempore.

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication:

SPEAKER'S ROOM, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., June 15, 1898.

I hereby name Mr. JOHN DALZELL, of Pennsylvania, to act as Speaker until the adjournment.

T. B. REED, Speaker.

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

AMERICAN REGISTERS FOR STEAMERS SPECIALIST AND UNIONIST.

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call up this morning, if the gentleman will allow it, a bill to grant American registers to a couple of vessels to be used as transports.

Mr. HITT. Will it lead to any debate?

Mr. DINSMORE. Mr. Speaker, I will have to ask for the regular order. We have given this time all out.

Mr. PAYNE. It will take but a moment. I have a very urgent letter from the Secretary of War urging the passage of this bill.

Mr. HITT. Will the gentleman withdraw it if it leads to any discussion?

Mr. PAYNE. Certainly I will.

Mr. DINSMORE. Very well.

Mr. PAYNE. It is a Senate bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from New York asks unanimous consent for the present consideration of a bill which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 4763) to provide American registers for steamers *Specialist* and *Unionist*.

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is hereby authorized and directed to cause the foreign-built steamers *Specialist* and *Unionist* to be registered as vessels of the United States, provided that they shall not engage in the coastwise trade of this Republic.

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

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

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

HAWAII.

Mr. DINSMORE. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. FITZGERALD].

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Speaker, I shall cast my vote against the annexation of Hawaii for various reasons.

I have always understood it to be one of the fundamental principles of the Democratic party that government should rest upon the consent of the governed; yet I think I am safe in saying that in Hawaii but 2,700 persons—out of a population of 100,000—have been consulted in regard to the annexation of that country to the United States. There are upward of 40,000 of native Hawaiians in these islands now, but they have never been given an opportunity to express their views in regard to this annexation question.

There has always been a question in my mind as to the justice and patriotism of those who dethroned the Queen in 1893, and the fact that Secretary Foster, in the treaty which he prepared in the closing days of the Harrison Administration, provided for the payment of \$20,000 annually to the Queen during her life, as well as for the payment to the princess of \$150,000 outright, if these women should in good faith submit to the authority of the Government of the United States and the local government of the islands, showed the personal rights of the Queen and the right of succession to the dynasty of which she was the head.

It seems to me nothing more nor less than the alliance of the United States Government with a band of men, American citizens, if you are pleased to term them such, who deliberately and willfully overthrew the legalized machinery of the Government in the Hawaiian Islands, dethroned its Queen, and appropriated the government property of all the people to their own use.

The American people were horrified a few years ago when the news of the attack of Jamieson and his English mercenaries upon the Transvaal country was made known; yet we submit to the spectacle of so-called American citizens deliberately overthrowing and capturing this Hawaiian territory, and then ask that it be annexed to the United States. I listened very patiently yesterday and to-day for some substantial reasons why these islands should be annexed, but I must confess that I have yet to hear such a reason.

Some of the Republican members, notably those from my own State, have changed their minds radically about this problem the past four or five weeks.

I have been surprised to hear some of them say on the floor of this Chamber that the United States Government was to inaugurate a policy of colonial expansion—that the Philippine Islands were to be kept by this Government after peace had been declared, and that this country must at last take its place side by side with the nations of Europe and Asia in the aggrandizement of empire.

I very much mistake the opinion of the American people if this policy will meet with their approval.

The present struggle was dictated wholly through humane motives, and was never intended to be a contest for empire.

Our men are in the field and upon the sea ready to fight and to die if necessary for the success of American arms in their legitimate mission of driving the Spanish flag forever from American shores, Puerto Rico as well as Cuba; but I doubt very much, if the temper of the American people could be tested, if even any great number could be found who would assent to the policy now being advocated by some of using the Army and Navy for the addition of insular possessions to our country.

Let us suppose for a moment that Hawaii was in our possession when the present hostilities broke out. It must be admitted that we have found use for every vessel in our Navy in the prosecution of the struggle in and about Cuba, with the exception of those ships under Admiral Dewey at Manila.

Hawaii is at least 2,500 miles from our shores, with a coast line as extensive as that comprised in the New England States. It would require a squadron equally as large and powerful as Dewey's to give proper protection to that island, and we simply could not do it without exposing ourselves to extreme and hazardous danger on this side of the water.

Who are the people inhabiting these islands we are going to annex? Forty thousand of them are native Hawaiians, 25,000 Japanese, 21,000 Chinese, 15,000 Portuguese, 3,000 Americans, and about 4,000 British, Germans, and French combined.

Are we to have a Mongolian State in this Union, or are the Japanese and Chinese to be exported, thus bringing us into difficulties with each of these Governments?

Where is the consistence of the junior Senator from my own State and the Representatives of that Commonwealth on this floor who have strongly advocated this exclusion of honest and hard-working Irish, German, Jewish, and Italian immigrants from our shores because they can not read or write, yet they are willing that the heterogeneous mass enumerated above should become part and parcel of the citizenship of this country? What has become of their oft-repeated professions of loyalty to the policy of our fathers, who have defeated every proposition for the acquisition of insular possession?

This very same proposition of the acquisition of the Sandwich Islands was made to the peerless statesman from Massachusetts, Daniel Webster, when he was Secretary of State in the year 1852; and was declined by him.

An attempt was made to annex St. Thomas in President Johnson's Administration and Santo Domingo in President Grant's Administration, but both treaties failed in the Senate.

I think that the history of our country has shown the wisdom of our action in these cases.

We have not been bothered with the intestinal trouble that follows a policy of territorial expansion, but have been allowed to pursue the development of our own natural and tremendous resources, with the result that our country is the greatest and richest upon the face of God's earth.

What great object is to be accomplished by a departure from our former wise and conservative policy in this direction? Some say that we are to have an offensive and defensive alliance with Great Britain, and that when this is accomplished our combined navies will rule the world. God forbid that this Government ever should leave the record behind her that England has obtained in her acquisition of territory.

It is true that the sun never sets upon British possession, but it is also true that history does not record one instance of greater oppression enacted in the pursuit of territorial expansion than has been exercised by England upon the Irish, the Boers, the Maltese, the Hindoos, the Burmese, and the Chinese. She finds herself to-day beset by foreign foes in the East. Her wicked aggressions upon national rights and her continued assaults on weaker nations, resulting in the absorption of their territory, has left her without a friend or an ally among the nations of Europe. Who else can she look to for aid or comfort but the United States? What position should the American people take in this condition of affairs?

The two nations which England must clash with are Russia and France. The friendship of both these Governments, of Russia particularly, has always been extended to this country. England, on the other hand, has been our traditional enemy in every struggle since the Republic was instituted, and yet there are a great many people in this country to-day, if the opportunity presented itself, who would advocate an alliance with England against Russia.

I have had a very strong suspicion for some time that strong English influences here are at work in favor of the annexation of Hawaii. England realizes full well that we will not stop with Hawaii. She wishes us to hold the Philippines. She realizes full well that after we establish our flag over these islands that we will be brought right into the midst of the contest that is soon to take place when the partition of the Chinese Empire takes place. It is then that England will need an active and alert ally to stand out against the claims of Russia, Germany, France, and Japan, and her only opportunity rests with the entrance of the United States into that field. The whole matter is very clearly stated by Lord Brassey, one of Great Britain's colonial governors, who said in an interview a short time ago:

In the present anxious position of affairs we shall not relax our efforts to create such naval forces as will insure the safety of the Empire, but if in the process of time we can accomplish a closer union between ourselves and the United States, if we can establish a perpetual league of all English-speaking countries for settling their differences by arbitration, nay, more, for mutual defense if threatened by external foes, then we shall have changed the circumstances. Our latent resources would be too overwhelming to be challenged or contested. Let us cherish the hope that a consummation so happy may some day be reached by the sagacity of our statesmen and the growing wisdom and good will of our kindred people.

It can readily be seen that the friendship of England in our present struggle is not an honest one, but is dictated by selfishness and greed and an anxiety that we should come to her assistance in pulling her Chinese chestnuts out of the fire.

Apart from any interest England may have in this conflict and looking at the question purely from an American standpoint, I think the conclusion is irresistible that this annexation should not take place.

The possession of noncontiguous territories is bound to result in constant and repeated friction with other nations.

Great Britain's possessions in North America have occasioned all our troubles with England, except in the Venezuelan matter, for the past fifty years. The seal-fishery question is only now being settled, and there has been constant friction about our herring fisheries the past twenty years. Constant difficulties between both Governments are now taking place in the Klondike region and other parts of Alaska, while difficulties are repeatedly encountered between authorities in the State of Washington and British Columbia. I bring these matters to the attention of the House at this time to indicate how impossible it is for any nation that pursues a policy of absorption of noncontiguous territory to keep itself from getting into constant difficulties.

It has been said during the course of this debate that the vast majority of the people of this country favor the annexation of Hawaii. Inasmuch as the great proportion of our people are wage earners and the annexation of these islands would bring the 50,000 Japanese and Chinese into competition with our labor, I can not believe this statement to be true. The Japanese at home at the present time are threatening our industrial supremacy, and if we admit these islands as part of our domain, our ambitious and thrifty manufacturers, who as a general rule employ the cheapest labor they can obtain, will build and establish factories in Hawaii, with Japanese and Chinese help, and easily undersell in the market made by American labor.

Then, again, these large coolie colonies, under the management of the gigantic sugar and tobacco combinations, would produce those articles so cheaply as to close up all of our sugar industries, both beet and cane, and reduce tobacco culture to such a condition as to make it absolutely impossible to raise at a profit even though the lowest wage should be paid. I would like at this time to quote that eminent lawyer of international reputation who, when asked his opinion as to whether we should keep the Philippines or not, replied:

We started to accomplish one single, declared, definite object, a most noble one, based purely upon humanitarian grounds. Our sincerity in our philanthropic profession is the only possible excuse for war. To maintain good faith and our reputation with the rest of the world is worth a dozen Philippines and millions of coolie Chinamen and Malays.

[Applause.]

The policy of colonial expansion means a large increase in our standing Army, and I am strongly opposed to the development of our Army on European lines. It would mean the loss of that feeling of citizenship and entity which is the pride of every American, when half-breeds and Malays are made part of our nation. It would breed corruption and suspicion in the management of colonies in different parts of the world, and it would provoke antagonism and violent discussion in our legislative chambers as to the government of these possessions.

The country is confronted now with many and serious problems. Our banking system is notoriously inefficient, our merchant marine a disgrace to a sixth-rate nation, our postal system can be vastly improved, and the condition of our working people all over this country is serious enough to demand the best thought and attention of our wisest statesmen. The addition to the English navy estimates as necessary for the present year amount to \$175,000,000, and if we are to vie with England, as some of our Repre-

sentatives say we should, we must surely spend as much money as she does for the building up of a navy.

I do not wish to be understood as one of those who do not believe in an adequate naval force, because since I have been a member of Congress I have favored liberal appropriations for the building of our Navy, but I do think that our Government can secure itself against any possible danger with a great many less ships than Great Britain possesses unless we branch out as that Government has done. The annexation of Hawaii is the first step in a policy to admit colonies speaking a foreign tongue, governed by military satraps as against self-governing States. It will mean the neglect of our Constitution and people.

It will cause entangling alliances with other nations and the fear of war, thus continually disturbing our home business affairs. It will result in the abandonment of economy and simple government ordained by Washington and Jefferson and the utter annihilation of the principle of the Monroe doctrine.

It will bring the intelligent American laborer into direct competition with the Japanese and Chinese laborer, who, when he is absorbed as part of the Hawaiian Republic into the United States, will be entitled to the protection offered him by our laws. The climatic conditions of this country are such as to produce the highest intellectual, moral, and physical development, and it is absurd to suppose that the inhabitants of Hawaii, situated as it is in the tropical zone, can begin to keep pace with the magnificent civilization of this nation; rather must they always stifle our growth and impede our progress.

My colleague [Mr. GILLET of Massachusetts], in his remarks the other day emphasized the pleasure that he felt in voting for annexation because of the fact that the islands had been redeemed from savagery by the devotion of American missionaries. In thinking this matter over I have come to the conclusion that the native Hawaiian's idea of the Almighty and justice must be a little bit shaken when he sees these men, who pretend to be the exemplars of Christianity and honor, take possession of these islands by force, destroy the Government that has existed for years, and set up a sovereignty for themselves. Not only that, but when they also witness the spectacle of the sugar and tobacco (Christian?) barons import coolies, Japanese and Chinese, both, until they outnumber the native Hawaiians in order to fatten the dividends of these trusts by their cheap labor, their ideas of the all-seeing justice of the Almighty must be somewhat dimmed.

The great argument that has been advanced for the possession of these islands is their advantage in time of war. They are said to be the key to the Pacific Ocean. This same argument was used when the proposition to purchase St. Thomas, in President Johnson's time, and Santo Domingo, in President Grant's Administration. There are innumerable islands on our eastern coast much nearer us than Hawaii on our western coast, yet nobody has ever seriously thought our Atlantic coast was in any great danger from their nonpossession.

Why, Europe herself is nearer to us than the Hawaiian Islands, yet nobody suggests that we should annex Europe. There are conditions, everybody must admit, under which these islands would be a valuable possession; but the question to my mind is, Are these conditions such as to justify our departing from our traditional policy of noninterference with the political affairs of the rest of the world?

Will anyone say that the possession of the Philippine Islands were of advantage to Spain in this struggle, and is not a magnificent advantage for the United States in the present struggle that she has no insular possessions to protect thousands of miles away from her base of supplies? We are told that the islands are a military necessity from coal supply standpoint. Who can tell what a few years will develop in the line of naval architecture and advancement? Russia has just contracted for war ships that will sail 17,000 miles without recoaling.

What trouble will it be for vessels of that kind to carry coal enough to attack almost any point in the world and then be able to return to her home port without recoaling? With the tremendous advance in electrical science, who can tell but that battle ships may be built within a few years which can traverse the oceans for weeks, perhaps months, without being compelled to stop for supplies. With all these possibilities is it wise, is it a sound plan to embark in this policy of territorial aggrandizement. I think not, and I venture the opinion when this matter is brought to the attention of the people of this country that they will indorse the words of Washington when he said:

The great rule of conduct for us in regard to foreign nations is, in extending our commercial relations, to have with them as little political connection as possible. So far as we have already formed engagements, let them be fulfilled with perfect good faith. Here let us stop.

Europe has a set of primary interests which to us have none or a very remote relation. Hence she must be engaged in frequent controversies, the causes of which are essentially foreign to our concerns. Hence, therefore, it must be unwise in us to implicate ourselves by artificial ties in the ordinary vicissitudes of her politics or the ordinary combinations and collisions of her friendships or enmities.

Our detached and distant situation invites and enables us to pursue a different course. If we remain one people, under an efficient Government, the

period is not far off when we may defy material injury from external annoyance; when we may take such an attitude as will cause the neutrality we may at any time resolve upon to be scrupulously respected; when belligerent nations, under the impossibility of making acquisitions upon us, will not lightly hazard the giving us provocation; when we may choose peace or war as our interest, guided by justice, shall counsel.

Why forego the advantage of so peculiar a situation? Why quit our own to stand upon foreign ground? Why, by interweaving our destiny with that of any part of Europe, entangle our peace and prosperity in the toils of European ambition, rivalry, interest, humor, or caprice?

Supplementing this, Jefferson, in his inaugural address in 1801, laid down the following rule of action:

"Peace, commerce, and honest friendship with all nations—entangling alliances with none."

[Loud and long-continued applause.]

Mr. HITT. Mr. Speaker, I yield thirty minutes to the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. BERRY].

Mr. BERRY. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the importance of the question now under consideration. Perhaps none of more gravity has ever been presented to the consideration of the American Congress in many years. I am an advocate of the annexation of the Republic of Hawaii—of the Newlands resolutions, which contemplate the indorsement of the treaty recommended to the Senate by President McKinley. I dislike very much to disagree with any portion of my party associates, but after patient and careful consideration I am satisfied they are in error who oppose this increase of territory, recommended by the best minds of America, and we are willing to trust to time to vindicate the wisdom of our action.

Never, sir, has there been one foot of territory added to the thirteen little colonies that first formed this Government along the Atlantic seaboard, up to this hour, when our territory is more than 3,000,000 square miles, that there was not violent opposition to the annexation. The apostle of Democracy, Thomas Jefferson, who has been quoted so much in this discussion, said himself when he gave his adherence to the purchase of the Louisiana territory from Napoleon, that there was no constitutional right for it, but that its advocates must appeal to the American people for an indorsement of the proposition.

Think of it, sir, in 1803, we were about 5,000,000 people. We had just emerged from a fearful struggle. Our garments were torn and bloody. Scarcely knowing whether we had a national existence, and only by the aid of a foreign power could we have achieved our independence. The mouth of the Mississippi was owned by foreign powers, and its commerce would be largely controlled by them. The first intention was to purchase what was known as the Island of New Orleans, where the city is now situated, as a resting place for the craft navigating that stream, which would of necessity be rapidly augmented.

We were represented at the court of France by a man who had administered the oath of office to George Washington as the first President of the United States, Mr. Livingston. He was instructed to negotiate for the Island of New Orleans at a price not exceeding \$2,000,000. The proposition was laid before the French minister, Marbois, who, under the direction of Napoleon, fearing the English might get it by conquest, said he would not only sell us the island, but all the extensive territory they possessed on the continent. Eighty million dollars was the price asked.

Mr. Monroe, afterwards President of the United States, was sent over to aid Mr. Livingston in arranging the terms, which negotiation laid in his mind the doctrine which will ever bear his name, and the price was fixed at \$15,000,000. There were many representative men in 1803, as there are in 1898, who declaimed against this Louisiana purchase—a wise and patriotic move. Mr. Livingston became alarmed, receiving information of the opposition to this new acquisition, extending from the Gulf of Mexico to the Pacific Ocean. Mr. Livingston said to his countrymen, "If we have more than we need, we can dispose of a part." But not one foot has ever been sold. That was Democratic doctrine then, as it is now, and the Democratic orators of to-day love to proclaim on the stump that our broad domain is to the credit of the party that followed Thomas Jefferson.

When the State of Louisiana came into the Union, there was found in the State of Massachusetts a distinguished man by the name of Josiah Quincy, who made a speech very much like those I have heard on the floor during this discussion, in which he said that the country was now going to pieces, that we were entering upon an imperial course, and that it was ruin to the country. Listen how much this sounds like my friend CLARK'S speech, or that of my friend from Arkansas [Mr. DINSMORE].

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I hope the gentleman will not attribute to me borrowing Josiah Quincy's ideas, for I take no stock in them.

Mr. BERRY. But they both violate the idea of Democracy.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Nothing of the sort. Josiah Quincy was a secessionist, and always was, and I never was.

Mr. BERRY. But I will show you better Democratic authority than you ever had in Missouri that the Democratic party has always been for the annexation of territory to the United States, and even the man that the Republican party sought to impeach,

and a better Democrat never lived on this continent than Andrew Johnson, under whose auspices the Territory of Alaska was added to this country, and not contiguous territory, as some gentlemen have been arguing here.

Now, what did Josiah Quincy say when Louisiana was going to be admitted as a State? I would like to call my distinguished friend's attention, the gentleman from Louisiana, to this. Josiah Quincy says:

Under the sanction of this rule of conduct I am compelled to declare it as my deliberate opinion that if this bill passes the bonds of this Union are virtually dissolved; that the States which compose it are free from their moral obligations, and that as it will be the right of all, so it will be the duty of some, to prepare definitely for a separation—amicably if they can, violently if they must.

Again:

If this bill pass, it is my deliberate opinion that it is virtually a dissolution of this Union; that it will free the States from their moral obligations, and as it will be the right of all, so it will be the duty of some, definitely to prepare for a separation—amicably if they must.

Now, how much that sounds like speeches made upon this floor in this discussion that I have listened to on this side—"that we are going on an imperial course" and "we are changing the principles of the Government." Why, gentlemen, we have been wooing the little Republic of Hawaii for more than half a century. We have been wooing it under Democratic Administration, under Republican Administration, under every Administration from 1842, when Tyler was at the head of this Government, to the present time. Every Democrat except Grover Cleveland—you can not find a single announcement up to this hour coming from the Democratic party that has not been in favor of the annexation of Hawaii. Mr. Buchanan—was he a Democrat? Mr. Legaré—was he a Democrat? Mr. Bayard—was he a Democrat?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. No.

Mr. BERRY. Why, you supported him and he was elected and was the mouthpiece of the Democratic party until he became associated with Grover Cleveland. Was Pierce a Democrat? Was Buchanan, his Secretary of State (afterwards himself a Democratic President, at the head of the Government when the civil war came upon us)—was he a Democrat? All these men have alike expressed their opinion that ultimately the Hawaiian Islands would become a part of the United States. Mr. Bayard said that whenever the apple was ripe it would naturally fall into the lap of the United States. And so it is coming now.

Mr. BAIRD. If the acquisition of the Hawaiian Islands is Democratic policy and has always been such, why is it that to-day it is indorsed by the Republican Administration and will receive the almost unanimous vote of the Republicans in this House?

Mr. BERRY. Well, I will tell you. The Hawaiian Islands occupy a peculiar position; they are a sort of derelict out in the North Pacific, waving a flag of distress. Naturally as those islands became known they became an object worthy of attention and consideration from this country. In the first place, about 1820, when the Americans sent missionaries there for the purpose of civilizing the natives, they found them in an almost barbarous condition and set to work to bring about a condition of civilization. Those missionaries took the native language, which was then without form, and gave it form—printed it in grammars and other books; and it has been taught for years upon the islands under the influence and inspiration of the American missionaries.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Will it interrupt the gentleman if I ask him a question?

Mr. BERRY. Not a particle. Let me say that if anybody wants to ask me any questions during the delivery of this speech I am ready to answer them.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Is it not true historically and absolutely that the action of William L. Marcy, Franklin Pierce, James Buchanan, and that whole crowd of Democrats prior to 1861 in advocating this annexation policy was part and parcel of the African slavery propaganda of which the Ostend manifesto was another manifestation? Is not that true?

Mr. BERRY. I will answer the gentleman's question. All along through the history of the admission of States to this Union, up to and including the time of the civil war, the question of slavery had a good deal to do with whether men in political life were for or against the admission. The men from the cotton States were in favor of the annexation of such territory as would give to them representation in favor of the Democracy; and the people of the North, as my distinguished friend [Mr. Grow] who is now looking at me knows full well, whenever there arose an occasion when territory proposed to be admitted was likely to be represented by old Whigs or Republicans on this floor, they were advocates of such annexation. But that question has gone by. The institution of slavery went down with the war. That question no longer enters into this proposition at all.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. But if that is true, ought not the arguments which those men used to go down with the question itself?

Mr. BERRY. That is a question which the gentleman can settle for himself. If he does not like these arguments, he need not adopt them. The arguments I like I propose to adopt in the course of this speech, showing that the Democracy of this country has stood for annexation at all times.

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

Mr. BERRY. Yes, sir.

Mr. GROW. If it will not interrupt the gentleman, I would like, before he leaves this historical recital, to call his attention to a fact which of course he knows, but has inadvertently passed over.

Mr. BERRY. What is that?

Mr. GROW. When the Louisiana purchase was under consideration, Mr. Livingston, representing this country, proposed only in the first instance to purchase from France all her territory east of the Mississippi River, but the French insisted that we should take it all.

Mr. BERRY. Yes, sir; and it grew out of the idea that Napoleon Bonaparte had found he could not hold the territory, and rather than let it go into the hands of England he gave it to the American people for a very small consideration; and he said when he did so that he would raise up a power on this continent that would threaten the position of England. And such has been the effect. To-day England extends her hand in anxiety to join her Anglo-Saxon kin on this side of the water for the control of the policy of the world.

Not only that. Do we not all recollect the circumstances connected with the annexation of Texas? And, by the bye, I believe there is not a Texas man on this floor who now favors annexation. Yet we wooed her for a while, and Texas wooed us for admission to the Union; and we admitted her. Out of that grew the Mexican war, which resulted in our obtaining the magnificent territory leading out to the Pacific. From Kentucky and all over the South we unsheathed our swords to defend the honor of the American flag in Mexico, and we followed that flag successfully until we saw it wave over the halls of the Montezumas, and we shall see it waving over Morro Castle and wherever else the American people feel disposed to plant it. It shall kiss the breezes of the Tropics as it is sure to wave over the Hawaiian Islands.

What was the effect upon those who opposed annexation? Tom Corwin, of Ohio, was the opponent of the war with Mexico. He was a great man, a great lawyer. He said he trusted that whenever Americans crossed the Rio Grande they would be welcomed with bloody hands to hospitable graves. And he was welcomed to a political grave, for he could never hold up his political head after making that declaration.

Mr. GROW. Will it interrupt the gentleman—

Mr. BERRY. Not a particle, sir. I am making a random sort of a speech upon a subject that I think I understand.

Mr. GROW. Mr. Corwin's declaration was that if he was a Mexican, as he was an American, he would welcome our soldiers with bloody hands to a hospitable grave.

Mr. BERRY. That is the same idea. I do not pretend to give the exact phraseology. I recollect the circumstances. So, sir, if we had been contentious then, as we ought to have been, instead of Vancouver and the country from Vancouver to Sitka being under the control of the English Government the Louisiana purchase justly entitled us to that territory, in order that we might be connected with the Alaskan country in the far North, and it would not now be declared not to be contiguous territory. We all remember that controversy in our history, and we recollect the ride of Dr. Whitman, which saved Oregon to us. Why, there was a time when even men like our old friend Benton, the apostle of Democracy, said that it would never do to extend this country much beyond the Mississippi River, that the Rocky Mountains were the natural boundary, and that it would never do to go beyond the Rocky Mountains.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Will the gentleman allow me to suggest that that is a historical mistake?

Mr. BERRY. Let us see whether it is.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Tom Benton always clamored for that line up to 54° 40'.

Mr. BERRY. Later in life he did.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. And he drew the most remarkable picture of the teeming population of the Oregon Valley that was ever drawn since the world began.

Mr. BERRY. That was later in life. Why, my friend, the Democrats and Whigs up to that time announced that the whole country running from Mexico north to the British possessions, west of the Mississippi River, was a barren desert, and you as a boy knew it on the map as the Staked Plain that nobody could travel across except with camels or something of that kind. Now the locomotive shrieks in wild triumph to the Pacific through the common territory of the United States, and that very land that was described as a desert is to-day the granary of the world.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. That was what Mr. Webster said, as representing the New England idea.

Mr. BERRY. Let us see what Mr. Webster said. Mr. Webster did not want the State of Texas in the Union. Let us read what Webster says about it. I do not like to have Democratic principles laid down to me that controvert every position that the fathers of the party have ever taken, and I do not believe that the Democracy of America, when the matter is brought to their attention, will go wrong upon this. I believe nine out of ten of the Democrats of America are for the annexation of Hawaii, and therefore I do not propose to be controlled by a Democratic caucus each of whose members only represents the same number of people upon this floor that I do. But when my party acts, I follow its platform.

Mr. BAIRD. I should like to suggest to the gentleman that there was no attempt in the Democratic caucus to bind its individual members upon this matter.

Mr. BERRY. I do not know whether there was an attempt or not. It certainly did not succeed.

Mr. BAIRD. Was it not so stated in the caucus, that there was no desire to bind individual members?

Mr. BERRY. I think it was. I saw it so stated in the newspapers. I did not remain during the entire caucus. And I am not ashamed to go for a thing because a Republican now and then is for it, if I believe it is right. Once in a while the Republican party does get right.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Very seldom.

Mr. BERRY. I heard the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. RICHARDSON] make an argument on this side, saying that the proposed annexation would have the effect of destroying the principle of the high protective tariff, which I think has been one of the curses of this Government, and I should be very glad if it had that result. It can not come too soon.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I hope it will.

Mr. BERRY. I will tell you what it will do. And I intend to discuss this before I complete this argument. It will show to the world that property like the Hawaiian Islands, lying close to our shores, 2,000 miles closer than to any other great body of land, comes within the Monroe doctrine, and belongs to the United States whenever she can get it by fair means. I would not advocate the sending of an army from the United States to take Hawaii from any people who were in possession of it against their will, but here comes a government that for three years has maintained itself, with representatives at nearly every court of the great nations of the world, and says to us, "We want to give you the territory that we own and make it a part of the United States, because we believe it will be useful to you and because we believe it will be better for us, fearing that some other power will disturb us." Now, I want to give these gentlemen from Texas a little piece of history. Mr. Webster arose and addressed the Senate in the session of 1845-46 upon the resolution for the admission of Texas. He said:

I am quite aware, Mr. President, that this resolution will pass this House. It has passed the other House of Congress by a large majority.

We are doing now just what they did then. A little complication on money matters and one thing and another have divided up the Senate, and the Republicans do not know exactly how many votes they have, and the Democrats do not know exactly where they stand. It takes two-thirds of the Senate to ratify a treaty, and the President has not been able to secure an indorsement by the Senate, and so he comes now, as they came in the case of the admission of Texas, to ask that both bodies representing the American people act upon this subject, as was done in that case. Continuing, Mr. Webster said:

There are members of this body, sir, who opposed the measures which came before Congress at its last session for the annexation of Texas who, nevertheless, will very probably feel themselves now, in consequence of the resolutions of last session, and in consequence of the proceedings of Texas upon those resolutions, bound to vote for her admission to the Union.

In the first place, I have, on the deepest reflection, long ago come to the conclusion that it was of very dangerous tendency and doubtful consequences to enlarge the boundaries of this Government or the Territories over which our laws are now established.

There was the distinguished Mr. Webster, who is succeeded on this floor by my friend Mr. FITZGERALD, and I have no doubt that he has read that speech and probably it has influenced him. Yet, in spite of Mr. Webster's opposition, the State of Texas is to-day perhaps one of the greatest empires in the world in its wealth of soil, in the character of its population, in its location, and in its possibilities for the future. And yet Mr. Webster said we ought never to admit Texas, that the country was getting so large that we should go to pieces and the country would dissolve.

Gentlemen refer us to the history of the past. They dwell with pleasure upon the history of Rome and of the Spanish Empire. Why, gentlemen, they were wholly different from this Government. Wherever we raise the flag of the United States we propose to give a better condition to the people, as we always have

wherever we have extended our territory given a better condition to the people than they had before. We do not propose to take Hawaii with the intention to draw from its resources money to be spent here at the Capitol in Washington, and to oppress them as Spain has oppressed Cuba and Puerto Rico and the Philippines, but we propose to give them the benefit of the great and glorious Government under which we live, to give them liberty, which is the purpose of this Government upon this earth, if it has any great distinctive purpose.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Now, one question more, and then I will quit you.

Mr. BERRY. All right.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. While Webster opposed annexation as long as he opposed slavery, is it not true that as soon as he came to the conclusion that he wanted the Southern slaveholders to give him a Presidential nomination, he flopped on the slave question on the 7th day of March, 1850, and then, in accordance with the behest of the slave propaganda, he advocated the annexation of the Sandwich Islands?

Mr. BERRY. It would be very difficult for me to tell what passes through the mind of every great statesman who has his eye fixed upon the White House or what has passed through the minds of such men in the past. Many things were said about Henry Clay. I do not propose to comment upon the dead. I do not know whether Webster had that purpose in view or not. In 1825, when an effort was being made in Congress to secure against the claims of Great Britain the territory now constituting the States of Idaho, Oregon, and Washington, Mr. Dickerson, of New Jersey, who represented that State in the Senate, opposed that proposition and pronounced it absurd. He said:

A member of Congress, traveling from his home to Washington and return, would cover a distance of 9,200 miles; at the rate of 30 miles per day, and allowing him forty-four days for Sundays, three hundred and fifty days would be consumed, and the member would have fourteen days in Washington before he started home; it would be quicker to come around Cape Horn, or by Bering Straits, Baffin Bay and Davis Strait, to the Atlantic, and so to Washington. True, the passage is not yet discovered, except upon our maps, but it will be as soon as Oregon is made a State.

Now, that sounds very much like the argument of my friend the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CLARK] in talking about Representatives from distant islands upon this floor—a Representative with gleaming teeth and savage eyes, who, he said, would look upon the Speaker as being good to eat, and he got a little mixed, because Mr. REED was not in the chair. [Laughter.] The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CLARK] was trying to alarm the American people, for fear that, because they take a small piece of territory in the Pacific, somebody from the Fiji Islands will be a Representative here.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Do you think it would really alarm the American people very much if the cannibals did get Mr. REED? [Laughter.]

Mr. BERRY. Well, that is a question you and Mr. REED can settle for yourselves. You and Mr. REED being together upon this proposition, I suppose you can determine that question better than I can. [Laughter.]

All along the line, it does not make any difference, where you have added territory to this country there has been some loud-mouthed people who said it would not do. They said on the eastern seaboard of Massachusetts that if we were to open territory anywhere beyond the Mississippi, the people of Massachusetts and New Hampshire would move out there and hunt bear with the people in that country, and the fellows who had been used to fishing on the eastern seaboard and the hunters could not get along together, and it would ultimately result in a division of the country. All of these arguments have been made; some of them so absurd that people will hardly recognize them now.

Mr. WHEELER of Kentucky. I would like to ask my colleague a question, if he will yield to me.

Mr. BERRY. Yes, sir.

Mr. WHEELER of Kentucky. Is it not true that the public press of this country that have been advocating the annexation of Hawaii have also demanded the annexation of the Philippine Islands and Puerto Rico and increasing the Army of the United States to 100,000 and doubling the Navy? Is not that true?

Mr. BERRY. Gentlemen, when I consider a resolution before this body, I do not consider it with a view that something else will come on hereafter that will complicate the matter. I am considering the resolution introduced by Mr. NEWLANDS for the purpose of accepting the Hawaiian Islands as part of the American Government. The Philippine Islands are not yet ours. We will settle that question when it is presented.

Mr. WHEELER of Kentucky. Will the gentleman allow me one further question?

Mr. BERRY. Certainly.

Mr. WHEELER of Kentucky. Is it not the duty of every legislator not only to consider the matter then before the body, but also to take into consideration the resulting effect?

Mr. BERRY. Oh, yes; what the gentleman says, I suppose, is true; but this country of 75,000,000 people has got past that point

of having to be scared like a child to go to sleep because it is informed that the bogey man is behind the door. [Laughter.] Why, sir, these gentlemen pretend to talk about Mr. Marcy. Mr. Marcy was one of the great men in the Democratic party, who wrote its platforms and formulated its policy. He had carried on the correspondence for annexation along in the fifties, to admit the Hawaiian Islands into the United States, and a treaty had been agreed upon, which only failed of consummation because the King died when he was about to sign it. And to show how solicitous other countries were to obtain the islands at that time, when the King died of measles, Great Britain put the remains on board a ship and carried them to his home. Great Britain has had possession of the islands once, France twice, and Russia once.

Mr. BODINE. Will the gentleman allow me to ask him a question?

Mr. BERRY. Certainly.

Mr. BODINE. Is it true that a Democratic House and a Democratic Senate voted for the annexation of Hawaii?

Mr. BERRY. A Democratic House and a Democratic Senate? No, sir. It was the State Department, where the treaty-making power belongs under the Constitution. They did not know that it would have the approval of their party.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Will the gentleman allow me to ask him one question?

Mr. BERRY. Certainly.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. If Mr. Marcy and such men believed that that was Democratic doctrine, why did they not put it in the platforms? You say Marcy was a man who wrote the platforms of his party.

Mr. BERRY. I do not know why they did not do it, unless they were afraid it might lead to some trouble and they did not want to talk about the acquisition. They left it until an authorized Government offered it as a gift.

Mr. SULZER. I suppose, no doubt, they did not want to make it a party question.

Mr. BERRY. No; they were not afraid to. About that time the Democratic party was well ensconced in power.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. It did not stay ensconced in power very long after that transaction.

Mr. BERRY. Here is President Tyler; he was in favor of annexation of Hawaii. Buchanan did the same. Was he a Democrat?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. He had softening of the brain. [Laughter.]

Mr. BERRY. Well, I suppose every man who is for annexation has softening of the brain. These are very distinguished gentlemen who advocated annexation, and do you propose to so characterize everybody who is opposed to it? I do not pretend to be a very wise man, but I have read the history of my country and of my party, and I say right here that the Democrats upon this floor will do a great wrong to their party whenever they plant themselves against the annexation of Hawaii.

Mr. GROW. Will the gentleman permit me to interrupt him before he leaves reference to Mr. Marcy?

Mr. BERRY. Yes, sir.

Mr. GROW. It is a well-known fact to those familiar with the inside politics at the time the Missouri Compromise was before Congress that Marcy was opposed to it because it was an extension of slavery.

Mr. BERRY. Yes. Now, Grant was not a Democrat, but he came pretty near it. We thought of nominating him for President, but Republicans got at him first. Harrison was for it, McKinley is for it, Admiral Dupont, General Schofield, Mahan, Secretary of State Webster, Marcy, Buchanan, Bayard, Sherman, Day—all for it. It seems to have been a universal sentiment up to this time, and now they come, because they are following Grover Cleveland—oh, it is a beautiful picture I have of my friend CLARK of Missouri, who always denounced him, now holding him up as the only example he had to follow—he and the distinguished gentleman, Mr. BLAND, from Missouri.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. That is the only thing I regret—where I am. [Laughter.]

Mr. BERRY. Well, get down on your knees and pray for forgiveness. [Laughter.]

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. DALZELL). The time of the gentleman from Kentucky has expired.

Mr. BERRY. Mr. Speaker, I only want two or three minutes more, and then I will close. Coming down to the question of Hawaii, ever since 1820, when the little colony of American missionaries went to the island for the purpose of civilizing the people, down to the present moment, the tendency of that little bunch of islands has been toward the United States. When King Kalakaua died after four Kamehamehas had been on the throne—the first Kamehameha was the man that gave the country its freedom and authorized the holding of private estates, destroying the feudal system that had existed on the island before 1840—the country went along smoothly until Kalakaua came on the throne,

The debt of the country was nearly all made after King Kalakaua ascended the throne, and he attempted to oppress the people. In the meantime there had gone to the island a large number of Americans, so that to-day they own three-quarters of all the property of the Hawaiian Islands. After his death—and he died at San Francisco—the United States Government in its regard for that little power that had been standing there begging so long to be a part of this country, ordered the U. S. S. *Charleston* to carry his remains back to Honolulu for interment.

Mrs. Dominis was placed on the throne, and in 1893 she proposed to overturn the whole republican system as it existed on that island and had been growing up for fifty years and establish again an absolute monarchy with herself at the head and everything at her disposal without a legislative branch of government. The American people owning three-quarters of the property of the island said, "This shall not be done," and they undertook to stop it. The U. S. S. *Boston* was in port, and finding that our American people's property was in danger, she moved up to the wharf and put her marines into the streets and without molesting anybody went to a hall and said, "We shall see that the property of the American people is not injured."

Well, Mrs. Dominis went off the throne by compulsion. The Republic was announced; a legislative body was elected very similar to the Constitution of our own States. Under a constitution the Republic of Hawaii, after three years of successful administration, a country able to pay its expenses, that has in the last year collected \$676,000 of revenue and paid \$70,000 of its debt, comes to the United States and says:

Assume the little public debt that stands over us of \$3,900,000, and we will turn over to you \$9,000,000 worth of public property if you will take us under the folds of your flag.

Is there anything wrong in that? What nation on the face of the earth has a right to come and object that the United States shall accept property tendered to her gratuitously and which the best minds of her country say is indispensable for the defense of her Pacific seaports?

My friend from Missouri [Mr. CLARK] was talking about the Hawaiian Islands of the olden time, before 1848. There was no such necessity arising on the Pacific Ocean at that time, for we had not reached the Pacific Ocean by California. We then had no Pacific coast communication with Honolulu; but now the trade between San Francisco and Honolulu amounts to \$24,000,000 a year.

Some gentlemen say it is going to interfere with the sugar trust. Why, gentlemen, the sugar trust is against annexation, and I will tell you why. Because the Hawaiian planter sells his sugar to the trust at \$2.50 a ton less than New York or London prices. If they do not sell it to the sugar trust, they will have to carry it around the Horn and take it to England, with all the insurance and loss of time, and so they are obliged to discount this \$2.50 on every ton of sugar made, out of which the trust makes about five hundred thousand a year, with an addition of about \$3,000,000 for refining.

Mr. BALL. Would not the case be the same if those islands were a part of the United States?

Mr. BERRY. Of course not. The high grades of sugar—refined sugar—coming from Honolulu to the United States pay a duty. Every particle of sugar that grades above 97 per cent comes in with a duty. It is shipped directly to the United States. I have seen it rolled out from the refinery; it is almost as white as refined sugar, and of a most delightful flavor. That is the reason the sugar trust is against annexation, because if annexation can be defeated it is \$3,000,000 a year in their pockets. Another reason is that the younger Spreckels owns 40,000 acres of the best land of the Hawaiian Islands—a magnificent plantation—and it is cultivated by contract labor brought from China and Japan. Spreckels knows that whenever the American flag goes up over Hawaii the laws of the United States apply to it, and that contract labor must come to an end. That is one reason for opposition to annexation; it is very easily explained; it does not take very many words.

I listened with attention yesterday to a discussion of this question by my distinguished friend from Georgia. Listening to his argument, as well as that of my friend from Indiana [Mr. JOHNSON], one would suppose that the people of Hawaii are a lot of heathens. I want to say that education is more universal in the Hawaiian Islands than it is in the State of Georgia. There is not a child reared on those islands 10 years of age who can not read and write. I question whether a single cotton State can boast of the same thing. Fourteen dollars a head is set apart by the Hawaiian Islands for the education of children. The country is dotted over with schoolhouses. The city of Honolulu has excellent kindergartens and primary schools, and an elegant college, with beautiful grounds embracing 15 acres, an edifice built of stone, which would be a credit to any State of this Union. The people there are honest. You can sleep in Honolulu with your doors wide open without apprehension of trouble. They are not the savages

which some of our friends here would have us believe. If brought here for the purpose of representing that country, they would not scare our Speaker, as my friend from Missouri [Mr. CLARK] seems to imagine.

I want to say to my distinguished friend from the State of Kentucky that in Honolulu and in the whole of the Hawaiian Islands education is more thorough and more money is spent per capita for the education of the children than in the State of Kentucky.

As to the military necessity of these islands, whose opinion are we to take? Are we going to take that of some of these young gentlemen who never heard a gun fire in real war?

Mr. CLARDY. The gentleman will allow me to say that the Chinese contract laborers of that country constitute a very large majority of the people.

Mr. BERRY. I want to say to the gentleman that the Chinamen and the Japanese are not naturalized citizens of that country, and under its constitution can not be; and when the flag of our country goes over Hawaii no Chinaman and no Japanese of that country can come to the United States by virtue of his being a resident of Hawaii.

Mr. CLARDY. If those islands are annexed to the United States, do not those people become citizens?

Mr. BERRY. No; they can not become citizens under the laws of the United States, and the Hawaiian treaty prohibits it, which the Newlands resolution purposes to approve.

Mr. CLARDY. Then the fourteenth amendment does not mean anything.

Mr. BERRY. The Chinaman, when he gets together a few hundred dollars, will go back to die in the happy Land of the Sun from which he came. There are not so many of them there as there are to-day in the city of San Francisco.

On this question of military necessity I am glad to see that map displayed there, because I think it is the best argument that can be made on this floor. Why, sir, my friend from Arkansas [Mr. DINSMORE] has become a great navigator. In spite of the fact that there are hundreds of men, embracing some of the brightest minds of this country, devoting themselves to the exploration of the trackless ocean, and in spite of the fact that such men have been endeavoring for hundreds of years to find out the best, the most expeditious, the safest lines for ocean travel, we have discovered an Arkansas Congressman who, ahead of all these navigators, has found a new route better than any previous one from America westward to Asia.

Mr. DINSMORE. I should like to ask the gentleman from Kentucky whether he controverts or denies any statement of fact which I made with reference to that?

Mr. BERRY. The only thing I complain of in the gentleman's remarks is that there was sometimes, as the lawyers say, a *suppressio veri*.

Mr. DINSMORE. The gentleman does well to express himself in a foreign language.

Mr. BERRY. Well, I will talk in Kanaka, if it will suit the gentleman better.

We have heard about the immoral forms of amusement practiced in Honolulu. Why, sir, I was one of the "visiting statesmen" of whom the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. SMITH] talked. I saw the hula-hula dance in the city of Honolulu; and I have no hesitation in saying that I can go to Kernan's Theater in the city of Washington and see a much more indecent performance than the hula-hula dance in Honolulu.

A MEMBER. How do you know?

Mr. BERRY. Because I have been there, and have seen a woman plant herself on a trapeze and undress herself, garment by garment, while Congressmen sitting about were getting very nervous with apprehension. [Laughter.]

Now, another great bugaboo which I want to answer is the statement in regard to leprosy. Why, gentlemen, you admit into this country all the Swedes who want to come here, and they make some of our best citizens. They are workers in iron, good mechanics, etc. You admit them freely, yet there is more leprosy in Sweden than in Hawaii. The leprosy will be the same distance from us after annexation that it is now, and such subjects are excluded under our laws.

It has been stated here (and the statement shows how little some gentlemen know about this matter) that an island has been devoted to the treatment of leprosy. What is the fact? They have simply cut off a little tongue of land, about 5,000 acres, with mountains just behind it and a wall running down each side, making it like a penitentiary, with the broad Pacific Ocean around it. And there the leprosy patients are sequestered. They are fed by the Government, they are attended by good physicians, and there is good moral care for them in every particular. And it is gradually dying out. Why, when Captain Cook discovered those islands there were supposed to be 300,000 natives on them. And yet in the last few years they have dwindled down at the rate of 1 or 2 per cent a year. The race is gradually becoming extinct.

Now, what do you people want? You say there ought to be a vote. Why, gentlemen, there is not a Kanaka that I talked with on the island who had anything but a sentiment about this old monarchy. They thought or seemed to think that if Queen Liliuokalani could be put upon the throne again they would all have a happy-go-lucky time, as they had during her reign. What has the Republic of Hawaii done for this queen? They agreed to pay her \$10,000 a year as long as she remained quiet, and they did pay it to her for three or four months; but when she started in to overthrow the Government they said, "Not another dollar goes from our treasury to pay a woman who wants to overturn a republican form of government." But they have been paying Kaiulani, who is the heir apparent to the throne, \$2,500 a year from the treasury of the Republic, and a few weeks ago they increased it to \$3,000 in a spirit of magnanimity.

Mr. WHEELER of Kentucky. Have we got to do that if we take the island?

Mr. BERRY. No; I do not think we have got to do it, but I think it would be a magnanimous thing to do.

Mr. WHEELER of Kentucky. Are they going to steal all these people's property and give them nothing in return?

Mr. BERRY. We will give them the blessings of American Government in return. There is not an acre of land in Kentucky that will produce one-half what the land in those islands will produce. They have marvelous wealth of soil. I have seen 14 tons of sugar produced from 1 acre of land in the Hawaiian Islands, and that sugar was worth \$60 a ton. You can not equal such a product as that on the land in Kentucky or any other State. Standing there, as it does, upon the line of the Tropics, bathing one foot in the waters of the Tropics and the other in the waters of the Temperate Zone, it is the most beautiful and lovable spot upon which I have ever seen the sun shine.

A MEMBER. Does it beat the blue grass of Kentucky?

Mr. BERRY. It beats everything that I have ever seen. You may stand at the base of the mountain with every variety of tropical verdure about you and look up to the peaks crowned with perpetual snow. You can have any climate you please without going more than 4 or 5 miles. Now, I have a document here containing some information which I have obtained from the Coast and Geodetic Survey, and I should like to call the attention of my friend from Arkansas [Mr. DINSMORE] to it, but I understand that some opponents of this treaty say that all the Departments here are on the side of this scheme, as though every man connected with the Government was trying to do a wrong, and that nothing can be believed that comes from any Department.

Mr. DINSMORE. You do not mean that I said that, do you?

Mr. BERRY. No; but I have heard it talked around here that the Army and Navy people want to build up a great imperial government like Rome.

Mr. DINSMORE. The gentleman mentioned my name. Did he ever hear me make any such statement?

Mr. BERRY. No, I did not; but I want to talk to you now about your new route over to the Asiatic coast.

Mr. DINSMORE. I wish you would.

Mr. BERRY. I want to test you upon the question of seamanship. Speaking of the Aleutian Islands, the Superintendent of the Coast and Geodetic Survey, in this communication to me, says:

We know little more than the mere fact of their existence, for they had not been studied and charted; neither do any accurate surveys of those islands exist. The Hawaiian Islands are a midway station between California and the Australian continent, which is peopled by an English-speaking race. They are not far distant from the Marshall Islands and other groups of islands which are controlled by other than English-speaking nations. They are already the center of commercial enterprise. It must not be forgotten that between us and the vast trade of China lie Japan and Formosa, and until recently the Philippine Islands formed a continuation of these barriers. A good sailing route from Hawaii to China exists at all seasons of the year along the parallel on which Hawaii is situated.

Up in the region of which the gentleman from Arkansas speaks, in the extension of the Aleutian Islands toward the Asiatic shore, there are heavy currents. There is the great ocean tide that sweeps from Japan toward the Bering Sea, which, striking the lower temperature of that region, makes it so densely foggy that navigation in that country is not at all safe. Consequently it is very rarely used. That accounts for the milk in the coconut. Yet the gentleman brings in here a sort of triangle to demonstrate that to go from San Francisco up to the Aleutian Islands and down toward the Asiatic coast would be better than any other route. I think he had better communicate that to the department in the Treasury which has charge of such matters of navigation. It might become very useful to the Government and to our seafaring interests.

The guns that opened in Manila Bay the other day meant something to this country. Suppose that we had been fighting a stronger power than Spain and that our vessels had been defeated in that fight and been compelled to return to the United States for protection or repairs. How gladly would they have welcomed the little Hawaiian Islands, with the flag of the United States above them, as a harbor to which they could go in their distress.

And it is not improbable that such a contingency may arise before the conclusion of existing hostilities. I have great respect for our naturalized Germans. They are good citizens and soldiers and have contributed much to the glory of American arms. I would not question their loyalty for a moment.

Germany is assembling a large fleet about the Philippines. Suggestions are being made that she might protest against our actions in that quarter, and as we have our fighting clothes on, I do not know that there will be any more auspicious time to settle with Bill Hohenzollern than just now. We have 158 ships in commission; and if she feels disposed to interfere with the legitimate rights of Uncle Sam, let her come on—75,000,000 free men are ready to meet him. [Applause.] I saw in the paper this morning a picture of the Philippine Islands with Uncle Sam's hat hanging on the corner of a sign, and down below the Kaiser Wilhelm looking toward it, while Uncle Sam was there with a box of goods that he was going to sell to the natives to increase the commerce of this country. I would commend it to my friend from Arkansas [Mr. DINSMORE] simply as an illustration of what may happen within the next few years.

Mr. DINSMORE. I have thought for some time that my friend was getting his political convictions from the cartoons in the newspapers.

Mr. BERRY. Well, you will find before I get through that I have some better basis than that if you will listen with attention.

Now, I want to say that when we look at the map and see the journey of 13,000 miles that the *Oregon* made and remember that the dispatches were announcing every day that perhaps the enemy would meet her and destroy her, the necessity for the Nicaragua Canal becomes plainly apparent. It must be built; it will be built. The intelligence of the American people will build that canal. With the Island of Cuba lying in the mouth of the Gulf of Mexico, with the Windward Passage one side, the Island of Puerto Rico lying a little farther down, with the Mona Passage lying upon one side, and another passage upon the other side, those islands become indispensable, either as a part of our country or in the hands of a people who are friendly to the future of this country.

With the Nicaragua Canal constructed, the Hawaiian Islands under our flag, lying directly in the track of commerce with Asia, whether from our country or Europe, a commerce the magnitude of which can scarcely be estimated will be ours under liberal maritime laws, pouring untold wealth into our coffers, making our people rich and prosperous.

This being true, let us construct the Nicaragua Canal and annex the Hawaiian Republic freely offered us as a resting place in the Pacific for military and commercial considerations. These purposes accomplished, the future of this country is bright almost beyond conception. [Applause.]

SWEARING IN OF A MEMBER.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. DALZELL) laid before the House the credentials of Hon. William S. Greene, member-elect from the Thirteenth district of Massachusetts.

The credentials were read.

Mr. Greene appeared at the bar of the House, accompanied by Mr. LOVERING, and the Speaker pro tempore administered the oath of office.

GENERAL DEFICIENCY APPROPRIATION BILL.

Mr. CANNON, from the Committee on Appropriations, reported favorably the bill (H. R. 10691) making appropriations to supply deficiencies in the appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1898, and for prior years, and for other purposes; which was read a first and second time, referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, and, with the accompanying report, ordered to be printed.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED.

Mr. HAGER, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that they had examined and found truly enrolled a bill of the following title; when the Speaker signed the same:

H. R. 10682. An act making appropriations to pay the Bering Sea awards.

HAWAII.

Mr. HITT. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. SPALDING].

Mr. SPALDING. Mr. Speaker, I had allotted to me by the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Affairs fifteen minutes, which I surrendered to the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. BERRY]. Inasmuch as he was making a speech in opposition to the caucus of the Democratic party, I thought his remarks of more value than anything that I could say upon this subject. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. SULZER. Mr. Speaker—

Mr. WHEELER of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, I want to correct that statement. My colleague [Mr. BERRY] did not hear that statement. He was not making a speech in opposition to the

Democratic caucus; he was making a speech defining his own views. The gentleman said—

Mr. SPALDING. Excuse me.

Mr. ERMENTROUT. I think you ought to withdraw that statement.

Mr. SPALDING. I say that the caucus had recommended it; not that it was binding—

Mr. ERMENTROUT. It did nothing of the kind. It did not recommend anything.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that it is not a fit subject for discussion. Even if it does not offend the rules of the House, it does offend common decency to bring the action of the Democratic caucus upon this floor.

Mr. DINSMORE. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. RHEA].

Mr. RHEA of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, when the ardor of my colleague from Kentucky has cooled and he comes to the hour of reflection, I am sure he will share in common the regret with which his Democratic associates listened to his assault upon them for their action in attempting to define a policy and enforce it with their views upon the floor of this House. He summons the ghost of "King Caucus" in the ardor of his speech, only to face it with a declaration of his manly independence and want of fear. The time has been, Mr. Speaker, when the efficacy of Democratic expression of principle and the saving grace thereof was beautifully illustrated, and in the case of my colleague from Kentucky—

Mr. BERRY. As the gentleman has referred to my action, I suppose he refers to the fact that I was an advocate of the Blair bill for the education of the people of the United States, distributed according to illiteracy; but my party having taken a position upon it, or at least Mr. Watterson and Mr. Carlisle having done so, I abandoned it, although I believed in it.

Mr. RHEA of Kentucky. To ease the conscience of my colleague, I will state it had no reference to old Granny Blair's education bill, but to more recent occurrences in the history of the Democratic party in Kentucky.

Mr. BERRY. It is not a matter of easing my conscience.

Mr. RHEA of Kentucky. Now, Mr. Speaker, it is not my purpose in opposing the pending resolution to annex the Hawaiian Islands to the United States to enter upon the discussion of any real or fancied constitutional objections that lie in the way. I am moved by other considerations, founded in prudence and based upon interest, I trust and believe. There is nothing in common in the habits, customs, or civilization of those native to the islands and the people of the United States. Years of missionary effort from the standpoint of commercial endeavor or religious advancement demonstrate the fact that hope in either direction is abandoned.

Indeed, the descendants of the missionaries sent there to save souls, seeing the utter futility of further effort in that line, for some years seem to have been and still are engaged in a frantic attempt to swap the original stock of piety carried over to the natives for their property, and by this legislation to coin what is left on hand into pennies.

The annexation of these islands invites to this country and makes a part of it a race of people, tried by every standard of moral and physical well-being, wholly undesirable, and which can satisfy no want of ours, unless it be that greedy spirit of commercialism which threatens the foundation of our social organism and civil government.

I do not overdraw or add color to the picture, Mr. Speaker. I quote from an author whose opportunity to observe and know has been ample, whose reliability none will dispute, and whose intelligence all will admit. He writes in no unfriendly spirit to the people of the islands, and is the avowed friend and advocate of the policy of annexation. I refer to naval officer Lieut. Lucien Young, a gallant Kentuckian. He says the Hawaiian religion is the embodiment of bestiality and malignity that frequently lapses into crimes of lust and revenge. The various legends of their gods abound in attributes of the most excessive animalism and cruelty. Lewdness, prostitution, and indecency are exalted into virtues.

One feature of the religious or idolatrous worship of these people, he says, is the hula dance, which, he tells us, is "accompanied with chants of unspeakable foulness of diction and description, elaborated with foul wit and jest, and extolling impurity. A dancing debauch usually lasts all night, and as a rule ends in a promiscuous drunk."

Mr. BERRY. This allusion of Lieut. Lucien Young, United States Navy, whom I know very well, refers to the condition of that country previous to 1840, when idolatry was abolished.

Mr. RHEA of Kentucky. I shall cite Lieutenant Young, because, while it has been said that this sort of fetich has been abolished by law, he says that the people secretly cherish and continue in this practice.

Mr. BERRY. Well, Lieut. Lucien Young is one of the most earnest advocates of annexation in America.

Mr. RHEA of Kentucky. I was conceding that, and I gave an author entirely friendly to your scheme. So much this author

bespeaks for the moral status of the natives of these islands. As to their intelligence, he declares them to be entirely superstitious. They believe in sorcery, and are wont to make sacrifices of beasts and fowls to remove spells and eradicate disease. Such is the statement of this naval officer, based upon months of careful study and investigation of the condition and customs of these people.

Yet, Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from my own State who has just taken his seat makes a comparison between these people and the people of Georgia—naming that great Commonwealth—the people of the entire cotton belt of this Union, and even includes my own beloved Kentucky. He makes this comparison only that he may draw a contrast and declare that for educational facilities afforded, general diffusion of educational attainments and intelligence, the balance is in favor of the native islander.

His statement is based upon observation and information gained during a stay of four or five days on the islands and in Honolulu, the most of which time, by inference from his speech, was spent in witnessing the delights of the hula dance, which, if he does not commend as altogether charming, he has not condemned. The statement is monstrous, and for Kentucky and Kentuckians I repudiate it. Naval Officer Young again says the retrogression of the common people is everywhere in evidence on these islands, and further tells us that in a little over one hundred years the native population has decreased from 250,000 to less than 30,000 pure natives at the present time.

This certainly does not denote a vigorous race or one calculated to benefit this country. And there exists to-day upon these islands, Mr. Speaker, a population for the most part a mixture of the Chinese with the islanders, thus making a homogenous whole of moral vipers and physical lepers. This same author summarizes the entire situation and deplorable condition of these native islanders in this strong and thoughtful language:

Chastity has no recognition in the social organism, and, unlike other races, the female is aggressive in solicitation.

Mr. BERRY. I want to say to the gentleman if he would look about the streets of the capital of Washington he would see that there is more immorality south of Pennsylvania avenue than there is in the whole Hawaiian Islands.

Mr. RHEA of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, as an American Representative, if I knew that to be true, I would blush to herald it upon the floor of this House. I would not blazon to the world the degradation of the most vicious of American women. But I deny it, Mr. Speaker. I deny that here in the capital city of the greatest Government in the world American womanhood has fallen to such a standard. Oh, for shame, that you should speak such words!

Mr. BERRY. I did not know that the gentleman ever blushed.

Mr. RHEA of Kentucky. Well, the gentleman from Kentucky will find that my cheek is not so hard as his, and that it does not take the same motives and influences to bring me around to the right thing. I sincerely believe the occasion will never arise when my aspersions upon the women of my own land should bring the blush to my face, but for you I can and do. I dismiss this feature of the discussion, not because it is unimportant or unworthy serious consideration, but because time and the steady progress of Christianity and civilization might ameliorate, if not cure, these radical defects.

From a commercial standpoint, Mr. Speaker, our interest can not induce us to annex these islands and assume the heavy money burdens their proper policing and regulating would entail upon the people of this country. We now have treaty relations with them that give to us the fullest benefits to be derived from mutual trade. We buy largely more from them than we sell, and if it is proposed to take them and colonize them with American citizens, we gain no new customers and open no new fields for American products or manufactures to find a market in, with all the disadvantages of competition of cheap Chinese labor with our own workmen. Will this treaty last? Most assuredly it will, for every dictate of prudence and self-interest will impel the islanders to wish to adhere to it, and under its stipulations the right of entrance to Pearl Harbor at our own will and pleasure exists.

The necessity for their occupation and absolute control is urged. What necessity, Mr. Speaker, exists now, or has existed in the past? We are told by some, and seriously it seems, that the necessity to use them as a coaling station for our Pacific fleets, merchant and naval, exists. This reason ignores the fact that there is not a pound of coal on the islands, except such as is carried there from coal fields remote from them. If there is, it has escaped the hunt of man, who is ever on the search to find and utilize so useful and absolutely necessary an article of commerce, navigation, and manufacture.

To use the islands for that purpose, the coal must first be carried there on transports and stored for use. To at all times do this we must annex the open sea betwixt our coal ports and the islands, and fence it in, so that no hostile navy could ride the waves to molest our safe and easy travel. Otherwise, in war, the enemy's

war ships would beset our path and we would be compelled to send with every coal barge a full complement of our own war ships, and we would, indeed, realize that we must win our way through "bloody seas." Again, it is declared to be a defensive necessity from a war standpoint.

We are told that we need the islands as a kind of military break-water against attack on our western coast. Eminent military authority is offered for this statement. Both land and naval officers are produced to justify this claim. All honor, Mr. Speaker, to our soldiers on land and sea. I glory in their just fame. Their deeds of valor are known wherever civilized man is found. They have carried our glorious flag to victory in every land, on every sea where they have fought, from the day they wrested from Great Britain the power to longer enslave us to that May day just gone when they sent to the bottom of Manila Harbor a Spanish fleet with every man on board.

But, Mr. Speaker, the calm judgment of a free people who believe, aye, know, that "eternal vigilance is the price of liberty" realizes, and in the years to come, if not now, will so declare, that the military arm of the Government can not safely be intrusted with the duty of controlling and shaping its civil policy. The profession, the training, and tendency of military life forbids it. The tendency of the military, whether on land or sea, is toward aggression and ever toward imperialism. And, again, we are to be made believe that if the United States does not annex the Hawaiian Islands some other power will, either with the consent of the islands or without it, and by the force of its own army and navy.

Does anybody really believe this? Has not this country many times declared that it would view with alarm and treat as an hostile act any such attempt? It could never be done and would not be attempted by any government of the Old World, unless it was predetermined and known that it could only be done by conquering the resistance of the United States. If such a determination is ever reached, our present annexation and possession of the islands would not stay the government that so lusts for territory, for the same power that could overcome our resistance in the first instance could wrest our occupation and possession in the last, and neither would or could ever be accomplished.

What do we fear, Mr. Speaker, and whom? Certainly not the ghost of dead and forgotten Spain. The throes of internal discord and colonial revolutions have rendered this effete Kingdom powerless for harm. Does Germany threaten us? No. Her good sense will restrain any ambition she otherwise might indulge for conquest. Does France? Most assuredly not. Nor Russia, nor Prussia, nor Italy. No Eastern power threatens our Western supremacy. In the meantime the British lion licks the hand that twice smote him, and England's Queen sends greeting and begs us believe she is willing to join hands with us and march forth on a mission of conquest and plunder.

No, Mr. Speaker; no cloud flicks the horizon in token of the brewing storm. None will appear unless we, "forgetful, stray after little lures;" unless we forget that Jefferson told us to have friendly relations with all nations, entangling alliances with none; unless we mix up in the politics of the East, none will appear. Finally, Mr. Speaker, we are urged to take Hawaii anyhow; the islands are offered, and let us take them. Suppose we take them, what form of government under our system by our Constitution will we give them? Is it proposed, does anyone believe, would any member of this House consent, to go 2,200 miles from our shores into the Pacific Ocean and erect a State in the American Union? No one contemplates, none would consent to such a proposition. Conditions will not warrant the making of a Territory of these islands, for the Constitution would control in this case as in that of the State.

What, then, remains to be done? Nothing is left except a military government for them; and surely no American who is not forgetful of the teachings of our fathers, unmindful of the traditions of the past, and, I hope, our welfare in the future, will ever consent to have any portion of this country in such condition. To do it we must write a new policy, tear down every safeguard of a free people—a democratic form of government—and declare our Republic a sham and a delusion. We must affirm our faith to be: The military is of right and ought to be superior to the civil arm of the Government. When this time comes, farewell, my country; thy honor and thy glory have departed forever; thy strength proved thy weakness.

This land has been dedicated to freedom. Here and under our system no chains of class or prejudice can fetter the wings of aspiring, ambitious genius. Here in free America true worth, whether it comes heralded from the palaces of the rich or springs of its own unaided strength from the hovels of the poor, may hope to find its just reward. In the twinkling of an eye things have changed—a military satrapy is set up, a ruling class is constituted.

Mr. Speaker, by every memory of the past, by every hope for the future; in the name of my country, whose institutions and people I love and whose greatness and glory I share, I appeal to its

Representatives on this floor not to enter upon this policy of aggression, fraught, as so many believe, with danger at every step. Have regard for the promise given the world but recently, and hedged about with all the binding force and obligation that official utterance could lend it, when you said in your declaration of war against Spain that war was to be waged for freedom's sake, in the cause of humanity, that no purpose of conquest or gain animated the purposes of the United States. On this declaration we won the world's respect and confidence and the approving smile of Him who holds in the hollow of His hand the destiny of nations as He does of individuals. It seems, however, the die is cast, the determination is entered upon, and take these islands we will.

Mr. Speaker, what do we need them for and what will we do with them? I suppose we might fit them up in royal style as a sort of national vaudeville theater or up-to-date "Midway Plaisance," and by Congressional enactment interdict any cheap and mere vulgar imitations that shall take place, but that only the original and genuine Hulas may appear in all the glory and splendor of nakedness unadorned, and give to the denizens of this benighted country daily and nightly exhibitions of their innocent divertisement. Or rather, shall we throw off the mask, come into the open, and join in the cry, but feebly heard now, On to Manila, to Puerto Rico, to the Carolinas, to the Canaries; down with the people; on with the empire? Mr. Speaker, what sound is it I hear? Is it the coming of the "Man on Horseback"?

Mr. DINSMORE. I yield fifteen minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BALL].

Mr. BALL. Mr. Speaker, in the limited time allotted me I can not attempt a full or satisfactory discussion of the pending resolution. I would not speak at all did I not in my heart believe that the question under consideration involves the most crucial period in our national history, not excepting the fratricidal conflict between the States.

The glowing picture presented by those who would lightly set aside the traditional policy of this Government and enter upon a career of colonial aggrandizement supported by a great army and navy, is certainly no more alluring than was Napoleon's dream of universal empire. Let us hope that, once entered upon, the result may not prove equally disastrous.

Mr. Speaker, in opposing this measure I shall present for the consideration of the House three propositions only. The annexation of Hawaii by joint resolution is unconstitutional, unnecessary, and unwise. If the first proposition be true, sworn to support the Constitution, we should inquire no further. I challenge not the advocates of Hawaiian annexation, but those who advocate annexation in the form now presented, to show warrant or authority in our organic law for such acquisition of territory. To do so will be not only to subvert the supreme law of the land but to strike down every precedent in our history. I know, as was said by the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. DINSMORE], that the mention of the Constitution in this body often invokes a smile, and yet it can not be that a majority of this body agree with the insignificant few "that there is a higher law than the Constitution;" or with that former member of this House who, in his good fellowship, "did not think the Constitution should come between friends."

Why, sir, the very presence of this measure here is the result of a deliberate attempt to do unlawfully that which can not be lawfully done. The gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. TAWNEY], in a very able argument in support of annexation on March 15 last, rested his case upon the general power in our Constitution and the express power in the constitution of Hawaii, conferred upon the Presidents and Senates of the two countries, to conclude a treaty of annexation. Now that, in pursuance of those powers, the President has submitted the treaty to the United States Senate and has been unable to obtain the consent of two-thirds of that body, we are called upon to override the constitutions of both parties to the proposed contract in order that we may do this thing.

When Louisiana was acquired, when Florida was received, when Alaska came to us, no statesman connected with the executive or legislative branch of the Government dreamed the territory sought to be added to our possessions could be received, except by treaty duly ratified. In their desperation, grasping at shadows for substance, those who now resort to this subterfuge cite the admission of the imperial State from which I hail—Texas—as warrant and authority for their purpose.

Mr. Speaker, no one familiar with the history of that transaction should make such claim. Advocates of the annexation of Texas rested their case upon the express power conferred upon Congress in the Constitution to admit new States. Opponents of the annexation of Texas contended that even that express power did not confer the right to admit States not carved from territory already belonging to the United States or some one of the States forming the Federal Union. Whether, therefore, we subscribe to the one or the other school of thought in that matter, we can find no precedent to sustain the method here proposed for admitting foreign territory.

Members need only refer to the extended debates in Senate and House of Representatives while the annexation of Texas was being considered to be assured of the correctness of this conclusion. The original proposition as offered contemplated the formation of a State from certain prescribed limits within the territory embraced in the Republic of Texas, while the balance of the area of the Republic was to be ceded as territory to the United States. The treaty having failed of ratification by the Senate, annexation by joint resolution was resorted to, and the outcome of the whole matter was that the entire Republic of Texas was admitted as one State, with the right to carve therefrom four additional States, this being done for the purpose alone of coming within the constitutional power to admit new States and in recognition of the fact that territory could only be constitutionally acquired by treaty.

I have not time to review much that was interestingly said about the matter. I shall quote only a few of the opinions advanced during the discussion of that matter. The Senate committee on Foreign Affairs consisted of five members, four of whom questioned the right to admit new States out of foreign territory, claiming it could only be done by treaty, the other member of the committee admitting that foreign territory could only be acquired by treaty, but contending that Texas could be admitted as a State.

Mr. Walker, of Mississippi, claiming to be the author of the idea to have Texas admitted under the clause of the Constitution authorizing Congress to admit new States, said—

That he was rejoiced that the great American question of the reannexation of Texas was being presented on all hands on the grounds on which it was placed originally by him [Mr. Walker] in his Texas letter of the 8th of January, 1844.

He [Mr. Walker] then proposed, more than a year since, to admit Texas as a State of the Union by the action of Congress under that clause of the Constitution which authorizes Congress to admit new States into the Union. That clause was not confined to our then existing territory, but was without limitation, and the framers of the Constitution had expressly refused to limit the general power contained in this clause to the territory then embraced within the Union. The general power was in express words, and no man had a right to interpolate restrictions, especially restrictions which the framers of the Constitution had rejected.

Mr. Buchanan, of Pennsylvania, the dissenting member of the Foreign Affairs Committee, advocating the resolution, said:

All the reasoning and ingenuity in the world could not abolish the plain language of the Constitution, which declared that new States might be admitted by Congress into the Union.

Mr. Henderson, of Mississippi, Mr. Benton, of Missouri, and other able advocates of the annexation of Texas urged the same arguments in support of the measure.

In the House of Representatives Mr. Yancey, of Alabama, supporting the resolution, advanced the same line of argument. On the other hand, the opposition, insisting that the power to admit new States was confined to territory already belonging to the United States, put forward many able advocates.

Mr. Morehead, of Kentucky, speaking for the Foreign Affairs Committee of the Senate, contended—

In the case now under consideration it was not proposed by the joint resolution before the Senate that Texas should be acquired according to what he considered the constitutional mode of proceeding, by the treaty-making power. The proposition is for Congress to admit her as a State. Now—

He asked—

when this Government was about to add a foreign domain to ours, was there any other mode of accomplishing that object except by the interposition of the treaty-making power, composed of the President of the United States in conjunction with the Senate? Was it constitutional to annex Texas by the treaty which was submitted to the Senate last session?

He believed there were few, if any, constitutional objections made. If, then, the power to annex foreign territory by treaty does appertain to the treaty-making power, he should like to see upon what ground it could be held that the Congress of the United States possesses concurrent legislative power upon this subject. If that which it is competent for the treaty-making power alone to accomplish, the majority of a quorum of both Houses of Congress could accomplish. The argument, he apprehended, would be this, that as a constitutional mode of proceeding we do not deny that foreign territory can be admitted into this Union by the treaty-making power. But there is another clause in the Constitution which gives Congress the power to admit new States into the Union. He proposed now to consider what was the character of that article and upon what conditions it rests. [Mr. Buchanan: That is the true ground.] His friend from Pennsylvania said that was the question, and to it he proposed to call particular attention.

Mr. Choate for three hours reviewed the whole question, bringing to bear his knowledge of the Constitution and its formation and the history of the country, clothed in redundant adjectives. He denied that the clause in the fourth article in the Constitution giving the power to Congress of admitting new States into the Union was given with the most remote idea of its being ever applied to anything but domestic territory. Said he:

No man could believe that by that provision it was intended to confer the tremendous power of admitting new States in any part of the world without limitation as to habits, customs, language, principles, or anything but the semblance of republicanism. Until it was found the treaty of last session had no chance of passing the Senate, no human being save one, no man, woman, or child in the Union or out of the Union, wise or foolish, drunk or sober, was ever heard to breathe one syllable about this power in the Constitution of admitting new States being applicable to the admission of foreign nations, governments, or states. It was a new and monstrous heresy on the Constitution, got up not from any well-founded faith in its orthodoxy, but for the mere purpose of carrying a measure by a bare majority of Congress that could not be carried by a two-thirds majority of the Senate in accordance with the treaty-making power.

Mr. Speaker, I will not further quote from this discussion. The language used by Mr. Choate certainly applies with peculiar force to the proposition now pending, and the entire debate upon both sides of that proposition shows conclusively that the advocates of this measure have no ground to stand upon so far as the annexation of Texas is concerned.

The gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. PEARSON] and the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. GROSVENOR] seek to aid their contentions in favor of this measure by the decision of Chief Justice Marshall. Let us see if they are sustained thereby:

The course—

Said Judge Marshall—

which the argument has taken will require that in deciding this question the court should take into view the relation in which Florida stands to the United States. The Constitution confers absolutely upon the Government the powers of making war and of making treaties; consequently that Government possesses the power of acquiring territory either by conquest or by treaty.

Thus it will be seen, Mr. Speaker, that Chief Justice Marshall not only fails to sustain these gentlemen, but bases the acquisition of territory, either by conquest or treaty, upon the war-making and treaty-making powers conferred by the Constitution upon the Government. Certainly, the treaty having failed to pass, no gentleman will contend that we are attempting to take Hawaii by conquest or by the power to admit States. They must therefore stand with the chairman of the Foreign Affairs Committee [Mr. HITT], who insists, in substance, that the National Government has the inherent right to acquire territory in this manner. The Constitution having pointed out the several ways in which territory may be lawfully acquired, I for one decline to accept this new doctrine by which territory can eventually come into partnership with the States and have equal rights and representation on the floor of Congress and elsewhere without first running the gantlet of every constitutional safeguard.

Mr. Speaker, I shall even venture to differ with those who declare this measure to be a military necessity. Even the array of expert testimony they bring to their support is not conclusive. A leading member of the bar once defined unreliable testimony as of three classes: "Ordinary liars, accomplished liars, and expert witnesses." [Laughter.] While I do not accede to this classification, I do know that great military and naval authority is not agreed at all times. It is also true that only witnesses in the matter were called who favored annexation. Even then, as stated by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CLARK], General Schofield, upon cross-examination, admitted that Pearl Harbor, now possessed by this country, was the only harbor that could be successfully fortified and defended. I will say in passing that we possess this harbor by treaty that can not be abrogated except by the consent of this Government. Again, we should bear in mind that, by professional instinct, Army and Navy officers are naturally predisposed toward that policy which would make this country a great military and naval power.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Will the gentleman allow me an interruption?

Mr. BALL. Yes; certainly.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I want to make one statement, and it is the gospel truth, that every one of these statements in favor of annexation was an ex parte statement, and I believe that any ordinary lawyer, just a plain, ordinary, average lawyer, can take every one of these men and on cross-examination make him swear to the same thing that General Schofield swore to, that that is the only harbor that can be fortified.

Mr. BALL. All right, put that in my speech. Now, against their judgment we have the safest of all guides—experience. For more than fifty years the Atlantic Ocean has bounded our eastern, the Gulf and Republic of Mexico our southern, the Pacific our western, and the British possessions our northern borders. During this period we have made marvelous strides in progress, the development of our resources, and increase of population. We have waged the greatest of all wars in our own borders, placing in hostile conflict two armies either of which could have whipped the combined legions of Napoleon or Wellington.

Since then we have nearly doubled our resources and population, and even now we are demonstrating to the world that the foreign power which breaks our peace must whip every man within our borders from Maine to Texas, from New York to California, before they can successfully give us battle. Why, then, extend our borders more than 2,000 miles in the Pacific Ocean? To do so will be a breach of public and national faith.

December 19, 1840, Mr. Webster announced that—

The Government of the Sandwich Islands ought to be respected; that no power ought to take possession of the islands, either as a conquest or for purposes of colonization.

President Tyler, two years afterwards, reiterated the same doctrine.

In 1843 Secretary of State Legaré notified our minister to England—

That we had no wish to acquire or plant colonies abroad, but would, if necessary, feel justified in using force to prevent their acquisition by one of the great powers of Europe.

This, Mr. Speaker, has been our established policy. Twice England has occupied the islands and as often peacefully retired. Does anyone believe that in the face of all this that even a remote possibility exists that any foreign power would dare incur our displeasure by attempting to possess themselves of these islands?

I must pass on. Mr. Speaker, it is not only unwise that we annex Hawaii, to do so will be a blunder approaching the gravity of a crime. I know that by many it is not considered up to date to quote Mr. Washington, Mr. Jefferson, or Mr. Madison, and yet I can not believe that the great and unselfish advice of these men, to whom we owe so much, should be lightly set aside.

I would certainly, when in doubt, prefer to go to him who used his private means to aid the Government and declined to accept compensation as Commander of the Army and President of the United States, and refused a crown, rather than those who would convert a war for liberty and humanity into a vehicle of conquest and commercial gain. In his farewell message to the Congress he warned us against a large standing army and cautioned us against entangling foreign alliances. With patriotic, far-seeing statesmanship, he advised against political connection with any foreign nation, called attention to their interests involving them in controversies foreign to our concerns. Said he:

Our detached and distant situation invites and enables us to pursue a different course. Why—

He asked—

should we forego the advantages of so peculiar a situation? Why quit our own to stand on foreign grounds?

That we might be the more secure in our position, in 1823 Mr. Monroe startled the world by putting the nations of the earth on notice that we would not permit foreign powers "to extend their system to any portion of this hemisphere." These policies have become dear to the American people, without regard to party. Guided thereby, we have preserved our Government and outstripped all nations in the race for supremacy. We have surpassed every power maintaining a colonial policy, having none ourselves. We have seen the flags of monarchies go down in South America, Central America, and the islands of the sea, and flags over liberty-loving republics hoisted in their stead.

We have seen a foreign emperor left to his fate in Mexico upon a simple protest by us and upon the ruins of his throne a Republic created. What more can we ask? Why not continue along the line of our great destiny, settling our internal questions upon just and proper lines and developing our magnificent resources? What need have we for the sugar lands of Hawaii? Thirty-six thousand square miles of sugar land in Texas, as fertile as the valley of the Nile, await development. Louisiana calls for money and men to quicken her fertile soil, while Nebraska and other beet-sugar producing States demand our attention. Only the other day the Washington Post stated:

Imperial Texas can produce food products for the entire population of the United States.

Yes, and furnish the wool and cotton to clothe them and the leather to shoe them. The gentleman from Indiana [Mr. JOHNSON] a short while ago in this House made a correct statement "that Texas could receive the population of the Union without being crowded." Do you, gentlemen, not find it difficult now to frame laws that will satisfy Maine and Texas, California and Louisiana, Minnesota and South Carolina, Pennsylvania and Alabama? Why, the first thing they found when we captured Manila and desired to collect their customs, was that the Dingley bill, whose authors promised universal prosperity, was not adapted to the Philippine Islands and we retained the Spanish laws.

Enthusiasts may paint glowing pictures of Hawaii, but the stubborn fact remains—that white men can not work under a tropical sun. They may prate of Americanizing it, but can not deny that under American influence for nearly three-quarters of a century there are no more than 2,000 American male citizens, less even than the number of lepers there now. They can not controvert that out of a population of about 110,000, more than two-thirds are men, 40,000 are Hawaiians, 24,000 are Japanese, 22,000 are Chinese, 15,000 are Portuguese, 1,000 are South Sea Islanders, 4,000 are white foreigners, and only 3,000 are Americans, male and female. Such as these we have legislated against; such as these we do not desire as competitors with free-born American laborers.

To take Hawaii, therefore, means not only to change our traditional policy as to colonial aggrandizement and abolish the Monroe doctrine, but it means to absorb a population that are alien to our form of government and strangers to our institutions. It means that the American flag, consecrated to the cause of liberty, shall float over a people where there can be no "union of hearts nor union of hands;" where the principle that "all men are created equal" must stand aside, while the franchised few must control the disfranchised many. Hawaii is but the entering wedge for other colonial possessions. What right have we to change a policy that has turned the eyes of the liberty loving of every land to our shores as an asylum for the oppressed?

Dare we take the chances for all time to come when so little is

at stake on the one side, our all on the other? If we stand by the faith, keep in the paths our fathers trod, not a hundred years hence 250,000,000 American citizens within our present borders will command the peace of the world and shape its civilization.

May God forbid that we take passage upon an unknown sea, and when, too late, we are asked from the watchtowers of liberty and free government, "Sentinels, what of the night?" we may not be able to say, "All is well." [Applause.]

Mr. HITT. I yield ten minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. ADAMS].

Mr. ADAMS. Mr. Speaker, I had not intended addressing the House on this question, because when the appropriation bill for the Post-Office Department was pending I availed myself of that opportunity to answer the argument of the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. JOHNSON] on this subject. Having had my full say on that occasion, I have nothing to add now except to say that the arguments which I before advanced, so far as relates to the strategic position of these islands for the protection of the Pacific coast, have been emphasized and strengthened by the events which have since taken place. That particular phase of the question in connection with these islands has been called to our attention by the necessities of the present war and the capture of the Philippine Islands.

My object in rising to-day is to answer some of the remarks made by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GILLET] in regard to the resolutions which he introduced and which were referred to our committee, making during a time of war the private property of the enemy at sea free from capture. The subcommittee to which those resolutions were referred felt obliged to refuse him, although a member of the committee, a favorable report. I had the honor to be the chairman of that subcommittee. The gentleman from Massachusetts, in a very able presentation of the subject delivered in this House a few days ago, presented arguments in favor of that doctrine. I am perfectly willing to admit that the higher trend of international law tends in that direction. The later writers all express the hope that it will soon become the recognized law among nations for their government during time of war. But these higher principles must be recognized and find their place as international law during times of peace. They must be agreed to by conventions of the different nations whose plenipotentiaries will pledge themselves for the future that this rule of law shall be carried out.

This identical rule was submitted to the convention in Paris in 1856, and the powers therein represented declined to adopt this rule that private property or merchant ships should be free at sea the same as private property is acknowledged to be exempt from capture on land except under stress of military circumstances. It was the United States that maintained that this doctrine should be put in full force when the proposition was made that privateering should no longer be tolerated. The convention of 1856 adopted a rule that thereafter privateering should not be allowed by the powers when at war; but the United States declined to join in that agreement because the further doctrine was not conceded that all property on merchant vessels should be free from capture on the high seas.

When the resolutions of the gentleman from Massachusetts came before the subcommittee, they were carefully weighed. We could not give them our approval in view of the course of Spain during the present war, for there has been no response on the part of Spain to the higher rule which was intended to prevail for the conduct of war at present and in the future.

When President McKinley issued his proclamation of April 5, 1898, he laid down the doctrine that privateering would not be carried on by our Government, in compliance with the rule laid down by the Paris convention in 1856. Although our Government was not a party to that agreement, and was not bound by it, he took high ground and planted our country upon that doctrine. All honor to him and all honor to our country for the advanced doctrine of international law to which we committed ourselves.

But, Mr. Speaker, how was this declaration of President McKinley responded to on the part of Spain? I call attention to the royal decree issued by the Spanish Government April 23, 1898, a copy of which we obtained from the foreign office of Great Britain, we ourselves not being in a position to obtain it. In Article I of that royal decree, issued by the Queen Regent, she states that all treaties heretofore existing between the United States and Spain are absolutely abrogated, including the solemn obligation laid down in the treaty of 1895, that when war breaks out between the two countries, American merchants shall have one year in which to close up their business and get out of Spain. Thus Spain absolutely breaks down the provision of that treaty which was to stand even during a time of war.

Article II, instead of allowing a period of thirty days, which President McKinley allowed in his proclamation for Spanish ships to clear from our ports and reach their destination, allows but five days after the publication of that decree for our ships to escape from Spanish ports.

Furthermore, in our deliberate judgment, we could not allow these resolutions of the gentleman from Massachusetts to be reported favorably to the House, because Spain, instead of responding to the high position taken by our country in regard to privateering, in reply to the inquiry of the Government of France whether she would not be bound by the provisions of the treaty of 1856 and not resort to privateering, absolutely declines to accede to that proposition. I cite the language of Article IV and Article V.

ART. IV. The Spanish Government, while maintaining their right to issue letters of marque, which they expressly reserved in their note of the 10th of May, 1857, in reply to the request of France for the adhesion of Spain to the declaration of Paris relative to maritime law, will organize for the present a service of "auxiliary cruisers of the navy," composed of ships of the Spanish mercantile navy, which will cooperate with the latter for the purposes of cruising, and which will be subject to the statutes and jurisdiction of the navy.

ART. V. In order to capture the enemy's ships, to confiscate the enemy's merchandise under their own flag, and contraband of war under any flag, the royal navy, auxiliary cruisers, and privateers, if and when the latter are authorized, will exercise the right of visit on the high seas and in the territorial waters of the enemy, in accordance with international law and any regulations which may be published for the purpose.

For these reasons, Mr. Speaker, as there is no response on the part of Spain to the position taken by our Government denying to her the right to use privateers in the prosecution of this war, we felt it was impossible, however much we might sympathize with the high aspirations to which the resolutions tended, to report them favorably. We felt that under the terrible strain of existing war we could not deprive ourselves of the right of capturing our enemy's property when found on the high seas. Furthermore, the last clause of the resolution was retroactive in character and declared that prizes already captured by the gallant men of our Navy should be restored to Spain. Anyone will see that it was impossible to report such a resolution as that. In the first place, it would be *ex post facto*; and in the next place, it would be depriving men of vested rights which they had already acquired under the laws of our country by captures on the high seas in a time of war.

Mr. Speaker, I will not detain the House any longer, but simply wished to state for the information of the House why the subcommittee of the Committee on Foreign Affairs could not favorably report the resolutions offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. HITT. I yield to the gentleman from New York [Mr. Low].

Mr. LOW. Mr. Speaker, I have, like all Americans, been opposed to the acquisition of territory.

Colonial possessions never had any charm for the American people, who have always thought that this republican form of government, under which they have lived and prospered, could be perpetuated with less friction without extending its present area and bearing the burdens of remote dependencies.

The question which challenges this nation at the present time is not what our country wants, but what it needs to maintain its elevated status among the nations of the earth. Any additional territory that could not strengthen this great Republic should not be annexed.

The question of annexing the Hawaiian Islands can not be fairly determined without considering the absolute necessities required to make a navy effective in time of war. At this time permit me, Mr. Speaker, to state that until the present period our Navy has not had from the Government that attention which it should have received. When the tocsin of war sounded a few weeks ago, the first cry of the nation was, "Our Navy;" but when the people looked for it they found that arm of our country's offense and defense numerically weak. Instantly drastic methods were employed to strengthen our fleets and relieve a situation which caused the blush of shame to mount the cheeks of all American citizens.

But we have seen the last of a feeble navy. From now on it will be increased until it will be double its present size and strength and ten times as large in its "torpedo branch." [Applause.] This is a demand of the people not only from the interior but from those living on our coast lines.

Mr. Speaker, the resolution which is before the House has been ably debated for and against annexation. The distinguished chairman of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, in presenting the affirmative side, gave an array of facts so clearly defined that, to my mind, they answered in advance all objections to annexation.

But if the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. HITT], through oversight, did omit some reasons why the Hawaiian Islands should be annexed, they were remembered by his ardent supporters who followed him in debate. I was very much interested last Saturday while listening to the able address delivered by my genial friend from Arkansas [Mr. DINSMORE]. His special reference to the availability of Kiska Harbor (situated in one of the westerly islands of the Aleutian group) as a coaling and supply station for our naval fleets, his limited statement of the climatic conditions along that chain of islands, together with his elucidation of the great circle route for trans-Pacific commerce, brought to my mind some facts that should supplement the statement which the gentleman made at that time.

The gentleman was correct in his statement that the great circle route which passed near Kiska was shorter from San Francisco to China and the East Indies than via Honolulu. He was right when he stated that the mercury never fell low enough to form ice in the harbor of Kiska. But there are other conditions and important facts about this northern route to China and this Kiska land which the gentleman did not embody in his remarks last Saturday.

I have here a copy of weather observations made by masters of vessels cruising in the vicinity of Kiska, which I ask to have printed in the RECORD as part of my remarks. I find it recorded in this copy that during the month of January it blows a gale 40 per cent of the time, and 50 per cent of the month is foggy. In July, gale of wind none, but 100 per cent of that month is foggy weather. The gentleman from Arkansas, when he spoke of the moderate temperature in the winter at Kiska, did not tell you that it blew a living gale of wind nearly half the time, and that the other half of the time the fog is so thick (using a sailor's expression) that a nail could be driven into it; and he did not tell you that the sea up there was heavier and more trying to a vessel than in any other part of the Pacific Ocean.

Nice place for a coaling and supply station! Why, if one of our fleets should put in there for supplies it would, between heavy gales and dense fogs, be as effectually sealed up as is the Spanish fleet to-day at Santiago de Cuba by the sunken *Merrimac*. [Applause.] And yet the Democratic party claims this to be a suitable coaling station. Now, about this great circle route from our coast to and from China. I have been reliably informed by shipmasters who have cruised up in the Bering Sea that this northern circle route is never taken by either steam or sailing vessels going to and from China on account of the heavy fogs, heavy gales, and rough sea. They go farther south some 200 to 300 miles.

Why, a shipmaster told me the other day that even trading vessels that have occasion to pass near the Aleutian Islands never enter Kiska Harbor unless compelled by stress of weather. The Island of Kiska is absolutely without natural resources. It is a damp, cold, bleak place, enveloped by arctic fog and with its shores lashed by a perpetual angry sea. If any anti-annexationist thinks he has found an Eden in Kiska, let him go there and live. He will not find a helpmate there to take charge of his home and share the burdens of an arctic life. The pilot chart issued by the Hydrographic Office states that:

A large portion of the tonnage engaged in trans-Pacific commerce passes back and forth along tracks varying in length, between San Francisco and Yokohama, from 4,700 to 5,500 sea miles, in a lane lying between 25 degrees and 35 degrees of north latitude.

A distance north of Honolulu from 240 to 840 miles.

Now, the fact of it is the Hawaiian Islands are reasonably near the great ocean highway or path between our coast on the west and Asia's shores on the east. More vessels go over this route than any other.

The geographical position of these islands is most convenient and easily reached from the Philippine Islands or from any part of the Pacific coast of North America.

Honolulu, the largest and principal seaport, is well adapted for commerce and it is easily fortified. We do not want these islands any nearer our coast, neither any farther from it. They are not too far north, neither too far south.

The islands have abundant resources, and they are also well adapted for a supply station. We want the islands now, not only for commerce, but for strategic purposes. Their value in the latter direction will increase with the march of time, for the great oriental problem, yet to be solved, will make the Northern Pacific Ocean a theater of active operations and resolute strife among the great nations of the earth for the next fifty years.

Should we fail to annex these islands at the present time, this Congress would, to say the least, commit an unpardonable sin against the liberty-loving people throughout the world. [Applause.]

Weather observations made by masters of vessels in the 5-degree square, 50°-55° north latitude, 175°-180° east longitude, containing Kiska Island.

	Jan.	Feb.	Mar.	Apr.	May.	June.	July.	Aug.	Sept.	Oct.	Nov.	Dec.
WINDS.												
Number of observations...	5	4	9	8	10	15	21	16	13	9	3	6
Percentage above force 6 (moderate gale and over).	40	25	33	0	0	7	0	19	54	11	66	17
WEATHER.												
Number of observations....	2	6	7	3	4	17	11	7	2	2	0	3
Percentage of mist and fog.	50	17	14	33	25	76	100	57	50	0	0	0
Mean temperature (degrees).....	38	32	35	34	46	43	46	48	42	42	38	33
Number of squalls.....	0	2	2	1	1	1	0	1	0	1	0	2

No ice reported.

Mr. DINSMORE. I yield to the gentleman from New York [Mr. BRADLEY].

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

Mr. HITT. Mr. Speaker, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. LINNEY].

Mr. LINNEY. Mr. Speaker, when this discussion began I was opposed to the annexation of the Hawaiian Islands. However, I have listened attentively with a view to getting what light I could from the active operation of the dry search lights on both sides of this House during the debate on this great question, and I have come to the conclusion that it is not only harmless, so far as jeopardizing the peace or life of this nation is concerned, but that especially now it is absolutely essential that we should annex the Hawaiian Islands.

Mr. Speaker, in 1845 it was asserted by the opponents of the annexation of Texas that territorial aggrandizement would make the Republic so great that it would burst of its own weight. At that time there had been four Presidents of the Lone Star Republic. Sam Houston was the first, Mr. Lamar was the second, Sam Houston again the third, and Dr. Anson Jones the fourth. It is said that an ardent opponent of annexation in hurling his anathemas against the Democratic party, which then favored annexation, said he believed that the Democrats would favor the annexation of hell, even if they had to make his satanic majesty President of the Republic in order to accomplish it.

Mr. GAINES. You should apply that to the Republicans now.

Mr. LINNEY. Annexation of Texas, however, took place, and what was the result? It not only added strength to the Republic, but it made the Democracy of that time more popular than that party had ever been before.

But, Mr. Speaker, I place my vote upon this ground: There is no danger of hazarding either the peace or safety of this Republic by annexing the Hawaiian Islands. Let me endeavor to make this clear, as it seems to me that there is no danger. We can reach out, I believe, with absolute safety as far as these islands. In fact, we have a precedent in the matter. It has been tested and we have had the experiment. We began with thirteen separate and distinct republics, did we not, the thirteen original States, all located east of the Mississippi River?

This noble system involves the idea of many in one, *E pluribus unum*. We know that when we have forty-five States there is more security and safety to the life of the Republic than there was when we had thirteen. There were four prosecutions for high treason and three convictions when there were only thirteen States in the Republic. Since we have had so many more—leaving out the unhappy struggle between the States, which was a war of necessity and in no way involved the question of high treason—there has not been a single prosecution for high treason since we had the many additional States.

So that, Mr. Speaker, the idea that controls me is that the matchless system which we have, which Jefferson called the world's best hope and which I will add is the world's only hope, has been made the more secure by the annexation of States. Being founded upon the idea of many in one, forty-five separate and distinct States, if the Hawaiian Islands shall be made one and Alaska made into twenty more, we may run it up to a hundred different States, and every State we add being in itself a separate and distinct organization, with its executive, judicial, and legislative departments; each new State is an additional prop, an additional safeguard for the protection of the life of the nation and of good order within its boundaries.

Mr. MAGUIRE. Will the gentleman vote for an amendment to this bill giving statehood to Hawaii upon the adoption of the proper constitution?

Mr. LINNEY. Oh, I have no time to enter into a discussion of that kind now.

Mr. MAGUIRE. I thought not.

Mr. LINNEY. But I say this, that the Hawaiian Islands might be made into a State without making this Government any the less secure, when its population justifies it. This great Government, with its hundreds of thousands of little kings in the Republic, could include Hawaii without any danger; but there is no necessity of going that far now, and perhaps the question of its admission into the union of States may not arise in the next century.

We already have territory more remote from the capital here than the Hawaiian Islands. Now, let us see. Run a line from Washington City to the Hawaiian Islands. Then run a line to the more remote portions of the Territory of Alaska, and you will find that it is much farther to that part of Alaska than it is to the Hawaiian Islands. So that I respectfully submit that the question of the remoteness of the islands does not affect this matter.

But, let us see again. Having demonstrated, it seems to me, with mathematical certainty that the adding of one more State to our noble system, which is a system of many in one, does not affect its peace or jeopardize its life, I wish to discuss another question, and that is the military aspect of the case.

Our great Republic, comprised of many smaller republics which we call States, as long as each remains in its proper sphere, incurs no additional jeopardy, either as to good order or as to national life, by the admission of any number of States. Another thought here is this: When these islands shall have been annexed the entire extent of the authority of this great Republic will not embrace in any direction over one-seventh part of the universe. The suggestion that the character of the inhabitants of the islands makes it undesirable to have annexation has but little force. Undoubtedly it were desirable that none but the highest type of manhood shall exist there, such as the American type.

But the American type was produced by a commingling of the blood of the different nationalities of the world, and in time to come the same causes may produce like results in these islands. I know some of the most robust intellects now live there. It was my pleasure to hear the Hon. Lorrin A. Thurston, of Honolulu, deliver an elaborate argument in favor of annexation. The effort was a creditable one indeed. In the town of Taylorsville, where I live, one of the most intelligent ladies I have ever seen resides. She lived for many years on the Hawaiian Islands with her husband, the late lamented Rev. Thomas G. Thurston. Desiring all the information I could get on this great question, I addressed her, and I have in my possession her reply, which I will present as a part of my remarks:

TAYLORSVILLE, N. C., June 10, 1908.

DEAR SIR: I have so little time in which to answer your letter I fear that I can not give you much light on the subject of your questions. As to the first question: How long did Mr. Thurston and family live on the islands? His parents, Rev. Asa Thurston and Lucy, his wife, sailed from Boston on the brig *Thaddeus* the 23d of October, 1819, and arrived at Honolulu March 31, 1820. Father never returned to New England, but came as far east as San Francisco for his health in 1833. He died at Honolulu in 1838, over 80 years of age. Mother Thurston survived him a few years, dying in 1876, being 81 years old. They had five children—three daughters and two sons—all of whom were educated in the United States. They then returned to the islands and spent the greater part of their lives there. The second daughter, the only survivor of the family, is still living in Honolulu. In answer to the second question—the social, moral, and intellectual status—I state the following: The condition of the Sandwich Islanders on the arrival of Father and Mother Thurston in 1820 was pitiable in the extreme. From a nation variously estimated by Captain Cook and others at 300,000 to 400,000 people, they had been reduced by wars, bloodshed, and vices, which follow evil passions, to about 150,000.

Disease, drunkenness, and debauchery had so weakened and prostituted their powers as to place them in a forlorn and almost hopeless condition. To human vision there was a sickening prospect before the missionaries. The grossest forms of idolatry abounded. Filial affection was unknown. Infanticide was universal, and captives taken in war were slain by thousands as sacrifices to the gods, or buried alive beneath the temples. With these filthy, naked, besotted creatures and their degraded surroundings before them, this brave band looked upon Hawaii. Father and Mother lived to see more than 50,000 converts to Christianity upon the islands and a degree of civilization established which compares favorably with the Christianized nations of the earth.

From the lowest depth of heathenism they beheld a nation raised to power, influence, and respect, with a commerce stretching over seas and turning its wealth even upon the nation which produced and sent out its benefactors. They saw from the vilest idolatrous superstition a marvelous growth of religious ideas, a degree of civilization of such marked advancement as to astonish the world. We desire to place no improper emphasis on human agencies. But if there ever has been one grand effort to elevate mankind more free from criticism than another, it is the Sandwich Island Mission. The third question: Is the island a healthy, pleasant place to live in? On their landing, revolting as the picture seemed, there was a ray of light that pierced the darker background. The natural beauty was charming. The climate was delightful. The breezes were mild and healthful, and now invite many from the colder climate of the States. The grand mountains and volcanoes that now attract the tourist are counted among the wonders of the earth. At that time there was no anticipation of the delightful homes and genial society that in late years have given to these islands a charm.

If these hastily gotten together facts will be of any interest to you, I will be very glad, as I am immensely interested in the islands and all born on her soil.

Respectfully,

Alice G. STEVENSON.

Mr. LINNEY.

Mr. Speaker, I have been honored with an acquaintance with this great woman for several years. Her high social excellence and her robust intellectuality prove conclusively that she knows what she is talking about and that every word she has written in this letter is entitled to credit. In view of the many harsh criticisms that have been hurled against the missionaries in this debate, I consider myself fortunate indeed to be able through this splendid agency to present the facts to this House and the country as they appear in this letter.

I can not escape the conclusion, drawn from the prospect of a higher civilization of the inhabitants of the islands and the natural resources of the country, that there is a bright prospect for the Hawaiian Islands. The sketch Mrs. Stevenson has given us of the topography of the country is indeed charming. The diversity of climate and production of the country, embracing everything from the tall, perpetually snow-clad peaks of the mountains on through almost every climate and vegetable growth to the sugar and banana farms, is simply without a parallel in the world. No country is better calculated to promote and reward industry, to foster genius and fire the imagination, and thus insure domestic happiness and State pride, than these islands.

What objection can there be, then, to annexation? Even if the island is a remote speck in the midst of the sea, why may it not be annexed as a territory, and finally admitted as a part of one of the

States, or, if that is impracticable, why may it not be admitted and remain as a Territory until such time as its population, both in character and numbers, shall justify its admission as a State of the Union? It is an inspiring thought to observe the sacred regard the States have for the rights of the Federal Government, because upon the recognition of these rights and powers each State depends for safety in time of war. What a poor figure would the armies of the States cut without this more perfect Union for common defense under the Constitution!

Forty-five different armies, depending upon the condition of the treasuries of the several States, would present a gloomy prospect for national defense or for an invasion. On the other hand, the Federal Government is equally as cautious in the exercise of powers tending to emasculate the States, and should be. Just a few days ago Congress was called upon to provide legal machinery for the soldiers to vote on the field of battle, and the act limits the voting to Federal offices, and that, too, in strict conformity to the election laws of the several States. The nation is safer and more competent to protect itself against sedition, domestic turbulence, and to resist foreign invasion with forty-five States than when we had only thirteen States.

In fact, the leading purpose of the present Constitution, adopted after the Revolution, was to provide for the "common defense" of the Republic of many States. Our Revolutionary ancestors, fresh from the great struggle for independence, saw the infirmities that clung to the system under the Articles of Confederation, and they, early in the nation's life, attempted to remedy these defects by bringing about a more perfect union, which, under the Constitution, could make its entire available war force felt when the safety of the Republic required it. There is, therefore, no danger likely to arise to the General Government merely from the multiplicity of States, except from the frightfully large and ungovernable House of Representatives which might spring out of a great number of States.

This mischief, however, could be remedied by reducing the representation of the various States. The laws of each State may not be the same; indeed, they are not the same. The will of the people of the several States is made omnipotent through the various State legislatures in framing laws which the local needs and conditions of each State may require. When the Lone Star Republic came into the Union as the State of Texas, she lost none of her rights and powers possessed by her as a republic with a president. The legislature of the State performs about the same functions after admission into the Union as a State that the Lone Star Republic could have done as a republic.

Both the State of Texas and the Republic of the United States were greatly benefited by this admission as a State. The Lone Star Republic took unto itself all the power of the United States to protect it from foreign aggression, and this reciprocal duty only imposed upon the State of Texas the payment of her proper share of national burdens. Now, suppose we had territory enough to make ten more States of Texas, does anyone doubt that all could with perfect safety be associated under the Constitution of the United States? Each State retains all the governmental machinery necessary for the protection of its citizens at home, and by this federal unity each State is made the more powerful in war. But it is insisted that annexation of the Hawaiian Islands is not the result of purchase or conquest, nor has it the sanction of the people of the Hawaiian Islands. Let us see about that.

For many months the authorities of the Republic of Hawaii have been active in trying to effect annexation with the United States. The Queen was the head of the government which preceded the present Republic. She is now exercising no power or claim of right as sovereign of the islands. She is now boarding at one of the hotels in this city. She is sometimes seen on our beautiful streets unattended with that splendor which crowned heads observe wherever royalty is enthroned. She in various ways has recognized the existence of the present Republic of Hawaii. But, Mr. Speaker, the question of the existence in these islands of a Republic seems to me can not now arise. If the Republic exists that now asks annexation, then all the wailings we have heard here about forcing the people of these islands into annexation with the United States amount to nothing.

For that Republic, through its properly constituted authorities now governing the island, is more anxious for annexation than we are. In fact they have labored as faithfully for that result as the Lone Star did before succeeding in obtaining admission into the United States as a State. I submit that it appears to this House that the whole people of the island have recognized the existing government there as the legal one. There is the executive, the President, Dole; the legislative, and the judicial departments of government, all exercising all the functions properly belonging to them, and all supported by the people. They are but the agencies of the people there in governing themselves. The taxes necessary to support this government are paid by the people. The courts are open and are sought by the people to adjudicate their private differences.

No revolt exists there against the constituted authorities with which we are now dealing. It is in law a time of peace there. The Supreme Court of the United States, in *Ex parte Milligan's Case*, held "that when the courts are open in judgment of law it is a time of peace." Then I maintain that a time of peace can not exist in any country without the existence of a government, and that, too, of the ruling power at the time. True, it may be only a de facto Government, but the acts of a de facto Government are valid as to judgments between its citizens. But this Government is more than de facto; it is de jure.

No one doubts that Queen Liliuokalani once ruled of right, but she now recognizes the existing Government there. She is a beneficiary of that Government. She looks to it for support. Its treasury pays her an annuity. She is now a loyal subject of the Republic of Hawaii with which we are now dealing. There is no organized armed resistance to its authority. Therefore it seems to me that these conditions establish the fact that the present governing power in Hawaii is the legal one, and it exists to-day as a Republic by the consent of the governed there. It does not matter that all did not vote or all were not allowed to vote.

There is no State in the Union to-day that does not restrict the exercise of the right of suffrage by its citizens. Even in North Carolina, probably the freest people on the globe, the laws exclude certain classes from voting. The insane, the felon, those who do not register, females, minors, and others. Many of the States have property and educational qualifications. In all these States no sound mind would question the validity of existing State government for that reason. Some of the States of the Union elect Congressmen by an average vote of 40,000. There are States in the Union where nine-tenths of the qualified electors vote. In others very little over one-third of the qualified electors find their way to the ballot box. Still it is a time of peace there. The courts are open for the transaction of business. Judgments against felons, taking, it may be, the life of the felon, are executed, and no one questions the existence of a State government there. So with these islands. They have restrictions on the right of suffrage. These are very numerous, probably wisely so. Whether wisely or not, the blessings of the present Government there are showered on all alike, and all are acquiescing in this authority, recognizing it and supporting it.

But suppose it should turn out that we have not treated with the proper authorities there. Suppose, for the argument, President Dole is not the legal President. Then how stands the case? If we get peaceful possession thereof, what government on earth has a better title? Once peaceably in possession, with the consent of the people now in possession, the rapidity with which the great natural defenses that exist there may be made available will soon plant the American flag there so deep and strong that it will not be shaken by the unfriendly breath of other powers. Indeed, with a little outlay of revenue the mighty marble and granite mountains, against which the waves of the ocean have been lashing ever since time began without subduing them, will become the mighty Gibraltar of this Republic.

The advantages accruing to a nation of possessing points desirable for military operations are indeed great. Look at the rock of Gibraltar, once owned by Spain, but since 1704 by England. The combined fleets of France and Spain spent their fury against the English garrison occupying Gibraltar for three years and seven months. From 1779 to 1783 the attention of the world was fixed on this great struggle. But while this wonderful fleet, with many thousands of soldiers, perished in the assault, only sixteen of the garrison defending Gibraltar perished.

Thus it appears that the advantages of a strong military post to any nation can not be estimated. It is said, however, that the mission of our great Republic is one of peace. Still, the infirmities that belong to humanity in general are seen in this Republic. All nations must have war. Foreign war is the natural motion of a nation. It seems that without war every generation the nation becomes diseased. If even this Republic is deprived of this motion, foreign war, for a century it would probably be assailed by that most dreaded national distemper—civil war. Foreign war, if successful, strengthens a nation and the heroic spirit of its people.

Civil war injures a nation, like the fever heat that takes away the light and life of the eye of the natural body. All the nations of the earth are subject to this law of natural motion, as much as it is to be deplored. No nation can be truly great, it seems, whose business is not largely of the heroic character. Our Republic has not yet secured the blessings of universal peace to mankind; indeed, can not do so. It may be that with us, as other nations, we can be greatest when we have the greatest number of citizens able to wear a helmet. The results of the war with Spain may require further demands on the martial spirit of our people.

The annexation of Hawaii and the conversion of its mountains into an American Gibraltar is probably the wisest thought of the President and our War Department. It does not follow that we are to extend our possessions by conquest. The Philippine Islands

need not be added. I should say must not be annexed at all. Still the United States should not pay the expense of this war when we are victorious. It may be that we will have to rely upon the possession of the Philippine Islands for a while as a means of war indemnity. I have read somewhere of the expression, a "bayonet mortgage."

The people of these United States will never consent to the payment of the expenses of this war which the cruelties of Spain on the Island of Cuba and the unparalleled atrocity of the crime of Spain in the harbor of Havana in blowing up the Maine made necessary. In enforcing our just demands for indemnity and for wars in the future, the causes of which are now unseen, the possession of the Hawaiian Islands is a military necessity. All nations of the earth, it seems, are strengthening their navies. The "web-footed warriors," as President Lincoln called them, may be in great demand in the future.

Although it has been the prayer of the best thinkers of the world for six thousand years that the spears shall be beaten into pruning hooks and the swords into plowshares, still the great warriors of all countries are its worshiped heroes, almost as much so to-day as they have been at any period of the world's history. A display of courage such as Admiral Dewey, Ensign Worth Bagley, and Richmond Pearson Hobson proved themselves to possess will ever be ranked among the noblest qualities of the soul.

Amid the earthly glory that attends the achievements of the hero, the distresses and calamities of wars lose their horrors. All the old nations of the world have overproduction of human muscle. They want employment for their surplus population. Add the glory of arms to the necessity for employment, and the profession of arms, even in this enlightened civilization of the world, may in the future as in the past be the greatest business of life.

That these United States may be able to command the respect of all the warlike powers of the earth and be absolutely secure against foreign invasion, and to possess the ability to protect the nation's honor when assailed, I think it the part of wisdom and prudence to accept the proposition of the Republic of Hawaii to become a part of these United States. I shall therefore vote for these resolutions.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. HITT. I yield ten minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. PARKER].

Mr. PARKER of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, if we shall determine to annex the Hawaiian Islands, it is by no means true, as has been claimed here, that it will be a reversal of American policy, nor do we mean to enter upon any career of conquest or imperial expansion. These islands will be taken for self-defense in order to retain and keep their civilization and our peace. They lie so close to our own country and to the continent which we protect that it would not be safe to allow them to go into other hands. We shall take and keep them as an outpost, chiefly because they are already being invaded, not by open warfare, but by the stronger though more insidious forces which attend the movement unto them of the hosts of Asia.

The objections which are taken to the annexation of the islands seem to be threefold. It is insisted that it is unconstitutional for the United States to annex territory; that such annexation must be effected by treaty and not, as now proposed, by statute; and that, in any event, annexation is not now politic or wise.

We may deal rather briefly with the questions of constitutional power, and of the form of the measure. It is rather late to talk about the constitutional power of the United States to annex territory.

The United States is itself a monument of such annexation. The thirteen original settlements along the Atlantic coast have become an empire, extending from ocean to ocean.

Puritan, Cavalier, and Huguenot reached toward the West for a hundred years before the Constitution was adopted that, it is now alleged, prohibited such annexation.

Mr. Speaker, the power to annex territory certainly belonged to the English colonies before the Revolution. George Washington led the forces of Virginia that extended its boundaries to the Ohio. Other States, by the force of American energy and American colonization, carried their boundaries west among the Indian tribes until they came to the Mississippi. Those colonies at the Revolution retained the sovereign power of annexing territory, in order to the expansion of their institutions, holding it as territory only until it could be Americanized and formed into States.

When the Constitution was adopted did that power remain with the States or did it go to the United States? The strictest constructionist will say that it went to one or the other. Did it remain with the States? Can Oregon or California go outside the bounds of the United States to take in Alaska or the Sandwich Islands? Certainly not. It is inconsistent with the principle that all foreign affairs are put into the hands of the United States, with the power of war and peace and treaty. As said by Chief Justice Marshall, we have the power to make war and therefore

to annex by conquest. We have the power to make treaties and therefore to annex by treaty. Such action by a State would be absolutely inconsistent with the delegation to the United States of the control over foreign affairs. The power to deal with such questions as these must be incident to that control.

The Union alone, therefore, could acquire new territory.

But the States went even further. They found that the holding of their Western lands was inconsistent with their functions as States. Georgia held the territory now covered by Alabama and Mississippi. Virginia held Kentucky and Tennessee. Ohio, I believe, held the Northwest Territory. These States found that the holding of these Western possessions was inconsistent with the functions of the State. So evident was this, so impossible was it for the States to deal with the Indian, French, and English disputes which were constantly arising upon our frontiers, that those States actually turned over to the United States all the territory which they had possessed and with which they were unable to deal properly. Their Western lands were then taken and held by the United States as territory, because this policy was necessary for the common defense and to promote the general welfare.

This action gave a practical construction to the constitutional power of the Union to hold and acquire territories.

Then came the Louisiana purchase. President Jefferson believed that under the Constitution there was no power to acquire territory. But he deemed it a military necessity to possess the mouth of the Mississippi and the city of New Orleans. He thought this necessary as outpost appanage and outlet for the Union, much as Hawaii is now deemed necessary. He therefore sent commissioners to Paris to acquire such outpost by purchase.

And when Napoleon offered the vastly greater territory then known as Louisiana, extending across the continent from the Mississippi to Oregon, his common sense determined that, although he deemed it unconstitutional, it was for the public welfare.

Jefferson thought that an amendment to the Constitution would be necessary to indemnify Congress and himself for this breach of the Constitution.

No such amendment was passed, and afterwards he himself suggested that it should not be brought forward.

Mr. GAINES. Will the gentleman allow me?

Mr. PARKER of New Jersey. I have not time to yield, as I have only ten minutes. But as I was quoting from Mr. Jefferson, I will give his words.

In a letter to Mr. Breckinridge, he remarks:

The Constitution has made no provision for our holding foreign territory, still less for incorporating foreign nations into our Union. The executive, in seizing the fugitive occurrence which so much advances the good of their country, have done an act beyond the Constitution. The legislature, in casting behind them metaphysical subtleties and risking themselves like faithful servants, must ratify and pay for it and throw themselves on their country for doing for them unauthorized what we know they would have done for themselves had they been in a situation to do it. But we shall not be disavowed by the nation, and their act of indemnity will confirm and not weaken the Constitution by more strongly marking out its lines.

With this view of the Constitution, he contemplated an amendment which would authorize his act. No such amendment took place. The treaty sanctioned by the President, Senate, and House of Representatives was acquiesced in by the people and soon ceased to be a disputed question either of constitutionality or expediency.

It was soon seen that what had been done for defense and self-protection was also well to be justified by the opening which it made for the growth of the nation. And as the tide poured westward by the flatboat and prairie wagon, and was followed by the railroad, the telegraph, and all the wondrous chains that link together the present nation, we no longer question whether the United States had the power to annex territory. The question has been settled. We annexed Louisiana by treaty. We admitted Texas as a State by act of Congress, overriding the allegiance claimed by Mexico. We took California and New Mexico by war and by the treaty of peace which followed it. We bought many more hundred square miles in the Gadsden purchase, and we finally acquired the vast and unknown regions of Alaska. The constitutional question may well be regarded as settled. It is only the antediluvian that will dispute the power of the United States to annex territory. Louisiana, that was acquired as a military necessity (as we speak of Hawaii now as a military outpost), has proved itself to be the great theatre for the energies of the American people. Even Alaska, a place of ice and rocks, is thronged by thousands.

Nor does there seem to be difficulty about annexation by act of Congress. An act of Congress is the highest and most solemn act of Government, and it may well be said that such an act may do whatever a treaty may do. The separate treaty-making power does not seem to have been established because Congress could not make treaties by law, but because it was deemed to be often inconvenient that international negotiations should be given the publicity which attends the passage of an act of Congress. It seemed so necessary that such secret negotiation should take place that the President was given the power to make treaties, with the advice and consent of the Senate, provided that two-thirds of the

Senators present concur, and it was further provided that the Constitution and laws made in pursuance thereof and all treaties made under its authority should be the supreme law of the land. But it is well to be seen that the treaty-making power is only a supplement to the lawmaking power, a supplemental means of making a law; and while it is not expedient that Congress should invade negotiations carried on by the President or attempt to pass laws as to foreign affairs where he does not lead, the jurisdiction of Congress to pass such laws under the lead of the President is undoubted.

A declaration of war is such a law. The lines are not and can not be exactly and exclusively drawn with reference to great governmental powers covering such subjects. The jurisdictions overlap. Congress had to pass the appropriations which made the treaties for the purchase of Louisiana and Alaska effective. Congress may declare war, and then the President, with the advice and consent of two-thirds of the Senators present, may make a peace which may nullify that declaration. It seems beyond question that the Congress that could have declared war to obtain New Orleans and the mouth of the Mississippi could likewise have passed an act to annex that territory without war.

The treaty-making power and that of Congress may be concurrent in jurisdiction. But such concurrent jurisdiction is sometimes the salvation of free government.

It seems hardly necessary, however, to suggest that Congress has concurrent power over this matter with the treaty-making power, because it may fairly be claimed that the annexation of the Hawaiian Islands can rightly be done only by act of Congress, and that a treaty would be ineffective to produce the result. France, Mexico, or Russia could dispose of part of its territory by treaty. France, Mexico, and Russia still remain, and the treaties between the United States and these several powers are the warrants for our holding this land. It is well understood to be a proper exercise of the treaty-making power that a nation may contract to sell part of its lands which another wishes to buy, but it may well be doubted whether a government can by treaty contract itself out of existence. There is force in the suggestion made that the Hawaiian Government may not have power constitutionally to turn its whole country over to the United States. It may acquiesce, it may agree, but the authority over these islands will not be derived from that agreement so much as from the act of the United States in taking possession. If it were unwilling; if, for example, the government of a native queen were proscribing and beheading Americans in the island, as Her Majesty once proposed, an act of Congress would annex this island by a declaration of war. But as the Queen is not in power, when the Government of the island and the forces therein that make for civilization and progress ask the country from which those forces sprang to take possession, we may do this act, not as a treaty, but as an act of the United States through its Congress to provide for the common defense and to promote the general welfare, as well as the welfare of these islands.

It seems to me that it can not be wholly done by treaty, and must be done by act of Congress, as every other annexation was finally done, when Congress appropriated the money. It may be well urged, as it has been urged on the other side, that no government can commit political suicide; that no government can surrender all its land, all its possessions, all its government to be mere territory. They can acquiesce, if they believe that it is for the best interests of their civilization; but it is an act of the United States. As it is, there is a government with American civilization in those islands which has maintained itself. All the civilizing influences in that land appeal to us to take them in. This we do. We take the islands, not by war, but by peace, but for the same purpose that might have led us to declare war and which justify peaceful annexation.

Now, one thing more. Shall we do it? I am not one of those who wish conquest; I am not one of those who wish a colony like India, which is only a thorn in the side of Great Britain. But when we find lands that are closer to us than any other nation, with an American civilization which is being invaded by the Orient, by Chinese and Japanese, and which finds itself in a condition where it must fail unless it has the help of its own parents, when I find a population less than any of our middle-size cities throughout the country, I see no danger in annexation. [Applause.]

We have thus come to the third branch of the inquiry, the wisdom and policy of annexation. This has been too well stated and by too many to bear repetition here. The civilization of those islands is American, and there are those of us who remember when their Sunday-school mites went to carry missionaries in the missionary bark *Morning Star* to these various islands. Hawaii is too near to us to be safely allowed to fall into the hands of some great military power, whose naval station there would be valuable as the only base from which operations could be carried on against this continent. The Pacific is too wide otherwise to be

crossed by naval expeditions, while the distance from Hawaii to our shores is short to the modern battle ship and transport.

But we are told to let things be as they are, to protect simply and preserve the status quo. The answer is plain. The invasion of these islands has begun, and the status quo can not be maintained. The native race is dying out; it is not one-tenth of what it used to be. The adult Chinese and Japanese together are more numerous than the natives. The hordes from which they come are inexhaustible. The lands are rich and the civilization which we placed there is in danger. The population is small, 100,000 in all. The islands are large and fertile and in the higher ground have a temperate climate. American immigration would quickly make them truly American, but such immigration can not be expected unless they be under the American flag. The question is not one of conquest, but of colonization.

It was the same question whether Louisiana should be French or American, and whether California should be Spanish or American, and it is now the question whether these islands, really an integral part of the American continent, shall be American and Americanized or shall belong to the Orient and be Chinese or Japanese. Mr. Speaker, I wish no possession that we can not Americanize. I wish nothing where the population is so large that a final difference must be made between the colonist and the homeborn. We wish no such question as Spain has made with Cuba; none such as England, in spite of her liberal laws, has now with India because of its enormous native population. To England India is rather a weakness. England's strength lies in her English-speaking colonies—Canada, Australia, New Zealand, and the Cape.

These colonies, like our own land, were at one time the home of various savage races, but English immigration has made them now more English in sentiment than England itself. What difference did it make to us that California and Louisiana contained many thousands of Spanish and French? We know their presence now only in a few names of people and places. California, Texas, and Louisiana are American; territory at first, they no sooner came under our flag than they were filled with our people. It is not a question of climate. Who would have believed that Florida would become the most Northern in its population of any Southern State, and that its orange groves and health resorts would be filled with people from the North? Exactly the same results are to be expected in these lovely islands, whose beauty of climate and scenery call to our people to come and occupy, and whose residents cry out to us to give them a stable government, an American population, and American institutions.

But there is one other reason which seems to me to be conclusive. We are at war. A patriotic Executive has the conduct of that war. He tells us that the acquisition of these islands is necessary as a war measure and for self-defense. If I differed on that question, I would yield my judgment to his. It is not a mere question of geography. While I am interested in the distances of Asia from America via Hawaii and the Aleutian Islands, I do not believe that the routes of commerce and the necessities of government can be wholly decided by measuring the globe with red tape. As to whether it is a proper war measure or not, I think that in time of war the President's opinion should govern. I might hesitate in this conclusion if I found reasons to the contrary—if, for instance, we were asked to take responsibility for millions of people, if it were a question of conquest from another power, or if it were an unsettling of the bonds that must prevail between nations. But when it is the only means to preserve present conditions; when it is the only way to fill these islands with the men who constitute a state; when this annexation is not a conquest or subjugation of others, but a continuation of our established policy of opening new lands to the colonial energy of the great colonizing nation of the century, then the fact that it is now a political and military necessity is only aided by the other circumstances, and we can but wonder at the antediluvian and thorough stupidity which can hesitate—much more, which can gravely declare that the United States can not constitutionally annex territory, and that she can not do this act by act of Congress.

Mr. HITT. Mr. Speaker, I now yield to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HULL].

Mr. HULL. Mr. Speaker, I am in favor of the resolutions now before the House and hope the time is not far distant when the contention over this question of annexation will be affirmatively settled. The question has been before the people so long that the popular mind is fully made up to acquire these islands, and through them hold for all time the key of the Pacific Ocean. Gentlemen opposed to the resolutions may delay annexation for a few days or weeks, but the popular demand for their acceptance by this Government is as irresistible as the flow of the tides, and before this session of Congress closes the resolutions will have passed both Houses of Congress and received the approval of the President. The present war has emphasized their importance. Without them we could not send troops to aid Dewey in crushing the power of Spain in the Philippines.

If the Government of Hawaii had declared neutrality, we could only coal to reach our shores, not to steam away from them. The statesmen of the past have recognized their great value to this country and looked forward to the time when we could get possession of them. Every improvement in steam and electricity has made them more important to us. The fathers have been quoted as opposed to any acquisition of such territory; but all such quotations have been from expressions made one hundred years ago. Then wind was the propelling power on the ocean. No proclamation of neutrality could deprive us of power to sail our ships. The breeze that threw out the folds of our flag filled the sails of our ships of commerce and of war, and our great naval commanders could go to any quarter of the globe and fight the battles of the Republic.

Paul Jones and Hull and Decatur could invade the English Channel, remain on the high seas, or fight the pirates of Algiers without fear of being unable to continue their voyages. Wind is no longer depended on. Our great war ships have mighty engines depending on coal to furnish the power to make them effective, and all the great nations have declared coal contraband of war. A ship without coal is as helpless in war as a ship without powder.

It is about 7,000 miles from San Francisco to the Philippines or Hongkong. No ship can go from our coast and return without having some place to coal. Very few of our battle ships can even cross the Pacific Ocean without coaling on the voyage out. This being true, the power controlling the Hawaiian Islands controls the trade of the Pacific Ocean; and if we control them, we have the best possible safeguard for our own coast. I imagine every gentleman in this House would oppose with the entire force of this nation any attempt on the part of any other nation to take possession of the islands. To my mind we must either take them or see them drift under the flag of another power. They are too weak to stand alone. Other nations want them and, if the opportunity comes, will seize them. That would mean war, and with the United States at a fearful disadvantage.

Hawaii will owe Spain an indemnity if we refuse to pass these resolutions. She has harbored our transports and furnished coal to our war vessels. As a nation she becomes liable for damages. We settled this question when we collected \$15,000,000 from Great Britain after the close of our civil war. We can not now take the other side of the question. Look at the map now before the Speaker's desk. See the islands a little over 2,000 miles from our shores and on the line of travel from the Occident to the Orient, and answer to the future, how can you vote against acquiring these valuable possessions? How refuse to take them as a free gift? The founders of this Republic were progressive men. They were far in advance of their time. If the same great intellects were to-day in active participation in public affairs, they would look to the future and not to the past.

The civilization of the islands is American. It is true there are thousands of Japanese there, but they are not permanent settlers. Their eyes are always turned to their native land where all their kindred live. A few years under our laws and customs will see them few in numbers. Almost without exception they came without their wives or children. In fact, Mr. Speaker, they came in large numbers to overawe the feeble Government and present the islands to the Kingdom of Japan. Why fear the power of this great people to take these islands and make them still stronger American in citizenship? How can there be danger to 75,000,000 of free and intelligent people in throwing the shield of their Republic over 100,000 people already dominated by American ideas?

Mr. President, when Jefferson concluded the Louisiana purchase, the same cry went up from the alarmists of that day. We were introducing a foreign element that would destroy the Government. The fight kept up until 1825. How is it to-day? The great States from the mouth of the Mississippi River to the north line of Minnesota and the broad prairies of Iowa, Nebraska, and other States answer. Every man in the United States rejoices in the fact that Jefferson was sagacious enough to seize the opportunity to purchase this territory. Of what interest now the tiresome debates as to the unconstitutionality of his act? The opposition is thrown with the rubbish of the past. The act of the President now has universal commendation.

The same is true of the acquisition of Texas and of the territory added as a result of the Mexican war. If the timid souls had been able to direct the destiny of the Republic, California would to-day be foreign territory. I do not believe decay or death comes from proper expansion. The Anglo-Saxon race must grow. England, if cooped up on the islands known as Great Britain, would not be a fourth-class power. Centuries ago her statesmen opened the way for her children, until the English race is to-day found in every clime and her colonies present the grandest system of governments, outside of our own, to be found on earth.

Canada, British Columbia, Australia, and others make of England one of the greatest powers of the earth. The fact that she has coaling stations for her vessels in every sea keeps her equal in naval power to all the other nations combined. We have de-

veloped and grown wonderfully in the past, but not by fearing expansion. We started out with less than 900,000 square miles of territory. We have now about 3,600,000 square miles under our flag; grown to almost four times our original size. The great development of the future will come from our building up commerce on the sea.

If we refuse to provide the means to defend our commerce, this added wealth to the nation will never come. In fact, a great merchant marine will be an element of weakness if we do not carry with it adequate protection. The fear of injury to our commerce will make us submit to wrong rather than risk loss. If for no other purpose, we should annex these islands to protect our Pacific coast. General Schofield strongly indorses the necessity of this Government acquiring these islands, saying, among other things:

We spent three months on the islands and made a careful survey of Pearl River Harbor and visited the other islands, and obtained the knowledge that that was the only harbor in the islands to be considered in respect to military and naval matters, and we found it to be of exceedingly great value. Its natural adaptability to naval purposes is perhaps not surpassed by any harbor in the world. In regard to its secure anchorage for large fleets, its distance from the sea, beyond the reach of the guns of war ships, and the great ease with which the entrance to the harbor could be defended by batteries, so as to make it a perfectly safe refuge for merchant shipping or naval cruisers, or even a fleet which might find it necessary under any circumstances to take refuge there; for coaling grounds, for navy-yard repair shops, storehouses, and everything of that kind.

The most important feature of all is that it economizes the naval force rather than increases it. It is capable of absolute defense by shore batteries; so that a naval fleet, after going there and replenishing its supplies and making what repairs are needed, can go away and leave the harbor perfectly safe under the protection of the Army. Then arises at once the question why this harbor will be of consequence to the United States. It has not been easy to make that perfectly clear to the minds of men who have not made such subjects the study of a lifetime till now; but the conditions of the present war, it seems to me, ought to make it clear to everybody.

At this moment the Government is fitting out quite a large fleet of steamers at San Francisco to carry large detachments of troops and military supplies of all kinds to the Philippine Islands. Honolulu is almost in the direct route. That fleet, of course, will want very much to recoal at Honolulu, thus saving that amount of freight and tonnage for essential stores to be carried with it. Otherwise they would have to carry coal enough to carry them all the way from San Francisco to Manila, and that would occupy a large amount of the carrying capacity of the fleet; and if they recoal at Honolulu, all that will be saved. More than that, a fleet is liable at any time to meet with stress of weather, or perhaps a heavy storm, and there might be an accident to the machinery which will make it necessary to put into the nearest port possible for repairs and additional supplies. By the time it reaches there its coal supply may be well-nigh exhausted; it then has to replenish its coal supply to carry it to whatever port it could reach.

Of course this subject may be extended indefinitely—the value of that harbor as a place of refuge in time of war for merchant ships which might be pursued by cruisers, or a place to replenish the supplies of our own cruisers. They are of infinite value to the United States, or to any country which may oppose them for such purposes, but the great military point is the one I made twenty-five years ago, and I have not ceased to insist upon it at all proper times from that time to this, that to guard our Pacific coast against the possibility of a naval power taking possession of those islands and make them a base of operations against our Pacific coast, the one thing necessary to be done is for the United States to acquire them, improve that harbor, fortify it, and make it perfectly secure and hold it forever.

Admiral Walker indorses all General Schofield says as to the necessity of our acquiring these islands. These two men have made a life study of war on land and sea, and their mature judgment should have weight with this Congress and the American people.

This Congress has decided that the Spanish flag shall be removed from Cuba and Puerto Rico. Gentlemen fear the lust of conquest is leading us on. The annexation of Hawaii was decreed by the logic of the situation before war with Spain was declared. What we shall do with the Philippines, with Cuba, or with Puerto Rico will be decided when peace is declared.

The decision will be reached in a proper way and at the proper time. We are not dealing with that question now. One thing I hope may be predicted, and that is that none of them will ever pass into the control of a power which can ever be hostile to us. For myself, I believe that if they are not kept under our flag they will be established in the family of republics and look to us for all time as their protector and friend. The starry emblem of this Republic will bless the islands of the sea as it protected and prospered the lands lying between the two great oceans. The future generations will indorse our action in passing these resolutions as we to-day ratify and indorse the action of those who have gone before in adding territory and giving us our present imperial domain.

Mr. DINSMORE. Mr. Speaker, I yield thirty minutes to the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. MEYER].

Mr. MEYER of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, I have weighed carefully the arguments presented in the different reports by committees of Congress favoring annexation of the Hawaiian Islands to the United States and especially the report of the House Committee on Foreign Affairs. It seems to me that everything that could be said for annexation has been presented in these reports and also in the able and ingenious speech of the chairman of the committee. But, sir, I do not find in these enough to satisfy my

judgment or to remove the strong and valid objections to the measure. Test these arguments and appeals by the logic of facts, and they fall to the ground.

HAWAII NOT ESSENTIAL AS A COALING STATION.

The most plausible of all the pleas for annexation is the claim that these islands would be necessary as a coaling station in this war now raging and for the future. Why, sir, this argument was fully and completely demolished by the speech of the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. DINSMORE] on Saturday. He demonstrated by figures and authority that could not be denied that the route to Yokohama, Hongkong, and Manila, by the way of the Aleutian Islands, of Alaska, which is our own territory, is 800 miles nearer than by the way of Honolulu, that there is abundance of anchorage there, and that it is open there all the year.

Here you have your coaling station already provided to your hand. We have not improved it for this purpose, but then, after having for a number of years the right to perfect your coaling station at Pearl Harbor in the Sandwich Islands, you have demonstrated by your neglect that you did not deem the matter to be of any serious importance; and yet you have had, long ago, the opinion of military and naval experts as to the adoption of Pearl Harbor as a naval station.

THE USEFUL COLLIER.

Sir, there is a coaling station which we can use whenever we will, which we are now about to use for the monitors *Monterey* and *Monadnock*, and which all modern ships of war can use at will. It is the collier, the vessel specially adapted to carry coal. There is hardly a day in the Pacific when it can not be safely employed. You carry your coaling station with you. So, sir, there is no occasion for haste, none for hysterics, nor for a departure from our old and honored policies. We have a right to a coaling station at Pearl Harbor. We may improve it if we choose, and well have we paid for it in giving the freedom of our ports to Hawaiian products. But, sir, I rejoice to think that we are not dependent on Hawaii for coal. As for it being used as a base of operations against the United States, I regard the idea as preposterous. What power would do so? What power could do so?

It is urged by the chairman of the Foreign Affairs Committee that Hawaii has violated her neutrality in our favor in this way, and that after the war is over, or before, she will be amenable by their displeasure. To which one, pray? Not Spain, for we will settle up all questions with Spain ere we finish the war. Who then is to punish Hawaii? Germany or France? Does any sane man suppose that on such a pretense or for such a reason as this Germany or France would singly risk a war with the United States?

HAWAII IN NO DANGER FROM FOREIGN POWERS.

Is there any man in our midst so ignorant of conditions to-day in Europe as to imagine Germany and France combining to chastise Hawaii and thereby provoking a war with the United States? Is Sedan forgotten? Is the capture and conquest of Alsace and Lorraine forgotten, or even forgiven? All this argument is based in the wildest and emptiest of chimeras and an utter ignorance of the relations, the jealousy, and the hates and rivalries of European States. In order to combine, nations must have a common interest.

UNMERITED ASSAULTS ON THE SPEAKER REBUKED.

The absence of any really valid arguments for annexation has driven its friends in other quarters than the House to violent and gross assaults upon those who differ with them. Individual gentlemen are bitterly and rancorously assailed because they decline to become partisans of this measure. They are even called traitors and disloyal. One of the most conspicuous victims of this species of assault is the Speaker of the House. Justly regarded as one of the ablest men of his party, its favorite repeatedly for one of the highest offices of our Government, the memory of his great services to his party and of his leadership has not availed to protect him in this House and his motives from being aspersed. And yet his only crime in the matter is that God having given him an intellect to weigh public questions, he has refused to jump at the crack of somebody's whip. I am not his defender. He does not need my help. I mention the fact merely to show the utter lack of fairness and wisdom on the part of those most active in favor of annexation, and their lack of fair and valid arguments.

But this is not all. We are told, sir, that the sugar trust is making the opposition to Hawaiian annexation. Sir, I speak for a population both white and black who are engaged in the production of cane sugar. We have no cause to love the sugar trusts. They are our competitors in the market. We grow and refine American sugars under many disadvantages growing out of a fluctuating and often unfair, inadequate revenue duty on raw sugars. The sugar trust reaches out its hand to Cuba, Demerara, Hawaii, the East, South, and the West for cheap raw sugars. It wants them duty free, if possible, and if not duty free, then as cheap as possible.

So, therefore, their interests and ours conflict. Does any man suppose that this trust which wants cheap sugars to refine from

the West Indies, South America, and the East Indies would not welcome the introduction of cheap raw sugar from Hawaii? Their interest is all that way. I have not seen their hand in this fight, but if it does exert an influence it will be quietly and steadily exerted in favor of annexation, for by annexation the Hawaiian product would be only grist to their mill.

It is suggested, I know, in the committee report that sugar would, in case of annexation, be refined on the Hawaiian Islands, and would come into competition with the refined sugar of the trust. Such an idea as this would not be entertained by anyone who had ever made a study of this subject. The refineries of the sugar trust, with their advantages of ample capital, skilled labor, established markets, and machinery of distribution, have nothing to fear from the petty, feeble competition of the Hawaiian refineries. There is no strife there. The sugar trust will get the raw sugars of Hawaii, if they want them at all, and will do the refining if it suits them to do so.

Mr. SULZER. Will the gentleman from Louisiana allow me a question?

Mr. MEYER of Louisiana. Certainly.

Mr. SULZER. I would like to ask the gentleman if the representative of the sugar trust is not now in Washington doing everything he can to defeat the Hawaiian annexation?

Mr. MEYER of Louisiana. No representative of the sugar trust is in Washington, to my knowledge. If there be one here, I have not met or heard of him.

Mr. GAINES. Who is the representative; what is his name?

Mr. SULZER. Oxnard.

Mr. GAINES. Where is his headquarters?

Mr. SULZER. I do not know; but it is published in the paper, in the Public Intelligencer, that you have on your desk, and it says it will be a hard fight to pass it in the Senate.

Mr. MEYER of Louisiana. I know that Mr. Oxnard, whom the gentleman names, is a representative of a large beet-sugar industry and establishment in Nebraska, and also that he is interested in a very large agricultural and industrial plant in the State of Louisiana, which grows and manufactures cane sugar. Beyond that I know nothing of his connections or bearings.

Mr. SULZER. Does that influence the Louisiana delegation?

Mr. MEYER of Louisiana. Speaking as far as I can for other members of the Louisiana delegation, I may safely say that they are influenced only so far as any member of the House can honorably be influenced by what he considers to be the interests of his constituents and the State he represents; and speaking for myself, I would say that if the State of Louisiana did not grow a single stalk of sugar cane or produce one pound of sugar, I would still maintain the position I do, because of the general principle involved in this resolution and the dangerous results that, in my judgment, would follow its enactment into law.

Mr. GAINES. Does the gentleman from New York mean to impute to me that because this paper was lying on my desk, which came in my morning mail, that my vote or position on this question was affected by it?

Mr. SULZER. Not at all. I say it is so charged in the paper, that the representative of the sugar trust is here and—

Mr. GAINES. If he is here trying to control legislation, he ought to be kicked out of town; and if he comes about me trying to control my vote, I will do it.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. DALZELL). Does the gentleman from Louisiana yield to the gentleman from Tennessee?

Mr. MEYER of Louisiana. I can not, for my time is brief. Since the gentleman from New York has injected the name of Mr. Oxnard into this debate, I want to say I know he is opposed to the annexation resolution as a representative of the beet-sugar growers of this country and because their interests would be seriously and adversely affected. I believe always in fostering the industries of this country to the exclusion of those of other countries, and any project which would injure the progress of our agricultural interests, be it in relation to sugar or any other, can not secure my advocacy.

THE REAL FIGHT BETWEEN THE AMERICAN SUGAR FARMERS AND THE SUGAR TRUST.

No, sir; the fight is not there. There is no fight between the sugar trust and the Hawaiian sugar planters, who are clamorous for obtaining annexation and the American market. The real fight is between the cane-sugar growers of Louisiana and the beet-sugar growers of Nebraska, California, Colorado, and other States, who are interested in preserving the present status of affairs on the one hand, and, on the other hand, the enormous aggregation of capital and skill known as the sugar trust, with their natural allies in Hawaii and other tropical countries.

And right here permit me to read a protest which fortifies my position very clearly:

In the name of the farmers of America we respectfully appeal to the honorable Senate and House of Representatives in Congress assembled:

First. We solemnly protest against hasty consideration in Congress of the treaty of annexation with Hawaii.

Second. We most urgently request that this subject be treated with the deliberation its vital importance deserves, thus affording the people of the United States sufficient time to inform the honorable Congress of their views.

Third. The farmers of this country oppose annexation. The sentiment among them against it is well-nigh unanimous. Their opposition is based upon the highest patriotism and most disinterested motives—the national welfare, political justice.

Fourth. In addition to these reasons for its defeat, the farmers recognize that annexation would seriously interfere with the otherwise promising development of our domestic beet-sugar and cane-sugar industry. Already the bare possibility of annexation has called a halt to numerous sugar-factory enterprises, which had promised a home market to farmers for a new and profitable crop. Defeat annexation and you remove the last obstacle in the way of enabling American agriculture, capital, and labor to produce the \$100,000,000 worth of sugar annually imported heretofore.

That the above truthfully and moderately expresses the earnest desires of the farmers of this nation will in due course be respectfully demonstrated to the complete satisfaction of the honorable Congress.

Done this 13th day of December, in the year of our Lord 1897, and of the Independence of the United States the one hundred and twenty-first, and in the first year of the era of our independence of foreign sugar.

Respectfully submitted.

THE AMERICAN SUGAR GROWERS' SOCIETY.

By its officers:

R. M. ALLEN,
President, Ames, Nebr.

(Also president Nebraska Beet-Sugar Growers' Association.)

C. A. FARWELL,
Vice-President, New Orleans, La.

(Also president American Cane Growers' Association of the United States.)

HERBERT MYRICK,
Treasurer, 52 Lafayette Place, New York City.

(Also president Orange Judd Company, and editor American Agriculturist, of New York; Orange Judd Farmer, of Chicago, and the New England Homestead, of Springfield.)

B. W. SNOW,
Secretary, Marquette Building, Chicago, Ill.
(Statistician Orange Judd Farmer.)

[SEAL.]

Why, sir, should Louisiana, why should the rising growth of the beet-sugar industry in this country, be sacrificed in order to swell the profits of a few planters in Hawaii? There are 500,000 people in Louisiana dependent on the sugar industry. The laborers are all blacks, 400,000 at least. You pretended to be their friends when you gave them suffrage. Now you give them a stone, and your heart goes out to a horde of Asiatics, Japanese, Chinese, and others working under contracts—a state of quasi slavery. The "man and brother" must go to the wall while you cultivate your new friends and find fresh materials wherewith to construct the temple of freedom.

Alas, sir, it is not a temple of freedom you seek to construct. You would not take Asiatics for that purpose. Your real scheme is to build an empire on the ruins of your old republic, of which you appear to be ashamed, and if you are to have an empire—a colonial system—you can not have a better start than a dependency composed of Asiatics and contract laborers.

I deny that you can have a colonial system, with inferior and mongrel races and mongrel governments, and standing armies to hold and defend them, without giving up your grand American system of free government with limited powers, State rights, local self-government, and individual freedom. This proposition is self-evident. It requires no argument and no elucidation.

Take this first fatal step and you can not recall it. Much of error we have corrected. Much that may hereafter be you can correct. But when this step shall be taken, you are irrevocably pledged to a system of colonies and empire. There are no foot-steps backward. You may have grandeur. Will you retain liberty?

WE SHOULD DEVELOP DEMOCRATIC PRINCIPLES.

Is there nothing better? Is there nothing to point the aspirations of our people? I think there is. I do not desire weakness as a people. I rejoice in our strength and growth. We are strong enough to pursue a grand and a glorious destiny. We can be easily the first power of the world if to ourselves only we be true. There are two things I would suggest, one a foreign policy, the other domestic. I have time only to glance briefly at both. In respect to our domestic policy, what is better to develop our happiness and liberty and growth than the cardinal policies of the Democratic party—a respect for the rights of the people and the States, the union of the States, a reverence for the Federal Constitution, an avoidance and hatred of class legislation, low taxation, no monopolies, no bounties to individuals or to classes, no effort to enrich any man at the expense of his neighbor; order, peace, and justice? The doctrines of Jefferson and the fathers, of the most eminent statesmen of the present generation, these will injure no man, but will benefit, bless, and advance the Republic. Under this system there is no limit to our growth; we can then defy all our enemies; we can open a hope for all our people; we can eclipse the glories of any empire of the past or the present; we can command peace and appal any country that would dare be a wrongdoer at our expense. In all this grand chart of progress there are no blood stains, no tears of orphan or widow, no standing armies, no doom for the poor or the humble man aspiring to earn his bread and live in the fear of God.

Thus living and moving we shall have the respect of foreign

powers. We shall be strong and we shall not want for friends. We may not join in the vulgar scramble for foreign territory or partake in the partition of Spain or Asia, but we are free to seek foreign markets, and we may say to foreign nations frankly and firmly that we will not allow their schemes of conquest or ambition to shut us out from markets that are fairly ours. We may say that the vast and growing trade of China belongs as fairly to us as to other countries, and that while we do not covet one foot of her soil we will not allow ourselves to be excluded from its commerce. We may not fight to have colonies, dependencies, and subjects, but we may take a start for free access to markets that are ours fairly by our position and growth on the Pacific Ocean. In such a contest we shall have the cooperation of at least one great and powerful nation. We stand only for what is just and right.

I shall not follow out this line of thought, but I submit it as a counter project to the miserable game of grab and incorporation of Asiatics and Malays into a free representative republic, which, if it is to remain great and honored, free and happy, must be a white man's government. I prefer the republican government of our fathers to this scheme of empire and of greed which is sought to be fastened on us by false pretense and appeals to our fears. I speak for the best and highest interests of the American people and not for speculators. I speak for the laboring poor; I speak only what all the fathers of our freedom have told us to believe and act upon. I ask you solemnly to listen to their counsels and to follow their footsteps. [Applause.]

RELATIONS OF THE ISLANDS TO THE UNITED STATES.

The relations of these islands to the United States have been a topic of interest to our statesmen for over seventy years. We have had several treaties of reciprocity with Hawaii, one of which is now in operation. We have had several treaties providing for annexation, one of which is now pending in the United States Senate. This treaty has been before the Senate a number of months and, report says, has been fully debated in executive session. It has not been confirmed, and it has not been finally rejected. It is reported that its friends are afraid to bring the treaty to a vote for fear that it will be rejected.

And thus, practically, the treaty project fails. That much, at least, we know, and now the friends of annexation have still another plan. It is to pass a joint resolution providing for annexation. This question is now before us. It may seem to some like a small matter—the annexation of 6,000 or 7,000 square miles of territory in all; and so to some persons at the time of our Revolution in 1775 a penny tax on tea seemed a very small matter; but it involved principles which led our fathers to combat the mightiest power in the world and evoked forces that will live forever. And so to-day this annexation of 7,000 square miles of territory—these little islands of the far Pacific—involves policies and consequences which may change the whole character of our Government. The present war with Spain may be prosecuted to a glorious conclusion, glorious for our arms, and far more glorious for the cause of humanity, for which we have prosecuted the war; and yet it may be that by wise councils this war may be so terminated and closed as to involve no serious change in our Government and general policy as a nation. But, sir, I apprehend that the annexation of Hawaii may involve consequences far more vast than the war with Spain. It will be a new departure. This fact can not be denied by any truthful and well-informed student of our history. We are treading on new and dangerous ground.

OUR OWN PEOPLE'S INTEREST SHOULD BE THE PRIME CONSIDERATION.

Mr. Speaker, I would not attempt to decry the ability of the advocates of annexation in and out of Congress. They have been insistent, earnest, laborious, ingenious, plausible in presenting their case, and for the most part I concede freely their patriotism and honesty of purpose. The report of the accomplished chairman of the Committee on Foreign Affairs is a proof of what I have said, and I regret to be compelled to differ from its conclusions. The advocates of annexation have made the most of their case, but notwithstanding their reports, arguments, and the great mass of annexation literature they have presented, their case can not stand the test of common sense and fair logic. Of course we must study the interests of our own people as a paramount object. If we annex Hawaii, it must be done not on merely sentimental reasons, because some four or five thousand Americans have gone there to reside and make money, but for the substantial reason that the step is necessary to the 70,000,000 of this country as a military or naval necessity, or is advantageous to us commercially, and will entail no corresponding evils. Don Quixote has no place in this business.

I believe, sir, that this project would be very much weaker but for the suggestion put forth that this annexation is important to us right now in carrying on the war with Spain. It is also pretended that Hawaii, by allowing our war vessels to coal there, is incurring great danger from some European power. Therefore it is said we must annex her immediately. Both these propositions are flimsy pretenses. I deny them both. From what European

power is Hawaii in danger? What power is going to assail her because forsooth she in some small way favors the United States? Spain, indeed, might and would do so, but she has not a single war vessel of any importance in the Pacific Ocean or even in Asiatic waters. She is not able to spare one ship to send to the Philippine Islands. Our own fleet is in possession at Manila. Will any European power venture to affront the United States by attacks upon Hawaii for alleged violation of neutrality? Of course that would involve a war with this country just as surely as if Hawaii were already formally annexed to us. Is Germany or France hunting for a quarrel with us? There is no sign of it—none whatever.

NOT NEEDED FOR NAVAL OPERATIONS.

But how does Hawaii help our naval operations in the Philippine Islands? How is she necessary to our success? Commodore Dewey did his work without help from Hawaii or any foreign power. It is true that we are sending him reinforcements of troops and supplies. There may be some little convenience in our ships stopping at Hawaii for additional coal, but this is really not necessary. The ships and the troops would go to Dewey just as surely as if the islands did not exist. Commercial instincts will secure him coal from citizens of neutral nations just as long as he is able to pay for it. The truth is that the reinforcement of Commodore Dewey is a mere matter of time and administration. Soon it will be un fait accompli. He will be master of the situation, able to occupy the city of Manila and the Island of Luzon and capture the Spanish forces long before an annexation resolution can pass the two Houses of Congress.

The capture of Manila and the destruction of the Spanish fleet was a glorious feat of arms, and we are all proud and glad of it; but if these Philippine Islands had not been assailed by Commodore Dewey our operations in the Antilles would have gone on all the same. It is there that conclusions are to be finally tried between the United States and Spain. The conquest of Cuba and Puerto Rico by our arms is essential. Hawaii is wholly unessential to our operations in the Atlantic or in the Pacific. I repeat, sir, that Hawaiian annexation has nothing to do with the case. The scheme of annexation was started long, long ago and defended for reasons and from motives which have nothing to do with our present war with Spain. Sir, I protest against any attempt to use and pervert the patriotic feelings of our people at this time and their desire to free Cuba into an argument for annexing the Hawaiian Islands. If it be true, as some friends of annexation pretend, that Japan and this or that European nation have fixed a greedy eye upon these islands, then this step of annexation, if it had any effect at all, would only tend to array new enemies against us. [Applause.]

GROWTH AND DEVELOPMENT OF OUR COUNTRY A SOURCE OF PRIDE.

Sir, I take pride in the growth and development of this country. I take pride in the fact that we have made great acquisitions of territory and that Democratic Administrations and Southern statesmen have had the leading part in promoting them. Well do I recall the fact that Thomas Jefferson, a Democratic President, acquired the vast Louisiana Territory, out of which many States, including my own State, have been carved and grown into splendid communities. I remember also that New England, which now seems to favor Hawaiian annexation, was largely hostile to the acquisition of Louisiana, and that some of her politicians threatened disunion on that occasion as a mode of resistance. The alternative to the Democratic policy of that day was the barrier of a great European colony, a new France or a Dominion of England interposed as an obstacle to our frontier progress and to the freedom of the Mississippi River. I remember in our history the expedition of Lewis and Clarke, which secured our title to Oregon.

I remember the acquisition of Florida, the acquisition of Texas, California, New Mexico—all the work of Democratic Administrations. I can not pause to dwell upon the effects and consequences of these grand acquisitions of territory upon our national growth and present rank as one of the great powers of the world. But, sir, these acquisitions were promoted by wise statesmen, who could compute cost and consequences. It was not the mere vulgar love of conquest. Look through all these grand acquisitions of territory, so potent as steps in our history and progress, and you find two attendant facts—perhaps I ought to say principles. One was that the territory was coterminous with our own. Another fact was that the existing population was so small that it would be an easy matter to fill these territories up with our own people. "Westward the star of empire took its way." As the American people pushed forward their emigration the savage gave way; they carried men of their own blood and race, their own institutions, the schoolhouse, the church, the free press, the trial by jury, representative government—all the muniments of liberty.

The acquisition of the Louisiana Territory gave us homes for our enterprising people, and ultimately communities as States well fitted to enter our system of States, fitted to augment, expand, and strengthen the Union. These States have not proved

a weight or a burden or an expense or a curse to us. They have been an added glory and safeguard to the Republic. The same is true of all our acquisitions save one. These lands are full of Americans—forceful, free, energetic, intelligent, liberty-loving. They speak our tongue. They think like the people of the old thirteen States and like the people who have populated the Northwest Territory given by Virginia to the Union. It is barely necessary for me to glance at these facts, for all in my hearing are familiar with them.

I have spoken of one exception. There was just one acquisition made by a statesman, and an able man, Mr. Seward, which rests on different grounds. There is far less to be said for the acquisition of Alaska than any other of our Democratic acquisitions. The country, indeed, is large. It cost us only \$7,000,000; but while we are not burdened there with a large alien population, it has no soil fitted for agriculture or for homes. It may have some advantages besides a precarious seal industry and a gold production; but it is not coterminous and it adds nothing to the strength of the Republic. It is doubtful whether Mr. Seward would ever have entertained the project at all but for the idea that some day the Dominion of Canada would enter our Union and that it might be well to have Alaska for a geographical effect upon the map. The acquisition may be more beneficial in the future, but as it is not coterminous it would be a source of weakness but for the growing good feeling between Great Britain and the United States.

THE TRUE LINE OF STATESMANSHIP.

I think that I ought here to recall the fact that at the time when Mexico lay at our mercy, when in 1848 we could have taken that whole country, and some of our politicians actually proposed to do so, we stopped short at the true line of statesmanship. Our ancestors had the great and admirable wisdom of moderation. The traditions of Jefferson, Madison, and Hamilton, the wise counsels of Calhoun, Clay, and Webster, had then a spell and a power for the American mind. We took from Mexico only those northern provinces of New Mexico and California which lay in the natural pathway of our progress and which by reason of a very scanty Mexican population were capable of being filled up by Americans, as they have been. They were easily assimilated to our own system, California especially. How wise this policy has proved! We left to Mexico all those portions of her country which were well populated by her own people.

MODERATION AND JUSTICE SHOULD DOMINATE.

We did not seek to incorporate them. A small strip, comparatively unsettled, known later as the "Gadsden purchase," was acquired subsequently by treaty in order to promote the construction of the Pacific railway. But we took in no large element of population speaking a different language and cherishing essentially different institutions from our own. I admire this moderation, this spirit of justice and statesmanship that dominated in that hour. The Republic of Mexico has great resources. After many trials and sad hours I rejoice to think that she is rapidly progressing and is happily prosperous under the conduct of a great and wonderful man, who deserves to rank among the foremost statesmen of the day and as a benefactor to a people who are our neighbors and friends. With them we have large and growing trade relations from which both countries are deriving profit, and which in the future will yield untold and only half-imagined benefits to both nations. Will any man be so foolish or wicked as to assert that it would be better to have incorporated Mexico as a province or a dependency?

This hasty review of the past, and I make it briefly because it is only necessary to allude to it, throws a broad light upon our present situation and our duty at this time. The present proposition is different from any we have ever had in the past. Even the case of Mexico in 1848 was widely different. Mexico was not densely populated. Her productions and resources were very great. Her future was beyond question. She was capable of supplying a very large product of sugar. She was then and is now capable of supplying the whole world with coffee of a quality equal to the best. Her capacities of production and her varieties of soil and climate in many respects made her a far more desirable acquisition than Hawaii, even if Hawaii were equally near and had an equal area. Mexico is a hundredfold richer.

HAWAII'S LIMITED DOMAIN.

But, leaving out the case of Mexico, compare the acquisition of Hawaii with the territorial acquisitions of the past. Compare the grand acquisitions of virgin lands, of grand areas of prairies, and forests of unoccupied lands with the pitiful area and meager opportunities of these little islands, thrown up by some volcanic action in the Pacific Ocean. Seven thousand square miles all told, surrounded by water and 2,200 miles away! A country hardly a fifth the size of Ohio, largely mountainous and uninhabitable, with no vacant or unoccupied lands, no opportunities for homes for our people, and already filled up full and running over and with Kanakas and Asiatics. Am I wrong as to this? I read from

the report of the Committee on Foreign Affairs the following facts and figures:

The census of 1896 shows the population to be 169,020.

In round numbers the different nationalities are represented as follows:

Native Hawaiians.....	31,000	Americans.....	3,000
Japanese.....	24,400	British.....	2,200
Portuguese.....	15,100	Germans.....	1,400
Chinese.....	21,600	Norwegians and French.....	479
Part-Hawaiian and part foreign blood.....	8,400	All other nationalities.....	1,055

The percentage of Americans and Europeans by birth or descent is here stated at 22, but this includes the Portuguese. I can not regard these as homogeneous. The European population are not united, small as they are, but are discordant, and only 3,000 out of 78,000 of those of foreign parentage or descent are Americans. The great bulk are Asiatics; yet Americans have had ample opportunities to settle there. They have not been interfered with nor oppressed. Why are there so few of them in Hawaii? I can only suppose that the Americans do not care to go there for lack of the opportunities that they have in their own country. The islands seem to attract the overcrowded populations of Asia, the class of people who can live and work in a hot climate for a few cents a day and in a low scale of life.

What are we to do with these Asiatics or with the Portuguese? You can not well ship them back to their own countries. Are you going to shut down on all Japanese immigration, or are you going to throw over them all the ægis of American citizenship? Do you propose to admit as a State a country with an overwhelming proportion of Asiatics and Polynesians and only 3 per cent of Americans? Do you propose to shut Hawaii out as a State of the Union and keep her as a dependency? What advantage are you to derive from assuming this burden? With every advantage to be derived from reciprocity treaties the total estimated area of land under cane cultivation is only 67,849 acres. The sugar exports have reached 292,083,589 pounds. But for the right to export sugar freely and duty free to the United States, and the American duties on all other foreign sugar—a great boom for somebody's benefit and a great loss to our own revenue—these islands would have to face a far different state of affairs.

A COLONIAL SYSTEM INCONSISTENT WITH OUR GOVERNMENTAL SYSTEM.

Disguise it as you may by ingenious phrases or specious pleas of military necessity, we are confronted with the grave question, Shall we enter upon a colonial system such as that of England, such as that which has been the curse and disgrace of Spain, such as that which burdens France and threatens to involve Germany and Italy in war with other powers—I might say a system that threatens to involve all Europe in war? Under this seeking out for colonies Africa has been partitioned, divided up, and now these great countries are quarreling over the spoils. With monarchical governments or governments only nominally republican, but really despotic or monarchical, this system of colonies, however burdensome, however tending to conflicts, may be pursued without a shock to their systems of government.

But with us the case is different. Our whole system is founded on the right of the people—all the people—to participate in the Government. If we annex Hawaii, we must soon admit the country as a State of the Union, with only 3 per cent of the population Americans, or we must keep the islands as a dependency—a sort of proconsulate where we can maintain rich men's sons in office and grandeur, or provide for needy and profligate politicians, such as those who for long years after the war scourged, robbed, and desolated the Southern States. At present there is no party bold enough to advocate the idea of admitting Hawaii as a State of the Union, whatever design they may propose in their hearts. They do not propose to make the Kanakas and Asiatics the equals in political power with New York, Ohio, Pennsylvania, Illinois. No! The plan is to have and keep Hawaii as a colony or dependency.

NO CONCEALMENTS SHOULD BE MADE.

Now, sir, if this be the design, let it be frankly and honorably avowed. Let us have no fraud or deception practiced upon the people. Let all be plain sailing. If we are to change our entire system and policy as a confederated republic and go in for a grand, colonial, and imperial system, let the issue be fairly propounded. Let the people see what they are to give up and what they are to gain by it. Above all, let us consider that it is the first step that costs. We can not stop with these petty islands of Hawaii. To do so would be a national humiliation. If we are to run a race for the acquisition of colonies with the European governments—for colonies with a population alien in race, language, religion, everything—let us not do things on a small scale. We must not fall behind Italy, France, Germany, countries inferior to us in wealth and population. Sir, I warn you that you can not ever enter on such a policy as this and stop short at Hawaii. You can not stop. Still less can you go backward in your tracks.

I have made no reference to the great Government of Russia. Ambitious as her rulers may be, ready and anxious for acquisi-

tions, and a great military power as she is, Russia seeks only contiguous acquisitions—countries adjoining her own. These she conquers or annexes, populates them, if there be room, and at any rate governs them by a strong hand. She seems to have a wonderful faculty in assimilating foreign countries that she conquers, as remarkable, indeed, as the Roman Empire of old, and so far there is no sign of decay. But Russia is a monarchy—a grand Empire with a gigantic army. Her system of government is not a representative one like ours. She has no free institutions. But with all this she acquires no colonies. The only colony she ever had—I mean Alaska—she sold to this country long ago. It was a wise act for her to do.

ABANDONMENT OF OLD SYSTEM UNWISE.

So the question presses on us, Shall we abandon our old system and adopt the colonial system, with all its consequences? Is it a necessity for us at this time? Is it wise? Is it calculated to promote liberty and free institutions, or does it tend to consolidation and empire? Would an empire, great though it might be, prove better for our people than the free institutions which have made us the first of the nations in wealth and progress?

If this question can be fairly put and considered by the American people, I shall not fear the response. I admit that men's minds are disturbed by the excitement of the war with Spain, but there is reason and method enough left to guide our people to a safe conclusion. We can carry on a war with Spain, I hope, with success and yet not surrender our system of free government.

NO OTHER POWER WILL INTERFERE.

One of the arguments usually urged in favor of annexing Hawaii is that if we do not take these islands at once, some other power will do so. There is no warrant for this assertion. There is no power on the globe that does not know that the Hawaiian Islands are forbidden fruit. They know that this country would not permit it. They each and all know that there is nothing in these islands to compensate the cost of a war with the United States, even if it should be successful. There have indeed been periods in the remote past when European powers have interfered with the independence of the Hawaiian Islands, but that time has long since gone by. The European powers now fully recognize the fact that the United States would regard this as a hostile act. They have had ample notice. Their position is apparent in the documents of this report. It is summed up well at page 81 by Lord Palmerston, speaking nearly half a century ago. He said that the British Government desired the Hawaiian people to preserve national independence. "If they were unable to do so, he recommended receiving a protectorate government under the United States or by becoming an integral part of that nation."

This attitude of England has been repeatedly and most frankly stated. The paramount influence of the United States and her moral right to control the destinies of the islands has been steadily recognized. It is a fixed policy and will not be varied by England. No other European power has proposed a different policy. Japan disavows any idea of annexation. Her interests are those of peace with this country. Japan and the United States have in common a great paramount interest in Asia in enlarged trade and free intercourse for all nations. Japan is not going to quarrel with the United States or to pursue an aggressive policy in respect to Hawaii. In a word, the United States are free in respect to Hawaii from all foreign complications. This effort to provoke our people to resentment of fancied wrongs, and then to annexation, in order to show what we can do if we will, has no adequate foundation or justification. It is a mere trick in the game of men who have a profit to make by annexation. It is a cheap, transparent device, and should not influence us for a single moment.

I come now to the point that those islands may be made the basis of an attack upon the Pacific coast. We have already a right to establish a coaling station at Pearl Harbor. We have not improved upon our right which exists by and under our reciprocity treaty with Hawaii. Of course we can improve this harbor at any time we please and fortify it if we desire to do so. I admit the advantage of coaling stations at Hawaii, at the Philippine Islands, and on the Asiatic coast. We ought to seek such a concession from China, and probably it could be readily obtained. China has made such concessions to less friendly nations than our own. But the fact stands that up to this time nothing has been done.

Mr. Speaker, I question the assertion that any power can make the Hawaiian Islands with success a base of hostile operations against our Western coast. England does not need it for this purpose. She has her own base at Esquimaux. She has British Columbia and Vancouver Island. The other countries are so remote from our Pacific shores that it seems to me idle to suppose that France, Germany, Russia, or Japan can direct naval or military operations against our Western coast. Gentlemen who make this argument appear to me to forget that our Navy is being rapidly developed and that the Pacific coast States are about to become the dominant force on the Pacific coast. That they can be successfully assailed by any other power than Great Britain seems in the

highest degree improbable. Of course if England has the power to strike us, we have the power to strike back. We can strike at her by land and water. I do not fear such a conflict, and I am glad to believe that such a conflict is not likely to occur. With the growing friendship and community of interests of the two nations there remains only a rivalry of commerce and of friendly offices. I recognize the necessity of building up a strong navy on the Pacific coast, one worthy of the country and able to defend our interests; but this does not require the annexation of Hawaii. Indeed, it renders annexation a matter of wholly secondary and minor importance.

Sir, I object to any policy of alarm and sensation. We are growing faster than any country in the world in wealth and population. Shall we lose our heads and our even balance because we are involved in a brief war with a weak power that is bankrupt and has only one-fourth of our population? This subject of annexation presents wholly different considerations and has nothing properly to do with the Spanish war.

I have already consumed more time than I had designed, but without going into detail or ancient history I have endeavored to present fairly some of the issues involved in the issue of annexation. I have not dwelt upon the commercial aspects of the question. We have a commerce with Hawaii which, while not large, is valuable. But these islands produce nothing of importance that we can not produce at home. Their chief product is sugar. With cheap Asiatic or contract labor these islands are able to produce a good deal of sugar, and this entered free in our ports reduces our revenues and creates a formidable competition to the growing beet industry on the Pacific coast. This, sir, ought not to be. With an adequate and steady duty on sugar, we can produce from the cane and the beet all the sugar this country can require. The question to be considered is, Shall these great and growing industries of our own people be broken down in order to swell the profits of adventurers and speculators?

If this one factor were removed from the problem, I am confident that we should hear much less of annexation than we have done for some years past. The fever for annexation is not pure sentiment. It is not a Platonic love. It means settlements, money for a certain class of interests, and is essentially a marriage de convenance. It has pressed and maintained the reciprocity treaty. There is mischief enough in that arrangement without adopting a colonial and imperial system which is to change the whole spirit and principle of our American representative Government. [Applause.]

Mr. HITT. I now yield to the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. CAPRON].

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

Mr. HITT. I yield now to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. RIDGELY].

Mr. RIDGELY. Mr. Speaker, I do not care to say a great deal upon this question. To my mind there has been too much dwelling on technicalities and its minor features. The whole question, as I see it, resolves itself into this proposition: Can we reasonably expect this little Republic to maintain itself as an independent and friendly Government? If not, in whose hands shall it fall? Upon my best investigation and judgment we can not expect, and I do not believe it possible for these islands to maintain themselves as an independent Government for any considerable length of time under present and threatening conditions. Therefore we are forced to take our choice as to whether we will accept their voluntary offer to become a part of the United States, or shall we reject them and leave them to drift into the hands of some foreign government?

Upon that question I do not hesitate to say that in my judgment the wisest and best thing for this Government to do is to accept the annexation of the islands. So far as the argument and fear of danger from their population of Asiatic pauper and contract labor is concerned, I have looked carefully into the statistics and possibilities and have no fears of this danger assuming proportions that will in any degree trouble us. In fact, I am not one of those who subscribe to the idea that the very small population of these islands is in any way a menace to us. If we have reason to fear any nation or people, it is not from the governments who pay their labor the least wages for what they produce. The weak nations and people all around the globe are the ones who are oppressing their laborers with the payment of the lowest part of what the laborers produce—that is, the lowest wages—and the strongest nations, commercial and political, are the ones that pay the nearest to the full product or value of the product to their producing classes.

This movement, so far as it affects labor, is a process of leveling upward and not downward. Therefore I have no fear whatever as to the influx into our markets of cheap labor or the products of these islands. By a treaty which has been in operation for a great many years we are already admitting their entire product of sugar free. Having stimulated their production of sugar to the highest

possible point, we find that the total is insignificant compared with the annual consumption and importation into this country. To continue this trade by annexation will, in my judgment, be no great menace to the production of sugar in this country.

I have considered this question fully and carefully. I well understand it is in no sense a political issue. I find that gentlemen of the Republican party on my right are dividing on this question and propose to vote in accordance with their personal convictions. I find also gentlemen on this side, able gentlemen, taking opposite positions. We understand that this is no partisan issue; and it should not be.

Each member on this floor must take upon himself the responsibility of voting his honest judgment as to what is best for our Government and for the interests of all. The record of this vote will show that the question has been viewed in this light; and I believe that when we come to vote to-day, this proposition will be carried by two-thirds of the voting strength on this floor; and I hope that in a few days it will receive the sanction of the other branch of Congress, so that this old Hawaiian question may be finally settled and settled right, as I believe it will be.

Mr. Speaker, for more than fifty years this Hawaiian question, the control of these islands by our Government, has been one of continual discussion. I do not regard the annexation of this little speck of land, with its limited possible population and products, as in any way, either in spirit or fact, a violation of our well-established policy, known as the "Monroe doctrine." To the contrary, it would be a greater violation of this policy and our national practice to refuse these islands at this time. While it is true they are some 2,000 miles west of our Pacific shores, they are the first land, and nearer to us by half than they are to the Oriental continent beyond. We need their friendly relation and use, not alone for national defense in times of war, but as a friendly commercial port in times of peace. In my judgment, the only way to make certain of both these advantages is to wisely accept their friendly tender at this time.

We may properly ask ourselves why this at present independent Republic should, by its governmental action, seek to surrender its independence to us. I had the pleasure last winter of an extended interview with a Mr. Thurston, a highly educated native of these islands, to whom I addressed the above question. His answer was that up to quite recently the friends of their Republic and those who had established it had cherished the hope of maintaining themselves as an independent government. Hence had opposed all suggestions of becoming a part of any other nation; but against their wishes they have come of late to see and fully believe that it will be utterly impossible to maintain their independence, in view of their limited population and resources.

Their geographic position and isolation make them the coveted port by all nations seeking to enlarge their commerce upon the Pacific Ocean. Their limited population will ever make it an easy matter for any strong mercenary interest to secure, at least for a time, control of the machinery of their Government in order to obtain special commercial privileges; and for the same reasons in turn would be sought and overcome by rival and still stronger commercial interests.

Thus their Government will be ever subject to frequent revolutions, which would inevitably so weaken them as to compel their surrender to some stronger government. Seeing this, their judgment has led them to their present decision, that it will be better to voluntarily choose, while they can, the government to whom they shall be annexed. Hence they offer to become a part of our Government. Fortunately for them as well as ourselves, it is, if possible, more to our interest than to theirs that we should accept them. And, in my judgment, we can not do so too soon.

Considered entirely independent of the present war, we know that our people are anxiously pressing for increased commercial exchanges with the outside world; and in accordance with a well-known law, we naturally look to the west. Civilization has ever moved westward, and we have every reason to believe that it will ever so continue. True, as we leap across the boundless Pacific, we find ourselves treading upon the heels of the old and dying civilization of the Orient. But who shall say that because we find their condition so far below that to which we have attained in our evolutions and revolution around the earth, for this reason we should refuse to cultivate conditions of friendly commerce?

To establish commerce with the Orient does not mean that we shall engage in political conquests; to the contrary, nations have long since learned the better way of respecting each other's political rights and powers, while by friendly treaties and mutual interests we build up our commercial exchanges, leaving political evolutions to be effected by the elevating influences which are the inevitable result of accelerated commerce and the higher intelligence which it ever produces.

We need not, nor do I believe we will, enter into a political conquest of force, but, to the contrary, our higher civilization will be carried across the Pacific by the white and peaceful wings of our rapidly increasing commerce with the mighty hordes with whom

we shall trade on terms of peace, giving and receiving benefits, using as we will the Sandwich Islands as the great "cross-roads" where our mighty commerce shall meet in our own waters for the purpose of making the necessary exchanges between all points of the compass and from every shore and clime. This is but a brief and homely picture of what I see involved in this question of annexation.

Now, a few figures as to the population and resources of these islands, and I will have finished. First, however, answering those who fear this step will involve us in foreign complications; to the contrary, I believe annexation is the only possible way open to us to protect ourselves against foreign complications. Now, to the population. Our able Committee on Foreign Affairs in their report state as follows:

While the character of the comparatively small population of the Hawaiian Commonwealth is a minor consideration as compared with the transcendent importance of the possession of that strategic point in the Pacific, it may be briefly considered: It is a mixed population, 24,407 Japanese and 21,513 Chinese, or together nearly one-half of the entire 100,020 on the island, but after annexation the Asiatic element would be reduced; the contract system would be terminated, and United States restriction laws as to immigration would be applied; the Hawaiian penal code (paragraph 1571) would gradually send back the Chinese laborers. This annexation joint resolution forbids further Chinese immigration, and under it those now in Hawaii can not come to other parts of the United States.

Our recent treaty with Japan, to go into effect next year, enables the United States to regulate the immigration of Japanese laborers. The supply being cut off, the number of Asiatics remaining in Hawaii would be very rapidly reduced by natural causes, which are plainly shown by the movements of the Asiatic population in past years; for since 1893, though the flood of Japanese coming in has been strong, the departures each year have been half as many as the arrivals. Like the Chinese, when they have accumulated a moderate competence, the craving for home takes them back. The enormous excess of men coming shows on its face that they do not come to Hawaii to establish homes. The Hawaiian laws exclude them from homestead rights.

These constant and powerful causes operating, if annexation were carried out the Asiatic proportion of the population would rapidly diminish. There is a large element of what are called Portuguese—15,191—but of these, who are a quiet, laborious population, over 7,000 have been born there, educated in the public schools, and speak English as readily as the average American child. They are a useful, orderly people, and rapidly assimilate the American ideas and institutions which now prevail in the islands.

The British element, 2,250, the German, 1,432, and others of European origin, probably 1,000, are elements with which we are perfectly familiar in our own country, which readily sympathize and blend with our own people. They will naturally adhere and cooperate as against Asiatic influence. The native Hawaiian race is decreasing from year to year by some mysterious law which has been in operation for a century. It is reasonable to suppose that within ten years after annexation the inconsiderable population of these islands will not differ widely in character from that of many parts of the United States.

This truthful statement by our committee, Mr. Speaker, clearly shows that all this alarm about our nation being flooded with hordes of Asiatic people, who these alarmists claim must be taken in with these islands, is absolutely unfounded in fact as to their present population, and when we have taken political control we will at once apply our national policy by shutting the gates against a further influx of the Asiatic races.

For the benefit of our sugar producers, of both cane and beets, I will read what our committee report about the sugar product and its possibilities:

The only way in which Hawaiian sugar can injure beet sugar is by being produced in such quantities as to supplant the beet product of the United States, or by cutting the price so as to lower the price of beet sugar to its producers.

Hawaii can never produce enough sugar to supplant the beet or any other sugar in the United States. The sugar consumption of the United States was approximately 2,000,000 tons during 1896, which consumption is rapidly increasing year by year. During 1896 Hawaii produced a little over 200,000 tons, or approximately one-tenth of the consumption of the United States. This is the highest output ever made by Hawaii, and is the best it has been able to do after twenty years of encouragement under the reciprocity treaty with the United States.

All of the natural cane lands of Hawaii are already under cultivation.

The only remaining lands which can possibly be cultivated with sugar cane are those now dry and barren, which can only be cultivated by artificial irrigation, by pumping water to an elevation of from 150 to 600 feet. It goes without saying that such irrigation must be limited in area and problematical in profits.

As to Hawaiian sugar cutting the price, sugar is a world product, and its price is determined by the world's price, which is fixed in New York and London. If the Hawaiian crop were cut off entirely, or doubled, it would not raise or lower the price of sugar in the United States one mill. It is sometimes suggested that Hawaiian sugar may more than equal the consumption of the Pacific coast, and that Hawaiian planters would lower their price rather than send it to New York. The reply to this is that the Pacific coast's consumption is only about 75,000 tons per annum, and long ago the Hawaiian product far exceeded this. About one-third of the Hawaiian product for 1896-97 was sent to New York, and probably more than one-half of the crop of 1897-98 will be sent there.

Again, the Hawaiian cane sugar planters suffer under many disadvantages which the beet-sugar producers do not. It takes from eighteen to twenty-two months to grow a crop of sugar cane in Hawaii, during the entire period of which it must be irrigated on most of the plantations every week or two. It takes the beet-sugar planter only about six months to make a crop.

The cane-sugar planter has to employ his laborers all the year round; the beet-sugar planter discharges his laborers when the crop is made.

The cane-sugar planter of Hawaii pays now somewhat less wages per month than does the beet-sugar planter, although not as much less as is generally supposed, the average laborer in Hawaii costing the planter from \$15 to \$18 dollars per month. Under annexation the Asiatic supply of labor will be cut off, and this slight advantage will be eliminated.

Again, it costs the Hawaiian cane planter approximately \$10 a ton to get his sugar from the plantation to its market, while the beet-sugar planter has his market at his door.

Taken all in all, the cane-sugar planter of Hawaii stands on no more favor-

able basis than does the beet-sugar planter of the United States, and there is no reason why their interests should clash any more than do the interests of the corn planter of Kansas clash with those of the corn planter of Nebraska.

This clear and complete statement by our committee at once proves that all this alarm about ruining our sugar industry, like every other argument by those opposing annexation, falls as a mere pigmy, and especially when we know that for many years the sugar product of these islands has been admitted to our markets absolutely free from all duty. And in the face of this little supply of Hawaiian sugar, our beet-sugar industry has had its birth and grown to its present proportions. Hence there is absolutely no danger to our sugar industry involved in this proposition.

Viewed from whatever standpoint, to my mind, every reason and every condition lead me to the irresistible conclusion that wisdom demands the annexation of these islands without further delay. Therefore I shall vote for this resolution. [Applause.]

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

Mr. HITT. I yield to the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. MUDD].

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

Mr. HITT. I yield to the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. KNOWLES].

Mr. KNOWLES. Mr. Speaker, in the short time allotted to me I shall not attempt to enter upon a discussion of the resolution under consideration. I simply desire to express to the House the effects upon me of the discussion of this question, to which I have listened with interest and attention.

Previous to the war with Spain, I was opposed to the annexation of Hawaii. I had conceived reasons and arguments sufficient to form such conclusion. I had made up my mind that its acquisition, instead of being a source of strength, would be an element of weakness, necessitating large expenditures in fortifying and defending it, and dividing our Navy between its defense and that of our own coast.

How completely arguments and conclusions drawn from a preconceived theory are knocked out by actual experience has been well illustrated in this case. It is true that our war with Spain in the Pacific Ocean has been entirely a one-sided affair. But let us for a moment suppose our country at war with England, Germany, France, Russia, or even Japan, all of whom have powerful fleets in the Orient. Then would Hawaii become an element of strength or weakness to the nation which possessed it.

No fleet can sail from the Orient and attack our coast without coaling. Hawaii offers the only practical point for a coaling station in the Pacific Ocean. It is the outpost to our coast, and is as necessary to our defense as is the picket line of an army.

I had been much influenced in my opposition to this measure by the very able argument of a distinguished Senator from my own State, for whose wisdom, judgment, and integrity I have the very highest regard. But when it comes to the final vote on this question, I must act for myself in view of all the circumstances and conditions, and I state frankly to you that, in view of those conditions as I understand them, I must vote for this resolution.

I have arrived at this conclusion against my prejudice and almost against my will. In a recent communication to my newspaper I expressed doubt in the matter, and stated that I hoped to receive additional light from this discussion, and, as I can now see, hoped that light would confirm me in my opposition to the measure. But so far from this being the case, the more I have heard from the opponents of this resolution the more have I become convinced of the inherent weakness of their case until I have arrived at the conclusion just expressed. Every single argument thus far produced against this measure can be found in substance in the Congressional Globe and RECORD against every acquisition of territory from the Louisiana purchase to the annexation of Alaska. All the dire calamities predicted in this case were predicted of those. And what one of all those acquisitions of territory would we rescind or give back to-day?

Mr. Speaker, in the evolution of society it seems natural that any step forward is dreaded by a certain conservative class. I find no fault with this spirit of conservatism. It seems useful in preserving much that is best in human society. But, on the other hand, it has ever been a clog upon the wheels of all human progress. It is this spirit which would stand in the way of the glorious future and ultimate destiny of this Republic. It is this spirit of conservatism which would build a Chinese wall around our country and prevent the spread of the example and benefits of free institutions. It is this spirit which seeks to oppose progress in our own methods of government, teaching our people that the systems, constitutions, and laws enacted in the days of stage-coaches and wooden plows are applicable, fit, and proper to-day.

I for one do not believe it. I believe there is room for improvement in our governmental machinery, as there has been in our industrial machinery, and I would extend these blessings as

far and as fast as peaceable means will permit to all the nations of the earth. [Applause.]

Mr. HITT. I yield ten minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. GRAFF].

Mr. GRAFF. Mr. Speaker, in arriving at a judgment regarding the annexation of the Hawaiian Islands I was not hampered by any previously formed or expressed opinion concerning the subject, and therefore was able to give the matter a conscientious, careful, and unprejudiced examination. I have been affected in reaching a conclusion, first, by what appears to be the sentiment of the American people. I have great confidence in their good judgment, and it is justified by the manner in which they have met the various crises through which the Republic has passed and the manner in which they have shown themselves competent to deal with the most complex questions.

A notable illustration of this we had in the last campaign. They sat in their meetings and at the fireside, and even in the shops and stores, and carefully delved into the complicated question presented, and, in my judgment, the verdict which they finally rendered was well ripened, mature, and wise. They are a courageous, but a conservative people. They have all due respect for the traditions of the fathers, and yet have a well-founded confidence in their ability to meet the problems of the future, which are for them, and not for those departed, to solve. I have ample evidence collected during the last few weeks that the great majority of the American people are in favor of the annexation of these islands in the Pacific Ocean. In the next place, so far as the advantages of annexation are concerned as a strategic, military, and naval base, I have yielded to the judgment of the experts of the Army and the Navy of the United States, and of the Administration. General Schofield, the last one of those surviving who were prominent in the late rebellion as a commanding officer, and one who by experience and ability has shown himself to be worthy of regard concerning a question of this character, stated to the House Committee on Foreign Relations that the most important feature of all is that it economizes the naval force rather than increases it. He said also:

It is capable of absolute defense by shore batteries, so that a naval fleet after going there and replenishing its supplies and making what repairs are needed, can go away and leave the harbor perfectly safe to the protection of the army. The Spanish fleet on the Asiatic station was the only one of all the fleets we could have overcome as we did. Of course, that can not again happen, for we will not be able to pick up the weakest fellow next time. We are liable at any time to get into a war with a nation which has a more powerful fleet than ours, and it is of vital importance, therefore, if we can, to hold the point from which they can conduct operations against our Pacific coast. Especially is that true until the Nicaragua Canal is finished, because we can not send the fleet around from the Atlantic to the Pacific.

In addition to this, Admiral Walker, who has had an extended experience in the waters of the Hawaiian Islands, emphatically confirms General Schofield, saying that it would cost far less to protect the Pacific coast with the Hawaiian Islands than without them; that it would be taking a point of vantage instead of giving it to the enemy.

It must be remembered, Mr. Speaker, that we have a coast line of nearly 2,000 miles on the Pacific, and our Alaskan coast line is greater in extent than our Atlantic, Gulf, and Pacific coast lines combined. To my inexpert mind, it would seem that modern ships of war and commerce as well require facilities for coaling and for frequent docking for repairs. We are entirely without this, and that, too, in the great expanse of the Pacific Ocean. With millions of square miles of water around them, it rises above the waves a single and only fortress of the sea and now offered to us for the taking. It must be remembered that the Pacific Ocean from our own coast is on an average more than 5,000 miles wide, twice that at least of the Atlantic and four times in area. England at least realizes the importance of such harbors of refuge and bases of supply and has established fortified coaling stations all around the world in the pathways of commerce. A cruiser or battle ship with a coal capacity necessary to carry her 5,000 miles, steaming at 10 knots an hour, will exhaust her coal in less than 1,000 miles by doubling her speed. With a supply of coal well guarded in Pearl Harbor, our war ships and merchantmen can cross the Pacific at the maximum speed or concentrate at distant points at high speed, thus largely increasing their efficiency, while their adversaries, being under the necessity of conserving their coal or risking the running out of coal away from their own ports, must move at much less speed, thus being placed at great disadvantage.

England, Germany, France, Japan, the United States, and once Spain, all have a Pacific squadron. Every one of these is stronger than ours, save that of Spain, which was the weakest. But the Administration has asked for the annexation, and the President has placed the military and naval advantage as one of the causes. This has also contributed to forming my opinion. To-day the people of this country are back of the Administration and the conduct of this war and in all those things which are necessary to its successful prosecution as viewed by the Administration as they have never been behind any Administration from the commence-

ment of this Government. Therefore, not being a military expert myself, I yield to the judgment of the Administration upon that point. But to me the controlling factor in the determination of this question is its importance from a commercial standpoint.

War is not our normal condition; we desire to pursue rather the arts of peace, and when war comes it can never be resorted to by the American people except upon justifiable grounds and as a necessity. To me, therefore, war is simply an incident, a most glorious one, but yet simply an incident in the determination of action upon these resolutions for annexation. I think it is unfortunate that in the discussion of this question the problem of the retention of the Philippine Islands should have been brought into consideration. I am not afraid that we shall be hysterical, and because we have annexed the Hawaiian Islands shall be intoxicated with an uncontrollable desire for territorial aggrandizement.

I do not believe that the decision of the present question will influence our judgment when we come to settle the Philippine problem. This has not been our history; it has not been the history of Congress. But in determining this question it is not the acquiring of territory to satisfy pride or the greed of possession that influences me. Territorial expansion is not the need of the hour, but, in my judgment, the central and controlling factor in the determination to annex the Hawaiian Islands is that it will aid in our commercial expansion. We must remember that marvelous as has been our growth in population, from 3,000,000 people at the close of the Revolution to 73,000,000 to-day, it is surpassed in the wonderful increase of the productive power of this country through improved machinery, the product of American genius.

Whether this fact be a matter of congratulation or regret, no legislative power can stop it. The difference between the amount which could formerly be produced by a given number of laboring men and that which can be produced with the machinery of to-day operated by the same number passes comprehension. It is a problem to be met. There is much to congratulate ourselves upon under present conditions. I believe that we should first take care of our own market, as we have done, through the policy of protection. But we must also put our foot upon the sea. We must have our share of the world's commerce. I am to-day informed by the gentleman from Maine [Mr. DINGLEY] that the Treasury statistics show that from February 1 of the present year to the end of the present month each month's receipts under the Dingley bill are sufficient to pay the peace expenses of the nation, basing those expenses upon the expenses of each month corresponding for the last year, and leave a surplus on July 1 of \$10,000,000, and that, too, in the face of the fact that importers, anticipating this protection feature of the Dingley bill, flooded our markets, especially with one year's supply of wool, thus materially lessening the possibility of large revenue receipts during the first year of its operation. I give below a table of the exports of merchandise manufactured in this country, not including coin or bullion of any kind, with the value of each year's exportation, commencing with the passage of the McKinley Act, in 1890:

Exports of merchandise.

Year ending June 30—	Value.	Year ending June 30—	Value.
1890.....	\$845,293,823	1894.....	\$892,140,572
1891.....	872,270,233	1895.....	807,538,165
1892.....	1,015,732,011	1896.....	832,606,938
1893.....	831,030,785	1897.....	1,050,993,506

It is somewhat significant that of the two years in which we sold abroad the largest amount of agricultural and manufactured products one should be under the operation of the McKinley Act and the other under the Administration of McKinley, and the next year will surpass, according to the estimate of the Treasury Department, that of the present; for the exports for the nine months ending March 31, 1898, are \$910,612,651, which would make the exports for the year ending June 30, 1898, \$1,214,150,201. But the struggle is ever necessary and ever unending. We can not be blind to the fact that the four great European powers, England, Russia, France, and Germany, are endeavoring to obtain commercial supremacy of the world by the policy of colonization. The territory of Africa is speedily being divided between the great powers, and now already has commenced the parceling out of the Empire of China between them. More than one-half of the population of the world is in countries upon the Pacific and Indian oceans. Hon. J. R. Procter, in an article he wrote for the Forum in September, 1897, says:

The foreign commerce of the countries bordering these oceans, excluding North America, already amounts to over \$2,250,000,000 a year. Of this great commerce we as yet have but a small fraction. Over 80 per cent of our total exports go eastward across the Atlantic and less than 5 per cent westward.

Nor can we ignore the new constitutional monarchy of Japan which has awakened from its sleep of centuries and startled the world with its progressiveness and power. Are we to be prepared for this changing of the front of the world's market? Are

we to forget that we are between two oceans? I verily believe that the commercial conflict of the future is to be for the trade of the Orient.

We are no longer simply an agricultural nation, and it is not for the interests of the farmer that we should be that alone. The splendid victory of Dewey at Manila has not aroused us to dreams of territorial aggrandizement, but it has awakened us to the necessity of ports of our own under the American flag where our vessels may seek refuge and coal all over the world. We wish to see the American flag floating on every sea over goods manufactured by American workmen and cereals raised by American farmers shipped in American bottoms. When the American goes to the Orient, or wherever he goes the round world over, we want it understood that he is a citizen of a Republic which protects the commercial and personal interests of the American citizen wherever he may be. This is not "jingoism." This is a practical possibility. I am not in favor of commercial expansion for any other reason than the benefit of the 73,000,000 people whom we have within our present boundaries. And if in the annexation of Hawaii we can give them the privileges of our Government, to our own advantage, we have enough of caution and discretion to meet the Philippine problem when it comes upon its own merits.

We did not seek to wage this war for territory. We entered into it because Spain had forfeited her rights to govern the Island of Cuba, and because her misgovernment had been an evil both to that unhappy people and to our own commercial interests. We sought, according to the usages of war, because Spain persisted in resisting, to strike her wherever we could find a vital point, and we certainly are not called upon to allow the expenses of this war, prolonged by Spain, to be paid other than out of any of her possessions of which we may have control at its close. Our right under the Constitution to acquire territory by conquest, annexation, or purchase has been too well established by precedents in our own history to be questioned. At the time of the Louisiana purchase Jefferson wrote to Gallatin:

There is no constitutional disability as to the acquisition of territory, and whether, when acquired, it may be taken into the Union by the Constitution as it now stands will become a question of expediency.

The Democratic members of this House last night held a caucus, and one of their members therein offered a resolution to the effect that the annexation of the Hawaiian Islands was dangerous, unwise, and un-Democratic. But the word "un-Democratic" was stricken from the resolution, as it wisely might be, and as amended the resolution passed.

Florida was ceded by Spain in 1819 without the consent of the Spanish population of Florida. Louisiana was purchased from France in 1803 without the consent of the French population of Louisiana. Texas was annexed in 1845, and that not by treaty ratified by the Senate, but by an act of annexation passed by both Houses of Congress, as we are attempting to pass these resolutions, and yet this method is now pronounced unconstitutional by one of the members on the other side of this Chamber. California was ceded by Mexico in 1848. The Gadsden purchase was made 1853, and the purchase of Alaska finally in 1867. In considering the form of government which we would give to the Hawaiian Islands it may be remembered that we delayed admitting portions of the acquired territory for more than eighty years, and parts of it still remain unadmitted as States.

The total area of the United States at present is, in round numbers, 3,668,000 square miles. It was originally only about 1,182,000 square miles. Thus by these acquisitions, after the formation of our Government, we tripled our territory and acquired all we now have west of the Mississippi, as well as Louisiana and Florida. And I am frank to say that the proudest part of the history of the Democratic party was that to it was due the greatest credit for these acquisitions. It seems to me that it is very inconsistent for them now to grow so very conservative over the acquisition of a little group of islands in the midst of the sea. It must also be remembered that the Whig party suffered by reason of its opposition to the Mexican war which resulted in the acquisition of the California territory ceded by Mexico; and the same forebodings existed then as are brought up to-day, and the arguments made now are repetitions of those days.

We remember that the Whig party only escaped condemnation by the wise selection of the old hero of the Mexican war, Zachary Taylor, who snatched victory from the jaws of defeat. The leader of the party on the opposite side of this Chamber would not be here were it not for the annexation of Texas. This is not a new question. The value of the Hawaiian Islands to the United States has been recognized by almost every Secretary of State for the last half century.

There is a little Republic in Italy 4 miles from the shore of the Adriatic, away up in the Apennine Mountains, thirteen hundred years old, consisting of five villages, with some 8,000 inhabitants, and 22 square miles, entirely mountainous. There is little or no use for the prison. She is not a tempting prize to the stronger powers of Europe. Her people are industrious, prudent, and

economical. She does not intermeddle with the world outside. She shuts out the telephone, the railroad, and all of the modern appliances of this age. They have been kept in simplicity, yes; in liberty, yes; but they also have been kept in ignorance. They enjoy liberty bound up within themselves, but not such a liberty as we would or can enjoy. They have no part in the world's work. We can not escape it. If they had existed from the time of Adam, we would have lived longer in our hundred and nineteen years of national life than they.

We frequently hear men longing for the simplicity of the primitive times of the beginning of this Government. Perhaps some may think it would be better. It matters not. Sir, we can not turn the wheels of progress back, if we would. We must meet the problems of the future. We can not rely upon the principles laid down for the settling of the problems of the past, when we were an agricultural Republic alone, to meet the problems of the future of a great commercial power, except as they may be applicable to the present time. I have confidence in the present and, above all, I have a confidence in the guiding power of the God of nations, who has directed us thus far in preserving a liberty which is not one simply for ourselves, not an exclusive privilege, but is typified in the statue at New York Harbor of Liberty Enlightening the World. [Applause.]

Mr. DINSMORE. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. SIMS].

Mr. SIMS. Mr. Speaker, I wish to express my gratitude to the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. DINSMORE] for yielding me time upon this subject, when I know that there are other members not pressing for time who, to do justice to the subject, ought to be heard.

I have no desire to make a speech to be printed and circulated in my district. I have no desire to take up the time of this House if it does not help to win a victory for our side. Therefore, having a hearty desire to benefit the cause, to help the country, in order that distinguished gentlemen who have not had sufficient time to properly discuss this subject may have that much additional time, I yield the time back to the gentleman from Arkansas, to give to those whom I hope can do better by it than I feel that I can. [Applause.]

But before yielding the floor I wish to incorporate as part of my remarks the substance of the speech of Hon. William J. Bryan, delivered at the Nebraska Building, in Omaha, on yesterday, which I clip from the Washington Post of this date:

OMAHA, NEBR., June 14.

The Nebraska Building at the exposition was dedicated to-day with appropriate ceremony, amid the plaudits of thousands of the State's citizens. Governor Holcomb and his staff took part in the exercises, along with many of the State's most distinguished residents. The speakers of the day were Hon. Constantine J. Smith, Hon. William F. Gurley, and Hon. William J. Bryan. Mr. Bryan's oration was notable for being his first public declaration on the war issue. He took a high ground on the question, urging that the war is for humanity, and not for the extension of United States territory. In concluding, he said the manifest destiny of this nation is not to acquire new realms to govern, but to carry out the fundamental principles of democracy, to the end that equality among the citizens may be secured. Mr. Bryan said:

"War is harsh; it is attended by hardship and suffering; it means a vast expenditure of men and money. We may well pray for the coming of the time, promised in Holy Writ, when the spears shall be beaten into pruning hooks and the swords into plowshares; but universal peace can not come until justice is enthroned throughout the world. Jehovah deals with nations as He deals with men, and for both decrees that the wages of sin is death. Until the right has triumphed in every land and love reigns in every heart, governments must, as a last resort, appeal to force. As long as the oppressor is deaf to the voice of reason, so long must the citizen accustom his shoulder to the musket and his hand to the saber.

FORCED TO TAKE UP ARMS.

"Our nation exhausted diplomacy in its efforts to secure a peaceable solution of the Cuban question, and only took up arms when it was compelled to choose between war and servile acquiescence in cruelties which would have been a disgrace to barbarism.

"History will vindicate the position taken by the United States in the war with Spain. In saying this I assume that the principles which were invoked in the inauguration of the war will be observed in its prosecution and conclusion. If a contest undertaken for the sake of humanity degenerates into a war of conquest, we shall find it difficult to meet the charge of having added hypocrisy to greed. Is our national character so weak that we can not withstand the temptation to appropriate the first piece of land that comes within our reach?

"To inflict upon the enemy all possible harm is legitimate warfare, but shall we contemplate a scheme for the colonization of the Orient merely because our fleet won a remarkable victory in the harbor of Manila?

"Our guns destroyed a Spanish fleet, but can they destroy that self-evident truth that governments derive their just powers not from superior force but from the consent of the governed?

"Shall we abandon a just resistance to European encroachment upon the Western Hemisphere in order to mingle in the controversies of Europe and Asia?

POSITION OF NEBRASKA.

"Nebraska, standing midway between the oceans, will contribute her full share toward the protection of our seacoast; her sons will support the flag at home and abroad; wherever the honor and the interests of the nation may require Nebraska will hold up the hands of the Government while the battle rages, and when the war clouds roll away her voice will be heard pleading for the maintenance of those ideas which inspired the founders of our Government and gave the nation its proud eminence among the nations of the earth.

"If others turn to thoughts of aggrandizement and yield allegiance to those who clothe land covetousness in the attractive garb of 'national destiny,' the people of Nebraska will, if I mistake not their sentiments, plant

themselves upon the disclaimer entered by Congress and expect that good faith shall characterize the making of peace, as it did the beginning of war. Goldsmith calls upon statesmen—

"To judge how wide the limits stand
Betwixt a splendid and a happy land."

"If some dream of the splendors of a heterogeneous empire encircling the globe, we shall be content to aid in bringing enduring happiness to a homogeneous people, consecrated to the purpose of maintaining 'a government of the people, for the people, by the people.'"

I also wish to read and make a part of my remarks an editorial from the *American Agriculturist* of June 4, which is as follows:

AN ALLURING TEMPTATION.

The conquest of the Philippines suggests an alluring policy of colonization to the United States. Here are some hundreds of islands endowed with all the natural wealth of the tropics, with a population variously estimated at 7,500,000 to 15,000,000, stretching almost from Formosa to the equator, and from longitude 115° to 165° east from Greenwich, including the Caroline and Ladrone islands. The water area of these heretofore Spanish possessions is about 1,000 miles north and south by nearly 3,500 miles east and west, and while Manila is some 8,000 miles from San Francisco, the most easterly of the Carolines, Pinlap Island, is only about 5,000 miles distant.

Besides this big slice of the East Indies, the banishment of Spain from the West Indies will give to the United States not only Cuba but Puerto Rico. Their annexation as colonies would doubtless be followed by the "absorption" of Haiti and Santo Domingo. Of course we must capture and hold the Canaries, to prevent Spain from having an outpost against us, and the "taking over" of the Sandwich Islands would become a natural part of the same policy.

The United States would thus surely be recognized as a dominant power, with its flag floating over its possessions in the Canaries 3,000 miles to the east of the seat of Government and 10,000 miles from Washington over the Philippines at the west. With a navy equal if not superior to England's, and with a standing army of commensurate proportions, of course we should want a slice of Africa, a piece of China, and our share of everything else in sight in every part of the world. Indeed, having entered upon the policy of expansion, having begun the job of establishing "stable governments" where needed, it would probably be necessary to occupy Spain itself. And having shown what we could do for the cause of humanity, there would be a great temptation to settle the next outbreak of atrocities in Armenia by attacking Constantinople. Uncle Sam would thus smash the European concert, and show that the new giant of the West, having succeeded in establishing ideal government three-quarters of the way around the earth, now hoped to reform the Old World.

The policy of colonial expansion, now so extravagantly urged in interested quarters, may not at present contemplate interference in European politics, but such interference would be less of a departure from the new policy than this policy is a departure from the Monroe doctrine. The new idea sounds very grand at first, and in the flush of victory the appeal to extend our domination beyond the seas is so alluring that the consequences of such action are lost sight of.

The policy of colonial empire would at once expose us to embroilment with other nations. It would vastly magnify the power and expense of Army and Navy. It would perpetuate increased taxes. It would inaugurate an era of corruption in our foreign possessions, a debasement of the blood, that could not fall to in time affect the physical and mental stamina of our people at home. It would be un-American, unwise, unconstitutional, and in results unworthy of the effort.

On still higher ground a colonial policy is objectionable. It would degenerate the holiest war ever waged for humanity into a campaign of conquest. This would lower the United States before the world, but its moral effect upon our own people would be still worse.

Again, the more our people are led to indorse the policy of expansion the more will domestic interests be neglected. Under such a policy no expense will be spared on Army and Navy. But how about those home interests that vitally concern everybody every day? Better roads and improved waterways, more mails and free delivery, a better banking system, better education, reform of existing abuses, protection against monopoly and corporate extortion—all these and many other things will be neglected. Monopoly in various forms and other enemies of social progress would hold high carnival at home while national and State legislatures were concerned about our colonies abroad.

It will be bad for the American farmer should Uncle Sam ever decide to embark upon an area of "imperial colonization." The cooly labor of these tropical colonies, directed by capable overseers, and their products manipulated by world-wide trusts, would close up every beet sugar proposition and cane sugar mill in the United States. The growing and manufacture of smoking tobacco and cigars, one of the large interests of the United States, would be annihilated, and the heavy leaf industry also injured. Rice, cotton, hemp, and all fiber crops would be so cheaply produced and worked in the East and West Indies as to sound the death knell of these industries in the United States, or perpetuate the low prices which have for a year past brought only disaster to the cotton planter, factor, manufacturer, or operative.

The new problem in politics that may be the outcome of this war bids fair to cut athwart all parties even more than did gold and silver. We have briefly suggested some of the possibilities that may be involved. We do this before these matters become political issues, in the hope that they may be so adjusted after the victorious culmination of the war as to avoid any departure whatever from the accepted policy of the American nation, and so as to perpetuate the perfect harmony among the people of all sections that is such a beautiful feature of the present and so hopeful for the future.

We speak at this time and in this way also because agriculturists represent the largest body of voters and the most powerful portion of the electorate. Upon them depends in the future, even more than in the past, the true welfare of the Republic.

Mr. DINSMORE. Mr. Speaker, I yield one hour to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. JOHNSON].

Mr. JOHNSON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I shall not consume any of the time which has been allotted to me for debate on the pending resolution in useless exordium, but shall proceed at once to the very heart of the controversy. I affirm, sir, and I shall endeavor to maintain before the House and the country, three propositions:

First. That the annexation of Hawaii to the United States is not necessary as a war measure in our conflict with Spain.

Second. That the annexation of the island is not necessary in order to prevent it from falling into the hands of some other great power, to be used by it to menace and attack our coast.

Third. That the annexation of Hawaii is of itself inherently wrong, and that it is the opening wedge which is designed to lead, and which will lead to still further acquisitions of insulated foreign territory, and that such a policy is against the best interest of the country, and therefore ought not to be entered upon. Now, sir, let us consider the first of these propositions. It has been contended in this debate that the present war makes it necessary that, in order to maintain ourselves against Spain in the Philippine Islands and prevent her from sending there for our overthrow a new navy and army, which it is claimed she is likely to do, we should annex Hawaii for our use as a coaling station and for a base of supplies for our operations in the Philippines.

Mr. Speaker, this war with Spain does not furnish a single additional argument in favor of the annexation of this island that did not exist before the conflict was precipitated. It does not strengthen the position of the annexationist one particle. It furnishes simply a pretext for annexation, not a reason for it. What is the condition of affairs in the Philippine Islands to-day? Commodore Dewey, with his heroic sailors, has swept out of existence the only fleet which Spain had in Asiatic waters. His squadron lies unopposed in the harbor of Manila. That city is under the guns of his victorious fleet and is completely at his mercy.

According to his own dispatches, his sailors are in high spirits and excellent health, and his vessels are entirely uninjured. He has seized upon the islands at the mouth of the harbor, and has fortified them. He has laid submarine mines in the harbor in order that he may be protected against any possible contingency which may arise. The insurgents are swarming upon the walls of the doomed city, cutting off its communications, and anxious to cooperate with our fleet in bringing about its capture or capitulation.

The very last dispatches sent from Manila by the Spanish captain-general to the home Government at Madrid are filled with tidings of dismay. He declares therein that while he will make the best resistance within his power, it is absolutely impossible for him to withstand the combined forces of our fleet and of the insurgents. Mr. Speaker, under such circumstances as these, what is the simple duty of our Government? That which it is already performing, the sending to Commodore Dewey of supplies and an army of occupation sufficiently large to enable him to land and man the forts which he has captured, and to take possession of the city and preserve peace and order.

Already the Government has sent some troops and supplies to his assistance. More troops are being mobilized upon the Pacific coast and will soon follow in their wake. We have done more than this. We have reinforced him with vessels of war. We have sent to him the *Charleston*, now well on her way. The *Monterey*, one of the most powerful vessels in our Navy, is even now following in her trail, and the *Monadnock*, conceded to be the most formidable monitor that we have afloat, is soon to take her departure for the same destination. I hesitate not to affirm upon this floor that if the combined navies of Spain could be precipitated upon Manila to-day Commodore Dewey, thus equipped with the new vessels that have been sent to his relief, could and would absolutely exterminate and destroy that entire navy.

But, sir, is there any man fool enough to believe that Spain can send at this time either a navy or an army to the relief of her doomed colony in the Philippines—that they will take their slow and tortuous passage through the Mediterranean, thence through the Isthmus of Suez, out into the Red Sea and Gulf of Aden, and on through the Indian Ocean to their destination? And where is the Spanish fleet that is able to come to the rescue of Manila? I challenge those who demand this annexation as a war measure to answer.

The pride of Spain's navy is this hour closely blockaded inside the narrow-mouthed and rock-ribbed harbor of Santiago de Cuba, absolutely incapable of escape or rescue, with an American squadron far outnumbering it in valor and in power awaiting it upon the outside, and the American Army is just about to assail the city of Santiago from the land side with a power which is irresistible. It is only a question of a few days, sir, until those Spanish vessels of war will be absolutely destroyed or compelled to unconditionally surrender. Is any man fool enough to believe that Spain dare send the only other squadron which she possesses, that which is designated as the Cadiz squadron and which is now maneuvering off the coast of Spain, to the Philippine Islands to relieve her forces there?

The very moment she attempts it, she leaves her own coast and the Canary Islands, which she owns, and which lie off the coast of northern Africa, the one to be ravaged and the other to be attacked and captured by the formidable fleet which we can with perfect ease and safety spare from our naval operations in the Caribbean Sea against Cuba and Puerto Rico. Nor is it possible to dispatch a Spanish army to the Philippines, for how can an army be sent without vessels of war to act as its convoy?

Mr. Speaker, in view of these facts which I have stated, and which can not be successfully controverted, I affirm that the man

who declares that there is any military or urgent necessity that we should, for the relief of Commodore Dewey, annex the Hawaiian Islands to the United States simply insults the intelligence of the gentlemen to whom he makes such an argument.

And now, gentlemen, answer me for one moment, upon what ground do you want Hawaii for the purpose of holding the Philippines during this war? Accord me, if you please, definite and specific reasons. Do not attempt to put me off either by dogmatic assertion or by glittering generalities. Do you expect to obtain men from there to carry on the war in the distant province? Not at all. You will not get a man there. Every soldier you get will have to come from under the shadow of the American flag, from our own domain, on this side of the Pacific. Is it intended to transport American soldiers to Hawaii, land them there, and then reembark them for Asiatic waters? No, sir; our forces will go direct from the great city of San Francisco.

You say we want a coaling station at Hawaii. Why can we not do as we have already started to do, and as every other nation is obliged to do where she undertakes to send her war ships a great distance and possesses no intermediate coaling station, load up the decks of our war ships, load up their bunkers with all the coal we can deposit there, and then take colliers along and load the war ships with coal in the open sea? Oh, but you say that this method is inconvenient and expensive. Possibly this may be true; but the inconvenience is nothing and the expense is nothing to what we will have to encounter if we are to enter upon this policy of annexing the islands to the United States. You say, too, that the proposition to coal at sea involves delay.

You talk as if Spain had a powerful fleet in the waters of the Pacific or a great army in the Philippines, and as though our heroic Navy there was in danger of being crushed out of existence by sudden and overwhelming attack, whereas, as I have already shown, just the opposite is the case. Our troops and our war ships would arrive at Manila in ample time and without injurious delay even were the vessels denied coaling facilities at the Sandwich Islands. All that can be said as an argument in favor of Hawaii as a basis for operations in the Philippines during the present war is that it would be a convenience—a mere convenience. No conscientious man who cares anything for his own standing or reputation will assert that it is a necessity. Let me put a square question to the rabid annexationists of this House, who pretend that annexation is an imperative necessity growing out of the war.

If the Sandwich Islands to-day were in the possession of France, Germany, or Great Britain, or any other powerful nation which was enforcing the laws of neutrality against us, or was denying us the right to coal there, do you not very well know that we would, nevertheless, be able to send both war ships and troops to Commodore Dewey without appreciable difficulty or delay?

But, Mr. Speaker, it is admitted that we already possess a coaling station in this island; that we have collected at Honolulu a large quantity of coal, and that, by permission of the Government of Hawaii, our war vessels and transports stop there and coal en route to the Orient. Gentlemen upon this floor have tried to draw on the sympathies of the American people by talking of the unselfish and patriotic love which these people have shown for us by thus defying the laws of neutrality in our behalf.

Let us not forget that this is owing to us, from the fact that for years we have protected the people of Hawaii and have guaranteed and secured to them independence against all foreign aggression. Let us not forget that it is our due, because by an unwise and one-sided treaty we have put millions of dollars into the pockets of the Hawaiian people by the admission of their products free of tariff duties. It has been said, too, by gentlemen that if we do not annex these islands, when peace is declared between Spain and ourselves she will claim damages and collect them from these people for their violation of neutrality laws in our interest, and that she will punish them.

All such talk, sir, is absurd. To assert that weak and impotent Spain, Spain who is unable to protect her own possessions in the Pacific, who is unable to go to the rescue of her own provinces in the Philippine Islands, can levy any damages against Hawaii or punish her because she has given us an opportunity to enter her ports and coal there during the existence of this war is simply ridiculous. Do gentlemen forget that the same fostering care upon our part that has maintained Hawaiian independence in the past will be exerted, if need be, to protect her hereafter, and that in the treaty of peace with Spain, a treaty that will be dictated by the United States, a clause can and will be inserted if necessary, upon our demand, releasing all claims against the Hawaiian Government by the Madrid authorities for any aid she may have afforded us during the existence of hostilities.

If Spain desires to visit punishment on the Hawaiian people, we can defend them when they are independent as well as though they are annexed to our own soil. We can easily come to their rescue without the necessity of political union with them. But something else has transpired, Mr. Speaker, in connection with this flimsy pretext of military necessity for annexation. What is

it? The Canadian Pacific Railway Company, in its excursions around the world, starting from England, crosses the Atlantic Ocean by a steamship line which runs to Quebec; thence its course is across the lower portion of Canada to Vancouver Island, from which point its line of steamships ply directly north, right near the Aleutian Islands, south of Alaska—islands owned and possessed by ourselves—thence to Yokohama, Japan, and on to Hongkong, China, very near to the Philippines.

This is a well-established route, a route over which those seeking pleasure, those whose safety is to be preserved, are taken by this great Canadian corporation. You will observe this route plainly marked on the printed map of the world, with a North Pole projection, which now hangs upon the rack in front of the desk of the Speaker, marked there by the printers and publishers of the maps themselves. We have been by Government officials told—and no man can dispute it to be true—that right among these Aleutian Islands is a magnificent harbor, in an island belonging to ourselves, a harbor that is accessible and deep, well protected on every side, and capable of accommodating vessels of the heaviest tonnage, and a harbor splendidly adapted for a coaling station.

It is in evidence by gentlemen living on the Pacific slope who can rise here, if necessary, and verify the statement—indeed, it is a fact quite well known to all acquainted with Pacific coast transportation lines—that there are three lines of steamships plying from that coast near Seattle and Tacoma, which pass close to the Aleutian Islands over the same excursion route I have mentioned to Yokohama and Hongkong. These lines, sir, transport passengers as well as freight and run the year round. One is an English line, one is an American line, and the other is a Japanese line. It is also in evidence here, being certified to by Government officials whose right and duty it is to speak on such subjects and who speak intelligently and knowingly, that this Aleutian route to the Philippines is 600 to 1,000 miles shorter than the route by Hawaii. This fact is also conceded upon this floor.

It has also been certified to by those who occupy a high position as Government officials and who are acquainted with the facts, that the temperature on this route is not severe, and that at no season of the year is that line of travel obstructed by ice or by any other impediment. Senator PETTIGREW, who traveled to Asia by this northern route and came back by the southern route last summer, I believe, declares that the length of time consumed by him in covering the outgoing route was three days less than that occupied by him on the return voyage by way of the Sandwich Islands. Admiral Walker, himself a strong annexationist, in his hearing recently before the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House, used the following language, which bears directly upon the matter I am now discussing, and which is doubly valuable, coming as it does from so biased a witness:

Steamers run both ways, and in crossing to Shanghai large steamers, which carry an abundance of coal, go farther north than the islands (Sandwich). They sweep up toward the Aleutian Islands, because of the shape of the earth, which makes it a shorter distance across.

I am aware of the fact that the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. GROSVENOR] has introduced here a statement prepared by Commodore Melville, a naval officer, in which he states that this Aleutian route is not a good one, for the reason that it abounds in fogs, for the reason that there are rocks along the coast, and for the additional reason that at various times of the year the passageway is clogged with ice. The naval officer, sir, who made that certificate is as bitter a partisan in favor of annexation as the gentleman from Ohio, or as you and I can possibly be in our opposition to what we consider to be a dangerous scheme.

Every word he says is to be taken with a grain of allowance. It is not the impartial declaration of a man who has no feeling one way or the other and is simply interested in placing all the facts before the House, but that of a person with strong prejudice, unduly anxious to promote the passage of the pending resolution. His certificate, therefore, is entitled to be weighed as an argument rather than accepted as a fact.

How much importance, Mr. Speaker, is to be attached to the statement of this naval officer as against the actual fact that the excursionists of the Canadian Pacific road are taken over the northern route, and that three different steamship lines for passengers and freight travel over it the whole year round. Think you, sir, that this would occur if the line of travel was obscured by fog or impeded by shoals, rocks, or ice? Would the pleasure of excursionists be enhanced by such a route? Would the Canadian Pacific Railroad Company transport its tourist passengers over lines so perilous? These things speak volumes in refutation of the evidence which the gentleman from Ohio has presented to this House, and clearly demonstrate the existence of at least as good and a speedier route to the Philippines than the one which touches at Hawaii; a route, too, where excellent coaling facilities can be easily provided en route at a magnificent harbor already our own.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I think I have sufficiently demonstrated my first proposition. I say that among all the flimsy pretexts that

have been laid before this House of Representatives to induce members to vote to abandon our old policy of nonintervention and venture into the acquisition of insular territory, not a single one has been so devoid of reason, so false in point of fact, as this declaration that it is necessary we should own Hawaii in order that we may maintain ourselves in the Philippine Islands during the progress of the present war with Spain.

Ah, sir, the annexation of this island is not being urged simply because we want to have a base for present operations or in the belief that we intend, when the war is over and we have exacted from Spain an indemnity, to turn the Philippines back to her, or in case she does not pay the indemnity, that we will dispose of them to some other nation at something like their reasonable value; but annexation is being urged upon this floor because it is the purpose of those who urge it that we shall acquire and use Hawaii as a base of supplies for the permanent holding of the Asiatic territory which the heroism of Dewey and his victorious sailors has delivered into our grasp.

This is one thing, Mr. Speaker, which induces me to declare that instead of the war being a reason why we should now proceed to annex Hawaii, it furnishes every reason why we should defer all action in the matter until a more suitable occasion, when we can ascertain all the facts and consequences in the premises and come to a deliberate conclusion—one which will not come back to plague us in the years that are to come.

Considering the question of the annexation of Hawaii alone and as an independent proposition, it is to my mind by all odds the gravest and most far-reaching proposition in its effect upon the American people which they have been called upon to confront since the days of the civil war, not even excepting the very vital question of finance itself.

But, Mr. Speaker, as I have said, the annexation of Hawaii is not the ultimatum of the annexationists. It is but the entering wedge. Permit this act to be done, and you gain an impetus which you will find it difficult to resist. Its avowed purpose, its natural tendency, its irresistible consequence means that we are to proceed still further in extending our possessions and in the acquisition of foreign territory in no wise contiguous to our soil.

And this above all others is the reason why I am now disposed to antagonize it upon this floor. Let no gentleman be vain enough to imagine that he can vote to annex Hawaii to the United States and then stop short in the career, or hold back from still further encroachments his ambitious colleagues whose appetite for territorial acquisition he has thus whetted rather than satisfied. He will awaken sooner or later to find out that he has set in motion a current which he is powerless to resist, and which, in spite of himself, will sweep him into the vortex below and inflict upon his country and his posterity numerous evils far beyond his ability ever to repair.

Yes, Mr. Speaker, the question is not simply whether we shall annex Hawaii. Gentlemen need not attempt to deny it; they shall not avoid it; they must come out squarely from behind the breastworks and meet us in the open on this proposition. Even now many of the newspapers of the country are declaring that we ought permanently to occupy the Philippines. This suggestion is in the very atmosphere that permeates this Chamber. It is openly avowed in conversation by many members on this floor.

A determined effort is being made in certain quarters to bring about a concentration of public opinion in this direction. Its promoters are masquerading under the pretense of military necessity. They are already prating about our "manifest destiny," telling us that the time has arrived for us to assume among the nations of the earth the position to which our great power entitles us and seeking to play upon the vanity and excite the cupidity of the people. And something still more significant—I see by the newspapers, and I doubt not that it is true, because it is consistent with all he has done up to this time upon the subject of annexation—that the President of the United States has said that he is very anxious that we shall be able to get possession of Puerto Rico before Spain has an opportunity to sue for peace.

Upon what ground is this desired? Are not the Philippines sufficiently valuable to secure to us any claim for indemnity which we can reasonably make against Spain? And how is it with respect to Cuba? I know it has been said from the White House that we do not propose to enter into a war for acquisition of territory, and that such a policy would be a crime against all our traditions.

I know it was declared in the war resolution which passed this House and the Senate that we disavowed any purpose to appropriate Cuba to ourselves, and that our only desire and object was to insure her independence and a stable form of government. I am not here to say that every man who joined in that declaration was insincere; but I am here to maintain that men sometimes forget and that men sometimes change their opinions for reasons which they deem sufficient to justify them in such conduct. We have always coveted the fair isle of Cuba. Once in possession of it, shall we not begin to reflect what it has cost us to gain a lodgment there?

Will we be disposed, with great expense incurred and much precious blood shed in her behalf, and with Spain, as you contend, practically bankrupt and unable, or perhaps unwilling, to pay us a money indemnity, to withdraw from the island? Will we not be attracted by its salubrious climate and its fertile soil? If a formal tender of the island be deemed necessary to afford us an excuse for forgetting our high-sounding declarations and for breaking our promises, will not a nondescript crowd be gathered from out of its motley population which will hold itself together, under a government upon paper, long enough to invite our avarice and secure our acceptance? Ah, sir, already we are beginning to belittle these Cuban patriots.

Already we are beginning to characterize them as disorganized guerrillas, utterly incapable of maintaining an organized warfare; already we are talking about their incapacity for self-government and the inadvisability of putting any one class of them in control for fear it will wreak its vengeance on the other class; already we are prating about our obligation to establish a stable government if it takes years to do so; already we are felicitating ourselves that we did not declare their independence, the significance of which omission, sir, is now plainly apparent to even the ordinary mind.

Mr. Speaker, is there not grave danger that this holy crusade for liberty and the independence of Cuba is liable after all to end in a disgraceful scramble for spoils, a scramble as disgraceful as any that ever characterized the people of ancient Rome? Is there not serious danger that this war for humanity, this righteous uprising to save the people of Cuba from starvation, which so far has resulted in a blockade under which the Spanish soldiery has thrived and many of the remaining concentrados have starved to death, will yet degenerate into a miserable war of conquest for the possession of territory?

Sir, with all these grave questions staring us in the face, what kind of a time is this for us to discuss and pass upon that which is intended to be the first step in this "march to empire"? Is there a disposition here to commit the American people, suddenly and before they can have an opportunity for calm thought and reflection, to a policy which will inevitably result in their injury, and which they will condemn when they have the time to grasp it in all its aspects and weigh it in all its consequences? Are we not acting here for posterity as well as for ourselves?

Why is it that gentlemen rush with indecent haste to pass this resolution now? Why is it that they are absolutely unwilling even to submit it to the people to be discussed pro and con at the polls at the next election? Such a discussion, I affirm, they have never enjoyed. When the first treaty for Hawaiian annexation, sir, was sent to the Senate by President Harvison, and was thereafter soon withdrawn by President Cleveland, there was some discussion of this subject in the papers.

The matter then, comparatively speaking, dropped out of the public mind until the present Chief Executive sent the second treaty for annexation to the other end of the Capitol. Every word of discussion that was uttered upon the proposition to accept that treaty, though it dragged along for weary weeks, was uttered behind closed doors, where the American people could not hear a solitary word that was said or get the benefit of the arguments that were made for and against the proposal which involved to them consequences of the most vital and far-reaching importance.

This is the first time in all the history of Hawaiian annexation that they have had an opportunity to hear an open discussion of this grave subject in Congress, and yet, sirs, you persist in withholding from them the benefits that will accrue from it by forcing the vote to-day at 5 o'clock, before they can have time to get the RECORD into their possession and to weigh the arguments which have been and are still being submitted.

Sir, I insist that this proposition for annexation should be postponed until after the next election, when our constituents can have the advantage of the arguments which have been made, and to the end that we may then come back here as their representatives, fully advised as to their judgment, given upon due deliberation, prepared thereby to execute whatever may prove to be their will.

Indeed, Mr. Speaker, it would be the part of wisdom to defer this whole matter of Hawaiian annexation until the close of the war, along with these other great questions of insular acquisitions so closely allied to it, which concern the weal or the woe of the great American people, that we may take them up then, not amidst scenes of excitement, not in passion, not under the coercion of party discipline or party prejudice, not at a time when men have only superficial views upon the matter and are forced to act upon first-blush impressions, or, having honest opinions well matured, dare not declare against annexation for fear it will be said that they are trying to interfere with the just prosecution of the war, but that they may be discussed in times of profound peace, under congenial surroundings, when the judgment of the people as finally given will be their enlightened and judicial judgment.

Then, if they deliberately favor this crusade for empire, we

must acquiesce and go forward in it cheerfully, whatever dangers it may bring to us; but if they then hesitate, they will have an opportunity to carefully investigate and exercise their free choice before gyves are put upon them by their Representatives and Senators in Congress.

Mr. Speaker, I do not believe that the masses of our countrymen favor this annexation. I do not accept the opinion of the Chief Executive as a just exposition of their views. Neither the clamor of certain of the press nor the demands of military and naval dignitaries should conclude them. But, even if the majority of our constituents are inclined to this measure, and we believe their conclusion to have been reached without having the facts fully presented for their consideration, and that annexation will result in their injury and to the damage of our country, it should still be our high prerogative and our bounden duty to interpose a barrier between them and the evil they are about to embrace, until they have had the opportunity to review their opinions and make a final decision in the light of all the evidence. I protest also against efforts which have been made, both here and elsewhere, to make it appear that Hawaiian annexation is a party question and that the tenets of the Republican party require it to be accomplished.

I grant you that the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. GROSVENOR] disavowed the political character of the question the other day upon this floor. He was too shrewd a man to be caught in a trap like that. He no doubt had in mind while he was speaking the declaration of the last Republican national convention upon this subject, and besides he doubtless thought that he could afford by his admission to allow several gentlemen upon this side to vote against annexation and to exercise the liberty of their consciences, so far as party discipline was concerned, if he could only be able to woo to his support some gentlemen on the other side of the Chamber.

But I say to the gentleman from Ohio, and I say it respectfully, that of all men upon the floor, he is the least likely, because of his known partisan views, to receive very much consideration upon this subject at the hands of those upon the other side of the center aisle.

But, sir, you have heard it through the press, you have heard it in private conversation, you have heard it in public discussions; it has been dinned in your ears everywhere, that Hawaiian annexation is a Republican measure; that the Republican party is in favor of it; that the President of the United States, who seems disposed to urge this matter, whatever may betide, is committed to it, and that we ought loyally to uphold the hands of the President, and that he is derelict in duty, not only to the Republican party, but also to the country, who will withhold this support.

Unfortunately for this contention the declarations of the Republican party in its last national convention assembled are in point. When Benjamin Harrison, a Republican President, sent the first annexation treaty to the Senate, and Grover Cleveland, in the exercise of his good, rugged common sense, withdrew that treaty from its consideration, an issue upon annexation was joined between the Republican President upon the one side and the Democratic President upon the other, and the Republican party was invited to define its position in the matter.

At the very next Republican national convention which assembled, the one which nominated the present occupant of the White House for the position of the Presidency, that convention, thus challenged to declare itself, responded. But how? Did it demand annexation? Upon the contrary, it carefully avoided any such a demand. It simply declared that it was in favor of the United States controlling the island, and against the intervention in its affairs by any foreign nation. "And, as if to show that it understood the meaning of words and used them advisedly, in the very next section it declared that the Nicaraguan Canal should be "owned" by the United States.

Mr. Speaker, who will pretend that this high declaration of Republican principles, by that organization in the party which alone has authority to declare its principles, commits the Republican party to the project to annex Hawaii? Mr. Harrison had no right to commit the Republican party to the proposition, though he possessed the clear right to his opinion concerning it and the constitutional power to negotiate the treaty by and with the advice and consent of the Senate; and I respectfully call the attention of the very excellent gentleman who is his successor and who is now in the White House to the fact that the position of the Republican party is to be defined by the party organization and not by the man whom it elects President, and he will do well in this peculiar juncture of human affairs to remember that whatever his action may be now, however the voice of censure in his party may be withheld from him at the present, there will come a time when every act of his Administration will be reviewed, not only by those opposed to him politically, but in the spirit of manly criticism and fairness by those inside the pale of his own party organization, who will not hesitate to denounce any action upon his part which in their honest judgment they deem to have been in violation of the best interests of the American people.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I propose to consider the second proposition which I laid down when I commenced my argument. I affirm that the annexation of Hawaii is not necessary to us in order to prevent it passing into the hands of any other nation, that there is no danger that it will be used in the future as a base from which to assail our coast if we now reject it.

Here is the argument that is made: We are told that foreign vessels of war can not carry sufficient coal to enable them to cross the Pacific Ocean and attack our western coast; that Hawaii is the only place where such vessels can replenish with coal for such hostile purpose; that it commands our shores and can be used as a base for prosecuting war against us; hence that we must annex it in order to stop supply of coal to foreigners and prevent it from being made a base for their warfare upon us. We are told that if we will do this that foreign fleets will be powerless for lack of coal, and will lie "like painted ships upon a painted sea."

Of course, sir, such an argument as this can have no application to the mother country, with whom, of all nations on earth, war is most to be dreaded, for in British Columbia, upon the Pacific coast, right above our domain, she has a strongly fortified base of supplies to which her vessels could resort to obtain coal, and from which they could come forth to menace and attack our coast.

But these advocates of imperialism are telling us, in answer to this suggestion, that the English coaling station, strongly fortified though it be, would not amount to anything to England in case of war with us, for the reason that at the very opening of the war we would take possession of it. Ah, Mr. Speaker, I want to call the attention of these omniscient gentlemen to the fact that we found it a good deal easier to boast what we would do before the opening of the present war, in the way of taking possession of the enemy's country, than it has been to perform that act since the war has come upon us.

We were going to seize Cuba in a few short hours and pull down the Spanish flag and emancipate the Cuban patriots without delay. But nearly two months have elapsed since war was declared and still we have been unable to find permanent lodgment upon Cuban soil. Spain is one nation, England is quite another. She is mighty upon both land and sea, and she could not be dislodged from British Columbia except after great expenditure of treasure and of blood, and after a considerable lapse of time.

Mr. Speaker, I make bold to assert that I would not regard it as a great national calamity if some foreign nation should get permanent possession of the Hawaiian Islands. I am one of those who do not believe that this great Republic would perish or even that our safety would be seriously endangered by such an event.

With a standing army of reasonable size, at all times well armed and equipped, with a strong Navy and coast defenses adequate and efficient, all of which equipment could be maintained at a far less expense than would be necessary if we were to embark upon this policy of territorial acquisition, I do not doubt that with our vast population, our immense resources, our base of supplies behind us, and our line of communication open and incapable of interruption, we could maintain ourselves with ease against the owners of this isle.

The logic which insists that we shall possess ourselves of Hawaii upon the ground that it can be used as a basis for menacing our coast proves too much. It goes too far. The same logic carried to its natural conclusion would require us to dislodge England from British Columbia in the Pacific and from Halifax and the Bermudas in the Atlantic, where for years she has held strongly fortified positions within easy range of our shores.

Let me call gentlemen's attention to this very significant fact, that we have had within easy striking distance of us for years these fortified strongholds of this powerful nation, and yet for nearly a century we have not had a single war with her. She has during all this period been unable to oppress us or deprive us of our rights. Every controversy we have had with her has been settled amicably and by the peaceful arts of arbitration, instead of resorting to bloodshed and the sword. In these modern days, sir, it does not follow of necessity that "land intersected by a narrow frith abhor each other." It is possible to occupy adjacent territory and still preserve peace. All depends, of course, largely upon the circumstances of each particular case.

I am well aware, Mr. Speaker, that distinguished military and naval gentlemen disagree with me in the position that it is not necessary for us to own Hawaii in order to protect ourselves against foreign nations. These gentlemen are in the habit of looking upon those who disagree with them in this matter, or in any other matter relating to our relations with other nations, for that matter, with a species of compassion that borders very closely upon contempt. I do not attempt, sir, to disparage the services that have been rendered our country by our military and naval officers.

They have always done their duty nobly in the past, and are doing it now with heroic courage. We can at all times depend upon them to valorously maintain the integrity of the country and the honor of the country's flag, whatever may be our territorial policy.

in the future. But it is well enough for us to remember that these gentlemen are but human—that they are by no means infallible. They have imbibed certain ideas from their education. Bred to arms, is it at all surprising that they should desire that which will give them opportunities for employment and distinction? In times of profound peace, when our Army and Navy is small, and when we have no colonial possessions to garrison, Othello's occupation is gone, and the opportunities for promotion are few and far between.

Under such conditions one may serve in the Army or Navy until his head is white with age and yet attain to no very high rank. But if we enter upon a colonial policy, and have vast possessions, maintained by great armies and great navies, opportunities for employment and for honorable distinction in the country's service are multiplied, promotions become rapid, and Othello's occupation is resumed.

We should remember these considerations, sir, and weigh with a grain of allowance what these officers of the Army and Navy say upon certain subjects. They are but a small portion of our population of 70,000,000 people, and others are quite likely to have sensible opinions on subjects which, I fear, they are inclined to arrogate wholly to themselves. Even upon military and naval affairs we are not required to abdicate our judgment entirely. We must reserve the right to test their opinions by our judgments. Certainly, on the question of annexations and their wisdom there is no monopoly of information; nothing so technical that the lay mind can not form quite an intelligent opinion concerning it.

One does not have to be a graduate of West Point or Annapolis to be able to read the pages of history aright and to draw from them accurate and useful lessons as to the effect of territorial and provincial holdings upon the destiny of nations. Our military and naval officers may declare until they are red in the face, as they did before the Committee on Foreign Affairs, that we will require a less navy instead of a greater one after we have annexed Hawaii, and you and I are at liberty to believe it or not, as we see fit. They may assert over and over again that the possession of insular territory will add to our happiness, prosperity, and power as a people, and still we are not concluded by their opinion.

But to get back to the point at issue. It is claimed that if we do not annex Hawaii its people will voluntarily transfer the island to some other power. Mr. Speaker, I deny it. The whole history of Hawaii shows that such action is wholly improbable. Through all the political vicissitudes of that people, under all the forms of government under which they have existed, whether native or white, oligarchical or republican, if there is any one thing above all others which has particularly distinguished them it has been their desire for independence of all governments except our own. Never have they manifested the least inclination to join their fortunes to that of any other nation on earth than ours. They have vigorously resisted at all times any suggestion of foreign domination by other countries. Their disposition and their trade has uniformly been toward us. They have had no inclination whatever toward the great nations of the Old World, from whom they are separated by thousands of miles of water.

For years their absolute independence has been guaranteed by the United States and by a joint treaty entered into between England and France, and they have all along had every reason to believe that there was no likelihood of that independence being interfered with. Are we to believe, then, that just at this time they are suddenly disposed, when no nation is moving against them, when the treaty between England and France is still in force, and when we, stronger and greater than ever before, are still guaranteeing their freedom, they will consent to transfer themselves to some other country simply because we do not accept them? The idea, sir, is preposterous, as preposterous as many other of the assertions whereby men are sought to be carried off their feet in considering this important measure, which ought to receive the closest scrutiny, and which no man should act upon without having first canvassed the whole ground, so as to be sure that he is absolutely right.

Why, if there is any doubt upon this point as to what is the inclination of these people on this subject, look at the declarations of President Dole. They ought to be good authority for annexationists on this floor. In an interview submitted to by him at the hands of a reporter on the occasion of his recent visit to this country, an interview which occurred in Chicago and was published in the New York Journal of the 24th of last January, he was asked what would happen in the event that the United States rejected annexation. He answered, "Well, the Republic is there. I do not know that anything would happen, except that things would go on as usual. I do not see any immediate danger from possession by any other country."

And yet there are those who conjure up this bugaboo to frighten gentlemen from the discharge of their duty and coerce weak minds which they can see in advance have not the strength to withstand such miserable claptrap. If, however, these people would not voluntarily surrender their autonomy, is there still

danger that a foreign power may seize and hold Hawaii against their will—forcibly annex it, and thus obtain a base of operations against us in case of war with us?

This pretense has also been made, sir. When the report from the Committee on Foreign Affairs was made to the Senate on a resolution for annexation of Hawaii, there was written in the report a statement that England had designs upon the island. But, sir, the ink upon the paper that contained that declaration was scarcely dry before Sir Julian Pauncefote, pursuant to instructions from his Government, hastened to make known to the United States that nothing of that kind was intended and to disavow all such purposes.

On several occasions after this the leaders of the English Parliament rose in answer to interrogatories and made the same frank disavowal. The idea, Mr. Speaker, is inconsistent with everything England has done with respect to the islands. Her treaty with France in 1843, to which I have already alluded and which she at the time asked us to join, and which she again solicited us to join as late as 1887, and her uniform observance of its terms for fifty-five years is pregnant evidence of the falsity of this accusation made against her by the report of the Senate Committee on Foreign Affairs.

It has also been claimed that the Japanese were trying to colonize the island with a view of getting it under control and then turning it over to Japan.

I think the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Foreign Affairs [Mr. HITT] made an intimation of that kind when he addressed this House on last Friday. Certainly the Japanese could not do this by peaceful methods, for in response to my question the gentleman admitted that, under the constitution and laws of Hawaii, the Japanese had not the right to vote. It is not denied that they are most of them on the island as contract laborers under a seven years' contract, without any political rights whatever. No sooner, sir, had this claim been made than the Japanese minister hastened to make a disavowal, not only on his own account, but for his Government.

He pointed out that the only trouble was that Hawaii herself had invited the Japanese by a treaty to immigrate there, and that they had gone in pursuance of that request, and that subsequently Hawaii had arbitrarily undertaken to expel them. Japan then did what any other nation on the globe would have done, demanded an indemnity, which Hawaii proposed to arbitrate, and which proposal Japan accepted.

The Japanese minister has further pointed out to us that Japan does not favor emigration of her people and that it has never been her policy to extend her territory beyond the zone which immediately surrounds her. He has also declared that Japan had no designs whatever upon Hawaii—has expressly repudiated the entire charge; and thus is exploded another of the false pretenses by which we are sought to be pushed into rash and precipitate action in the passage of the pending resolution.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I assert that there never has been but one instance—and if I am wrong I submit to correction; probably I had better say that there never has been but one instance that has come to my knowledge—where any nation has undertaken to seize Hawaii with the intention of retaining it. Indeed, even in this instance the nation whose officer committed the act disavowed it.

What are the historical facts? In 1839 a French vessel landed there, not to seize the island, to take possession of it permanently for the French Government, but simply for the purpose of redressing oppressions which were being committed on converts on the island made by the Spanish priests, and the purpose having been accomplished this vessel instantly withdrew. In 1843 a British vessel sailed into the harbor of Honolulu and her captain extorted a deed of cession of Hawaii from the king, drew down the ensign of the island and ran up the British flag, but upon a mere protest, unaccompanied by threat or show of force on the part of our Government, in less than four weeks the British disavowed the act, and the flag of Great Britain was drawn down, the Hawaiian flag run up again, and the island left in possession of its rightful owners.

In this very year, 1843, Mr. Speaker, as I have already said, the British Government entered into a treaty with France whereby they forever guaranteed the independence of Hawaii and bound themselves never in any manner to take possession of any part of it. Upon England inviting us to become a party to this agreement, we declined to do so, but our Secretary of State at the time declared in effect that we were in sympathy with the proposition and that it conformed to the American policy. That treaty stands to-day unabrogated and observed. As late as 1887 England again approached us and asked us to join in a treaty with France, Germany, and herself, guaranteeing the independence of Hawaii. Again we declined, at the same time reiterating the declaration of our traditional policy in favor of the absolute independence of the island.

I believe, sir, that there was one other instance subsequent to this—probably in the year 1849. Some French vessels, for some

alleged grievances which Hawaii was unwilling to admit, landed men upon the island, took possession of the Government buildings, and remained there for some time. But these Frenchmen never pulled down the Hawaiian flag, and they finally left. They declared to England they had not violated either the spirit or letter of the treaty and had never intended to do so—had never intended to take permanent possession of the island. They cited as evidence of this fact that they had not pulled down the flag of Hawaii or raised the French flag in its place and that they had retired from the island.

Does any man on this floor dare to tell me that when for a vast number of years our declaration to the world that the independence of Hawaii should be maintained has been accepted and acquiesced in by all nations—a declaration made when we were a young country, a weak country, without much of an army, and with a navy of small proportions—now, when we have grown to be a powerful nation of 70,000,000 people, with vast and illimitable resources, with a great navy, and with a capacity to raise and equip in a few short months an immense army—that now these nations are getting ready to depart from their old course of conduct and to seize this island and hold it as a base from which to attack our coast? The claim is absolutely preposterous. It shows how hard pressed these annexationists are for arguments that they resort to such a pretense as this for the purpose of blinding the intelligence of the people upon a question so important.

Mr. Speaker, our traditional doctrine, down to the time that this policy of annexation has been agitated within the last few years, has always been in favor not of the annexation but of the independence of Hawaii. The utterances of our Presidents; of our Secretaries of State, of our diplomats, of our publicists, of our legislators down until this desire for new empire has taken possession of the minds of some of our people, have been, with but few exceptions, in favor of simple independence. As late as 1894, this House and the body at the other end of the Capitol practically reiterated this doctrine in separate resolutions which were passed by the respective Houses.

Sir, pass the resolution which the minority offers in this instance as a substitute for the annexation resolution of the majority, declare to Hawaii and the world once more our old doctrine that we guarantee the independence of the island and will maintain the same, and that no foreign nation must lay hands on it, and there is not a power in the world that would dare to violate the declaration, because it would know that a violation of it simply meant a terrible and destructive war with the greatest nation of modern times.

But if there is any doubt upon this point, how easy it would be to settle it by an amicable arrangement. I myself had the honor to introduce into this House a joint resolution, now pending before the Committee on Foreign Affairs, which provides that the President of the United States shall appoint three commissioners on behalf of the United States to meet a like number of commissioners from each one of the leading nations of the world, at a conveniently early day, at Washington, to formulate a plan for an agreement, to be reported back to the respective governments for their adoption, forever guaranteeing the entire independence of Hawaii, and prohibiting the taking possession of any part of its soil.

There is not a nation on the face of the earth that would not be willing to accept an agreement containing this proposition. England is committed to the principle; France is committed to it; Japan is committed to it. I assume, sir, that the President would be willing to negotiate a treaty upon the basis of such a plan if Congress passed this resolution; that, even if he did not sign it, he would be disposed to accept it as an expression of popular will, and take the initiative in the matter, thus obviating any constitutional objections, if such exist, to the joint resolution.

Mark you, I do not say that such an agreement is necessary, for I do not believe the possession of these islands is essential to our safety. I do not believe the people of Hawaii, if we reject this proposition, will ever give themselves away to any other nation. I have demonstrated, I think, quite conclusively that there is no danger that any other nation will step in and undertake to take possession of it by force.

But, I say, if anyone has any fears on this subject, here is a proposition which will accomplish the very purpose of annexation, prevent this island from falling into the hands of any foreign country, and at the same time relieve us from the terrible burdens that would come from annexing it to the United States.

With this proposition agreed to by every nation, making this solemn guaranty, there is not a country in the whole compact that would ever dare attempt, in case of war, to seize the island as a base for operations against us. Such an attempt would call down not only our own resentment and the resentment of the people of Hawaii, but the resentment and interposition of the other nations that were parties to the agreement.

Ah, but I have been told by gentlemen to whom this plan has been submitted that it involves "entangling alliances" with foreign powers—the very thing that we have been warned against by Washington in his memorable Farewell Address.

Entangling alliances! Why, the very purpose is to prevent entangling alliances and things infinitely worse. Entangling alliances! It is just such an alliance as we have to-day with many nations upon various subjects which concern us, and if I mistake not is something akin to the alliance which we have at this time with certain nations with respect to our rights and their rights in the island of Samoa.

I have been told, too, that it involves a surrender of the Monroe doctrine. Mr. Speaker, I have never yet been able to find two gentlemen who could agree in their definition of this famous doctrine. It certainly is a very elastic doctrine which can be extended 2,200 miles out into the Pacific Ocean. But admitting that it is capable of such expansion, let us stop and consider for a moment whether this objection that has been suggested to the scheme is tenable.

I took great pleasure in reading the other day a memorable speech delivered by Mr. Calhoun in 1848 in the Senate of the United States, a speech which I had read once before years ago, containing an exposition of the Monroe doctrine. He points out very clearly in this speech that which a certain jingo element in this country would do well just at this crisis of public affairs to observe, that this doctrine had frequently been misconceived and misconstrued, and that individuals had often sought to extend it far beyond its proper scope and in a manner that was extremely dangerous to the country. He declared that as construed by some the doctrine would put it in the power of every petty South American country to involve us in all its wars.

He further declared that the Monroe doctrine did not arbitrarily make each occupation of territory in this hemisphere a cause for offense and resistance by us, but that whether an occupation was to be so regarded and treated must depend upon the facts in each particular case, and he then went on to define the doctrine as involving three principles. What were they? First, that the Holy Alliance, formed after the overthrow of Napoleon by certain European nations, the object of which was to discourage republican institutions and to promote monarchical institutions, and which was particularly aimed at that time, so far as this hemisphere was concerned, at the provinces of Spain in South America, should not enforce its peculiar tenets in the Western Hemisphere; second, that there should be no oppression by the nations of the Old World of the people of this hemisphere, and third, that there should be no colonization by foreign nations upon this hemisphere, whether upon land that was previously occupied or land that was unoccupied.

Now, tell me, gentlemen, if you please, which one of these three principles the plan I have suggested for the neutralization of the Hawaiian Islands violates?

Mr. TAWNEY. Will the gentleman allow a question?

Mr. JOHNSON of Indiana. No. The gentleman must pardon me; I prefer not to be interrupted, as I have only a little time.

Mr. TAWNEY. You have an hour; more time than anybody else.

Mr. JOHNSON of Indiana. The gentleman will do me a kindness and do himself infinite honor if he will drop into his seat. I do not want to yield to him. If I had more time, I should gladly do so.

The holy alliance has gone out of existence. That principle can not apply. It would not be an oppression of these people, for its very purpose is to secure their independence. It would not be a colonization of them. It would leave them to determine the conditions of immigration and of residence for themselves.

If, however, it is thought that by inviting other nations to have a voice in this arrangement concerning Hawaii there would be a yielding up of the principles of the Monroe doctrine, how easy it is to disavow such a surrendering except in this specific case in the very agreement itself, and to declare that the making of it by us shall not be construed as a warrant to the contracting nations for aggression in our hemisphere.

But, Mr. Speaker, it is contended that we already have a perpetual right to Pearl Harbor, which is the essential part of the Hawaiian Islands, under our second reciprocity treaty with that country. This harbor and its immediate environments are practically all that is necessary to be held for war operation and a coaling station. I grant you that whether we possess perpetual right in this harbor is a debatable question. Mr. Bayard has said that our rights there will expire when the treaty expires.

But, sir, I see it positively stated that Mr. Sherman has said and that Mr. MORRILL has said that it was the understanding, when this Pearl River Harbor grant to us was inserted in the last reciprocity treaty with Hawaii, that it guaranteed to us a permanent right to that harbor. It is also stated that they have said that Mr. Edmunds, whose legal ability no man can gainsay, drew the provision with this very object in mind, and that he always put that construction upon it.

But I care not which one of these constructions is accepted. The fact remains that we can, if we want to, purchase Pearl Harbor of Hawaii and fortify it, and in my humble opinion we can purchase it without any difficulty. [Applause.]

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

Mr. JOHNSON of Indiana. I believe, Mr. Speaker, that general leave has been granted to extend remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. It has.

Mr. JOHNSON of Indiana. I presume that includes the printing of papers and documents which any gentleman may desire to include in an appendix to his remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. General leave has been granted.

Mr. JOHNSON of Indiana. I will avail myself of that right.

Mr. Speaker, I can not conceive it possible that the Hawaiian people, whom, as I have shown, we have always aided to maintain their independence, and to whose products we have granted the most liberal admission to our ports, would refuse to sell us this harbor if we offered to purchase it, especially as we are looked to as one of the nations which will perpetually guarantee their absolute freedom from any foreign attempt at domination.

To be sure, sir, the simple ownership of this harbor will be in many ways a burden to us, but it would not be near as bad as the ownership of the entire island, for reasons which will readily occur from what I have said and what I shall say before I close my remarks. The purchase of this harbor I of course only suggest as a choice of evils, in the event we are obliged to own any territory in the Sandwich Islands at all.

I have thus endeavored to maintain the second of my propositions—that annexation of Hawaii is not necessary to prevent it from passing into the ownership of some other nation and being used to menace and attack our coast. If the island remains free from the grasp of other countries, the same object, so far as preventing offensive warfare being waged against us is concerned, is attained as would be secured by our annexation of it, and “painted ships would lie upon painted seas” for want of a coaling station and base of supplies in the Pacific Ocean.

True, for purposes of defense we would not own the island, but would have there only the right of a neutral power; but we could well endure this, sir, rather than take upon ourselves the burdens which ownership would entail. Besides, what need would we have of Hawaii for defense when the enemy could not avail himself of it for purposes of attack? What defense is necessary to be made against war ships which are powerless for lack of coal and a base of supplies in the island? If, perchance, however, an enemy should reach our shores with coal obtained from collieries, or in some other way, we could safely trust to our Navy, whose coal supply would be at its very back, and to our coast defenses, manned by our Army, for an effective defense.

Much that I have already said, Mr. Speaker, bears upon the third proposition for which I am contending. Let me now discuss this proposition a little further and submit some remarks on other matters closely related to it.

What disposition, sir, do we propose to make of Hawaii and of these other islands which the valor of our soldiers and sailors will soon transfer to our possession when we have obtained them? The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. GROSVENOR] has not condescended to give us any light upon this very pertinent inquiry. In the course of his remarks yesterday he even exclaimed, “I scorn to discuss with any man what is to come of this acquisition.”

Indeed, all the other gentlemen who have advocated annexation in this debate have also “scorned” to discuss this question, so far as I have observed. Generally speaking, they have been careful to avoid this phase of the subject, adverting to it only when interrogated about it, and then dismissing it hurriedly with the declaration that the question will be solved when the proper time arrives, that we can safely be trusted to determine the matter wisely, and other answers equally as vague and evasive.

Mr. Speaker, what kind of statesmanship is this which regards only present action and gives no thought to ultimate results? Is this the kind of “leadership” which we are to follow—the leadership which leaps without looking? Is forethought to be thus abandoned and everything in the future thus left so largely to chance? Is this a wise course to pursue? Is it prudent in a matter so important as this, so fraught with far-reaching and dangerous possibilities to our people? I for one do not “scorn” to discuss the question, and I again ask what do we propose to do with Hawaii and these other insular territories when we get them? The demand for the immediate passage of the pending resolution makes this a present problem, and gentlemen can not either ignore or evade it.

Are we going to erect these islands into States, admit them to the Union, and confer the right of suffrage upon their inhabitants? Why, sir, these mongrel denizens of the Tropics are utterly incapable of self-control, to say nothing of self-government. What, pray, do they know about free institutions, and what can they be taught concerning them, for that matter? Confer Statehood and suffrage upon them, and they will not only be in confusion themselves, but they will also work irreparable injury to the whole Union. The Senators and Representatives which they will elect to Congress under the machinations of the designing knaves

who will control them will be men who are both unscrupulous and incapable, and whose only mission will be evil.

Have we not enough ignorant voters now within our borders that we need to increase their number? Is not a more general diffusion of knowledge and an elevation of the standard for citizenship the imperative demand of the hour? Shall great public issues affecting the vital interests of all our people be submitted for determination to the Senators and Representatives from Hawaii, Cuba, Puerto Rico, and the Philippines? Shall they, by holding the balance of power and casting the decisive votes where the questions are close, shape thereby the civil policy and direct the destiny of 70,000,000 of free people?

You can not break the force of this objection, sir, by admitting these islands as States in the Union and yet depriving the masses of the right to vote by the imposition of a restricted ballot. Such a policy would establish in Cuba and Puerto Rico a suggestion of slavery much akin to that which existed in Georgia and Alabama before the war; it would impose upon Hawaii and the Philippines by the force of positive law the same deprivation of suffrage which is claimed to exist in the Southern States now, in defiance of law, and as a matter of fact; it would establish in this great Republic by legal enactment the hateful rule of caste, and create an oligarchy under the American flag as tyrannical and as brutal as any that ever flourished in the despotisms of the Old World.

Can you avoid these difficulties, gentlemen, by creating these provinces into Territories after the manner in which our Territories have been accustomed to be administered? Why, sirs, the same incapacity that unfits those alien people for statehood unfits them also for territorial form of government, for in our Territories the people largely govern themselves and manage their own affairs.

There is but one other course left open to us. We must govern these islands as conquered provinces. We must hold them by the hand of stern repression, by laying upon them the heavy hand of mail, according to their inhabitants neither participation nor representation in our Government. It is thus that ancient Rome was accustomed to hold her conquered territory. It is thus that England now holds certain of her tropical possessions. We must have our captains-general, our governors-general, our councils of administration, and our executive councils. We need not call our governing bodies by these very names, but they will possess and exercise the precise functions of these dignitaries.

But where do we find American precedent or authority for such a form of government as this? You will search for it in vain, though you ransack every archive and depository in the land. Nor can you find any sanction for it in the customs of our people. The Declaration of Independence, the spirit and letter of the Federal and State constitutions, the utterances and writings of the fathers, every page in the Federalist, the teachings of our publicists, the decisions of all our courts, aye, the very genius of our free institutions, as well as the invariable practices of our people, cry out in vigorous protest against it.

This Government of ours is “of the people, for the people, and by the people;” it contemplates no such thing as the holding of provinces with no right of local control and no hope of ultimate statehood. It was conceived in protest against the holding of men in servitude. It hath ever been and ever must be the antithesis to that odious system which holds possessions by the sword and draws sustenance from their products. Under our flag individual aspirations for liberty and citizenship are encouraged. If men are never to be qualified to participate in the blessings of free government, we should studiously avoid extending over them the folds of our starry flag. A name will avail us nothing if we abandon the essence of our polity. We can not remain a republic and at the same time practice the methods of a despotism.

And where, may I ask, have we the machinery for the government of provinces? I know, sir, that we pride ourselves upon our capacity for political affairs; that we boast of our genius for administration. I have heard gentlemen say that whatever any other nation can do we can do also. Notwithstanding all this, I venture to suggest that we have no special training for the management of colonies and outlying provinces in the region of the Tropics, populated by alien and mongrel races. Great Britain, who has been beyond doubt the most successful of modern nations in this line, despite the many misfortunes which have plagued her in her colonies, is thoroughly equipped for such administration. She possesses a magnificent civil service, in which persons are specially educated and equipped for the government of her dependencies. With her favoritism is unknown in the selection of these officials. The most perfect qualification is required.

But how long would we tolerate such a system of selection of men for the administration of our tropical possessions; we who are constantly denouncing our civil service as an undemocratic and monarchical institution and are vociferously demanding its overthrow and destruction? Ah, sir, of one thing we may well rest assured: Whatever form of government we may confer upon these islands, the offices essential to the conduct of their affairs will be eagerly sought after with wild clamor by the henchmen of

public men as rewards for political services which they have rendered to their masters. Favoritism in appointments will abound. Thorough equipment for the work will be largely ignored.

We have recently seen the incompetent sons of the wealthy and the favored sons of public men appointed to offices created by the war through the influences which wealth and public station were able to command, while the meritorious sons of the poor and the private citizens who were without influence in public affairs were passed over in dead silence. Can we expect any different conditions to prevail in our appointments to our provincial offices? We will but augment the opportunities for favoritism and increase the number of offices to corrupt men's consciences. And what is to be expected, gentlemen, of an administration of a province conducted by such appointees as these? Away from the scrutiny of the home Government, they will prey like harpies upon the ignorant people, who will not only be incapable of defense but even incapable of protest. Injustice, speculation, and scandal equal to that practiced by Lord Clive and Warren Hastings in India will be the order of the day.

Our public officials will vie with the unscrupulous adventurers who will seek these islands in hopes of bettering their fortunes, in schemes for their enrichment by means of oppression and plunder. The great syndicates and trusts will find there a congenial field for their operations, where, away from the pressure of that public opinion which here imposes a certain degree of restraint upon their excesses, they will pursue their heartless and unconscionable practices without stint and without restraint.

These provinces, too, Mr. Speaker, will become the inevitable home for political intrigue. Here it will be that the unscrupulous politicians will lay their plans, will hatch schemes for the control not simply of dependencies but of States—of the National Government itself. The thunderbolts that are to be launched at a free people will be forged upon these islands, which, in our weakness and folly, we unconsciously dedicated to this hostile purpose.

And thus, Mr. Speaker, this new and unfortunate policy, this rash and wholly unnecessary experiment, will not only inflict upon our helpless dependencies tyranny, misgovernment, and extortion, but it will also entail shame and dishonor upon ourselves and be the prolific source of anxiety, irritation, and, I doubt not, of bloodshed.

Sir, we do not want Hawaii or any of these other islands. We do not care to assume their debts and obligations. We have enough debt of our own, now rapidly increasing day by day, to tax our resources severely and impose heavy burdens upon our people. Let Hawaii keep her volcanoes, which are extinct, and her leprosy, which is extant. Nor do we covet the vices and miseries of these heterogeneous populations of the tropics. Their possession will promote neither our happiness, our prosperity, nor our power as a nation.

We do not need any of this territory for the expansion of our people, for, unlike the thickly-settled nations of the Old World, we have here a mighty area, a vast empire of our own, amply large enough to accommodate with comfort any possible increase to which our population may attain in centuries to come. We have a variety of soil and climate, diversity of industries, and unbounded natural resources and material wealth all at our command. Our fields are to be sown with grain, our mines are to be opened and worked, our factories are to be operated, and there are sufficient to occupy our time and our energies and to yield us an ample return for our endeavors. Why should we, then, abandon the development of that which is our own for these less desirable and less profitable lands, where none but those who are accustomed to the climate can cultivate with success?

We can not afford, sir, to take these people in the Tropics into political union with ourselves, but upon this I have already dwelt. They are an inferior race; they are not at all of our habits of thought. Unlike the inhabitants of the Temperate Zone, they are wholly incapable of assimilation, and without capacity either to appreciate or embrace the genius of our institutions. Mr. Garfield was right when he said, at the time the first treaty of reciprocity with Hawaii was pending, that there ought never to be any extension of our territory into the Tropics and that to do so would weaken both our Government and our people.

Nor should we annex to our domain, Mr. Speaker, any territory whose people are many of them unwilling to consent to the annexation. Talk, sir, about the authority of the Hawaiian Government as you will (and no one disputes its *de facto* existence nor that it has the bare legal right to form a union with us by treaty, as provided in its constitution), the fact, nevertheless, remains, and it is useless to deny it, that a large number of the people there are strongly opposed to this movement. Of this we have ample evidence. Shall we now, as a free people, invoke the technicalities and brush aside the equities of the case to the end that we may receive in a spirit of cupidity a gift which the Dole Government can not in honor and good faith proffer and which we can not in honor and good faith accept?

Gentlemen, we do not desire to establish a precedent by making this acquisition. We appreciate that it will scarcely be made before it will be cited as authority for still further encroachments. Ah, Mr. Speaker, how easy it is to make a misstep! How difficult to recover ground once lost! How terrible the force of a wrongful inertia!

We oppose the pending resolution, too, because it involves a total abandonment of our cherished traditions, traditions which we have maintained faithfully from the foundation of the Government down to the present hour, save in the sole case of Alaska, which, in addition to having embroiled us in controversy with the mother country, and entailed upon us anxiety and expense, is still within the boundaries of experiment and yet capable of involving us in additional perplexity and embarrassment.

I have heard those who oppose these efforts at annexation stigmatized, both here and elsewhere, as back numbers, as barnacles who impede the onward progress of the ship of state. It has been said that we are making now precisely the same arguments and predictions which were made against the annexation of all the vast territory whose subsequent history has added so much to the greatness of the country and has shown conclusively the fallacy of the objection urged to its annexation. Mr. Speaker, the gentlemen who indulge in this kind of prattle seem wholly incapable of drawing plain distinctions.

In the exuberance of their denunciation they seem to overlook entirely the difference between annexing territory which is contiguous and territory which is insular, territory which is in the temperate and territory which is in the tropical zone, territory which our own people are capable of inhabiting and cultivating and territory which they can neither exist in with comfort nor cultivate without distress; between territory in which self-government is a possibility and territory in which it is wholly out of the question, territory which can be defended with ease and territory which can be defended only at great risk and expense.

Under this traditional policy of ours, sir, we have grown and developed until we have become the wealthiest and most powerful country upon the globe, far outstripping in progress the nations who have adopted and practiced the policy of insular acquisitions.

This marvelous progress has everywhere excited wonder and admiration. It has drawn from the lips of Mulhall, the famous English statistician, the loftiest panegyric, and Bismark, one of the greatest and most far-seeing statesmen in all Europe, has spoken of it in terms of unstinted praise and commendation. Why, then, gentlemen, should we not let well enough alone? Why do you insist that we shall abandon the high and secure ground from which, in conscious pride, we have been accustomed to look down with philosophy and contempt upon the selfish and costly struggles of other nations for spoils, and the frictions and conflicts thus engendered, and ourselves become greedy participators in the ignoble strife?

Mr. Sherman has twice entered his solemn protest against this dangerous policy—the first time before he assumed a place in the Cabinet of the present Chief Executive, and the second time soon after his retirement therefrom. On each of these occasions he declared most emphatically not only against the annexation of Hawaii, but also against any annexation of insular territory whatever.

Concentration, sir, not diffusion, is the desideratum; a nation which is compact, not one which is scattered to all parts of the globe. Russia seems to have grasped the force of this proposition. She saw in Alaska a segregation which was her weakness. She was glad to rid herself of the danger. Her great power to-day rests no more upon her vast population and her autocratic rule than upon the compactness of her domain, from which she can send forth her mighty armies to attack and overpower, and yet be under no necessity of defending distant provinces from the assaults of her enemy.

Hawaii, Puerto Rico, Cuba, and the Philippines once a part of our domain, they become not sources of strength but sources of weakness. They are vulnerable places in our national armor which invite attack. They will be constant subjects for irritating differences with other powers—powers with whom our present isolation makes it easy for us to remain at peace and yet grow and prosper with unprecedented rapidity. It is the possession of outlying territory that to-day puts Spain in our power. Her diffusion is her greatest weakness.

With this territory wrested from her grasp, we will be better able to defend it than she; but reflect one moment, sir, at what an enormous outlay of trouble and expense. Admiral Irwin, himself a strong advocate of territorial expansion, admits that the adoption of such a policy will require us to maintain a navy equal in power to any in the world. Measure, gentlemen, the disparity between our own Navy and that of the mother country, and then tell me what it will cost us to build such a navy, to say nothing of the cost of its maintenance.

But the Navy is not the only arm of our service which will be needed. Our Army must be enormously increased in size, for

these various acquisitions must be both strongly fortified and garrisoned. And there, gentlemen, is also our increased reserves, and our coast defenses, which must not be neglected, for this novel and splendid policy of empire which we are to inaugurate requires that we shall continue to defend our own shores as well as defend these islands which we are to acquire.

Mr. Speaker, this is a brilliant and a dazzling career that is being marked out for us; but will it pay? Will our people be the happier, the more prosperous, the more powerful, if they pursue it? The trained eye of Bismarck has been quick to grasp our situation and to see our folly, and he has declared that this proposed policy would be an intermeddling policy, leading to unavoidable frictions; that it would require us to become a military and a naval power—which he characterizes as an expensive luxury, rendered unnecessary by our geographical position. He has truthfully declared also that our change of front means retrogression in the high sense of civilization.

Mr. Speaker, are we to exchange the tranquillity which has been ours for the alarm and anxiety which is the plague of the people who thirst for universal empire? Are we to have war furies which disturb business and international differences which check development? Our interest clearly requires that we should steer clear of an Anglo-American alliance, however much our sympathy may bind us to our kindred across the sea. But what nation which holds colonies has ever yet been able to avoid alliances with other powers in order to maintain her possessions against nations of envious and unfriendly disposition or whose interests clash with her own? Does not all history demonstrate that this is true?

Gentlemen, there is but one safe course to pursue. Let us avoid the segregation which leads to war and makes defense difficult. Let us preserve our territory compact, where our geographical position, our immense population, and our great resources render us impervious to successful attack. Our base of supplies is thus at our very backs; our lines of communication can not be cut off. Let us apply ourselves to the correction of internal grievances by the passage of just and wholesome laws, and to the development of our wonderful natural resources. That we should have an adequate Army and Navy and coast defenses is undoubtedly true; but let our mission be that of peace, and no nation is likely to disturb or to oppress us. It has not been done in the past; it is not at all likely to occur in the future.

But I have heard it said in this debate that we must acquire these possessions to increase our trade. Mr. Speaker, neither economic science nor human experience sanctions the theory that trade can only be built up by the annexation of territory. The logical way to increase our trade is to produce commodities superior in quality and cheaper in price than our competitors, and then to break down the walls of our tariff, except so far as the protection of our laboring population makes it necessary that it shall stand, that combines and trusts may not interdict trade, oppress the consumer, and grow wealthy upon the monopolies which they enjoy. Nor should we forget, sir, that trade is not the selling of commodities for money, but the exchange of commodities for commodities.

I confess my amazement that gentlemen on this floor who are staunch Republican protectionists should be urging so strongly the annexation to the United States of these tropical countries where cheap cool labor, under the direction and control of great syndicates and corporations, can and will produce competing products of the American farm, such, for instance, as rice, sugar, and tobacco, cheaper than they can be produced here, and then transport them to our shores duty free and sell them in the American market.

What is likely to be the effect, sir, upon the American laborer, especially the American farm laborer, of such a policy as this? I do not wonder, in view of the outlook, that the president of the American Federation of Labor has addressed a letter to the Speaker of this House protesting against the passage of the pending resolution. Mr. Speaker, this new policy of imperialism is against both the interest of the farmer and the interest of the laborer, and for this reason those who profess to be in sympathy with these classes should antagonize the policy at the very outset.

And, then, there is the Monroe doctrine. Gentlemen, has this doctrine no corollary? What is it that has induced the trans-Atlantic nations to acquiesce in our domination in this hemisphere if it is not our disavowal of all intention or right to interfere in the affairs of the other hemisphere? And yet it is now openly declared on every hand by those who believe in this "march of empire" that we propose, having justly pushed our way to the very doors of Asia, to remain there after our necessity has ceased and establish ourselves forever as a factor in the local affairs of the Orient.

Think you that this course will increase European respect for the Monroe doctrine and tend to increase its stability? Beware, gentlemen, of the law of retaliation. We must take the burdens along with the supposed benefits of this novel doctrine which we

are to embrace. Let us not be surprised if we become the subject of reprisals from abroad and if, in grasping for power there, we suddenly discover that we are in danger of losing power nearer home.

Mr. Speaker, in conclusion, there is one pathway out of this dilemma which is less dangerous than the rest. Why shall we not take it? Let us reject the proposition to annex Hawaii. Let us retire from Cuba as soon as possible after this war and the establishment of an independent and stable government by its people, thus keeping faith with the Cubans, the world, and ourselves.

Let us not hesitate to seize upon Spanish soil wherever the necessities of war may demand it for the sake of victory; but when peace is restored and our indemnity paid, let us restore her lost provinces to the Government at Madrid, or, if Spain will not or can not redeem them, let us dispose of them to some other nation, for we will hardly be able to find a purchaser who will not govern them more justly than she. This should be done for our own sake, not for the sake of Spain. Having done this, let us turn again to peaceful pursuits and to the realization of that glorious destiny which awaits us if we are only true to traditions which deserve to be imperishable.

APPENDIX.

[Mr. Webster's letter to Edward Everett.]

March 23, 1843, Daniel Webster, then Secretary of State, wrote Edward Everett, our minister to England:

"The course adopted by this Government in regard to the Sandwich Islands has for its sole object the preservation of the independence of these islands and the maintenance by their Government of an entire impartiality in their intercourse with foreign states. The United States desires to exercise no undue influence or control over the government of the islands, nor to obtain from it any grant of exclusive privileges whatever. This was solemnly declared in the President's message to Congress."

[Extract from speech of James A. Garfield.]

I wish to state distinctly on the general question of annexation of outlying islands or territory—except in the north, and I make an exception there—that I trust we have seen the last of annexation, and in this remark I include the whole group of the West India Islands and the whole of the Mexican territory contiguous to the United States, inhabited as it is by a portion of the Latin races, strangely mixed and degenerated by their mixture with native races; a population and a territory that naturally enfeebles man; a population and a territory that I earnestly hope may never be made an integral part of the people and a territory of the United States. We occupy a portion of that great northern zone which girdles the world and which has been the theater of the greatest achievements of civilization, especially in the history of the Anglo-Saxon races; but should we extend our possessions into the tropical (Hawaiian) belt, we would weaken the power of our people and Government.—*Congressional Record*, Forty-fourth Congress, first session, pages 2273, 2274.

[Extract of letter from British minister to Secretary of State, 1887.]

In December, 1881, Mr. Blaine wrote:

"This Government firmly believes that the position of the Hawaiian Islands as the key to the dominion of the American Pacific demands their benevolent neutrality, to which end it will earnestly cooperate with the native Government."

In December, 1887, the British minister gave the following to our Secretary of State:

"WASHINGTON, December 23, 1887.

"England and France, by the convention of November 28, 1843, are bound to consider the Sandwich Islands as an independent State, and never take possession, either directly or under the title of a protectorate or any other form, of any part of the territory of which they are composed.

"The best way to secure this object would, in the opinion of Her Majesty's Government, be that the powers chiefly interested in the trade of the Pacific should join in making a formal declaration similar to that of 1843, above alluded to, and that the United States Government should, with England and Germany, guarantee the neutrality and equal accessibility of the islands and their harbors to the ships of all nations without preference."

[Extract from national Republican platform of 1863.]

FOREIGN RELATIONS.

Our foreign policy should be at all times firm, vigorous, and dignified, and all our interests in the Western Hemisphere carefully watched and guarded. The Hawaiian Islands should be controlled by the United States, and no foreign power should be permitted to interfere with them; the Nicaraguan Canal should be built, owned, and operated by the United States.

[Resolution of United States House of Representatives, February 7, 1894.]

Resolved, * * * That foreign intervention in the political affairs of the [Hawaiian] Islands will not be regarded with indifference by the Government of the United States.—*Congressional Record*, Fifty-third Congress, second session, page 2001.

[Resolution of United States Senate, May 31, 1894.]

Resolved, That * * * any intervention in the political affairs of these islands [Hawaii] by any other government will be regarded as an act unfriendly to the United States.—*Congressional Record*, Fifty-third Congress, second session, page 5499.

[Extract from report of Senate Committee on Foreign Affairs on resolution for annexation of Hawaii.]

ENGLAND DENIES IT.

The report of the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations covering the Hawaiian annexation proposition, which was presented by Mr. Davis on March 16, has called forth a protest from Great Britain, and Sir Julian Pauncefote, under instructions from his Government, has informed the Department of State that the committee of the Senate are under an entire misapprehension, and that there is no ground whatever for the allegations contained in the statement.

The passage referred to states that "if Great Britain is not industriously and openly engaged in fomenting this concerted movement for the destruction of the republic and the restoration of the monarchy on its ruins, her agents and the princess, her protégé, are kept conveniently near at hand to fasten her power upon the islands on the happening of any pretext for the protection of the lives and property of British subjects in Hawaii."

[Extract from an article entitled "The New Japan," by Mr. Toru Hoshi, minister of Japan to the United States.]

Japan is so new as a factor in the world's calculations, so little studied, and so little understood, that her motives and her actions are sometimes seriously misconstrued. This is a topic upon which I must speak with due caution, but even at the risk of seeming impropriety I can not allow the opportunity to pass of saying a word upon subjects which have lately been attracting widespread attention.

No citizen of this country should be ignorant of the fact that among the people of Japan there is a genuine and deeply rooted attachment to the United States. It is not a merely sentimental liking, but a feeling founded upon the memory of many kindnesses received. The United States has been a friend to Japan, helpful in the hour of need, considerate at all times. If there was a nation upon whose sympathy they could rely in the effort to improve their condition, and of whose appreciation they were certain in whatever successes they might gain, that nation the Japanese people have thought was the United States.

Such being the case, the tone of many recent utterances in the American press will be to them like an angry blow from a friend. That the American people should regard Japan as an aggressor, lustful of aggrandizement, eager to quarrel, and ready, if need be, for war, will seem to them incomprehensible. And that this clamor should have arisen because their Government, in pursuance of clear and legitimate duty, has chosen to present, in a respectful, calm, and moderate way, certain reasons why a certain thing should not be done, will add to the mystery. There are jingoes in Japan, as a distinguished countryman of mine said the other day, but I have heard of none so forgetful of right, of friendship, and of interest as to make the declaration, recently attributed to Japan by a prominent American journal, "let us send a few war ships to the United States."

This is a delicate subject, I know, but I can not refrain from saying that Americans especially should appreciate the solicitude which Japan feels in the welfare of her subjects in foreign countries. The Japanese Government has never permitted the establishment of anything like a "coolie" system among her people. If they go abroad, it desires that they shall go as men and not as numbers, and it asks and expects for them the same treatment and the same protection as are accorded to other strangers. Whatever may be said to the contrary, the Japanese are not an emigrating people; but to provide for all contingencies an emigration law has been enacted, carefully framed, to protect the emigrant and to prevent him from going to countries where he would not be welcome. Japanese emigration to Hawaii involves this, among other questions. That emigration was instituted upon the solicitation of Hawaii under the strictly guarded stipulations of a special treaty.

The welfare, much less the independence, of Hawaii has never been endangered by the operations of that treaty. On the contrary, Japanese immigration was zealously promoted and encouraged in the islands until political contingencies rendered another policy advisable. Japan did not seek the treaty, but her people have been induced to resort to Hawaii under the guaranties it provides, and certainly no one with any sense of justice can now blame her for endeavoring to conserve their rights.

Touching upon another yet a cognate subject, it may be said most emphatically that the Japanese nation has no tendency toward territorial aggrandizement. Neither in the past history of the Empire nor in its modern annals can there be found any trace of such a spirit. Formosa was taken from China, but that was in lieu of indemnity, which it was inconvenient for China to pay; besides, the status of Formosa as an appendage of China has not always been strictly maintained.

At one time the Japanese, Chinese, and Dutch simultaneously occupied different parts of the island. More recently Japan sent an expedition thither, with the consent of China, as was supposed, to punish the savages for their cruelty to shipwrecked seamen. Historically, therefore, there were close relations between Japan and Formosa. The most conclusive reason, however, in favor of the cession of the island is that by geographical position it is a natural addition to the Empire. The cession of the Liao-tung Peninsula is the only other instance of the forcible acquisition of territory by Japan. The peninsula was returned to China, and although the return excited some popular disapproval, it was not so much on account of the loss of territory as because of the manner of retrocession.

I repeat, therefore, that history affords no example of greed of territorial aggrandizement on the part of Japan. It is as foreign to the genius of her people as it is to the designs of her government. The charge that she intends, either by forcible seizure or by peaceful occupation, to acquire possession of a country thousands of miles distant and totally without the sphere of her territorial influence, can therefore only be accounted for in one of two ways: It is either prompted by ignorance or by interested motives.

Japan's real ambition lies in quite another direction. In her geographical position, her natural resources, as well as in the capacity and adaptability of her people, she perceives the surest means of attaining national greatness. The watchwords of the Japan of to-day are enterprise and industry. The people have turned their attention to commerce, to manufactures, and to the arts. They realize the advantages their country possesses, and are doing what they can to utilize them. They may not yet have reached the full measure of their ambition, but they look forward hopefully to the time when Japan will be the emporium of the Orient, firmly bound to her neighbors, east and west, by the strong ties of mutual interest.

TORU HOSHI.

[Mr. JOHNSON'S resolution for independence of Sandwich Islands.]

For the neutralization of the Sandwich Islands.

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the President of the United States be, and hereby is, authorized and empowered to appoint three commissioners to meet a like number of commissioners appointed on the part of each of the Governments of Great Britain, Germany, Russia, France, Austria-Hungary, Italy, Japan, and China, to meet at the city of Washington at as early a date as may be practicable, the said commissioners to formulate and consider and report to their respective Governments a plan for the neutralization and independence of the Sandwich Islands and the prevention in the future of any nation taking possession of said islands, either directly or indirectly. That the sum of — be, and the same is hereby, appropriated out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, for the purpose of defraying the expenses of the said commission.

[Resolution reported to House of Representatives by the minority of the Committee on Foreign Affairs as a substitute for the resolution of annexation reported by the committee.]

MAY 21, 1898.

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, 1. That the United States will view as an act of hostility any attempt on the part of any government of Europe or Asia to take or hold possession of the Hawaiian Islands, or to exercise upon any pretext or under any conditions sovereign authority therein.

2. That the United States hereby announces to the people of those islands

and to the world their guaranty of the independence of the people of the Hawaiian Islands and their firm determination to maintain the same.

HUGH A. DINSMORE.
CHAMP CLARK.
JOHN S. WILLIAMS.
WM. M. HOWARD.

[Extract from newspaper interview of President Dole at Chicago in January, 1898, published in the New York Journal January 24, 1898.]

There is absolutely no foundation for these stories of Hawaii being menaced by Japan. There is absolutely nothing in it. There is nothing in the relations between our country and Japan that hurries me to Washington. Asked what would become of the present Government should the United States refuse annexation, he said: "Well, the Republic is there. I do not know that anything would happen except that things will go on as usual. I do not see any immediate danger from possession by any other country."

[Extract from testimony of Admiral Walker before House Committee on Foreign Affairs in second session Fifty-fifth Congress.]

Mr. BERRY. Suppose a man was going from San Francisco to Shanghai, would he necessarily touch at the Hawaiian Islands?

Admiral WALKER. Not necessarily. He might go far north, up this way [referring to map].

Mr. BERRY. I supposed it was simply because they did not wish to carry coal enough to cross to the Japanese coast and not touch on the Hawaiian Islands; to get the advantage of the space and fill up at the Hawaiian Islands rather than to make the whole trip without touching anywhere.

Admiral WALKER. Steamers run both ways, and in crossing to Shanghai large steamers, which carry an abundance of coal, go farther north than the islands. They sweep up toward the Aleutian Islands because of the shape of the earth, which makes it a shorter distance across.

[Statement of Admiral Irwin, United States Navy.]

I have expressed myself before as to the wisdom of annexing Hawaii, which offers itself to us, and the Spanish possessions we may conquer in the present war. The Ladrões, Carolines, and Philippines, in the Western Ocean, are in the path of trade to India, and the Spanish islands of West Indies should naturally belong to us. The possession of these outposts would make necessary the establishment and maintenance of a navy equal to any in the world.

[Opinion of Bismarck.]

The result of the war can not be wholesome either to America or Europe. The United States will be forced to adopt an intermeddling policy, leading to unavoidable frictions. She thus abandoned her traditional peace policy, and, in order to maintain her position, she must become a military and a naval power—an expensive luxury, which her geographic position rendered unnecessary.

America's change of front means retrogression in the highest sense of civilization. This is the main regrettable fact about this war.

[Article from the Cosmopolitan of March, 1898, on the subject of leprosy in the Hawaiian Islands.]

SHALL WE ANNEX LEPROSY?

By a Hawaiian Government school-teacher.

In the Hawaiian Islands one is never far removed from the seat of government, and the applicants for office are known personally to a majority of foreign residents; hence affairs of state assume a personal character, while the personal matters of citizens often become strangely mixed with the machinery of the Government.

Under such circumstances it naturally follows that anything which tends to detract from the financial prosperity of the island is strongly resisted by foreign residents.

On the subject of leprosy I find the people extremely reticent; indeed, nearly all foreigners seem to have entered into a tacit agreement not to mention it unless it becomes necessary and to dismiss it with the greatest possible dispatch when it is introduced to their notice.

The subject is closely guarded by resident physicians and Government officials. The island publications seldom mention it, and when reference is made to it by them it is of a vague and noncommittal sort, not at all likely to give one a distinct idea of the true state of affairs. In truth, every effort is made here by the people and press to prevent strangers from dwelling upon the fact that leprosy is a common thing on the island or that it exists at all.

Tourists coming here for a short time can form no accurate estimate of its permanency even though they come for the special purpose of learning of it, for the officials will see to it that no one gives information save one whose interests are identical with those of the islands.

Perhaps no one else has so many opportunities of observing the real state of affairs as the Government school-teacher.

As we neared the islands, on our way from California, we ran quite near the north coast of Molokai (Mō-lō-ki) (land of cliffs), and had a clear view of the peninsula and town of Kalaupapa, the latter being the largest leper settlement. The coast is very precipitous. Its walls of rock rise perpendicularly from the sea to a height varying from 1,000 to 3,000 feet, in extreme grandeur and picturesqueness, and are slashed by immense ravines whose broad mouths form natural lawns down to the very sea waves.

On one of these green spaces, which extends about a mile along the shore, stand the whitewashed cottages and grass huts of the lepers. On either side the perpendicular "palis" rise gray and stern. Before them the blue Pacific stretches away unbroken for 2,000 miles, and behind them the mountains tower aloft to meet the clouds in indescribable irregular, jagged peaks. Their form speaks at once of a violent and fiery origin, though they are now mostly clothed in robes of perpetual green.

In their savage roughness they serve as impassable guards on the south side of Kalaupapa, the only access to the peninsula being by the sea and by a slender path cut along the face of a cliff, so narrow and difficult that cattle can not be driven down it, and the settlement depends upon schooners for its supply of fresh meat.

In 1885 the Hawaiian Government chose this isolated spot for the centralization and segregation of leprosy. Hundreds of lepers were at that time scattered up and down the islands, living in the most intimate relations with their friends, who seemed perfectly unaware of or indifferent to the danger of infection. But laws were passed for their apprehension, and it became the painful duty of the marshal and board of health to make repeated voyages around the island and collect the victims.

The woes of those who were taken, the dismay of those who were left, and the agonized partings when friends and relatives clung to the swollen limbs and kissed the glistening, bloated faces of those who were exiled from them forever, formed a scene which, once witnessed, was never to be forgotten; and yet it is still a common one on the islands.

None ever returns from that home of hideous disease and slow-coming death. It is a community of doomed beings, socially dead, "whose only business is to perish;" beings who "have no more a portion in anything that is done under the sun;" condemned to watch the repulsive steps by which their fellows go down to a loathsome death, knowing that they, too, must pass by the same way.

We felt relieved when we had passed the settlement, though it looked harmless and peaceful enough in the distance, bathed as it was by the friendly sunshine and washed by the lazy waves.

Near Honolulu a temporary home for lepers has been established. To this place they are sent from the various islands of the group, and from there they are sent to Molokai, thus preventing the making of mistakes by unskilled physicians in the outlying districts. No one is permitted to visit this institution except by permission from the board of health, which is seldom granted.

I felt much interest in the subject and made many fruitless endeavors to learn the facts of the situation while I was in Honolulu, but no one had anything to say about leprosy, and all appeared so indifferent that I finally became so too.

Before leaving Honolulu I was advised by a friend to take my own bed linen and towels on the *Kinau* (the interisland steamer), no definite reason being given except that natives often used its staterooms.

In the various outlying districts I found that foreigners live entirely apart from the natives. The Hawaiians are not fitted, morally or intellectually, for social intercourse with the respectable foreigners here. They have their own churches, with native pastors, and there are sixty-four native schools on the islands, with Hawaiian teachers only, who teach the Hawaiian language. It is impossible in many localities to secure foreign teachers, as there is no place for them to board except among the natives.

My native assistant teacher is considered a model for a Hawaiian woman, and yet she is scarcely more than half civilized. She has little opportunity of becoming familiar with the ways of well-ordered homes; consequently knows little of them. She knows nothing of cooking except to roast fish in the ground and boil beef over hot stones. She sits crosslegged on a mat to take her meals, and eats poi with her fingers from a calabash which is common to the whole family. She has absolutely no knowledge of books aside from text-books, and reading, writing, and a very little arithmetic are all she has gained from them.

Hawaiian women are not employed as house servants. Few families care to have one of them about their homes. So the Hawaiian people are cast out from all intimate relations with the respectable foreign population here, and, with a very few exceptions, have almost no opportunity of improvement except through the efforts of their foreign teachers, and the teachers work with them at the school buildings only.

When I expressed a desire to see and know more of the people in their homes, I was met by a polite stare and told that it would not be safe to visit some of their dwellings.

On visiting the schools I found the teachers wearing gloves in the school-room, and using various precautions against contact with the children. I found by degrees that neither their moral nor intellectual deficiencies served to bar this people from foreign society as did their physical foulness. Rumors of leprosy reached me more and more frequently and clearly. I found the teachers of the Government schools to be less reticent than other foreigners, as they have little financial interest in the islands, and are often here for but a short time.

Before the new administration, the laws for the segregation of lepers were much what they are at the present time, but so large a majority of the sheriffs and officers were natives that it was found to be impossible for the Government physician to apprehend the lepers until they were too bad to be removed.

The native officials would warn them in time that they might be concealed. The lepers generally roamed about at will, afraid of the physician only. One met them in the highways and in the stores. No effort was made by the officials to secure them, but after the resolution of 1887 the present Government physician was appointed, together with white sheriffs, and the work of segregation began in earnest.

The lepers of the district now became alarmed. Many of them fled to the mountains. Twenty-five formed a company and took up their abode in an isolated valley between some great palis. The spot faces the sea, and is almost totally inaccessible by any other route. The Government physician allowed them to remain in this retreat until he found that they were coming out at various times to visit friends, and that they were making "awe" (their native intoxicating drink) for sale. This determined the physicians to make an effort toward securing them. Accordingly the plans were all laid to go by sea at night with a force of officers and secure them all. A native heard the sheriff read the names to the doctor, and at once discerned their intention. He stole a horse the same night, rode as far as possible, and scrambled the remainder of the way over those awful palis to inform his friends of their peril.

When the officers reached the valley they found the lepers' huts empty, with every evidence of a precipitate flight. The poor hunted lepers had not remained to secure even their most valued possessions. They have all been killed or taken since. God help them!

Some in our district who were known to be lepers remained in their homes, and, by the timely intervention of friends, managed to elude the sheriff.

One wealthy Hawaiian woman, who lived in the house which adjoins my present dwelling, remained here for more than a year, in spite of the efforts of the physician to secure her, during which time she kept the disease in check by the assistance of the native healers, who sucked the poisonous blood from the leprosy spots. One of her relatives was finally bribed to betray her.

The natives hide their friends in cane fields, caves, and gulches, or under mats in their own homes. Some have been discovered when their limbs were gone and only a bloated head and trunk remained. Such a case as this is at present only a short distance from me.

But, in the face of all this misery, nothing can be done to arouse fear of contagion among the natives. They will smoke the pipe of a leper, eat poi from his calabash, sleep in his bed, and wear his clothes. They become neither disgusted with his distorted and swollen features nor afraid of becoming infected with the disease. They seem perfectly indifferent as to the risk of contagion.

Although the Hawaiians' family ties are strangely weak, their gregarious or social instincts are exceedingly strong, and they herd together in a manner most repulsive to foreigners. This trait of character greatly aids the spread of leprosy. It has been disseminated by vaccination also and by the aid of flies and mosquitoes; but the exceeding immorality of the people has done more toward perpetuating this disease than any other cause.

Considering the number still at large and the 1,400 on Molokai, I estimate that about 5 per cent of all the inhabitants of these islands are lepers.

The schools are examined twice a year by a government physician, and each child who is not infected by any contagious disease receives a health certificate.

I had one odd little boy in my room. He had a peculiar complexion generally, but was as bright as is usual with these Hawaiian children. He had a dark, slightly protruding mark on his chin, which I took to be a birthmark. When he had been in school a few weeks, he had his arm broken on the playground. After school I went to his parents and found the arm unset and uncared for. They refused to have a physician. Such actions are characteristic of the natives. They preferred the weird incantations of *kahunas* (a law has been passed against their practicing) to anything more scientific.

I called an intelligent-looking native in from the road as he was passing, and with his help as an interpreter, I insisted on their sending for a physician, but nothing I could say would prevail upon them to do so. I visited them frequently, sitting in their house and handling the boy's hand and arm, with no suspicion that he was a leper. Yet such he was—hence their aversion to having the physician see him.

I noticed a white scurf on one side of his nose, as if the skin had become dry and dead. The old crone with whom he lived tried to explain it to me, but I understood only a word now and then of her language.

The boy returned to school wearing a pair of long trousers, so uncommon an occurrence with these children as to attract my attention at once. One day as he sat in school his limb became exposed and I observed some ugly dark-brown spots upon it. The largest of them was nearly the size of a silver dollar. They looked like blood blisters somewhat, or like the top of a dark-brown mushroom; the skin appeared very thick and wrinkled. I thought he must suffer with such horrid-looking sores, but as nearly every child in school is afflicted with cutaneous eruptions of some sort, I did not yet think of leprosy.

As I watched him he drew up his limb and began squeezing and pressing the spots in an absent, careless manner. In answer to my questions he said that the spots were not sore, that they did not give him any pain, but he was disturbed and began to explain that the spot on his chin was done by a fall. I had stood over that child for weeks, guiding his hand in his first efforts to write, and yet I now felt an instinctive horror of touching him. I touched the spots with the end of my pointer and soon found them to be insensible and lifeless. I decided that unless the physician came the following day I should dismiss the boy from school.

While I was examining him, the tears rolled down his cheeks. He is but 6 years old, and yet seemed to understand fully the consequences of being discovered.

The physician came the next morning, but our patient did not make his appearance. The doctor feared that the child had been concealed, as he stated, that was a suspected family, the mother having died shortly before in that house of leprosy.

No warning had been given me, no instruction as to detecting disease if it appeared in that boy or in any other of the children.

Our Portuguese truant officer soon returned accompanied by the boy, his father (a stalwart Hawaiian in his prime), and his aged grandmother. The child had one limb bandaged, and what was my horror when the bandages were removed to find that the natives had gouged a great piece of flesh from his limb. They said they did it with a piece of glass, and that they would remove the other spots in like manner that evening.

They evidently think there is some virtue in the glass and that the doctor will deem a cure made if the spots are removed. The doctor said that it probably gave the child very little pain, as the flesh about a leprosy spot is devoid of feeling almost entirely. One of the surest means of ascertaining the presence of the disease is to thrust a needle into the flesh. No pain will result if the disease is leprosy.

On glancing at the child, the doctor said, "He is in for it," and then I knew that it was leprosy. I felt faint and giddy; not so much from the sight of the horrid wounds or fear of personal injury as from the knowledge that I stood face to face with that most terrible of human ills. None of us mentioned the word. We said "it" and "that," but never leprosy.

The child was almost a baby, and I pictured him leaving his home and friends to be lost amid the sighs and groans of Molokai. No mother to soothe his path to the awful death before him! I thought of it all in a moment, and my strength deserted me. The child's father lay prone upon the ground wailing dismally, while his aged grandmother clasped her knees and added her shrill voice to the same despairing cry.

After years of experience in the midst of leprosy this physician could only say that it is a strange disease. The father of this boy remained with his wife until her death and is apparently untainted still, while a half-caste woman here was married to three foreigners, each of whom went to Molokai. After each case she was examined for signs of the disease, but none appearing she went free until suddenly it appeared in its most malignant form, and she soon died. Thus it seems that all do not appear to be leprosy who are lepers, nor do all who appear to be lepers prove to be so. The Hawaiian blood is very bad. The natives suffer from a great variety of diseases, some of them so nearly resembling leprosy as to be mistaken for it by the most experienced physician.

Some eminent scientists in Honolulu have been experimenting. They tried the virus on a man who was condemned to be hanged, and he was sent to Molokai as a leper.

A physician of large experience informed me that there is scarcely a city in the United States without some lepers, and that he has reason to believe that these islands contribute a majority of them all.

When a case of leprosy develops among the foreigners, it causes a short-lived stir, or is more often secretly sent to the States; but so long as it is confined to the natives—well, "It is only a native. He will be as well off on Molokai, where he will probably meet friends." He will scarcely have a second thought from the foreigners; but what must he feel who knows that the curse is laid upon him or his loved ones?

People in general think of leprosy as something vague and far away. They have read of it in the Scriptures or elsewhere, but they scarcely comprehend that it is an awful reality to-day. Even here, surrounded by it as we are and witnessing the misery it causes, we seldom think of fearing personal injury. It is not strange that people lose their fear of leprosy. Do not thousands of Americans degrade themselves and their families and die miserably every year from the effect of alcohol? And yet if you should warn a man to beware of it, and point to thousands of ruined lives to prove the justness of your warning, nine times out of ten you would be laughed at for your pains.

On Molokai the 1,400 lepers compose a regularly organized community. They have a court with a leprosy judge, a store with a leper keeper, leper officials, hospitals with many leper nurses (some of them are not), a school with a leper teacher, and a church with a leper pastor.

Their marriage laws are much like those of other communities, and there are forty children among them who have leprosy parents, yet show no signs of the dread disease themselves.

Mr. HITT. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. DOLLIVER] twenty minutes.

Mr. DOLLIVER. Mr. Speaker, I have listened with very great pleasure, as has every other member of the House, to my friend from Indiana [Mr. JOHNSON]. It is the second time in this session of Congress that he has given the House his views and arguments upon the Hawaiian question, and I think it will not be regarded as a disparagement of others to say that in the speech which he delivered last winter and the speech to which he has just given utterance he has probably made the strongest showing that has been made against the proposition that is now pending.

If that is so, there is a significant lesson to be derived from a consideration of the effect of his arguments.

My friend himself, when the roll call is taken at 5 o'clock, will begin to distrust the value of the arguments which he has made when he discovers that while the House has accorded universal applause to his eloquence, there is, at least among his associates on this side of the House, a singular absence of votes in favor of the proposition which he has defended. Now, while there may not be much, there is something in the fact that an argument so able and so learned, reinforced by a second appearance of the gentleman in this debate, has not been able to command anything except the applause of the House. [Laughter.]

My friend fears that we are being hurried into a discussion and settlement of the Hawaiian question. The first public question that I have any recollection of is the question of annexing Hawaii. I was engaged in a debate on that subject when I was a boy, and was on the side of my friend from Indiana. I do not suppose I made very much of a speech, but I gathered up all that had been said on the subject up to that day and put it into my remarks, and the fellows on the other side gathered up everything that had been said on that side and put it into their speeches.

I recollect that they quoted Daniel Webster against me. They quoted Secretary Marcy. They quoted William H. Seward. I was a little troubled about that phase of the matter, but at that time I thought that I knew more about the business than any of them, and I discounted the authority of any statesman, however great, whatever his politics; but the longer I have lived the more I have come to value the mature judgment of the great statesmen of the last generation. And I say to this House that there can be no better evidence of the merit of the pending proposition than the fact that for nearly sixty years it has been the opinion of our great Secretaries of State that this thing ought to be done.

They never expected that we could accomplish it without bloodshed. They never expected that we could do it without expense. And yet, in the winter of 1892, the hope, the aspiration, and the dream of the statesmen of the last generation came true in the United States, without the loss of a dollar or the shedding of a drop of human blood. This possession in the Pacific Ocean fell into the hands of the American people. Unfortunately we had that year a change of Administration.

Mr. Cleveland made haste—I had almost said indecent haste—to withdraw from the consideration of the Senate the treaty of annexation which had been negotiated by President Harrison. All through his Administration, while he bore many burdens of popular odium and distrust, I think his position on Hawaii did more than any other one thing to enable the Democratic party to cast him off, in a matter in which he was not only strong, but right, without incurring the hostility of the entire American public. [Applause and laughter.]

I recollect that I spent four years among the people of my district disputing the wisdom of the policy of the President of the United States on the Hawaiian question, and so far as I was able to see, I had the sympathy not only of the people of my political way of thinking, but practically of the whole population.

Now, for the second time a treaty has been negotiated annexing these islands, and the opposition of less than a majority in the Senate has held up the treaty and we are driven to the unusual expedient of a joint resolution of Congress to accomplish a thing which ought to have been accomplished nearly ten years ago.

My friend from Indiana [Mr. JOHNSON] complains of the action proposed here at the end of a six years' debate, because, he says, it will lead us in the direction of territorial aggression. He says that already our high motives in incurring the burdens of war have been diverted in the direction of conquest. To his imagination the Administration and the American people have already turned aside from the humane purpose with which we entered into this war and are to-day waging it with the design of conquering and taking possession of the islands of the sea; and yet when he comes to the proposition that Great Britain or Germany, or some great commercial power, will possibly in the future take possession of Hawaii, he says such a thing is not to be thought of, that it is incredible and not to be anticipated for a moment.

He seems to see nothing in the action of his own country but the evil passions of national greed and injustice, while the other commercial and military powers are acquitted of all base schemes of selfish aggrandizement. In this he seems to differ from those who champion the minority resolutions, upon which we are shortly to vote. They seem to think that other nations ought to be warned away from Hawaii; that we have enough interest in the islands to protect them from the world, even at the expense of their independence in the matter of choosing their own destiny.

What a jumble is this! The gentleman from Indiana is nearer right than those whose case he has been arguing. We either have an interest in acquiring the islands or we have no interest in standing guard over them against others. If they are important enough to defend from others, they are important enough to acquire for ourselves. I for my part have more confidence in our

own country than I have in any other country in the world. We know there is no nation in Europe that does not appreciate the strategic value of this halfway station in the ocean. My friend started out with the proposition that it was not necessary for us in this war.

That is not the question. This war is an incident, a noble and splendid incident, but only a transient incident in the life of a great community like ours. We are not dealing to-day altogether with the war with Spain. We are not acting for this hour, or for this year, or for this century, or for the next century; we are acting for the millenniums yet to come, with our hearts full of the sublime hope that the institutions planted by our fathers shall endure through long distant ages. [Applause.] The fate of the Hawaiian Islands will be settled in the near future, and the nation that gets possession of them, if that nation survives, will hold them for centuries to come; and, therefore, I say to my friend from Indiana, that even if he had succeeded in showing that they are not needed in the emergency of the present war, a proposition which he fell short of maintaining, he has only approached the question here at stake, which touches all the commercial and military problems of the coming generations. Most of us have a little hesitation in putting our judgment against the judgment of the great statesmen of the past. My friend has overcome that. Most of us have a little hesitation in putting ourselves against the military authorities of our own times. My friend from Indiana has overcome that, also. I regret to see so good a man setting himself to write a platform for all the street-corner strategists of the country to stand on. It would seem that we have had enough of cheap and furious general orders issued on the dry-goods boxes in the villages of the United States.

When I want to get light on a military question I go to a man who has made war a study, and for that reason I can not accept my friend's opinion of the military necessity for the annexation of the Sandwich Islands. We have in the United States several great soldiers, men trained to the profession of arms, and who in the civil war proved that they were masters of all its mysteries. All these agree, and their common verdict in this case is against the gentleman from Indiana. I like the gentleman, and confide in his abilities as a lawyer, but in this matter I prefer to go to General Schofield, who says that from a military standpoint the annexation of these islands is a necessity to the United States.

We have also the authority of Captain Mahan, in some respects the most influential living authority in naval matters, an authority on war recognized by the whole world, who says that the annexation of these islands is of immense importance now and hereafter to the successful naval operations of the United States. Now, the gentleman from Indiana ridicules this, and says that the officers of the Army and Navy of the United States, having been educated at our academies, are circumscribed in their outlook and liable to give an unreliable counsel in these matters on account of the selfish prospect of their own promotion.

I am ashamed to listen to such a judgment offered upon this floor. Is it any wonder that my friend, who has pored over the Hawaiian question until he has lost confidence in the foremost statesmen of both parties in the past fifty years, has also had his mind poisoned by the atmosphere which surrounds the position he has taken, until it appears credible to him that the opinions of our great soldiers and sailors are worthless, because, in his judgment, they are actuated by a desire for promotion in the national service? I do not believe it. I believe Captain Mahan's opinion as to the necessity of the acquisition of the Sandwich Islands is not only wise, but entirely patriotic.

In the midst of the thick darkness that surrounds so many of these questions to the uninitiated inquirer there is one thing about Captain Mahan's reasoning that I like, and that is that, notwithstanding my meager technical knowledge, I can understand this man. He says that few ships of war can carry fuel enough to go from San Francisco to Asia without stopping to recoal, and he says that no ship can come from an Asiatic station to our shores to attack our coast and be able to get back without having a place to coal. Even a landsman can understand that; and therefore I put my faith in him when he points out that since these islands must harbor the coal supply of the mid-Pacific, they literally command that ocean, so that if our country controls them we have in them an absolute protection for our coast. [Applause.] Therefore, in view of what now is, in view of all that is to come, I favor the immediate annexation of these islands.

My friend says you can go to China and the East by a shorter route. If that were true, it would not touch this question. This is a question of national defense, not a problem for passenger agents. The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. GROSVENOR], in the great speech that he made in this House yesterday, quoted the statement of Captain Bartlett, former Hydrographer and now Chief of the Office of Naval Intelligence, in which he points out in plain terms the reasons which offset the geographical advantage of sending ships from San Francisco to the Orient by way of the Aleutian Archipelago.

And the explanation which he gives seems in my mind to be reasonable and conclusive. Ships going by that route encounter a current running at the rate of more than a mile an hour, and ships passing through that latitude encounter fogs and foul weather at all seasons, and therefore this practical student of the problem is convinced that that route is not advantageous, even if it is pursued by some lines of steamships. If what is said about this Alaskan port is true, it is another evidence of the farsighted wisdom of Secretary Seward in boldly rejecting the counsel of the enemies of that annexation in his day. But what has that to do with this question? What comfort is the United States to get out of this Aleutian harbor if a hostile squadron, approaching us from Asia, is admitted to the coaling privilege at Honolulu?

But my friend says we are about to annex all the Spanish islands, east and west, as well as this Hawaiian group. Now, the question of the Sandwich Islands arose fifty years ago, and, as I have indicated, it has been up in the United States ever since. It was here in a lively form before we had any problems in the Philippines. We have an interest in the Orient to-day. It is not our fault. When we entered on the war with Spain we entered upon a duty to strike Spain wherever we could find her, and in the discharge of that duty the Philippine question has come suddenly upon us. We have a little squadron of our Navy there, with the most famous admiral of the world on our flagship in the harbor of Manila. [Applause.]

Nothing has happened at Manila for which I shall ever be persuaded by friend or foe to make an apology. We are there in the providence of God, and not by any human design. I sometimes think that we have been caught in a great current, an inscrutable movement of events not altogether subject to our poor guidance, but I have faith to believe that if the American people will go forward in the discharge of their duty, the same Providence that has guided us until this hour will direct us in a wise solution of every question that is created by our new relations to the civilization of the world. And yet, my countrymen, there is no excuse for a man who rises upon this floor to make what he complacently describes as a dispassionate argument on the subject of annexation of Hawaii to say that those who favor the proposition are insincere, and that their real purpose is to force the country into a wicked policy of conquest all over the habitable globe.

The American people will take care of the Philippine Islands when our campaign in the Orient is at an end. They will take care of Puerto Rico; they will take care of Cuba, and that afflicted community will find in the hearts of our people, when our work in Cuba is done, the same sympathy, the same anxiety for their welfare, that persuaded the great Republic to enlist an army and send its Navy on its mission of mercy and peace in the West Indies. [Applause.] My friend need have no fear. Every question that arises will be taken care of; but we must take care of the question of Hawaii first, because it had the floor fifty years before the other questions arose. [Laughter and applause.] Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I am in favor now and here of making an end to this controversy and raising in that fortress of the Pacific the old flag of our fathers, once hauled down, but about to be run up again, forever afterwards to glorify the skies of the Southern Ocean. [Prolonged applause.]

Mr. HITT. Mr. Speaker, I now yield to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WM. ALDEN SMITH].

Mr. WM. ALDEN SMITH. Mr. Speaker, it is with some misgiving and trepidation that I rise toward the close of this discussion, so full of interest and enlightenment. I do not take part, however, with any expectation of affecting the vote soon to be taken, but solely for the purpose of reflecting public sentiment in the district which I have the honor to represent and to discharge my duty as a Representative upon this floor.

Through four sessions of Congress I have willingly followed the wise leadership with which we are favored, and in much of my public work have been blessed with the wisdom and experience of older Members, whose right to lead has been earned by long and faithful service in legislative affairs.

Even now, were the latitude less circumscribed and the subject under discussion less important, I would not venture to take the time of the House, but as a member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, charged with the preliminary responsibility for this legislation, I owe a duty to you, which it shall be my privilege to perform.

Our action to-day will mark a new era in national affairs. God grant that it may be wisely performed, and that the century now closing may lose none of its luster thereby, and the proud and honorable achievements of our country may be made more secure and enduring by our legislation of to-day.

"The world will little note nor long remember" the petty struggles of individuals for honor and place, but in the world's grand pageantry of glorious and progressive enlightenment, along whose fitful highway nations travel in their onward march, these epochs constitute the century marks upon eternity's dial.

Not a determined navigator upon unknown seas, not a faithful

explorer in darkness and gloom, not a struggling genius whose mind, clogged with cumbersome detail, finally bursts into practical invention, not a sturdy pioneer in the march of progress, who has not builded better than he knew.

Perhaps, sir—who can say nay?—we are building better than we know for the future grandeur and greatness of America.

The important question of Hawaiian annexation is not new to the country. Nearly fifty years ago our Government undertook negotiations for its annexation, and the American minister to Hawaii was at that time instructed that we were ready to receive the formal transfer of the territorial sovereignty of the islands, and there has never been a time since when important negotiations were not pending for their absorption into the Union.

Why have we delayed? Through whose instrumentality have we been influenced?

With a constancy born of sincere desire, this little group of Pacific pearls have maintained their friendship for us through strife, revolution, and disaster, refusing alliances from others, helpful and honorable.

Four times she has been seized in eighty years—once by Russia, once by England, and twice by France. Hostile demonstrations upon her own part and the threatening attitude of our country caused her release. Finally, for fear and in dread of conquest, the absolute cession of her sovereignty to the United States was executed and delivered in 1851, and a treaty was negotiated in 1854.

Mr. Speaker, there is not a nation in the world that does not recognize the importance of the Hawaiian Islands to the United States. Are we blind to our interests when the disinterested vision of others is so clear? Will we longer neglect this plain duty, now so near consummation?

For one, let me say that no obstacle is too great to be overcome in the definite and distinct purpose of this hour, and the weak and foolish prejudices of men have no terror whatever for me in the performance of plain public duty.

Long before the independence of America from England, the question of island ownership was one of the utmost importance among European nations. With an eye to the extension of her trade and commerce, every island in the Atlantic Ocean, the Caribbean Sea, and the Gulf, which they could trade for or easily conquer, has been brought under the English flag. It is not my purpose to criticize this upon her part, for I believe it to have been wise, farsighted, and sagacious, and worthy of emulation.

Is it not essential that we should be vigilant as to our true interests at this point? Would it not be wise to seize the opportunity presented to us by Providence and the logic of our national fate?

It has been urged that we have no constitutional power to annex new territory. In what line of the Federal Constitution is this prohibited? Who knew more than Thomas Jefferson or Gouverneur Morris, whose pens put the Constitution into form, about the meaning and the purpose of this instrument in the matter of territorial acquisition? At the time of the Louisiana purchase Morris wrote, "No decree de crescendo imperio," especially emphasizing the fact that limitations were not inserted in the instrument, because no boundaries could be safely assigned to our future extension; and he further says:

"I knew as well then as I do now that all North America must at length be annexed to us. Happy indeed if the lust of possession stop there."

While the great Jefferson, whose fertile mind is reflected in so much of our Constitution, wrote, in reply to the letter of Gallatin, regarding the Louisiana purchase:

"There is no constitutional difficulty as to the acquisition of territory, and whether when acquired it may be taken into the Union by the Constitution as it now stands, will become a question of expediency."

The turning point in that great question of territorial aggrandizement was solved upon the question of whether or not our young Government wanted a portion of its contiguous soil occupied by the French—whether we wanted to take the chances of a Napoleon at the head of a French army ascending the Mississippi River to reconquer, if possible, a new world; and Jefferson, out of the wisdom of his experience and the courage of his conviction, made a purchase which the American people have approved every moment since it was consummated; and never in the history of the Republic was fifteen millions of American money better invested to secure wise territorial addition and to secure the peace of our border.

When Spain offered to this Government the Floridas, or at least a quitclaim of her title and pretensions, in 1819, the Supreme Court of the United States, called upon soon thereafter to define our relation to the new acquisition, held, to the great surprise of some of the strict constructionists of the Constitution, that the right of the United States to wage war and to make treaties necessarily implied the right to acquire new territory, whether by conquest or purchase. This decision came from our greatest

Chief Justice, John Marshall, and has been repeatedly affirmed by his successors upon the bench. (See 136 U. S. Rep., 1-42.)

While Chief Justice Taney, in the celebrated Dred Scott decision, said:

"We do not mean, however, to question the power of Congress in this respect. The power to expand the territory of the United States by the admission of new States is plainly given; and in the construction of this power by all the departments of the Government it has been held to authorize the acquisition of territory, not fit for admission at the time, but to be admitted as soon as its population and situation would entitle it to admission. It is acquired to become a State, and not to be held as a colony and governed by Congress with absolute authority; and as the propriety of admitting a new State is committed to the sound discretion of Congress, the power to acquire territory for that purpose, to be held by the United States until it is in a suitable condition to become a State upon an equal footing with other States, must rest upon the same discretion. It is a question for the political department of the Government, and not the judicial; and whatever the political department of the Government shall recognize as within the limits of the United States the judicial department is also bound to recognize, and to administer in it the laws of the United States, so far as they apply, and to maintain in the territory the authority and rights of the Government, and also the personal rights and rights of property of individual citizens, as secured by the Constitution."

In 1836 there came an application from the Republic of Texas for admission into the Union as a new and equal State. The dominant population there had always been composed of emigrants from the United States. President Adams had tried to purchase it from Mexico in 1827; while Andrew Jackson offered \$5,000,000 for it in 1835. A year later Texas claimed to have achieved her independence, and sent commissioners to Washington to negotiate a treaty of annexation. Mexico had not relinquished her claims of ownership, and our Government delayed recognition until Texas had proven its ability to defend its separate existence and diplomatic relations had been established between that independent Republic and the United States, and many European powers.

In 1838 John Quincy Adams introduced in the House of Representatives a resolution denying the power of the United States to annex the people of any independent state into the Union, holding that no such authority resided in the Constitution or Government or any department thereof, and that this exercise would be an assumption of power unlawful and void, even going so far as to hold that if Texas were annexed, it would inevitably result in a dissolution of the Union. The situation there presented, the resistance offered, and the encouragement given were sharp, tireless, and effective. Nevertheless, sir, in 1844 a treaty of annexation was concluded, which the Senate rejected by a vote of more than two to one.

Texas was the issue in the succeeding Presidential election, and the Democratic party scored a great and decisive victory; which President Tyler promptly ratified by recommending an act of annexation. The history of that controversy is well known to those conversant with public affairs. Congress authorized the erection of Texas into a new State of the United States, and President Tyler promptly affixed his signature to the act of union, and this independent Republic, the cause of so much contention in the past, entered the Union over a new legislative highway which has been blazed so wide and so straight that in the present emergency we have a precedent ample indeed.

While there can be no question, Mr. Speaker, but that treaty making was especially lodged by the Constitution in the President and Senate, and that the composition of the Senate was so framed that each State should have an equal voice, nevertheless, the exigencies which at times confront the Republic warn us of the importance of the popular branch of Congress, coming direct from the people; and the Texas precedent has made the votes of a majority of both branches of Congress sufficient.

I am well aware, sir, that Jefferson has expressed doubt as to the wisdom of our Government receiving acquisitions which it would take a navy to defend, but the necessity for a strong navy, able to give absolute security to our commerce upon the sea, has forced its way permanently into the public mind. Secretary Adams, in his instruction to our minister to Spain, once wrote that Puerto Rico was the natural appendage and Cuba had become an object of transcendent importance to the commercial and political interests of our Union. The commanding position of Puerto Rico with reference to the Gulf of Mexico and the West India seas gave it advantages which could not be easily ignored, while Cuba, because of its situation between our southern coast and the island of San Domingo, with its splendid harbor at Havana, fronting our shores, almost destitute of the same advantage, its productions and its necessities, with mutually profitable commercial advantage, gives this territory national interest with no parallel in either ocean. At least one President (Polk) has tried to purchase

it, adding his testimony to the right and ability under the Constitution for our Government to acquire foreign territory.

At the close of the Mexican war we paid fifteen million dollars for New Mexico and California, while the Gadsden purchase of 1853 added southern Arizona at a cost of ten millions more. These acquisitions, understood and appreciated by the American people, have increased our interest at advantageous and desirable points. It has stimulated our desire for a canal across the Isthmus, in accordance with the spirit of progress and development of the world.

Nearly fifty years ago the advantages of this project were hedged about by diplomatic agreements, which during much of the intervening time have been onerous and unacceptable. Whether the Clayton-Bulwer Treaty shall be the basis of such an enterprise and its realization I do not care to say in the present controversy; but Edward Everett in 1852, referring to one of the islands in the Gulf and the effect that a canal might possibly have upon it, said that—

"Territorially and commercially it would in our hands be an extremely valuable possession; under certain contingencies it might be almost essential to our safety."

While the Ostend manifesto of 1854 emphasized these considerations quite strongly, that if a final cession can not be accomplished, that conquest of valuable territory might be dictated by the law of self-preservation. The interests of the American people in properly protecting our Government by the acquisition of foreign territory is reflected upon the statute books to-day, where Title LXXII of the Revised Statutes expressly lodges in the hands of the President the right to acquire foreign territory by right of discovery, and to take possession of any guano deposits on any island, rock, or key, which does not belong to any other government, expressly providing that such island, rock, or key may, at the discretion of the President, be considered as appertaining to the United States. Thus our Government acquired jurisdiction over and title to the island of Navassa, two miles long and lying between Jamaica and San Domingo, discovered in 1857, and for crimes committed upon that island, the courts of the United States have in the past assumed jurisdiction and punished the offender.

Mr. Speaker, when President Lincoln recommended to Congress the advisability of some colonization scheme, he said that the plan which he proposed might involve the acquiring of territory and also the appropriation of money beyond that to be expended in territorial acquisition, adding that—

"Having practiced the acquisition of territory for nearly sixty years, the question of constitutional power to do so is no longer an open one with us. * * * On this whole proposition, including the appropriation of money for the acquisition of territory, does not the expediency amount to almost necessity, without which the Government itself can not be perpetuated?"

The purchase of Alaska from Russia in 1867 for \$7,200,000 brought us into possession of large territory remote from our own over two thousand miles. The question of contiguity was by this act finally and completely abandoned, there being but two votes in the Senate against the ratification of the treaty.

The same year that marked the extension of our territory by the purchase of Alaska marked the negotiations with Denmark by Secretary Seward for the cession of the West India islands of St. Thomas and St. Johns for a consideration of \$5,700,000, and President Johnson thus tersely and effectively gives the reasons for our course:

"In our Revolutionary war, ports and harbors in the West India islands were used by our enemy to the great injury and embarrassment of the United States. We had the same experience in our second war with Great Britain. The same European policy for a long time excluded us even from trade with the West Indies while we were at peace with all nations. In our recent civil war their piratical and blockade-breaking allies found facilities in the same ports for the work which they were successfully accomplishing, the injuring and devastating the commerce which we are now engaged in rebuilding. We labored especially under this disadvantage, that European steam vessels employed by our enemies found friendly protection and supplies in the West India ports, while our naval operations were necessarily carried on from our own distant shores. There was then a universal feeling of the want of advanced naval outposts between the Atlantic coast and Europe. The duty of obtaining such an outpost peacefully and lawfully, while neither doing nor menacing injury to other States, earnestly engaged the attention of the executive department before the close of the war, and it has not been lost sight of since that time.

"A not entirely dissimilar naval want revealed itself during the same period on the Pacific coast. The required foothold there was fortunately secured by our late treaty with the Emperor of Russia, and it now seems imperative that the more obvious necessities of the Atlantic coast should not be less carefully provided

for. A good and convenient port and harbor, capable of easy defense, will supply that want. With the possession of such a station by the United States, neither we nor any other American nation need longer apprehend injury or offense from any trans-Atlantic enemy. I agree with our early statesmen that the West Indies naturally gravitate to and may be expected ultimately to be absorbed by the continental States, including our own. I agree with them also that it is wise to leave the question of such absorption to this process of natural political gravitation. The islands of St. Thomas and St. Johns, which constitute a part of the group called the Virgin Islands, seemed to offer us advantages immediately desirable, while their acquisition could be secured in harmony with the principles to which I have alluded."

Because of the inharmonious relation existing between President Johnson and the Senate, a treaty for the acquisition of these islands was rejected, and the first disturbance of our peace foreshadowed in the recent declaration of war with Spain was sufficient to call the Senate of the United States into executive session for the very purpose of considering the annexation of the Danish possessions, undertaken by Secretary Seward and unsuccessfully carried on under the Administration of President Grant.

The question of the annexation of San Domingo did not turn upon the wisdom or unwisdom of such a course upon the part of this Government; its fate was decided within the narrow confines of spitefulness and personality, and our action to-day must not be supported or opposed by the temporary exigencies of party politics.

As far back as 1843 an English officer, without any authority from his Government, took possession of Hawaii in the name of the Queen, but England's young Queen, who still, by the grace of a generous Providence, occupies the throne, promptly disavowed the movement, when Mr. Legare, writing to our minister to England, said that the Hawaiian Islands bore such peculiar relations to us that we might feel like interfering by force to prevent their acquisition by any of the great powers of Europe.

Great Britain and France immediately thereafter agreed with one another never to take possession of the Islands, or assume a protectorate over them.

Following that, Mr. Marcy, our Secretary of State, in 1853, thus addressed our minister to France:

"It seems to be inevitable that they must come under the control of this Government."

And two years thereafter he informed our minister to Hawaii that this Government was ready to receive the formal transfer of the territorial sovereignty of the islands; while in 1868 negotiations were again undertaken, and Secretary Seward, in view of his failure to impress the Senate with the necessity of annexing the Danish West Indies, wrote our minister to Hawaii that the time for consideration of annexation by the United States was not propitious.

The attempted annexation of these islands by President Harrison is familiar to every citizen of our country, and the course of his successor, in withdrawing the treaty then pending in the Senate, has been the cause of severe criticism and sharp comment ever since.

However honest President Cleveland may have been, his course with reference to this subject, in my opinion, has never met with favor among the people.

Annexation is not new to our country. The area of the United States before the Louisiana Purchase consisted of a million square miles, according to the estimate of Morse's American Geography, while the subsequent acquisition of Louisiana and the Floridas doubled our territory, and Texas brought us three hundred thousand square miles, while Mexico in 1848 and 1853 ceded a larger number.

In Alaska we received in 1867 a large addition, and thus our total area has increased, under this policy of territorial acquisition and annexation, from a million square miles in 1793 to more than three millions five hundred thousand square miles at the present time.

It has been generally supposed that our possessions were large enough, but the area of Canada and Newfoundland, owned by Great Britain in this hemisphere, excels our own by several hundred thousand square miles.

Under the Clayton-Bulwer treaty we have practically pledged our Government against further extensions in South America, but in my humble opinion the whole North American continent and every island in the gulf and the Caribbean Sea, and such islands in the Pacific as may be deemed desirable, are worthy of our ambition. Not that we are earth hungry, but, as a measure of national protection and advantage, it is the duty of the American people to lay peaceful conquest wherever opportunity may be offered. [Applause.]

It has been argued that our Constitution makes no provision for a colonial system, but, Mr. Speaker, if President Monroe had been merely a lawyer, if he had contented himself by looking for

precedent which he was unable to find, if he had consulted the jurisprudence of his time and planned his action along academic lines, the greatest doctrine ever announced to the civilized world, which now bears his name, though in unwritten law, but in the inspiration, the hope, the security of every American heart, would have found no voice potent enough and courageous enough to have encircled the Western Hemisphere with his peaceful edict.

Precedent, sir, may do for a rule of law upon which a fixed and definite superstructure must be built, but it is the duty of statesmanship to cease looking at great public questions with a microscope, and sweep the world's horizon with a telescope from a commanding height. [Applause.]

Avoid, if you can, sir, by specious reasoning the history of your own country, but tell me what precedent Thomas Jefferson relied upon when in 1803 he took \$15,000,000 out of the Federal treasury and purchased Louisiana?

This great and worthy act of one of the most enlightened of our constitutional authors gave to the country a territory which now composes the States of Louisiana, Arkansas, Missouri, Kansas, Nebraska, and Minnesota; west of the Mississippi, Colorado, the Dakotas, Wyoming, and Montana.

Naturally it would have been expected that Jefferson would have been praised for his courage and foresight. On the contrary, he was denounced with bitterness and partisan rancor almost unknown in the discussion of our public affairs to-day.

Notwithstanding the limitations with which he was hedged about, Jefferson believed that each generation was competent to manage its own affairs, and his peaceful accomplishment in 1803 was the most important achievement since the Revolution, and furnished a precedent by which Florida was purchased in 1819 for five million dollars, California and New Mexico in 1848 for fifteen million dollars, Arizona in 1853 for ten million dollars, and Alaska in 1867 for seven million two hundred thousand dollars. The grand total of this territorial investment foots up fifty-two million two hundred thousand dollars—a sum so small as not even to attract the attention of the House of Representatives in a day's debate, in the present period of our country's affairs; and yet the investments made thereby constitute living monuments to the statesmanship that foresaw their importance and the Americanism that prompted their acquisition.

The spirited rivalry among nations for trade early found expression in the exclusive charter given by Queen Elizabeth to the Great East India Company in 1599, and their general monopoly of the market from the Cape of Good Hope to the Straits of Magellan was the resultant effect.

The importance of this company in establishing British supremacy in the East is well known to every student of history. The ostensible object of charity in the Empire of Hindoostan gradually brought the entire Empire into the possession of that company, thus christening Queen Victoria "Empress of India."

Who is not familiar with the escapades of Dr. Jamieson and the South African Company, who undertook, in the interest of trade and conquest, to overthrow the South African Republics and make Victoria Queen of Ethiopia.

Can you read of England's efforts in the Celestial Empire without detecting the important trend of events? Chinese resistance to English opium smugglers opened the way for the English to bombard the forts at the mouth of the river and effect an entrance to Canton, where an indemnity of \$6,000,000 was demanded and collected, followed by the siege of Peking, which netted the English Government \$21,000,000, and secured for her the cession of Hongkong, thus securing the commerce of southern China, and placing herself in position to command the trade of 400,000,000 frugal and industrious people.

Mr. Speaker, territorial and trade conquests are world-wide. Russia and England have appropriated the continent of Asia from the Indian to the Arctic Ocean, where our trade is one of purchase only. The Dutch own the great islands of the Indian Archipelago, and England holds the balance, absolutely controlling their commerce.

We must recognize the fact, sir, that England holds the whole of the Australian continent and its neighboring islands, and nearly half the area of our own continent.

Within the last three years the nations of Europe have by mutual agreement divided among themselves the entire area of Africa. England has added Egypt to her other African dominions; France has appropriated a large part of North Africa between Egypt and the Atlantic; all the equatorial region is now divided among Italy, England, France, Germany, and Austria.

South America and the Orient are the natural trade allies of the United States. Their relation to us must grow more important and desirable in the years to come. Then why talk of an Anglo-American alliance? Who is so short sighted as to wish us to assume any responsibility, however remote, for the faithful performance of the multitude of agreements, treaties, and protocols of England? To be sure, they are our natural kin, and we are

proud of our ancestry, but our friendship will be more enduring and our burdens easier to bear if we refrain from entangling alliances with any powers across the sea. Such territory in the ocean or in the Gulf as naturally belongs to our Government we can make our own in due season, and wisdom would seem to prompt us to leave no natural or willing ally, weak and defenseless as it may be, to become the mere toy of an aggressive empire, imperiling our peace and good order.

The Pacific Ocean, unfettered by European subjugation, can be made indeed pacific, if we are wise enough to garner the harvest now so ripe for our sickle.

Who opposes this wise policy that has received the sanction of many Presidents? The same halting, hesitating conservatism that admonished Washington against taking on the Northwest Territory, and prompted Benjamin Franklin to favor its relinquishment; the same doubting conservatism that deprived us of Canada in the war of 1812, and defeated by a tie vote in the Senate the treaty for the annexation of San Domingo. [Applause.]

Our military school taught Grant the value of strategic points of defense and attack. His campaigns were marvels of exactness and keen perception, executed with prowess and true military genius. His keen appreciation of the advantage of American ownership and control of the Island of Santo Domingo was in line with his record so amply demonstrated in the field of military triumph. He decided that it was wise for the American nation to accept this island, freely offered by its inhabitants; he believed the acquisition of Santo Domingo to be a strict adherence to the Monroe doctrine—a measure of national protection.

From the formation of our Government it has been important that the American nation control, as far as possible, the West Indies. Our Presidents have expressed an almost universal desire of the people for an advanced naval outpost between the Atlantic coast and Europe. The Dominican people longed for a higher civilization; they had fought for and established their government against oppression and conquest, just as the Hawaiian Republic has since done, and they turned to us as a Mussulman turns toward Mecca. The Commission of Inquiry appointed by our Government, and of which the honorable chairman of the Committee upon Foreign Affairs of this House was identified, made a most searching, critical investigation into the condition, character, and resources of that island, and reported back that the people were courteous, respectful, and polite; that crime was comparatively unknown; that no pauper class existed; that intemperance and beggary were more common among the enlightened nations of the world; that the resources of the island were vast and various, making it one of the most fertile regions on the face of the globe. Fanned by trade winds, they were constantly supplied with pure air from the sea, while the bay of Samana was the most important in the West Indies, being 30 miles long and 10 miles broad, commodious enough to accommodate the largest fleets.

Why did we need this island? For this good and sufficient reason—it sits like a sentinel in the Caribbean Sea, guarding the Mona Passage, destined to be the eastern avenue of communication between two great oceans when the Nicaragua Canal shall be an accomplished fact. A trained military eye could appreciate the importance of this outpost, and President Grant would have made it part of the American Union. How clearly he saw, how courageously he acted, and with what patriotism was he inspired!

Sir, the countries of the Western Hemisphere stand face to face with the necessity of dealing with one another as Americans. This entire group of magnificent islands is naturally a part of the American territory.

“The West India Sea corresponds to that of the Mediterranean from Syria to the Pillars of Hercules. The Mediterranean is divided into an eastern and western basin, and as Italy, Sardinia, and Tunis divide the basin there, so Cuba, Jamaica, Santo Domingo, and Yucatan divide the Gulf and the Caribbean Sea. As the former is fed by the venerable, ancient Nile, so ours is augmented by the pulsating artery of the Mississippi. The Mediterranean is a world's sea, lying in the temperate zone, amid an ancient civilization, and our southern basin is destined to be a world's sea when an international waterway shall pierce the isthmus connecting the Eastern and Western Hemispheres by direct and rapid communication.”

This has been the dream of trans-Atlantic thinkers for two hundred and fifty years. Indeed, its importance was first suggested by Charles V after the discovery of America by Columbus, and later by Phillip II, to whom Cortez reported that the greatest service he could render to the King was to find an opening through the Isthmus to the Pacific.

The idea of constructing a canal through Lake Nicaragua was first suggested in 1665. Thus we see why European countries have always been alive to the importance of island ownership in the vicinity of the Isthmus. Its construction will raise the islands to an importance beyond calculation. A lavish nature, tropical cli-

mate, and prolific soil have rendered their possession valuable. They will be the cause of contention and competition in the future.

Is it not essential that we should be vigilant as to our true interests at this point? Great Britain already holds the keys to navigation in the West Indies. She owns Jamaica—Cromwell wrested it from the Spaniards in 1655, and Kingston is the base of operations of the British West India fleet. Her flag floats over the Caman Islands, Trinidad, St. Vincent, the Barbadoes, St. Lucia, and the Bahamas, as well as the eastern coast of Yucatan and British Honduras, all strongly fortified. Spain with dying grasp, scarcely felt in her benumbed extremities, clutches at her vanishing dominion in this hemisphere; but the realization of the hopes and desires of humanity everywhere will soon light this dark corner of the world with the bright flame of indignant liberty. [Applause.]

France owns the Islands of Guadeloupe and Martinique, lying well up toward the Mona Passage; but Santo Domingo rises above them all, with special advantages and with special prominence.

Had President Grant's fervent wish been granted, our flag would to-day wave over the island, and from the folds of its stars and stripes, dedicated to liberty and union, would float out over the gulf and sea a spirit of patriotism tempering the entire archipelago. Should it have been accepted when tendered? Then, is it not our duty to accept the Hawaiian Islands, situated with reference to our own country as advantageously in the Pacific as Santo Domingo is at the Gulf? The faintest encouragement would have been sufficient for some countries to have encircled these islands. And this generation will be unfaithful to those that follow if we do not lessen the possibilities of war by taking into the National Union such naval outposts in both oceans as are naturally a part of our country. [Applause.]

Mr. Speaker, the United States is a great manufacturing nation; eventually we must find new markets for our energy and enterprise; such desirable territory is fast passing under the control of other nations; our history is filled with unaccepted opportunities. How much longer shall we hesitate? Is it not time to take new observations of the world's affairs, and be guided by more progressive enlightenment? Just as the mariner scans the firmament, when the compass is doubted, and follows the familiar planet into his true course, so we, in this new period of the world's affairs, should look up from the ledger and receive new inspiration and guidance from the movement and course of nations with whom we share the world. [Applause.]

Sir, the proverbial friendship of the great Empire of Russia, with its population of nearly a hundred and thirty million people, must not be impaired. She is to-day one of the most powerful nations of the earth—a devoted, worthy, and unselfish friend to our Government. When the fate of this nation was struggling in the balance, the Emperor of Russia sent a fleet to our door with instructions to conserve the peace at any hazard, should European unfriendliness become manifest. “Russia was never so powerful, so wealthy, so full of exultant confidence in her destiny; never was there such profound peace and general wellbeing within the Empire; never were her counsels of such weight abroad. The potent and patient genius of Alexander III has made Russia the arbiter of Europe, as Napoleon once made France, and Bismarck made United Germany.” We rejoice in her progress, and no alliance must be made that will in the slightest degree impair the friendship we hold most dear.

Commercial scope—internal improvement—an American foreign policy, vigorous and humane—are the necessary accompaniments of greatness. The annual products of our country amounted in 1890 to nearly \$14,000,000,000; and is rapidly increasing from day to day. In the present fiscal year the balance of trade in our favor will be \$600,000,000; our exports are double our imports, while our total foreign commerce will, upon the 30th of the present month, reach the enormous sum of \$1,800,000,000. Our best customers are Great Britain, Russia, Germany, and France. If we will take in the Hawaiian Islands, hold on to the Philippines, and cultivate good neighborhood with the Orient, to which they are the key, the expansion of our commerce will be augmented a thousandfold, and the artisans, mechanics, and laboring men of our own country will then supply much of the genius and the handiwork of the whole world, thus realizing the fulfillment of the prophecy of Gladstone, who, a few years ago said of our country:

“It is she alone who, at a coming time, can and probably will wrest from us that commercial supremacy, we have no title. I have no inclination to murmur at the prospect; if she acquires it, she will make the acquisition by the right of the strongest, but in this instance the strongest means the best. We have no more title against her than Venice or Genoa or Holland against us.”

Our manifest destiny is the heritage of mankind; then let us neglect no opportunity to strengthen and conserve our proud and responsible position. The twentieth century will open upon twenty Republics, ours being the first, and perhaps—who knows?

before another century has gone the world may be crowned with a new diadem, sparkling with the jewels of humanity, enthroned and elevated, and empowered with the natural and divine right to govern themselves. What then will our position be? Shall we lead by virtue of being the conservator of good government and the champion of human rights? or shall we, sordid-like and indifferent to the welfare of others, content ourselves to live alone and apart from the rest of the world? From whom did we receive the cup of liberty? From the oppressed and bound of every land. Can we, then, refuse to pass this cup to those thirsting for self-government, liberty, and peace? No, Mr. Speaker, our duty is plain; we must lift up, by example and otherwise, our weak and burdened neighbors; we must take them into the Union when opportunity offers, thus strengthening ourselves and helping those less fortunate.

The Hawaiian Islands possess advantages in the Pacific which can not be ignored; Pearl Harbor is the only great land-locked harbor, easily defended, in the Pacific; we have no rights there that are not determinable upon one year's notice by either party; we should take immediate steps to utilize this great harbor, lying at the intersection of the commercial routes from Vancouver to Australasia, from the Isthmus of Panama to Japan, and from San Francisco to Manila and Hongkong. These watery highways mark the course of commerce in the future. More than one-half the population of the world is bounded by the Pacific and Indian oceans, while the commerce countries bordering these oceans, not including North America, amounts to over \$2,250,000,000 a year, of which we get but a small part.

"Over 80 per cent of our exports go eastward, across the Atlantic, and less than 5 per cent westward. We grow 80 per cent of the raw cotton in the world, yet with the cheapest power in the world and the most efficient labor we have only 15 per cent of the spindles of the world. China, Japan, Korea, and India are cotton-using countries, and with changing conditions there is a market worth striving for." Already Russia sees the advantages which will accrue to her in the Pacific, and the construction of its trans-continental railway from St. Petersburg to the Pacific foreshadows her intentions in that rich but long-neglected field. Sir, I favor the annexation of the Hawaiian Islands, because it will prevent the establishment of hostile sovereignty at that advantageous point, and will tend to straighten our western border and conserve its peace. [Applause.]

The nearest English station is 4,600 miles distant from San Francisco; the nearest French station is 3,600 miles distant; the nearest Spanish station is 4,700 miles distant, and will soon be removed, thank God, more than twice as far. Russia is 4,700 miles away, and Japan 4,500 miles away, while China is 5,500 miles from our coast. Take these islands into the Union and you will remove other nations far from our door and insure more permanent peace and security. It was upon this theory that the old seers and prophets advocated annexation of contiguous territory as a peace proposition; but it has been said by some opposed to annexation that the population is undesirable; possibly that may be so, but the same argument was used against the admission of California and Texas into the Union, but the undesirable element in both States was soon lost sight of in the sturdy immigration that stable government attracted, and so it will be with these islands. Strengthened by absorption into the Union, they will become attractive and inviting fields to American enterprise.

The strategical importance of the islands has been attested by scientific, military, and naval experts without number, while the ripe testimony of Mahan, Schofield, and Belknap must be accepted as of great value. Some concern has been manifested regarding the character of the government to be established there. It will be such in my opinion as the wisdom of Congress may determine, and the power and authority of Congress in this regard has just received enlarged and high judicial sanction in the decision of Judge Morrow, of the United States circuit court of California, which says:

"Congress may legislate in accordance with the special needs of each locality and may vary its regulations to meet the circumstances of the people.

"The Territories of the United States are entirely subject to the legislative authority of Congress. They are not organized under the Constitution, nor subject to its complex distribution of the powers of government as the organic law, but are the creation, exclusively, of the legislative department, and subject to its supervision and control.

"It may legislate in accordance with the special needs of each locality, and vary its regulations to meet the circumstances of the people."

A hundred years ago it was predicted of our nation that it would some day stretch its arms upon two oceans, and direct the vessels from one to the other by an artificial route through Lake Nicaragua that would change the course of the commercial world and the fate of empires. At such a time how important our action to-

day may become and of what vital value the undisputed possession of the Hawaiian Islands.

Let us rise to the occasion to-day, meet this important exigency in our national affairs with courage and patriotism, and, inspired by the glorious achievements of the past, prepare for greater victories in the years to come, and thus prove ourselves worthy the proud legacy fortune gave us by inheritance. Wave proudly and grandly, O flag of our country; from each of thy folds let some inspiration go out to melt away prejudice and avoid friction; in each star let every republic find its hope and every empire see its duty! [Prolonged applause.]

Mr. HITT. Mr. Speaker, I now yield to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. LACEY].

Mr. LACEY. Mr. Speaker, the Constitution of the United States, in section 2, Article II, provides that the President "shall have power, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, to make treaties, provided two-thirds of the Senators present concur."

It seems evident to me that the word "treaties" in this connection means diplomatic agreements with foreign nations.

But when in pursuance of a treaty it is proposed to annex additional territory the question is not one for the President and Senate, but the people through their Representatives in Congress should be consulted.

Annexation should be made by law and not by treaty. Where annexation heretofore has been attempted by treaty it has been immediately followed by the enactment of law passed by both Houses, and thus all question of authority has been removed by ratification through act of Congress.

The question as to whether territory might be constitutionally annexed without the authority of Congress is an interesting one and one that is not likely to be decided in such form as to be deemed closed.

I feel confident that a fair and reasonable construction of the Constitution would require that the House of Representatives should act before any additional territory could be annexed. To assume the contrary might lead to endless confusion.

Suppose a treaty should be made by which a tract of territory shall be ceded to the United States, and by the terms of the treaty such additional territory shall be at once admitted into the Union with Senators and Representatives in Congress and the number of Representatives agreed upon; we would then have representation in the House of Representatives determined by the President and Senate. Or the Senate and President might agree to annex the Sandwich Islands as five separate States, with ten Senators, and change the entire complexion of our Government, without the people having any chance to protest through their Representatives in Congress. Such possible results will show the impropriety of annexation in any method other than that of the enactment of a law by both Houses with the approval of the President. I think, therefore, that this question has now been brought up in the proper form, and should be considered on its merits by both Houses.

In the Fifty-third Congress I took occasion to speak in behalf of annexation. The opinions I then expressed are only strengthened by subsequent events. I will not repeat the arguments then made. These islands are the key to the trade of the Pacific Ocean. We must take them with some incumbrances of population.

There are elements among the inhabitants of these islands which we would not admit to our shores as immigrants, but fortunately the population is not large enough to involve us in any difficult social problems. The importance of these islands to our people for either commercial purposes or for defense entirely overshadows the conceded disadvantages which are involved in the addition to our population of a considerable portion of their present inhabitants.

No change of policy is involved in this annexation.

For fifty years the final incorporation of this archipelago has been anticipated, and their commercial annexation has already practically occurred.

The Pacific, with our present rapid means of communication, has become a great lake, and the central location of Hawaii makes it the controlling center of the commerce of the future.

Conceding the disadvantages involved in taking nearly a hundred thousand people of an alien race into our population, I feel sure that this is a small incumbrance when compared with the great importance that these islands must be to our commerce on the one hand and to the defense of our Pacific coast on the other.

It is contended that by annexing these islands the country will become committed to a new colonial policy. The same argument might have been made as to Alaska. The extension of our domain into the far East is not at all involved in the present question.

The Hawaiian treaty was made five years ago, when we were free from the present difficulties with Spain. It can and should be settled upon its own merits, entirely independent of any of the problems which grow out of the Spanish war.

Mr. DINSMORE. I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. TODD].

Mr. TODD. Mr. Speaker, the importance of the pending resolution, by which it is proposed to annex to the territory of our Union distant islands of the sea, many of whose inhabitants differ from us in language, religion, and social customs, can not be overestimated. I have therefore listened with interest to the arguments of those gentlemen who have so ably opposed the resolution, actuated by motives which, I trust, are patriotic, and for reasons which, in their judgment, are for the best interests of the American people.

And, sir, I too should view this action with alarm if I thought their fears and objections were well grounded and that it was the purpose of this measure to inaugurate an era of imperial aggrandizement by an aggressive colonial policy through military conquest over weaker nations, resulting in riveting a more rigorous and centralized government upon our citizens, enforced by a great standing army. If I thought this was the inspiring motive, I should give both my vote and voice in opposition.

But, sir, I am glad to say that, highly as I personally respect the opponents of the measure, I believe their fears are largely groundless and that a careful survey of the entire question furnishes an overwhelming evidence in favor of annexation.

NO CONQUEST CONTEMPLATED.

It is known to everyone that the proposed measure does not contemplate any invasion of the islands by force of arms or their conquest by what is often a more dangerous power, subtle diplomacy. On the contrary, the contemplated action is one that was first urged by the Hawaiians themselves nearly fifty years ago and which they have ever since had constantly in view. It is no new question or policy of either our nation or the little commonwealth that seeks the protection of our flag, the fellowship of our people, and the benefits of our civilization. I shall briefly review the history of these interesting negotiations, the reasons in favor of annexation, with a glance at the history and nature of the islands, and the objections urged against the adoption of this resolution.

THE CONTEMPLATED ANNEXATION THE RESULT OF FRIENDLY NEGOTIATIONS.

In 1851 the King, hard pressed by the aggressions of England and France, first formally sought the protection of our nation by delivering to our representative a deed of cession of the islands to the United States. In 1854 our Secretary of State authorized a treaty of annexation, but the negotiations were broken by the death of the King while they were pending. In 1893 a new annexation treaty was negotiated, but while pending in our Senate a change of Administration caused its withdrawal by the President before ratification. June 16, 1897, a treaty was again negotiated similar to the pending resolution, and which, with other papers related to the subject, I will submit as an appendix to my remarks. This treaty has been already approved by the people of Hawaii and ratified by their Senate.

There is, therefore, no hasty action by either party to the compact; no undue stress; no objection by foreign nations which would lead to international complications. It is only the natural and logical result of intelligent negotiations for many years between two sovereign nations, through their accredited representatives, acting in friendly concert to promote the mutual interests of both nations.

WE SHOULD BE GOVERNED BOTH BY ENLIGHTENED SELF-INTEREST AND THE CLAIMS OF HUMANITY.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that nations, like individuals, should be actuated by the highest considerations both of their own welfare and that of humanity. The law of nature, through which we have life, makes it the first duty of every being to protect and extend its own existence so that it can best fulfill the mission of its Creator. As the Creator has placed under the control of every person the development of his own faculties and holds him responsible for their proper use and preservation, it may be well said both of nations and individuals that "self-preservation is the first law of nature." But while our first duty is to ourselves, it can not be severed from our obligations to a world-wide humanity, of which we are all a part. I wish, then, to discuss this question both from the standpoint of American interests and welfare and of mankind at large.

Indeed, Mr. Speaker, the motives which led us to the present war with the Kingdom of Spain are analogous to those which have brought forward the present measure. In both resolutions the protection of the rights and interests of our own nation stand side by side with the interests of humanity. In the joint resolution (H. Res. 209) which I had the honor to introduce in Congress March 30, declaring the independence of the Cuban Republic, to be enforced by armed intervention, if necessary, the outrage to the humane and Christian sentiments of the American people, through the barbaric cruelties of the Spaniards toward an oppressed people beyond the jurisdiction of our Government, were placed side by side with the assassination of our own seamen, the

destruction of an American battle ship, and the interests of American industries and commerce.

And, sir, the result of the magnanimous spirit and lofty motives which inspired our nation to prevent at any sacrifice the continuance of Spanish atrocities on the Western Hemisphere has been that in this struggle of arms we have had the moral support of the great nations of the earth. Had we been actuated by merely selfish motives or a desire for conquest, the nations of Europe would have found in our aggressiveness a menace to the security of their own territorial possessions. Nor could we then have implored the blessings of Almighty God upon our cause, nor would His Providence have so ordered events that the struggling native islanders of the Philippines as well should be freed from the barbarisms of the land of the Inquisition. Nor could we have hoped for the splendid and speedy triumph of American arms in the Pacific which has inscribed the name of Admiral Dewey and his brave seamen above that of Lord Nelson, and made Manila Bay more historic than Trafalgar! [Applause.]

THEIR STRATEGIC IMPORTANCE.

Our war with Spain has emphasized the fact that our national safety and prosperity require increased harbors for vessels both of war and commerce. While opposed to inaugurating an era of imperial conquest at the expense of our free institutions, yet believing that this nation has a God-given mission to perform as the standard bearer of civil liberty and progress for the ultimate advancement of all the nations of the earth, it becomes our duty to use all the means which Providence has placed before us for maintaining the integrity of our possessions and due respect for our demands, always to be founded on justice. The hostilities in which we are now engaged demonstrate that, as war may be sometimes unavoidable, it is necessary that our ships, both of war and peace, should have convenient harbors of refuge for safety in times of storm, accident, or war, as well as convenient stations for coal and supplies.

England, with rare foresight, many years ago secured insular and littoral possessions in every corner of the earth, by which her interests and power on land as well as sea have been greatly advanced.

On the other hand, the lack of adequate coaling stations has, fortunately for us, greatly crippled the efficiency of the Spanish navy. It is well known that modern men-of-war, especially those which attain high speed and whose engines in some cases develop 18,000 horsepower, rapidly consume enormous quantities of coal and, owing to their special construction, have coal storage but for short trips only. In fact, the question of coal supply has perplexed the Spanish thus far on the Atlantic more, perhaps, than any other condition relative to their naval strategy.

But aside from the necessities of our Navy, our merchant vessels as well need, both in peace and war, both in accident and safety, harbors under the protection of our flag for all of the needs of commerce, travel, and the advancement of science, to be liberally encouraged by our Government.

A BRIEF VIEW OF THE ISLANDS.

The Sandwich or Hawaiian Islands lie about 600 miles north of the equator, their capital, Honolulu, being 2,089 miles southwest from San Francisco, 3,399 miles west of Yokohama, 4,917 miles west of Hongkong, and about 4,000 miles from the Philippines, Australia, and New Zealand. Their combined area is about 7,000 square miles, two-thirds of which is contained in the principal island, Hawaii. The capital city, Honolulu, is located on the island of Oahu, and on the coast of this island, 12 miles away, is situated the famous Pearl Harbor, now under control of our Government, said to be the finest natural harbor on the globe, capable of floating all the navies of the world. This harbor consists of a large inland lake, broken by islands which maintain a smooth surface of water, protected by hills from storms and the guns of hostile fleets, and connected with the sea by a long and narrow channel, easily fortified.

It is objected that we have already a shorter route to China and Japan, with opportunity for a coaling station at Unalaska, in the Aleutian Islands, about 2,000 miles north of Hawaii; but that route is rarely taken, owing to storms, fogs, and floating ice from the polar sea prevailing there, dangerous to navigation. On the other hand, the route via Hawaii is an ideal one in every respect, and its freedom from storm is typical of the name of the ocean traversed—Pacific. In the event, also, of the completion of the great Nicaragua Canal, through which all of our ships of commerce and war will quickly pass from ocean to ocean, these islands will be on the most direct route to China, Japan, and the Philippines. They are also on the direct route to Australia and New Zealand, with whom we have a large commerce.

Regarding the climate and the other physical and natural attractions of the islands, an enthusiastic traveler says:

"It is simply 'Fairyland,' 'Rainbowland'; a land of perfect rest and repose; a land of color; a land of magnificent hills, cloud-topped, of a thousand valleys and ravines, of streams and waterfalls, of glorious sea and sky."

I had the pleasure recently of spending an evening with the able and statesmanlike minister of the Hawaiian Republic, Hon. Lorrin A. Thurston. He showed me an extensive series of photographs illustrating the islands, their people, products, vegetation, etc., and it certainly seemed like fairyland indeed.

Each island consists of one or more mountains, with valleys and plains between. The soil is decomposed lava, irrigated by mountain streams and wells. The principal products are sugar, coffee, and fruits. About 80,000 acres are devoted to sugar cane, and in 1896, 221,000 tons of sugar were exported. If annexed to this country, this sugar will reach American consumers free of duty, and the combine of the oppressive sugar trust may be broken.

The healthful and balmy climate has given these islands the appellation of "The Paradise of the Pacific." The temperature is mild and even, averaging about 82° in summer and 74° in winter. The lowest temperature at the level of the sea in winter is about 56° and the warmest in summer about 88°. The cool northeast trade winds blow eight or nine months in the year.

With all these gifts of nature inviting us, as well as the entreaties of the citizens of this little Commonwealth, who desire to enjoy our institutions, how can we refuse? As the muse best expresses it:

O how canst thou renounce the boundless store
Of charms which Nature to her votary yields:
The warbling woodland, the resounding shore,
The pomp of groves, and garniture of fields;
All that the genial ray of morning gilds,
And all that echoes to the song of even,
All that the mountain's sheltering bosom shields,
And all the dread magnificence of heaven:
O how canst thou renounce, and hope to be forgiven?

THE NATIVE RACE.

When Capt. James Cook discovered (or rediscovered) these islands December 8, 1778, while circumnavigating the globe with his armed vessels, the *Resolution* and *Discovery*, as so interestingly narrated in his famous Voyages, he found a confiding race of aborigines, who welcomed him and afterwards worshiped him as a god, the number of whom he estimated at 400,000. During fierce wars for supremacy among rival chiefs nearly one-half of the inhabitants lost their lives about the beginning of the present century.

THE DESTRUCTIVE EFFECTS OF "MODERN CIVILIZATION" UPON THE ISLANDS.

It is a sad fact that although in 1840 King Kamehameha III, called "The Good," granted the people a constitution, abolished idolatry, and encouraged Christianity, yet contact with "civilization," through contagious disease, and more especially the importation of intoxicating liquors, with the art of producing them, has so decimated the population that in 1896 but 31,000 native Hawaiians remained! And all authorities agree that in but a few years a once happy people of trustful and confiding "children of nature" will be extinct, with no trace except in history! What a commentary on our civilization! Our own country is witnessing a like passing of the "Red Men of the Forest." And if the influence of strong drink has so rapidly decimated the aborigines, inured to privations and hardships, who can measure the extent of its baneful effects on the happiness, the power, and the lives of our "civilized" Anglo-Saxon nation!

POPULATION.

The census of 1896 shows the population to be 109,020.

In round numbers the different nationalities are represented as follows:

Native Hawaiians	31,000
Japanese	24,400
Portuguese	15,100
Chinese	21,600
Part Hawaiian and part foreign blood	8,400
Americans	3,400
British	2,200
German	1,400
Norwegian and French	479
All other nationalities	1,055

Expressed in percentage the population is as follows:

	Per cent.
Native Hawaiian	28
Japanese	22
Chinese	20
Americans and Europeans by birth or descent	23
Mixed blood	8

FORM OF GOVERNMENT, PAST, PRESENT, AND AS PROPOSED BY ANNEXATION.

Early in the present century the tribes of the various isles were united in a Kingdom by Kamehameha I, chief of the most powerful tribe. This, said to be the "noblest of all savage dynasties," ended in 1872 by the death of Kamehameha IV. The Government, however, remained a monarchy until January, 1893, when Queen Liliuokalani attempted to abrogate certain constitutional rights and to disfranchise the white population.

Thereupon a provisional government was established and a con-

stitution framed and adopted, which was promulgated on July 4, 1894, the people desiring that the two nations should be united by the same historic birthday. Thus by every avenue open to them the Hawaiians show the sympathy and love for our country and its institutions.

CHINESE WILL BE EXCLUDED.

Objection is made that Asiatics will be thus allowed citizenship, and that the interests of American labor as well as the safety of American institutions will be jeopardized. If this were true, I should oppose the measure with all my power. Happily both the facts and effects are the opposite, for it will be seen by referring to the resolution of annexation that the islands are to be "annexed as a part of the territory of the United States, and are subject to the dominion thereof," etc.

It is also further provided that, "There shall be no further immigration of Chinese into the Hawaiian Islands except upon such conditions as are now or may be hereafter allowed by the laws of the United States; and no Chinese, by reason of anything contained herein, shall be allowed to enter the United States from the Hawaiian Islands.

"The President [of the United States] shall appoint five commissioners, at least two of whom shall be residents of the Hawaiian Islands, who shall, as soon as reasonably practicable, recommend to Congress such legislation concerning the Hawaiian Islands as they shall deem necessary or proper."

It is also stipulated that pending the above legislation the present laws of the Republic of Hawaii shall be in force, so far as they do not conflict with the Constitution or laws of the United States. By the present laws of Hawaii, Asiatics are not eligible to citizenship or to a vote. Thus the interests of labor as well as the integrity of our institutions seem to be fully protected. Furthermore, labor should be benefited by the enlarged market for its products and the decreased cost of the sugar it consumes.

The present government is almost identical with our own. The members of its senate and house of representatives are elected for the same terms as ours. Their president, whom many of us have met, is of American parentage and a graduate of Williams College. The foundation of their laws, like ours, is the common law of England, and their courts are founded on the American system. Thus they are already accustomed to our institutions and laws.

THE CONSTITUTIONAL ARGUMENT.

But objection is made that there is no authority in the Constitution for acquiring foreign territory. If this were true, Mr. Chairman, a great part, more than half our present territory, including some of our most important States, is not properly within the Union. Who shall say that the many States comprised in the Louisiana purchase, and California, Texas, and New Mexico should have been repelled?

But, sir, on this question as on others we have the highest authorities for saying not only that foreign territory can be annexed when done for just reasons, without a violation of the Constitution as liberally construed, but where the Constitution is defective by reason of contingencies not thought of by its framers, it is our duty then, as always, to be guided by an enlightened conscience as the needs of our nation and those of humanity shall dictate. The Constitution was intended to secure civil rights and enlarge the benefits of free government—not to abridge them.

But happily we have many high constitutional authorities as well as historic precedents for the proposed annexation. These having already been brought to public attention, I shall only briefly refer to a few instances.

When the Louisiana purchase was under consideration, the great Jefferson, who, as the author of the Declaration of Independence, on which the Constitution was afterwards based, should be the highest authority, said:

"There is no constitutional difficulty as to the acquisition of territory, and whether when acquired it may be taken into the Union by the Constitution as it now stands, will become a question of expediency."

President Lincoln also said:

"Having practiced the acquisition of territory for nearly sixty years, the question of constitutional power to do so is no longer an open one with us. * * * On this whole proposition, including the appropriation of money for the acquisition of territory, does not the expediency amount to almost necessity, without which the Government itself can not be perpetuated?"

In the Dred Scott decision Chief Justice Taney said:

"The power to expand the territory of the United States by the admission of new States is plainly given; and in the construction of this power by all the departments of the Government it has been held to authorize the acquisition of territory, not fit for admission at the time, but to be admitted as soon as its population and situation would entitle it to admission. It is acquired to become a State, and not to be held as a colony and governed by Congress with absolute authority; and as the propriety of admitting a new State is committed to the sound discretion of Congress, the power

to acquire territory for that purpose, to be held by the United States until it is in a suitable condition to become a State upon an equal footing with other States, must rest upon the same discretion.

"It is a question for the political department of the Government, and not the judicial; and whatever the political department of the Government shall recognize as within the limits of the United States the judicial department is also bound to recognize, and to administer in it the laws of the United States, so far as they apply, and to maintain in the territory the authority and rights of the Government, and also the personal rights and rights of property of individual citizens, as secured by the Constitution."

So, according to this learned judge, the power of Congress in regard to territorial acquisition is supreme, and not subject to the review of the Supreme Court.

It simply remains, then, to decide "What is for the highest interests of our nation and humanity?" Having faith, Mr. Speaker, that the American people will continue to be inspired with humane and lofty motives, I trust the proposed measure will pass and that our action in rescuing the oppressed people both of the West Indies and the Philippines, joined to this, will be the auspicious introduction to a century of advancement for us and for all mankind. [Applause.]

Mr. SMITH of Arizona. A parliamentary inquiry, Mr. Speaker. The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. SMITH of Arizona. Is it proper at this time to offer an amendment to this resolution, to come in at the end, to include what is known as the home-rule bill for Arizona?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair thinks, from the gentleman's description of the amendment, that it would hardly be germane to this bill, even if it were proper to offer it at this time.

Mr. HITT. Mr. Speaker, while the House is waiting for gentlemen to proceed on the side of the negative, I will ask the House to adopt a formal amendment to the resolution, to strike out, on page 3, line 12, the words "of the exchange." It was a mistake in copying the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

On page 3, line 12, strike out the words "of the exchange," so that it will read: "the public debt of the Republic of Hawaii lawfully existing at the time of the passage of this joint resolution."

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the amendment will be considered as agreed to.

There was no objection.

Mr. DINSMORE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the minority resolutions, reported as a substitute and printed with the views of the minority, be considered as pending.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the substitute will be considered as pending.

There was no objection.

Mr. DINSMORE. I yield ten minutes to my colleague from Arkansas [Mr. TERRY].

Mr. TERRY. Mr. Speaker, in the limited time allowed, I can only briefly touch a few of the points involved in the question before the House. I can see no present necessity, Mr. Speaker, for the passage of the pending bill for the annexation of Hawaii, and I think that I can see in it the beginning of a policy of territorial aggrandizement, aggression, and imperialism that bodes no good to this Republic. I am in favor of seizing and holding such islands and dependencies of Spain as may be necessary to indemnify us for the costs and sacrifices of the present war.

If, after we have completed their seizure and occupation, the annexation of Hawaii should become a military necessity to enable us to reap the benefit of what we have taken, it will then be time enough for us to consider that proposition, but the unseemly manner in which the pendency of the Americo-Spanish war is being taken advantage of to press the passage of this bill, in advance of any real necessity for the same, is but an additional proof to the multiplying evidence that a war solemnly declared for the cause of humanity, justice, and the vindication of the national honor and the national flag is being perverted from the plain and proper purposes for which it was authorized by Congress and indorsed by the American people.

The bond grabber, the boodler, the land grabber, and the spoilsman are gathering to the front and exercising their baleful influence in every quarter that can be reached. They have forced the needless issue of \$400,000,000 of bonds, and in a bill imposing onerous burdens and taxes upon the plain people of the land they have obtained practical exemptions and immunities for themselves. In the matter of supplies and transportation they are bleeding the Government at every point where possible, so that nearly one-half of the appropriations voted here will never inure to the benefit of the patriotic men who have gone and are still going to the front of war to offer their services and their lives for the upholding of the honor and glory of the flag.

That flag, sir, was unfurled and uplifted for a high and holy

purpose, and under its inspiration the American people were ready at once to leap to arms. They want that purpose preserved and carried out, and in the end, sir, you will find that their wrath and indignation will be kindled against all of those who have perverted patriotism for the unholy purposes of greed and speculation.

That flag, sir, in all its history, was never uplifted in a foreign war for unjust conquest and aggression. It has always been glorious and honored among all the nations of the earth, because wherever it floated, upon the land or upon the sea, it was recognized as the emblem and very symbol of freedom, humanity, and justice. [Applause.] God grant that it may ever continue so to be! In all its beauty of blended colors and glorious emblazonry of stars, it is honored and respected throughout the world.

Of all the flags of all the governments of all the kingdoms, principalities, empires, and nations of this earth, there is no other flag that shines so resplendent with the light of human freedom, none that is lifted higher in the march of human progress, and none that is greeted more gladly in its coming than the banner of the great Republic. Let us stand true to the lofty principles of those who gave it to our keeping. Let it continue in the future, as in the past, the symbol of honor, of equity, humanity, freedom, and justice, and it will continue throughout the centuries to be honored among all the nations of the earth, and will go forth leading the van of that mighty march of civilization and enlightenment, which, moving out in ever-widening circles toward the uttermost parts of the earth, is as resistless in its advance as the tides of the ocean and as glorious in its glad coming as the waves of the morning light. [Applause.]

Mr. DINSMORE. Mr. Speaker, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. GAINES].

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

Mr. DINSMORE. I yield two minutes to the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. SMITH].

Mr. SMITH of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, at this time I offer and ask the Clerk to read the following amendment to the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. It will be read for the information of the House.

Mr. SMITH of Arizona. I ask the Clerk to read it in my time, and whatever purposes I can make of it afterwards I shall do.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it further resolved, That on Tuesday after the first Monday in November, 1898, at the general election then to be held in the Territory of Arizona, the following-named Territorial officers shall be elected by the qualified electors of said Territory, who shall hold their respective offices for the term of four years, unless otherwise prescribed by the legislative assembly of said Territory, to wit: One governor, secretary of state, auditor, treasurer, attorney-general, superintendent of public instruction, one chief justice and three associate justices of the supreme court of Arizona, and when elected said justices shall exercise and have the same powers, duties, jurisdiction, etc., as is now prescribed by law. The election of said justices shall in no wise interfere with the jurisdiction of the courts as now established, the purpose being only to change the manner of selecting the judges.

The board of control shall consist as now prescribed, except that the citizen member thereof shall be elected at the time and in the manner hereinbefore provided. There shall also be elected at said election a Territorial board of equalization, consisting of the number of persons now constituting said board, whose duties shall be such as are now or may hereafter be prescribed by the laws of said Territory.

All other Territorial officers not herein named shall be appointed by the governor, by and with the consent of the Territorial council. The clerks of the district court in each county shall be elected by the qualified electors of the county in which he resides and is to serve.

Nothing in this act shall be construed as limiting the power of the legislative assembly of said Territory over said offices, nor from abrogating the same, except the offices of governor and the justices aforesaid.

The salary and compensation of said officers, when elected, shall be paid at the time and in the manner now prescribed by law.

Mr. DINGLEY. I understand that this is only read for information.

Mr. SMITH of Arizona. That is not my only purpose, as I stated. I wish to know, as a parliamentary inquiry, whether there is now or whether there will be an opportunity to offer amendments to this resolution. I want that amendment voted on by the House, if I can get the opportunity—if it is germane. If, in the opinion of the Chair, it is not germane, I should like to be heard a minute on that whenever it is in order. I do not wish to interrupt the orderly proceeding of the House.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will say that the gentleman from Arizona was not recognized for the purpose of offering the amendment, but was recognized in the time of the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. DINSMORE], and the so-called amendment could only be read for information in the time of the gentleman.

Mr. SMITH of Arizona. I do not know for what purpose I was recognized, but I know for what purpose the floor was accorded to me.

Mr. HITT. I yield to the gentleman from New York [Mr. CUMMINGS] ten minutes.

Mr. CUMMINGS. Mr. Speaker, no man rejoiced more than I did when I heard that the bestial Queen of the Sandwich Islands

had been dethroned and a provisional government established. No man rejoiced more than I when the President of the United States recognized that provisional government. No man rejoiced more than I when that provisional government became a republic. And no man felt a greater tinge of shame than I when an ex-member of Congress from Georgia went to those islands, by direction of another President of the United States, and hauled down the American flag that had been placed there for the protection of American citizens. [Applause.] But as an American I felt a greater tinge of shame when that same President made an effort to destroy the little Republic and reestablish in authority the bestial Queen—a fit companion for Queen Isabella of Spain—and was only deterred in his attempt because the Queen insisted upon butchering the patriotic men who had dethroned her and established a republic upon the ruins of her barbaric monarchy. Fitly was he repudiated by his own political party and fitly was his course disapproved by the American people.

Now, Mr. Speaker, that Republic has opened its ports to the ships of the American nation. We are at war, and this sturdy little Republic has made its ports practically American ports. She takes all the risks of trouble with foreign nations to prove her sympathy with the American Republic in its hour of trial; and I am not the man to give her a blow in the face in return for that courtesy by voting against this bill. [Applause.]

Sir, territorial acquisition is the desire of every people. With the English-speaking race it is not only a passion, but the source of all their strength and greatness. Not a foot of ground do they demonstrate on but what was taken from strangers. It was not a national movement that planted them on these shores at first. It was a movement of groups, instigated by a desire to escape oppression. From this transplanting came our nation, not by preconceived designs, but as a result of the movement. When the thin line was planted on the Atlantic coast there was no idea of overspreading the continent. A commission sent out from Boston to explore the wilderness went as far as Beaver Creek, Waltham, and returned with the report that civilization would probably never extend beyond that limit. But the impulse to expand was at work, and colony after colony appeared. When we separated from Great Britain the idea of continental supremacy was so weak that Jefferson's purchase of Louisiana met with bitter resistance; but with the victory of Andrew Jackson at New Orleans the tide set in, and shortly thereafter we assumed political guardianship of the New World. Then came the Spanish treaty, which gave us Florida and completed our coast line on the Gulf, and also the Spanish confirmation of the French grant, to which up to that time Spain had laid claim. Texas was next admitted. Then came the Mexican grant, after the war with that country, which gave us our possessions on the Pacific. And then the Gadsden purchase.

These were Democratic moves, resisted by opposition. The purchase of Alaska was a tremendous leap over British domain, and was a Republican measure, which has caused us considerable trouble, and which has yet resulted in no permanent benefit, though the Klondike gold mines, it is hoped, will bring us out. It was an out of the way purchase. This objection does not lie against the Sandwich Islands. They are in the strict line of communication, and, except for mere distance, have much the same connection with us as Brooklyn had with New York before the two were made one. The ferry is longer, but the business and government of the island are essentially American.

Moreover, sir, distance on the ocean is fast being annihilated. It does not take much longer now for one of our wave-splitting steamships to go from San Francisco to Honolulu than it did a century ago for a Dutch sloop to run from New York to Albany. The business over the former route is infinitely greater and of vital importance to this nation. Steam has practically condensed the globe and is fast obliterating ocean barriers.

In every essential respect the Sandwich Islands are already annexed. The laws, the manifestoes, and the proclamations there—indeed, all of their political literature—are already in our language. The islands have been civilized by Americans. They are governed by Americans, men of our kith and kin, anxious for the union. They are an essential outpost of the United States. The objections to their annexation are weak indeed compared with those urged against former acquisitions; yet who would give up a single foot of the territory already acquired? Experience has shown that the web and woof of our system grows stronger with territorial extension instead of weaker, as was formerly urged. It is the history of all nations that when they begin to lose territory they decline. The Roman Empire and the Kingdom of Spain, once a province of that Empire, are conclusive on this point. So is the fact that we have not a foot of territory that we have not taken from others. A higher power than that of the sugar kings has decreed that these islands shall become an integral part of the United States. It is the decree of the King of Kings, the Ruler of the Universe. His missionaries rescued the Sandwich Islands

from barbarism, and He will preserve them for ages in the bosom of the American Union. [Loud applause.]

[Here Mr. CUMMINGS's time expired.]

Mr. DINSMORE. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi twenty-five minutes.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I have listened, as I always do, with much interest to the various utterances of my friends upon this question, and with especial interest to what was said by the gentleman from New York, especially a friend of mine. The gentleman, however, is not so happy to-day in the conclusiveness of his logic as he sometimes is. In fact, his zeal for Hawaiian annexation has led him to indulge in some of the ordinary fallacies in which men indulge when they are actuated by overzeal. About the last thing my friend said was that the whole history of the world proved that whenever people began to lose territory, they began to lose weight in the affairs of the world and to decline.

My friend has simply put the effect in place of the cause. Whenever people begin to lose weight in the world, then they begin to lose territory. That is the proper way to state it. But wherever people have fairness enough and foresightedness enough to know what is their proper territorial limit and to stop within this limit, they gain strength and do not weaken themselves. The Roman Empire grew stronger when its rulers concluded not to go beyond certain bounds. As long as it had attempted to carry the eagle into lands too far distant it was a source of weakness and death and destruction to the army, the legions, and the people from whom they were drawn. But when Hadrian concluded to stop further conquests and defend its possessions as far as they had gone in the Orient on the one hand and to the Rhine and Danube on the other, it showed itself capable of maintaining an unheard-of stability, of perpetuating itself absolutely in the West or East for a thousand years—longer than any other government ever lasted on the face of this globe.

Mr. CUMMINGS. The gentleman reads Roman history different from what I do.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. I think most people will agree with me that when the rule was laid down that the imperial possessions should be confined within certain limits that was the beginning of the stability of the Roman Empire, and as great a man as Gibbon agrees with me, and not with the gentleman from New York.

Mr. CUMMINGS. I say it did not last a thousand years.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Oh, yes; the Roman power lasted fully a thousand years, much over it, before it was disrupted by the barbarians. Now, the gentleman says these people in Hawaii "have taken the chances of a war with Spain in order to be favorable to the United States in the present war." In that assertion there are two mistakes. In the first place, the people of Hawaii have had nothing to do with the action of the Hawaiian Government; secondly, the Government itself has not run the slightest chance of war with Spain. We have coaled in our own harbor, to which we have not only the right to proprietorship, but the right of sovereignty, and we have coaled from our own coal, and we had just as much right to do so as we have to coal in New York Harbor.

Mr. CUMMINGS. You can not sail a vessel into Pearl Harbor, and this House has refused to make an appropriation to clean it out.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. You can not sail through the reefs; I know that. Now, I want to dwell on that point a moment, because there seems to be a great deal of difference of opinion and confusion as to our rights at Pearl Harbor. I take it that when a sovereign grants another sovereign "exclusive right to enter" a place, it carries with it, from the very necessity of the expression and the very necessities of the condition of the two parties, a right to sovereignty, unless it is bounded and limited in express terms so as to confine it to the right of proprietorship. Moreover, if I could be mistaken, and we have only a proprietary and not a sovereign right in Pearl Harbor, the peace to follow this war will be of our dictation, and Hawaii knows that we will not forget to protect her.

Now, my friend has indulged, as have other gentlemen, in a discussion of previous territorial acquisition, eminently irrelevant to this particular question. If the purpose and nature of territorial acquisition now under discussion is of like character to the others, if it is to be brought about in the same manner, then all of these arguments will be relevant; but in the first place they were not of like character in many regards, all of which points of difference I discussed and explained at a previous time on the floor of this House. Now, I want to call attention to the fact that the contemplated Hawaiian annexation is not to be accomplished by like methods; and when I say that, I want to first call the attention of the House to the only possible methods by which, under our form of government, with a written Constitution of limited and granted powers, we can accomplish territorial acquisition.

Mr. CUMMINGS. I do not like to interrupt the gentleman—
Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Oh, I never refuse to be interrupted, and I like to be interrupted by one for whom I have so high a personal regard as for the gentleman from New York.

Mr. CUMMINGS. Was not Texas acquired by resolution?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Undoubtedly; but I will show the gentleman so plainly that, in its nature, it has nothing to do with this matter, that he, with his clear head, never will ask the question again. I will come to territorial addition by joint resolution later, and to the manner of admitting Texas. The Constitution gives to the President and Senate the right to make treaties. Of course any power under the sun giving the right to make a treaty at the conclusion of a war (which is one of the occasions when the making of treaties is absolutely necessary) carries with it as a necessary incident the power of ceding territory, because it may be absolutely necessary to cede and give up territory in order to conclude a treaty securing peace.

Thus the power to make a treaty of peace carries the right, therefore, to cede territory. E converso, any government having that power has the right also to acquire territory. Mr. Jefferson was at first somewhat in doubt as to whether even this right existed; but he came to the conclusion in his old age that he had been mistaken. And at the time when the acquisition of Louisiana was a live issue, the great majority of his party conferees—the party of strict construction—differed with him in his then opinion and candidly told him so, holding that it was unnecessary to amend the Constitution in order to make the acquisition of Louisiana constitutional.

Now, there is in addition to this power as an incident to the treaty-making power one other method given in the Constitution for acquiring territory; that contemplates the acquisition of a certain kind of territory only. The power to which I now refer is given in that clause of the Constitution which empowers Congress by joint resolution to admit new States. Now, answering the gentleman from New York [Mr. CUMMINGS], Texas was not “annexed” in the sense in which we to-day are talking about “annexing” Hawaii. Texas came into this Union by joint resolution under an express power given to Congress in the Constitution, “to admit new States.” She came as a State. She came under an enabling act passed in order to let her come in as a State. It is only a popular confusion of terms that calls the admission of Texas “annexation.”

Mr. Speaker, I would not care to set my view on a constitutional question before this House as worthy of its sole consideration; but when I am borne out by the United States Supreme Court, I dare set up that view in which the court sustains me. The United States Supreme Court, in the Dred Scott case, takes exactly the position I have stated. Then it goes one step further, and only one step further, and that step is an obiter dictum—not a necessary part of the decision—and being an obiter dictum, and not being binding in law, it seems to me it is not entitled to be received as a correct construction of the constitutional question. But admitting for the sake of argument that it is so, let us inquire what the obiter dictum is. The Supreme Court says that under the power to admit new States into the Union Congress may admit Territories which are in contemplation of formation into States. Now, there is not a man on this floor, there is not a man who hears my voice, who will say that he or this Congress contemplates the acquisition of Hawaii for the purpose of making a State of it. There is not a member of the Foreign Affairs Committee that will risk his reputation in the judgment of men or put his sincerity to the point of criticism by making that statement. On the contrary, this House is full of men who would not vote for this resolution except with the understanding in their own minds that Hawaii is not to be introduced as a State into the Union.

Now, while I am talking about the constitutionality of this step, I want to talk about the democracy of it. And when I say democracy I do not mean democracy spelled with a big “D,” in a partisan sense; I mean democracy spelled with a little “d,” in the sense of popular government. Mr. Speaker, in order to get at the democracy or nondemocracy of this proposition, let us resort to the New England mode of argument; let us ask a question—a question which has been asked on this floor, not once, but four or five times, which the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Affairs will not undertake to answer, which the gentleman from New York [Mr. CUMMINGS] will not undertake to answer, which the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. SMITH] will not undertake to answer, which the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. PEARSON] will not undertake to answer, which not a man here will dare undertake to answer. That question is: How are the Hawaiian Islands, after admission, to be governed in a democratic way? If they can not be governed in a democratic way consistently with the Constitution, then their annexation is undemocratic. What possible conception of popular government is to be applied to them consonant with the Constitution of the United States? Remember that you

can not now, since the enactment of the fifteenth amendment, discriminate against people with regard to the exercise of the right of suffrage “because of race, color, or previous condition of servitude.”

Mr. WM. ALDEN SMITH. May I ask the gentleman a question?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Certainly.

Mr. WM. ALDEN SMITH. I desire to call the gentleman's attention to a recent decision of Judge Morrow, of the United States circuit court of California, who has expressly held that “Congress may legislate in accordance with the special needs of each locality, and may vary its regulations to meet the circumstances of the people.” That is a decision fresh from the United States circuit court of California.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. I understand the gentleman to say that the person who made that decision has declared that Congress has the right to legislate broadly, without any limiting or qualifying words, “to suit the necessities of each locality.” If that is his declaration, then that judge ought to collect his opinions in a volume and ought to dub them “The curiosities of judicial announcement.” There is not a man who ever lived in the blindest, the wildest days of federalistic saturnalia, when the alien and sedition laws were stalking through the country, who ever dared take the position that the Congress of the United States could “legislate to suit the wants of particular localities,” except only when it had a power granted to it, either expressly or by necessary and proper intendment, in the Constitution of the United States.

Mr. WM. ALDEN SMITH rose.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. One moment. Now, the Constitution of the United States says to-day that there shall be no discrimination in regard to the exercise of the right of suffrage on account of race, color, or previous condition of servitude. There is, therefore, no way of disqualifying from suffrage these Kanakas in the Hawaiian Islands unless they be disfranchised in some indirect way. Now, in the State of Mississippi we were confronted with that problem; but we had a different race to deal with—a race that abhors a book just about as much as a Comanche Indian abhors a prayer meeting.

We put an educational qualification into our State constitution, and it had the effect of disfranchising a great number of those people. But the Kanakas are not that sort of people, although they are racially and hereditarily unfit for self-government, because no race ever existed that could equip itself in the short time of one or two generations with those magnificent traits of self-control and comprehensive information that make people capable of self-government. Capacity for self-government comes by long heredity, by inbreeding for a long time. Although those people in the Hawaiian Islands are not fitted for self-government, they happen to be a people who educationally possess a higher percentage of literates, and will continue to do so, than does the State of Michigan or the State of Massachusetts. [Laughter.]

Mr. WM. ALDEN SMITH. Mr. Speaker, I want to ask the gentleman one more question, with his consent.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Yes.

Mr. WM. ALDEN SMITH. Judge Morrow, in this decision, which is likely to become a notable one, said:

The Territories of the United States are entirely subject to the legislative authority of Congress. They are not organized under the Constitution, nor subject to its complex distribution of the powers of government as the organic law, but are the creation, exclusively, of the legislative department, and subject to its supervision and control.

It may legislate in accordance with the special needs of each locality, and vary its regulations to meet the circumstances of the people.

There is a judge, occupying a distinguished place in the judiciary of the Government, and who has occupied a seat upon this floor with honor and credit, and that is his view upon this question.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. I thought the gentleman was going to ask me a question. Now, I understand him to say that this gentleman says that territorial government and the rights of citizens and people in the Territories are exclusively within the powers of Congress. Well, if he said that, you are doing him great injustice to take it for granted that he meant it regardless of constitutional limitations, powers, and defenses. [Applause on Democratic side.] Do you believe that the Congress of the United States could dispense with the right of trial by jury, with freedom of the press, with freedom of religion, or with any other constitutional right in the Territory of Arizona, and that that very judge, if he had as much sense as would fill a mustard seed, would not decide, if Congress attempted either of these things, that the law purposing to do it was unconstitutional?

Mr. KING. There have been dozens of decisions of the Supreme Court of the United States to the effect that all of the personal constitutional guaranties extend to the Territories and the citizens of Territories.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Why, of course, there is no

doubt about that in the mind of any boy that ever read the Federalist, or who ever had the opportunity of talking half an hour with somebody who did know something about the constitutional limitations of our Government. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Now, Mr. Speaker, there is one other way in which territory may be acquired, although it does not appear in express terms in the Constitution itself. That is when the territory is a mere attachment to the person of the citizen. If I were to go out, for example, and discover an uninhabited island, as was done by American citizens in the case of Midway Island, and in the case of Navassa and some of these other islands—the Guano Islands, for instance—to which gentlemen have referred, I being a citizen of a State, and therefore, under the Constitution of the United States, a citizen of the United States, and being upon that island without any adverse or prior governmental authority or possession to conflict with that of the United States, I would carry my citizenship with me, and if by right of discovery the island was mine the jurisdiction of my Government would be extended over it as a part of and as an appendage to me. But that is not the case with Hawaii, so that principle does not come in.

Now, Mr. Speaker, if anybody upon this floor can realize more deeply than I do the gravity of this question he must indeed have a weight of sadness upon his soul, if he fears, as I fear, that this thing which seems to me the liad of many a yet unforgettold woe and war leading to woe will be accomplished. At some times I have felt dissatisfied with the Government. I have felt it at home and I have felt it with the National Government. I have sometimes felt dissatisfied with the expression of the will of the people; but back of it all was the consoling reflection that here was at least one country in the world that was honestly and sincerely trying to make an experiment of having “a just government founded upon the consent of the governed.” And I had hoped until very lately that the time would never come when the United States Government would step out into the arena of nations, under the plea of military necessity or any other necessity—the plea of tyrants now, as always—and undertake anything in direct violation of the very principle upon which you founded the Union, the very principle upon which you founded the independence and the liberty of the colonies and the liberty of the citizens—the principle embodied in the general announcement that all just government under God is a government that is founded upon the consent of the governed, and that no power from the outside has a right to come in to me or to you, our ancestors in the colonies or to us now, and superimpose a government which we do not want.

They may have the power, but they have not the right, and when they do it they are guilty of the act of a tyrant, they are guilty of the contradiction of every sound principle upon which popular government rests. Gentlemen “pooh-pooh” the idea of consulting the people of Hawaii as to whether they desire to be governed by ourselves. Tories pooh-poohed it when our ancestors emblazoned it upon their battle flags.

But notwithstanding the arrogance of power, I honor the man who has the spirit anywhere or at any time to assert it and to fight for it.

Mr. LINNEY. If the gentleman will allow me to interrupt him in his very able speech, his point, as I understand it, is that we have not the consent of the people of the Hawaiian Islands.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Yes.

Mr. LINNEY. Now, this is a question I want to put to the gentleman as a lawyer: Where there is a governing power in any country, consisting of an executive, like the President of the Hawaiian Islands now, where the courts are open and where there is a regular machinery for collecting the taxes by which the treasury is supplied, is it not the presumption *juris et de jure* that that is the proper government, and that you can not go behind it?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. There is undoubtedly a bare technical legal presumption to that effect, which, by the way, would have justified the recognition of the government of Nero and would have justified that of any other government that ever existed.

Mr. LINNEY. Yes; but in the light of present civilization and as a lawyer, is not that presumption conclusive?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. I was trying to answer the gentleman's question. I say there is a bare legal presumption which every government will make in dealing with another, that the *de facto* government is the government of the legal representatives of the inhabitants of the country. But that is a presumption originated for technical purposes, and you and I are not now trying to violate the maxims and principles of our ancestors by bringing in naked technicalities. Now, I say, and I say that the gentleman from North Carolina knows, that the present Government in Hawaii is not founded upon the consent of the people of Hawaii. And I say that he and you all know that long ago if the Hawaiian oligarchy had had the slightest idea that the people of Hawaii would have voted in favor of annexation to the United

States they would have had a “plebiscite” and a vote of the people for the purpose of deciding that very thing.

Mr. LINNEY. Now, one other question, if the gentleman will allow me, and I ask it not with any intention of stirring up anything personal or anything sectional. You say only one-tenth or probably only one-thirtieth of the Hawaiian people have voted. In Mississippi not more than one-third of the people have voted. Now, that being so, and I take that from the Congressional Directory—

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Never mind about that; just make your statement as broadly as you please.

Mr. LINNEY. I make that statement. Now, would you not think it transcending the powers of this Congress if in any course of legislation it were to refuse to recognize the present government in Mississippi as a proper one, upon the ground that the majority of the citizens have not voted?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, that question is totally unworthy of the intellect of the gentleman from North Carolina, and not altogether worthy of his heart nor of his appearance of sincerity. The State of Mississippi is a State in the Federal Union, with certain rights growing out of the same instrument from which the Federal Government itself derives its rights.

Mr. LINNEY. I admit that.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Except that one is derived by reservation and the other is derived by expression, and when our forefathers, wiser, perhaps, than you and I, left the question of the qualification of the voters to the States it was left without any limitation in any way under the sun, except by the fifteenth amendment, which said that they shall make “no discrimination on account of race, color, or previous condition of servitude.” Mississippi has made none, though her enemies have tried the best they could in the Supreme Court of the United States and elsewhere to show that she has. But I was trying to show you that that very same possibility of preserving civilization from negro domination and yet not violating the Constitution of the United States, which has been wrought out and does happily exist in Mississippi, could not be wrought out and could not exist amongst this race known as the Kanakas in the Hawaiian Islands.

Now, Mr. Speaker, if Hawaii were admitted as a State into this Union—and the gentleman and his colleagues know that they have no idea of admitting her as a State—she would have the right, under the Constitution, to limit the number of her suffragists in any way that she chose, provided only that it did not violate the limitation of the Constitution as to “race, color, or previous condition of servitude.” But that is not the question here; and the object of the gentleman from North Carolina, despite his disclaimer of any personal or sectional intent, was the old familiar object that is known to men who are sophists, and that was to prejudice the minds of the audience against the side of the question being advocated by the speaker by attempting to invoke their prejudices against the locality or personality of the speaker; that is all.

Mr. LINNEY. You do me an injustice in that.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Now, Mr. Speaker, there are overlying all great questions some great general principles, and I want to read to you a little utterance which in my opinion expresses very well indeed the general principle controlling the determination of questions of territorial acquisition, and within the boundaries of the expression of which may be found a proper solution of the Hawaiian question itself. The words come from that matchless and magnificent tribune of the people, that brave soldier, I hope, soon to be, in the esteem of all of his fellow-citizens, William J. Bryan [applause on the Democratic side and laughter on the Republican side], in a speech made the other day in Nebraska. Here it is. I want you Republicans who are so in the habit of laughing whenever there is any attempt to go back to the real principles of popular government and liberty and the rights of the masses against the classes, or at any mention of the name of a friend of the people, and who think you can, in the arrogance of temporary success, safely afford to laugh, to listen to this. It may do you good hereafter if it does not do you any good now, when you are run mad with the war craze and the urging of war emergencies. Here it is:

The manifest destiny of this nation is not to acquire new realms to govern, but to carry out the fundamental principles of democracy, to the end that equality among the citizens may be secured. Mr. Bryan said:

“War is harsh; it is attended by hardship and suffering; it means a vast expenditure of men and money. We may well pray for the coming of the time, promised in Holy Writ, when the spears shall be beaten into pruning hooks and the swords into plowshares; but universal peace can not come until justice is enthroned throughout the world. Jehovah deals with nations as He deals with men, and for both decrees that the wages of sin is death.”

And, by the way, the greatest sin I know whose wages has been death in all history has been the sin of overgreed and overexpansion. Macedonia and Greece were comparatively happy and free until they undertook to enslave other people—until they undertook to extend Greece all over the East. Rome was comparatively free and her citizens were comparatively happy until they

undertaking to dominate the entire world she brought to the homes and household of Rome the corruption and degeneracy of the Orient and into her senate the bribery of rich peoples from all over the world who wanted to be "annexed" in "friendly alliance." Carthage was a respectable power until by the Sicilian and Spanish colonizations she had overspanned herself and excited envy, hatred, and war. Rome pursued the same course until the barbarians, pressed and pushed behind the wall, where they continued to multiply, came down for safety and from greed both for position and for food itself, and overwhelmed with hatred and contempt the proud oppressors of all mankind.

Yes; it is true with nations as with men that "the wages of sin is death," and that the greatest of all sins is blind greed and selfishness and covetousness. "Whom the gods would destroy they first make mad." But to continue reading from Mr. Bryan:

Until the right has triumphed in every land and love reigns in every heart, governments must, as a last resort, appeal to force. As long as the oppressor is deaf to the voice of reason, so long must the citizen accustom his shoulder to the musket and his hand to the saber.

FORCED TO TAKE UP ARMS.

Our nation exhausted diplomacy in its efforts to secure a peaceable solution of the Cuban question and only took up arms when it was compelled to choose between war and servile acquiescence in cruelties which would have been a disgrace to barbarism.

History will vindicate the position taken by the United States in the war with Spain. In saying this I assume that the principles which were invoked in the inauguration of the war will be observed in its prosecution and conclusion. If a contest undertaken for the sake of humanity degenerates into a war of conquest, we shall find it difficult to meet the charge of having added hypocrisy to greed. Is our national character so weak that we can not withstand the temptation to appropriate the first piece of land that comes within our reach?

To inflict upon the enemy all possible harm is legitimate warfare; but shall we contemplate a scheme for the colonization of the Orient merely because our fleet won a remarkable victory in the harbor of Manila?

That reminds me that right now gentlemen are urging the annexation of Hawaii as necessary in order to maintain temporary control of the Philippines. It will not be six months, mark my words, before they are advocating the annexation of the Philippines because they are an "outpost" to protect Hawaii. Thus one is made to serve the purpose of the other.

Mr. BRUCKER. Do I understand the gentleman from Mississippi to read the speech of Mr. Bryan as an argument that Mr. Bryan made against the annexation of Hawaii?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I do not think my friend understood me that way, because in private conversation I have found his judgment so clear that I have never heretofore known him to be guilty of so obvious a mistake. But I did say this was an admirable expression of general principles militating against colonial acquisition, within the boundaries of the consideration of which would come the Hawaiian question.

Mr. BRUCKER. But the gentleman from Mississippi knows that when Mr. Bryan was making this utterance he had in view territorial acquisition in the Orient, and not in the West Indies; and let me say to the gentleman—

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. We are not talking about the West Indies. The gentleman is taking my time.

Mr. BRUCKER. I want to ask the gentleman this question: Had Mr. Bryan desired to make it understood that he was against the annexation of Hawaii, would he not have said so in language that would have been unmistakable?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. The question before the House at the present is not Mr. Bryan's opinion as to whether Hawaii should or should not be annexed.

Mr. BRUCKER. Then why should you read from his letter?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. It is a question of the right of annexing Hawaii; and Mr. Bryan has given utterance to certain general principles on territorial acquisition and colonial establishment and conquest, and I was reading them, and I thought them a fit subject to introduce as establishing general principles as a deduction from which and within the limits of which the right determination of the Hawaiian question is included.

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

Mr. DINSMORE. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi such time as I have remaining, that is, seven minutes.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, this is going to be the first time since I have been on the floor of the House that I have ever declined to yield to interruptions, but the continuity of my argument has been broken. I have not reached, and in the seven minutes remaining will not be able to reach, the point I wanted to discuss. I decline, therefore, to be interrupted hereafter, though I do not want to be discourteous to anybody. I want to put the balance of what Mr. Bryan said in the RECORD, but I will read this much of it:

Our guns destroyed a Spanish fleet, but can they destroy that self-evident truth that governments derive their just powers, not from superior force, but from the consent of the governed?

[Applause.]

That is where he drops the Hawaiian questions within the general principle most beautifully.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I am aware that gentlemen in favor of the annexation of Hawaii say it is not a first step in any scheme of colonization or the acquisition of a colonial empire. Some of them say that. But the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WM. ALDEN SMITH] this evening, honest, brave, bold, stood out and gave them the denial. He boomed Santo Domingo as a thing we ought by all means to have. He concluded that everything in the Caribbean Sea and everything in the Gulf of Mexico ought to belong to us. He bewailed the fact that the Bermudas threatened our Atlantic coast, and he was in favor of taking about everything I heard him mention during his remarks. I believe he is one of the very fairest weather vanes. I do not mean that in any sense derogatory, and I did not mean to use the word at all, but his standing on any question is one of the very best indications of the average sentiment of the men upon that side of this Chamber that I know of. From the fullness of the heart, without any express intention, the mouth spoke. [Laughter.]

Now, Mr. Speaker, when I made a speech some time ago in opposition to a Hawaiian annexation, I said that when we got as far as annexing Hawaii we should want to go from island to island until there was no end to the places that would be annexed; each place would be an outpost to the next one. Now gentlemen are crying for the Philippines. Why? Simply because Admiral Dewey happened to demolish a Spanish fleet there—happened to land some marines at Cavite. I suppose if he had happened to fight off the coast of Spain itself, and had won a victory in the Bay of Biscay, these gentlemen would have been contending for Spanish annexation, and would have contended most earnestly today for the annexation of the Canaries, as a bridge between the two on the way over, so that we might call there more conveniently. [Laughter.]

Now, Mr. Speaker, in this connection every single effort made by the gentlemen on the other side to show that there is a commercial or military necessity for the possession of the Hawaiian Islands has failed. Admiral Walker was before the Foreign Affairs Committee of the House and testified that very few of the ships that sail to the Orient from San Francisco do land at Hawaii at all, and that they do not land there because commerce does not justify it and because it would make a detour and consume more coal. So much for the coaling-station and commercial-necessity argument.

Now, let us see about the military necessity. Gentlemen, in giving their general opinion, like General Schofield, said it was important—aye, necessary—as a matter of strategy to the United States. Now, although I am not a military man, I am a lawyer, and as a lawyer practiced in getting at facts I cross-examined General Schofield. This morning one of the gentlemen on the other side, my friend from Iowa [Mr. DOLLIVER], was laughing at the idea that a man in this House should "set up his opinion as to military necessity against that of the officers of the Army." We have not done that; we have merely taken the liberty of cross-examining them, just as the gentleman from Iowa has cross-examined an expert medical witness on the stand, not because he knew more about medicine than the witness, but because he was better qualified in getting at facts. What I want is not the opinion of these men so much, but the facts upon which they base their opinion.

Now, I am going to publish the cross-examination of General Schofield made by me before the committee, and I do not believe there will be a member of this House who will not agree that General Schofield did say that "the only essential thing"—I am quoting his very language—was "the harbor at Pearl Harbor." Then Admiral Walker came, and he was asked a question as to the possibilities of fortifying this position, and he said it would cost \$500,000, and with that amount of money all the navies in the world could not take it if we did not own anything else in the Hawaiian Islands. [Applause.]

The following is the cross-examination of General Schofield referred to, quoted from the committee's publication of the hearings had before the House Committee on Foreign Affairs on May 10, 1898, beginning on page 4:

Mr. WILLIAMS. What is the capacity for defense of the harbor already granted to the United States? How far does it extend, how is it situated, and how could it be defended?

General SCHOFIELD. As it exists to-day it has no capacity for defense at all, but its natural adaptability is very great, and it is naturally as perfect as any harbor I know of in the world. It consists of a narrow channel several miles long leading from the ocean into a deep bay, where there is ample anchorage for all naval fleets of the world.

Mr. WILLIAMS. What is our present grant there?

General SCHOFIELD. Just the right to hold and use, and improve and fortify that harbor, as I understand.

Mr. WILLIAMS. In peace or war?

General SCHOFIELD. I believe there is some question about the perpetuity of it, but that is a question—

Mr. WILLIAMS. Leaving the question of perpetuity aside, as long as the grant exists it is a grant extending to time of war as well to time of peace?

General SCHOFIELD. Undoubtedly, and yet the condition of the grant is

that it shall be improved in time of peace. When a time of war comes on, you could not improve it.

Mr. WILLIAMS. We have the right to hold and fortify and use it in time of war as we choose?

General SCHOFIELD. That is the original grant.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Is there any difficulty, say, in a fleet sailing from San Francisco to relieve the Philippine Islands going in that harbor—

General SCHOFIELD. You can not get in there; you have to cut open a channel before you can get into a safe harbor. The harbor at Honolulu is absolutely worthless as a war harbor.

Mr. WILLIAMS. The reason you can not get in there is on account of the physical trouble in the channel, not a political or sovereignty trouble?

General SCHOFIELD. No.

Mr. WILLIAMS. You speak of the easy defense of the harbor in your main statement. Does that easy defense of the harbor apply with equal force to the defense of all these islands?

General SCHOFIELD. They need no defense. There is no other harbor in all the islands except this one valuable for a naval harbor.

Mr. WILLIAMS. If there is no other harbor in these islands of any value to any naval force, there is no other harbor where they can make a depot against us in time of war; so if we hold the harbor without holding the islands they would have no place that they could use as a basis of supplies and attack us?

The CHAIRMAN. I would like to ask the General if he has finished his general statement?

General SCHOFIELD. Yes, sir; I had gone as far as I intended at that point.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I took it for granted that he had. A single question, and I am through. As you say, if we can hold it and fortify it the foreign powers could not take it, and that applies to the harbor, as I understand.

General SCHOFIELD. Yes.

Mr. WILLIAMS. It does not apply to all the Hawaiian Islands because, as I understand you, we could not fortify them because they have no harbors and nobody else could use them as a basis of supplies against us. Now, one other thing. You say that if we do not perfect our title in due time others will take those islands. What do you mean by "due time?"

General SCHOFIELD. I think that is a matter that is beyond my political acumen. I should think probably a week, myself.

Mr. WILLIAMS. When we first took that harbor, I understood you to say that you were one of the gentlemen who made the negotiations?

General SCHOFIELD. I did not negotiate, but I made an official report—a purely official report.

Mr. WILLIAMS. You thought it was wise to get the harbor because that was about the only thing valuable to us?

General SCHOFIELD. The only thing essential to us.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Are you still of the opinion that the harbor is the only thing essential to us?

General SCHOFIELD. From a military standpoint; the others I did not discuss.

Mr. WILLIAMS. A military or a naval standpoint is the only standpoint on which we want these islands at all, as far as your evidence goes?

General SCHOFIELD. No; I did not wish to discuss that matter.

Mr. WILLIAMS. What I mean to say is, the only standpoint from which you would justify it is that?

General SCHOFIELD. Yes.

Testimony of Admiral Walker (ibid., page 14):

We found we could come down without the slightest trouble as deep as we wanted to go; but this is fine sand, which can be sucked off with a suction dredge with the greatest ease. That entrance through the reef was in its narrowest part about 500 feet, as I recollect. When that should be opened, which could be done at small expense, it would leave an entrance varying, say, from 800 or 1,000 feet to 500, every inch of which would be covered by the guns placed in the fortifications on the beach, and it would not be a straight channel, it would be a curved channel; and by means of mines and a few guns on the beach all the navies in the world could be stopped from entering in there.

Mr. DINSMORE. What distance would these batteries be from Honolulu?

Admiral WALKER. They would be about 7 or 8 miles from Honolulu.

Mr. DINSMORE. And at what distance from the entrance to the harbor would the batteries be?

Admiral WALKER. The batteries would be right at the entrance; they would be on either side of the entrance.

Mr. DINSMORE. I understand now; the entrance to this lagoon.

Admiral WALKER. Yes, sir; it is called Pearl Harbor and it is called Pearl River and it is called Pearl Lagoon. It is practically a lagoon open to thesea.

Mr. NEWLANDS. How large is that lagoon inside the coral reef?

Admiral WALKER. It is very large, and cut up by points and islands so it is very smooth water, always as smooth as the water of the Potomac here, and it is entirely secure as an anchorage. There is plenty of depth of water.

Mr. WILLIAMS. How deep is it?

Admiral WALKER. You could always get 6, 7, or 8 fathoms of water; all the water a ship wants.

* * * * *

Mr. COUSINS. How much would it cost to make the Sandwich Islands impregnable to a fleet such as composes a first-class power now?

Admiral WALKER. It is not at all probable that any power would send a very heavy fleet out there, as it is a long way from Europe.

Mr. COUSINS. It is presumed that would be their business, to send one there. How much would it cost to fortify this harbor?

Admiral WALKER. That is a question I could not answer. It would not be very heavy of making fortifications for Pearl Harbor so it could not be taken at all, and the only other secure landing place would be at Honolulu, which is from 7 to 10 miles away, and it is perfectly easy to fortify that sufficiently to prevent anybody from landing there.

Mr. BERRY. It would cost less than to build a battle ship now?

Admiral WALKER. Yes.

Mr. PEARSON. I suppose half a million to deepen it and half a million more to build fortifications.

Admiral WALKER. I can not speak as an engineer as to the fortifications. I should think a half million would put up all the fortifications we would want there.

Advocates of annexation strive strenuously to produce the impression that the issue to be met is the alternative either to annex the islands or to leave them a prey to any nation—leave them as Henry VIII left Woolsey, "naked to their enemies."

Not at all. We have a policy. It is that of more than a half century, announced by our Presidents and our Secretaries of State; announced awkwardly, it is true, but sufficiently by the last Republican national convention, which dared not declare for annexation, though Republican Representatives in the Fifty-third and Fifty-fourth Congresses prated much about it.

That all may understand, I here insert the report of the minority members of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, giving their "reasons for the faith that is in them," and terminating with the resolutions which they offer as a substitute for the majority resolutions of annexation. The Hawaiian plank of the last national Republican platform, above referred to, is as follows: "The Hawaiian Islands should be controlled by the United States, and no foreign power should be permitted to interfere with them."

REPORT AND RESOLUTIONS OF MINORITY.

We, the undersigned members of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, report adversely to the passage of the joint resolution, for the following reasons: First. The people of Hawaii have not been consulted about the proposed annexation.

Second. The people of the United States have not been consulted about the proposed annexation. In fact, we believe and charge that the only hope for Hawaiian annexation, and therefore the desire of the annexationists, is to consummate their scheme under the cry of "war emergency" before the American people can be consulted. In the case of Texas the question of annexation had been one of the issues before the people and had been decided by the nomination and election of those favorable thereto.

Third. The annexation in the manner proposed is unconstitutional. There are two constitutional methods of increasing the domain of our country. One is under the treaty-making power, as all of our territory, including Louisiana, save Texas, has been acquired. This is not the means resorted to here. It was the means first tried, and confessedly it failed. The other is under that clause of the Federal Constitution which gives the power to "admit new States." The power applies only to States, not to territory avowedly not wanted for purposes of statehood, not to colonies, not to military or naval stations. It is true that the Supreme Court, in an obiter dictum, has construed the language "new States," beyond its manifest intent, to mean territory avowedly proposed to be erected into a State or States. Even granting, for the sake of argument, that this obiter dictum is court-made constitutional, it does not apply to the case of Hawaii, because the advocates of its annexation not only do not avow any purpose to erect it into a State, but base their argument upon a contrary intent, and thereby obtain the votes of many who would otherwise be against the scheme. (19 How. U. S., 448, 447.)

Fourth. The islands are too remote, being 2,100 miles from the nearest point of our coast, and furnish too much additional coast line to be defended, the patrol line around them being over 800 miles.

Fifth. The population is not racially, nor religiously, nor otherwise homogeneous with our own.

Sixth. Political dominion over the islands is not commercially necessary.

Seventh. The islands are not from a naval or military standpoint necessary to our defense, as was admitted by General Schofield before the committee when he said there was but one harbor on the island which could be fitted up as a point d'appui against us. That harbor we already have. Nor are they in any manner necessary, unless we wish as a people to take a new departure from our historical course and become a "colonial power," and, therefore, one of the troublesome and entangling "concert of great powers." If that course shall ever be wise, we are not ready for it now, and are not even willing or ready to get ready for it. At least fifty years of home strengthening and home growth may well be given our people before launching out into this new departure, inimical to our present, if not to our ultimate, interest, and contrary not only to the teachings of our fathers, but to the lines of policy along which we have been so marvelously successful and peaceful and happy in the past.

Eighth. Even if, for the sake of argument, it be granted, first, that Hawaii would be a source of material danger to us if in the hands of a foreign power; and, second, that there exists a single nation willing in the face of our repeated diplomatic declarations of our position with regard to the islands to incur the dangers of war with us in order to seize or hold them—and we refer to history, including diplomatic correspondence with Great Britain and Japan, and also to our geographical situation with regard to other and nearer islands under the sovereignty of foreign powers for a disproof of both assertions—then this danger may be met when the first overt act or open declaration shows its actual existence, or may be prevented and forestalled now by the passage of the following resolutions, which we offer as a substitute to those reported by the majority, to wit:

"Joint resolution to announce the policy of the United States relative to the Hawaiian Islands.

"Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, 1. That the United States will view as an act of hostility any attempt upon the part of any government of Europe or Asia to take or hold possession of the Hawaiian Islands or to exercise upon any pretext or under any conditions sovereign authority therein.

"2. That the United States hereby announces to the people of those islands and to the world their guaranty of the independence of the people of the Hawaiian Islands and their firm determination to maintain the same."

HUGH A. DINSMORE,
CHAMP CLARK,
JOHN S. WILLIAMS,
WM. M. HOWARD.

Mr. HITT. Now, Mr. Speaker, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HEPBURN].

Mr. HEPBURN. Mr. Speaker, complaint has been made by gentlemen as to the inadequacy of time devoted to this discussion. It will be remembered that four days have been given to the discussion now. Five years ago this same subject occupied the attention of the country for many weeks. During the period from that time to this on various occasions our relations with the Sandwich Islands, their importance to us, have been a matter of discussion here and elsewhere. I think I am justified in saying that no subject of general importance is more thoroughly understood by the American people than is the one involved in the resolution now pending before this House.

I have been surprised during this debate, now and heretofore, at the character of the objections made by gentlemen who oppose the resolution. In every instance, Mr. Speaker, their arguments have been based not upon conditions existing, not upon realities as they are, but on a possible fulfillment of a prophecy that they indulge in. They tell us that we are now starting upon a new

departure, that the counsel of the fathers to maintain close relations only with those nations that are near to us on this continent and to avoid all entangling alliances, to confine ourselves, our efforts and our hopes, to home interests, is about to be abandoned, and we are starting out now upon a new rôle of colonial acquisition. They do not tell us that they object to the acquisition of these islands except as this is the entering wedge to a policy which they assure us must be disastrous in the extreme. For one I commit myself to no policy of that kind in giving an affirmative vote upon this resolution. I can distinguish between a colonial policy and a commercial policy. I can distinguish between the policy that would scatter colonies all over the islands of the sea and the lands of the earth and that policy which would secure to us simply those facilities of commerce that the new commercial methods make absolutely essential. There is a broad distinction between colonial possession and the possession of frequent friendly ports. The last I want; and I commit myself to nothing more than that by the vote I now give.

But, Mr. Speaker, is it not true that the Sandwich Islands in their relations to us stand alone as a type? It seems to me their acquisition does not present the same considerations as would the acquisition of the Philippine Islands. We not only want to possess all commercial advantages and all warlike advantages that are incident to the ownership of the Hawaiian Islands, but we want to prevent every other nation from having the same rights in those islands. [Applause.] If we could take Pearl Harbor and by that means exclude all other nations from those islands or from proximity to our western coast, I would be content. But we can not do that. We must take all, in order to have all of the advantages of possession by us and exclusion of others.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi rose.

Mr. HEPBURN. I prefer not to be interrupted; I have only seventeen minutes.

Mr. Speaker, gentlemen tell us—and they seem to derive gratification from the illustrations that they make—that if we pursue this course, of acquisition of these little islands, the fate of Greece, the fate of Rome, the fate of all the old empires or republics will surely be ours. I am not sure, Mr. Speaker, that the fall of those empires was not a blessing to mankind. I am not sure that their self-aggrandizement, carrying their civilization, as they did, to all parts of the world, was not a blessing to mankind, although it might have resulted (yet no man can say it with certainty) in their own overthrow.

Where did Alfred get the knowledge of law and jurisprudence that enabled him to found the British Empire save from Rome; and how could he have had that knowledge had it not been for this lust of power that gentlemen now so much condemn? Where did Charlemagne learn that which enabled him to lay broad and deep the foundation of the French Empire? Was it not this same "greed" which carried the eagles of Rome and the civilization of Rome into those far-distant provinces?

Who dares to say that, even if we should enter upon this new policy, the fate which befell the Roman Empire would be ours? Look at England. What would she be to-day if confined to her insular domain? What could she be? The mistress of the seas? Ah, no! One of the leading nations of the earth? Ah, no! Giving her laws, her literature, and her civilization to all the world? Ah, no! She would have been powerless for this great end. Had there not been a Frederick the Great, who can say that the little Duchy of Brandenburg would have extended itself into the great German Empire of to-day? This same "greed," this thirst for annexation, this desire for new territory, this passion for extending civilization, has blessed the earth.

And while I listen to gentlemen here who are full of forebodings—while I have great respect for their learning—yet I have more respect for the statesmanship of England, of Germany, of Russia, of France, nations that are to-day pursuing successfully and to our detriment this same colonial system that gentlemen here tell us is to be ruinous to us if we follow their example. The statesmanship of the earth to-day is in favor of this system of colonization, of territorial expansion, of breadth and greatness and grandeur, of extension of empire. All the statesmanship of the world, save that of the Democratic party here in the United States, says "aye" to the proposition; they alone are halting in the procession. [Laughter.]

But, Mr. Speaker, how strange is this attitude of the Democratic party! Gentlemen, what inspires you now to this new departure? I say it is a new departure. Heretofore you have been the annexationists. Every argument that you have made here to-day or during this debate was refuted by the friends of Mr. Jefferson in 1803; again in 1819; again in 1845; again in 1848—refuted over and over again. Let me read a sentence or two of Democratic doctrine to remind you gentlemen how far you are departing from the faith of the fathers—your fathers, not mine, thank God! [Laughter.] Mr. Speaker, I read from a document that forty-odd years ago occupied more of public attention, that commanded more of the respect of the Democratic party, than

any other single document that you can find, unless it is the Declaration of Independence:

It must be clear to every reflecting mind that from the peculiarity of its geographical position and the considerations attendant on it Cuba is as necessary to the North American Republic as any of its present members, and that it belongs naturally to that great family of States of which the Union is the providential nursery. Its immediate acquisition by our Government is of paramount importance, and we can not doubt but that it is a consummation devoutly to be wished for by the inhabitants. Our past history forbids that we should acquire the Island of Cuba without the consent of Spain, unless justified by the great law of self-defense. After we shall have offered Spain a price for Cuba far beyond its present value, and this shall have been refused, it will then be time to consider the question, Does Cuba in the possession of Spain seriously endanger our internal peace and the existence of our cherished Union? Should this question be answered in the affirmative, then by every law, human and divine, we shall be justified in wresting it from Spain if we possess the power.

Gentlemen, do you remember who penned those words? They were not the utterances of obscure individuals. Let me read the names: James Buchanan, J. Y. Mason, Pierre Soulé. They were addressed to Hon. William L. Marcy, Secretary of State. The three gentlemen first named were at the time—the first, the minister to England; the second, to France; the third, to Spain. They were instructed by the Secretary of State, by order of the President, to formulate the statement of the United States with reference to the acquisition of Cuba. They met at Ostend. This is from the Ostend manifesto, one of the sacred canons of your party, one of the documents that all Democrats revere. This is not ancient history. That paper is dated October, 1854, and responsive to that paper your Democratic convention—or both of them, for in the multitude of blessings that year, 1860, you had two conventions—both in their platforms made expressions upon the subject. One of them says:

Resolved, That the Democratic party are in favor of the acquisition of the Island of Cuba on such terms as shall be honorable to ourselves and just to Spain.

The other one says:

That the Democratic party are in favor of the acquisition of the Island of Cuba on such terms as shall be honorable, etc.

That was your doctrine, gentlemen, only a little while ago. What now has become of your then passion for territorial aggrandizement? What has given birth to these new fears of yours? There was no fear in 1854 or in 1860 that through the acquisition of Cuba we should have implanted in the system of the body politic that thirst and hunger, that greed for territory which would lead us on to that kind of expansion that resulted in the destruction of Rome. No man seemed to care a "continental" then about Rome [laughter on the Republican side]; no Democrat in the land was howling then about the example and fate of Greece; no man was fearful that we should extend our territory over Africa and Asia and the islands of the sea. Are you gentlemen wiser? Ah, no. Those gentlemen—all Democrats—who assembled in this Hall last night after the adjournment of the House paid a tribute to the old doctrines of the Democratic party. They passed a resolution that declared "that the annexation of Hawaii is dangerous and unwise."

Mr. Speaker, the morning print informs us that when that resolution was introduced it read: "That the acquisition of Hawaii is dangerous, unwise, and un-Democratic."

But they struck out the word "un-Democratic." [Laughter on the Republican side.] Why did you do that except in recognition of the time-honored policy of the party? This time-honored policy was established when James Buchanan, when Pierce, when Soulé, when Hunter, when Douglas, when men of that class were the leaders of the great Democratic party, and before the era of William J. Bryan, of Nebraska, and Mr. BAILEY, of Texas. [Laughter on the Republican side.] The old men thought that what brought about the grandeur of their country, territorial expansion, was Democratic. The new men are unwilling that anything of that kind shall be done by a Republican Administration.

Mr. Speaker, I am not prepared to say how Hawaii would be governed if a part of the United States, but I undertake to say that if the Republican party is in power and has control that it will be well governed. If there is slavery there now, as gentlemen tell us, it will be obliterated. [Applause on the Republican side.] I can promise you that. If there are unjust laws there now, they will be repealed then. I can not tell you whether Hawaii will be a State of the Union, or when. I undertake to say, however, that with the experiences that we have recently had they will be permitted to undergo such period of probation as will assure us that they are fitted for republican institutions. [Applause on the Republican side.] I do not know how long that time will be, but I am reminded that the State of Louisiana was kept in "vassalage," as the gentleman from Arizona would say, for nine years; the State of Arkansas for seventeen years; the State of Montana for eighty-six years before it was given Statehood. We have an abundance of illustrations, if we choose to follow them, that we can take such time as will fit those people for self-government.

Mr. Speaker, there are three methods of acquiring territory—by discovery, by conquest, by purchase. Each is legitimate and recognized by the family of States in the law of nations. We are now engaged in war against Spain. It is our duty to cripple Spain in her navy, in her army, in her revenues, in her possessions. We hope, every patriot hopes, that Cuba, Puerto Rico, the Philippine Islands will be ours by conquest. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Successful war demands that this should be. When you gentlemen say that you will have none of it, are you praying that disaster shall come to our fleets and to our armies—that we may fail in conquering those islands? Surely I know that you do not mean that. Therefore you must be consenting that we may acquire in legitimate and lawful ways—by conquest—these possessions of Spain. What we will do with them afterwards is a question for the statesmanship of this great nation. That we will act wisely I have no doubt. But whatever we do with that territory, I am persuaded that this side of the House, and I believe that side, will insist upon retaining such portions of that territory as will enable us to meet all of the requirements of modern commerce. In the old days, with the old instrumentalities, we did not need the frequent friendly port. Now we do. We must have it or drop out of the procession of nations in their great effort to capture the commerce of the world. [Prolonged applause.]

[Here the hammer fell.]

Mr. HITT. Mr. Speaker, the order of the House, which is equivalent to the previous question, requires no motion, but brings the resolution to a vote, first on the substitute and then on the resolution recommended by the committee, to the final passage.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The hour of 5 o'clock having arrived, under the order of the House made on Friday last the time has now come to take a vote on the resolution. The first question will be upon the adoption of the substitute offered by the minority of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, 1. That the United States will view as an act of hostility any attempt upon the part of any Government of Europe or Asia to take or hold possession of the Hawaiian Islands, or to exercise upon any pretext or under any conditions sovereign authority therein.

2. That the United States hereby announces to the people of those islands and to the world their guarantee of the independence of the people of the Hawaiian Islands and their firm determination to maintain the same.

The question being taken on the substitute,

Mr. DINSMORE and others demanded the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 96, nays 204, answered "present" 2, not voting 53; as follows:

YEAS—96.

- | | | | |
|-------------|-----------------|---------------|-----------------|
| Adamson, | Davis, | Kitchin, | Rixey, |
| Bailey, | De Graffenreid, | Kleberg, | Robb, |
| Baird, | Dinsmore, | Knowles, | Robertson, La. |
| Ball, | Dockery, | Lamb, | Robinson, Ind. |
| Bankhead, | Elliott, | Lanham, | Sayers, |
| Bartlett, | Fitzgerald, | Lester, | Settle, |
| Bell, | Fleming, | Little, | Shafroth, |
| Benton, | Fowler, N. C. | Lloyd, | Shuford, |
| Bland, | Fox, | Love, | Sims, |
| Bodine, | Gaines, | McAleer, | Slayden, |
| Bradley, | Griffith, | McCulloch, | Sparkman, |
| Brantley, | Griggs, | McDowell, | Stallings, |
| Brewer, | Handy, | McMillin, | Stark, |
| Broussard, | Hartman, | McRae, | Stephens, Tex. |
| Brundidge, | Hay, | Maguire, | Stokes, |
| Carmack, | Henry, Miss. | Martin, | Strait, |
| Clardy, | Henry, Tex. | Maxwell, | Stroud, N. C. |
| Clark, Mo. | Hinrichsen, | Meyer, La. | Swanson, |
| Clayton, | Howard, Ala. | Moon, | Tate, |
| Connolly, | Howard, Ga. | Ogden, | Underwood, |
| Cooney, | Jett, | Osborne, | Vandiver, |
| Cowherd, | Johnson, Ind. | Pierce, Tenn. | Wheeler, Ky. |
| Crumpacker, | Jones, Va. | Rhea, | Williams, Miss. |
| Davey, | Kelley, | Richardson, | Wilson. |

NAYS—204.

- | | | | |
|---------------|-----------------|----------------|---------------|
| Acheson, | Brewster, | Crump, | Foss, |
| Adams, | Broderick, | Cummings, | Fowler, N. J. |
| Aldrich, | Bromwell, | Curtis, Iowa | Gibson, |
| Alexander, | Brown, | Curtis, Kans. | Gillet, N. Y. |
| Babcock, | Brownlow, | Dalzell, | Graff, |
| Baker, Ill. | Brucker, | Danford, | Greene, Mass. |
| Baker, Md. | Brumm, | Davenport, | Griffin, |
| Barham, | Bull, | Davidson, Wis. | Grosvenor |
| Barney, | Burleigh, | Dayton, Ky. | Grout, |
| Barrows, | Butler, | Dayton, | Grow, |
| Bartholdt, | Cannon, | De Vries, | Hager, |
| Belden, | Capron, | Dingley, | Hamilton, |
| Belford, | Chickering, | Dolliver, | Hawley, |
| Belknap, | Clark, Iowa | Dovener, | Heatwole, |
| Bennett, | Clarke, N. H. | Driggs, | Hemenway, |
| Berry, | Cochran, Mo. | Ellis, | Henderson, |
| Bingham, | Cochrane, N. Y. | Ermentrout, | Henry, Conn. |
| Bishop, | Codding, | Faris, | Henry, Ind. |
| Booze, | Connell, | Fenton, | Hepburn, |
| Botkin, | Cooper, Wis. | Fischer, | Hicks, |
| Boutell, Ill. | Corliss, | Fletcher, | Hillborn, |
| Boutelle, Me. | Cousins, | Foote, | Hill, |

- | | | | |
|------------------|---------------|------------------|----------------|
| Hitt, | McCall, | Pearson, | Stevens, Minn. |
| Hooker, | McCleary, | Perkins, | Stewart, N. J. |
| Hopkins, | McCormick, | Peters, | Stewart, Wis. |
| Howe, | McDonald, | Pitney, | Stone, C. W. |
| Howell, | McEwan, | Powers, | Strode, Nebr. |
| Hull, | McIntire, | Prince, | Sulloway, |
| Hurley, | Mahon, | Pugh, | Sulzer, |
| Jenkins, | Mann, | Ray, | Tawney, |
| Johnson, N. Dak. | Marsh, | Reeves, | Taylor, Ala. |
| Jones, Wash. | Marshall, | Ridgely, | Thorp, |
| Joy, | Meekison, | Robbins, | Todd, |
| Kerr, | Mercer, | Russell, | Tongue, |
| Ketcham, | Mesick, | Sauerhering, | Updegraff, |
| Kirkpatrick, | Miller, | Shannon, | Van Voorhis, |
| Knox, | Mills, | Shattuc, | Vehslage, |
| Kulp, | Minor, | Shelden, | Wadsworth, |
| Lacey, | Mitchell, | Sherman, | Walker, Va. |
| Landis, | Moody, | Simpson, | Wanger, |
| Lawrence, | Morris, | Simpson, | Ward, |
| Lewis, Ga. | Mudd, | Skinner, | Warner, |
| Lewis, Wash. | Newlands, | Smith, Ill. | Weaver, |
| Linney, | Northway, | Smith, S. W. | Weymouth, |
| Littauer, | Norton, S. C. | Smith, Wm. Alden | White, Ill. |
| Livingston, | Olmsted, | Snover, | White, N. C. |
| Loud, | Otjen, | Southard, | Wilber, |
| Loudenslager, | Packer, Pa. | Southwick, | Williams, Pa. |
| Lovering, | Parker, N. J. | Spalding, | Wise, |
| Low, | Payne, | Sperry, | Yost, |
| Lybrand, | Pearce, Mo. | Steele, | Young, |

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—2.

- | | |
|--------------|--------|
| Norton, Ohio | Zenor. |
|--------------|--------|

NOT VOTING—53.

- | | | | |
|---------------|----------------|-------------|---------------|
| Allen, | Colson, | Hunter, | Smith, Ky |
| Arnold, | Cooper, Tex. | King, | Sprague, |
| Barber, | Cox, | Latimer, | Stone, W. A. |
| Barlow, | Cranford, | Lentz, | Sturtevant, |
| Barrett, | De Armond, | Lorimer, | Sutherland, |
| Beach, | Dorr, | McClellan, | Talbert, |
| Benner, Pa. | Eddy, | Maddox, | Taylor, Ohio |
| Brenner, Ohio | Evans, | Mahany, | Terry, |
| Brosius, | Fitzpatrick, | Miers, Ind. | Vincent, |
| Burke, | Gardner, | Odell, | Walker, Mass. |
| Burton, | Gillett, Mass. | Otey, | Wheeler, Ala. |
| Campbell, | Greene, Nebr. | Overstreet, | |
| Castle, | Gunn, | Quigg, | |
| Catchings, | Harmer, | Roysse, | |

So the substitute was rejected.

Mr. RICHARDSON. Mr. Speaker, I have received a telegram from the gentleman from New York, Mr. McCLELLAN, telling me he has missed the railroad connection, and it was impossible for him to get here in time to vote, and requesting me to say that he is paired with the gentleman from Pennsylvania, Mr. WILLIAM A. STONE, and that if present and not paired he would vote "yea" on this motion and vote against the annexation resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman is paired.

Mr. BURKE. Mr. Speaker, I have voted "yea" upon this proposition. I have a general pair with the gentleman from Idaho, Mr. GUNN. I do not know how he would vote upon this proposition. I know how he will vote on the original proposition. I therefore withdraw my vote, and ask to be marked "present."

Mr. KING. I voted "yea." I desire to withdraw my vote and be marked "present." I am paired with the gentleman from Nebraska, Mr. GREENE.

Mr. TAWNEY. Mr. Speaker, my colleague, Mr. EDDY, is at home on important business. If present, he would vote "nay" on this proposition, and would vote in favor of the annexation of Hawaii.

Mr. SLAYDEN. Mr. Speaker, I have a general pair with the gentleman from Pennsylvania, Mr. STURTEVANT. I have transferred the pair to the gentleman from Nebraska, Mr. SUTHERLAND, and I have therefore voted "yea" on this proposition.

Mr. TERRY. Mr. Speaker, I voted "yea" on this resolution, but I am paired with the gentleman from Massachusetts, Mr. GILLETT, and therefore withdraw my vote.

Mr. NORTON of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I am paired with my colleague from Ohio, Mr. BURTON. If he were present, he would vote "nay" upon this proposition, and I should vote "yea."

Mr. GROSVENOR. Mr. Speaker, my colleague, Mr. TAYLER, is absent, and he requested me to say that if he were present he would vote "nay" on this proposition and "yea" upon the passage of the joint resolution.

The following pairs were announced:

Until further notice:

- Mr. ROYSE with Mr. ZENOR.
- Mr. SPRAGUE with Mr. LENTZ.
- Mr. LORIMER with Mr. CAMPBELL.
- Mr. EVANS with Mr. SMITH of Kentucky.
- Mr. EDDY with Mr. TALBERT.
- Mr. CASTLE with Mr. HUNTER.
- Mr. GILLETT of Massachusetts with Mr. TERRY.
- Mr. GREENE of Nebraska with Mr. KING.
- Mr. BURTON with Mr. NORTON of Ohio.
- Mr. BEACH with Mr. BRENNER of Ohio.
- Mr. COLSON with Mr. FITZPATRICK.
- Mr. ODELL with Mr. DE ARMOND.

Mr. HARMER with Mr. ALLEN.
 Mr. BARRETT with Mr. COOPER of Texas.
 Mr. W. A. STONE with Mr. McCLELLAN.
 Mr. ARNOLD with Mr. COX.
 Mr. OVERSTREET with Mr. MIERS of Indiana.
 Mr. QUIGG with Mr. CRANFORD.
 For this day:
 Mr. GARDNER with Mr. LATTIMER.
 Mr. BROSIUS with Mr. OTEY.
 On this question:
 Mr. GUNN with Mr. BURKE.
 Mr. STURTEVANT with Mr. SUTHERLAND.
 Mr. REEVES with Mr. BARLOW, on Hawaiian annexation. Mr. REEVES for annexation and Mr. BARLOW against it.
 Mr. WALKER of Massachusetts with Mr. MADDOX. Mr. WALKER would vote for and Mr. MADDOX against the resolution.
 Mr. TAYLER of Ohio with Mr. CATCHINGS, on Hawaiian annexation. Mr. TAYLER would vote for and Mr. CATCHINGS against it.
 Mr. HENRY of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I desire to announce that my associate, Mr. OVERSTREET, is absent. If present, he would vote "nay" on this proposition, and would vote in favor of annexation.

The result of the vote was then announced as above recorded. [Applause.]

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question now is upon the engrossment and third reading of the joint resolution.

Mr. GROSVENOR. The yeas and nays.
 Mr. DINSMORE. I ask for the yeas and nays.
 The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. HITT. Mr. Speaker, I suggest that the gentleman withdraw the call for the yeas and nays, and take the vote on the passage of the joint resolution.

Mr. GROSVENOR. Very well.
 The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the order for the yeas and nays will be vacated.
 There was no objection.

The question was then taken, and the joint resolution was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading; and being engrossed, it was accordingly read the third time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question now is on the passage of the joint resolution.

Mr. HITT. Upon that I demand the yeas and nays.
 The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 209, nays 91, answered "present" 6, not voting 49; as follows:

YEAS—209.

Acheson,	Davidson, Wis.	Knowles,	Pugh,
Adams,	Dayton, Ky.	Knox,	Ray,
Aldrich,	Dayton,	Kulp,	Ridgely,
Alexander,	De Vries,	Lacey,	Robbins,
Babcock,	Dingley,	Landis,	Russell,
Baker, Ill.	Dolliver,	Lawrence,	Sauerhering,
Baker, Md.	Dovener,	Lewis, Ga.	Shannon,
Barham,	Driggs,	Lewis, Wash.	Shattuc,
Barnes,	Ellis,	Linney,	Shelden,
Barrows,	Ermentrout,	Littauer,	Sherman,
Bartholdt,	Faris,	Livingston,	Showalter,
Belden,	Fenton,	Loud,	Simpson,
Belford,	Fischer,	Loudenslager,	Skinner,
Belknap,	Fletcher,	Lovering,	Smith, Ill.
Bemis, Pa.	Foote,	Low,	Smith, S. W.
Bennett,	Foss,	Lybrand,	Smith, Wm. Alden
Berry,	Fowler, N. J.	McCall,	Snover,
Bingham,	Gibson,	McCleary,	Southard,
Bishop,	Gillet, N. Y.	McCormick,	Southwick,
Booze,	Graff,	McDonald,	Spalding,
Botkin,	Greene, Mass.	McEwan,	Sperry,
Boutell, Ill.	Griffin,	McIntire,	Steele,
Boutelle, Me.	Griffith,	Mahany,	Stevens, Minn.
Brewster,	Grosvenor,	Mahon,	Stewart, N. J.
Broderick,	Grout,	Mann,	Stewart, Wis.
Bronwell,	Grow,	Marsh,	Stone, C. W.
Brown,	Hager,	Marshall,	Strode, Nebr.
Brownlow,	Hamilton,	Meekison,	Sulloway,
Brucker,	Hawley,	Mercer,	Sulzer,
Brumm,	Heatwole,	Mesick,	Tawney,
Bull,	Hemenway,	Miller,	Taylor, Ala.
Burleigh,	Henderson,	Mills,	Thorp.
Butler,	Henry, Conn.	Minor,	Todd,
Cannon,	Henry, Ind.	Mitchell,	Tongue,
Capron,	Hepburn,	Moody,	Updegraff,
Chickering,	Hicks,	Morris,	Van Voorhis,
Clark, Iowa	Hilborn,	Mudd,	Vehslage,
Clarke, N. H.	Hill,	Newlands,	Walker, Va.
Cochran, Mo.	Hitt,	Northway,	Wanger,
Cochrane, N. Y.	Hooker,	Norton, S. C.	Ward,
Codding,	Hopkins,	Olmsted,	Warner,
Connell,	Howe,	Osborne,	Weaver,
Connolly,	Howell,	Otjen,	Weymouth,
Cooper, Wis.	Hull,	Packer, Pa.	White, Ill.
Corliss,	Hurley,	Parker, N. J.	White, N. C.
Cousins,	Jenkins,	Payne,	Wilber,
Crump,	Johnson, N. Dak.	Pearce, Mo.	Williams, Pa.
Cummings,	Jones, Wash.	Pearson,	Wise,
Curtis, Iowa	Joy,	Perkins,	Yost,
Curtis, Kans.	Kelley,	Peters,	Young.
Dalzell,	Kerr,	Pitney,	
Danford,	Ketcham,	Powers,	
Davenport,	Kirkpatrick	Prince,	

NAYS—91.

Adamson,	De Graffenreid,	Lamb,	Robinson, Ind.
Bailey,	Dinsmore,	Lanham,	Sayers,
Baird,	Dockery,	Lester,	Settle,
Ball,	Elliott,	Little,	Shafroth,
Bankhead,	Fitzgerald,	Lloyd,	Shuford,
Bartlett,	Fleming,	Love,	Sims,
Bell,	Fowler, N. C.	McAleer,	Slayden,
Benton,	Fox,	McCulloch,	Sparkman,
Bland,	Gaines,	McDowell,	Stallings,
Bradley,	Griggs,	McMillin,	Stark,
Brantley,	Handy,	McRae,	Stephens, Tex.
Brewer,	Hartman,	Maguire,	Stokes,
Broussard,	Hay,	Martin,	Strait,
Brundidge,	Henry, Miss.	Maxwell,	Strowd, N. C.
Carmack,	Henry, Tex.	Meyer, La.	Swanson,
Clardy,	Hinrichsen,	Moon,	Tate,
Clark, Mo.	Howard, Ala.	Ogden,	Underwood,
Clayton,	Howard, Ga.	Pierce, Tenn.	Vandiver,
Cooney,	Jett,	Rhea,	Wadsworth,
Cowherd,	Johnson, Ind.	Richardson,	Wheeler, Ky.
Crumpacker,	Jones, Va.	Rixey,	Williams, Miss.
Davey,	Kitchin,	Robb,	Wilson.
Davis,	Kleberg,	Robertson, La.	

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—6.

Bodine,	King,	Terry,	Zenor.
Burke,	Norton, Ohio		

NOT VOTING—49.

Allen,	Cooper, Tex.	Hunter,	Smith, Ky.
Arnold,	Cox,	Latimer,	Sprague,
Barber,	Cranford,	Lentz,	Stone, W. A.
Barlow,	De Armond,	Lorimer,	Sturtevant,
Barrett,	Dorr,	McClellan,	Sutherland,
Beach,	Eddy,	Maddox,	Talbert,
Brenner, Ohio	Evans,	Miers, Ind.	Taylor, Ohio
Brosius,	Fitzpatrick,	Odell,	Vincent,
Burton,	Gardner,	Otey,	Walker, Mass.
Campbell,	Gillett, Mass.	Overstreet,	Wheeler, Ala.
Castle,	Greene, Nebr.	Quigg,	
Catchings,	Gunn,	Reeves,	
Colson,	Harmer,	Royse,	

So the joint resolution was passed.

Pending the announcement, the following took place:

Mr. BURKE. Mr. Speaker, I desire to withdraw my vote and be marked "present." I am paired with the gentleman from Idaho, Mr. GUNN.

Mr. DE VRIES. Mr. Speaker, I am requested by my colleague, Mr. CASTLE, to say that he is unavoidably absent, but that if present he would vote "aye."

Mr. TERRY. Mr. Speaker, I desire to withdraw my vote. I voted upon this roll call. I am paired with the gentleman from Massachusetts, Mr. GILLETT. If he were present, he would vote "aye" and I would vote "no."

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, I desire to say that my colleague, Mr. LORIMER, is detained at home by illness. If present, he would vote "aye."

Mr. KING. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Nebraska, Mr. GREENE, is absent. I have a general pair with him. Not knowing how he would vote, I desire to be marked "present." I think he would vote "no," and I would vote "aye."

Mr. RICHARDSON. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from New York, Mr. McCLELLAN, is unavoidably detained. If present, he would vote "no."

Mr. NORTON of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I have a general pair with my colleague, Mr. BURTON, and I wish to vote "present." I think if he were present he would vote "aye," and I think I would also.

Mr. RIDGELY. Mr. Speaker, I wish to say on behalf of my colleague, Mr. VINCENT, that he is temporarily absent. I am satisfied if he were present he would vote "aye."

Mr. GROSVENOR. Mr. Speaker, I desire to say that my colleague, Mr. TAYLER of Ohio, is unavoidably absent. If present, he would vote "aye."

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. DALZELL). Before announcing the result of the vote I desire to say that the Speaker of the House is absent on account of illness. He authorizes me to say that if present he would vote "no."

The result of the vote was then announced as above recorded. On motion of Mr. HITT, a motion to reconsider the vote whereby the joint resolution was passed was laid on the table.

Mr. HITT. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn. Mr. McCLEARY. Mr. Speaker, pending that motion I want to say that I have this day reported a bill from the Banking and Currency Committee, and I ask, as agreed upon in the committee, that the minority have ten days to file their views.

Mr. BAILEY. Is that the agreement of the committee?
 Mr. McCLEARY. It is.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE.

A message from the Senate, by Mr. PLATT, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed bills of the following titles:

in which the concurrence of the House of Representatives was requested:

S. 4764. An act to repeal so much of the act approved July 31, 1876, as forbids publishing in the District of Columbia certain advertisements for contracts;

S. 2059. An act to authorize a retired list for enlisted men and appointed petty officers of the United States Navy;

S. 3795. An act for the relief of Hubert Nyssen;

S. 4340. An act for the relief of Charles T. Rader;

S. 3701. An act authorizing the President of the United States to nominate Lieut. Commander R. M. G. Brown, now on the retired list, to be a commander on the retired list;

S. 4036. An act to amend an act entitled "An act granting to the Des Moines Rapids Power Company the right to erect, construct, operate, and maintain a wing dam, canal, and power station in the Mississippi River, in Hancock County, Ill.;" and

S. 2821. An act to provide a home for aged and infirm colored people.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed with amendment the bill (H. R. 6098) to correct the military record of N. Ward Cady, late major, Second Mounted Rifles, New York Volunteers, and to grant him an honorable discharge; in which the concurrence of the House of Representatives was requested.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed without amendment bills of the following titles:

H. R. 10423. An act to amend an act entitled "An act to promote the administration of justice in the Army," approved October 1, 1890, and for other purposes;

H. R. 6679. An act to repeal an act entitled "An act to perfect the military record of James T. Hughes;" and

H. R. 1307. An act to correct the naval record of G. K. Knowlton, late of the United States Navy.

SENATE BILLS REFERRED.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, Senate bills of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and referred to their appropriate committees as indicated below:

S. 4764. An act to repeal so much of the act approved July 31, 1876, as forbids publishing in the District of Columbia certain advertisements for contracts—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

S. 2059. An act to authorize a retired list for enlisted men and appointed petty officers of the United States Navy—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

S. 3795. An act for the relief of Hubert Nyssen—to the Committee on Claims.

S. 4340. An act for the relief of Charles T. Rader—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

S. 3701. An act authorizing the President of the United States to nominate Lieut. Commander R. M. G. Brown, now on the retired list, to be a commander on the retired list—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

S. 4036. An act to amend an act entitled "An act granting to the Des Moines Rapids Power Company the right to erect, construct, operate, and maintain a wing dam, canal, and power station in the Mississippi River, in Hancock County, Ill.—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

S. 2821. An act to provide a home for aged and infirm colored people—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE.

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows:
To Mr. VINCENT, for five days, on account of important business.
To Mr. STEVENS of Minnesota, for five days, on account of important business.

To Mr. SHUFORD, for two weeks, on account of sickness in his family.

To Mr. FOWLER of North Carolina, indefinitely, on account of important business.

To Mr. TALBERT, indefinitely, on account of sickness in his family.

The motion of Mr. HITT was then agreed to; and accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 46 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until to-morrow at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATION.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, a letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a communication from the Supervising Surgeon-General of the Marine-Hospital Service submitting estimates of appropriations for additional clerical services, was taken from the Speaker's table, referred to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

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. OSBORNE, from the Committee on Claims, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 3140) to reimburse the State of Wyoming for money expended by the Territory of Wyoming in protecting and preserving the Yellowstone National Park during the years 1884, 1885, and 1886, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1571); which said bill and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. CANNON, from the Committee on Appropriations, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 10691) making appropriations to supply deficiencies in the appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1898, and for prior years, and for other purposes, reported the same, accompanied by a report (No. 1574); which said bill and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. McCLEARY, from the Committee on Banking and Currency, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 10289) to provide for strengthening the public credit, for the relief of the United States Treasury, and for the amendment of the laws relating to national banking associations, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1575); which said bill and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. SHAFROTH, from the Committee on the Public Lands, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 4439) to relieve owners of mining claims who enlist in the military service of the United States for duty in the war with Spain from performing assessment work during such term of service, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1576); which said bill and report were referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. HENDERSON, from the Committee on the Judiciary, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 421) providing for an additional circuit judge in the sixth judicial circuit, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1577); which said bill and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. GRIFFIN, from the Committee on Military Affairs, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 8272) providing for the extension of the Loudon Park National Cemetery, near Baltimore, Md., reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1578); which said bill and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. BABCOCK, from the Committee on the District of Columbia, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 10667) to change name of Capital Railway Company, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1582); which said bill and report were referred to the House Calendar.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

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

Mr. McEWAN, from the Committee on Claims, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 9191) for the relief of Philip Hague, as administrator of the estate of Joseph Hague, late of New York City, N. Y., reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1569); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. RIXEY, from the Committee on Claims, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 3261) for the relief of P. F. Dundon, of San Francisco, Cal., reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1570); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. CLARDY, from the Committee on Claims, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 6545) for the relief of Smith R. Mershon, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1572); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. SULZER, from the Committee on Military Affairs, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 6971) to remove the charge of desertion standing against the name of Eugene Ellard, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1573); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. FENTON, from the Committee on Military Affairs, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 6127) for the relief of Henry C. Rawson, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1579); 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 Senate (S. 2035) for the remuster of Francisco V. De Coster as captain of Companies A and D, Mississippi Marine Bri-

gade Cavalry Volunteers, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1580); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

ADVERSE REPORTS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII, Mr. DAYTON, from the Committee on Naval Affairs, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 6188) to amend the naval record of Lieut. Commander William L. Stone, reported the same adversely, accompanied by a report (No. 1581); which said bill and report were laid on the table.

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. CANNON (from the Committee on Appropriations): A bill (H. R. 10691) making appropriations to supply deficiencies in the appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1898, and for prior years, and for other purposes—to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

By Mr. DINGLEY: A bill (H. R. 10692) supplemental to acts relating to internal revenue—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HULL: A bill (H. R. 10693) directing the enlistment of cooks in the Regular and Volunteer Armies of the United States—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. GROSVENOR (by request): A bill (H. R. 10694) to provide for increasing the military establishment of the United States in time of war—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. BULL: A resolution (House Res. No. 322) to retain on the rolls as employees until the beginning of the third session of the Fifty-fifth Congress the two folders in the Clerk's document room—to the Committee on Accounts.

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. ACHESON: A bill (H. R. 10695) to correct the military record of Francis D. Morrison—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. BREWSTER: A bill (H. R. 10696) granting an increase of pension to James W. Ingram—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CRUMP: A bill (H. R. 10697) granting a pension to Erasmus L. Wenz—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CURTIS of Kansas: A bill (H. R. 10698) for the relief of Francis Mooney—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10699) for the relief of Samuel Liverpool—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10700) granting an increase of pension to Charles P. Judd, of Topeka, Kans.—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. DAVISON of Kentucky: A bill (H. R. 10701) for the relief of James Madison Martin—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. DOVENER: A bill (H. R. 10702) for the relief of Alexander Lucas, of Viola, Marshall County, W. Va.—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. FOWLER of North Carolina: A bill (H. R. 10703) granting a pension to Elizabeth Comer—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. GAINES: A bill (H. R. 10704) for the relief of George P. Morton, late private Company H, First United States Cavalry Regiment—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. GROSVENOR: A bill (H. R. 10705) granting an increase of pension to William M. Walker—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MANN: A bill (H. R. 10706) granting a pension to Johann G. Fleckles—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. PEARSON: A bill (H. R. 10707) for the relief of James Ledford, late private in Company H, Eleventh Regiment Tennessee Cavalry Volunteers—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. WARD: A bill (H. R. 10708) for the payment of the heirs of the late William A. Wheeler, of Yonkers, N. Y.—to the Committee on Claims.

PETITIONS, ETC.

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

By Mr. BELDEN: Petition of Thomas B. Fellows, of Syracuse, N. Y., to refer his claim to the Court of Claims—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. BOUTELLE of Maine: Petition of J. H. Norcross and 19 other citizens of the State of Maine, protesting against the passage of the so-called anti-scalping bill or any similar measure—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. CANNON: Petition of John A. Witcher, of South McAlester, Ind. T., for a pension—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CLARK of Missouri: Petition of judges of the county court of Crawford County, Mo., to refer case to Court of Claims—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. DOVENER: Papers to accompany House bill for the relief of Alexander Lucas—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HILBORN: Resolution of the Board of Trade of Oakland, Cal., in favor of the annexation of the Hawaiian Islands—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, resolution of Stockton Grange, No. 70, Patrons of Husbandry, San Joaquin County, Cal., urging the completion of the Nicaragua Canal by the Government—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. HOWE: Petition of the Wholesale Liquor Dealers' Association of New York City, asking that the Evans-Bromwell bill be amended by striking out sections 4 to 9, inclusive, and the bill be expeditiously passed—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MANN: Paper of Henry A. Fleckles, to accompany House bill granting a pension to Johann G. Fleckles—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

SENATE.

THURSDAY, June 16, 1898.

Prayer by Rev. W. R. STRICKLEN, D. D., of the city of Washington.

The Secretary proceeded to read the Journal of yesterday's proceedings, when, on motion of Mr. BURROWS, 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 a joint resolution (H. Res. 259) to provide for annexing the Hawaiian Islands to the United States; in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

SEIZURES OF TIMBER BY SPECIAL AGENT.

The VICE-PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, in response to a resolution of the 10th instant, a report from the Commissioner of the General Land Office relative to the instructions given to Charles E. M. Schlierholz, special agent, General Land Office, at Batesville, Ark., as to seizing timber, etc., together with a copy of Instructions to Special Agents of the General Land Office Relative to Timber on Public Lands, and a copy of Compilation of Public Timber Laws; which, on motion of Mr. JONES of Arkansas, was, with the accompanying paper, ordered to lie on the table, and to be printed.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES.

Mr. MILLS, from the Committee on Commerce, to whom was referred the bill (S. 4741) to authorize the construction of a bridge over Tombigbee River, in the State of Mississippi, reported it with amendments.

He also, from the same committee, to whom was referred the bill (S. 1114) for the establishment of a light and fog signal on or near Sabine Bank, Texas, reported it without amendment.

Mr. STEWART, from the Committee on Claims, to whom was referred the bill (S. 4774) for the settlement of Piute war claims, reported the following resolution; which was considered by unanimous consent, and agreed to:

Resolved, That the bill (S. 4774) entitled "A bill for the settlement of Piute war claims," now pending in the Senate, together with all the accompanying papers, be, and the same is hereby, referred to the Court of Claims, in pursuance of the provisions of an act entitled "An act to provide for the bringing of suits against the Government of the United States," approved March 3, 1887. And the said court shall proceed with the same in accordance with the provisions of such act, and report to the Senate in accordance therewith.

Mr. BATE, from the Committee on Military Affairs, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. 1046) to correct the military record of James P. McGee, reported it without amendment, and submitted a report thereon.

Mr. JONES of Nevada, from the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate, to whom was referred the amendment submitted by Mr. FAIRBANKS on the 30th of March, 1898, proposing to pay \$150 to John Brady, an employee of the Senate, for injuries received while in the discharge of his duties, intended to be proposed to the general deficiency appropriation bill, reported it favorably, and moved that it be referred to the Committee on Appropriations and printed; which was agreed to.

Mr. McMILLAN, from the Committee on the District of Columbia, to whom was referred the bill (S. 4625) to regulate insurance in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes, reported it with amendments, and submitted a report thereon.

Mr. FRYE, from the Committee on Commerce, to whom was referred the bill (S. 4712) designating Titusville, Pa., a subport