

Tenth Regiment Volunteer Infantry.

David B. Jeffers, commissary-sergeant, United States Army, retired, to be second lieutenant.

Ninth Regiment Volunteer Infantry.

William H. Coston, of Ohio, to be chaplain.

To be signal officer with the rank of captain.

First Lieut. Alvar G. Thompson, United States Volunteer Signal Corps.

To be signal officers with the rank of first lieutenant.

Second Lieut. Charles H. Gordon, United States Volunteer Signal Corps.

Second Lieut. Alson J. Rudd, United States Volunteer Signal Corps.

Second Lieut. William Mitchell, United States Volunteer Signal Corps.

To be signal officers with the rank of second lieutenant.

First-Class Sergt. Charles C. Shew, United States Volunteer Signal Corps.

First-Class Sergt. Robert B. Montgomery, United States Volunteer Signal Corps.

First-Class Sergt. James P. Anderson, United States Volunteer Signal Corps.

First-Class Sergt. Edward E. Kelley, United States Volunteer Signal Corps.

To be brigade surgeon with the rank of major.

Orlando Ducker, of Kentucky.

Third Regiment Volunteer Engineers.

First Lieut. James D. Fountleroy, to be captain.

Second Lieut. St. Charles B. Gwynn, to be first lieutenant.

Sergt. Lee Shaffer, Company G, to be second lieutenant.

Second Regiment Volunteer Infantry.

Sergt. Christopher Lanahan, Second United States Volunteer Infantry, to be second lieutenant.

Seventh Regiment Volunteer Infantry.

Second Lieut. Jesse C. Duke, to be first lieutenant.

Second Lieut. Beverly Perea, to be first lieutenant.

Owen T. Kenan, of Georgia, late major, First Georgia Volunteers, to be captain.

Sergt. Daniel T. Brantley, Company D, Seventh United States Volunteer Infantry, to be second lieutenant.

APPOINTMENTS IN THE ARMY.

To be professor of mathematics in the Military Academy.

Associate Prof. Wright P. Edgerton, October 7, 1898.

To be associate professor of mathematics in the Military Academy.

First Lieut. Charles P. Echols, Corps of Engineers, October 7, 1898.

PROMOTIONS IN THE ARMY.

CAVALRY ARM.

To be captain.

First Lieut. John M. Stotsenburg, Sixth Cavalry, December 14, 1898.

To be first lieutenants.

Second Lieut. Frank A. Barton, Tenth Cavalry, October 16, 1898.

Second Lieut. Robert Sewell, Seventh Cavalry, October 24, 1898.

Second Lieut. George C. Barnhardt, Sixth Cavalry, November 7, 1898.

Second Lieut. James H. Reeves, Sixth Cavalry, November 10, 1898.

Second Lieut. Kirby Walker, Third Cavalry, December 14, 1898.

Second Lieut. Claude B. Swezey, Eighth Cavalry, December 14, 1898.

Second Lieut. Sterling P. Adams, First Cavalry, December 14, 1898.

REJECTION.

Executive nomination rejected by the Senate January 26, 1899.

APPOINTMENT IN THE VOLUNTEER ARMY.

TENTH REGIMENT VOLUNTEER INFANTRY.

To be first lieutenant.

James A. Roston, of District of Columbia, to fill an original vacancy, July 5, 1898.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

THURSDAY, January 26, 1899.

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

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

RECORDS OF THE UNION AND CONFEDERATE ARMIES.

Mr. RICHARDSON. Mr. Speaker, I desire to present a conference report, and I ask that House concurrent resolution No. 36 with Senate amendment be read, and then I will say a word.

The resolution was read, as follows:

Concurrent resolution.

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That the Secretary of War is hereby authorized and directed to furnish one complete set of the Official Records of the Union and Confederate Armies to each Senator, Representative, and Delegate of the Fifty-fifth Congress not already entitled by law to receive the same; and he is further authorized to use for this purpose such incomplete sets as remain unsold or uncalled for by the beneficiaries designated to receive them under the authority contained in the several acts of Congress providing for the distribution and sale of this publication: Provided, That the Secretary of War may call upon the Public Printer to print and bind such parts of said work as will enable him to complete the sets herein provided for.

The amendment of the Senate is as follows:

The provision in the "Act making appropriations for the sundry civil expenses of the Government," approved August 5, 1892, providing for the printing and binding of 500 copies of the Official Records of the War of the Rebellion for the use of Senators, Members, and Delegates of the Fifty-second Congress, shall not be construed to prevent the binding of any public document which would otherwise be provided for by the "Act providing for the public printing and binding and the distribution of public documents," approved January 12, 1895, which provides "that each Senator and Representative shall be entitled to the binding in half morocco, or material no more expensive, of but one copy of each public document to which he may be entitled."

The conference report is as follows:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the House concurrent resolution No. 36, in regard to printing and binding of the Official Records of the Union and Confederate Armies, having met, after full and free conference have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate, and agree to the same.

GEO. D. PERKINS,
JAMES D. RICHARDSON,
Managers on the part of the House.

H. C. LODGE,
A. P. GORMAN,
Managers on the part of the Senate.

The statement is as follows:

The resolution as it passed the House provided for the supplying of members of the Fifty-fifth Congress who were not already entitled by law to receive the same a complete set of the Official Records of the Union and Confederate Armies.

The Senate amended the resolution by providing that the resolution should not interfere with the privilege or right of members to have binding done at the Government Printing Office under existing law. The House disagreed to this Senate amendment, and the conference committee was appointed. As the resolution did not, in the opinion of the House conferees, interfere with this privilege and was not intended to have any such effect, the House conferees have agreed to recommend that the House recede from its disagreement to the Senate amendment and to recommend that said amendment be agreed to.

Mr. RICHARDSON. Mr. Speaker, one word by way of explanation. The statement explains fully the condition and situation, but it is a fact that the original resolution and the amendment of the Senate were lost, and these papers simply supply the lost papers; and I ask unanimous consent that they may be accepted as originals. They have been carefully gone over and they are identical with the original resolutions. I hope they will be substituted for the originals and that the conference report be agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Tennessee asks unanimous consent, the original papers having been lost, that the copies sent to the Clerk's desk may be substituted in all respects for them. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

The conference report was agreed to.

On motion of Mr. RICHARDSON, a motion to reconsider the vote whereby the conference report was agreed to was laid on the table.

REORGANIZATION OF THE ARMY.

Mr. HULL. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H. R. 11022) for the reorganization of the Army, and for other purposes.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, with Mr. PAYNE in the chair, for the further consideration of the bill (H. R. 11022) for the reorganization of the Army, and for other purposes.

Mr. HULL. Mr. Chairman, I yield one hour, or so much as he may require, to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MARSH].

Mr. JETT. Before the gentleman from Illinois proceeds, I should like to inquire how much time is remaining on this side of the House?

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk informs the Chair that there are remaining on the gentleman's side two hours and four minutes.

Mr. COX. Mr. Chairman, I want to make an inquiry in this connection. As a member of the committee, I was entitled to an hour, and when I spoke I requested the Chair to stop me when I had occupied forty minutes. My purpose was to yield to two of my colleagues ten minutes each. Now I wish to understand whether I have the right to do so.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair thinks the gentleman would not have the right unless time was yielded to him by the gentleman from New York [Mr. SULZER], because the House ordered that the time should be equally divided, the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HULL] to control the time on one side and the gentleman from New York on the other.

Mr. COX. Mr. Chairman—

Mr. HULL. Mr. Chairman, is this coming out of the time I have yielded to the gentleman from Illinois?

The CHAIRMAN. Certainly not; the gentleman from Illinois is entitled to an hour.

Mr. HULL. All I want is that the time occupied by this "free and easy" shall not be charged to us.

Mr. COX. Mr. Chairman, I made my proposition when I was recognized as plainly as I could make it, that I would yield a part of my time for the benefit of my colleagues.

The CHAIRMAN. If the gentleman from New York should yield to the gentleman from Tennessee, of course the time would be within the disposal of the gentleman from Tennessee, unless objected to by some member of the House.

Mr. COX. The gentleman from New York did not yield to me; I had my own time.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is mistaken. The House has ordered that the time be equally divided between the two sides, and that the gentleman from New York control the time on the side of the House to which the gentleman from Tennessee belongs.

Mr. CARMACK. I understood—and I think my colleagues will bear out my statement—that my colleague [Mr. COX] was given an hour, and that he stated at the beginning of his remarks his desire to talk only forty minutes and yield the rest of his time.

Mr. COX. Yes, sir.

Mr. CARMACK. My colleague made that statement when he opened his remarks.

Mr. COX. When I was recognized in my own right for an hour I kept back part of that time for the benefit of two of my colleagues.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair understood that when the gentleman from Tennessee addressed the House and concluded his remarks, he did not reserve any time.

Mr. COX. I did; and the RECORD shows it.

The CHAIRMAN. The RECORD will show what was the fact.

Mr. COX. Yes, sir; and I reserved twenty minutes of my hour.

Mr. HULL. Mr. Chairman—

Mr. HAY addressed the Chair.

Mr. HULL. I do not want to take my friend from Virginia [Mr. HAY] off his feet.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair thinks the time of the House ought not to be occupied now with a discussion of this kind.

Mr. HULL. My understanding is that the RECORD will show the facts in regard to this matter, and that we are using now time that ought to be devoted to debate. I yield an hour, or so much as he may need, to my colleague on the committee, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MARSH].

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois is recognized.

Mr. HAY. Before the gentleman from Illinois proceeds I desire to make a statement in regard to the time.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MARSH] yield?

Mr. HAY. I do not wish to take any of the gentleman's time.

Mr. COX. I rise to a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Tennessee rises to a parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. COX. I announced as distinctly as I could what I proposed to do and asked the Chair and the timekeeper to call me down when I had occupied forty minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair understands that the gentleman did make that announcement.

Mr. COX. And I was called down.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair would state to the gentleman from Tennessee that he can raise this question when the time comes back to his side of the House; and in the meantime the record can be looked up. The Chair thinks there will be no difficulty in settling this matter.

Mr. HAY. I wish to make a statement, with the consent of the gentleman from Iowa.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois is occupying the floor; does he yield?

Mr. HAY. I do not wish to take any of the time of the gentleman from Illinois. I wish simply to make the statement that the gentleman from New York [Mr. SULZER] who has been authorized to control the time on our side of the House asked me in his absence to control the time, and therefore I am doing so. I desire my position in that regard to be understood. That is all.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the Chair will recognize it. The gentleman from Illinois will proceed.

Mr. MARSH. Mr. Chairman, the discussion on this bill has wandered very widely from the bill itself; and if the House will have patience with me, I will occupy but a few minutes of its time in calling its attention to what I believe to be some very important provisions in the bill that ought to be modified. But before proceeding further, Mr. Chairman, I send to the Clerk's desk and ask to have read, as a part of my own remarks, an extract from the message of the President of the United States, sent to this House at the beginning of this session.

The Clerk read as follows:

Under the act of Congress approved April 26, 1898, authorizing the President in his discretion, "upon a declaration of war by Congress, or a declaration by Congress that war exists," I directed the increase of the Regular Army to the maximum of 62,000, authorized in said act.

There are now in the Regular Army 57,862 officers and men. In said act it was provided, "That at the end of any war in which the United States may become involved the Army shall be reduced to a peace basis by the transfer in the same arm of the service or absorption by promotion or honorable discharge under such regulations as the Secretary of War may establish of supernumerary commissioned officers and the honorable discharge or transfer of supernumerary enlisted men; and nothing contained in this act shall be construed as authorizing the permanent increase of the commissioned or enlisted force of the Regular Army beyond that now provided by the law in force prior to the passage of this act, except as to the increase of 25 majors provided for in section 1 hereof."

The importance of legislation for the permanent increase of the Army is therefore manifest, and the recommendation of the Secretary of War for that purpose has my unqualified approval. There can be no question that at this time, and probably for some time in the future, 100,000 men will be none too many to meet the necessities of the situation. At all events, whether that number shall be required permanently or not, the power should be given to the President to enlist that force if in his discretion it should be necessary; and the further discretion should be given him to recruit for the Army within the above limit from the inhabitants of the islands with the government of which we are charged.

It is my purpose to muster out the entire Volunteer Army as soon as the Congress shall provide for the increase of the regular establishment. This will be only an act of justice and will be much appreciated by the brave men who left their homes and employments to help the country in its emergency.

Mr. MARSH. Mr. Chairman, that portion of the President's message was, by the order of the House, referred to the Committee on Military Affairs, and in pursuance of and in response to that portion of the message your committee has reported and now presents for your consideration the pending bill. I do not understand, sir, that the committee considers that bill as perfect in all of its details. It is reported here by that committee with its recommendation, and of course it is for this House to determine whether all of its provisions are wise or unwise.

As a member of that committee, I wish to state that I distinctly reserved the right as a member of the committee to propose amendments or to oppose features of this bill as I might deem best when the matter was before the House. The main object of the committee is—or at least it ought to be—to supply to the President of the United States the increased strength of the Army that he calls for and deems necessary at this time, and I am in perfect harmony and in perfect accord with the President in his desire to have an increase in the Regular Army. He says:

At all events—

Quoting from the message—

whether that number (100,000 men) will be required permanently or not, the power should be given to the President to enlist that force if, in his discretion, it should be necessary.

I am willing and anxious and desirous of conferring upon the President of the United States the right and the power to exercise, according to his best judgment, that power to increase the Army to 100,000 men, or to 75,000 men, or to 60,000 men, or to any other number, not exceeding 100,000 men, such as his own judgment may dictate. I am not prepared to say to this House, I am not satisfied or sufficiently informed to enable me to say to the House, that the country now needs an increase in the Regular Army to 100,000 men.

But, Mr. Chairman, I am prepared to say that I am willing to leave that question absolutely and entirely in the hands of the President.

Mr. COX. Will my colleague on the committee allow me just here—

Mr. MARSH. I would prefer to proceed now.

Mr. COX. Only a word on this point.

Mr. MARSH. I must decline to be interrupted.

Mr. COX. All right, if the gentleman declines.

Mr. MARSH. Mr. Chairman, knowing full well that the President of the United States will not increase that army to the extent of one single enlisted man or one commissioned officer beyond what he may deem absolutely necessary under the responsibilities

that rest upon his shoulders, I am willing to intrust this power to him; and hence when we get into the consideration of the bill under the five-minutes rule I shall offer an amendment to the bill giving to the President discretionary power to increase the Army to 100,000 men, or less, according to his own judgment.

As the bill now reads it leaves no discretion with the President. As the bill has been prepared it makes it mandatory and obligatory upon him to increase the Army to about 100,000 men, whether he deems that increase necessary or does not deem it necessary. When peace shall have been declared, the Regular Army will consist of 26,610 enlisted men, and it will take weeks and months—a gradual process—to increase that number to 100,000 men. And I will say that while that process is going on it should go no further than the judgment of the President deems to be wise and proper and for the best interests of the country.

Under the existing law—or under the proposed bill, I should say—five new infantry regiments must be added to the Regular Army, and the necessary officers appointed to command them must be commissioned by the President, whether he needs them or not. Under the provisions of the pending bill, if it becomes a law, it becomes mandatory upon the President of the United States to appoint these additional officers for the infantry or the additional officers required for the artillery, and also the additional, the numberless, officers in the various staff departments of the Army.

Now, sir, I would leave to the President of the United States absolute power in this regard. I would leave him untrammelled. I would leave it to his judgment whether that increase should be made or not, as he shall think necessary for the best interests of the country; and he has indicated his views in his message to the House, in which he says:

At all events, whether that number shall be required permanently or not, power should be given to the President to enlist that force if, in his discretion, it should be necessary.

And I want to say, Mr. Chairman, further, that this bill largely increases the staff department or bureaus of the Army, an increase that may be necessary if we have a force of 100,000 men in the Regular Army, as proposed by the bill, but which will be unnecessary if we are to have an army of 60,000 or 70,000 men. Yet under this bill this staff will be created and must be created; these officers must be promoted and commissioned and new ones appointed to fill the vacancies at the bottom. There is no discretion left in the President; but we undertake now to say in this bill to the President that he must provide an army of 100,000 men, whether he needs it or whether the country does not need it.

I would leave the discretion with the President. The country has confidence in his judgment. The country has confidence in his patriotism. The House can not but have confidence in his judgment, a judgment which I propose to have him exercise during the coming months after Congress shall have adjourned on the 4th day of March next. And in proposing this amendment, and in making this suggestion, I want to say to the House that I am speaking in harmony with the wishes of the President himself. I violate no confidence when I say that in two recent conversations with him he has said to me that he would not recruit a soldier nor add an officer to the Army unless he deemed it to be necessary.

In that conversation the President said to me that he thought Congress ought to be willing to trust him as to whether the Army should go up to 100,000 men or whether it should go to a less number, and that he would not add a single man nor a single officer nor a single organization unless at the time he deemed it to be necessary. Hence I trust that when we come to consider this bill under the five-minute rule the chairman of the Committee on Military Affairs and the members of this House will agree to an amendment relieving this bill from its mandatory character and conferring upon the President the discretionary power as to how fully he shall carry it into operation.

Mr. COX. Will the gentleman yield to me for a question now?

Mr. MARSH. Certainly, for a question.

Mr. COX. Let us get the point down.

Mr. MARSH. Put the question, my friend.

Mr. COX. I am going to put it. You wish to leave the President the power to organize the Regular Army to the limit of 100,000 men?

Mr. MARSH. Substantially.

Mr. COX. If that is true, why not confer upon the President the power to extend the Army to any number he wants?

Mr. MARSH. Mr. Chairman, if this bill becomes a law as it now stands it is mandatory on the President. He must appoint all the thousands of officers that it provides for, whether at the time he deems them necessary or not. This simply puts it in his discretion as to whether it shall be increased to the full extent or only part way. Why not confer upon him that discretion? Are you afraid that he will not make the Army large enough? Are you afraid that he will make it too small? My friend from Tennessee does not want a large army.

Mr. COX. No.

Mr. MARSH. This provision of mine relieves the President from the obligation imposed by the bill in its present form to make an army of a hundred thousand, and he can stop with 60,000 if he chooses, and he may stop in the appointment of the large number of officers provided for in this bill. He may stop halfway. I say, let him have that power. From that I will pass on to another point.

Mr. COX. Pardon me right there for one moment, for I am not going to interrupt except—

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Illinois yield to the gentleman from Tennessee?

Mr. MARSH. Why, I must yield to my good friend from Tennessee, although he knows he is taking my time.

Mr. COX. I will give you all mine.

Mr. MARSH. You have given yours away already.

Mr. COX. I will borrow some more somewhere else.

Mr. MARSH. Very well.

Mr. COX. I know what my friend's idea is, but I want the House to understand it. If you are going to confer upon the President of the United States the power to call out a certain number of troops, why do you limit him at all? Why put the limit at 100,000?

Mr. MARSH. Mr. Chairman, we limit him to a hundred thousand, because nobody believes that the Army, under any circumstances, will need to be larger than a hundred thousand men, and it is supposed by a great many people that we shall not need a hundred thousand. Hence, I do not want to provide absolutely in the law that the Army must be composed of 100,000 men. We placed a limit upon the number of volunteers, in the volunteer act last spring, if I recollect right, not to exceed 500,000 men. The President called out 175,000.

Mr. COX. I beg my friend's pardon. That bill does not limit him.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Illinois yield?

Mr. MARSH. No, I do not want to yield.

Mr. COX. I know the gentleman does not want to make an incorrect statement.

Mr. MARSH. No, I do not want to.

Mr. COX. Another thing—

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Tennessee is not in order. The gentleman from Illinois declines to yield.

Mr. MARSH. I hope my friend from Tennessee will allow me to proceed.

Mr. COX. I hope my friend will correct the statement that he has made.

The CHAIRMAN. The committee will be in order.

Mr. MARSH. Now, Mr. Chairman, in the organization of the infantry companies under the present law, 106 enlisted men are provided to each infantry company. The 106 enlisted men include the privates and noncommissioned officers. This bill increases the number of the enlisted men of an infantry company to 145. I hope at the proper time, when we get into consideration of the bill under the five-minute rule, to move an amendment reducing that number from 145 to the present number, 106. Under the present mode of handling troops, fighting necessarily in open order, instead of close order, 145 men are too many for a company commander to command. Under the old system of war, such as General HENDERSON and my friend Colonel COX were engaged in, the companies were formed in compact order. We formed even in three and four lines and charged in columns of brigades and columns of divisions in close order. The men touched elbow to elbow. That mode of warfare has passed, and the fighting now is done upon the front line, with the men 5, 6, and 8 and 10 feet apart.

Mr. HULL. Will it interrupt my friend to ask him a question?

Mr. MARSH. Not at all.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman yield to the gentleman from Iowa?

Mr. HULL. Is it not true that the open order of fighting—

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman yield?

Mr. HULL. The gentleman yielded to me. I say that in order that the gentleman may elaborate it somewhat at this time, is it not true that the open formation of the modern organization of infantry in the German army has increased the number in the company in place of decreasing it?

Mr. MARSH. Mr. Chairman, the German law provides 250 for the company. There are reasons for it there that do not obtain here. In my time I do not care to discuss it here. I want to say what I ought to have said a while ago—that the Committee on Military Affairs had hearings before the recess, and reported this bill just before the recess was taken. We had before us that accomplished officer, Lieutenant-General Schofield, and that equally accomplished officer, Major-General Miles; and we had before us the representatives of the staff department here in Washington. If I recollect aright, there was not a line officer whose views were submitted to the Committee on Military Affairs. So far as I

know, the only officers who appeared there were staff officers—men that have no command, men who do not command, but men who act by virtue of the orders of their superiors.

Now, I am not complaining of that. I am not criticising that; but I am calling the attention of this House to the fact, and it is a fact, that so far as the hearings are concerned, and the information given to the committee, it comes to us solely from the staff department up here at headquarters, from men who did not command men; who under the law can not command men; men who under the law as it now exists are in the staff for a lifetime.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I want to call the attention of this House to the real meat in the cocoanut of a large company to a regiment, and I get it from that frank and candid old soldier, General Schofield. I read to you from page 21 of the hearings:

I would say, though, in connection with the strength of the Army, that it would seem to be wise to make the necessary increase by adding as few regiments as practicable—

You know the fewer regiments we have the more men we must have in the company—

and getting the necessary strength by giving very large size if necessary to the companies, making the enlisted strength very large in proportion to the number of officers—

That is what this bill does—

so, if the time comes, as I hope it may in a very few years, when a considerable reduction can be made in the force now presumed to be necessary, that it can be done without any injury to the military effectiveness by simply discharging unnecessary enlisted men, still leaving an efficient organization of 50 or 80 or 100 men to the company.

I would not hesitate, with that in view, to make the companies as large as 150 men, and I know from my own experience that with such officers as are now found in the Regular Army a company of 150 men can be made more effective than any new troops under new officers could be made in a short time, although troops organized as our volunteers generally are, of the character generally found among them, would become as good as regulars in the course of a few years; but for a long time a company of volunteers would be less efficient than a company of 150 men organized under such officers as now exist in the Army.

Subordinating the efficiency of the organization of the Army to the interest of the commissioned officers when the time comes to reduce the Army—

Mr. COX. That is what it means.

Mr. MARSH. That is the meat in the cocoanut. That was the meat in the cocoanut of the Regular Army bill last spring, when it came in here providing for 250 enlisted men in an infantry company. I asked of General Schwan, who was one of the three or four staff officers who prepared this bill, about it. It turned out upon the hearing that three or four staff officers—if I misstate it, the chairman will correct me—it turned out in the hearings that three or four staff officers in the War Department, men who never will have command of troops, who now are barred by law from the command of troops, three, four, five, or six officers up here in the War Department prepared this bill—and if I am in error, the chairman can correct me—with some corrections and some suggestions that the chairman of the Committee on Military Affairs himself made.

Mr. RAY of New York. Will the gentleman permit me?

Mr. MARSH. I will permit a question.

Mr. RAY of New York. I understand the gentleman to say that if the idea of General Schofield is carried out for the proper organization of full regiments, and a larger number of enlisted men in the companies or regiments is provided for, it will operate in the interest of the officers when we come to reduce the Regular Army, if that is ever done.

Now, it struck me—and if I am wrong I will be pleased to have the gentleman correct me—that that will not be so, because the fewer the number of regiments the fewer the number of officers; and therefore, when we come to reduce the Regular Army, by reducing the number of enlisted men there will not be as many commissioned officers remaining as there would be if we had more regiments with their necessary officers and the same number of enlisted men as in the Army with the larger number of regiments.

Mr. MARSH. I see the trouble in the gentleman's mind. Suppose the infantry organization contains 50,000 men; that is about what this bill provides for—145 men to a company. Suppose two or three years from now Congress passes a law reducing the number of men in the infantry to 20,000. Then 30,000 of the infantry are mustered out, leaving the companies, instead of 145 strong, 50 strong, and, as General Schofield said, thereby preserving the organization and not disturbing the officers.

Mr. COX. That is the point.

Mr. BROMWELL. Will the gentleman from Illinois permit a question?

Mr. MARSH. If the gentleman will wait a minute. On page 33 of the hearings before the committee, in response to a question that I propounded to General Schofield, he said:

Mr. MARSH. Now, in case, after the organization of this army of 145 men to the company, it was found that we could reduce it ten or fifteen or twenty thousand under your system, the men could be mustered out without any injustice in mustering out officers?

General SCHOFIELD. Yes. I think that would be a very important matter. It would save the danger of having to reduce the number of regiments, and so obviate the stagnation in promotion that would follow such a course,

You want to make an organization that will last and that will be efficient, and let the President fill it up when necessary.

Now I will listen to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BROMWELL].

Mr. BROMWELL. The question I propose to ask is—

Mr. MARSH. How much time, Mr. Chairman, have I remaining?

Mr. BROMWELL. I will take but a minute.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman has occupied thirty-four minutes.

Mr. BROMWELL. The question I propose to ask is as to the contract relation existing between the officers of the United States Army who become regulars and the Government. I understood the gentleman to say a few days ago that in his judgment an Army officer, regularly mustered into the regular service, had a claim for his salary, or at least a right to retirement with salary for the rest of his life.

Mr. MARSH. The gentleman from Ohio misunderstood me.

Mr. BROMWELL. Let me put my question.

Mr. MARSH. Well, you are going to base the question on a misunderstanding.

Mr. BROMWELL. Now, I ask the gentleman this question: If the number of men is enlisted at 100 instead of 150, as in this bill, that will make one-half more regiments than are provided for by this bill, and it would increase the number of Regular Army officers one-half. What I want the gentleman to state is, whether, in his judgment, the officers who would be retired when the regiments were mustered out, in case a reduction became necessary, would have any claim against the Government for their salaries after the muster out?

Mr. MARSH. Mr. Chairman, what I want is a properly organized army. I do not want the efficient reorganization to be subordinated to the interests of the officers or anybody else that may take place in future years. I do not think that Congress should so legislate as to make it necessary to muster out of the service three or four years hence, when a reduction of the Army takes place, men who have devoted their lives to the Army service; while they have no vested rights to remain in the service until the period of retirement, yet I would not have Congress deliberately legislate with a view to mustering them out, when it is not necessary to do so.

Mr. COX. I hope my friend from Illinois will yield for a moment.

Mr. MARSH. I will hear the gentleman.

Mr. COX. Of course you will. [Laughter.]

Mr. MARSH. I always have to. [Laughter.]

Mr. COX. Under the bill when you come to reduce the Regular Army and muster out the privates—

Mr. MARSH. Under this bill we do not reduce it.

Mr. COX. You muster out the privates and keep the officers. Is not that so?

Mr. MARSH. Now, Mr. Chairman, when we get to the consideration of this bill under the five-minute rule, I will submit an amendment reducing the infantry company to the present number of 106 enlisted men.

Now, there is one other point I desire to call the attention of the House to, and that is the reorganization of the staff of the Army, and I do it for the purpose of expressing my views on that subject, because the time, if it has not now come, will come when this reform I suggest in the staff of the American Army will be accomplished.

Your staff now is a permanent staff. The officers on that staff are selected from the line of the Army by the President and appointed to the lowest grade where a vacancy occurs in the staff. They remain on the staff for life, or until the age of retirement. They no longer acquire experience in the field; they no longer have experience in commanding men; but they remain upon the staff for the rest of their lives.

When we get to the point under the five-minute rule where amendments may be offered, I shall offer an amendment providing that hereafter all vacancies in the staff of the Army shall be filled by details from the line for a period not exceeding four years (if the officer should not earlier be returned to his regiment), and at the end of that time, under the provisions of this amendment, such officers will be sent back to the line of the Army whence they came and will not be eligible again for staff duty until they have served in the line as long as they have served in the staff.

Mr. HENDERSON. Suppose in the meantime the vacancies caused by detailing them to staff duties are filled?

Mr. MARSH. The vacancies will not be filled. There need be no trouble in arranging that matter. That is a question of detail which can not interfere with the practical operation of this proposition. Under this system we shall be training the staff in the duties of the line, and we shall be training the line in the duties of the staff. Suppose, Mr. Chairman, that thirty-three years ago, at the close of the civil war, such a provision as I have just outlined had been in the law. Then when this Spanish war broke out your regiments would have been filled with competent staff

officers. And while I have no word of criticism, while I have none but words of praise for the staff officers who performed their duties in the recent Spanish war, I will say that if there was any weak point in our military forces during that war it was with the staff in the field. Witness the condition of things at Tampa, and I will not go further on that point.

The measure I am advocating will bring the staff and the line of the Army in closer touch, and will largely, if not entirely, prevent jealousy, envy, and ill feeling that exist in the Army between the line and the staff, and which always will exist while the staff is a separate organization.

I would not interfere with the gentlemen who are now in the staff; let them remain. But when vacancies hereafter occur or when new staff officers may be provided for by future legislation, the amendment would cover such cases.

Now, Mr. Chairman, one word further, and I am through. The bill provides for the abolition of the regimental form in the artillery. If you will refer to the hearings, you will find that General Schofield and General Miles both agreed that that feature of the bill was not right. Both of those distinguished officers—and they are the only officers who had command of anything that were heard before the committee—both of those officers were emphatic in adhering to the present regimental organization of the artillery.

So much, Mr. Chairman, for the provisions of this bill. Now, a word or two to show why, in my judgment, the President should be clothed with the power, to be exercised in his good discretion, to increase the Regular Army from 26,610 to not exceeding in the neighborhood of 100,000.

New conditions have come to the country. New responsibilities have fallen upon our shoulders. I was one of the gentlemen on this floor last spring who tired of diplomatic attempts to cure the troubles that existed in the neighboring island of Cuba. I was one of the gentlemen of this House who were anxious, on the very day that we received the news of the blowing up of the *Maine*, to declare war against Spain. I would have done it the next morning if I could have had my way. When the declaration did come, I was one of the gentlemen on this floor who urged it in season and out of season. And when I did that, Mr. Chairman, I stood ready then, as I stand ready now, to assume all the responsibilities that might flow from that war. And one of the responsibilities flowing from that war is the possessions that we now have in Porto Rico, and Cuba, and the Philippine Islands. Whether you are in favor of retaining the Philippine Islands for all time, or whether you are in favor of retaining them only so long as may be necessary to establish law, order, peace, and good government there on the part of the people, in either event the President needs an increase of the Army above 26,610.

I have heard the question asked very frequently on this floor, "What is the policy of the Administration with reference to the Philippine Islands?" I do not know what the policy of the Administration is now or what it will be in the future. I have no hesitation in saying here now, as I said to the people of my district in every one of those seven counties in Illinois, that, so far as I am concerned, I am in favor of holding the Philippine Islands and Porto Rico as long as the people of this country desire to hold them. There is no halfway measure with me on this matter. The Philippine Islands are ours by conquest; and I would not return them to Spain; I would not leave them to the mercies of their own people, who are incapable of self-government. I would give to those islands all the liberty that they are capable of enjoying and properly exercising.

I would hold those islands, not as a part of the United States, but as the property of the United States, and I would make such rules and regulations for their government as may be deemed wise by Congress from time to time. I would apply to those islands such tariff laws as Congress might deem necessary from time to time. I would apply such tariff laws to imports from those islands to this country as Congress may deem best. I would apply tariff laws in those islands to the products of other countries as well as our own, as Congress may deem necessary from time to time. In other words, I would not make those islands a part of the United States as we made Louisiana, but I would make them the property of these United States, so that the people of those islands may enjoy just such rights as the American Congress deems wise and best to confer upon them.

Why, Mr. Chairman, somebody says, "Would you use force to bring about this condition of things?" I would. Of course I would use force to bring about this condition of things. [Applause on the Republican side.] I would not have this Government a sneak and an imbecile.

Why are we sending troops and munitions of war to Manila and the Philippine Islands if it is not necessary to use them to preserve law and order and assert our authority in these islands? Nobody is responsible for the expression of these views, let me say, but myself.

Mr. COX. Nobody wants to be responsible for them.

Mr. MARSH. There is nothing new in this. Why, we used force of arms before in this country on numerous occasions. It has been necessary at times in our history. When we became the possessors of the Louisiana purchase in 1803, we sent troops there at once to take possession. We have not acquired a solid foot of territory in any portion of our land in all of that time that we had not sent a standing army there to maintain law and order and to protect the peace of the people. The acquisition of territory during the present century in every case has been followed by the same process, and we have kept this territory in that connection for years until it acquired statehood under our laws. The Regular Army has been there all of the time—a part of the standing Army to maintain law and order. Not volunteers, Mr. Chairman, please remember, but a standing Army in every instance.

When we acquired California from Mexico and acquired the Territory of New Mexico, we had no sooner done so than we sent a standing army, not volunteers, but men from the Regular Army of the country, to maintain law and order there and to protect our rights. And we did not ask the consent of the people there as to whether they were willing or not that our Army should be there. We sent troops into Florida after we had paid cash for it and closed a solid business transaction for the acquisition of that country—we sent an army there to maintain the dignity and the power of the United States and to enforce law and order and to preserve peace amongst the people. What objection, then, can there be to operating in the same way and exercising the same functions in other places? The people, speaking for all of these Territories, thank God to-day that the United States Government did send the Regular Army there from time to time as was found necessary. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Why, sir, the proposition to use force and compel obedience to the laws of the United States, the proposition to use the Army of the Government to reclaim and care for territory belonging to the Government of the United States, is, I repeat, no new one. It is a part of the history of the country.

I do not like to refer to the civil war, but I must do so, because it is one of the leading incidents, one of the leading illustrations, of the doctrine to which I am referring; that is, the doctrine of using force to preserve and maintain American territory. We used force for four long years in that struggle, and my friends on both sides of the House will well remember the fact. We mustered the largest army of modern days and fought a war for four long years, one of the greatest on record.

For what purpose? To compel a people to submit to the Constitution of the United States of America against their will. And they did submit. And, Mr. Chairman, there is not a man of them to-day but what glories in the fact that the old flag floats over them, although they fought for four years with courage and valor to down it. Even my friend from Tennessee, Colonel Cox, is proud that he lives under the "starry banner;" and the old flag in all of its glory is enshrined in his heart on the 4th day of every July, when it waves over his own beautiful home in the State of Tennessee. The men who submitted to force have learned the beauties of American rule and of the protection afforded by the American flag. And they are the very last persons on earth who should resent the use of military force to retain territory belonging to this country. They are the last persons, I say, who should do so—gentlemen like my friend from Tennessee, whom I regard very highly.

But for the use of that force, but for the use of an army of one and a half or two millions of men, where would you and your people be to-day? Talk about this proposition of "using force" to compel obedience and enable the country to retain its territory! Why, it is preposterous, and ought not to come certainly from gentlemen on the other side of the House. They ought to know that if the result of force has spread such blessings and prosperity, contentment and love of country to the people of the South, great God, what may it not bring to the people of the Philippine Islands! [Applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. COX. Mr. Chairman, by the indulgence of the gentleman, your compliments to the South, let me state—

Mr. MARSH. With my friend's consent, I must decline just now to be interrupted.

Mr. COX. I only want to say a word.

Mr. MARSH. Well, if my friend wants to ask a question, I will gladly yield.

Mr. COX. Oh, well, you will have no trouble about my question. Let me say one word to you—

Mr. MARSH. Very well; say it. [Laughter.] Let me put one to you first, however, before you begin. Are you not glad the Southern Confederacy failed, and that the Union of the country has been restored, and was restored by force of arms? Now answer that frankly, from your heart. [Laughter and applause.]

Mr. COX. I will do it.

Mr. MARSH. I know you are a patriot and love your country

and glory in that flag. Now, say so to these people. [Laughter and applause.] And say it so loud that the people down in Tennessee can hear it.

Mr. COX. Do not be excited about the flag. I have my convictions, as you have yours. You need not attack me.

Mr. MARSH. Oh, no.

Mr. COX. I did what I thought was my duty.

Mr. MARSH. That is right; I know you did. I am not denying that.

Mr. COX. I have no apology to make in this Congress or anywhere else.

Mr. MARSH. I would not have you to do it. I would be ashamed of you if you did.

Mr. COX. Well, if you did expect it, I would not respect you.

Mr. MARSH. No, no.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired.

Mr. COX. I wish I had one minute. [Laughter.]

Mr. HAY. I yield to the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. DINSMORE] thirty minutes.

Mr. DINSMORE. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MARSH] who has just taken his seat is a grizzled veteran of the Union Army in the civil war. The gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. COX], with whom he was in altercation, another, of the Confederacy. I would be glad if I could give expression to my emotions in hearing these two in fraternal terms discussing the welfare, the hopes of our common country, and referring to the past without bitterness or reproach. The gentleman from Illinois asked my friend from Tennessee if he was not glad the South had failed to disrupt the Union, and that the Stars and Stripes to-day float over a reunited, a consolidated country. As a son of the South, keenly sensitive to her honor, and resentful of any imputation against her motives or her cause in that unfortunate period, I say to the gentleman from Illinois that I am glad. I rejoice that we have a reunited country, with one flag and one people—a people devoted to the preservation of the inestimable blessings of free institutions for ourselves and all humanity.

Gentlemen have said with reference to the war with Spain that it is a blessing, in one sense at least, that it has united the sections of this country and made them all loyal and true to the Government. I deny this, Mr. Chairman. It has only furnished the opportunity for the people all over the land to discover that they are one people, loyal and united, forgetful of past differences, but this has been true for years. Lincoln and Grant conquered the feeling of rebellion largely in the South, and they did it more by what transpired at the surrender at Appomattox and afterwards than they did with their arms upon the hard-fought fields before. [Applause.] It was done in the terms of surrender and the treatment of the surrendered Confederates.

I was not prepared yesterday for the statement of the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. DOLLIVER], that the utterances upon this side of the Chamber had been almost treasonable. Mr. Chairman, has the time come when questions of great national importance are pending and we, as representatives of the people in the discharge of our duties to our constituencies, dare to speak out boldly, as all American citizens should speak, that we should be charged with treason; that we shall be considered as traitors? The gentleman said that the President had been twice insulted upon this floor.

I could not sit quietly and hear an insult offered to the President of the United States, but I have never heard it. Although he is the highest official in this land—and in the world, for that matter—he is but the servant of the people, an American citizen, and we have the right, nay, it is our duty, to animadvert upon his official conduct when it deserves criticism and censure.

I would approach the present crisis, Mr. Chairman, without any feeling of partisanship. It is one which requires the unbiased, the unprejudiced consideration of every member of this body. It is one fraught with more than usual importance to our people. Its results may lead to disaster. We who would caution against any imprudent action, against unwisdom, as we believe, are sometimes called pessimists. It suits the humor of our imperialistic friends to so characterize us, but, sir, I think we are but patriotic conservatives. I have no tolerance for that expression of opinion which I see sometimes about "little America." America is not little. She is great, and has grown great by the energies, intelligence, patriotism, and courage of our own people, attending to their own business, in their own dominion.

In the limited time allotted to me it is scarcely possible for me to do more than to make a protest in my own behalf and that of my constituency against the proposed measure to largely increase the standing Army and the Government's policy which has brought the measure before Congress. I can not conceive of any condition consistent with the safety, welfare, and happiness of the American people which would justify the increase of the Army proposed by this bill.

For many years the Army has been limited in its numbers by the law as it now exists, and though the population has outgrown

the numerical strength of the Army in its proportion, nevertheless it has been at all times in the past sufficient to meet every requirement for military purposes. Our national history in the past century is without a precedent in the history of nations. Our growth in science and art, in civilization and learning, in invention and industrial development, has challenged the admiration of the world.

When the fathers established this American Republic by a Revolution in behalf of liberty and the equality of man, although successful in the initial steps, the world laughed and prophesied that the Government thus established would be but a brief experiment. The flight of time has changed contempt into admiration and wonder, and to-day we stand without a superior in the family of nations.

In civilization, in industrial enterprise, in scientific development, in educational advancement, in moral and intellectual growth, we stand in advance of many and behind none. We have achieved all this, sir, without a great standing army, walking in the well-defined and unquestioned paths of constitutional and peaceful pursuits, in the way pointed out to us by the patriot fathers who laid deep the foundations of the Republic. We were ever taught by those fathers that a great military establishment was a menace to individual freedom and might be made an instrument for the destruction of the liberties of the people.

The purpose of the establishment of this Government was the promotion of human rights, the enlargement of human liberties, the universal equality of man. It was designed that this should be a government where the people might live together upon terms of equality, at peace with each other and with all the world, where tyranny should not exist, and where the civil should predominate over the military authority, a government which should respect the rights of foreign nations and excite the just animosity of none. "Peace and honest friendship with all nations, entangling alliances with none," is the graphic expression by which Jefferson defined our relations with the world.

How successful we have been in following these salutary and happy principles is attested by the wondrous success which we have achieved. Until the recent changed conditions growing out of the war with Spain, has there ever been any to suggest the necessity to increase our military establishment, as is proposed by this measure? Have any before had the temerity to insist that there was a demand for a large increase of our Army? No, Mr. Chairman, it has been universally known that a land of peace and industry had no such requirements, and there were none to advocate it. Indeed, sir, the conditions twenty-five, thirty years ago were such as to require a greater military force than at any time since until hostilities began with Spain.

The Indian tribes, in the interior of the country, remote from the fringes of civilization on the Atlantic and the Pacific, were numerically stronger and more warlike and savage than at the present day, and more troops were required to keep them in subjection and restrain them from the perpetration of outrages against the whites in those sparsely settled localities. It has always been considered that the only purpose of a standing army was to police the country in the Territories, assist the Executive authority of the Government within constitutional limitations, and form a nucleus about which the militia of the country might be constructed into a military force requisite for the demands of any emergency.

A standing army has only been tolerated as a necessary evil, and it certainly should be kept within bounds commensurate with necessity. The people are entitled to administration of government with the least possible measure of expense, and the expenses of maintaining a standing army are enormous. Each soldier is a charge upon the labor and industrial production of the country; he adds nothing to the general stock of wealth, and his subsistence is taken from the earnings of toil in which he does not participate.

When he is disabled, he is pensioned for life; when he grows old and infirm, he is retired and maintained at the Government expense; no other class of citizens enjoys these benefits than the military forces on land and sea. The people have a right, therefore, to demand that these forces shall be kept within the strict limitations of necessity. It is proposed by this bill to quadruple the expense of the Army to the people. If it is done, Mr. Chairman, it shall be without my consent. I perceive no necessity to justify it. I recognize no conditions that require it.

The supremacy of the civil over military authority was what Jefferson advised, and the experience of the world proves that it is wise to maintain it. Let us take a lesson from France, our sister Republic, yet barely a republic—more a military despotism. The army, if not the supreme influence, has so superseded civil authority that it seems impossible to resist its power. France is a republic in name, and yet it is possible there for man to be deprived of his liberty without due presentment, without information, and without trial. We have seen Dreyfus banished and imprisoned in cruel and wretched solitude—"incommunicado,"

denied the privilege of confronting the witnesses against him or even of knowing the evidence. Palpably the result of military tyranny, the supplanting of civil by the military authority. If the over-sanguine say such conditions are impossible here, I answer that no man can say. Great things result from small beginnings. A rivulet is a thing of beauty, to inspire a poet's fancy, but when it grows to be a river it is an irresistible flood.

It is proposed that this large increase shall be made in obedience to a demand growing out of our changed conditions. It is said that we must have a military force in Cuba, in Porto Rico, in Hawaii, and in the Philippines, and it is suggested that war is likely to occur to us and that our force is insufficient upon which to build an efficient army.

Mr. Chairman, I have no patience with or tolerance for the tendencies of the hour. I disapprove of the method adopted for securing to the Cubans a stable and permanent government, and I utterly abhor the proposed annexation of the Philippine Islands to the dominion of the United States. We are told, sir, by different eminent authorities in military circles that from thirty to fifty thousand men are necessary to maintain order in Cuba while a stable government is being established.

I am not an expert in military science—I pretend to be only a civilian; but I assert to this House that if the people of the country and the Congress of the United States had dreamed that such exorbitant demands would be made they would have been more reluctant to take up arms in a cause prompted solely by sympathy and humanitarian impulse.

What man dreamed of conquest when war was declared? The Congress, in the war resolutions, specifically and in distinct terms disavowed any purpose of conquest, and we believed that the good faith of this Government and the integrity of the American character was a sufficient guaranty against hypocrisy and deceit and a betrayal of our expressed purpose. The President of the United States, on April 11, 1893, in a message to Congress, used this unequivocal language with reference to Cuba:

I speak not of forcible annexation, for that can not be thought of. That, by our code of morality, would be criminal aggression.

What did the President mean by this language? He could only mean that the United States would not forcibly annex Cuba to her territory without the consent of the Cubans themselves. What does the President propose to do with reference to the Philippines? Is not his language used with reference to Cuba equally pertinent to those islands? What is it that is holding up the country to-day, awaiting the action of ratification to a treaty which has been extorted from Spain with the bayonet at her throat?

Spain has yielded to us under these conditions her sovereignty over the Philippines. She did it not without long and persistent protest, but she was a conquered foe, subject to the dictation of her conqueror, and had to yield. But after this remission by Spain of her authority, her sovereignty, such as it was, we are confronted by the graver problem of the unwillingness of the Filipinos to submit themselves to our authority. What does the President propose to do? What does his administration advise him to do?

The gentleman from Iowa [Mr. DOLLIVER], and other gentlemen who stand for this Administration, decline to tell us; they only tell us that the President will do all things well, but the rack and thumbscrew applied by the relentless gentleman from Indiana [Mr. JOHNSON] could not extort from the gentleman from Iowa yesterday a statement as to what he wished the Government to do with reference to the Philippines. They are content to cast it into our teeth that if there is a failure of the ratification of the treaty it will be due to Democratic opposition; that a failure to ratify will leave us at war with Spain, while ratification would bring us much-desired peace.

Ratification of the treaty closes the incident with Spain, but opens another as serious with the inhabitants of the Philippines. We are told that by opposition to the treaty we would prevent peace and continue the war with Spain. How absurd! Will Spain take up arms again because we refuse to ratify the treaty for the reason that it extorts more from her than we are willing to take? Besides, if she would, she could not fight us again. Will she send back her soldiers that we have returned to her with guns in their hands? Where and how will they land? Where is her navy? Can Cervera and Montojo muster their ships from the bottom of the sea? Those ships are no longer engines of destruction, but habitations for fishes and slimy reptiles of the deep that play hide and seek behind piles of "dead men's bones." Spain is helpless against us. It can no longer be a question of war with her. It is a question of national honor and our own preservation, which we must determine for ourselves without consideration of Spain, and gentlemen must know it. Since the beginning of our national life we have boasted that all just government is derived from the consent of the governed.

Shall we, then, govern a people without their consent—nay, even against their solemn protest and violent opposition? It does not answer for gentlemen to say we will confer the benefits of our

civilization upon them, which is far better than anything which they can accomplish for themselves. Who has constituted us a judge? Doubtless the Britons thought we would be much better off under their Government, but our fathers thought differently and asserted and maintained their right to govern themselves independently of Great Britain and her supposed superior civilization. No, Mr. Chairman, we may not do this thing. If it is done, then burn the Declaration of Independence, tear up the Constitution, and retrace the steps by which we have marched to national greatness and renown. There is a moral obligation upon us, but it is to our own people, to preserve their ancient and present liberties, to guard against exposing them to war with other nations, to exclude from our citizenship objectionable material—this is our obligation, and at the peril of this we owe no obligation to anybody.

At this point, Mr. Chairman, I hope I may be pardoned if I make a partisan digression. I have felt that this discussion should be conducted with no partisan feeling, but yesterday my distinguished friend from Iowa [Mr. DOLLIVER], so versatile in genius, so blessed with nature's gifts, having talents rarely given to men in this world, could not refrain in his remarks from partisan thrusts and taunts at this side of the House, entirely irrelevant to the matter under discussion.

When the distinguished gentleman from Iowa [Mr. DOLLIVER], who has no superior in this House nor elsewhere in many respects, being blessed with gifts of expression and thought, is driven from the dignified field of dispassionate discussion, from logical and legitimate debate, and tumbles and vaults in rhetorical athletics, seeking to win from the House its sweet applause and from his admirers and friends on the floor and in the galleries vocal approval, not by argument, but by prancing, prismatic platitudes [laughter], it shows to the country and to the House how absolutely barren is the ground upon which he stands of reason, logic, and argument.

Ah, he is not a man to leave the field of argument when there is material to be used. Not he, Mr. Chairman, nor the very able gentleman from Ohio [Mr. GROSVENOR], who the other day asked of the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. CARMACK], "What would you have our Navy do in the Philippines?" The gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. CARMACK] said, "Sail away and never look back." Thereupon the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. GROSVENOR] said, "And have yourselves branded in the back as cowards."

Mr. GROSVENOR. The gentleman mistakes my answer. I said "And all the world would brand you as cowards."

Mr. DINSMORE. Well, as you like. "All the world would brand us as cowards." For what, Mr. Chairman? Why cowards? Because we abandon a country a part of which has fallen into the hands of our military forces in war? Why cowards, if they act in pursuance of and in conformity with the traditions and written creed of this country, within the spirit of the Constitution, not forgetting that this is a free government which respects the rights of every people in the world and whose own people govern themselves with a view of promoting their own happiness?

Who shall brand us as cowards? Who are cowards? They are people who do not dare to meet danger and who do not dare to do the right.

But my friend from Iowa [Mr. DOLLIVER], after speaking about the beautiful event of the unanimous vote upon the \$50,000,000 appropriation, which he was pleased to consider the most glorious in the history of this country, as a vote of confidence in the President of the United States, said it was a misfortune—I speak from memory, because his speech is not in the RECORD this morning—it was a misfortune that a different feeling should have taken place on this side of the House, and that we should so suddenly become partisans as to have voted against the war-revenue measure. He criticises the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BAILEY] for certain utterances said to have been made somewhere. He said we voted against the revenue bill in the House of Representatives.

Did the gentleman tell the country why? Did he say that we did it because we were not willing to hold up the hands of the Administration? That is the implication. Does he not know—at least, if he had taken the pains and had sufficient interest to be accurate, he could have ascertained—that it was stated by the gentleman from Texas on this floor that if they would take out the bond feature of that measure, the Administration could get a unanimous vote for the war-revenue bill?

Mr. GAINES. And the speech of the gentleman from Texas was printed in the RECORD.

Mr. DINSMORE. Yes, the speech was printed in the RECORD. We withheld our support from that measure because the gentleman and his colleagues forced upon us and our constituents a bonded indebtedness which we felt was an injustice. Interest-bearing bonds when there was money in the Treasury! Interest-bearing bonds when we had other means by which revenue might have been obtained! Instead of complaining that it raised too much revenue, we suggested a way by which more revenue might be

raised—by an income tax—which was rejected with scorn by gentlemen on the other side of the House.

The gentleman from Iowa [Mr. DOLLIVER] made allusions to our fondness over here for "moonshine" money. When, Mr. Chairman, did the gentleman from Iowa ascertain that the money advocated by the Democrats in the last campaign and upon the floor of this House is "moonshine?" He is a recent convert, Mr. Chairman. The gentleman from Iowa was not wont originally to hold to these views about "moonshine" money.

The gentleman has a record upon this floor and in the country upon the question of "moonshine" money; and if the House will give me its attention for but a moment (as I see the gentleman in his seat), I shall take pleasure in referring to a part of the record which he has made for himself. What I am about to read was said by him in 1890 in this House; and I will ask the Clerk to read from the RECORD that part which I have marked in pencil—an extract from a speech made by the gentleman from Iowa on the floor of this House upon the subject of "moonshine" money.

The Clerk read as follows:

The act of July 12, providing for the free coinage of the whole product of the American silver mines, is a monument to the wisdom of this Congress. It expands the currency by the annual addition of not less than \$60,000,000 and keeps the money of the people as good as gold. The immediate effect of this law has been to advance the price of silver, and with the advance of silver every product of agriculture has felt the influence of advancing prices. It has solved the silver question and made the way to the free coinage of the world's silver supply easy and plain.

All this has been done without panic or financial convulsion, and in the light of what we have seen and done the words of Mr. Cleveland's last message to Congress read like the lines of a comedy. He said: "The Secretary recommends the suspension of the further coinage of silver, and in such recommendation I earnestly concur." The comedy lies in the queer fact that the very fellows who are most eager to make Mr. Cleveland President again are to-day the loudest in their pretended friendship for silver.

Mr. DINSMORE. Speaking of the farmers, he says:

They are not radicals or fanatics. They are the true, conservative force in American society.

The real anarchist of our day is not the miserable wretch in a garret working out his infernal ideas with gas pipe and dynamite. We need not fear such a man. The true anarchist in modern times is the bloodless spirit of wealth acquired without conscience, a spirit that in all ages has considered property as a mere possession and treated the commonwealth as a cheap and helpless word.

Mr. Chairman, the great misfortune to the country was that the gentleman's prediction did not prove true; and I presume the reason his prediction did not prove true was largely because he withdrew his support and influence from the purpose which was declared in that speech.

Mr. DOLLIVER. My friend will permit me to say that if he will read the whole speech, he will see that it was delivered against the free coinage of silver and not in favor of it, but in favor of the silver-purchasing law of 1890.

Mr. DINSMORE. I can not read the gentleman's whole speech, however delectable it might be; but I wish to say that it is inconceivable to me how words such as those just read could be made in opposition to silver.

Mr. CARMACK. He changed his position before he got through his speech.

Mr. DINSMORE. No; he did not. The passage read is from the concluding portion.

Mr. DOLLIVER. I voted against the free coinage of silver on the occasion when that speech was made, as I have done in every Congress since I have had the honor of a seat on this floor.

Mr. DINSMORE. Well, the gentleman's position on this question reminds me of an old fellow I once heard of who ran for the legislature. While serving there he voted for a law which proved to be unpopular. He went back home and ran as a candidate for reelection, and the people got after him for having voted for this obnoxious law. In defending himself he said: "Fellow-citizens, it is true I was for that law, but I was agin its enforcement." [Laughter.]

The gentleman says that he voted against free silver. I have not looked at the RECORD to see how he did vote, but I accept his statement in this case, as I always do his statements under every circumstance, as true. But if he was voting against free silver, he was telling the people that while Grover Cleveland, the enemy of the people, had been trying to crush silver, had quoted the recommendation of his Secretary of the Treasury in favor of suspending the further coinage of silver, and had said "in which declaration I earnestly concur." Then, says the gentleman from Iowa, the comedy lies in the fact that the very fellows who are most eager to make Mr. Cleveland President again are the loudest in their pretended friendship for silver. Here is a gentleman who voted against free silver using this language:

On the other hand, listen to the words of President Harrison's first message: "I have always been an advocate of the use of silver in our currency. We are large producers of that metal and should not discredit it." I predict that before the Administration of President Harrison ends silver will be coined by the United States without limit, as gold is now coined.

Is this a consummation to be wished? The gentleman is using this argument in favor of the Administration, whose servant he

was, or one of whose members he was at that time. But, Mr. Chairman, he sings pæans of praise of the silver-bullion-purchasing law as having put up the price of silver bullion in the country and at the same time put up the price of every agricultural product. The gentleman was not trying to show the discrepancy and divergence between wheat and silver at that time.

Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Iowa on that occasion had most respectable company. Now when I speak of the President of the United States I want it understood that I speak of him respectfully—not only so, but I have high admiration for many of the qualities which he possesses. He is a genial, amiable gentleman; but my friend from Iowa was standing alongside of the President at that time. My friend from Iowa was expressing views which accorded with views expressed by the President in that same period.

My friend from Iowa was standing by the gentleman who has been elected and inaugurated President of the United States as the leader of the enemies of silver, and those enemies, as the gentleman said at that time, were Grover Cleveland and his followers. How things change, Mr. Chairman! Now, my friend still stands by the President; that is to say, to use the expression of the sailor, he is "standing by," waiting for the President to tell him what he must do. He seems to have no well-settled convictions as to what is the duty of the Government with reference to the Philippines.

The gentleman from Indiana [Mr. JOHNSON] yesterday mercifully plied his questions to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. DOLLIVER] to obtain a direct response as to what ought to be done. The gentleman said he could answer; but he did not answer. I presume that having been placed once in the position of following the President on the money question, and having been obliged to take back his avowals and make explanations to the people, he does not want to commit himself this time until he finds out who else are with the President and what the President really means. [Applause.]

Ah, Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Iowa has not many defects; there are not many weaknesses in his character. He is brilliant and able. The only thing that I would suggest that any power can add to improve him would be that he might have the courage to stand by his own convictions—to announce them and follow no leader contrary to conscience. [Applause.]

Now, Mr. Chairman, I have consumed more time than I had intended to devote to what seems to be, and is partially, at least, an irrelevant matter. This bill to increase the Army is inseparably connected with the question as to whether we shall take, as a part of our dominions, the Philippine Islands. And the measure is urged with a great deal of energy for that purpose, and the possibility of our control of the Philippines is used as an argument in support of the bill. That is the main ground upon which the bill is urged before the House.

Why should we take the Philippine Islands? We should not take them, because, Mr. Chairman, in the first place, we have no earthly use for them.

Mr. WM. ALDEN SMITH. Not for a naval station?

Mr. DINSMORE. Why, Mr. Chairman, in response to the suggestion of the gentleman from Michigan, when we were confronted with the question as to whether Hawaii should be annexed as a part of the United States, we were told by many gentlemen, and by my distinguished friend from Michigan particularly, that we needed these islands as a base for naval purposes or a naval station; and that it was the "key" to the Pacific Ocean, and would enable us to control the commerce of that great region, and we have Hawaii.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. HAY. I will yield to the gentleman from Arkansas ten minutes more.

Mr. DINSMORE. Mr. Chairman, I was proceeding to say that the islands of Hawaii were regarded as the key to the Pacific Ocean. Some of the members on this side of the House pointed out the fact that it was intended to use their occupation as an entering wedge to the possession of foreign territory and start upon this system of expansion, which would involve us with the great powers of the world which are contending for territory in the far East.

Now, the Philippine Islands, after Hawaii has been disposed of, have become important, and have become another key; and Guam, I presume, will be another "key" for commercial purposes; and the Caroline Islands will become a "key" for telegraphic communications; so that eventually, with all of these various "keys," Columbia will have to untravel all of its policy in the past and adopt the new arrangement, which will be contrary to the traditions, the history, and the interests of our people. [Applause.]

But the question of trade has been urged in behalf of these acquisitions, and the commercial interests of the country are presented as at least an apology for the acquisition of new territory. We have been told by gentlemen of the Republican party on this floor that the export trade of the United States—the foreign trade—has increased in an enormous proportion to the trade of

other countries. This was asserted the other day by the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. BINGHAM], and afterwards, I think, by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. GROSVENOR], and that we had become second only to one great power in the world in the matter of foreign trade, and that was Great Britain.

In the last Congress the President of the United States sent with his message to Congress a report communicated to him by his Secretary of State, setting forth the facts in relation to the foreign trade of the United States and showing results. I speak of the Annual Trade Review. This report tells us that the time has come when it can be no longer questioned that the United States can compete successfully in all the markets of the world against all of the powers of the world, and not only that, but even in their own peculiar markets.

How has all this been accomplished? At the point of flashing steel and bright bayonets? Under the frowning cannon of strategic keys and military outposts? Not at all. But our trade has thus grown while we were walking in the ways of peace, in accordance with the teachings of the fathers, according to the long-recognized principles of our Government, according to the spirit of the Constitution, which has given life and strength and success to the Republic; and yet we are told by gentlemen who support the pending bill that we must "have an army" to promote and protect that commerce!

Mr. Chairman, trade travels under the white banner of peace. It has always come in that way to America, and we can make ourselves first in the market of the world by keeping on terms of friendship and good will with other countries and offering terms mutually and reciprocally beneficial. That is what brings commerce to us; not standing armies, not fortresses in the sea, nor guns, nor swords, nor the paraphernalia of war. [Applause.]

What does the President of the United States propose to do with the Philippines? Do you know? Yesterday morning's press brings us a statement that General Otis is already having trouble in the Philippines, even at Manila. Not only at Iloilo, but a disturbance is likely to break out amongst the natives at any time at Manila, and the papers say that a victory over them would not be desirable at this time.

The President's purposes are carefully concealed with reference to our actions as a Government in that quarter. Now, what is the real purpose? Is it to turn the islands over to the people of the islands themselves to form their own government? If not, it is certain, at least, that nothing we can do will be acceptable to the people. What the people of the islands want is independence; they will be satisfied with nothing else. They will resist all else with arms. Mr. Chairman, the situation presented is unique. The President has said repeatedly that he did not desire possession of the Philippines, but asks the stereotyped question: "What can we do?" It is insisted that if we relinquish all claim and control that the several thousands of Spanish prisoners in their hands will be butchered. Yet the natives assure us that if we will withdraw our claims and leave them to control their own destiny these prisoners shall be all released.

We are told that if we leave them to themselves the Filipinos will murder each other, will cut each other's throats. Mr. Chairman, I would regret to see that, but I would far rather see it than to have our people cut their throats. [Applause on the Democratic side.] I would much prefer to see that, Mr. Chairman, to seeing them cut our people's throats. It is war, and war to which no man may place a limit now, if we attempt the conquest of these people. Why talk about relinquishing possession when we have never had possession and can not obtain it without bloody, deadly war?

We never have had anything but Manila. Dewey had to have a place of shelter for his ships, being shut out by the laws of neutrality from other ports. He sought it from the enemy, and captured it like a true American, and wrote his name in golden letters upon the scroll of history; but he took it for military purposes, and destroyed the enemy's fleet there, and when he did it his purpose was accomplished so far as the fleet was concerned. Mr. Day, the late Secretary of State, and later commissioner, some time ago, according to the press, made the suggestion that when Dewey failed to sail away on the morning after the battle of Manila he imposed upon us the responsibility of taking the Philippines. How? Why? We had Manila. Of those 2,000 islands we had one port, with the fortress at Cavite. We could have retained a naval station, if you please, and it was desirable; but I can conceive of no obligation entailed upon us in behalf of the natives that demands of us to imperil our own interests for them.

Mr. WM. ALDEN SMITH. Would you advise doing that?

Mr. DINSMORE. Doing what?

Mr. WM. ALDEN SMITH. Retaining the island of Luzon as a naval station?

Mr. DINSMORE. I advise nothing in that regard; but I tell my friend that I do not think we need it. I do not think it is necessary. You have provided one naval station already by the treaty. You get one in Guam, you have Hawaii, and Pearl Harbor will be made a naval station, and I do not believe it is necessary for

our purposes of commerce or of defense. You want it as a strategic point, and you have got nothing to defend by it except the strategic point itself.

But, Mr. Chairman, the gentleman diverted me from the course of my thought. It is argued we must take them for their own preservation. Have gentlemen reflected upon what this involves? They do not reflect that before we have them in subjection we must keep our boys there, thousands of them, as they are going over there now, dying with pestilential and loathsome diseases, subject to be killed by the murderous inhabitants of those islands, many of whom are barbarians and cannibals. Their bleaching bones will whiten the plains of a thousand islands, the bones of our own boys, the sons of this happy land.

Do you want this? If this is your ambition, you will have it gratified. I would save my country from it, particularly when it brings us no single benefit, in my judgment. Those bones will be scattered wide, and you imperialists may gather them up and build of them a pyramid as a monument to your abandonment of Americanism, the safe ways of the Constitution, the sacred teachings of the Declaration of Independence; and I would have you inscribe upon it in grim letters of grinning skulls the language of the President, "Forcible annexation is criminal aggression." [Prolonged applause on the Democratic side.]

[Here the hammer fell.]

Mr. HULL. I yield one hour to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. GROSVENOR].

Mr. GROSVENOR. Mr. Chairman, I trust I may be able to discuss the momentous questions that are pending before this body with due reference to the solemnity of the occasion, the importance of the issues presented, and the far-reaching consequence that may follow our action.

I shall not approach this subject indifferent to the opinions of others. I shall not approach this question with vituperation or denunciation. I shall not attempt the flights of eloquence and oratory that entertained the House yesterday upon either side of this question, for reasons perfectly manifest to the whole body of the House. I could not if I would, and I would not if I could. There are matters here of so much importance that I deem it proper not to reply to all the arguments or many of the arguments that have been presented, but to point out as well as I may be able the position which I occupy in my capacity as a Representative upon this floor, bound by no action of any party and controlled by no impetus other than my own judgment.

I do not wonder that among the representatives of the American people there should be a wide, distinct, and antipodean divergence of opinion upon what is said to be the question involved here. In order that any man may justify himself in discussing the past, the present, or the future supposed policy of the Government it has seemed to be admitted that by inference we will assume certain facts to be decided upon, certain administrative purposes developed, and certain policies already marked out, against which we inveigh. I shall try to come back, as well as I am able to do so, to the questions that are actually now pending in this proposed legislation.

I do not wonder that gentlemen on that side, under the inspiration of the opposition, say that this pending legislation is an assault upon the liberties of the American people. We have lived under this form of government for more than a hundred years. During all that time, or nearly all that time, we have had a standing army, as it is called. We have had officers in the Army rise to enormous popularity and distinction, appear upon the stage of politics, retire, die, and leave nothing but a fragrant memory to the people of the country.

I challenge the side of this House that undertakes to arraign this side of the Chamber for a purpose which they themselves created, a man of straw which they themselves construct, that there is no purpose of the kind that they assume, and that in the history of this country there has never been any military officer or any civil officer who by his orders to the Army or militia has ever trespassed upon the rights, the privileges, and the immunities of the American people.

Men returned from the Army in the war with Mexico and became Presidential candidates and Presidents. They were citizens of the United States; they sought nothing but the applause of their fellow-citizens in the civil walks of life. They came from the battlefields of the civil war, men of enormous genius in war and wonderful popularity in peace; and yet no one of them ever failed, either in the Presidential office or in the halls of legislation or among the citizenship of the country, to draw the line closely and accurately between the domain of the military and civil authorities of the United States.

Only twice in the history of this country, so far as I now remember, has the Regular Army been used for any purpose other than opposition to the internal or external armed enemies of the Government. One of them was in the famous times when we sat here in midsummer horrified by the situation in a far distant State, in one of the great cities of the Union, when for the first time the law officer of the Government—a Democrat, a Democrat

of Democrats, a Democrat whose record as a Democrat was as unassailable as any in the Government—gave to the President of the United States a written opinion, that no lawyer has ever assailed, that it was his duty to send troops to Chicago.

He did send them; and if I was appealed to to select a single act of that Administration that commended it above all other acts, I would point it out as being his stern, inflexible desire to stand against any exercise of the military against the rights, privileges, and immunities of the citizenship of the country. So I appeal to the records and say they sustain me in saying that there is nobody in this country, great or small, who ever harbored the thought that there might be a time come when a popular expression of sentiment in the United States—as it was put by one gentleman on the other side, would be seen the calling out of the Regular Army of the country to suppress and crush that sentiment.

It is a mere man of straw. Nobody believes it. There is no gentleman on this floor that believes that any administration of this Government, or any fractional part of this Government, from the President down to the humblest sheriff of a county, has it in mind, nor is it in the range of human possibility that, without the direst necessity, troops will ever be called to suppress even an insurrection anywhere. It is a slander against the American people. I do not complain of anybody who, in the heat of debate, wants to ornament his speech, and who will bring forward something of a death's head and crossbones as something of a fright to the people of this country, but I deny that the American character is rightfully assailed by any such attack as that.

Now, Mr. Chairman, therefore, this much I have entered upon for the purpose of defense against this allegation. Who on this floor is more jealous than any other of the rights of the common people of this country? Do gentlemen on the other side assume to themselves all the virtue, all the guardianship of the common people? This side of the Chamber belongs to a party that started out with Abraham Lincoln, with the rail splitter of Illinois, and from that time to this has never elected a man President who did not come from the so-called common people of the country. We have never elected a single candidate of the distinguished aristocracy or plutocracy of the State of New York for President yet, and certainly have never repeated a nomination three or four times in succession, to our sorrow. [Laughter.]

Mr. Chairman, the question here is, Is there a necessity for legislation upon the subject of the reorganization of the Army? I shall refrain in my remarks from discussing the merits of this bill—I mean the details; I mean those provisions of it which will be open to discussion and amendment when we come to read the bill for amendment. There may be a difference of opinion here—doubtless there is; and I shall condemn nobody because he differs with me. I reserve to myself the right, as each current question arises, to dispose of it, so far as my vote and action are concerned, as I see fit, always keeping in mind that I shall support the great purpose of this bill in so far as I understand it.

Now, on yesterday I listened with some considerable interest to the fiercest, most powerful, and in form of expression the most vindictive of all the attacks that have ever been made on this floor upon the present Administration of the Government. I have no criticism of the gentleman's purpose or motive; he has a genius for the field into which he entered; he has capacity away beyond the action governed, in my judgment, by wise consideration. But I shall treat his argument, so far as I refer to it, as an argument made in perfect good faith, without any improper or ulterior purpose or motive.

I am not here to assail the gentleman, but I will try to point out that upon the very foundation of his speech and upon the foundation upon which he built the whole of that magnificent superstructure he laid down a false premise, an untrue declaration of conditions, and that, possibly without full knowledge of what he was saying, he made an argument which answered itself the very moment the intelligent mind recapitulates the history of the past few months. I will not refer to that now, but I want to go over briefly what has happened.

It is very easy, in a matter of this character, to stand to-day and say there were some things done last April that ought not to have been done at all, and it is just as easy, and a little easier, to say that there were some things done last April that ought to have been done differently from what they were done. I stood on this floor and received the arrows of criticism from both sides of the Chamber, and they were reiterated in the press of the country from many directions, that I was holding back—that is, that I was joined with those that were holding back the war.

Well, gentlemen, looking at the whole situation to-day, looking over the past history of my country since these eventful days of April, coming down to the present time, looking forward as well as I can, I am not only proud that I stood in the ranks of the men who are willing to go slow, but I almost wish the purposes of this Administration in averting war had been accomplished. But I dare scarcely say it—I dare scarcely say, looking as I now look upon the whole prospect ahead of us—I can hardly say that I

would like to have been even the humble instrument to seek effectually to turn aside the providence of Almighty God in the matter of our nation's action.

But it is unwise and impolitic, and without any force, to discuss the question whether we ought to have gone to war or not. We did go to war. We went to war with a purpose which I am going to undertake to show we have never deviated from. I know it is easy to stand up and say we went to war for humanity, we went to war to relieve the downtrodden, and suddenly became imperialists and aggressors. The facts do not justify the assertion. I tried to point out that in the declaration of war adopted in this House there is an absurd provision for which nobody would vote to-day if he had an opportunity. The Government, under the guiding hand of this Administration, has never deviated from the declared purpose of the Government at the time, and stands to-day executing, simply as he is bound to do, the orders and decrees of this Congress, and the orders and decrees of civilization, and the orders and decrees of Almighty God.

Mr. RICHARDSON. Will the gentleman allow me a question?
Mr. GROSVENOR. I have not the slightest objection. I have no manuscript.

Mr. RICHARDSON. I did not understand what part of the declaration of war the gentleman said no man would support to-day. Will he be a little more specific?

Mr. GROSVENOR. I will.
Mr. RICHARDSON. Was it the Teller provision?
Mr. GROSVENOR. The declaration that the people of Cuba were, and of right ought to be, free. I never voted to strike that out, although I made a little struggle on the other item. Speaking for myself, and I do not believe the gentleman from Tennessee differs with me on that point, I never could see how it was, if the people of Cuba were free and independent, we ought to go to war or have any fuss about it. But that was a tub to the whale of the Cuban republic.

Mr. GAINES and Mr. COX rose.
Mr. GROSVENOR. Now, I will take but one of you at a time. I started in on the great leader of the Tennessee delegation. I will take any one of the others, but not two at a time.

Mr. GAINES. Define your position.
Mr. GROSVENOR. If I fail to define it, that will be my misfortune, not my fault. What does my friend Mr. Cox desire? Whenever a gentleman with white hair gets up I always respect them.

Mr. COX. Oh, well, your hair is as white as mine. [Laughter.] White hair does not mean much. Now, I want to ask—

Mr. GROSVENOR. The trouble with the gentleman is that he does not appreciate a good thing when he hears it.

Mr. COX. The trouble with the gentleman from Ohio is that he does not appreciate anybody but himself. [Laughter.]

Mr. GROSVENOR. I started out with the best effort I was capable of to show my appreciation of my friend from Tennessee, and I have been so unfortunate as first to fail to make myself understood, and, second, to irritate him.

Mr. COX. Oh, there is no trouble about that. The gentleman is doing the best he can.

Mr. GROSVENOR. Yes; and he is not responsible for his failure to penetrate some places in this House. [Laughter.]

Mr. COX. No; I am not responsible—
Mr. GROSVENOR. Now, I am through with that. I decline to yield further for a colloquy of this kind. If the gentleman has anything to say to me about this subject, I will be glad to hear it.

Mr. COX. Well, if we have got down to a point where we can talk business, that is all right. [Laughter.]

Now, I want to call the gentleman's attention to this proposition; let us see what he has to say about it: What right have we to dictate to the people of the island of Cuba what kind of a government they shall have?

Mr. GROSVENOR. Well, that is straw which has been fairly well thrashed by pretty able gentlemen.

Mr. COX. Oh, yes; the straw is pretty well thrashed, but you did the striking. Now go on.

Mr. GROSVENOR. If the gentleman will let me make my own speech in my own way, without repeating these old, time-honored interrogatories, I will try to get along to his satisfaction, if my time holds out.

Mr. COX. Yes; but your time will not hold out. [Laughter.]

Mr. GROSVENOR. Mr. Chairman, I differ with the gentleman from Tennessee about his right to make me make one part of my speech at a time, to be directed by him. I propose to do the best I can in the hour allotted me, and I hope the gentleman will not use any more of it.

Mr. COX. I will not, because you can not get along anyway.

Mr. GROSVENOR. The gentleman has a lot of time which he says he reserved, and I have no doubt he will have a chance to be heard after a while.

Mr. Chairman, I was trying to proceed to say that the war

came; and now the very first act of the war that was war is the act which has brought us into collision with our friends on the other side; and the whole of the trouble originated on the 1st day of May, 1898. It has not been very long since there seemed to be throughout this country an organized effort to make one of the great heroes of this war a candidate for the Presidency in 1900. And looking at the matter from my standpoint, that shows great wisdom on the part of the Democratic party. Their necessities have come home to them, and they are looking about with intelligence and devotion to their country's interest and their party's good, and a great body of them, headed by one of the great leading journals of the South, nominated George Dewey to be the Democratic candidate for President.

But it was Dewey that got us into the whole of this trouble. I do not charge the other side of the House with the responsibility for Dewey's attack on Manila; because I am free to admit that at that time I barely knew, with a limited knowledge, where Manila was. But in this country we learn a great deal. My friend from Indiana now understands all about the people of Manila and the Philippine Islands, and he has come to be exceedingly fond of a gentleman over there by the name of Aguinaldo, or something to that effect; and he has baptized him on the floor of this House as a second George Washington.

At the time of Dewey's attack on the Spanish fleet in the harbor of Manila not one of us knew within a thousand, I venture to assert, how many islands were embraced within the archipelago, and not one of us would dare to have put his money or have entered into an obligation of any kind to venture an assertion that would have come within a very long distance of the facts. We did not know anything of the question, as a rule. It was not familiar talk with us, and the people of the country knew nothing of it. But the Navy of the United States knew what was required of it. The Navy Department had a duty to perform, and that duty was performed faithfully and well. The Navy Department informed the commander of our fleet in these eastern waters that the fleet of the enemy had gone into a certain bay; that this fleet belonged to an enemy of our country, with which we were at war, and there is but one single, short, curt statement embodying the order of the Navy Department: "Go and find the enemy's fleet—the fleet of the Spaniards—and capture or destroy it."

And the most brilliant page, Mr. Chairman, in the naval history of the United States, brilliant as the shining of the stars, glorious almost as the flag of the Union itself, was the answer of that splendid officer and of his men to that order. [Applause.] And when he had executed the order what could he do? He was powerless to get out of Manila Bay. His ships were so far disabled—they were so short of coal and naval supplies—that he was compelled to stay there. Is there anybody on the other side of the House who would undo what was done by that gallant officer? Is there anybody who would tear from the history of the American people that page of our history containing the operations of our naval forces in the harbor of Manila? Is there one, I ask, who would do so? Now, in this same connection, will my friend from Tennessee tell me—and not in my time, because I have but little time, but in his own time, for he is abundantly able to answer in that time, and I respectfully ask the question—will he tell me, will he tell this House, under what law, under what provision of international law, and under what provision or sentiment of public duty there could ever come a time while Spain resisted our authority when we could turn over to the Spanish Government the position and the territory we occupy in that oriental sea?

Now, then, Mr. Chairman, let us proceed a little further. The war went on. I will not discuss its glorious features. It is not necessary to do so. The history of the country will elaborate and enshrine them in its pages. I stand here to protest, in the name of the glory of my country, against the assaults which have been made upon our honor and our integrity. [Applause on the Republican side.] I will not discuss the question of the greatness or the comparative value of regulars or volunteer troops. It is not necessary that I should do so. Somebody said the volunteers did most of the fighting in other wars. That is true, as a matter of fact. But nobody who knows anything of the results of the wars in which this country has been engaged will undertake to assert here, on the floor of this House, that the proposition now pending is not one that is fraught with good and supreme importance to the people of the country. There is nobody who knows anything of war who will imperil his credibility by asserting that we could make fighting men of the volunteers of the country in four months' time and in the manner that has been suggested by the opponents of the pending bill.

It is true, Mr. Chairman, and we glory in the truth, that volunteers achieved military renown at Santiago. They carried the banner of the country with a valor that the history of the world does not excel in these bloody battles on the island of Cuba, and the wonder is not that so many mistakes were made, but the wonder is that the volunteers got there and so distinguished themselves in that noble charge and in the battles around Santiago, and cooperated so well with the forces of the Regular Army of

the United States and helped to carry the flag of the country to imperishable and undying victory. [Applause.] And I will not undertake to quarrel about the men who won that victory, whether volunteers or regulars. I will not enter into or be a commissioner to partition out the glory of Santiago between the men who were on the ground and who took part in that celebrated contest. I will not enter into a contest to partition the glory to any man or any set of men in the Army or in the Navy. It is enough to say that they did their full duty without question until disgraceful bickerings and recriminations began at home.

Mr. Chairman, I hope to live to see the day when the American people will find the man or set of men, from the highest to the lowest, who, either by inspiration or otherwise, have tarnished the name of the United States and its Army, punished, whoever they may be, whether high or low, with the whip of scorpions and the contempt of a free and honorable people. [Applause.] Let them be punished with the reprobation of a free people. [Applause.] We shall expect and hope that in these cases there will be full proof, not of any mistake—for I know something of mistakes; they may be made by everybody—not of inadvertence or anything of that kind, but there must be something shown of personal dereliction of duty which will be manifest to the American people; and then, Mr. Chairman, the time for punishment has come! And until the time has come we must uphold the flag of our country's honor. [Applause.]

Then came the close of the war. Oh, was it not a glorious day for the armies of the United States! It so happened that I came to the shores of my country, a passenger, coming up the magnificent bay of New York, that so charms even the citizens of the Old World as they approach that magnificent harbor. In the morning a paper appeared on the vessel, and I learned for the first time that a protocol of peace had been signed. There was nowhere on the continent on that day a John Hook to make outcry and complaint against it; nobody calling "Beef!" "Beef!" And I will stand here, and stop to say it, that I challenge any man on this side of the House or that side of the House to assert that the President of the United States, from the day the proclamation of war was signed to the date of the signing of the protocol of peace, failed in any duty in his high office that he was called upon to discharge. [Applause on the Republican side.]

For one hundred and twenty days and nights he kept up the almost sleepless vigil, and there stood behind him and by the side of him during all that time a man of whom I turn aside for a moment to speak, the head of the Department of the Adjutant-General, a soldier who volunteered at 17 years of age, and served from that day to this in all the gradations from a private soldier up through the lieutenantcies to be a brigadier-general and head of the great Adjutant-General's Department. No man on this continent ever did his duty better than did Henry C. Corbin. [Applause on the Republican side.] He was sleepless, untiring, just, intelligent, wise, and patriotic.

The President of the United States found himself with a protocol of peace submitted to him that nobody protested against, and he signed it, and he sent a commission. I am not here to utter fulsome praise, but that from the day when Franklin and Jay stood before the British commissioners to make the great peace that acknowledged our independence down to this day there never was an equal number of men who more fully and more grandly represented the best type of the best patriotism of the American people than did the Peace Commission at Paris. What did they meet there? They met the eyes of the world. They had no sentiment of politics. They had no thought of future political aggrandizement. One of them, I doubt not, fully understood when he took upon himself the high duty that he so grandly discharged that he was taking his political life in his hands, and that he would probably be sacrificed to an insensate opposition to the Administration of the Government. And if he thus prophesied, if he thus felt, the result has justified it. I am a partisan in politics. Sometimes I am charged with being too much so, but if I had it within my power, as a monument of the appreciation of the American people, GEORGE GRAY should be continued in a high position in this Government. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Now, what was done at Paris that ought not to have been done? What act? Has there been any criticism? Has anybody said that our peace commissioners ought, under the demand of Spain, to have surrendered those islands to the domination of Spain? And here our friends are confronted with a most troublesome question, and the differences of opinion are so wide and so irreconcilable that I shall only point them out. The gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. CARMACK] said the other day that he would have turned his back upon the islands and gone away; the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. JOHNSON] said yesterday in substance the same thing; and yet both of them are appealing to us from the standpoint of love of humanity. Love of humanity! A love of humanity that would have dictated that when we had our foot upon the neck of our fallen foe, we should have turned him loose to continue his barbarism of three hundred years upon the peaceful, liberty-loving citizens of the archipelago of the Philippines.

Mr. CARMACK. Will the gentleman permit me?

Mr. GROSVENOR. Certainly.

Mr. CARMACK. I made my statement that I believed the people of the United States ought to sail away from the city of Manila and from the Philippine Islands, not because I believed it would turn the people of those islands over to Spain, but because I knew that Spain has been practically driven from the islands, and that for the United States to leave the islands would simply be to turn them over to the people of the Philippines.

Mr. GROSVENOR. Why, the army of Spain, four times the size of our army there, is on the Philippine Islands to-day and has never been taken away, but would have been taken away long ago except for two reasons—two things which I will point out. First, because there sprang up a political idea in this country that assaults upon the Administration could be successfully made by the cry of "heathen" and "savages," and all that sort of thing, and because there was just intelligence enough in those savages to hope that that cry might drive the President of the United States to prepare to enforce his authority on those islands.

But I am coming along down. The gentleman from Indiana would give them liberty. And here I want to call the attention of the House and of the gentleman from Indiana, who I know will not fail to appreciate the fair purpose I have, at least. I listened yesterday with the utmost attention to every word of the gentleman's speech, and I understood him to say that when the treaty had been signed at Paris, or at some time during the pendency of the protocol of peace, if the President had sent some message to the Philippines, giving them some assurance of the kindly purpose of this Government toward the establishment of their rights and liberty, Aguinaldo would not have been an offensive element and that peace and harmony would have been the result.

Mr. JOHNSON of Indiana. I did not say it.

Mr. GROSVENOR. Well, that was the spirit of it. The complaint was twice made by the gentleman, as will appear in his speech when printed, a criticism of the President for having failed to make known to the Filipinos his purpose.

Mr. JOHNSON of Indiana. I criticise him for not making it known now.

Mr. GROSVENOR. Well, I will come to that, my friend, a little later.

Mr. JOHNSON of Indiana. I am simply trying to set you right.

Mr. GROSVENOR. Then let it be that way. That is better for my purpose by far. You are criticising the President because he has not yet let the Filipinos know what his purpose is. It would be a disgrace to us; and the President of the United States will never be a usurper of authority, if I know him. Quietly and with dignity he has discharged the duties of his office thus far without any encroachment upon the dignity and rights of Congress. Never once has he failed to recognize the authority of Congress; and I stand here to say that the sole and only power under the Constitution that William McKinley as President of the United States has the right to exercise in the islands of the Philippines is to take military possession of them and make known to them and this country his purpose in so doing—and as to all that is in the future, all that is to come after us, all of the future disposition of these great questions, the President of the United States is the adviser of Congress—and the right of veto; and beyond that he has nothing to do with these questions.

So the criticism of the President falls to the ground. He can not make war, but he can negotiate a treaty of peace. He has done so. He did not make the war, but he has negotiated the treaty of peace. He could send that treaty to the Senate of the United States and await their action, and even if the delay in that body shall fill a hundred thousand graves and make widows and orphans in this country, he is powerless to turn another wheel, except to exercise his right as Commander in Chief of the Army and hold these possessions until the treaty is acted upon. And let me tell gentlemen, not of this House, but in the country at large, ye who are clamoring for the prolongation of this struggle, ye who desire to defeat this treaty of peace—let me tell you that at your doors and upon your skirts will rest the blood of the men who are being sacrificed to-day in the Philippine Islands. [Loud applause on the Republican side.] The people of this country are not blind. They move slowly, but they move with unerring instinct, with the necessary results ahead of them.

Now let us see how the President has discharged his duty in the Philippines. He found himself by the accidents of war in possession of the Philippines. Do not quibble with me—

Mr. TERRY. Will the gentleman allow me to ask him a question right there? If we were in possession of the Philippine Islands, due to the magnificent victory of Dewey, why did our commissioners agree to pay \$20,000,000 for them?

Mr. GROSVENOR. Will the gentleman tell me another thing? When our flag was floating from the halls of the Montezumas, when she was bathed in the brine of the Gulf of Mexico, when we were in possession of Mexico by superior power, why did our

Government, in the spirit of magnanimity, give that country \$15,000,000? [Loud applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. TERRY. Why did not the gentleman answer my question, which is pertinent to this discussion, instead of asking me another?

Mr. GROSVENOR. That is the Yankee of it.

Mr. TERRY. Answer my question.

Mr. GROSVENOR. The trouble is my question answers your question.

Mr. TERRY. Will you answer me that question before the American people?

Mr. GROSVENOR. If the gentleman will keep quiet, I will answer his question.

Mr. TERRY. I ask the gentleman for information, because I know he has it.

Mr. GROSVENOR. There will be no evasion about it. We were in possession, constructively, of the Philippine Islands. We entered into a treaty stipulation which involved the turning over of certain public works, certain results of a recent expenditure of large sums of public money, and Spain lay crushed. The American people were proud and haughty, and they were generous and benevolent; and in the interest of appealing to the world that we were willing to deal justly, equitably, and generously with the Kingdom of Spain, they gave them \$20,000,000. [Renewed applause on the Republican side.]

Oh, my country, in the light of the magnificence of this war—

Mr. TERRY. If we had—

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Ohio declines to be further interrupted.

Mr. TERRY. I do not wonder that he declines to yield to further questions.

Mr. GROSVENOR. In the light of these days, in the light of the splendid achievements of the past, I will not discuss the question of the comparatively puny sum of \$20,000,000 that this commission has agreed to give.

But now I am going back to where I left off, to see whether the President of the United States has done that which the gentleman says he ought to have done. I hold in my hand an Executive proclamation dated on the 21st day of December, 1898, and addressed, through the Secretary of War, to the people of the Philippine Islands. And before I read this proclamation or any part of it, I beg that you will allow me to say that this unlung barbarian, this vile traitor who twice sold his country's honor for money, this gentleman who is so well depicted as a traitor of traitors, a man who has developed apparently the highest attributes of a bad man under the distinction made by a gentleman in New York some time ago, that "he wouldn't stay bought"—this man took that proclamation—

Mr. JOHNSON of Indiana. To whom does the gentleman refer?

Mr. GROSVENOR. To your George Washington II. [Laughter.]

Mr. JOHNSON of Indiana. That man was good enough to be our ally.

Mr. GROSVENOR. An ally ought to be true, and if he was our ally it was his duty to have stood with us to the end. Benedict Arnold was our ally, but did that prevent the American people from branding him for all time as the greatest criminal traitor that ever lived? Times change, but I want to show you, I was trying to show you, that this man took this proclamation of our President and, as is reported, burned it up and shot the men who attempted to publish it. I am going to read a little portion of it, but in my remarks I will publish the whole of it. Consider it as having been read, and let me comment on two or three points in it.

EXECUTIVE MANSION, Washington, December 21, 1898.

SIR: The destruction of the Spanish fleet in the harbor of Manila by the United States naval squadron commanded by Rear-Admiral Dewey, followed by the reduction of the city and the surrender of the Spanish forces, practically effected the conquest of the Philippine Islands and the suspension of Spanish sovereignty therein.

With the signature of the treaty of peace between the United States and Spain by their respective plenipotentiaries at Paris on the 10th instant and as the result of the victories of American arms, the future control, disposition, and government of the Philippine Islands are ceded to the United States. In fulfillment of the rights of sovereignty thus acquired and the responsible obligations of government thus assumed, the actual occupation and administration of the entire group of the Philippine Islands become immediately necessary, and the military government heretofore maintained by the United States in the city, harbor, and bay of Manila is to be extended with all possible dispatch to the whole of the ceded territory.

In performing this duty the military commander of the United States is enjoined to make known to the inhabitants of the Philippine Islands that, in succeeding to the sovereignty of Spain, in severing the former political relations of the inhabitants and in establishing a new political power, the authority of the United States is to be exerted for the security of the persons and property of the people of the islands, and for the confirmation of all their rights and relations. It will be the duty of the commander of the forces of occupation to announce and proclaim in the most public manner that we come, not as invaders or conquerors, but as friends to protect the natives in their homes, in their employments, and in their personal and religious rights. All persons who, either by active aid or by honest submission, cooperate with the Government of the United States to give effect to these beneficent purposes will receive the reward of its support and protection. All others will be brought within the lawful rule we have assumed, with firmness if need be, but with out severity so far as may be possible.

Within the absolute domain of military authority, which necessarily is and must remain supreme in the ceded territory until the legislation of the United States shall otherwise provide, the municipal laws of the territory in respect to private rights and property and the repression of crime are to be considered as continuing in force, and to be administered by the ordinary tribunals, so far as practicable. The operations of civil and municipal government are to be performed by such officers as may accept the supremacy of the United States by taking the oath of allegiance, or by officers chosen, as far as may be practicable, from the inhabitants of the islands.

While we control all the public property and the revenues of the State passes with the cession, and while the use and management of all public means of transportation are necessarily reserved to the authority of the United States, private property, whether belonging to individuals or corporations, is to be respected, except for cause duly established. The taxes and duties heretofore payable by the inhabitants to the late Government become payable to the authorities of the United States, unless it be seen fit to substitute for them other reasonable rates or modes of contribution to the expenses of Government, whether general or local. If private property be taken for military use, it shall be paid for, when possible, in cash, at a fair valuation, and when payment in cash is not practicable receipts are to be given.

All ports and places in the Philippine Islands in the actual possession of the land and naval forces of the United States will be opened to the commerce of all friendly nations. All goods and wares not prohibited for military reasons, by due announcement of the military authority, will be admitted upon payment of such duties and other charges as shall be in force at the time of their importation.

Finally, it should be the earnest and paramount aim of the military administration to win the confidence, respect, and affection of the inhabitants of the Philippines by assuring to them in every possible way that full measure of individual rights and liberties which is the heritage of free peoples, and by proving to them that the mission of the United States is one of benevolent assimilation, substituting the mild sway of justice and right for arbitrary rule. In the fulfillment of this high mission, supporting the temperate administration of affairs for the greatest good of the governed, there must be sedulously maintained the strong arm of authority, to repress disturbance and to overcome all obstacles to the bestowal of the blessings of good and stable government upon the people of the Philippine Islands under the free flag of the United States.

WILLIAM MCKINLEY.

TO THE SECRETARY OF WAR.

With the signature of the treaty of peace between the United States and Spain by their respective plenipotentiaries at Paris on the 10th instant, and as the result of the victories of American arms, the future control, disposition, and government of the Philippine Islands are ceded to the United States.

Ceded by whom? By the terms of the treaty. Now that we are there in constructive possession, no matter if we have not got a soldier on every square foot, under the law of nations when the power holding the sovereignty yielded to us one foot of land there our authority extended clear back to the verge of the country.

Now, first he points out to the Filipinos what has been done, what has been the legal result of the transfer by the Spanish Government to the United States, and now he tells them what the effect is upon them:

The authority of the United States is to be exerted for the security of the persons and property of the people of the islands and for the confirmation of all their rights and relations.

What do you say to that? What rights and what relations? The President of the United States was not defining their rights; he had no power to do it. He was not defining their relations; he had no power to do it. The President said to them, "We come to take possession of that which has been surrendered to us by Spain, and we give notice to you that your rights shall be protected."

Then he goes further:

It will be the duty of the commander of the forces of occupation to announce and proclaim in the most public manner that we come, not as invaders or conquerors, but as friends, to protect the natives in their homes, in their employments, and in their personal and religious rights.

What more could you do than that? There is no other alternative, no other thing to do, except when Spain had signed the treaty, and it had been ratified, to turn the islands over and run away from them. And when this nation does it, the men or set of men who bring it about will be damned for all eternity, the nation will be disgraced, until the Cuban republic will be an honor among the nations of the earth in comparison. [Applause.]

Within the absolute domain of military authority, which necessarily is and must remain supreme in the ceded territory until the legislation of the United States shall otherwise provide.

That is all there was of it, and that is all there is of it.

Finally—

Says the President—

Finally, it should be the earnest and paramount aim of the military administration to win the confidence, respect, and affection of the inhabitants of the Philippines by assuring to them in every possible way that full measure of individual rights and liberties which is the heritage of free peoples.

And that, says the President of the United States, is the purpose for which our Army has gone there, and, Mr. Chairman, while the world shall stand, while intelligent judgment of men shall be brought to bear upon the things on earth, the intelligent judgment of mankind will say that but for the two things I have spoken of there would have been peace and cooperation in the Philippines to-day. Early in the campaign the eruption began in New England, and broke out again when Carnegie shouted, and some other persons came over and with a conglomeration of political ideas began to agitate the American people; and here stood the Representative that to-day is insulting and demanding of the

President of the United States that he shall define his position, telegraphing or sending his communications to the Philippines all that had been done, and the resistance of the ratification of the treaty of peace became the watchword of a great body in this country.

Then it was for the first time that any considerable opposition to the power and the authority of the American Army and the American Administration to establish and protect the personal, religious, and property rights of the people of these islands was resisted by Aguinaldo and his people. To-day Admiral Dewey sends word—I meant to have brought it here and read it—in a letter to his nephew, "If you will ratify the treaty of peace and teach these fellows that they will not be supported by a great political party in the United States"—I am giving the substance—"there will be an end of strife, and peace will be established." [Applause.]

Great God of my country! Is party necessity and personal hostility of so much value in this country that the peace of the country is to be destroyed? Is the party politics of this country a matter of so great importance that it is wise and just to impede the progress of this Union toward the settlement of these mighty questions?

The gentleman from Indiana says that Porto Rico is satisfied with our occupation; but there is in that case just as good an illustration as in the other of the failure of the governed to give their consent. I hope the gentleman will not tell the General of the Army that he only went over there to receive the assent of the Porto Rican people. The fact about it was that the Porto Rican people found an army there too strong for their resistance; they did not like Spain very well anyhow, and they said, "We can not go to war with the United States;" and "the consent of the governed" was found when twelve, fifteen, or seventeen thousand magnificent troops were marching over the island in the direction of San Juan.

A gentleman over here says—

Mr. JOHNSON of Indiana. Does the gentleman from Ohio take the ground that the people of Porto Rico are opposed to our domination?

Mr. GROSVENOR. No, indeed. And if your friend Aguinaldo were only in purgatory the people of the Philippines would stand side by side shouting with the people of Porto Rico to-day. [Applause.]

Before my time shall expire, as I do not want to be accused of not answering a question of the gentleman from Tennessee (I hope he hears me) I will answer him now. He wants to know what right we have in Cuba to send troops there. Why, let me say to the gentleman that we were all unanimous about one thing. We said we were not going to own Cuba. I am ready to take that back whenever we have a fair expression of the will of the governed. And we said: "We are going there to establish a stable government." Well, under the treaty Spain got out; and we had a right to go ahead and do that which was the keynote of our war with Spain; that is what we did.

Mr. CARMACK. To what gentleman from Tennessee is the gentleman from Ohio now referring?

Mr. GROSVENOR. The older gentleman, the more—well, the man of longest experience. [Laughter.]

So we have gone to Cuba under the very terms of our proclamation of war; and to-day I have received a letter, which I hold in my hand, stating that there are 28,000 Spanish troops in the province of Santa Clara getting away as fast as they can. And we are sending troops there to preserve order. And what else are we doing? We are putting the native Cubans into such power and places as they are fit to occupy. They are building railroads and telegraphs.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Ohio has expired.

Mr. GROSVENOR. I wish I had five minutes more.

Mr. HULL. I am crowded tremendously for time; but I will yield the gentleman five minutes more.

Mr. GROSVENOR. And we are giving to that island the hope of the future, which they never had before. Is it possible that in this country there is a great political party, or a great body of men—I will not say a political party—unwilling that the blessings of our Government shall be extended to the Philippine Islands?

Mr. Chairman, all this must be done by the American people by some sort of concord in support of the Administration of the Government. I was led to say what I did say personal to the President of the United States because I felt there ought to be here something in the form of a challenge to any man to say, first, that the President had deviated from the course mapped out for him by Congress, or, second, to assert that he has usurped any authority that he was not compelled to assume. And above all else I desired to say that in my humble judgment the future of the Philippines is a question for the future.

The question now is our duty to-day. All that is to come in the future is a question that stands behind the veil. The vast curtains that veil the future are all luminous to me with the glories

of coming day. And I shall answer now once more the gentleman from Indiana by saying that it would have been a usurpation upon the part of the President to send to Congress a statement that he desired to do this or that in relation to the Philippine Islands at this time. He has done his whole duty. Assaults upon him fall as broken arrows at the foot of his integrity, his patriotism, and his great leadership of the mighty hosts of the majority of the American people. [Applause.]

Mr. CARMACK. I would like to ask the gentleman a question. I understood him to say that it would be impossible for the President of the United States to make any statement to Congress with reference to the policy of his Administration toward the Philippine Islands?

Mr. GROSVENOR. The policy in the future, as to the disposition of the islands, until after the ratification of this treaty. Until that time it would be brutum fulmen—nothing but the declaration of a man undertaking to act outside of his jurisdiction.

Mr. CARMACK. Would it not be just as proper for the President to send a recommendation to Congress with reference to the Philippines as to send his recommendation, as he did, with reference to Cuba—to state his views, his policy? Why should he not say with reference to the Philippine Islands as he did with reference to Cuba, "Forcible annexation would be criminal aggression"?

Mr. GROSVENOR. Would it not be a beautiful spectacle—Mr. CARMACK. I think it would be—beautiful.

Mr. GROSVENOR. Would it not be a beautiful spectacle to put forward to the world a plan of action when the defining of that plan of action is exclusively the duty of Congress, and while Congress has in its possession the open question whether we shall have war or peace in the future?

Mr. CARMACK. The case was the same with reference to Cuba, but the President made a statement of his policy with reference to that island.

Mr. GROSVENOR. The President has made no statement of his policy with regard to Cuba since the treaty was signed.

Mr. CARMACK. He did. He said that "forcible annexation would be criminal aggression."

Mr. GROSVENOR. That was before the war and the treaty. The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Ohio has expired.

Mr. GROSVENOR. I add one of the most unanswerable arguments upon all these questions yet made in this country. The author is an eminent lawyer, and his arguments are of priceless value.

[Address by Charles A. Gardiner on the question of expansion.]

THE CONSTITUTIONALITY AND VALIDITY OF THE ADMINISTRATION'S POLICY DEFENDED—OTHER PAPERS.

ALBANY, January 18, 1899.

The State Bar Association opened its second day's session at 10.30 o'clock. Charles A. Gardiner, of New York, was the first speaker. His address was on "Our right to acquire and hold foreign territory." It follows:

The sovereign nations of the world possess equal rights and equal powers. Their equality is perfect, their independence absolute. Between them national constitutions are unknown. In external or international relations the United States is assumed by all other sovereignties to possess absolute powers, unrestrained by constitutional limitations. That assumption is correct, based upon the fundamental canon of the law of nations. The United States may ratify its proposed treaty with Spain, and no other nation has any right to question its political or constitutional authority to do so.

Are there, therefore, no limitations on our national sovereignty? During the colonial period, as Mr. Justice Fredell explained, the British monarchs were sovereign, and the colonists their subjects; but after the Revolution sovereignty passed to and vested in the people (3 Dall., 93), and there it remains vested to-day in the 75,000,000 American citizens, not as individuals, but as a political and sovereign unit. Historically this unit preceded both State and Federal constitutions. It created them.

The Declaration of Independence, the supreme act of sovereignty, gave birth to the nation, while the Constitution gave form to its government. The Constitution is but a law of the people, distributing, not creating, sovereign powers among the several organs of sovereignty. A vast residuum of power, not disposed of by the Constitution, is "reserved to the States, respectively, or to the people" (Article X).

Although the distinction is not expressly made in the Constitution, the consensus of decisions for a century, as well as the logic of the situation, makes the following deductions irresistible: In all internal and domestic relations the States possess the sovereignty originally vested in the people, except such as the Constitution specifically grants to the Federal Government; where there is no such grant the National Government has no power; authority resides in the State governments exclusively. In all external and international relations the rule is reversed. The Federal Government possesses every sovereign power not expressly prohibited by the Constitution. If the Constitution is silent, the Federal Government, directly representing the sovereign people, is duly constituted agent and trustee to exercise such sovereignty. The States have no national powers whatever.

Early in the century Chief Justice Marshall announced as a proposition which should "command the universal assent of mankind," that the Government of the Union "is supreme within its sphere of action. * * * It is the Government of all; its powers are delegated by all; it represents all, and acts for all." (4 Wheat., 405.)

Chief Justice Chase reiterated this sentiment: "The people of the United States constitute one nation under one Government, and this Government within the scope of its powers is supreme." (7 Wall., 73.)

The idea was elaborated by Mr. Justice Bradley: "The United States is not only a government * * * it is invested with power over all the foreign relations of the country, war, peace, and negotiations and intercourse with other nations, all which are forbidden to the State governments." (12 Wall., 505.)

In the Chinese exclusion cases the court held: "The United States, in their

relation to foreign countries, are one nation invested with powers which belong to independent nations." (130 U. S., 604.)

And Mr. Justice Lamar in the Neagle case used this language: "The Federal Government is the exclusive representative and embodiment of the entire sovereignty of the nation in its united character. * * * In our intercourse with foreign nations, States and State governments and the internal adjustment of Federal power, with its complex system of checks and balances, are unknown, and the only authority those nations are permitted to deal with is the authority of the nation as a unit." (135 U. S., 81.)

RIGHT TO ACQUIRE TERRITORY.

I. *Right to acquire.*—The United States possessing every attribute of the most potential sovereignty, and, in the felicitous language of Mr. Justice Lamar, the Federal Government in all external relations being "the exclusive representative and embodiment of the entire sovereignty of the nation," it follows that any power possessed by any sovereignty is possessed by the United States; and unless specifically prohibited by the Constitution can be exercised without restriction by the Federal Government.

The war and treaty making powers are not created by the Constitution; it merely designates agencies to exercise them. No one assumes that had such agencies not been designated this nation could not have waged the wars and made the treaties of our history. The nation needs no express grant of power for an international act, and it has specific authority for extremely few. It had none when it laid the embargo act of 1807, nor when it extended sovereignty over Bering Sea or the Guano Islands.

The right to acquire territory irrespective of its situs, contiguous or foreign, by conquest, treaty, purchase, or discovery, is an acknowledged and well-established attribute of sovereignty, and has been exercised by sovereigns from the beginning of recorded history. No one pretends that the right is specifically renounced in the Constitution. Hence it remains an attribute of the sovereign people, and Congress and the President, the sole agents and trustees of that sovereignty, have exclusive and unrestricted right to exercise it.

I advance the proposition with deference that this right is itself a primary and substantive attribute of sovereignty, as is the right of national existence or self-defense, and I shall regard it in this discussion as the primary and fundamental authority for territorial expansion.

The right to acquire is also derived from the enumerated constitutional powers to declare war and to make treaties. "The Constitution confers absolutely on the Government of the Union the powers of making war and of making treaties," said Chief Justice Marshall, first advancing the theory; "consequently that Government possesses the power of acquiring territory either by conquest or by treaty." (1 Pet., 512.)

"The power of the United States to acquire new territory by cession or conquest," in the opinion of Mr. Justice Story, "does not depend upon any specific grant in the Constitution to do so, but flows as an incidental power from its sovereignty over war and treaties." (Constitution, section 1287.)

And Mr. Justice Bradley, in the Mormon Church Case, said: "The power to acquire territory * * * is derived from the treaty-making power and the power to declare and carry on war. The incidents of these powers are those of national sovereignty, and belong to all independent governments." (136 U. S., 42.)

The right to acquire was also derived by Chief Justice Taney from the express power of Congress to admit new States. "The power to expand the territory of the United States by the admission of new States is plainly given," he said. "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." (19 How., 47.)

RIGHT TO HOLD AND GOVERN IT.

II. *Right to hold and govern.*—Possessing the right to acquire territory, it follows as an inevitable consequence that we also possess the right to hold, and hence to govern it. (Story, Const., section 1324.)

In 1810 Chief Justice Marshall announced these views: "The power of governing and of legislating for a Territory is the inevitable consequence of the right to acquire and to hold territory." (6 Cranch., 336.)

"And whatever may be the source whence the power is derived," he said, "in a later case, 'the possession of it is unquestioned.'" (1 Pet., 512.)

"It would be absurd," was the opinion of Mr. Justice Bradley, "to hold that the United States has power to acquire territory and no power to govern it when acquired." (136 U. S., 42-44.)

Mr. Justice Matthews said, of our right to hold and govern: "That question is, we think, no longer open to discussion. It has passed beyond the stage of controversy into final judgment." (114 U. S., 44.)

And Mr. Justice Gray, in a recent case, thus summarized the law: "The United States having rightfully acquired the Territories * * * have the entire dominion and sovereignty, national and municipal, Federal and State, over all the Territories." (152 U. S., 48.)

The right to acquire being a primary attribute of sovereignty, and the right to hold and govern being ancillary thereto, it follows that wherever our sovereignty extends, there our right to acquire, and hence to hold and govern, extends also. The situs of the territory is immaterial; it may be contiguous or remote; on the American continent or in foreign lands. Our abstract right to acquire and hold is as plenary and sovereign in the Philippines as in Alaska or Arizona.

POLITICAL QUESTIONS.

III. *All problems of expansion political, not constitutional or judicial.*—Before considering the concrete application of these rights, it is important to determine their precise governmental character. Are they political or judicial? The public mind is so confused on all problems of expansion that it bases every objection thereto on assumed violations of the Constitution. Political questions differ from judicial in that none but the sovereigns can determine them. A sovereign decides by his own will, sic volo, sic jubeo. A court decides according to the law prescribed by the sovereign. Political power is that which a sovereign exerts by its own authority; judicial power is that which a sovereign grants to its own courts. Political power is sovereign and plenary, while judicial power is derivative and limited.

"The maintenance and extension of our national dominion" is a political and not a judicial problem. The reasons are thus stated: "The President and Congress are vested with all the responsibility and powers of the Government for the determination of questions as to the maintenance and extension of our national dominion. It is not the province of the courts to participate in the discussion or decision of these questions, for they are of a political nature and not judicial. Congress and the President having assumed jurisdiction and sovereignty, * * * all the people and courts of the country are bound by such governmental acts." (50 Fed. Rep., 110.)

The acquisition of territory by treaty is, therefore, political and nonjudicial. The Senate can ratify, reject, or modify any treaty. There is no limitation upon its treaty-making powers. It modified a draft treaty with England in 1795, with France in 1801, with Norway and Sweden in 1818, with Mexico in 1848, and with Bolivia in 1862. It rejected many, among them the treaty of arbitration with England in 1896, and many it has ratified without change. The action of the President and Congress will be final as to all international and political phases of the pending treaty. If a court could

modify or annul a treaty in these respects, it could, as suggested by Mr. Justice Miller, "annul declarations of war, suspend the levy of armies, and become a great international arbiter instead of a court of justice for the administration of the laws of the United States." (1 Woolw., 150.) And referring particularly to the acquisition of new territory by treaty, the Supreme Court said: "This court has solemnly and repeatedly declared that this was a matter peculiarly belonging to the cognizance of the legislative and executive departments, and that the propriety of their determination was not within the province of the judiciary to contravene or question." (9 How., 153.)

All questions also incident to acquisition and preliminary to government, whether the territory be contiguous or remote; whether our tenure be temporary or permanent; whether we keep, or give back, or sell, or lease—these are all political problems, intrusted without appeal to the discretion of Congress. (14 Pet., 538; 9 How., 242; 18 Wall., 320; 101 U. S., 133.)

CONSTITUTION NOT INVOLVED.

The same is emphatically true of the government of new territory. It belongs, as the Supreme Court has ruled, "primarily to Congress, and secondarily to such agencies as Congress may establish" (18 Wall., 319). "Territories are not organized under the Constitution, * * * but are creations exclusively of the legislative department, and subject to its supervision and control" (9 How., 242). "Congress has full and complete legislative authority over the people of the Territories and all the departments of the Territorial governments" (101 U. S., 132). In ordaining Territorial governments "all the discretion which belongs to legislative power is vested in Congress" (114 U. S., 44). Also, "In a Territory all the functions of government are within the legislative jurisdiction of Congress" (86 Fed. R., 459). And finally, all Territorial powers "are created by Congress, and all Territorial acts "are subject to Congressional supervision" (139 U. S., 446).

Hence, again, whether our new territory be organized or unorganized, governed directly or indirectly, temporarily or permanently; whether the Constitution and Federal statutes be made operative, or new rules and regulations be enacted—these and all other problems of government are political and not judicial.

IV. *Concrete application of rights—Extent and means of exercise.*—Our abstract rights and their governmental character being thus determined, we will next consider their concrete application, and the extent to which and the means by which they can be exercised.

The power to "dispose of territory," under Article IV, section 3, of the Constitution, is not alternative to the power to rule and regulate. Both powers are granted and are unlimited (8 Wheat., 589). Congress can "dispose of" Porto Rico or the Philippines as unreservedly as it can dispose of personal property; the prizes, for example, captured in the late war (14 Pet., 538). We may cede the Philippines to the inhabitants thereof, as a gift, or on such terms as may be agreed. We may let them to tenants, as China is leasing its ports to European powers. We may sell them to any bidder—England, Germany, Japan—as Russia sold Alaska to us.

The right to acquire territory being a primary attribute of sovereignty, and being therefore general and plenary, and the right to hold, and hence to govern, being a corollary of the right to acquire, it follows that such right, irrespective of the Constitution, belongs to the United States as fully and completely as a similar right could belong to any sovereign nation. So far as rights are concerned, if England can hold, and hence govern, colonies, so can we. If Russia has the right to exercise sovereignty over Port Arthur, we have an equal right of sovereignty to rule the Philippines.

In the absence of constitutional provision, this attribute of sovereignty might have been exercised by the Executive, by Congress, or by both. But the Constitution specifically designates Congress as the sole agent of sovereignty "to make all needful rules and regulations respecting the territory of the United States" (Article IV, section 3); and the decisions of the Supreme Court are uniform that these words alone empower Congress to regulate or rule territories in the manner and by the means it chooses—ranging from a joint protectorate, such as we extend over Samoa, to a fully organized Territorial government, such as we maintain in Arizona.

SAMOA AND GUANO ISLANDS.

In 1872 Pango Pango Harbor, by a treaty of cession, was "given up to the American Government," but until recently we had not even established our sovereignty over the harbor, merely exercising a protectorate over Samoa jointly with England and Germany. (1 Whart. Dig., 436.) The guano act declares that any island discovered by an American citizen shall be "considered as appertaining to the United States." (U. S. Rev. Stat., section 5570.) Under this act we hold and exercise not merely a protectorate, but actual, though tenuous, governmental authority over Navassa, Roncados, Howland, Baker, and several other guano islands. (137 U. S., 206, 647; 25 Fed. R., 675; 44 Barb., 23.)

PROVISIONAL GOVERNMENTS.

The President now maintains provisional military governments in Cuba, Porto Rico, and the Philippines—provisional upon the ratification of the treaty and upon the subsequent action of Congress. Upon ratification, and until Congress makes "rules and regulations," the President may continue these governments. Many precedents are furnished by our history—during and after the Mexican war in Tamaulipas and California, and after the rebellion in Florida, Alabama, and Arkansas from 1865 to 1868, in Mississippi and Georgia from 1865 to 1870, and in Virginia and Texas from 1865 to 1870.

The President may also, in his discretion, abolish military rule and establish provisional civil governments—provisional again until Congress enacts "rules and regulations." Such was the first and only American civil government established in California prior to statehood. (16 How., 193.) Concerning it the Supreme Court said: The civil government of California "had its origin in the lawful exercise of a belligerent right over a conquered territory. * * * It did not cease as a matter of course or as a necessary consequence of the restoration of peace. The President might have dissolved it by withdrawing the army and navy officers who administered it, but he did not do so. Congress could have put an end to it, but that was not done. The right interference from the inaction of both is that it was meant to be continued until it had been legislatively changed. * * * It must be presumed that the delay was consistent with the true policy of the Government." This provisional civil government was continued after the treaty of peace until California was admitted to the Union and its legality and powers were sustained by the Supreme Court. (16 How., 190.) Until Congress acts it will be the duty of the President under his war power to maintain in the ceded territory such military or civil rule as he chooses (29 Wall., 304; 16 How., 190), and the precedents furnish him ample political and judicial support.

COLONIES DEFINED.

Congress, however, whenever it determines to exercise its prerogatives, can govern the new acquisitions as "organized" or "unorganized" territories, directly or indirectly, temporarily or permanently. "Dependencies" or "provinces," as defined by our courts, are territories already partially or wholly settled, distinct from the sovereign State, but belonging to it and subject to the laws and regulations it may prescribe (3 Wash. C. C. Rep., 286). "Colonies" are territories settled by citizens of the sovereign or parent State (3 Wash. C. C. Rep., 286); "unions of citizens or subjects who have left their

country to people another and remain subject to the mother country" (Bouv., Tit. Colony). Porto Rico and the Philippines, already densely populated and affording no opportunity for American colonization, can not, under our decisions, be strictly designated "colonies."

TERRITORIES DEFINED.

"Organized territories" are portions of the public domain over which Congress has extended our Constitution and laws, and has established a system of organized local government, such as Arizona, New Mexico, and Oklahoma (Rev. Stat., sections 1839-1895). "Unorganized territories" possess no organized local government, are usually not subject to our Constitution and laws, and are ruled directly by Congress. Such are Alaska and Indian Territory. Territories, dependencies, and provinces are in our jurisprudence practically synonymous terms. "Territories" in legal contemplation are organized or unorganized dependencies or provinces. The phrase has been incorporated in our political and judicial history for a century, and if we should designate Hawaii, Cuba, Porto Rico, and the Philippines as "territories" it would be more in harmony with American institutions than to style them "colonies."

CONGRESS HAS ABSOLUTE POWER OVER TERRITORIES.

Congress has the same power over its public domain as over any other property belonging to the United States (29 Fed. R., 305; 14 Pet., 537; 18 Wall., 319; 136 U. S., 42). "This power," said the Supreme Court, "is vested in Congress without limitation, and has been considered the foundation upon which Territorial governments rest" (14 Pet., 537). The Supreme Court early announced the comprehensive principle that "Territories are not organized under the Constitution nor subject to its complex distribution of the powers of government as the organic law, but are the creations exclusively of the legislative department and subject to its supervision and control" (9 How., 242).

Chief Justice Waite, sustaining this power of Congress, said: "All territory within the jurisdiction of the United States not included in any State must, necessarily, be governed by or under the authority of Congress. * * * It has full and complete legislative authority over the people of the Territories and all the departments of the Territorial governments" (101 U. S., 132). In a later case the court decided that "in ordaining government for the Territories all the discretion which belongs to the legislative power is vested in Congress" (114 U. S., 44).

"The power of Congress over all Territories is general and plenary," said Mr. Justice Bradley (136 U. S., 42). And the court, summarizing the whole matter, announced this opinion through Mr. Justice Brewer: "A territory is a political community, organized by Congress, all whose powers are created by Congress, and all whose acts are subject to Congressional supervision" (139 U. S., 446).

Under this full and comprehensive authority the form of local civil government first compels attention. It is absolutely in Congressional discretion. "All the discretion which belongs to legislative power is vested in Congress," said the Supreme Court, "and that extends * * * to determining by law from time to time the form of the local government in a particular Territory" (114 U. S., 44). "There can be no question," said Judge Dawson, "of the authority of Congress to enact such forms of Territorial government within the Territories as it may choose or deem best" (29 Fed. R., 205).

MAY RULE FROM WASHINGTON.

All the functions of government being within legislative discretion, Congress may exercise them directly from Washington, or indirectly through organized local rule. (86 Fed. Rep., 459; 18 Wall., 319; 114 U. S., 44.) It may, as succinctly put by Judge Morrow, "legislate in accordance with the separate needs of each locality, and vary its regulations to meet the conditions and circumstances of the people." (86 Fed. Rep., 459.)

In the language of Chief Justice Waite, "Congress may not only abrogate laws of the Territorial legislatures, but it may itself legislate directly for the local government. It may make a void act of the Territorial legislature valid and a valid act void." (101 U. S., 132.) It is true that Congress, with few exceptions, has not directly enacted the municipal laws of Territories, but this is a matter of legislative discretion, not a constitutional obligation, and Congress may, if it chooses, enact at Washington all municipal laws for Hawaii, Porto Rico, and the Philippines, as it does now for the District of Columbia and Alaska. (152 U. S., 48; 101 U. S., 133; 114 U. S., 44; 1 Dedy, 31; 86 Fed. Rep., 459.)

OUR FORMER COLONIES.

Under the ordinance of 1787, as subsequently modified, the Territories of Ohio, Mississippi, Indiana, Michigan, and Illinois had a governor, judges, and council appointed or selected by Congress; governments as purely colonial, except for a Delegate in Congress, as any to-day maintained by England, Germany, or France.

Orleans Territory, a part of the Louisiana purchase, existed from 1803 to 1811, and furnished another example of colonial administration—a local legislature, a governor exercising the functions of the old Spanish intendant, a judiciary administering the old Spanish code—all appointed by the President; Federal statutes operative only in criminal cases, and a separate port law for New Orleans (2 How., 344).

Of it, Nicholson, of Delaware, said: "It is in the nature of a colony whose commerce may be regulated without any reference to the Union." "It was a startling bill," remarks Benton, "continuing the existing Spanish government, putting the President in the place of the King of Spain, putting all the Territorial officers in the place of the King's officers, and placing the appointment of all these officers in the President alone." Yet the validity of the Orleans government was repeatedly sustained by the Supreme Court (2 How., 344; 3 How., 589; 13 Wall., 434). In many respects it might furnish an acceptable model of civil rule by Congress for Porto Rico, the Philippines, and even Hawaii.

ALASKA NOW A COLONY.

Alaska was ceded to us in 1867 without any treaty covenants for future admission as a State. The Constitution and Federal laws have not been made operative therein, and only such statutes have been extended over it as circumstances gradually required. It is an unorganized territory, governed directly from Washington (U. S. Rev. Stat., section 1954). Physically it is foreign territory, its nearest point being 400 miles and its farthest point 2,400 miles from Seattle. The Aleutian Islands extend even into the geographical limits of another continent. For thirty-two years a few judicial and executive, but no legislative functions of government have been conferred upon the inhabitants. "Congress," said Judge Dawson, "could confer upon Alaska such powers, judicial and executive, as they deemed most suitable to the inhabitants. It was unquestionably within the constitutional power of Congress to withhold from the inhabitants of Alaska the power to legislate and make laws." (29 Fed. R., 205.)

CAN HOLD TERRITORIES PERMANENTLY.

The right to govern Territories temporarily or permanently is equally in the discretion of Congress. The opponents of expansion urge, however, that every foot of soil acquired by this nation is impressed with a trust or franchise of statehood, and that the Constitution prohibits its acquisition except

for such ultimate purpose. The permissive language of Article IV, section 3, is construed as mandatory. It is said to be unconstitutional to hold territory, even temporarily, except "in a state of pupillage," as Judge Bradley expressed it, in preparation for eventual statehood.

DRED SCOTT CASE.

This objection is based exclusively upon the decision of the Supreme Court in the Dred Scott case. Chief Justice Taney's words are now historic: "There is certainly no power given by the Constitution to the Federal Government," he said, "to establish or maintain colonies bordering on the United States or at a distance, to be ruled and governed at its own pleasure, nor to enlarge its territorial limits in any way except by the admission of new States. That power is plainly given. * * * It has been held to authorize the acquisition of territory not fit for admission at the time, but to be admitted. * * * It is acquired to become a State, and not to be held as a colony." (19 How., 446, 447.)

First. I am of opinion that this declaration is not a dictum, as often contended, but a vital part of the decision: an essential step in an elaborate argument; a point necessarily involved in deciding that the Missouri Compromise was unconstitutional and Dred Scott a slave and not a citizen.

Second. The Dred Scott decision has never been judicially reiterated. No court ever concurred in it. It precipitated the civil war. It is stamped with the bad eminence of antebellum conflicts. Its very title is odious, and sends a shudder through a reunited people. Such is the only decision quoted to-day against territorial expansion.

Third. The decision is either law or not law. It can not be valid as to colonies, a secondary consideration, and invalid as to slavery, a primary issue. It must stand or fall as a whole. Hence we have this dilemma: If to-day the Dred Scott decision is law, then the thirteenth, fourteenth, and fifteenth amendments are not law, the results of the rebellion are nullified, the Missouri Compromise was unconstitutional, slavery can be maintained in all our Territories, and the negro has "no rights which the white man is bound to respect" (19 How., 407). This dilemma has been overlooked.

Fourth. The major premise of Judge Taney's argument against colonies is that our sole authority to acquire territory is derived from the power to admit States. That proposition has never been accepted by any other judge or court. On the contrary, unanimous benches have declared our right to acquire territory irrespective of its situs, and irrespective also of any franchise of statehood, as a primary attribute of sovereignty and as a corollary of the war and treaty powers. Judge Taney's major premise has been specifically overruled three times (16 Wall., 434; 136 U. S., 42; 137 U. S., 212). The Supreme Court having held it utterly fallacious, all his arguments fall with it. His conclusion, therefore, that we can not hold Territories per se falls also, and is as dead to the American people as the stamp act or statutes against witchcraft.

Fifth. The utter futility of the declaration should be observed. It is without practical value. What right had the court to make it? What jurisdiction had it over the subject? Can an injunction restrain the Senate? Can the President be enjoined? How will the Supreme Court prohibit this sovereign nation from extending its sovereignty over conquered territory? The error is fundamental. Judge Taney's decision was intended to and did encroach upon the political power of the Government. He had no authority to do so. His decision, pro tanto, judged even by his own clear and logical utterances in other cases, was not law when uttered and is not law to-day.

Sixth. An exhaustive investigation of the writings and speeches of the founders of our Government and a scrutiny of the proceedings attending our acquisition of the Northwest, Louisiana, and Florida Territories establish beyond dispute the historic inaccuracy of Judge Taney's assertion that a trust or franchise of statehood was intended to be impressed upon all newly acquired territory. Edmund Randolph submitted to the Federal convention the first propositions relative to new States and Territories. Madison offered amendments, and then the present language was introduced into the Constitution on the motion of Gouverneur Morris.

During the controversy over the Louisiana cession in 1803 he was appealed to for information in regard to the meaning of the third section of the fourth article. He answered: "I am very certain I had it not in contemplation to insert a decree de coerendo imperio in the Constitution. I knew then as well as I do now that all North America must at length be annexed to us. (3 Mor. Writ., 185.) A few days later he again replied: "I mistook the drift of your inquiry, which substantially is whether Congress can admit as a new State territory which did not belong to the United States when the Constitution was made. In my opinion they can not. I always thought when we should acquire Canada and Louisiana it would be proper to govern them as provinces and allow them no voice in our councils. In wording the third section of the fourth article I went as far as circumstances would permit to establish the exclusion." (3 Mor. Writ., 182.)

ANTI-EXPANSIONISTS CHANGED ATTITUDE.

The opposition to acquiring Louisiana was based upon the treaty covenants guaranteeing ultimate statehood. No opposition developed to acquiring and holding per se Territories or dependencies. That right seems to have been assumed without discussion (Story, Constitution, section 1286). The resolution of the Massachusetts legislature is one of many similar public expressions: "The annexation of Louisiana to the Union transcends the constitutional power of the Government of the United States. It forms a new confederacy to which the States united by the former compact are not bound to adhere." (Life of Quincy, page 206.)

The Supreme Court has long since overruled these objections. I cite them merely to show that at the beginning of the century anti-expansionists acknowledged the nation's right to expand, insisted that new territory be governed permanently as such, and objected to its ultimate admission to statehood. At the close of the century anti-expansionists deny our right to expand, if territory be governed permanently as such, and insist that all acquisitions be converted into States.

Both legal and historic precedents are thus established for governing new acquisitions as organized or unorganized Territories, directly or indirectly, temporarily or permanently; and all such questions are political, subject to the discretion and power of Congress, and foreign to the jurisdiction of the Constitution and courts.

V. *Civil rights and political status of inhabitants.*—The civil rights and political status of inhabitants of ceded territory are those guaranteed by treaty and conferred by Congress. They acquire no rights under our Constitution and Federal statutes, *ex proprio vigore*. The Constitution makes "all treaties the supreme law of the land." (Article VI, section 2.) Treaties, as Chief Justice Marshall held, are obligatory upon the people of the United States (1 Pet., 542); and binding "as a constitutional law." (16 How., 637; 19 How., 372.) The pending treaty with Spain provides: "The civil rights and political status of the native inhabitants of the territories hereby ceded to the United States shall be determined by the Congress." (Article IX.) Hence, if Congress should ratify the treaty and do no more, that document alone would measure the civil rights and political status of the inhabitants of the ceded territory.

CONSTITUTION AND STATUTES NOT OPERATIVE.

Originally the Constitution was operative in the thirteen States which ratified the document. (Article VII, section 1.) As new States were ad-

mitted the Constitution became operative therein *ex proprio vigore*, even if, as in the case of Texas, it had not previously been extended over the annexed territory (143 U. S., 69). The geographical limits of Federal statutes are the national boundaries on the day of enactment. If our domain is expanded, our statutes are not *ex proprio vigore* expanded also.

Statutes possess no innate power of expansion. The Dingley tariff, for instance, is limited strictly to the area of the United States as it existed July 24, 1897. To make it operative over Porto Rico, the Philippines, or a single foot of new territory, a special act extending it is necessary. Even when new States are admitted, two statutes are required—one admitting to statehood, and hence to the rights of the Constitution, the other extending our laws over the admitted territory. The thirteen original States were a mere fringe along the Atlantic. By conquest, annexation, and purchase, within a hundred years we expanded our territory on this continent over 3,250,000 square miles, and over all this vast domain, with the exception of Alaska, the Constitution and laws of the Union have been made operative by more than a hundred special acts of Congress.

Prior to 1850 there was no uniformity of legislative expression, but every organized Territory then existing and every Territory subsequently organized became subject to the following section of the Revised Statutes: "The Constitution and all laws of the United States which are not locally inapplicable shall have the same force and effect within all the organized Territories and in every Territory hereafter organized as elsewhere within the United States." (Section 1891.)

In an early case Chief Justice Marshall decided that territory annexed did not *ipso facto* derive rights from the Constitution. Its only rights, he said, were those "stipulated in the treaty," or granted by "its new master." (1 Pet., 542.) Mr. Justice Nelson, in a subsequent case, suggested a potent reason therefor. Territories "are not," he said, "organized under the Constitution." "They are the creations exclusively of the legislative department of the Government, and subject to its supervision and control." (9 How., 252.)

If Territories are neither created nor organized nor supervised under authority of the Constitution, how can it be urged that they acquire rights from the Constitution *ex proprio vigore*? Consider also the remarks of Mr. Justice Bradley: "The extent of the power thus granted (to Territories) depends entirely upon the organic act of Congress in each case, and it is at all times subject to such alterations as Congress may see fit to adopt." (18 Wall., 319.) Also the words of Mr. Justice Brewer: "A Territory is a political community organized by Congress, all whose powers are created by Congress, and all whose acts are subject to Congressional supervision." (139 U. S., 446.) If all Territorial rights and powers are created by Congress, then none are created by the Constitution; if all are subject to alteration and supervision by Congress, then none are fixed and unalterable by virtue of the Constitution.

NO INALIENABLE RIGHTS.

Not only are the Constitution and laws not operative, but Congress, in creating, organizing, and supervising Territories, is not bound to grant the inhabitants any of our so-called "inalienable rights," not even those enumerated in the Constitution and its amendments, and commonly called the "bill of rights." This principle was distinctly announced by the court in an elaborate opinion in the Mormon Church case (136 U. S., 42), the consensus of all the authorities sustaining the principle that neither the letter nor the spirit of the Constitution is operative in Territories without the specific act of Congress. Although this doctrine may startle humanitarians, it was reiterated with approval by Mr. Justice Harlan in a decision of the Supreme Court on April 25 last. (170 U. S., 349.)

Ex-Senator Edmunds's recent statement is not necessarily in conflict with these views. "The Constitution," he said, "does operate and have full force in our Territories in the respects that affect the personal and civil rights of all." That is unqualifiedly true of every organized Territory since 1850. The Constitution has been specifically made operative therein. For forty-nine years the inhabitants of Arizona and New Mexico have enjoyed the same "personal and civil" rights under the Constitution as the inhabitants of New York. But if Senator Edmunds intends his statement to apply to Alaska or Porto Rico or the Philippines, or any other unorganized territory over which the Constitution and Federal statutes shall not have been specifically extended by Congress, he is opposed by uniform decisions of the Supreme Court. The inhabitants of ceded territory therefore acquire no rights from the Constitution, Federal statutes, or treaties, except such as are specifically granted. This principle has been overlooked in all pending discussions, but its logical application will solve the most perplexing problems of expansion.

First. It is urged that the inhabitants of ceded territory possess implied rights to a republican form of government. Even our Constitution guarantees only "to every State in this Union a republican form of government." (Article IV, section 4.) It guarantees no form of government whatever to a Territory. We can not put the inhabitants to the sword, but we can banish them entirely from the country and confiscate their property (8 Cranch, 122; 143 U. S., 350), or grant them any quantum of rights even to statehood. Natural rights of barbarians to a republican form of government—who can define them? None exist outside of Utopia or Plato's Republic. Whatever is granted is an act of sovereign grace. Any government, or no government, rests with Congress. Any right, or no right, is in sovereign discretion.

TAXATION WITHOUT REPRESENTATION.

Second. Taxation without representation is an equally fallacious doctrine. In 1820 Chief Justice Marshall decided that the power of Congress to tax the Territories as well as States, irrespective of representation, was "incontrovertible." "If it were true," he said, "that according to the spirit of our Constitution the power of taxation must be limited by the right of representation, whence is derived the power to lay and collect duties, imposts, and excises?" (5 Wheat., 325.)

INHABITANTS NOT CITIZENS.

Third. Inhabitants of the States of the Union have a dual citizenship, State and Federal. Article IV, section 2, guarantees to "the citizens of each State all the privileges and immunities of the several States." But this interstate citizenship is granted only to citizens of a State, not to citizens of the United States. There is no citizenship of a Territory, and the only citizenship Congress can confer is national. (22 U. S., 542.)

The fourteenth amendment provides that "All persons born or naturalized in the United States, and subject to the jurisdiction thereof, are citizens of the United States." Children of ambassadors and consuls born here are not "subject to our jurisdiction," and do not become citizens. (16 Wall., 73.) "This section," said the Supreme Court, "contemplates two sources of citizenship, and two sources only, birth and naturalization." (112 U. S., 101; 169 U. S., 702.) Persons may be naturalized either individually, under the naturalization acts, or "collectively," as the court explained, "by the force of a treaty by which foreign territory is acquired." (112 U. S., 102.) Inhabitants of Porto Rico and the Philippines not being naturalized, and the pending treaty not providing for the naturalization of either natives or Spanish subjects, it follows that they can only become citizens by a specific act of Congress.

The pending bill for Hawaii contains such naturalization provisions. The only other source of American citizenship is birth, and that must be within American territory over which the Constitution and laws shall have been

specifically extended. No Constitution, no fourteenth amendment; hence no citizenship by birth. Therefore, if Congress ratifies the treaty and does no more, neither present nor future native inhabitants will be citizens; but if Congress extends our Constitution and laws over the annexed domain, all present and future native inhabitants will be endowed with Federal citizenship.

CAN PROHIBIT IMMIGRATION.

4. The inhabitants of ceded territory, not being citizens, will have no right to immigrate to this country. Their rights will be no more nor less than those of aliens of like races immigrating from any foreign land. The Chinese in the Philippines and Hawaii will be excluded absolutely under our Chinese-exclusion acts. (139 U. S., 581.) Malays, constituting a considerable proportion of the Filipinos, being neither black nor yellow, but brown, the fifth subdivision of the human race, can be excluded as absolutely as the Chinese.

It has been repeatedly suggested by the Supreme Court that the thirteenth, fourteenth, and fifteenth amendments apply only to whites and blacks and not to Chinese, and hence Malays. (16 Wall., 73; 100 U. S., 306; 112 U. S., 101; 21 Fed. Rep., 909; 5 Sawy., 155; 71 Fed. Rep., 274; 169 U. S., 697.) White and black inhabitants migrating to this country can be admitted on the same terms and no other as white and black immigrants from any foreign land. Citizenship and that alone prevents exclusion. Any United States citizen, whatever his race or origin, may, under protection of the fourteenth amendment, reenter the United States and pass from one State to another, and Federal or State governments can not deny him that right except in punishment for crime. (21 Fed. Rep., 910; 130 U. S., 581; 169 U. S., 649.)

NO CHEAP LABOR.

Hence, unless Congress confers citizenship, Caucasians and negroes will be admitted under our immigration laws, while Mongolians and Malays may be debarred absolutely, and threatened incursions of cheap labor will not imperil the interests of American workmen.

NO UNIFORM TARIFF.

5. In construing the provision of the Constitution that "all duties, imposts, and excises shall be uniform throughout the United States" (Article I, section 8), Chief Justice Marshall in 1820 defined "United States." "Does this term," he said, "designate the whole or any particular portion of the American empire? Certainly this question can admit but of one answer. It is the name given to our great Republic, which is composed of States and Territories. The District of Columbia or the territory west of the Missouri is not less within the United States than Maryland or Pennsylvania" (5 Wheat., 319).

In its ultimate analysis it included all the land owned by the nation in 1820. It includes all the land owned to-day—even Alaska and Hawaii. It will include every foot of soil that may be ceded by the pending treaty. The islands will no longer be a part of Spain; they will not be independent; they will be ours, ceded, annexed, their very soil forming a constituent portion of the physical area of the United States. Our national entity is coterminous with our physical domain, and will anyone assert that our physical domain is not coextensive with our national entity? Judge Marshall's views are thought to favor free trade. It is assumed that the uniform tariff provisions of the Constitution will become operative and compel free trade within all our borders. But are not protectionists and free traders zealously quoting Marshall and Taney and Webster and Calhoun, while they overlook a principle which renders their dispute purely academic?

DINGLEY TARIFF INOPERATIVE.

How will tariff regulations become operative? There is no provision in the treaty; hence that document does not apply. The Constitution and statutes do not operate *ex proprio vigore*; hence they do not apply. We find ourselves again relegated to Congress. If it makes operative the Constitution and Dingley tariff, they will be operative—otherwise not. If it enacts new tariff laws, those laws will prevail. If, however, Congress ratifies the treaty and does nothing more, leaving the adjustment of tariffs to the President as a war power, such course is equally in Congressional discretion.

TARIFF PRECEDENTS.

These principles have been applied on several occasions in our history. Louisiana was ceded in 1803; Orleans Territory was organized therefrom in 1804, and in 1812 it was admitted as the State of Louisiana. Our tariff imposed a lower duty by 25 per cent on goods imported in American than in foreign bottoms. The Louisiana treaty gave a similar reduction to French and Spanish merchantmen trading to New Orleans, thus establishing lower duties there on French and Spanish imports than elsewhere in the Union. For eight years the Territory of Orleans had an essentially different tariff system from the rest of the United States.

Florida was ceded to us in 1819. After we had taken possession it was decided by the Treasury Department that goods imported from Florida before Congress had made our laws operative therein were liable to duty. "That is," said Chief Justice Taney, "although Florida had by cession actually become a part of the United States and was in our possession, yet under our revenue laws its ports must be regarded as foreign until they are established as domestic by act of Congress." (9 How., 617.)

In 1846 the Mexican State of Tamaulipas was conquered by us. During our military and civil rule therein, and prior to the treaty of peace in 1848, there arrived at Philadelphia an American vessel, cleared from Tampico, upon whose cargo duties were exacted as from a foreign country. The Supreme Court, sustaining the tariff, said: "There was no act of Congress establishing a custom-house at Tampico nor authorizing the appointment of a collector. The regulations the collector adopted were not those prescribed by law, but by the President in his character of Commander in Chief. The permit and coasting manifest granted by an officer thus appointed, and thus controlled by military authority, could not be recognized in any port of the United States, nor could they exempt the cargo from the payment of duties." (9 How., 618.)

Commenting generally upon this and other instances Chief Justice Taney made this decisive utterance: "The Treasury Department, in no instance that we are aware of since the establishment of the Government, has ever recognized a place in a newly acquired country as a domestic port, unless it had been previously made so by act of Congress. The principle thus adopted and acted upon by the executive department of the Government has been sanctioned by the decisions in this court and the circuit courts whenever the question came before them. And all of them maintain that under our revenue laws every port is regarded as a foreign one unless the custom-house from which the vessel clears is within a collection district established by act of Congress, and the officers granting the clearance exercise their functions under the authority of the laws of the United States." (9 How., 617.)

A separate tariff may be provided for the new territory by the simple means of continuing the present military governments. Their ports may thus remain foreign for tariff purposes (9 How., 615); they may levy a tariff on imports from us, and their goods continue to be subject to our import duties. As the Supreme Court specifically decided relative to the provisional governments of the South, such governments can "prescribe the revenues to be paid and apply them to their own use or otherwise." (20 Wall., 300.) And

these governments, as we have seen, may continue indefinitely, and be terminated only in Congressional discretion. (16 How., 164.)

NO FREE TRADE.

New territory, therefore, may be acquired without becoming subject to the tariff provisions of our Constitution and laws. Sugar from Cuba and Hawaii, tobacco from Cuba and Porto Rico, and the products of the Philippines and Ladronez will not be admitted duty free, unless Congress so determines. Hence the vast sums invested in our sugar and tobacco industries need not be imperiled, nor need colonial imports reduce our customs revenues or disturb our economic status.

THE OPEN DOOR.

Sixth. The commerce of our Territories with foreign States involves the international trade problem of the "open door." The President's recent proclamation to the Filipinos has been misunderstood. "All ports," he says, "will be open to the commerce of all friendly nations. All goods will be admitted upon payment of such duties and other charges as shall be in force at the time of the importation." If no duties are in force, none will be exacted. If Dingley tariff duties or any other exist, they must be paid. This is no "open door," nor even free trade. It is, moreover, only a military order, and may at any time be rescinded by the President. But when Congress makes "rules and regulations" for the new Territory, what then? If it should extend our Constitution and laws over the islands, free trade would then, as now, prevail within all our borders, and theoretically the Dingley tariff between us and the rest of the world.

The uniform tariff clause of the Constitution being operative, Congress would have no more authority to admit English goods free at Manila than at New York or Philadelphia. It must not be forgotten, however, that such action, while conclusive within our boundaries, is not final in our international relations. The President and Senate have, under the Constitution, unlimited power to make trade treaties. If we are not prepared to adopt free trade in its entirety, we must continue in the future, as in the past, to regulate our open doors by treaty and not by statute. As matter of fact, there has been no uniformity of tariff with foreign nations since our Government began. The "favored-nation" clause has not prevented such treaties, for nations have uniformly ignored it in their trade wars.

A trade war now exists between the United States and every European nation in the Orient except England. If England permits us to trade in China and India, our treaty-making power has authority to permit England to trade in the Philippines; if other European powers exclude us from their Asiatic ports, our treaty-making power, by refusing discriminating tariffs, can practically exclude them from the Philippines. There is no constitutional objection to giving Spain the preferential duties provided in Article IV of the pending treaty; and, if policy dictates, the President and Senate can extend similar discriminations to our trade allies, and refuse them to nations waging a tariff war against us.

EXPANSION DUE TO THE PRESS.

During the last year the American people have resolved upon a most momentous policy—to expand their continental bounds, acquire foreign territory, and take their place among nations as a dominant world power. Expansion is no longer a theory, but a fact. To the press of this country more than to any other aggregate intellectual force must be ascribed the development of this national policy, and for services thus rendered no tribute of praise can be unmerited.

The pending treaty will soon be ratified, and in practically its present form. As Senator GRAY tersely remarked, "it will merely put us in control of the situation." Then will confront Congress the gravest problems of the century. We have never legislated for barbarians in the Orient, nor enacted municipal laws for Malays, nor adjusted our institutions to Asiatic civilization. Old principles must be applied to new conditions. Congress shares the general confusion of public thought, distrusts its own prerogatives, and while possessing absolute power, yet daily discusses its limitations under the Constitution and Federal statutes.

DUTY OF THE AMERICAN BAR.

Now arises the opportunity of the American bar. Now is its time for action. It should emulate the patriotic services of the press; its counsel is imperatively needed; its advice will supremely benefit the nation.

What more vital issues can engage the attention of this association? What discussions can be more in harmony with its spirit and traditions? In all crises of our history the bar of New York, by profound learning, strength of argument, and splendor of eloquence, has beneficently influenced the destiny of the nation. Let us not now stand quiescent. Let us perform our full duty, and as "counsel learned in the law" advise the people and their representatives to a wise and just solution of these momentous problems.

Mr. HAY. I yield so much time as he may desire to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. JETT].

Mr. GROSVENOR. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to be permitted to add to my speech—as an appendix—a portion of certain citations from the authorities to which I have referred, on the question of international law as involved in this proposition.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair thinks that under the leave already granted by the House unanimous consent would not be necessary.

Mr. GROSVENOR. I only wanted to be certain on that point.

Mr. JETT. Mr. Chairman, this is the second time during my service in the House of Representatives that a bill for the reorganization of the Army has been up for consideration in this body. I remember very distinctly the discussion that was aroused over this matter during the last session of Congress when it was up for consideration by the House. I had my convictions then with reference to the question as to whether or not the standing army of my country should be or should not be increased, and I maintain the same convictions on this great and important question at the present time—the same convictions that I maintained when the matter was before us on the occasion to which I have referred.

I regarded it, Mr. Chairman, then, as now, that character of question that should be discussed by the representatives of the American people with calmness, deliberation, and sincerity, by first laying aside all political prejudice or bias which we might entertain.

But let me say, as a humble representative of the people upon this floor, that I am sorry to see that some members have seen fit

to inject into this discussion their political feeling and political prejudices when so important a question is under consideration. I regret it much, because I believe this is a question that should be considered by the people's representatives, regardless of their political affiliations or opinions now or heretofore entertained.

I am surprised to hear, within the short period of time that has elapsed since this question was then considered—I mean that time which has elapsed since we discussed this question last spring—that some of the gentlemen have so completely changed their positions upon the question presented by this bill.

I remember that my good friend and colleague from the great State of Illinois took a position in regard to the bill then under discussion, and in the debate during the time we had it under consideration stated fully his convictions before the House. He expressed at that time precisely the sentiments that I now hold and that I then held—the sentiments that I have maintained without change up to the present hour. But for some cause or other my colleague has seen fit to absolutely change his position and reverse the views he then entertained. He was in the frame of mind then of being willing that we should always rely in case of emergency upon our citizen soldiery. But to-day he is supporting a measure demanding the organization of an army of more than 100,000 enlisted men and officers—a regular army.

How he can reconcile his present opinion with that he entertained a few months ago I am unable to say, and I simply want to read in this connection a few words in which he set forth the views he then held, not by way of any reflection upon him whatever, but because of the fact that they announce perhaps more clearly and fully than I could do myself my views on the present question.

During the time that this measure was up for discussion on the 6th day of April, 1898, my colleague from Illinois [Mr. MARSH] used this language, as it appears in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

Now, in the first place, I am opposed to the increase of the Regular Army to any such extent. The policy of European governments is to maintain large standing regular armies. Just the opposite has been the policy of this Republic from the earliest days down to the present time. In all of our wars, foreign and internecine, we have depended upon the citizen soldiery of the country to defend the flag. And, Mr. Speaker, the country has never depended upon them in vain. They have performed fully and completely all the functions of good soldiers. And I am opposed, even in time of war, to the considerable increase here proposed of the regular troops. In case of war, the imminent possibility of which now confronts us, I think it wise to do in the future as we have done in the past—to depend upon the citizen soldiery of the country.

Mr. Chairman, I have read these lines because, as I have already stated, they announce my convictions clearly on the matter that is before the House for consideration. What has caused this change in the opinion of my friend and colleague since that time? He thought it a wise thing and a good thing to do at that time. I think it is a wise thing and a good thing to do now. We have never had occasion to regret in the past our dependence upon the citizen soldiery of the country. And if we may judge the future by the past, we can confidently rest our faith in the perpetuity of the Government in the future upon the volunteer soldiers of the country. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. MARSH. Will the gentleman allow me?

Mr. JETT. To be sure; I always would do a thing of that kind for my friend.

Mr. MARSH. Does my colleague believe that the volunteer soldiery of the country desire to perform garrison duty and police duty in the Philippine Islands, in Cuba, and in Porto Rico?

Mr. JETT. I will answer that by saying no; because the purposes for which the volunteer soldiers were enlisted who are now serving have been accomplished. Their duty has been discharged. They have complied with the terms of their contract.

I will say, however, further, that I do not believe there is any necessity at this time for a standing army of 100,000 men, as is proposed by this bill. I believe the substitute offered here, upon which I hope we shall have an opportunity to vote, more thoroughly carries out what I believe to be just and right and proper for us to enact at this time. As there is no necessity for a large increase in the standing army, this substitute provides for a standing army of 30,000 men, and it further provides that if there is any necessity for it, if the President in his discretion believes that there is any necessity, he can call and raise a volunteer army for the purposes set forth in the substitute, and those who would volunteer under the provisions of this substitute would know for what purpose they were volunteering, and the men who volunteered and entered upon this war in which we were so successful, who did not enter the service to do garrison duty, could be discharged. They have discharged their duty according to the terms of the contract as they understood it.

And now, if we should adopt this substitute, then I say that those who enlisted under it would understand clearly and thoroughly the purpose for which they entered the service of the United States, and I believe that we would not have the difficulty and complaint which arises at this time from those who are doing garrison duty from the volunteer soldiery. [Applause.]

And now, Mr. Chairman, the bill under consideration is one the

provisions of which are for the reorganizing of the Army of the United States, and at the same time increase the Army to more than 100,000 enlisted men and officers. It is a measure that is of as much consequence to the American people, in my judgment, as any that has been considered by the Congress within the last quarter of a century.

It is important to the people because of the fact that it is a departure from the old established policy of our Government, as well as of the fact that, if it becomes a law, it will add heavy burdens upon an already overburdened people. I have at all times been opposed to a strong standing army, and am still of the same opinion on this question that I have maintained for years, and at this time I am unable to see any necessity for an army of the proportions called for in this bill known as the Hull bill. I believe that a strong standing army as provided in and by this bill is one that is antagonistic to the principles of a republican form of government, and that it would prove detrimental to the institutions of our country.

I can not by any process of reasoning arrive at the conclusion that a strong standing army goes hand in hand with a republican form of government. The fathers never contemplated such when they outlined and drafted the fundamental law of the land, because, as I believe, it was never expected that in a government such as they were then organizing, and which put the power into the hands of the people, such an emergency would ever arise that would require the sustaining of a strong standing army, or that such a policy as is now called for by the author of this bill could be sustained and the rights and interests of the people remain inviolate upon a theory of a government by the people.

I believe that a standing army as large as asked for at this time would prove a menace to the people. We know from the past history of other countries what effect a strong army has had, and what influence it has wielded at the expense of the great mass of the people, and that it has had the effect of overthrowing governments. If we are to judge the future by the past, and knowing the effect that strong armies have had toward the downfall of governments, we should, as representatives of the American people, representing their interests in the American Congress, take into consideration those things, and not favor a policy and the enactment of a law that has led toward the downfall of governments and destroyed prosperous and happy people.

We have for more than a quarter of a century maintained in this Government a standing army of less than one-fourth of the size of the Army that is now asked for. With a population of over 75,000,000 people, we have maintained an army for years of but 25,000, and up until recently there has been no great demand from any source for an increase of our Army. For years prior to the breaking out of the Spanish-American war, in my judgment this House would not have for a moment considered a bill the purpose of which was the increasing of the Army. If an increased army is required or needed, it is because of the fact of our new possessions. As we have had an army heretofore sufficient to meet all requirements at home, the increase demanded should not exceed more than will be required to maintain peace and order in our newly-acquired territory and in the island of Cuba.

Mr. Chairman, there appears to be a difference of opinion, even among those who are in favor of and are advocating the passage of a measure of this kind, as to the number of troops that will be required in the different islands. The Adjutant-General is of the opinion that 50,000 soldiers are required in Cuba to maintain peace and order. This is, in my judgment, an extravagant estimate. Whilst this number is demanded for Cuba, yet no good reason is shown why so many troops should be sent there. The fact is, as was developed before the Committee on Military Affairs, that before the insurrection was on in Cuba the Spanish Government only kept 12,000 soldiers in the island. The Cuban people were unfriendly to the Spaniards, yet it seems that 12,000 soldiers held them in subjection. If such was the case, when the Spaniards are removed why should it be necessary to have a force of 50,000 upon the island? If the old Cuban patriot, General Garcia, who but recently departed this life in this city, has been reported correctly, then there is no necessity for 50,000 troops. General Garcia is reported as having said that 8,000 troops would be sufficient to garrison the island, and he declared that "the American flag alone, after the departure of the Spaniards, would preserve order."

General Wood, military commander of Santiago, is still claiming that we should have 50,000 troops in Cuba. While I do not agree with him, yet it seems to me that if his judgment is correct, as those favoring the bill will probably say it is, or accept it, then it seems that the gentlemen who are strong expansionists would learn an important lesson from the experience or judgment of General Wood, and that is, if it takes 50,000 soldiers to maintain peace and order in Cuba, with a million population, at that ratio it would take an army of 500,000 to maintain peace and order in the Philippines, and cost five hundred millions annually.

As to the Philippines, it appears to me at this time we are not in a position to legislate with reference to the size of the Army or

the number of troops that should be provided to maintain peace and order in those islands, and simply because they are now sending troops to the Philippines is no good reason why the Army should be increased as is provided in and by this measure.

While the question of the disposition of these islands is still an open one, if it is necessary to have an increase at all I believe the substitute which has been read and will be offered at the proper time more clearly meets the demands according to the situation at the present as I understand it. The substitute provides for an army of 30,000, the same as under existing law, and the President of the United States, at his discretion, may issue his proclamation for not more than 50,000 men, whose services are deemed necessary by reason of the relation of the Government of the United States to the islands of Porto Rico, Cuba, Philippines, Hawaii, and the Ladrone Islands.

It provides further that the same organization shall apply to this body of troops as applies to the Regular Army of the United States, and that they shall be officered by officers appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate; and it provides further that these volunteers herein provided for shall be organized into such classes of troops as the President in his discretion shall deem best.

Mr. Chairman, the substitute further provides that this Volunteer Army shall, as far as practicable, be taken from the several States and Territories and the District of Columbia, and that they shall be mustered out of the service of the United States two years from the date of the passage of this act, unless their time of service is sooner terminated.

It will therefore be seen that by the provisions of the substitute a sufficient force is provided for the coast and interior defenses of the United States; and if we are to continue to send troops to the Philippines and garrison Porto Rico and Cuba, liberal provisions are made in the substitute by which the President can call into the service an army for their use in these places. Why, then, place on the Federal statutes of this country a law providing for a standing army of more than 100,000, and put the people of this nation to the enormous expense that would necessarily be required to sustain such an army? I am not only opposed to this on account of the enormous expense that it would put our people to, but I am opposed to it also as a matter of principle.

It is antagonistic to the teachings of a democratic government, and if the policy sought to be thrust upon the American people by the supporters and adherents of the bill reported by the majority of the Committee on Military Affairs of this House is successful, the effect of it will be to build up an aristocracy in the Army. I will not lend my vote to a measure the effect of which will be to build up an aristocracy in the Army or in any other branch of the Government. I am not one of those who believe that the proud American Republic, after more than a hundred years of its independence, should now embark upon a policy that would ultimately lead to the dictation of the policy in this country by the military arm of the Government. I need only to cite you to the so-called republican form of government in France, where the army dictates and absolutely controls the policy of that nation. We see how unsettled it is at this time, and we know how it has been for years, all of which is the result of the strong army that it maintains and by reason of which it has built up an aristocracy in that country in the army.

Mr. Chairman, I will not detain the House for any considerable length of time. I know that there are many members here who desire to speak; but there is one question to which I desire to call the attention of the House, and that is the question of expense. I desire to call the attention of the House to the enormous expense of maintaining an army of the size provided for by this bill.

I know there has been a difference of opinion on this question in the minds of members in this House. I have heard the testimony of the Adjutant-General; I have seen his estimates; and yet I will say frankly that I am at a loss to know or to estimate anywhere in the neighborhood of the annual cost. I see in the report made by the Adjutant-General to the committee he says it would cost annually \$82,053,655.56 to maintain the army provided by the present bill. That is his statement in his report.

I remember very distinctly when the Adjutant-General of the Army was before the Committee on Military Affairs, when he was being heard, the question was put to him as to what would probably be the expense of maintaining this army, and to show to the House that there is not only a difference of opinion in the minds of members of this body as to the cost of maintaining this army provided for by the Hull bill, but in the mind of the Adjutant-General himself, I call attention to the discrepancy between the statement in his report and his statement when orally examined before the committee. In his report he says, on page 16, that the cost will be \$82,053,665 annually, but here is what the Adjutant-General said when he was before the Committee on Military Affairs. The question was asked by my colleague on the committee [Mr. SULZER]:

What would the annual cost be to the people of this country for an army of 100,000 strong, such as is contemplated by this bill which has been introduced by Mr. HULL?

General CORBIN. I could not answer that question unless I had a pencil and paper. I could send you that from the office. There are so many elements that enter into it that I could not answer right off.

Mr. SULZER. I wish you would send to the committee a statement as to the cost of the present Regular Army, and what the cost would be to maintain the Regular Army according to the provisions of Mr. HULL'S bill, including the cost of transportation.

General CORBIN. It is a pretty safe rule to follow that the pay for the subsistence, the clothing, the transportation, the arms, the ammunition, and all that relating to the soldier, in rough figures will amount up to \$1,000 per capita; not much less and not much more. One thousand dollars per capita for every man in the Army is a fair average. If you have 100,000 men, you can just put it down at \$100,000,000.

There is the testimony of the Adjutant-General as to the probable cost of sustaining an army of 100,000 men as provided in this bill. Yet he has submitted another estimate, in which he says it would cost only about \$82,000,000.

Then he goes on to say:

If you will run through the appropriations made by Congress for the Army during the war, before the war, and during all the years, you will find that the appropriations have been about on a basis of \$1,000 per annum per man.

I do not, Mr. Chairman, intend any reflection upon the Adjutant-General, but merely to show that, apparently, no one is hardly able to estimate this great cost that would have to be met.

This, of course, contemplates the cost of maintaining the Army when the Army is kept at home; but if they are to be sent abroad, then the estimates will be more than they have been reported by the War Department thus far. So, then, I say, Mr. Chairman, that this is an important element that should receive the consideration of this House. I believe that I am as patriotic as my brother member who holds a seat on the other side of this Chamber, but I am not in favor at this time of thrusting upon the people of my country such an enormous tax as this would bring. While I have the honor to represent one of the most important districts of this country, a proud and patriotic constituency, I do not believe that they are in favor of a standing army of 100,000 men and the necessary expense that would follow. It is their interests that I am trying to represent here.

The question now is, Mr. Chairman, who is it that is demanding a strong standing army for this country? From what source is the call made? Is this coming from the great mass of the people, who are the wealth producers? Is this demand coming from the laboring classes, those who are depending on their toil for the support of themselves and their families? I answer in the negative. Those engaged in agriculture and those who gain a livelihood by manual labor are not demanding an army of the proportions provided for in this bill.

There are no more patriotic people than the wage-earner and the farmer. They are always willing to respond to the call of their country, and have heretofore, at all times when the interests of their country were at stake, volunteered their services and gone forth and fought and won the great battles of the nation. They stand willing at all times to go forth and do battle for their country's sake, but in my judgment they are not demanding a strong standing body of troops in a time of profound peace, who are to be kept and maintained at the expense of the taxpayers.

Again, if the President desires a strong army he ought to say to Congress for what purpose the army is needed. No showing has been made to Congress that there is any necessity for such an array of troops to be organized into regulars as is asked for here and at this time.

Now, in conclusion, Mr. Chairman, I desire to say a few words with reference to the Philippines.

I am willing to put the Philippines upon the same basis and give to them the same right as the American Congress agreed to give and to do by Cuba. I am unable to see any reason why we should not treat with the Philippines as we agreed to do, as is evidenced by the resolutions passed by Congress last spring, with the Cubans. If we were right in principle when we resolved to give to the people of Cuba a stable government, why is it not right at this time to make the same advances toward the people of the Philippines? I am for my country and my country's welfare at all times, but I am opposed to oppression and the instruments of oppression. [Applause.]

[Here the hammer fell.]

Mr. HAY. Mr. Chairman, I yield twenty minutes to the gentleman from Arkansas.

Mr. McRAE. Now, Mr. Chairman—

Mr. HULL. Before the gentleman proceeds, will he allow me to yield twenty minutes to the gentleman from Ohio? Gentlemen on that side are much ahead of us now, and we have not much longer time for general debate.

Mr. McRAE. I hope that will not interfere with the arrangement already made. I am needed in the committee room, and the delay will only be twenty minutes.

Mr. HULL. We have but little over two hours of our time remaining and gentlemen on that side have less than an hour, and I simply ask to use a part of that time now.

Mr. McRAE. I can not consent to yield the floor since I have been recognized.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Arkansas is recognized.

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

Mr. HULL. I yield twenty minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BROMWELL].

NECESSITY OF A LARGER ARMY.

Mr. BROMWELL. Mr. Chairman, the general provisions of this bill I am heartily in favor of. About some special items I shall perhaps offer some suggestions when we come to consider the bill under the five-minute rule. Therefore I shall not now comment upon the bill except in a general way.

It seems to me, Mr. Chairman, that this is a bill about which there ought not to be any division along party lines, because I am willing to concede to gentlemen on the other side of the House the same desire to uphold American honor, to protect American interests, and to preserve the internal peace of the country that we on the Republican side claim for ourselves.

This is a bill for the reorganization and increase of the Army. It is a bill which is recognized as necessary by every military expert in the country. It is rendered necessary not only by the experiences of the late war and the mistakes that were made therein, but it is rendered equally necessary by the rapidly increasing population of this country and the increase in the interests which the Army is called upon to protect. It is necessary in case of war or to maintain our possessions recently acquired; and it is equally necessary if we are to surrender every inch of new ground upon which the foot of an American soldier has trodden within the last year.

We have learned a lesson in regard to our Navy. Fortunately, we commenced the upbuilding and rebuilding of our Navy many years ago; and we can not but congratulate ourselves that we did take in hand this great work of rebuilding this bulwark of our national defense in time of peace, so that we might be prepared for the emergency of war. It is our duty to-day to do for the Army what we did years ago for the Navy—to start its reorganization and to increase it to sufficient strength to meet all the demands that may be made upon it. We have rested content for thirty years with this obsolete organization which is now in force. The world in the meantime has been moving on; other nations have studied the art of war and have made improvements of which we have not yet taken advantage.

In this bill, in its general features, it is proposed to profit by that experience and put the American Army on the same footing of efficiency as the armies of the military nations of the world.

OBJECTIONS URGED.

The objections which have been made to the increase of the Army are based upon the following considerations: First, that there is no necessity for it at this time; second, that it will cost a large sum of money and increase the burdens upon the people to such an extent as ought not to be borne; and third, that it is a menace to the liberties of the people of America.

It has been well said and is practically admitted by everyone that if we are to hold the Philippine Islands, Cuba, and Porto Rico, even for a limited time, these islands must be policed by the regulars of the United States Army for the purpose of maintaining order and government until the political disposition of the islands shall be determined upon by the Government. The expense which gentlemen have alleged was to be such a grievous burden upon the people of America may be, let me say, but a trifle as compared with the expense in men and in money which may come to us if we do not, in time of peace, when we can deliberately prepare an army for future emergencies, take such steps as will make it a satisfactory and efficient organization.

THE ARMY WILL BE NO MENACE.

The fear that the American Army will be a menace to the liberties of our own people is almost too ridiculous, Mr. Chairman, to combat.

The American Army—of what is it made? It is composed of our own people, officered by our own sons and our own brothers, our neighbors and their sons, composed of the young men we have year after year sent to our Military Academy to receive the necessary training to fit them for the duties imposed upon them—men who in an emergency can be relied upon, who know what the demands of the hour are upon them as citizens of the United States, and educated not only in military science at the expense of the Government, but, better than all of that, educated in the love of country and their duty to their fellow-citizens and to themselves. Shall we look to these young men who have gone into the Army of the United States to become traitors to their country, even while they bare their heads to their country's flag, as they do every time that they pass by it?

Is it possible that sensible men can entertain such an opinion as that? They are not Hessians; they are not slaves, purchased soul and body for military purpose. They are American citizens, as we are. They have the love of country implanted in them as firmly as we have. They have their devotion to the flag of their

country as thoroughly grounded as you or I. And the rank and file of the Army are also Americans. They are men taken from the walks of private life, from the farms, from the workshops, and from the great masses of the people. Can it be asserted that they will betray their country because for the time being they are enlisted in the Regular Army of the United States? It is impossible, Mr. Chairman, to believe such a suggestion. Fearless in the defense of their country's honor, they would be equally fearless in refusing to partake in the destruction of its liberties.

What could such a diminutive number do with the ten or twelve millions of men capable of bearing arms in this country? What an insult to the patriotism and courage of the American people to say that the little, insignificant Regular Army of 50,000 or 100,000 men can crush out the liberty of a great republic!

COMPARISON WITH ARMIES OF OTHER COUNTRIES.

Compare the Regular Army of our country with those of other nations on a peace footing. The regular army of Russia is 860,000 men; France, 615,413 men; of the German Empire, 585,440 men; of Austria-Hungary, 385,697 men; of Italy, 231,355, and of Great Britain, 163,569. Compare these with the Army of the United States—only about 25,000 men.

These numbers, too, let me state, are exclusive of the native colonial troops. Assuming that the population of the United States is 70,000,000, that would make one regular soldier for about 2,800 inhabitants. Then compare that with the number which exists for one regular soldier and is protected by that soldier in each of the other countries of the world. In France they have 63 citizens to 1 soldier; in Germany, 1 soldier for every 89 inhabitants; in Austria-Hungary, 1 for every 115; in Italy, 1 for every 135; in Russia, 1 for every 150; in Great Britain, 1 for every 233 inhabitants, while in the United States the regular soldier stands in front of and protects 2,800 men, women, and children, and protects them against everything, not only from domestic troubles but foreign invasion and on every occasion.

Mr. HENRY of Mississippi. Are we threatened?

Mr. BROMWELL. We are threatened every day of the existence of the country, and we must prepare ourselves at all times to meet emergencies which may arise.

LABORING MEN DO NOT FEAR OUR ARMY.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I know gentlemen say that when we increase this standing army it is going to be for the purpose of permitting corporations and trusts to use this army to crush out the life of labor and to interfere with the individual liberty of the citizen.

This statement is an insult to the patriotism and the love of order of the American workingman. Who is it that fears the American Army? Not the American laborer, either organized or unorganized; not the man who desires to obey the laws of the country; not the man who is interested, perhaps more than any other class of men, in being protected in his labor that he may by that labor earn the bread with which he feeds his wife and children. It is the disorderly; it is those who are not law-abiding. It is the great undercurrent of the vile life which drifts into our great cities that finds fault with the standing Army of the United States, with the sheriff and the posse comitatus of our county and State, and with the police force of our cities. They, and not the honest, law-abiding laborer, would be glad to have unlimited license to interfere with human liberty and with private and public property.

Two years ago, in the platform of one of the great parties of this country, it was proposed to break down the barriers which protect society. What answer did the workingmen of the country make to that? Did they blindly follow this doctrine of anarchy? Did they decide that the Supreme Court of the United States should be shackled? Did they decide that the Executive of this great nation should not be given the power to protect its interests? On the contrary, in every street, in every great city of the country, thousands upon thousands of these laboring men marched in their clubs and organizations, from their factories and workshops, to show that they were in favor of a stable, capable, and safe government of their liberties.

Mr. LEWIS of Washington. Will the gentleman allow me?

Mr. BROMWELL. Excuse me.

VOLUNTEERS CAN NOT TAKE THE PLACE OF REGULARS.

Gentlemen who are opposed to this increase will say, "Why not depend upon the spontaneous enthusiasm of American patriotism to furnish an army of volunteers for emergencies as they arise?" Gentlemen, volunteers are not regulars. Patriotic devotion can not take the place of discipline. Enthusiasm is but a poor substitute for trained knowledge. Heroism and personal devotion can accomplish little compared with the results obtained by years of physical training for the fatigues and hardships of the soldier's life.

I would not detract in the slightest from the magnificent work which has been done by the American volunteer in this and in every war in which he has been engaged. He has made a record

of which the nation may well be proud and will do so again whenever it becomes necessary to call him into action. But we must not forget that the science of military affairs, like that of naval warfare, is advancing with rapid strides. Methods and implements of war which were successful thirty years ago have, like the wooden ships of the old Navy, become useless in the light of progress. Even as the United States has profited by the experience of other nations in rebuilding her Navy, has avoided their mistakes and adopted their successes, so she should to-day be willing, in the reorganization of her Army, to profit by the experience of other warlike powers.

It is true that our conditions are far more fortunate than theirs in that we are not in close touch with jealous nations, ready at all times and upon slight pretext to take offense and commit aggression. But, on the other hand, we must not forget that we no longer occupy the position of isolation in the world that we had in the days of our fathers. We can not forget, either, that our country is growing enormously in its population, both by natural increase and by foreign immigration, and that this growth is largely being concentrated in the great cities of the country, from which, as centers, the arteries of commerce, transportation, and finance reach out to every part of our system.

We can not forget how utterly dependent, by reason of this interconnection of interests, vast sections of country become upon these centers. Paralyze the nerve center, and prostration results; give mob rule control of a great city, stopping transportation and traffic, stopping the transmission of intelligence through the mails, and the result is not confined to the one locality in which the disturbance occurs, but affects the nation at large.

A city would be looked upon with contempt whose police force could not be sufficient to maintain order and protect life and property. A State would be worthy of no respect if its laws could be overridden and put to defiance by a reckless mob. This great Government owes it to every citizen that so far as the great interests which are placed by the Constitution in its care and keeping—the protection of public property, the preservation of public order when called upon by the executive of a State, and the free and uninterrupted conduct of interstate commerce—it shall have an ample force of trained regular soldiers at its disposal and for discharging these duties.

The day may come when not only nations will lay down their arms, but the entire citizenship of this country shall become so law-abiding that police supervision shall become unnecessary, but that day marks the beginning of the millennium and is not yet upon us. We must legislate for conditions as they are, we must still continue in force our statutes for the prevention and punishment of crime, we must give to the strong executive arm of the Government the means to enforce the Constitution and laws, which the President and every officer of the United States is sworn to support and maintain. It is the judgment of those best informed that even on a peace basis and for these purposes the Army should be largely increased.

We are in possession of islands which have come to us as the fruits of war. These islands are now occupied by American soldiers, most of whom must be discharged at the conclusion of the treaty of peace. The passage of this bill becomes a necessity for supplying men to take their places if we are to continue the occupancy of these territories. It is apparent that the principal opposition to this bill grows out of and is coincident with the feeling that these possessions should not be permanently retained and controlled by the United States. The objections which are made are of two general classes:

OBJECTIONS TO EXPANSION.

First. That it is unconstitutional to acquire, retain, and govern them.

Second. That admitting the constitutional right to do so, it is unwise as a question of national policy.

The first contention, viz, that it is unconstitutional to acquire, retain, and govern this territory has been made the subject of deep and exhaustive research by some of the ablest men in the country, and notably of distinguished gentlemen in the Senate.

I wish to call the attention of the members of the House who have not seen it to an address made by Mr. Gardner, of New York, published in the New York Tribune of the 19th instant. It is the most convincing and logical argument in favor of the constitutionality of the right to take, maintain, and govern these territories that I have yet seen. Briefly, the points made in that admirable address are as follows:

LEGAL RIGHT TO ACQUIRE, HOLD, AND GOVERN TERRITORY.

First. *That the United States, when the colonies became free and independent, became invested with all the rights of a sovereign nation, with rights equal to those of every nation on earth, not hampered or controlled by any constitution, so far as those rights of sovereignty are concerned; not hampered or controlled by any legislation which had taken place under the Constitution, but free and independent, with the inherent right to declare war, to make peace, to acquire territory, to cede territory, to do all else that independent nations might do.*

Second. *This right of sovereignty preceded and is independent of the Constitution and the Federal Statutes. It is lodged in the people of the country, all the people as a unit, without reference to the form of government.*

Third. *That among these sovereign rights is that of acquiring territory, either by purchase, cession, voluntary annexation, or by conquest and resulling treaty. This right has been exercised in each of the above forms in the acquisition of territory we already possess. This right to acquire territory has been sustained by a long line of decisions. Among others, see 1 Pet., 542; Story on Constitution, section 1287; 136 U. S., 42; 19 Howard, 447.*

Fourth. *The right to acquire gives the right to hold and govern. This principle is stated concisely by Justice Bradley, as follows:*

It would be absurd to hold that the United States has power to acquire territory and no power to govern it when acquired.

See also 136 U. S., 42-44; Story on Constitution, 1324; 6 Cranch, 336; 1 Pet., 542; 114 U. S., 44; 152 U. S., 48.

Fifth. *The question of annexation of territory is a question for the executive and legislative branches of the Government, with which the courts have no concern.*

*The President and Congress are vested with all the responsibility and powers of the Government for the maintenance and extension of our national dominion. It is not the province of the courts to participate in the discussion or decision of these questions, for they are of a political nature and not judicial. Congress and the President having assumed jurisdiction and sovereignty * * * all the people and courts of the country are bound by such governmental acts.*

See also 50 Fed. Rep., 110; 14 Pet., 538; 9 How., 242; 18 Wall., 320; 101 U. S., 133.

Sixth. *Having power to acquire and to hold and govern, the next question which seems to have been fully settled is that the form of government rests entirely with the Congress of the United States and that the Constitution and laws enacted previous to the territorial acquisition do not of themselves become operative in the new territory, but require special legislative action to extend them over such territory.*

The Constitution of the United States, Article IV, section 3, clause 2, reads:

The Congress shall have power to dispose of and make all needful rules and regulations respecting the territory or other property belonging to the United States, etc.

That the government of the Territories belongs solely and exclusively to Congress independent of any constitutional provisions or general legislation affecting the States has been repeatedly affirmed by the Supreme Court.

See 18 Wall., 319; 9 How., 242; 101 U. S., 132; 114 U. S., 44; 139 U. S., 446; 14 Pet., 537; 136 U. S., 42.

That special action has always been deemed necessary in order to extend these constitutional provisions and general laws to newly acquired territory has been conclusively shown by the citations of the various laws printed in the RECORD, pages 1070 and 1071 of this session.

This disposes of the contention that when the treaty of peace is signed the inhabitants of all these islands shall under the Constitution ex proprio vigore become citizens of the United States with the rights of all other citizens under the Constitution.

WHAT IS THE POLICY OF THE PRESIDENT.

The Constitution of the United States, Article IV, section 3, just cited, answers the question that has been so persistently put to the President of the United States by gentlemen on this floor, "What is your policy?" The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. GROSVENOR] has answered that question fully and satisfactorily.

The President has no policy until this Congress acts. The Constitution of the United States does not give him authority to dispose of and make rules and regulations for the government of the Territories; but it gives to this House and to the Senate, with the approval of the President, the power to make these rules and to dispose of these territories. The only authority that he will have will be, when these two Houses of Congress shall have sent to him a bill expressing their wishes and their policy, to attach his signature in approval or disapproval. If it meets his disapproval, then the President of the United States in his message to Congress can announce his views as to our policy, not his.

VARIOUS FORMS OF TERRITORIAL GOVERNMENT.

That no uniform system of government is demanded of Congress is illustrated by the various Territories over which our jurisdiction extends at the present time, independent of our recently acquired territory. Thus we have in the District of Columbia one class of laws. In Arizona and New Mexico, to which will shortly be added Hawaii and Alaska, other forms of government as organized Territories, but differing widely in details among themselves. In the Indian Territory we have no Territorial organization, but administer the government directly from Washington. In Samoa we govern jointly with two other nations in the form of a protectorate and under treaty stipulations. Any of these various forms will be changed at the discretion of Congress.

Upon the signing of the treaty of peace Porto Rico and the Philippines will come to us as unorganized territories, for the reason that there is no stipulation in the treaty which requires an

immediate extension of the constitutional provisions or general laws over their inhabitants. We can extend these provisions if we choose to do so, or we can refrain from so doing if we choose; and until some action is taken by us the Executive has authority under the precedents already established to maintain a military government.

That was the case, notably with Florida, between the time of our taking possession and the enactment of laws for its government by Congress.

Article IX of the pending treaty with Spain is in the following language:

The civil rights and political status of the native inhabitants of the territory hereby ceded to the United States shall be determined by the Congress.

Seventh. *As a corollary to the above proposition these territories may be given a system of taxation, both local and by way of customs impositions, different from those imposed upon the States, for taxation is but one of the forms of legislation growing out of sovereignty and coming within the power of Congress to make all rules and regulations for the Territories. It need not be upon the basis of representation, as Chief Justice Marshall stated very clearly in the following language:*

If it were true that according to the spirit of our Constitution the power of taxation must be limited by the right of representation, whence is derived the power to lay and collect duties, imposts, and excises? (5 Wheat., 325.)

The treaty of peace containing no provision concerning taxation, it follows that until Congress extends the constitutional provisions, Article I, section 8, requiring all duties, imposts, and excises to be uniform throughout the United States, that the matter of uniformity or nonuniformity is entirely within the control of the Congress itself.

Eighth. *The accession of this territory does not extend the right of citizenship to the inhabitants of these islands, nor is the fourteenth amendment applicable to their condition, for the reason, above stated, that the Constitution does not either in its body or in any of its amendments become operative without express action.*

Ninth. *As a further corollary the entire subject of immigration into the United States from these islands is a matter within the control of Congress. It can extend the exclusion acts or it can modify or repeal them, as it sees proper. This disposes of the objection that upon the conclusion of the treaty of peace the Chinese and Malays or other objectionable elements of the population of those islands may come in vast numbers into this country to enter into competition with American labor.*

So much for the legal aspect of the case. With absolute power in Congress to legislate for these territories, not only for their own best interests but for the best interests of our own country as well, I can foresee no great difficulty as to acquiring, retaining, governing, or disposing, in any way we see proper, of these possessions.

THE POLICY OF EXPANSION.

The other phase of the question as to the proper policy of the Government is another question, about which there may be legitimately a wide diversity of opinion. One fact we must, however, recognize at the very outset, and that is the fact that we are to-day in actual possession of this acquired territory and responsible in the eyes of the world for the preservation of order and the protection of life and property while that possession continues; and, being thus responsible, we should put ourselves in a position to discharge that duty effectually.

It can only be done at the present time by military occupancy, to preserve these islands either from the anarchy of misrule by native leaders or absorption by foreign powers. It has been well stated by distinguished gentlemen who have already spoken upon this subject that all the other alternatives, of returning these islands to Spain, of disposing of them to other foreign powers, or of withdrawing our protection from them, are so contrary to our own ideas of duty and so contrary to the expectation of the world and our own ideas of justice that we are remitted to the final alternative of continuing, for a time at least, our present status therein.

The gentlemen who are so persistent in catechising the members on this side of the House as to their views in regard to forcing, as they put it, the government established by the United States against the wishes of the inhabitants of the Philippine Islands will no doubt desire an expression of my views, if they consider them of any importance, upon the subject. While I believe the question is a mere hypothetical one, and is based upon no condition which now exists or which may hereafter arise, I shall not hesitate to answer it frankly and fully. I believe that candor is due not only to this House but to the country upon every great political question. When the question of the recognition of a supposed existing government in the island of Cuba at the declaration of war was before this House, I was one of a few Republicans who honestly and conscientiously, and upon information which we supposed at that time to be accurate and trustworthy, favored that proposition.

WHO HAVE A RIGHT TO SPEAK FOR THE PHILIPPINES.

Candor compels me to say that in the light of history and subsequent events I believe now a mistake would have been made in doing so. The situation in the Philippines is radically different from what I was led to believe was the case in Cuba. It is not claimed by even the most ardent supporters of the anti-annexation policy that there is to-day any form of government in those islands other than that maintained by the United States by reason of military occupation.

The claim that Aguinaldo and his half-savage followers represent either a present or possible stable and independent government, capable of maintaining peace, protecting life and property, or discharging the duties of international obligations, is not seriously believed or advocated by any gentlemen upon this floor or elsewhere. Were the question of submission to his rule passed upon by the civilized inhabitants it would be unanimously rejected. He has no more rights to consideration than the chief of an Indian tribe in the Louisiana Territory, who had been at war with France and Spain while this Territory was in their possession, to have set up the claim that the United States having acquired it by cession from its former owners should be compelled to recognize him and his savage followers as entitled to recognition and recession of the Territory.

Under a Democratic Administration Louisiana became ours by purchase; the Orleans Territory, which was carved out of it, was as alien to our people, our language, our laws, and our customs and traditions as are the Philippines to-day. Its people were as vigorous in their protest against annexation to the United States as could any inhabitant of Luzon be to-day. We forced our Government upon them without their consent; we maintained order by military force; we kept the people of the territory in a state of tutelage until the time came when we could admit them to the Union.

I am not now referring to the legal right to acquire this territory, nor to the fact that under the treaty with France by which Louisiana became a part of this country there was a specific provision for the extension of the Constitution and laws of the United States and its admission to the Union as soon as possible. That question I have considered settled by the citations heretofore made. But I am referring merely to the fact that we have historical precedent, and that, too, under the Administration of the father of the Democratic party, Thomas Jefferson, for forcing an unwilling people to accept our government.

Briefly, therefore, my position is this: We are in the Philippine Islands as guardians of peace and order until at least some form of self-government shall be established. Should Aguinaldo and his insurgent followers attempt by force to interfere with the discharge of this duty, I for one would be willing to use the Army and Navy of the United States to compel him by force to submit to our control just as I would require an Indian chief and his tribe to maintain order in any part of the territory we had previously acquired.

I for one do not propose to repeat with the Filipinos the mistake which might have been made had we recognized the reputed government of Cuba, which did not represent and could not represent the wishes of the inhabitants of that island. I, for one, believe that the present status should be maintained in the Philippines until we can study the conditions and means of its inhabitants, not of the savage, barbarous tribes which neither have nor are capable of having local government, but of those civilized portions of the islands which live in settled communities, enjoy the blessings of civilization, are capable of local self-government and possibly of national existence, and who desire a stable government, whether it be dependent upon the United States as a protectorate, as an integral part of our jurisdiction, or as an independent government.

WE SHALL ACT WHEN WE HAVE FULL KNOWLEDGE.

When this information shall have been had, we shall be ready to act and we shall act. I have no doubt, wisely for our own interests as well as justly for theirs. But until that decision is reached, Aguinaldo and every other agitator and disturber must be compelled to recognize the authority of our Government, and await the working out of the problem. If this means forcing upon an unwilling people a government of our own instead of theirs, I am in favor of it, but until we hear from the real parties in interest, who are entitled to have a voice in the decision of this question, I deny that any such question is more than a hypothetical and academic one.

It is also urged that in reaching out into this distant part of the world and planting our flag in another hemisphere we are forgetting the traditions of our fathers; forgetting the precepts of Washington, and acting in violation of the Monroe doctrine.

For a phrase that is so frequently used as the Monroe doctrine I know of nothing concerning which there is more universal mistake and misunderstanding. Time does not permit me to comment upon this phase of the subject in the presence of the House, but I shall take the liberty of inserting, under the permission given

to extend our remarks, a few remarks upon the history and interpretation of this doctrine, and will endeavor to show its limited application, its true sphere, and that it in no wise hampers or controls our action in the present case.

THE FUTURE OF OUR COUNTRY.

In conclusion I wish to say that engrossed as we have been in the past with the settlement of our internal affairs, looking inwardly upon our domestic concerns rather than outwardly upon the world at large, we have suddenly, as a result of the Spanish war, awakened to a realization of the fact that the genius of our institutions will not permit us to slumber in the sleep of lethargy which dwarfed the advancement of China and Japan for so many centuries. We have climbed to higher altitudes, and above the mists and fogs which have obscured our vision in the past we look out upon a broadening horizon. We see and realize that in this busy, modern world, upon which the twentieth century will soon dawn, we must bear our share with the enlightened nations of the world in advancing the happiness and welfare of humanity.

With this brightened vision we see the commerce of the United States again reviving and its white sails fluttering on every ocean and its flag floating in every breeze. We see the products of American ingenuity, the rich harvests of American soil, and the treasures of her hills and mountains offered in every mart of the civilized world. We see American vessels, built by American skill, manned by American sailors, and laden with American merchandise, in every quarter of the globe. We see an American Navy, the equal of any in the world, with Deweys and Sampsons and Schleys and Wainwrights in command and American men behind the guns to protect our merchant marine. We see coaling stations and resting places for this vast fleet to enter and renew their energies and strength. We see a great canal across the Isthmus, built by American capital, controlled by American influence, and constructed for American commerce, across the narrow strip that connects our northern and our southern continents.

We see that as the old nation of eastern Asia or the new developments in Africa open up new markets and new fields of enterprise, the United States claims its full and fair share in the benefits of this onward march. We can not stand still; stagnation means retrogression, and that means ultimately political death. We must move upward and onward with the rest of the world; we are entitled to be in the van of the march. Wherever our flag shall be planted it shall bring to the people who rest beneath its shadow the blessings of liberty and equality and a better civilization. The Monroe doctrine shall no longer be limited to the claim of America for Americans, but shall be enlarged to mean, "All the world for American commerce, and the protection of the American flag over the lives of American citizens and American property in every corner of the earth;" and as one by one the countries of the earth yield to the beneficent influence of American liberty, morality, and religion, either under our Government or their own, the day will ultimately come when there shall no longer be only the United States of America, but all the nations of the earth shall be joined in one great United States of the World.

THE MONROE DOCTRINE.

In view of the frequency with which the Monroe doctrine is invoked to sustain views, however diverse, connected with the management of Federal affairs relating to our foreign policy, it is a matter of some importance in determining its applicability to any particular state of facts that we shall know a little more definitely than the average American, even though well informed upon other subjects, seems to be as to what the so-called Monroe doctrine actually is.

It might be well to state at the outset that the Monroe doctrine is entirely without the sanction of any direct legislation to give it any binding force. It stands to-day, as it has stood for the last seventy-five years, the expression of a national sentiment, the avowal of a national purpose, the indication of a national determination. But Congress has not, by either statutory enactment or by resolution, during all these seventy-five years, specifically enunciated the Monroe doctrine as a part of the law of the land, although the attempt has been made several times without success, nor has it ever been recognized as a principle of international law by foreign nations.

It was the offspring of an emergency, or, rather, of two emergencies which came so close together and were of so similar a character that President Monroe combined the utterances upon both in his same annual message delivered to Congress December 2, 1823.

It may conduce to a clearer understanding of the language of his message, so far as it enunciates this doctrine, for me to briefly outline the historical events which led to its announcement.

THE ORIGIN OF THE MONROE DOCTRINE.

In 1823 the western coast of North America was an almost unknown land to the civilized world. By treaty with France and Spain and by the explorations of Lewis and Clark we had extended

our territory westward from the 13 original colonies with their adjacent possessions east of the Mississippi River until the western boundary included a portion of the present States of Washington and Oregon. The coast south of Oregon was still a portion of the Mexican territory. To the north of Washington Great Britain had already laid claim by reason of discovery, and Russia had already advanced a similar claim to the right of discovery in colonizing other portions to the Pacific coast of the northern continent.

These claims of Russia, Great Britain, and the United States overlapped upon each other, and threatened to involve the three countries in a controversy that would result in war. The actual boundaries of the possessions of the three nations, although not accurately determined, were still in a general way fairly well recognized.

President Monroe, in order to forestall the planting of colonies within any portion of the territory bordering upon the Pacific which then belonged to the United States or was likely ultimately to become a portion of it, announced the views of this Government upon the subject in the following language:

At the proposal of the Russian Imperial Government, made through the minister of the Emperor residing here, a full power and instructions have been transmitted to the minister of the United States at St. Petersburg to arrange by amicable negotiation the respective rights and interests of the two nations on the northwest coast of this continent. A similar proposal had been made by His Imperial Majesty to the Government of Great Britain, which has likewise been acceded to. The Government of the United States has been desirous by this friendly proceeding of manifesting the great value which they have invariably attached to the friendship of the Emperor and their solicitude to cultivate the best understanding with his Government. In the discussions to which this interest has given rise and in the arrangements by which they may terminate the occasion has been judged proper for asserting, as a principle in which the rights and interests of the United States are involved, that the American continents, by the free and independent condition which they have assumed and maintain, are henceforth not to be considered as subjects for future colonization by any European powers.

The commissions referred to adjusted this controversy satisfactorily, and the emergency which had given rise to the declaration of President Monroe passed away. No similar occasion has since arisen for its reannouncement, and this clause of the Monroe doctrine may be considered as a dead letter at the present time, for the reason that no nation would think of putting forth a claim to any portion of the continent by reason of prior discovery or make an attempt to establish colonies thereon. It may therefore be dismissed without further consideration.

The other two clauses of the Monroe doctrine grew out of a different state of facts.

THE HOLY ALLIANCE.

The balance of power in Europe which originated in the attempt made by France under Richelieu to maintain its supremacy over Austria in the affairs of Europe was rudely shattered by the schemes of conquest which Napoleon Bonaparte was able to carry out so successfully for awhile. He broke the balance of power by practically absorbing all of Europe except Great Britain and Russia in the Empire of France. With his downfall and immediately afterwards a so-called Holy Alliance of the three great powers, Austria, Prussia, and Russia, was established, following the treaty of Chaumont. The purpose of this alliance, as it was announced shortly after, was to intrust in the great powers named therein the right to settle all European questions, and was afterwards extended to nullify all reforms which had been effected by insurrection against the authority of any of these powers and to suppress any institutions or governments whose existence might be attended with danger to the rest of Europe.

Under the authority of this "concert of Europe," as it was called, or the Holy Alliance, Austria had suppressed popular uprisings in Naples and Piedmont; the house of Bourbon had been restored to the throne of Spain; a revolt of the Spanish people had ensued, and France, with the approval of the Holy Alliance, had marched her armies into the peninsula, triumphantly suppressed the will of the people, and restored the Bourbon monarchy.

The former colonies of Spain in South and Central America had but recently revolted and established their independence. It was well understood that when the Holy Alliance should have coerced the rest of Europe into the adoption of their system and the recognition of the divine right of kings, its next step would be to restore to Spain these South American colonies. These colonies had all been recognized as free and independent governments by the United States, and diplomatic representatives had been exchanged between our Government and theirs. We had maintained an absolute neutrality so long as they were struggling for existence, but when the time came which demonstrated, as it has recently in the case of Cuba, the inability of Spain to recover her control of the colonies and the ability of the colonies to maintain their own independent government, a ready recognition had been extended to them by the United States, who welcomed them into the great family of nations.

Up to this point and so long as the object of the alliance was limited to the suppression of republican institutions in Europe and the restoration of the old order of things, which had existed

prior to the Napoleonic wars, England, as one of the five great powers, had readily acquiesced in and sanctioned what had been done. But when it became a question of the interference of European nations with the governments established on the Western Continents with the possibility of all this immense territory which had been wrested from Spain being returned to her, England, or more properly Great Britain, became alarmed. The establishment of this vast power which was most certain to receive the sympathy and support of all the continental portion of Europe was looked upon by her as a coming menace to her possessions in Canada and the other provinces of North America which could never arise if the lately established governments in South and Central America were permitted to exist.

THE MONROE DOCTRINE SUGGESTED BY GREAT BRITAIN.

Accordingly we find that the British minister of foreign affairs, Mr. Canning, called the attention of our minister to England, Mr. Rush, to the threatened danger, and proposed that England and the United States should jointly declare against this proposed intrusion of the Holy Alliance into the Western Continent. Our minister, Mr. Rush, immediately communicated the proposition to President Monroe. The latter, while tolerably well determined in his own mind as to the course to be pursued, felt, however, that it involved a question of so much importance and fraught with so momentous responsibility that his judgment should be reinforced by that of others in whom he placed the utmost confidence. He accordingly referred the matter to Thomas Jefferson and James Madison for their consideration and advice.

VIEW OF JEFFERSON AND MADISON.

As throwing light not only upon the subject before us, but as indicating the wonderful, almost prophetic, discernment of Jefferson concerning the future of Cuba and the possibility of an Anglo-American alliance, which has recently attracted so much attention, I can not refrain from quoting a part of Jefferson's reply in his exact language. He said:

The question presented by the letters you have sent me is the most momentous which has ever been offered to my contemplation since that of independence that made us a nation; this sets our compass and points the course which we are to steer through the ocean of time opening on our view, and never could we embark on it under circumstances more auspicious. Our first and fundamental maxim should be never to entangle ourselves in the broils of Europe; our second, never to suffer Europe to meddle in cis-Atlantic affairs. America, North and South, has a set of interests distinct from those of Europe and peculiarly her own. She should therefore have a system of her own, separate and apart from that of Europe. While the last is laboring to become the domicile of despotism, our endeavor should surely be to make our hemisphere that of freedom. One nation, most of all, could disturb us in this pursuit; she now offers to lead, aid, and accompany us in it. By acceding to her proposition we detach her from the hands of despots, bring her mighty weight into the scale of free government, and emancipate at one stroke a whole continent which might otherwise linger along in doubt and difficulty.

Great Britain is the nation which can do us the most harm of any one or all on earth, and with her on our side we need not fear the whole world. With her, then, we should the most sedulously nourish a cordial friendship, and nothing would tend more to knit our affections than to be fighting once more side by side in the same cause. Not that I would purchase even her amity at the price of taking part in her wars. But the war in which the present proposition might engage us, should that be its consequence, is not her war, but ours. Its object is to introduce and to establish the American system of ousting from our land all foreign nations, of never permitting the powers of Europe to intermeddle with the affairs of our nation. It is to maintain our own principles, not to depart from it. And if, to facilitate this, we can effect a division in the body of European powers and draw over to our side its most popular member, surely we should do it.

But I am clearly of Mr. Canning's opinion that it will prevent war instead of provoking it. With Great Britain withdrawn from their scale and shifted into that of our two continents, all Europe combined would not dare to risk war. Nor is the occasion to be slighted which this proposition offers of declaring our protest against the atrocious violation of the rights of nations by the interference of any one in the internal affairs of another, so flagitiously begun by Bonaparte and now continued by the equally lawless alliance calling itself holy.

But we have first to ask ourselves a question. Do we wish to acquire to our confederacy any one or more of the Spanish provinces? I candidly confess that I have ever looked on Cuba as the most interesting addition which could ever be made to our system of States. The control which, with Florida Point, this island would give us over the Gulf of Mexico and the countries and the isthmus bordering on it, as well as all those whose waters flow into it, would fill up the measure of our political well-being.

Yet, as I am sensible that this can never be obtained, even with her own consent, but by war, and as her independence, which is our second interest, and especially her independence of England, can be secured without it, I have no hesitation at abandoning my first wish to future chances and accepting its independence with peace and the friendship of England rather than its association at the expense of a war and her enmity. I could honestly, therefore, join in the declaration proposed, that we aim not at the acquisition of any of these possessions, that we will not stand in the way of any amicable arrangement between them and the mother country, but that we will oppose with all our means the forcible interposition of any other power, either as auxiliary, stipendiary, or under any other form or pretext, and most especially their transfer to any power by conquest, cession, or acquisition in any other way.

Madison replied in a similar manner, although he took occasion to express as his opinion that Canning was not actuated by any desire to advance the cause of liberty, but rather by the desire to preserve the possessions of Great Britain free from the threat of foreign interference.

THE DOCTRINE STATED.

The opinions of these two eminent statesmen so thoroughly coincided with that of President Monroe that he no longer hesi-

tated to incorporate a statement of these views in his coming annual message. He did this in the following language:

The political system of the allied powers is essentially different in this respect from that of America. This difference proceeds from that which exists in their respective governments; and to the defense of our own, which has been achieved by the loss of so much blood and treasure and matured by the wisdom of their most enlightened citizens, and under which we have enjoyed unexampled felicity, the whole nation is devoted. We owe it, therefore, to candor and to the amicable relations existing between the United States and those powers to declare that we should consider any attempt on their part to extend their system to any portion of this hemisphere as dangerous to our peace and safety. With the existing colonies or dependencies of any European power we have not interfered and shall not interfere. But with the governments who have declared their independence and maintained it, and whose independence we have on great consideration and on just principles acknowledged, we could not view any interposition for the purpose of oppressing them or controlling in any other manner their destiny by any European power in any other light than as the manifestation of an unfriendly disposition toward the United States.

The immediate result of this declaration was the abandonment of the attempt of the Holy Alliance to interfere with the rights or independence of the Spanish-American government.

THE PANAMA CONVENTION.

The first occasion which presented itself after this memorable declaration was issued to construe its full meaning by those who had been most active in its preparation and indorsement grew out of a request for a joint conference of representatives of all the Spanish-American republics to be held at Panama in 1826. To this conference the United States was invited to send a representative. Among the topics which it was officially announced were to be discussed was that of opposition to colonization in America, and also the establishment of what was called a continental system, the object of which was to unite in a common league or alliance all of the governments of the Western Continent for the purpose of resisting the interference of European nations in behalf of Spain in her attempt to reduce her former colonies to submission.

The Official Gazette of Colombia announced as one of the topics to be discussed:

To take into consideration the means of making effectual the declaration of the President of the United States respecting any ulterior design of a foreign power to colonize any portion of this continent, and also the means of resisting all interference from abroad with the domestic concerns of the American governments.

At the time this proposition was submitted to the United States Government John Quincy Adams, who had been Secretary of State under Monroe, had succeeded to the Presidency. Adams, as a Cabinet officer of his predecessor, had himself suggested and even furnished the language in which the Monroe doctrine so called was declared. He was undoubtedly in thorough sympathy with that doctrine, and in his annual message of December 6, 1825, announced the acceptance of the invitation to this conference and stated that commissioners from the United States would be authorized to attend the conference and to take such part in it as might be compatible with the neutrality which it was the intention of the American States to maintain.

This was followed by a special message to the Senate upon the same subject, dated the 26th of December, 1825. In this the President took occasion to disclaim any intention on the part of the United States of taking part in any deliberations of a belligerent character and announced that the motives of the attendance of our representatives at this Panama Congress was "neither to contract alliances nor to engage in any undertaking or project importing hostilities to any other nation."

After commenting rather pointedly upon the fact that these various Spanish-American States had stipulated with Spain for certain special privileges and concessions in the way of trade regulations, and had also established duties and impositions operating unfavorably to the United States as compared with European nations, he gave them distinctly to understand that it was not the purpose of the United States to interfere with every quarrel that might arise between these Spanish-American Governments and any other nation of Europe, nor was it the intention of our Government to allow them to sit down supinely, making no effort to defend themselves and looking to the United States solely for protection against foreign aggression. His language was as follows:

An agreement between all the nations represented at the meeting that each will guard by its own means against the establishment of any future European colony within its borders may be found advisable. This was more than two years since announced by my predecessor to the world as a principle resulting from the emancipation of both the American continents. It may be so developed to the new southern nations that they will all feel it as an essential appendage to their independence.

This was followed by an admirable address sent to the House of Representatives on March 15, 1826, in response to an inquiry as to the purposes of the Panama Congress, to which the President, with the consent of the Senate, had already appointed its commissioners. This address would well repay its complete quotation, but the purposes of this paper and the limit of time at my disposal will prevent my using more than one brief citation. After referring to the interest which our own Government had taken in the

establishment of the independent Governments of South and Central America, and alluding to the friendly relations which had already grown up between the new governments and our own, he referred to the objection which had been urged to the appointment of the commission, on the ground that it would stir up the antagonism of European nations, in the following patriotic language:

To the question which may be asked, Whether this meeting and the principles which may be adjusted and settled by it as rules of intercourse between the American nations may not give umbrage to the Holy League of European powers or offense to Spain, it is deemed a sufficient answer that our attendance at Panama can give no just cause of umbrage or offense to either, and that the United States will stipulate nothing there which can give such cause. Here the right of inquiry into our purposes and measures must stop. The Holy League of Europe itself was formed without inquiring of the United States whether it would or would not give umbrage to them. The fear of giving umbrage to the Holy League of Europe was urged as a motive for denying to the American nations the acknowledgment of their independence. That it would be viewed by Spain as hostility to her was not only urged, but directly declared by herself. The Congress and Administration of that day consulted their rights and duties, and not their fears. Fully determined to give no needless displeasure to any foreign power, the United States can estimate the probability of their giving it only by the right which any foreign State could have to take it from their measures. Neither the representation of the United States at Panama nor any measure to which their assent may be yielded there will give to the Holy League or any of its members, nor to Spain, the right to take offense; for the rest, the United States must still, as heretofore, take counsel from their duties, rather than from their fears.

CONTROL OVER A PANAMA CANAL.

The next important occasion on which the Monroe doctrine was placed in issue was in regard to the proposed control over an interoceanic canal across the Isthmus of Panama by certain of the European nations. Our Secretary of State, Mr. Frelinghuysen, said, in a letter to the British minister in relation to the assumption of a joint control or a protectorate by several powers over such canal in case it should be constructed, that the President would not consent to or look with indifference upon such an intervention in American affairs; that such a protectorate by European nations over the Isthmus transit would be in conflict with the American doctrine many years asserted by distinguished citizens, believed in by the people, and approved by Great Britain, and that a protectorate over the proposed canal would seriously affect and threaten our political interests.

It was again made the subject of expression by Blaine while Secretary of State in connection with certain provisions of the Clayton-Bulwer treaty which seemed to permit the occupancy of territory in Nicaragua by Great Britain, and Blaine, in his vigorous style, condemned these provisions as contrary to the Monroe doctrine, and they have since been repudiated.

THE INTERFERENCE OF THE FRENCH IN MEXICO.

The attempt of the French Government during our civil war to interfere in the affairs of Mexico, overturn its existing Government, and place the unfortunate Maximilian upon the throne of a kingdom dominated by foreign influence, led to a most vigorous protest on the part of this Government and ultimately toward the movement of troops toward the Mexican frontier for the enforcement of our demand for recognition of the principle of the Monroe doctrine as applied to the condition of affairs then existing. Bloodshed was averted by the withdrawal of the French forces, but the very fact of this peaceable yielding on the part of France to our demands was itself a practical acknowledgment of the justice of the doctrine.

THE VENEZUELA BOUNDARY DISPUTE.

Finally, to bring the doctrine down to its latest episode, we must refer to the Venezuelan boundary question, which threatened serious complications between this Government and Great Britain during the Cleveland Administration. This dispute is of so recent a date that you are no doubt all familiar with its details. It grew out of the attempt of Great Britain to extend her possessions in her colony of Guiana into territory claimed by Venezuela as her own. There was an overlapping of the two claims. The disputed territory, while small in area, was important and valuable to either country by reason of rich deposits of gold and other minerals contained therein. Great Britain, with her usual policy of enforcing her demands by her military and naval strength, was proposing to take possession of this territory against what seemed to our Government to be at least an unsettled and disputed claim of Venezuela which appeared to be just and equitable. The United States assumed the part of an intermediary as between the greater and the weaker power and succeeded in obtaining the consent to the appointment of arbitrators to settle the disputed boundary. This commission is still in existence, and we have no reason to doubt that its findings will be submitted to by both of the Governments interested.

Thus we have brought in a hurried manner the discussion of the Monroe doctrine and the various cases in which it has arisen down to the present time. It would appear plain, it seems, that this doctrine is one which grew out of the demand for self-protection of our country against European encroachments. A portion of it has undoubtedly become obsolete, for the reason that we can conceive of no case arising in the future to which the clause in rela-

tion to colonization will apply; and as to the other portion of it, it is equally clear that it applies only to the conduct of affairs in this Western Hemisphere, and in no way affects the policy of our Government in relation to our interference in the affairs of other nations, either in this hemisphere or the other. It in no way affects the right of this Government to acquire and hold as the legitimate fruits of war any of the territory we have captured from Spain in our recent war, and any attempt to cite the Monroe doctrine as an estoppel to our right of expansion in any direction or to any extent is an extension of that doctrine not warranted either by the occasion which gave rise to its enunciation, the historical precedents in which it has been applied and enforced, or by any authority vested in the President or in Congress to curtail the inherent rights of sovereignty possessed by every independent nation, and one of the attributes of which is the right to acquire territory, without limit as to extent, location, or character, either by purchase, cession, voluntary annexation, or by treaty as a result of conquest.

THE RESULTS OF A WAR MAY DIFFER FROM THOSE EXPECTED.

It is no answer to this to assert that the war with Spain was founded upon a humanitarian basis and was solely to put an end to the barbarities practiced upon the inhabitants of Cuba, and that the nation had no thought of the acquisition of territory as the result of that war.

Few wars in history have worked out precisely the end in view at the time they were begun. Two striking instances of this are recorded in our own annals. It is well known that the Revolutionary war was inaugurated with no thought of an absolute separation of the colonies from the mother country. Its purpose was to secure a redress of wrongs and a reformation of the colonial government.

It was with hesitation and reluctance that the statesmen of that day reached the conclusion that the only remedy for existing evils was a complete independence, and that conclusion was reached only after the actual war had been in progress many months. The result was unforeseen when the minute men at Lexington and the yeomanry at Bunker Hill sounded the first tocsins of war. Yet none the less we accepted the destiny that was mapped out for us and became an independent people.

The civil war was waged for the preservation of the Union. There was little or no thought of destroying the institution of slavery, and had the North triumphed in a few decisive battles at its outbreak and won a peace before the issue of the emancipation proclamation, its end would have been accomplished without resulting in the breaking of the shackles which fettered the limbs of the colored people of the South. Thus the actual purposes for which a war may be inaugurated and the results which may come from that war are sometimes widely diverse. But whatever may have been the motive which fires the first gun in deadly conflict, the responsibility of accepting its results rests equally upon the victor and the vanquished. We, as the victors in the recent struggle, can not shirk, even if we would, the duties which it has imposed upon us. We owe a duty to ourselves, to the inhabitants of the conquered land, and to the world at large, and this duty we are ready to assume and to perform with that same faith in republican institutions, that same love for human freedom, and that same trust in Divine Providence which has shaped our course as a nation during our century and a quarter of existence.

There are conscientious men, no doubt many of them, who look with foreboding on the new departure upon which we seem about to enter. They decry what they style the spirit of imperialism which has seized upon the nation; they point out that we are departing from the teachings of the father of the Republic; they would circumscribe our energies to the confines of this continent; they opposed, sincerely, I believe, many of them, the acquisition of Hawaii; they demur to the retention of Porto Rico; they lift a finger of warning against the hoped for and expected request of Cuba to come into our Union; they speak in tones of dread of the retention of a part or all of the Philippines; they would have us turn back the dial of time six months in the history of the world and surrender to Spain her conquered islands.

THE OBJECTIONS TO EXPANSION ARE NOT NEW.

The same opposition and the same voices of warning were raised at each accession of territory which came to us, whether by purchase or conquest, from the time we were but the thirteen original colonies. The purchase of Florida and of the Louisiana Territory, the accession of Texas, and the territory obtained from Mexico, all found ready opposition on the part of those who were opposed to expansion. And yet, when we look over this vast expanse of acquired territory, with its millions of happy and prosperous human beings breathing in the pure atmosphere of freedom under the benign influences of the American Constitution, how false have proven these prophecies of disaster. Our whole history has been one of expansion.

The words of Washington in his Farewell Address are entitled to the reverent admiration of every American citizen. Construed as they should be with reference to the conditions which existed

at the time he gave them to the world, and with the announced purpose of preserving our country from entangling alliances with European nations until we should be strong enough to stand alone in defense of our rights and liberties, they were the wisest utterances of his time. But a hundred years have wrought a mighty change in the world. We are no longer a weak and struggling people, fearful lest the liberties which we had acquired at the cost of so much blood and treasure should be snatched from us by a powerful foe. We stand to-day a mighty nation, the mightiest, in many respects, of any on earth.

We need no alliances for our own protection; we will make none to our detriment. That Providence which shapes the ends of nations as of men is working out for us a future of which we had but little thought a few short months ago. In the language of Jefferson already quoted, the war, the events of which have forced themselves so rapidly upon us, "sets our compass and points the course which we are to steer in the ocean of time opening on our view." We, as a Christian nation, look forward to the coming of that millennium when all the world shall be at peace, and those who look justly upon the grave and momentous questions that confront us can not but feel that as the chosen instruments of this Divine plan we are most surely and most certainly bringing nearer to its realization the promise of this day of peace by extending to the suffering and oppressed of foreign countries the beneficent influences of American civilization and the genius of our free institutions.

WE CAN TRUST THE PRESENT EXECUTIVE.

We have to-day in the Executive Mansion at Washington a man of the purest and loftiest type of patriotism, a Christian gentleman, a statesman the equal of any that the history of our country has known, conservative yet progressive; a man to whom justice and honor, personal and official, are the guiding stars of his conduct; a man who, whilst reverencing the traditions of the fathers, is wise enough to recognize the fact that the world is moving on, and that new conditions impose new obligations and demand the performance of new duties. Let us, then, as good, patriotic American citizens, trust to that wisdom, conservatism, and patriotism which have ever distinguished his course in public affairs and uphold his hands in the discharge of the trying duties that we have devolved upon our honored President, William McKinley.

I have thus briefly sketched the Monroe doctrine of the past and of the present. But what of the future? The doctrine of the past was one suited to our conditions as a weak and timid nation. The Monroe doctrine of the present, as applied to the Venezuela case and announced to the strongest nation on earth, is the sentiment of a nation self-reliant, mature in experience and development, fearing no opposition when assured of the justice of its cause, counting no odds too great, courting no alliance, but ready and willing, if necessary, to submit even to the final arbitrament of the sword the justice of its cause and its right to protect not only itself but its weaker neighbors from the rapacity and encroachment of other nations.

Mr. HULL. Mr. Chairman, I yield twenty minutes to my colleague from Iowa [Mr. HEPBURN].

Mr. HEPBURN. Mr. Chairman, the objections offered to the pending bill are somewhat various. One gentleman objects to it because he says that it raises a standing army that is to be used—to quote him literally—"to shoot labor in the back." Another one tells us it is to be used to subvert human liberty in the Republic. Another tells us it is to be used to rewrite the Declaration of Independence, to make a new Constitution, from which we shall leave out all reference to liberty, equality of human rights, the doctrine that governments derive their just powers from the consent of the governed, and to start out upon a mission of hostility to all the world that differ from us in form of government and to begin wars of subjugation and territorial expansion.

These gentlemen who fear that this measure proposes to shoot labor in the back fail, it seems to me, to realize of whom this army is to be composed, from where they come, or that there is an army of laborers, 23,000,000 in number, of men, women, and youths, who are to be shot in the back. Why, Mr. Chairman, where will this army come from? From the homes and the fire-sides of this land. They are to be citizens of the United States; they are to be men who have learned the lessons of liberty from liberty-loving fathers and mothers; they are to come from the great labor fields in the United States; they are to be recruited from this great army of 23,000,000 people. Are they by their mere enlistment to be changed in nature at once? Are they at once to learn to hate the liberty they have always been taught to love? Are they to become enemies of the class from which they sprang? Are they to assail their fathers, mothers, brothers, and sisters that are now in the labor field and who it is said they are to "shoot in the back?" No man believes that, in my humble judgment. It is but the catchword of those who are seizing upon this opportunity to bolster up the falling fortunes of a decaying political party. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. Chairman, gentlemen have quoted illustrious names, and chief of them that of Thomas Jefferson, as unalterably opposed to a large standing army. Gentlemen must remember that when we have secured 100,000 men our standing army will not be larger in proportion to our area, in proportion to our population, in proportion to our necessities than was the standing army of which Thomas Jefferson was the advocate, and that he aided as Chief Executive of this nation in raising, and which he commanded as Commander in Chief. I suppose that when he indulged in the utterance he had in his mind that the Army must have proper relation to the wants and the interests of the country. And I can not see that this Army that we propose will be disproportionate to the one that he thought in his judgment was ample, and only ample, for the needs of the people, when we had 5,000,000 people the day he was inaugurated President of the United States.

Then we had 5,000,000; now we have 75,000,000 people. Then we had 800,000 square miles of territory; now more than 4,000,000 square miles of territory. Then there was not a settlement beyond the Mississippi River; now there are great States, an empire that he never even dreamed of when most hopeful for the future of his country. Gentlemen have made this the occasion of an assault on the President of the United States in his administration of this Government during the last year I think unfairly; I think without the candor that ought to have been theirs on a grave occasion like this. They have said that the President of the United States had pressed a war upon the liberty of the people of the Philippine Islands; that he pressed a war of conquest; that he had departed from those pledges that the nation made a year ago when we entered upon the war with Spain. I believe those charges to be unjust.

Mr. Chairman, we ought to discriminate, it seems to me, between the purpose of the war with Spain and some of the results of the war with Spain. Gentlemen tell us that we are about to take the territory of the Philippines. Ah, not so. Dewey took that territory on the 1st of May last. [Applause.] Dewey created the situation that exists to-day. It is not for the President to create a new situation, a new condition, but to deal with the one that came in the natural progress of events that we all hoped for. Every gentleman upon that side of the House hoped that we might be successful in our war with Spain. National pride, love of country, love for those that constituted our gallant Army and our Navy, compelled them to hope that victory would come to us, that we would overcome our enemy.

How was that to be done? How? Only in three ways: Overcoming his military forces, destroying his revenues, or capturing or conquering his territory—the three objects of war, the only means by which we can assail the enemy, each legitimate and each right. When we entered upon that war every patriot hoped that we would overcome the military power of the enemy; every one hoped that we would be able to cripple their revenues; every one hoped we would occupy their territory, and that we would be the conquerors of more or less of their domain. Did you not? You anticipated that? Surely as patriots you must.

Now, just what you expected came. And you now say that the declarations that we made in regard to Cuba, the object of the war, shall be applied to all of the results of the war. There is no pledge of that kind. That territory is ours. It is ours by the right of conquest; it is ours by the laws of nations; it is our property. We can invest, when we please, in the good time that we may determine, the independence of that territory of ours with just such political rights as we choose. It is for us to determine—the Congress—and not the President of the United States. He simply, in his connection with them, is the Commander in Chief. It is for this body, and the one at the other end of the Capitol, to inaugurate the policies that shall determine the political rights of the people that are now occupying our territory.

But, gentlemen say—and here is where the greatest unfairness has been manifested—they say that the President is now inaugurating a rule of conquest; that he is going to rewrite the Declaration of Independence; that he is going to deprive certain people of their liberties. When you ask them for the proof, they say to us, "Did he not, in a speech recently made, state that 'the American flag had been planted in two hemispheres, who will take it down?'" And, therefore, they argue, that the flag is there to be maintained by force, against the will of the people, in subversion of liberty, and out of harmony with the declaration which we have heretofore made in our Constitution, in our State and national bill of rights, and in the Declaration of Independence.

Ah, Mr. Chairman, it is most unfair, unfair to charge the President of the United States with a crime against liberty and then pretend to prove it in the way you have. What do we, as practicing lawyers, say of that man who will assume to read to the court an authority, and garble it, read a sentence here, leaving out connecting explanatory sentences, give it a meaning not intended? We brand him as a shyster, and where the bar is self-respecting, we drive him from it, condemned as unworthy of the confidence, respect, and association of decent practitioners. Let

me suggest the correct reading of that quotation. The President says:

That flag has been planted in two hemispheres, and there it remains, the symbol of liberty and law, of peace and progress. Who will withdraw from the people over whom it floats its protecting folds? Will the people of the South help to haul it down?

[Great applause on the Republican side.]

That is what the President said; that is the declaration and his inquiry. There the flag is planted over these people, symbolizing to them that they are now entering upon a new existence of liberty, law, of peace and progress. Yet gentlemen here of his own party, who helped to elect him, who heretofore have given adhesion to their belief in his integrity and his statesmanship, garble that quotation, garble it, I say, for the purpose of sustaining a statement that it is his purpose to overthrow the liberty, to do away with the peace, to check the progress, to take from these people the benefits of the war. Shame on the cause, shame on the man, that needs to bolster up a cause by such misrepresentation.

Nothing that the President has done, nothing that he has said, justifies this assault. Nor has anything been done or said that justifies any gentleman in believing that the majority propose, when the proper time comes in their treatment of that people, to do other than that which we propose to extend to those who live nearer to our shores.

We have said that—

The United States disclaims any disposition or intention to exercise sovereignty, jurisdiction, or control over Cuba except for the pacification thereof, and asserts its determination, when that is accomplished, to leave the government and control of the island to the people.

Who doubts that that is the purpose of the Administration? Who believes that there exists in the minds of any considerable number of people in the United States a thought other than that of giving them pacification, giving them opportunity to establish order and law under such a form of government, and with proper safeguards to liberty, as they choose. And that will be the time. I will say to my friend from Tennessee, when we should "sail away."

Why should we not pursue precisely the same course toward the people of the Philippine Islands? There is much more of interest to us in seeking the immediate and forceful annexation of Cuba than there is in seeking it in those distant seas. We need probably coaling stations for the purpose of aiding our expanding commerce. Is there any gentleman that asks for more? We shall, I doubt not, true to all the traditions marked out for ourselves, pursue in their case the same course that we marked out for the people of Cuba. We will pacify their disorders; we will expel anarchy; we will give the people an opportunity to express their wishes—to form a purpose and then to form a government—and when they are self-sustaining and self-supporting, when they are able to maintain the government they have erected, then will be the time for us to "sail away" from Manila, and not till then.

[Loud applause.]

[Here the hammer fell.]

Mr. HULL. I yield fifteen minutes to the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. TONGUE].

Mr. TONGUE. Mr. Chairman, the responsibility for the unusual conditions that now confront us can be charged or credited to no one branch of the Government, to neither House of Congress, to no section of the country, to no political organization. There was a time when the preservation of peace seemed to be in the hands of the President. Again, the question of peace or war between Spain and our own people seemed to be in the keeping of Congress. But there came a time when neither the President, nor the Senate, nor this House, nor all combined, could have prevented the conflict between the armies of Spain and the people of the United States. When the long career of Spanish cruelty, oppression, and bloodshed culminated in the destruction of the *Maine* and the murder of American sailors on a mission of peace and friendship, no human power could have stayed the hand of vengeance, or could have prevented the American people from meting out adequate justice and retribution for the greatest crime of the century.

The duty of the President and Congress became merely that of furnishing money and leadership for the prosecution of a war that could not be avoided or delayed. The successful termination of this conflict has changed our attitude to Spain. While at peace we demanded only the relinquishment of Spanish sovereignty over Cuba. Victory entitles us to demand not only this, but compensation for the sacrifice in blood and treasure the conflict has entailed upon us. With victory has come duties and responsibilities that it would be cowardly to evade, opportunities that it would be criminal to neglect. Let us consider them as we did the declaration of war—as Americans, without sectional, partisan, or personal bitterness.

But, Mr. Chairman, in the storm and tumult of discussion of these questions growing out of the annexation of territory, whither are we drifting? Would it not be well to inspect the compass and

take our bearings? Is it profitable to indulge so much in speculation about future problems rather than those demanding present attention and present action? Why attempt to surmount difficulties that will never arise? Why assume and discuss conditions that do not, that never will exist? Why conjure up an imaginary tyranny to be erected and maintained by the American people, which every lover of freedom knows never will be constructed or tolerated by freemen? Are there not enough present duties to perform, questions to settle, and difficulties to surmount now, today, and during this Congress? We know too little of existing conditions, the capacities or will of the people, to determine upon a plan of future government for the people of the islands.

It was contended yesterday by the gentleman from Indiana that the inhabitants of the Philippine Islands have in operation a full government—executive, legislative, and judicial—of their own selection. I do not know that such a government exists. I do not believe that it exists. Had opportunity been given, I should have liked to ask the gentleman some questions, and obtain, if possible, some information upon that subject. But the distinguished gentleman's desire to question others, and to dictate the form of their answers to his own questions, was exceeded only by his eagerness to evade being questioned himself. I trust that gentleman will yet inform the House and country who provided for this election? When and where was it had? Under whose control? Upon how much, and what kind of notice? What was the qualification for exercising the right of suffrage? Who and how many were the electors? How were the ballots taken? How and by whom counted? Of the eight or ten millions of people inhabiting those islands, how many voted? How many ballots were cast in Manila or Iloilo?

But if we know little of them, the people of the Philippine Islands know less of us; less of our institutions than we do of theirs. Not only this, but their ignorance and passions are being inflamed by fraud, by falsehood, by deceit, and by slanders of Americans and American institutions, in the Philippine Islands, in the press there and here, and in both ends of this Capitol. On both sides, in both countries, we need more light. Our future policy in the Philippine Islands, the nature of the government we may conclude to establish, the extent of suffrage, trial by jury, questions of tariff policy, and others of like nature—all these problems will be better solved next year than now; better in two years than in one; better in three years than in two.

But what are the conditions now existing, and with which we must deal, and ought to deal at once? A few weeks ago the Philippine Islands were a part of the Spanish empire. They were as much a part of that empire as the Ladrões or Porto Rico. Spanish authority was supreme and uncontested. They were under laws enacted by Spain, administered by Spaniards. They knew no other laws, no other authorities. American arms and courage in the shock of battle changed these conditions and broke the power of Spain. We destroyed the only recognized government in the Philippine Islands, the only government that those people have known or recognized for centuries. The cannons of Dewey and Otis repealed every law, disarmed every officer, and removed the last vestige of every lawful authority but our own. We have destroyed the only power, the only government, the only authority that did or could furnish protection to person or property.

Now, what shall we do? Not next year, or in ten years, but now, in this Congress? Shall we leave them to anarchy or their own fierce contentions? Shall we stand aloof while the civilization, the wealth, and the intelligence in the cities shall be engaged in a bloody contest for existence and life with barbarous hordes from the mountains? Where would it end? Who would eventually be supreme? Of the vast number of tribes likely to contend for supremacy which will be the victor? Which will ultimately control the fortunes of the islands? Or are we to leave these islands "a derelict in the ocean," a prize to be contended for either in the market or in the arena of armed conflict between the powers of Europe?

Those who talk of Philippine independence must remember that the Filipinos have not won independence. Without the ratification of the Spanish-American treaty and the payment of American money, the sovereignty of Spain in those islands will not be relinquished, but will be reasserted. All of Spanish pride, of Spanish interest, of Spanish cruelty will be aroused for the subjugation of those islands. Shall we who waged the late war because the tyranny of Spain in Cuba could no longer be endured subject the Philippine islands to unrestricted exercise of Spanish cruelty, of Spanish tyranny, and of unchecked Weyerism? Shall we withdraw our forces and witness there the repetition of the butchery and starvation, the untold and indescribable cruelty, that marked the bloody history of Spanish rule in Spain?

If Spain is unable to subjugate them, is it to be doubted for one moment that she would procure foreign assistance, either by ceding a portion of the islands or by selling the entire group to some foreign power that would conquer and subjugate them? Is it in the interest of humanity that we are to assist in bringing about

any of these conditions? Who can tell the results of such a conflict? How will it affect the islands? How will it affect other nations? How will it affect the peace of the world? What would be its result upon our own interests, upon our own trade, in Asiatic countries? Would it strengthen the policy that permits us to trade upon the same conditions with other civilized nations in China, Japan, and other Asiatic ports, or would it tend to close them against American trade and against American commerce? The consequences of any such conduct are too fearful to contemplate, and could result only in untold disaster. Every instinct of humanity, every dictate of duty to the inhabitants of those islands, to civilization, to Christianity, to humanity, and to ourselves, forbid such a course of conduct.

We can not turn these islands back to Spain. We can not permit or consent for them to be returned. We can not abandon them to a reign of anarchy, cruelty, and bloodshed more terrible even than the tyranny of Spain. We can not permit them to be the subject of competition between the powerful governments of Europe. Having destroyed the only government they had, it is our imperative duty to substitute something in its place. Having destroyed their laws, we must give them others. Having removed their protectors, we must ourselves become their protectors. We must restore order. We must establish constituted and lawful authority. We must enthrone the supremacy of the law. We must furnish protection for life, liberty, reputation, property. We must maintain a government capable of protecting not only Aguinaldo and his savages from the mountains, but civilization, intelligence, and property in the cities. This is a duty we can not escape if we would; we ought not to escape it if we could. To properly perform this duty, the authority of this Government must be asserted, maintained, and rendered supreme. Those who are opposing this are fighting not for liberty, but for anarchy and the right to plunder.

The problem now before us, pressing for immediate solution, is how to establish such a government, giving the greatest amount of protection to life, liberty, and property, with the greatest measure of personal liberty and political freedom, and as much a government by the people of the islands themselves as is consistent with the safety of all classes of the inhabitants. To the solution of this important and pressing problem there are those upon the floors of this Congress, in both ends of the Capitol, who contribute nothing but indiscreet utterances, every word of which will be paid for by the life of an American soldier at Manila.

Those gentlemen who have no words of praise for their own Government, for American institutions, American civilization, or anything American, who denounce the government to be established under Dewey and Otis as equal to the butchery and tyranny of Weyler, who describe their own Government "as a counterpart of the one of Spain, and as willing to become one of the vultures hovering around China, preparing to devour her when she becomes a carcass," who allege that we are now waging a war "to establish despotism in another country, and to destroy the liberty of its people," a war that "is a crime against liberty, and the curse of God is upon it," who are describing the government that we may establish as "a tyranny, and that rebellion against it would be a duty, and not a crime," who describe the public utterances of the Chief Magistrate of a free people as "a nasty and reeking mess that is set before us, fit only for obscene birds and beasts of prey," are lending no aid to their own Government.

On the contrary, by their intemperate speech and incendiary utterances they are encouraging and strengthening armed resistance to the lawful authority of this Government. They are furnishing hope, encouragement, and moral support to Aguinaldo and his barbarians. Their speeches are filling insurgent ranks, nerveing insurgent arms, and firing insurgent hearts. They are shooting guns to be fired into the ranks of American soldiers. They are whetting knives to be plunged into American bosoms. They are preparing to make American wives widows, American mothers childless, and to slaughter the flower of American manhood in Manila.

I must insist that until we have restored order in the Philippines, until we have established some government, asserted and maintained its supremacy, until we have given to the inhabitants of those islands protection for all they have and for all they hold dear, until we have broken down armed resistance to the lawful authority of this Government, it is the duty, imperative duty, of every patriotic American citizen to stand shoulder to shoulder, side by side, in supporting the Administration in every laudable effort to bring about this result.

A prompt ratification of the treaty, a united people loyally supporting the Administration of our own country, and even now peace would prevail. An unratified treaty and divided counsels paralyze the executive arm and furnish insurgent opportunities.

Oh, but we are told, we have no right to govern these people. We have not obtained "the consent of the governed." While this question will arise hereafter, it does not arise now. We are

not going to annex Cuba, but none question our right to maintain order, to establish the supremacy of law, to enforce the authority of the United States through the entire island, and to constitute and maintain a lawful government until the wishes of the Cuban people may be ascertained in an orderly, regular, and accurate manner. Shall we do less for the Filipinos? Are they more capable of organizing present government than the people in Cuba? Is Aguinaldo, who betrayed his countrymen, more statesman than Gomez and the Cuban leaders?

Have we the consent of the one more than the other? Is not our duty to one as imperative as to the other? Before the consent of the people of the Philippine Islands could be taken to anything, before their wishes could be known, order must be restored, armed resistance to constituted authority must be overcome, and the supremacy of the law must be maintained. But have we no right to govern the people of the Philippine Islands? Let us see. A few weeks ago these islands were a part of Spain. The Spanish Government was supreme; its authority was undisputed. As a part of the Spanish Empire they waged war against the United States. Oh, do not tell me that some of them did not. The constituted authorities, the people who controlled the islands and its government and its resources did, and the government of a country makes war or maintains peace and determines its attitude as a friend or enemy to other countries.

These islands furnished a basis of supplies for armed enemies. They furnished food and shelter and a harbor of refuge to a hostile fleet that threatened our commerce and the cities and trade on the Pacific coast. The Filipinos were either unwilling or unable to prevent this. We had a right to make war upon them. We had a right to capture them. We had a right to take possession of them, and we had a right to retain them as the fruits of victory. What has the consent of the governed to do in a case like this? When a hostile army or a hostile navy confronts you must you ask the enemy's consent to be conquered? After being conquered, must we ask his consent to submit to the consequences of his defeat? Must the victor ask the consent of the vanquished to settle the terms of peace and to pay the expenses of the conflict? Do we destroy civil liberty unless we ask the consent of the convicted felon to imprison him?

Have we undermined the rights of property if we enforce execution against the property of a judgment debtor? As the victors in the late war, we had a right to hold the Philippine Islands as the fruits of victory and as a compensation for our loss. And now Aguinaldo, who had sold his birthright and had become an exile for a consideration, whom we restored to the country he had sold and the people he had betrayed, proposes to slip in and appropriate to himself the fruits of our victory.

But outside of this, have we not as much the consent of the people of the islands as any annexed nation ever gave? We have the consent of the only Government in force, the only Government the people recognized, the only Government that they have known for three hundred years, the Government that exercised undisputed sway and control of every particle of civil and military authority.

Spain's title to these islands was as complete as any title she ever had to Florida or Louisiana. We dealt with the Philippine Islands as every nation deals with another nation, by dealing with the government that represents, controls, and is in the possession of the actual sovereignty. Even the Senator from Massachusetts admits that it is "impossible in dealing with a people to deal with anything but the established government." We have as much the consent of the Filipinos to administer the government over them as we have to-day the consent of the people of Alaska to administer government there. Strange uses are being made of this portion of the Declaration of Independence. A meaning is given never intended by the author of the sentiment that we now hear so often quoted.

The pilgrim fathers did not wait upon Plymouth Rock for the "consent of the governed" before taking possession of this continent. The framers of the Declaration of Independence organized a government in the Northwest Territory without consulting a single inhabitant. Men who had signed the Declaration of Independence proceeded to organize State governments, and proceeded to govern the illiterate, landless, and those who did not belong to some Christian sect, without asking their consent. Massachusetts did not ask the consent of its illiterate. Connecticut, New York, Maryland, North Carolina, South Carolina, and Pennsylvania proceeded to govern those who were without real estate without their consent.

Mississippi and other States are disfranchising large numbers, if not a majority, of their male citizens without their consent. We did not consult the inhabitants of Louisiana, of Florida, of Texas, of New Mexico, of California, of Alaska, or of the Hawaiian Islands, before annexing them. Within the memory of this generation, we expended billions of treasures and sacrificed hundreds of thousands of valuable lives to force upon the people of a part of this country a government to which they did not consent.

If this declaration means that before government can exercise its authority it must have the direct expressed consent of the governed, then there is no government on the face of the earth where this doctrine is maintained. We are governing more than one-half of the territory of the United States without ever having attempted to gain this consent.

There is not a single member upon this floor who has the expressed consent of one-fifth of the inhabitants of his district. There are 65,000,000 people in the United States who have not consented to be governed by the President of the United States or by the members of either House of this Congress. There is nowhere in the whole land a citizen of the United States who has given his expressed consent to be governed under the Constitution and laws of the United States. Some of the gentlemen who are now most solicitous that government should be "with the consent of the governed" occupy their present positions on this floor by the expressed consent of less than one-twentieth of the population of their districts. Should this spasm of virtue continue until after another election, it is difficult to predict the results upon the complexion of another Congress. This "consent of the governed" can mean nothing more than implied consent, and is generally expressed by acquiescence. In dealing with a nation we must deal with it as a unit, we must deal with it through the constituted authorities, through the de facto government in whose authority the inhabitants acquiesce. We must assume that it is with their consent, and must deal with it accordingly.

The consent of the governed must always yield for the public good and for the good of the governed themselves. We restrain the criminal and insane for the good of the public. We place a guardian over the imbecile, the dissolute, the spendthrift, for their own good. To govern with the "consent of the governed" and by the aid of the governed is an ideal that should be constantly kept in view and to which all liberty-loving nations should aspire. It is the ideal to which the American people not only aspire, but which they have more nearly approached than any other nation of ancient or modern history. To enable the American people to attain this high ideal should be the earnest desire and constant aim of every patriotic statesman and citizen. We shall abolish the prison and the asylum when there are no criminals or insane. When people cease to be imbeciles or spendthrifts or dissolute, we shall abolish their guardians.

A government by the "consent of the governed" will not attain its full perfection, a government "by the people" will not be a government by all the people, until all the people are endowed with great intelligence, are inspired by justice, devoted to humanity, possess great self-control and great capacity for self-government. Under the American flag the Filipinos will have what has been denied them for three hundred years—personal and political liberty. They will at all times have all the self-government consistent with their own freedom, their own welfare, and their own safety.

But we are told that even if we have the right so far as the Philippine Islands are concerned to annex them, this Congress has not been authorized by the American people to accept them, and that annexation is a violation of the Constitution of the United States.

I am getting wearied with this constant discussion of imaginary constitutional questions. Did the Constitution prohibit to the American people the exercise of one-half the privileges it is claimed on this floor that it prohibits, we should be a nation of slaves and serfs rather than freemen. "Unconstitutional" has lost its meaning and become "undesirable" to the unconstitutional objector. To give credence to one-half we hear, the Constitution is being violated from beginning to end about every other day in the 365 days of each year. The Constitution survived the purchase and annexation of Florida, of Alaska, of the western half of the territory of the United States, of Hawaii, and it will survive the annexation of Porto Rico, of the Ladrone Islands, and the Philippines. It seems singular that this argument should be used now. It seems still more strange that the disciples of Jefferson, the first great American annexationist, should make this contention and appeal to Moses, the first great expansionist and forcible annexationist, to support this contention. It seems still more strange that those professing adherence to the political party that since the formation of the Constitution has annexed one-half of the present territory of the United States should make this claim.

I think we are beginning to concede that the United States is a nation. It is too late now to question that doctrine. It is too firmly established. It has been sanctioned by the Supreme Court of the United States. It has been established still more firmly in the shock of battle, from whose rude decisions there is no appeal. Somewhere in this nation there is national sovereignty. There is a power to deal as a nation with other nations. The right to declare war, the right to make treaties and settle the terms of peace, is vested by the Constitution in the President and the Congress of the United States. The right of the President and Senate to make and ratify treaties with other nations is absolute and un-

limited. The President and Congress are vested with full, complete, and absolute power to settle the terms of peace. They have full power, at the termination of war, to collect the expenses and costs of the conflict from the vanquished in cash or territory. The Constitution nowhere, in any manner, attempts to limit or control the exercise of this authority. This has been sanctioned by the highest judicial authority of the land on numerous occasions.

The Supreme Court of the United States, in a decision delivered by Judge Gray (in 149 U. S., page 711), decided:

The United States are a sovereign and independent nation, and are vested by the Constitution with the entire control of international relations, and with all the powers of the Government necessary to maintain that control and to make it effective. The only government in this country which other nations recognize or treat with is the Government of the Union, and the only American flag that is known throughout the world is the flag of the United States.

To the same effect is the opinion of Judge Field (in 130 U. S., pages 603, 604, 605):

While under our Constitution and form of government the great mass of local matters is controlled by local authorities, the United States, in their relation to foreign countries and their subjects or citizens, are one nation, invested with powers which belong to independent nations, the exercise of which can be invoked for the maintenance of its absolute independence and security throughout its entire territory.

Chief Justice Marshall delivered the opinion of the Supreme Court (in *Cohens vs. Virginia*, 6 Wheaton, 264), which decides—

That the United States form, for many and for most important purposes, a single nation has not yet been denied. In war we are one people. In making peace we are one people. In all commercial relations we are one and the same people. In many other respects the American people are one, and the Government, which is alone capable of controlling and managing their interests in all these respects, is the Government of the Union. It is their Government, and in that character they have no other.

Justice Bradley, in delivering the opinion of the Supreme Court in *Knox vs. Lee* (12 Wall., 457), states:

The United States is not only a Government, but it is a National Government and the only Government in this country that has the character of nationality. It is invested with power over all the foreign relations of the country—war, peace, and negotiations and intercourse with other nations—all which are forbidden to the State governments.

In the case of the American Insurance Company vs. Canter (1 Peter, page 511), in which Chief Justice Marshall delivered the opinion, the Supreme Court decided that:

The Constitution of the United States confers absolutely on the Government of the Union the power of making war and of making treaties; consequently that Government possesses the power of acquiring territory either by conquest or by treaty.

Mr. Caleb Cushing, when Attorney-General of the United States, in one of his opinions gave his views upon this subject as follows:

The power which the Constitution bestows upon the President, with advice and consent of the Senate, to make treaties is not only general and without express limitation, but it is accompanied with absolute prohibition of exercise of treaty power by the States. That is, in the matter of foreign negotiation the States have conferred the whole of their power, in other words, all the treaty powers of sovereignty, on the United States. Thus, in the present case, if the power of negotiation be not in the United States, then it exists nowhere, and one great field of international relation or negotiation and of ordinary public and private interest is closed up, as well against the United States as each and every one of the States. That is not a supposition to be accepted unless it be forced upon us by considerations of overpowering cogency. Nay, it involves political impossibility. For if one of the power functions of sovereignty be thus utterly lost to us, then the people of the United States are but incompletely sovereign, not sovereign nor in coequality of right with other admitted sovereignties of Europe and America.

Mr. Gallatin, Secretary of the Treasury under President Jefferson, wrote a letter to the President, containing the following:

First. That the United States, as a nation, have an inherent right to acquire territory.

Second. That whenever that acquisition is by treaty, the same authorities in whom the treaty-making power is vested have a constitutional right to sanction the acquisition.

Acting upon this view, the Congress of the United States authorized the acquisition of Louisiana.

Even Judge Taney in the discarded *Dred Scott* decision, admits that the power in the Federal Government "to enlarge its territory and limits by the admission of new States is plainly given."

On any other principle this Government would be denied a power possessed by the smallest nations on earth. It would be powerless to purchase a coaling station, a naval station, a concession for the Nicaraguan Canal, a cable station, or a rock upon which to erect a light-house.

The practice of this Government from the time of those who made the Constitution until now has been in accordance with this power. This question has been settled too long and too uniformly to be questioned now.

But we are told we should declare our future intentions in reference to these islands. What right or power or authority have we to declare, to divine, or control the future intentions of the American people? What right or authority have we to bind the American people or their representatives at the expiration of our terms in matters that concern their own policy, and within the sphere of their own right, and aside from contracts with other people? Let the future questions be settled, as they will be settled,

by the people in authority at the time of settlement. When the people of the United States have more light, more information, know more about the Philippine Islands, their resources, their capabilities, the intentions, character, and disposition of the people, they will be much more able to determine for themselves their future intentions than we are to-day.

The gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. CARMACK] has asserted that we should turn our backs upon the Philippine Islands "and sail away and never look back." Such conduct has been characterized as it properly deserves by the gentleman from Ohio. But before he does that, let me commend to the gentleman his own utterances:

We only ask, sir, that they shall not be cast aside without mature deliberation: that this grave step shall not be taken upon the sudden and passionate impulse of the moment. We say that it should not be done until we are in possession of all the knowledge necessary to a comprehensive survey of the problem that is before us; until with conscientious care we have sifted all the arguments for and against it; until we have scrutinized and tested all its supposed advantages and weighed them in the balance against the perils, the costs, and the consequences.

But, Mr. Chairman, should it be the deliberate judgment of the people of the United States, and the desire of the people of the Philippine Islands, that we should release our claim and give to the latter independence, now is not the time to do so. In addition to the necessity of establishing some suitable and orderly form of government, there are other matters to be considered. There must be a business settlement between them and us before we part company. We must not forget that they did not achieve their own independence; they did not throw off Spanish control; they did not extinguish Spanish sovereignty; they have not released themselves in the slightest degree from the tyranny of the Spanish yoke—if that is done, it will be by the American people, not by the Filipinos. We must remember that when Dewey entered the harbor of Manila, he found the Spanish Government in full, complete control. Its authority was undisputed and opposed by none.

Aguinaldo was an exile from his native land. His followers had been defeated, betrayed, and dispersed. The last vestige of opposition to Spanish authority had been overcome. Spanish power in Manila was shattered and finally overthrown by American soldiers, American sailors, American courage, and American heroism. If remaining Spanish sovereignty is completely and wholly released from every portion of the Philippine Islands, it will be done by American valor and the expenditure of American money. If the treaty is ratified, the United States pay for the relinquishment of this sovereignty, not only the \$20,000,000 provided in the treaty, but we are accepting the relinquishment of that sovereignty in lieu of millions of dollars that we were entitled to demand as expenses of the late war.

The destruction of Spanish sovereignty, the overthrow of Spanish tyranny, the termination of centuries of Spanish cruelty in the Philippine Islands will be done, not by the inhabitants, but by the valor and expenditure of blood and treasure of the people of the United States. If we should give the Philippine Islands independence, if we should release all claim upon them, justice would require that they must reimburse us the amount those liberties have cost. The people of the United States will not consent to pay out their taxes, give the use of their armies and navies, shed the blood of their sons, and make all this a present to warring, struggling bands of savages in the Philippine Islands or elsewhere.

Another question for our consideration: Should we at some future time decide to permit the people of those islands to form an independent government, we must not only remove the sovereignty of Spain, we must not under any circumstances permit them to be annexed, to become a part of or be possessed by any other foreign power. We ought to retain, and the inhabitants of the islands ought to consent for us to retain, under any circumstances, a naval and coaling station. We ought to have such treaty relations with the islands that would authorize us to intervene and prevent the interference of any foreign power or the attempt of any foreign power to establish any dominion, to exercise any authority, to take possession or control of the islands, or any portion of them, either with or without the consent of the inhabitants.

To make such treaties and such stipulations there must be organized government. It must be organized at once. It must represent the people of all the islands, as near as that can practically be done. With whom could we now make such an agreement? From the shores of islands which we possess by such good titles, and in which we possess so many rights, costing so much of blood and treasure, we must not retreat before armed enemies, nor be driven by naked savages, even if encouraged in their insolence by members of both Houses of this Congress.

But they tell us we are going to overturn our own liberties, destroy the Constitution, endanger the perpetuity of the Union, trample under foot the unbroken precedents of the nation, and "take the Stars and Stripes down from Independence Hall!" Predictions like these have been made on the eve of every acqui-

sition of territory by the United States. They began with the acquisition of Louisiana. It was predicted on the floors of Congress that the acquisition of Louisiana "would prove a cemetery for the bodies of our citizens." Senator Plumer, of New Hampshire, contended that to—

admit this Western world into the Union would destroy at once the weight and importance of the Eastern cities, and compel them to establish a separate independent empire.

Senator White, of Delaware, declared:

But as to Louisiana—this new, immense, unbounded world—if it should ever be incorporated into the Union, of which I have no idea, can only be done by amending the Constitution. I believe it will be the greatest curse that could at present befall us. It may be productive of innumerable evils, and especially of one that I fear to ever look upon. * * * Thus our citizens will be removed to the immense distance of two or three thousand miles from the capital of the Union, where they will scarcely ever feel the rays of the General Government. Their affections will become alienated. They will gradually begin to view us as strangers. They will form other commercial connections and our interests will become distinct. * * * And I do say that under existing circumstances, even supposing that this extent of territory was a desirable acquisition, \$15,000,000 was a most enormous sum to give.

Upon the annexation of Texas these doleful predictions were repeated. Even statesmen like John Quincy Adams declared that—

Annexation would be identical with dissolution. It would be a violation of the natural compact. * * * It would eventually result in a dissolution of the Union.

These evil predictions failed of fulfillment. Every acquisition of territory by the United States has proved a blessing, not a curse. It has added to our national resources, our national wealth, our national power, and national liberties. It is the source of our present position amongst the civilized nations of the earth. Among the gentlemen who oppose the annexation of the Philippine Islands there is not a single one who would be willing to relinquish a foot of territory that the United States has ever acquired. All of our great gold mines, our great silver mines, our most magnificent forests, great plains, teeming with the products of agriculture, have all been acquired by annexation and expansion.

One of the greatest blessings that the people of the United States possess is our expansive domain and large stretches of territory; the fact that its citizens have elbow room, room to breathe, room to move, room to build up and carry on great enterprises, and room to build homes for the people. All this is due to expansion. Expansion is not new to us. It has been the constant policy of the United States. It has been the law of our growth, the instinct of our nature. It is the tendency of our race. We could not prevent it if we would. We ought not to prevent it if we could. Why should this policy that has been fraught with so many blessings, that has brought no evil, mean destruction now? The Filipinos, indolent as all tropical people are, will be far more tractable than the American Indians, while the islands are more accessible and more easily reached now than was California at the close of the Mexican war.

Mr. Chairman, I have no sympathy with those timid souls who constantly fear and predict the overthrow of our liberties and the final collapse of our free institutions. I have more faith in the good sense, and wisdom, and patriotism of the American people, in the stability and perpetuity of our institutions and the future of our race, than to believe for one moment that our liberties, our safety, our Constitution, or our institutions depend in the slightest degree upon whether we retain or let go every foot of territory lately acquired from Spain. We may retain Porto Rico or not, we may retain the Philippine Islands or not, we may retain or release any or all of them, we may retain them now and release them hereafter, and the perpetuity and stability of our Government, of our institutions, the liberties of our people will be in no wise involved. The life, the strength, the endurance of this splendid Republic, for which valor has fought and devotion has prayed, cemented by the blood of heroes and the tears of bereavement, have stood every strain, in war and peace, and are too vital, their principles too firmly grounded in the hearts of 75,000,000 people, to be seriously affected by anything this Congress will or can do upon the question of annexation. If our final decision is right, it will be approved. If it is wrong, it will be swept aside by the onward march of a liberty-loving people.

Again we are told "this presents a serious matter to those of our fellow-citizens who live by the sweat of their brow; it means that every toiler in this country must compete with millions of Asiatic laborers, who are content with wages of less than 10 cents per day. It means reduced wages, consequently less comforts, less opportunities to the laboring masses. It means the crowding of the labor market of this country with a class of laborers far inferior to the Chinese, whom we have excluded." It is very gratifying that some of the gentlemen on that side of the House have become of late extremely interested in the welfare "of our fellow-citizens who live by the sweat of their brows." At last they are discovering that competition "with millions of Asiatic laborers who are content with wages of less than 10 cents per day" means "reduced wages," "less comforts," "less opportunities to the laboring masses" of our own country. Heretofore these gentlemen have subjected American laborers to competition with laborers who

labor, with workmen who work, and work cheap; men who are able, willing, well equipped with brawn, brain, and modern implements; men who must have food, clothing, reasonable comforts of civilized life for themselves and family; men who place their products in our own markets to the exclusion of products of our own labor.

Now, these gentlemen are solicitous only to protect us from competition of laborers who do not labor, from workmen who do not work, from men who do not produce, whose only raiment is a palm leaf, whose only implement is a knife, and whose only lawful occupation is gathering bananas and coconuts. But this small improvement even is welcome. It is to be hoped these gentlemen will learn another lesson equally, if not more, important. They should learn that competition with cheap labor in Europe, in South America, in Mexico, in any part of the world is as injurious to American laborers as competition with Asiatic labor. They should remember that competition with what cheap labor produces, puts upon our own market, and sells in competition with like products from our own workmen, cheaper than they can produce it, is competition with cheap labor itself.

But let me call attention to the fact that during our whole history it has been as competent for the Filipinos to enter the labor markets of America as it is to-day. They were entitled to come to our shores and capable of becoming citizens of the United States. There has been nothing to detain them but their want of desire to come. The annexation of those islands will not increase their facilities, their temptations, or their desires to "crowd the labor markets of this country." When Spanish tyranny rendered their lives burdensome, when they were goaded to fury by Spanish cruelty and Spanish oppression, when unprincipled tyrants rendered their homes a hell upon earth, even these were not sufficient to drive them from their homes to American shores to "crowd the labor markets of this country." If a single Filipino ever came to labor or engage in industrial pursuits in the United States, even to escape Spanish oppression, I have never heard of it.

If they preferred their own country to ours under those circumstances, preferred to endure oppression rather than exile, will they love home and native land less when under the Stars and Stripes they are guaranteed "life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness?" Nor will their labor compete with ours by selling its products in our own market in competition with the products of our own labor. They will send us only what we can not produce in sufficient quantities to supply our own market. Attempts are being made to alarm the sugar and tobacco producers by the dread of a fearful competition. They can produce but the smallest fraction of the amount necessary to supply our own deficiencies. Of the \$60,332,072 paid to foreign countries during the last fiscal year for sugar, we paid to the Philippine Islands only \$381,279. Of the \$10,327,479 paid for the purchase of foreign tobacco during eleven months last year, the Philippine Islands received too small a sum to be reported, if any. Their productions of these articles will doubtless increase under American control, but they can never in a hundred years supply our own deficiency. The goods they will send us will be in exchange for the products of our own labor and are those for which we now pay cash to foreign countries.

Other prophets of evil tell us that we are going "to acquire territory, not that it may be the home of a free and self-governing people, but to set it apart as a land accursed, a land into which the Constitution and the principles of American liberty are forbidden to enter;" that we are going to establish over the inhabitants of the islands "a tyranny, and that a rebellion against it would be a duty and not a crime;" that the President of this Republic is endeavoring "to establish despotism in another country and to destroy the liberties of its people." What soothing effects such utterances will have upon the insurgents now threatening our soldiers at Manila! How they are pouring "oil on the troubled waters!" How they will make the Filipinos love us and our institutions! I denounce these utterances as unfounded slanders upon the American people and the American Government. If some future historian or some enemy of our country should desire to find and select the most bitter denunciations of our people and our institutions, he will find them in the newspapers and the CONGRESSIONAL RECORDS of the closing year of the nineteenth century.

No government can be established over those islands, if annexed to the United States, except with the consent of this House, of the Senate, and the President of the United States. Who has authorized you to say that a government so framed, so sanctioned, will be despotic, subversive of the liberties of the people? Who has authorized you to prophesy for the future Congress? Who has drawn such a plan of government? By what authority is it promulgated? In whose hands is its formation? What right have you to say that the representatives of the American people, men who are to be or have been elected by freemen, will impose a tyrannous government upon any people that is under their protection? Every proclamation issued by the President of the United States

with reference to the government of the territories to be annexed has been a refutation of these unfounded statements.

When the needs and industries and resources of the country have been ascertained, when we have had time to acquire the necessary information, it is safe to trust the representatives of the American people to establish a government in the Philippine Islands, not only much better than the people have ever known, but one that will give the fullest share of personal liberty and political privileges that the people are capable of receiving consistent with their own welfare and happiness and the honor of our country.

We are pointed to the example of Spain in proof of the evil effects of extended territories. Why compare America to Spain, Americans to Spaniards? The difference between these two races was demonstrated by Dewey at Manila, by Sampson and Schley at Santiago, by Shafter and Wheeler and their magnificent soldiers at San Juan Hill.

Why not rather point us to our own race, to the example of our own history? Why cite us to a nation that has failed in all she has ever undertaken? Why not hold before us rather the example of that race which since the commencement of the fifteenth century has increased the area of its dominion from 125,000 square miles to 15,050,000 square miles and the people protected under its flags from 4,000,000 to 475,000,000, and who now govern and control nearly one-third of the earth's surface and one-third of its population? In the face of the success of our own previous policy of expansion, as well as the success of English colonial government, it is un-American, unpatriotic to say "can't." We can. We can do what any other people can do. Everything is possible to Americans that is possible to any other race or nation. We have met every crisis in our history successfully. The American people have surmounted every difficulty in their paths, they have proved equal to every burden, to every duty imposed upon them, in war or in peace, in science or in literature, or civil government. We have filled every ideal, and there are none to claim superiority over us.

Objections are raised that the annexation of the Philippine Islands will require a large standing army. I confess to some misgivings as to the propriety of the full increase of the Army provided for in this bill. I am not devotedly attached to a large standing army in time of peace. But it is singular that so many of the objections are urged only against the annexation of the Philippine Islands and none against the annexation of Porto Rico or the preservation of peace and order in Cuba. We hear nothing about the "consent of the governed," the "establishment of tyranny," or the "overthrow of the liberties" of the people in Porto Rico. The expense of the increase of the Army made necessary by annexation of outlying territories or preservation of peace in Cuba may well be borne by those territories. But the large increase of the Army provided for in this bill is not made necessary by the annexation of the Philippine Islands.

If some of the utterances to which we have been listening of late had been unsaid, the army needed in the Philippines would have been less in numbers and for a shorter duration. But we have not forgotten the lessons of the late war. We remember too vividly the defenseless condition in which the opening of hostilities found us. Had our enemy been a nation well prepared with an army and navy equipped and ready for action, defeat, disaster, and national humiliation at the beginning of hostilities would have undoubtedly overtaken us. We were extremely fortunate in having for an enemy a nation as unprepared as ourselves and one willing to wait until we were ready to open hostilities. But the safety and honor of the nation require that no future national difficulties in which we may become involved should find us in a like condition of unpreparedness. The position of a nation among other nations of the earth, its peace and security, are determined by the strength of its arm, the number and size of its cannon, the strength and swiftness of its battle ships, and the quality of the men it is prepared to place behind its guns. I want to see an army of such size—and of such size only—as is necessary for the national honor and national defense and the national safety.

We are told the Philippine Islands possess no trade. The same could have been said successfully, much more successfully, and with much more truth, of every Territory ever acquired by the United States, except Hawa'i. As well compare the productions of gold in Colorado and California, the wheat productions of the Dakotas, the corn productions of Iowa and Nebraska, now and at the time of their annexation as compare the trade of the Philippine Islands now under the Spanish flag with what it will be under the Stars and Stripes.

But, Mr. Chairman, the trade of the Philippine Islands, while even now it is something worth acquiring and will be much expanded and increased in value through annexation by the United States, is only one part, an exceedingly small and insignificant part, of the future trade and commerce that the annexation of these islands will help us to acquire. The productions of the United States are increasing year by year with tremendous rapidity and are assuming unheard-of proportions. The end is not

yet. There is room for vast development all over the United States, East and West, North and South. Why, Mr. Chairman, if I take the train at Washington City and ride to New York, I pass in the vicinity of cities containing six to eight millions of people. Taking the train at my own home, and passing a like distance through a country more fertile, with far richer soil, much healthier in climate, with brighter skies, with infinitely greater natural resources, I pass in the vicinity of towns containing 30,000 inhabitants.

That is the difference between the East and the West. There will come a time when this difference will grow constantly less, until it will cease to exist. The opportunities for development in the West are beyond description. Its future growth and development none can foretell. But when the people of the West have attained full growth, developed all their resources, extended and expanded their industries, what is to become of our surplus productions? Where will our purchasers be? To whom shall we sell them? In the past we have depended almost wholly upon England and her colonies for our markets. Should their demands continue, which is improbable, our productions are far exceeding their needs.

Somewhere we must obtain new markets, somewhere new outlets for our productions. The only remaining field is in Asiatic countries. There are over 500,000,000 people who are just awakening from the lethargy of ages. They are just beginning to feel their wants, realize their powers. They are just beginning the development of their own resources. Their purchases now exceed \$1,066,000,000 annually and are upon the constant increase. Their purchases from us have doubled in two years. They are just beginning to eat the food and wear the clothing of civilized people. As that development increases their wants will increase, their trade and commerce will increase, and it is important—extremely important—that we should be prepared to take hold and defend our share of it. No other power must be permitted to close those ports to our commerce. This will be our most natural sphere. There we enjoy advantages possessed by no great rival. Over the Pacific Ocean we are far nearer to the principal ports of eastern Asia and Oceania than any European nation. From Hongkong to San Francisco is 6,380 miles and but little more to Portland and Puget Sound ports; the average distance from western European ports is 9,900 miles. From San Francisco to Shanghai is 5,400 miles; the average from English and German ports to Shanghai is 10,000 miles. From Yokohama to San Francisco is 4,790 miles; the average from European ports is 11,250 miles. In our trade on the Atlantic we are at a disadvantage with all our competitors. In our trade on the Pacific the advantages are all with us. There is where we must strike for future trade and future commerce, and we must be prepared to protect it. It is as much our duty to protect the business as the property of our citizens.

The gentleman from Indiana on yesterday told us that commerce is the child of peace. Not in the Orient. What would become of the commerce of Great Britain in Asia and Africa but for British tars, British cannon, and British battle ships? The kind of peace that begets commerce in that part of the world is the peace for the maintenance of which you are prepared to fight and fight hard. We can preserve and increase our trade and commerce in the Orient if we are prepared to defend them. If we hesitate or falter, they are lost. With a chain of naval stations in Hawaii, the Ladrões, and the Philippine Islands, the Pacific Ocean will become an American lake, and will bear American commerce, not only now, but in the future, when the cities of the West rival the great cities of the East and when the commerce upon the Pacific equals that upon the Atlantic Ocean.

If we lose the opportunity to secure these stations now, it may never occur again. There has been no period since the birth of the American Republic when it would have been possible in any manner, by conquest or by peaceful methods, to secure in an honorable way a good title to the islands to be acquired by the treaty with Spain. If not acquired now, there may never again in all our history occur a like opportunity. The excellent lines of ex-Senator Ingalls contain a warning:

OPPORTUNITY.

Master of human destinies am I!
Fame, love, and fortune on my footsteps wait;
Cities and fields I walk; I penetrate
Deserts and seas remote, and passing by
Hovel and mart and palace—soon or late
I knock unbidden once at every gate!
If sleeping, wake; if feasting, rise before
I turn away. It is the hour of fate,
And they who follow me reach every state
Mortals desire, and conquer every foe
Save death; but those who doubt or hesitate,
Condemned to failure, penury, and woe,
Seek me in vain, and uselessly implore.
I answer not, and I return no more!

Our national opportunity is here! It is at our very doors! It is knocking at our gate! It is upon the threshold of the Capitol! It is

the hour of our fate! Let us awake, arise before it turns away, open wide our portals, welcome the coming guest, and follow the paths in which it leads, lest it pass by to "return no more." [Applause.]

Mr. HAY. I yield fifteen minutes to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. SIMS].

Mr. SIMS. Mr. Chairman, it is not my purpose to join in any unseemly criticism of the President. I am ready to concede to him the purest of motives. Ohio has given us three great Republican Presidents, and the present occupant of the White House, in my judgment, is not the least of them. As far as I am concerned, I would not exchange him for any other Republican from that great State.

But, Mr. Chairman, shall our admiration of the President prevent us from exercising our own independent judgment on questions which it is as much our duty to investigate and determine for ourselves as it is his?

I am not such a blind follower of those high in authority as to regard it as treasonable to exercise my own independent judgment in all matters coming before us without reference to what may be the opinions of the President. I applaud as much as any one the kindly utterances of our President in his recent Southern tour regarding the graves of the Confederate dead. But shall I, on that account, say that because our flag, in time of war, has been raised in two hemispheres it shall never be hauled down? Our flag has never yet floated over a subject people, and I hope that it never will. How long has it been since a Republican President from Ohio in effect hauled down the flag when it was used to cover despotic military rule in the States of Louisiana, South Carolina, and Florida? Our flag was made to float over the land of the free and the home of the brave. Shall it take the place of the sword of Saladin and the torch of Omar?

Since the days of childhood one warning has never ceased to reverberate in my ears: "Beware of a large standing army!" I have been taught all my life that a large standing army is the one thing most dangerous to a republic. This has been the universally expressed opinion of all the people.

It is not necessary at this time to go over in detail the elementary principles underlying and justifying our position. They are as old as our Government, and as well if not better known than any other general political doctrine. But our inquiries should rather be, What is there new in the present situation that will justify a departure?

History furnishes no example of a nation in either ancient or modern times that has equaled the growth and prosperity of our country. Ours is the one country on the face of the earth to which the people of all other nations do most like to come when they leave their own. It is the dream of half the youths of all other lands and countries that they may some fortunate day be able to make their homes in America and share the great blessing of our free and independent institutions. Then why should we change our fundamental principles and turn back, as it were, to the usages and customs of the Old World, to escape which our forefathers underwent the hardships of pioneer life in the New World?

Large standing armies have been the curse of the Old World. Why invite it to our shores?

Mr. Chairman, it is a strange contemplation to me that we are asked to increase our Army at a moment when all Europe is suffering from conditions brought on by large standing armies and at an hour when we are invited to attend a peace parliament of the world; at a time when one of the most warlike of all modern nations, one of the most successful of European powers, one of the greatest and most aggressive nations of the earth, the one having the greatest number of trained soldiers, invites all Christendom to join her in a universal peace movement. In her benign and Christian effort to reduce all the armies of all the earth, we stand forth solitary and alone in our action looking to a great increase of our standing Army. While the Old World is trying to lay down the sword we seek to take it up. While they are trying to quit the fields of blood and carnage we turn our face the other way. While the Old World powers are striving for universal disarmament we propose to increase our standing Army in time of peace by 400 per cent.

Why should we for one moment seriously consider such a proposition? What are our necessities? Does any foreign power threaten our shores? Are we in new dangers threatening us from internal sources? The answer is emphatically no. Then why increase our Army? Simply to enable our Government to carry out a policy as antagonistic to the principles and doctrines of our Constitution and Declaration of Independence as it is possible to be conceived. To enable our Government to enter upon a course of criminal aggression and foreign conquest, exceeding the designs of the most rapacious and greedy of any European nation. Simply to place ourselves in a situation to be a party to all future European and eastern complications. Simply to enable our Government to subjugate and hold in a state of continuous subjugation many millions of people who are as much entitled to free and independent government as are the people of Cuba, for whose

independence and freedom we have waged a successful but most expensive war.

Why should we fight to free the people of Cuba and fight the people of the Philippine Islands in order to keep them from establishing a free and independent government of their own? If we are not to fight the Filipinos in order to keep them from gaining their freedom, we do not need the large army called for in this bill. No other nation is making or threatening to make war on Cuba, Porto Rico, or the Philippines. The Filipinos are not asking us to assist them to form a government for themselves. They only ask to be let alone. They claim that if they are worthy of freedom they ought to be able to set up the institutions of that freedom. Putting behind us the temptations of conquest and gain, how are we to answer the argument of these people?

We are assured by one high in the councils of the dominant party that it is not the intention to hold these islands as a permanent colonial possession. Then why have a permanent increase in the standing Army? If ultimate independence is contemplated, what necessity is there for an increase in our military force of a permanent character? If our possession and occupation of the Philippines is to be only temporary, why not call for volunteers for this service to be held no longer than they are needed? The temporary occupation of our newly acquired territory can not be the excuse or justification of a permanent increase of the Army.

On the other hand, if our possession of the Philippines is to be permanent, and in order to be so we must keep up the large Army provided for in this bill, it is impossible to realize a revenue from them that will equal the increased expense of providing for so large an increase in the Army. Our holding the islands must result in an inevitable loss to our Government, while it may be beneficial to many men as individuals. It may result ultimately as a benefit to the people of those islands. But, Mr. Chairman, are we to go on increasing the burdens of our citizens as taxpayers that, forsooth, we may be of ultimate benefit to these strange and unknown people who are now getting ready to fight us in order to keep from accepting our beneficence?

Our present standing army on a peace footing does not cost us exceeding \$25,000,000 a year. With the increase contemplated it will not cost the taxpayers of this country less than \$100,000,000 a year. Then there will be a large increase growing out of the added expense to the War Department in the way of additional clerk hire and other outlay due to increased work on account of this increase in the Army, also to an increase of the pension list and to a large increase due to the increased retirement list. It is now the custom before retiring an Army officer to promote him. He then retires on three-fourths of full pay in this higher rank, which usually is about equal to the full pay of the rank from which he has just been promoted.

In this way the retired officer is virtually pensioned for life at full pay of the rank he held while in the actual service of the Government. When we sum up all these expenses, direct and indirect, due to this proposed increase of our standing Army, we will have added to our annual expenses not less than \$100,000,000. Where is this money to come from? Are we going to tax the Filipinos, the Porto Ricans, and the Cubans to raise this enormous sum to be used in holding them in subjection? If so, what benefit will it be to them to have been freed from the Spanish yoke of like oppression? Is it possible to realize so large a sum from the resources of these countries after providing for their local wants? Will the friends of this measure be willing to make it a part of this bill that the expenses of all troops and war material used by the United States in any of these islands are to be paid out of the revenues of the islands?

The American people are willing to stand any tax that may be needed for humane and Christian purposes, but they are the last people on this earth to submit to an unjust tax or one to be used for unjust and inhuman purposes. [Applause.]

Already there is much complaint at the burden and inconvenience of our internal war taxes, while yet the war is hardly over. I ask, Mr. Chairman, what will be the storm of denunciation of this tax when it is continued indefinitely in order to keep up a large standing army in these newly acquired territories against their will and over their protest and armed opposition? No party can hope to retain control of this Government that advocates the continuance of a direct tax for purposes not approved by the people.

Our Navy is to be vastly increased, and our additional annual expenses on this account will run into the millions. Our civil expenses will also be vastly increased, by reasons of changes made necessary by the war. I again pause to ask, From what source is the money to be realized? Imports are falling off every year. We can not hope to increase our revenues from tariff taxes under the present prohibitory protective laws. The present tariff, as a revenue producer, is a lamentable failure, which will be only the more clearly demonstrated as the years go by. If our expenses are to be increased, this increase must come out of the direct taxpayer. When taxes are so collected, their burden is seen and felt

by the people, and they will not submit to any taxation that does not appear to be an imperative public necessity.

We have just passed a bill reported by the Committee on Naval Affairs, called by the innocent name of the personnel bill, that increases the expenses of our Government \$600,000 per annum, to be continued, as far as I can see, for all time to come. It seems that since the war some of our friends have so grown and expanded that they are unable longer to think or consider the poor taxpayer. I wish to call your attention to the fact that the apparently forgotten taxpayer does a large share of the voting, and if he has no voice here he will have one in future elections, and my opinion is that when his voice is heard again many voices heard here now will be heard here no more forever. When the taxpayer sees that his patriotism is imposed on, and that a just war waged in the name of humanity is made the excuse to pile up his burdens unnecessarily, he will be heard from in thunder tones.

I know a great deal is being said about the great balance of trade in our favor during the last year, and I am glad that it is true; but do not forget that this increase in our balance of trade is due in a large part to the reduction of imports. We do not collect revenue on exports, however large they may be. Revenue comes from imports, and when imports decrease, revenue decreases. This large and favorable balance of trade, in so far as it is due to increased exports, does not bring one cent of revenue into the Treasury of our nation.

Our pension burden in round numbers is now about \$145,000,000. This amount must be augmented to some extent by the results of our late war with Spain. I think that we may reasonably expect the annual pension appropriation to reach \$150,000,000 within five years from this time. If we increase our Regular Army and our Navy we must expect an increase in pensions proportionately.

Add to the present pension appropriation \$150,000,000 for this standing Army, as provided in this bill, and we have an annual burden of \$300,000,000 in these two items as war expenses. Then add to this annual war burden \$600,000 per annum, the accruing interest on the \$300,000,000 of bonds issued in aid of the late war with Spain, and we have the enormous annual expense of \$300,600,000, to be raised by taxation on the people, besides the \$200,000,000 of principal of these bonds to be paid when due.

Besides this, we must add the annual accruing interest on all other outstanding bonds issued for war purposes, amounting to \$29,896,023.20 per annum, before we know what our annual expenses are for war purposes. Then add to this the principal of unpaid bonds issued on account of the war between the States, amounting to \$747,400,580, and we begin to see what the people have to pay on account of wars that have been, without adding anything for wars that we will certainly have with increased frequency when our possessions cover half the globe.

Under our system of taxation, both direct and indirect, all this vast sum must be raised by taxing consumption and current business transactions. Not a dollar is to be levied or collected from realized wealth. If the treaty is ratified without amendment we must pay \$20,000,000 to Spain. Now, I have only referred to expenses and debts of the Government due alone to wars and on account of wars. Besides all this vast sum the current expenses of the Government must be paid, which as the country grows and population increases must necessarily increase in amount.

Had we not better stop and consider where all this vast sum of money is to come from before we create the necessity for it? Is this not a surprising condition for the heretofore most peaceful nation on the earth? How unfavorably do we contrast with those nations of the Old World who, after having tried this course for centuries and finding their people no longer able to stand up under the burdens of great standing armies, invite us to join them in universal disarmament. I am told, too, that the President proposes that we take part in that great first movement toward the millennium and encourage all nations to join hands in this blessed effort to secure and maintain universal peace. Then what a sad reflection on the sincerity of our President, that we are asked to vote for this bill increasing our standing Army fourfold and our war expenses 400 per cent.

I want to warn our friends in the possession of great wealth that such legislation as this is driving us in the direction of an income tax as fast as the wheels of time can carry us. No doubtful decision of a divided court will serve longer to satisfy the people in their demand for this most just of all species of taxation. The people can make or amend constitutions, and will certainly do so where its provisions are so construed as to shield those most able to bear the burdens of government from a just and due proportion thereof.

There is another branch of this subject to which I wish to invite the attention of the House, and that is the increased political power that the Army will have when it is increased fourfold. There is no way to maintain the supremacy of the civil over the military power in this country except by keeping the Regular Army down to a comparatively small force in time of peace. I saw passed in this House, by reason of the favor of many and the

fear of others, a bill to permit the volunteer soldiers to vote for Congressmen wherever the soldiers might be stationed on the day of election.

There is no reason why the elective franchise should not be given to the soldiers of the Regular Army, if the soldiers of the Volunteer Army are to have it. The same reasons why the one should or should not vote applies with equal force to the other. Give us an army of 100,000 men, under the direct command and control of the President, and place the ballot in their hands, and you will, in my humble judgment, never defeat the party in power in any election that may hereafter be held. Should the ballot not be given the soldiers of the Regular Army, they have friends and relations who are voters and on whom they exert a most powerful influence. It would not be unreasonable for each soldier and officer in the Regular Army to influence as many as 10 votes.

With 100,000 men in the Regular Army, 1,000,000 votes may be controlled by them. With their chances of promotion all in the hands of the President as their Commander in Chief, how natural it will be for the officers and soldiers of the Army to see that their interest lies in the success of the party in power. The greater the Army the greater the inducement and temptation to use their influence. Virtual military rule in this country can be escaped only by keeping the military influence down to the minimum. I hope ours will never become a French republic. We do not need a large or even increased standing army unless we create or bring about conditions calling for it.

The total imports into the Philippine Islands from all the world for the year 1896 were \$28,815,075, of which the United States contributed \$162,446, or 5.5 per cent. The total exports for the same year were \$33,481,484—\$4,982,857 of which came to the United States, or 14.9 per cent. The total imports and exports for that year were \$62,296,559. Is it reasonable to suppose that we will at once very greatly increase our trade with these islands?

Suppose that all the trade of the Philippines follows our flag at once. All the exports and imports combined in value would not exceed the cost to us of the army and navy that we would have to keep there. If we could get all the trade of the Philippines, which is an impossibility, we would be benefited only to the extent of the profits of the business, both direct and indirect, which can hardly exceed 10 per cent on the volume handled, which would be only about \$6,000,000 in the combined volume of both imports and exports.

Another thing to be considered is that the profits of trade go to corporations and individuals engaged in the business, whereas taxes are collected off all citizens subject to taxation, whether they are or are not engaged in any particular business. Is it right, is it just, to tax the people of the United States in a gross sum exceeding \$50,000,000 per annum in order that some of the citizens of the United States, on increasing their trade with the people of the Philippines, may realize a profit of not exceeding \$5,000,000 per annum?

Suppose we are all ardent expansionists, is it not good statesmanship to consider in detail the circumstances and possibilities of benefits to result in each proposed instance of expansion, and if the difficulties and expenses attending the exercise of sovereignty and control over any particular country exceeds any possible benefits to be derived from such a country, is it not good judgment to refuse to take control of such country? From the standpoint of an ardent expansionist I can not see how it is advisable to take the Philippines.

I do not see how we can in the exercise of a good conscience take forcible control of those islands against the wish and will of those people and then tax them in order to furnish the means with which to perpetuate that control. From the devastated condition of the islands I have no doubt that it will require all the revenue their people are able to pay for many years to repair and build up the waste places left as the result of war, and the expense of keeping our Army and Navy there will have to be paid by the people of the United States for many years to come, and that it is not possible under any conceivable circumstances that the United States will ever directly or indirectly be reimbursed for the vast sums she will have to expend on this account. The only way I see to prevent it is to either modify the treaty or to give the islands their freedom.

I think patriotism, like charity, should begin at home. I think we should first consider what is best for our own people before we rush into sources of untold expense either to promote the private enterprises of our own citizens or to benefit the condition of foreigners.

It seems to me that we should confine our acquisition of territory to the Western Hemisphere. If we dominate and control half the globe, is not that enough? But under no circumstances do I favor the forcible annexation of any country whose people are struggling for freedom and independence, without their consent freely and voluntarily expressed. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. HULL. I yield ten minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. STEWART].

Mr. STEWART of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, in the consideration of the pending bill for the increase and reorganization of our Army much extraneous matter of a sensational nature has been obtruded in the discussion.

Gentlemen cry "Imperialism!" and "Expansion!" and wave in our faces the imperial purple of the degenerate Caesars, and pretend to believe that this nation, the asylum of the oppressed and haven of freedom, has entered on a new policy of tyranny and repression of freedom and independence in the Philippine Archipelago.

In the subjugation of Spain destiny fixed one of the great arms of the Spanish fleet in Manila Bay. Dewey was forced to follow and destroy it there, and through the unforeseen exigencies of war the Filipinos were thrown upon us as a sacred trust to protect and defend.

We would stultify our position did we do otherwise. The Filipinos require at our hands the same treatment, the same high humanity that we accord to Cuba.

The gentleman from Indiana [Mr. JOHNSON] declaims that the people of Spain are in sackcloth and ashes, their fleets at the bottom of the seas, and that they are unable, if they were so disposed, to further molest the Philippines.

If I have read history aright, I am informed that Spanish fleets have been destroyed before in many seas, and these calamities have not cured Spain of her desire to oppress and plunder.

Spain will arise again with gloomy and baleful face and blood-shot eyes to ravage and to murder.

Had the fleet been at the Canaries or the Carolines, the Philippine question would not vex or trouble us to-day, and Spain doubtless would now control them as she does the Canaries and Caroline Islands.

Our solemnly declared policy with reference to Cuba to leave her to herself when a stable government is established would seem to furnish strong presumptive evidence that the same policy will guide us with reference to the Philippines. The Government has never declared it to be its intention to permanently annex these islands; indeed, our policy points to the opposite intention.

Reference has been made to the extempore speeches of the President on his late Southern trip as to the hauling down of the American flag. No gentleman will pretend that the President meant other than that no hostile hand should haul it down. We ourselves hauled it down in Havana when it was prematurely raised, and we are committed to the policy of hauling it down in Cuba when a stable government is established. We hauled it down in Mexico when good sense and good statesmanship suggested the wisdom of the act.

But while the Government and Administration is engaged in the solution of a complex question with reference to the Philippines, requiring much further data and information than we now possess, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. JOHNSON] insists upon looking over the shoulder of the Administration and demanding an immediate solution. He insists that the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. DOLLIVER] shall answer categorically what the definite intention of the Administration is with regard to the future of these islands.

We submit that the problem is still unsolved, and he should be content with the answer that in the opinion of this side of the House no definite intention now exists to forcibly and permanently annex the Philippine Islands.

These islands came to our charge through the bloody issue of war. We entered that war for humanity's sake, and we will hold the Philippines by the same tenure. Call it a protectorate or what you may for humanity's sake until they can be exploited among the nations of the earth with the blessings of a free and stable government of their own.

I firmly believe that the United States will never coerce those islands or Cuba against their will to share the fortunes and destiny of the mightiest, richest, and freest nation on earth.

Again, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. JOHNSON], from the fact that we propose to increase our Army to 100,000 men, draws the unwarrantable conclusion that we must intend to use it to subjugate and tyrannize over the Philippines.

Our flag waves now and forever over Hawaii and Porto Rico, and, in the nature of things, must glorify Cuba and the Philippines for an indefinite term in the future. Can it reasonably be said that in view of this vast acquisition of territory, both permanent and temporary, a standing army of 100,000 regular soldiers to environ our volunteers in case of war and form the first fighting line is excessive? Surely not. The only fear is that it may prove too small.

What American really fears that the most ardent devotees of freedom, the fearless champions of independence, will lend aid or countenance to oppression and tyranny? We risked our national integrity and honor, the lives and fortunes of our people, in the uncertain issues of a foreign war to save a neighboring people from the cruel oppression and injustice of vindictive Spain.

Unselfishly we demanded justice of Spain for the suffering and distracted people of Cuba, and patiently waited while the bloody work of Weyler went on, and not until our glorious ship *Maine* with her immortal crew went down in the darkling waters of Havana Harbor by the explosion of a submarine mine, while ostensibly under the protection and hospitality of Spain, did we raise the menacing arm of war, not for punishment, retribution, or conquest, but that a neighboring people might be freed from the unbearable cruelties and tyranny of Spain. [Loud applause.] Such is the unselfish part that the United States has played in this great tragedy.

Such national characteristics can not be changed in a day. The traits that have made us peculiar among the nations of the earth from the beginning will abide with us to the end.

The morning twilight of our national existence found our forefathers willing to sacrifice their "lives, their fortunes, and their sacred honor" in the holy cause of freedom and independence, and when the evening twilight arrives in the gloaming of our fading selves we will still exhort high Heaven that freedom and independence shall not depart with us from off the earth. [Loud applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. HULL. Mr. Chairman; before I move that the committee rise, I desire to state that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MARSH] will control the time on this side at the evening session.

Mr. HAY. I want to state that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. JETT] will control the time on this side.

Mr. HULL. I move that the committee rise.

The motion was agreed to.

The committee accordingly rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. PAYNE, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that committee had had under consideration the bill H. R. 11023, and had come to no resolution thereon.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE.

A message from the Senate, by Mr. PLATT, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed joint resolution and bills of the following titles, in which the concurrence of the House was requested:

S. R. 231. Joint resolution providing for the further distribution of the compiled statutes of the District of Columbia;

S. 5224. An act to extend the time for the construction of a bridge across the Missouri River at or near the city of Boonville, Mo., by the Boonville and Howard County Bridge Company;

S. 5186. An act to amend an act entitled "An act to amend the statutes in relation to immediate transportation of dutiable goods, and for other purposes," approved June 10, A. D. 1880, by extending the privileges of the first section thereof to the subport of Miami, Fla.;

S. 5144. An act authorizing and directing the Secretary of the Treasury to donate one set of life-saving beach apparatus to the Imperial Japanese Society for Saving Life from Shipwreck;

S. 5130. An act to provide for the erection of a building for the Department of Justice;

S. 5019. An act to prevent the failure of military justice, and for other purposes;

S. 4549. An act authorizing the British Columbia, Seattle and Pacific Coast Railway Company to construct a bridge across the Columbia River; and

S. 3377. An act for the relief of Clinton F. Pulsifer, of the State of Washington.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed without amendment bills of the following titles:

H. R. 11116. An act to authorize the Little River Valley Railway Company to construct and operate a railway through the Choctaw and Chickasaw nations, in the Indian Territory, and branches thereof, and for other purposes; and

H. R. 774. An act for the relief of Samuel D. Hubbard.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED.

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

H. R. 10459. An act to amend section 5 of the act approved June 10, 1880, governing the immediate transportation of dutiable goods without appraisement; and

H. R. 8882. An act for the reestablishment and reconstruction of a light-house at or near the mouth of Salem Creek, New Jersey.

WITHDRAWAL OF PAPERS.

By unanimous consent, Mr. KERR obtained leave to withdraw from the files of the House, without leaving copies, papers in the case of George W. Harbough, Fifty-fifth Congress, no adverse report having been made thereon.

Mr. HULL. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now take a recess until 8 o'clock.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER appointed Mr. CONNOLLY to act as Speaker pro tempore.

And accordingly (at 5 o'clock p. m.) the House was declared in recess until 8 p. m.

EVENING SESSION.

The recess having expired, the House (at 8 o'clock p. m.) was called to order by Mr. CONNOLLY as Speaker pro tempore.

ARMY REORGANIZATION BILL.

On motion of Mr. MARSH, the House resolved itself into Committee of the Whole on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H. R. 11023) for the reorganization of the Army, and for other purposes, with Mr. LACEY in the chair.

Mr. MARSH. I yield to the gentleman from New Hampshire [Mr. SULLOWAY] such time as he desires.

Mr. SULLOWAY. Mr. Chairman, I am earnestly supporting this measure to increase the Regular Army and authorize the Commander in Chief to recruit it, if need be, to 100,000 men, and shall favor the most liberal appropriations to increase our Navy. I am for maintaining the gold standard, the only standard of intelligence and of the commercial nations of the world, and I am also in favor of maintaining an army and navy sufficiently large and powerful to protect and defend our citizens and their property at home and abroad. I am for annexation as territory of the United States every grain of sand (the fruit of victories won by our sailors and soldiers on sea and land) that Spain has ceded to us by the terms of the pending treaty. I believe duty demands this to save the Filipinos (who are our wards as the result of war) from anarchy and to protect them against adventurers and tyrants. There are now in the service at least 75,000 men who, by the terms of their enlistment, will be entitled to be discharged the minute the pending treaty is ratified and the war now pending between this country and Spain is at an end. These good citizens and patriotic men, who abandoned their business and families to take part in the shooting match, are now held to service, and each day's delay to ratify the treaty and pass this bill causes many of them irreparable loss. This measure, if enacted into law, will enable President McKinley to further recruit the Regular Army and discharge the patriotic and heroic volunteers, who did not, when they enlisted, expect to be held to do garrison duty.

Our Navy should be second to none. I hope, trust, and expect to see our merchant marine the equal of that of any other nation. It will be if the American Congress in its wisdom shall so legislate that our commerce upon the seas can be carried in American bottoms, under our flag, instead of paying to aliens, as we are now doing, \$200,000,000 annually to transport that which we sell and buy. We pay to aliens \$500,000 for freight every day in the year—fifty millions more than we appropriate, and nearly sixty millions more than we pay in pensions. What a princely portion of this \$200,000,000 would go into the hands and pockets of our laborers and seamen if we would legislate to put this business under our flag and into the hands of Americans, as I believe duty demands of us. With that commerce we must have a great navy to police the seas in time of peace and protect our commerce in war; for wars ever have been and must of necessity ever continue to be.

Not until human nature is annihilated will war cease to be, and it is the part of wisdom, as I believe, to accept what is inevitable and be prepared to meet conditions that must confront us in the future. Men talk of peace perpetual, arbitration for settlement of international disputes—a theory beautiful to contemplate—but it is only a delusion, a deceptive snare by which this people in their power and wisdom ought not to be caught. It pleases some to advise the beating of our swords into plowshares. If we are deluded into such action, some other people will beat their swords into our heads and take from us or destroy what we possess. I do not doubt the sincerity of purpose of those who contend for arbitration for the settlement of international disputes, but I am opposed to this Government adopting what they contend for—first, for the reason that any treaty, contract, or agreement entered into by and between nations for that purpose would be in binding effect only as a rope of sand.

The mighty will and wish of a great people, in their sovereign right, can not be chained and bound by written law or treaties. When millions of men are ready to rush to arms and die, if need be, for a cause in which they believe honor and duty demand the sacrifice, he who thinks a written constitution or a treaty would restrain them ought to have had the privilege of reading the riot act at Antietam, Shiloh, Gettysburg, or the Wilderness to convince him that such a notion was and is a delusion. For one I do not want international arbitration when the issue involves the rights of this nation or the rights of the humblest citizen thereof whom it is the duty of the nation to defend. I do not want as a board of referees, as a court of final jurisdiction, the boy King of Spain, the Sultan of Turkey, and the Shah of Persia, or any other kings or czars. I do not think they are free from prejudice toward our

form of government and us as a people. We have got on quite well in the old way, from Bunker Hill to San Juan Hill on land, and have never had very serious trouble at sea.

When diplomacy fails and duty compels this people to submit no longer to the then existing conditions, I would prefer, much prefer, to point our foe to Generals Miles, Shafter, Wheeler, Merritt, Lee, and other commanders, with one or, if need be, five million men, with arms in their hands, at their command, and to say, "There are the arbitrators selected by the United States if you wish to arbitrate on land;" and point them to Rear-Admiral Dewey, Sampson, Schley, Evans, Clark, and others of our naval heroes if they desire to arbitrate at sea. [Applause.] I should have much greater confidence in either of those tribunals and their ability to secure for this people a verdict to their liking than I should at the hands of all the crowned heads that live to-day. I believe that we are entitled, when on trial, to a jury of our peers, and the crowned heads of the Old World are not the peers of the sovereign American citizen.

The tendency is not in the direction of arbitration or disarmament, but exactly the reverse. The nations that practically govern and control the people of this planet are not disarming, but, on the contrary, without exception, are increasing their armies and navies more rapidly—and have been doing so for the last quarter of a century—than at any time in their history. The nations of continental Europe have increased their armies at least 25 per cent during that time, if not during the last decade. We have ceased to be a hermit nation, isolated from the rest of mankind. We are not among nations, as some dreamers fancy, what Robinson Crusoe was in his business relations to other individuals. We are interested in every part of the globe that has commerce or conditions such that it can be developed. With this enlarged sphere for trade we must have greater power to protect and defend our rights, and the rights of our citizens, on land and sea.

Our experience during a few months of the year just past covered our Army and Navy with glory such as was unknown to the world before; but it awakened us to a realization of what would have been our weak and defenseless condition had we been at war with a first-class power. In my judgment the people do not desire to remain longer in that condition; and it is my conviction that it is our duty as their servants to increase our Army, add battle ships to our Navy, and strengthen our fortifications along our entire coast line. I rejoice that we have before us a bill to increase the Army, and it has my hearty, enthusiastic support.

We have reached such a point in our development as a nation that from this time onward we can not expect to live within ourselves and have and enjoy that degree of prosperity which has blessed us, while our laborers, under the protective system, were enriching themselves and we were dotting our land with manufacturing establishments that now produce in abundance almost everything desirable known to man and have the capacity to produce much more than we can consume. While we shall continue to protect our toilers, we must adopt the courageous and, if you please, heroic methods essential at this time to secure to the people of this nation their share (and as much more as we can obtain by legitimate means) of the world's trade and commerce on land and sea.

A policy that fifty years ago, under then existing conditions, may have been the best possible for us as a people may not be calculated to give the best results under the present changed conditions, with all that they include, in increased facilities for agricultural productions and for manufactures, and our improved methods of transportation on land and sea, by means of which, comparatively speaking, time and distance have been to a great extent eliminated. Our 80,000,000 people, with brain and muscle the equal of that number of people anywhere, are not in their industrial and business pursuits to be confined within the narrow limits that we occupied when only half our territory was under cultivation, much of that sparsely settled; when our cities were small, and for many of our manufactured articles we depended upon alien people to supply us, and when we were, as a whole, looked at from our present condition, comparatively poor. In justice to ourselves, and from a sense of duty to those who will live after us, I am in favor of taking advantage of all means that we may rightfully and honorably employ, consistent with self-interest, to broaden our horizon of trade and annex territory that may come to us by conquest or purchase in any quarter of the globe.

In connection with this subject gentlemen are discussing—and properly, I think—the question whether it is policy and wisdom on our part to retain the territory that Spain, by the terms of the pending treaty, has ceded to us. On that question I am an ardent supporter of the treaty, believing it represents what duty and patriotism demand. There is no longer any doubt as to the wish of an overwhelming majority of this people in regard to what is termed territorial expansion. A few conservative men are not enthusiastically for it; here and there one is opposed to it; but such men are retreating, and covering their retreat by apologies. There are some who are violently opposed to such a policy; but,

as a rule, there are exceptions. They are the men who were bitterly opposed to the war with Spain; and some of them, I fear, in view of the glorious results obtained, are smarting under a sense of humiliation that actuates them to oppose the Administration and refuse to accept as the fruits of victories won what Spain is willing to surrender to us.

I am an earnest supporter of the Administration and desirous that the treaty be ratified. The opponents, the men who with voice and pen would deprive this people of the fruits won by our soldiers and sailors, do not meet the issue squarely, but make violent and unwarranted statements as to what the Administration proposes to do. They indulge in an extravagant extent in the use of catchwords—"imperialism," "colonial possessions," "deprive the Filipinos of their liberty," "reduce them to vassalage." Expressions of this character are substantially the stock in trade of the opponents of annexation. What has the President said or done that warrants those who oppose annexation to use any of the catchwords or sentences quoted as if they represented his views, wishes, or purposes? I answer, nothing. Such expressions, when used by those sufficiently intelligent to know what they mean, are deliberate and wanton misrepresentations, made with a purpose to mislead, prejudice, and deceive. The use of such expressions is just the course of men smarting under disappointment and humiliation, who are unable to give substantial reasons for their actions.

Has the President, or any official representing him, ever by word or act intimated that he desired to hold and govern the territory that Spain, by the treaty as written, is to cede to us in any other manner than we have held and governed territory ever since the Constitution was adopted? I challenge his opponents to produce a scintilla of evidence to prove their assertions. Who is seeking to make this an "imperial" government in the sense they wish to have the word "imperial" understood? Who is clamoring for "colonial possessions" in the sense in which they use the term? The tender solicitude that the opponents of the President profess to have for the Filipinos, and their dislike of "imperialism," and their great desire that the Filipinos shall have liberty, is shown to be only a pretense when they insist that those people be left subjects of Imperial Spain, subject to all the barbarities Spaniards know how to inflict, or perhaps the prey of an adventurer or tyrant.

When did the Filipinos ever possess liberty that these men ask American citizens to believe President McKinley desires to deprive them of? The first ray of hope in that direction that ever flashed athwart their pathway was visible to them on that May morning when Dewey, by orders from President McKinley, entered Manila Bay, when they saw the American fleet with the starry flag, the symbol of liberty, at the masthead of every craft that formed Dewey's line of battle, advancing upon the Spanish fleet, upon Spanish forts, and Spanish power. In the thunder of Dewey's cannon they heard a voice as from Jehovah proclaiming the end of Spanish savagery, robberies, and barbarities in the Philippine Archipelago. They who saw that battle saw, as an eyewitness has described it in speaking of a shell from one of the guns in Dewey's fleet as it entered one of the enemy's ships, "It looked," he said, "as if a hogshead of hell entered her." Dewey's cannon were the first that ever thundered defiance to Spanish rule in that bay, and spoke deliverance to that people from the worst and most oppressive Government that ever cursed human beings.

The "hogsheads of hell" hurled from Dewey's guns into the Spanish ships and Spanish forts were admired by the Filipinos as messengers of deliverance and hailed by them as instruments of love and mercy. In the roar of Dewey's cannon and the fire that leaped from their mouths the Filipinos heard a voice commanding the Spaniards not only to take their yoke of cruelty off the necks of the inhabitants, but to take both their shoes and feet off those islands. [Applause.]

I belong to the political party that elected William McKinley President. That party in 1856 raised in this land the flag of liberty, on which was written, "All men are entitled to liberty who have not forfeited their rights by crime."

The people of my State are not oppressors of others; yet I sit here and listen to men who, while they pretend to be very solicitous for the liberties of the Filipinos, represent constituencies in sections of our country where within my memory the price of labor was regulated by the sale of men, women, and children at the auction block. It took rivers of blood to wipe out that damnable system of human slavery; it was an atonement that soaked the Southern soil with blood and billowed our land with graves. I do not think the men of any party in this land to-day desire to oppress or enslave any people, or that members of the Republican party are called upon to defend themselves against the charge that they favor "imperialism" and oppression. And least of all do I believe that President McKinley, who has been a chief in active service in that party for many years, who has the confidence of this people as no man since Lincoln has had it, should be asked to answer such a charge.

It is just possible that some of the opponents of annexation are smarting under the remembrance of the fact that they did not succeed in preventing war with Spain, which has proved to be the most popular war ever waged by this country, with results more glorious than were ever before achieved by our countrymen. As a sort of an apology for opposing the Administration, they shout "imperialism," "colonial possessions," etc., thereby endeavoring to set up a man of straw as a target of their own manufacturing; and then they proceed to arraign the President and his followers in thought and convictions as to what is best for the public weal, and thus seek to mislead the public. Some of these, more violent than others, take a bold stand and deny that we can acquire territory unless it is to be admitted to statehood, and others contend that we can not acquire territory except by the consent of the inhabitants thereof.

Taking these propositions in the order I have named them, I say first, that if the question were new, it would seem to me the mere definition of "sovereignty" would alone be a conclusive answer. "A sovereign State," according to the definition most commonplace and really as expressive as any, would, I think, be "a State without a superior." All governments without a superior possess "sovereignty." The United States as a State, a Government, has no superior. It can make war and peace and can acquire territory. No intelligent man questions that power. It has made war and acquired territory in the past; it has acquired territory by purchase. And to those who were emboldened to question its sovereignty in that respect the Supreme Court has said from first to last, "You are in error." The contention of the annexationist is unanswered, and must ever remain unanswered because unanswerable. That contention of the opponents of the Administration is too idle to command respect. States independent, sovereign States having no superiors, are governed by what to them seems best. They, as Judge Day said to the Spaniards at Paris (I do not quote his exact language), put into a treaty whatever as conquerors they deem best. It seems to be an idle waste of time to notice the contention of the opponents of the Administration in that respect. Let them play with their man of straw. It is a harmless bundle, and too transparent to do service as a scare crow in intelligent communities. [Applause.]

Who coined the expressions so frequently invoked by the opponents of the President, like the declaration that "in the Constitution of the United States no power is given to the Federal Government to acquire territory to be held and governed permanently as colonies." Why are such declarations made? Who is contending that we, in acquiring territory to-day, are adopting "the colonial system of other nations?" Has the President or any friend of the treaty made any such declaration, or intimated such a purpose? What difference or distinction is there in this respect between the territory we may now acquire and that acquired in 1803, when we took by purchase and treaty the Louisiana territory; in 1819, when we acquired Florida; in 1848, when we conquered vast territorial possessions from Mexico; in 1853, when we acquired the "Gadsden purchase," and in 1867, when we purchased Alaska? In 1898 we annexed by law the Hawaiian Islands. Oregon we acquired by exploration, discovery, and settlement. The last-named territory was discovered by Gray in 1792, explored by Lewis and Clark in 1805, and colonized in 1811 by what is known as the Astor Settlement. We have acquired territory by purchase, by conquest, by discovery, and by operation of law.

Our power as a sovereign State in this respect can not be limited. The decisions of our courts and the policy the nation has pursued for nearly a century establish the fact that the Government of the United States has the inherent power, as fully and comprehensively as any Government on the face of the earth can have it, to acquire territory either by treaty, conquest, purchase, or by exploration and discovery; and there has never been a judicial opinion that I am able to find, or any intimation or insinuation, that we have only the right to acquire territory that we will immediately admit to statehood. That contention is new, and when confronted by the decisions of our courts, the long line of precedents, the manner in which for almost a century we have been acquiring and governing territory thus acquired, makes but feeble impression upon the minds of this people. It looks to be only an apology for opposition. We are asked, "What right has the Government of the United States to control by military force territory that we thus acquire through conquest as the result of war?" I answer, the same right that we have exercised without exception when we have acquired territory in any manner.

There seems to be in the minds of those who thus oppose the pending treaty a fear of the military arm of the Government. Generally speaking (there are some exceptions), these individuals were opposed to using the military arm of the Government against Spain in 1898. They talked and wrote of the horrors of war, told us "the mailed hand" of the Government would be laid on the shoulder of the mother's darling boy and he would be carried by force to a foreign land to suffer and die. They pictured the widows with brows craped in mourning for husbands slain, and

orphans on bonded knees with uplifted hands and closed eyes, piteously imploring the God of mercy to remember them in their forlorn condition. Such scenes no longer haunt them in dreams or imagination. We are at war with Spain to-day, and if the treaty, the ratification of which they seek to defeat, is not adopted, hostilities will be resumed. There will be new-made graves and weeds of mourning in fact rather than in imagination.

There are more than 75,000 men in the regular and volunteer forces of the Government who want to be discharged from the service, and are entitled to be the minute the war is ended by a treaty of peace. These are kept in the service by the opponents of the treaty and the opponents of the measure now under consideration. Every tear that moistens an eye, every sigh that comes from a heart pained by grief, because of the forced retention of these men in the service, is chargeable directly to the opponents of the treaty and the opponents of the bill under consideration. [Applause.] I want this bill passed; I want the treaty ratified.

To their second proposition, that we can not acquire territory without the consent of the inhabitants thereon, I would suggest that this proposition is, if possible, more ridiculous than the first, and to make it cover all their contentions I will add "and unless those inhabitants speak the English language." Early in our history the then President and Secretary of State said to Spain: "We will pay you so much for Florida or take it by force of arms." I do not quote the diplomatic language used. Who in Florida then spoke the English language; the Spaniards, the Indians, or the crocodiles? None of them. There was not an English publication in Florida that I am aware of possessed by a permanent resident of that Territory. Did the Spaniards desire to be annexed? No! Did the Indians? No! Did the crocodiles? I do not know. Spain concluded to sell, and ceded the territory. In our sovereignty we then possessed it, held it, and at our own sweet will governed and controlled it as seemed best to our own people.

Prior to this we purchased the territory then known as Louisiana—a territory imperial in magnitude. Did we inquire what language the inhabitants spoke and whether they desired to be annexed? No! It was known that but a comparatively few spoke our language. The sovereign state of France ceded that territory to the sovereign state known as the United States of America, and we possessed it and our sovereignty extended over it. It is true that some opposed the annexation of Florida and of the territory acquired from France, and gave as reasons what the opponents of annexation repeat to-day. Daniel Webster, great as he was, proposed, it is said, to exchange that vast domain for the right to catch codfish off the coast of Newfoundland. This is a good illustration of how the prejudice and sentiment of a locality may mislead great men. Mr. Webster's constituents were much interested in the fishing industry.

Later we went to war with Mexico, and by conquest and purchase we acquired another empire territorially. Did we inquire what language they who lived on it spoke? No; we knew that, as in the other cases named, the language was Spanish and Indian. Did we ask the consent of the inhabitants to become citizens of this country? No. We spread over Florida, the Louisiana purchase, and the territory acquired from Mexico our sovereignty and commanded the inhabitants thereof to respect and obey the authority of the United States; and when, as in each case, some persons refused to submit, we sent the Army and compelled them to obey. We made quiet, permanent settlers of them with bullets or with a rope around the neck of those it was deemed best to hang for effect on others. Have any of the opponents of the Administration and the treaty discovered any dangerous ruptures in our Constitution produced by our conduct toward the people of those territories, a fracture of any of its limbs, or seen any evidence of contusion of any of its parts? Will they to-day contend that those who opposed the acquisition of either of the territories named were wise and that the acquisition was a mistake or a misfortune to the people of the United States or the inhabitants of the territories?

"But," says one, "I contend that we can not acquire and hold territory unless we admit it to statehood." How do you know? Who authorized you to limit the power of a sovereign State? Who shall say when any territory belonging to the United States and the people living thereon shall be admitted to statehood? Congress, not you or I. It is half a century since we acquired from Mexico the territory mentioned. We have held a considerable part of it for that length of time and not given it statehood. It is claimed that there are 400,000 people in the Territory of Oklahoma—as many as in New Hampshire. They have not statehood. They will not have until Congress grants it. What becomes of your scarecrow pretense that we can not acquire and hold territory if the wisdom of the powers that be sees fit to do so?

We have done it for at least half a century in the case named, and are continuing to do so. Has the Constitution sprung a leak by so doing? Did you feel damp and complain until Dewey at Manila won for us a victory, matchless in the annals of warfare,

and an empire territorially which as a base of operations will afford us opportunity to extend our commerce and dispose of our manufactured products in the East, where live 400,000,000 people whose trade every nation is struggling to secure—trade that must be worth to us many billions? And this was done in pursuance of orders from the President in waging a war that you opposed; and you are to-day opposed to retaining the fruits of our victories on land and sea. Why this tender solicitude of yours as to the Filipinos, the Cubans, and the Porto Ricans, when for half a century you have been as dumb as an oyster as to the oppression of those who live on territory we now possess?

The motive of this opposition to the Administration is transparent. The real reason is patent—opposition to war with Spain. This Government can acquire territory and hold it as such at home or abroad at its own good will. It can admit to statehood as seems best for the public weal. The contention of our opponents in this respect is unworthy of consideration. As to what policy should be pursued in governing territory at home or abroad, that will always be a question open for discussion and difference of opinion; but the right to acquire territory is a right inherent in a sovereign State. If by conquest we captured the Bermudas, or by purchase acquired them, does anyone think we could not hold them unless we gave them statehood? I, for one, wish we possessed them.

It is not the Constitution that prevents our possessing them. It is the sovereign State of Great Britain. And yet the contention of the opponents of the treaty and of annexation would prohibit our acquiring them for the reason that their population would not entitle them to statehood. If we engage in war with a foreign power and as an incident acquire territory by conquest as compensation, or for the protection of our commerce, or the safety and general welfare of our people, I deny that fitness for statehood is an essential condition precedent to such acquisition by us. I have frequently thought, as I have listened to speeches from gentlemen in this House opposed to annexation, gentlemen who deny the power of the Government to acquire territory except it be immediately admitted to statehood, that one who failed to hear the text announced but heard the argument and the citation of authorities would think that the gentlemen were arguing a flowage case to a jury and struggling to confuse them by citing the decisions of some court as to the rights of riparian owners.

We are asked, "What right has the Government of the United States to control by military force and power territory that we acquire through conquest and as a result of war?" That question was raised and distinctly settled in the case of *Cross vs. Harrison*, 16 Howard. That was a case that arose by reason of our acquiring California from Mexico through the Mexican war. I quote from the head note or syllabus:

In the war with Mexico the port of San Francisco was conquered by the arms of the United States in the year 1846, and shortly afterwards the United States had military possession of all of Upper California. Early in 1847 the President of the United States, as constitutional Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy, authorized the military and naval commanders of the United States forces in California to exercise the belligerent rights of a conqueror, and to form a civil and military government for the conquered territory, with power to impose duties on imports and tonnage for the support of such government and of the army which had the conquest in possession.

The formation of the civil government in California, when it was done, was the lawful exercise of a belligerent right over a conquered territory. It was the existing government when the territory was ceded to the United States as a conquest, and did not cease as a matter of course or as a consequence of the restoration of peace; and it was rightfully continued after peace was made with Mexico until Congress legislated otherwise, under its constitutional power to dispose of and make all needful rules and regulations respecting the territory or other property belonging to the United States.

The cases of *Leitensdorfer vs. Webb* (20 Howard, 176) and *New Orleans vs. Steamship Company* (20 Wallace, 387) are also in point. Can any one doubt the right, authority, and duty of the President, through the Army, to govern and control Porto Rico, Cuba, and the Philippine Islands until Congress shall provide some other form of government or until some disposition is made of those islands? There is no limitation upon the power of Congress to govern, control, and regulate all our territory, no matter how acquired. (*Scre vs. Pitot*, 6 Cranch, 336-337; *American Insurance Company vs. Canter*, 1 Peters, 542; *Bank of Brunswick vs. Yankton*, 101 U. S., 130.) I quote from the decision last cited. The court said:

We do not consider it necessary to decide in this case whether the governor of Dakota had authority to call an extra session of the legislative assembly, nor whether a law passed at such a session or after the limited term of forty days had expired would be valid, because, as we think, the act of May 27, 1872, is equivalent to a grant of power direct from Congress to the county to issue the bonds in dispute. It is certainly now too late to doubt the power of Congress to govern the Territories. There have been some differences of opinion as to the particular clause of the Constitution from which the power comes, but that it exists has always been conceded. The act to adapt the ordinance to provide for the government of the territory northwest of the river Ohio to the requirements of the Constitution (1 Stat. L., 50) is chapter 8 of the first session of the First Congress, and the ordinance itself was in force under the Confederation when the Constitution went into effect.

All territory within the jurisdiction of the United States not included in any State must necessarily be governed by or under the authority of Congress. The Territories are but political subdivisions of the outlying dominion of the United States. They bear much the same relation to the General

Government that counties do to the States, and Congress may legislate for them as States do for their respective municipal organizations. The organic law of a Territory takes the place of a constitution as the fundamental law of the local government. It is obligatory on and binds the Territorial authorities, but Congress is supreme, and for the purposes of this department of its governmental authority has all the powers of the people of the United States except such as have been expressly or by implication reserved in the prohibitions of the Constitution.

In the organic act of Dakota there was no express reservation of power in Congress to amend the acts of the Territorial legislature, but none was necessary. Such a power is an incident of sovereignty, and continues until granted away. Congress may not only abrogate laws of the Territorial legislatures, but it may itself legislate directly for the local government. It may make a void act of the Territorial legislature valid and a valid act void. In other words, it has full and complete legislative authority over the people of the Territories and all the departments of the Territorial governments.

The only legal opinion I have seen to the contrary is a dictum of Chief Justice Taney in the *Dred Scott* case. I say "dictum," for it was only that. The court did not accept it as law; it was not the opinion of the court. And I quote from Judge Taney in another part of his opinion, that which I submit is an admission that Congress has plenary power in the premises:

The power to acquire necessarily carries with it the power to preserve and apply to the purposes for which it was acquired. The form of government to be established necessarily rested in the discretion of Congress. It was their duty to establish the one that would be best suited for the protection and security of the citizens of the United States and other inhabitants who might be authorized to take up their abode there, and that must always depend upon the existing condition of the Territory, as to the number and character of its inhabitants, and their situation in the Territory. In some cases a government consisting of persons appointed by the Federal Government would best subservise the interests of the Territory when the inhabitants were few and scattered and new to one another. In other instances it would be more advisable to commit the powers of self-government to the people who had settled in the Territory as being the most competent to determine what was best for their own interests. But some form of civil authority would be absolutely necessary to organize and preserve civilized society and prepare it to become a State; and what is the best form must always depend on the condition of the Territory at the time, and the choice of the mode must depend upon the exercise of a discretionary power by Congress, acting within the scope of its constitutional authority. (19 How., 418, 419.)

There is no mandate in the Constitution commanding Congress to admit new States; the authority is permissive only: "New States may be admitted by the Congress into this Union." Prior to the time when the Constitution was adopted, prior to the Articles of Confederation and the Declaration of Independence, there existed in this country thirteen distinct, separate colonies, each independent of all the others, and each a political body. They associated together to carry on the Revolutionary war by means of the Continental Congress. Afterwards they formed a National Government under the Articles of Confederation, and later, to make what seemed to them a more perfect Government, they adopted the Constitution of the United States. It has been said that "the Government thus formed, while it was a political partnership between the people, was also a partnership of States."

Any one of the States (partners), in the absence of the permissive, not mandatory, clause already quoted, would have been able to prevent the admission of a new State, to refuse to take into the partnership a new member. Article XI of the Articles of Confederation reads as follows:

ART. XI. Canada, acceding to this confederation, and joining in the measures of the United States, shall be admitted into, and entitled to, all the advantages of this union; but no other colony shall be admitted into the same, unless such admission be agreed to by nine States.

In the convention that framed the Constitution Mr. Randolph introduced a set of resolutions. I copy one:

10. Resolved, That provision ought to be made for the admission of States lawfully arising within the limits of the United States, whether from a voluntary junction of government and territory or otherwise, with the consent of a number of voices in the National Legislature less than the whole. (5 Elliott, 128.)

It would appear that Mr. Randolph was clearly of the opinion that unless provision was made for admission of a State none could be admitted without the consent of all. Later Mr. Pinckney submitted a plan for a Federal Constitution. I quote Article XIV:

ART. XIV. The Legislature shall have power to admit new States into the Union on the same terms with the original States, provided two-thirds of the members present in both Houses agree. (5 Elliott, 132.)

The Randolph resolution was later reported back to the convention. Mr. Patterson proposed an amendment. The whole matter was referred to the committee on detail, which reported back the following:

ART. XVII. New States lawfully constituted or established within the limits of the United States may be admitted by the Legislature into this Government, but to such admission the consent of two-thirds of the members present in each House shall be necessary. If a new State shall arise within the limits of any of the present States, the consent of the legislatures of such States shall be also necessary to its admission. If the admission be consented to, the new States shall be admitted on the same terms with the original States. (5 Elliott, 381.)

This was referred to the committee on style, and was finally adopted as found in the Constitution to-day.

I desire to call attention to the views entertained in 1803, when matters connected with the Louisiana purchase were under consideration.

Senator Plumer, of my State, said:

Admit this western world into the Union, and you destroy at once the weight and importance of the Eastern States and compel them to establish a separate, independent empire.

He was an "imperialist" and anti-expansionist.

Senator Pickering, of Massachusetts, said:

It is declared in the third article (of the treaty) that "The inhabitants of the ceded territory shall be incorporated in the Union of the United States." But neither the President and Senate, nor the President and Congress, are competent to such an act of incorporation. He believed the assent of each individual State to be necessary for the admission of a foreign country as an associate in the Union.

Representative Griffin, of Virginia, said:

He feared the effect of the vast extent of our empire; he feared the effects of the increased value of labor, the decrease in the value of lands, and the influence of climate upon our citizens who should migrate thither. He did fear (though this land was represented as flowing with milk and honey) that this Eden of the New World would prove a cemetery for the bodies of our citizens.

Senator Toucey, of Connecticut, said, speaking upon the same subject at that time:

We can hold territory, but to admit the inhabitants into the Union, to make citizens of them, and States, by treaty, we can not constitutionally do; and no subsequent act of legislation or even ordinary amendment to our Constitution can legalize such measures. If done at all, they must be done by universal consent of all the States or partners to our political association.

Delaware was heard from. Senator James White, of that State, said:

But as to Louisiana, this new, immense, unbounded world, if it should be incorporated into the Union, which I have no idea can be done but by altering the Constitution, I believe it will be the greatest curse that could at present befall us. It may be productive of innumerable evils, and especially of one that I fear to ever look upon. * * * Thus our citizens will be removed to the immense distance of two or three thousand miles from the capital of the Union, where they will scarcely ever feel the rays of the General Government; their affections will become alienated; they will gradually begin to view us as strangers; they will form other commercial connections, and our interests will become distinct. * * * And I do say that under existing circumstances, even supposing that this extent of territory was a desirable acquisition, \$15,000,000 was a most enormous sum to give.

Representative Griswold, of Connecticut, said:

It is not consistent with the spirit of a republican government that its territory should be exceedingly large, for as you extend your limits you increase the difficulties arising from a want of that similarity of customs, habits, and manners so essential for its support.

It will not be found either in the report of the secret committee, which has recently been published, or in any document or debate that any individual entertained the least wish to obtain the province of Louisiana. Our views were then confined to New Orleans and the Floridas. * * * The vast and unmanageable extent which the accession of Louisiana will give the United States, the consequent dispersion of our population, and the destruction of that balance which it is so important to maintain between the Eastern and Western States threatens at no distant day the subversion of our Union.

It will be observed that the opponents of the pending treaty in the march of progress have got up to 1803, and have exhumed the expressions of the men of that day, which they use with all the apparent satisfaction and enjoyment that a child gets from its first rattle. The same melancholy gloom envelops them that haunted the opponents of annexation in 1803. Note their expressions: "Immense, unbounded worlds," "immense distances," "their affections will become alienated," "a cemetery for the bodies of our citizens," "vast and unmanageable extent," "productive of innumerable evils," "the greatest curse that could at present befall us," "feared the effect of the vast extent of our empire." Eliminate from the speeches and editorials against annexation to-day the expressions borrowed from the men of 1803, and they would be mild as May zephyrs and sweet enough for use at a New England quilting. [Laughter.] I have made the quotations to refute the contention now made that the provision in the Constitution was understood by its framers to be mandatory and compels us to admit to statehood all territory acquired in any manner, regardless of its condition.

I think the evidence I have cited establishes the fact that the framers of the Constitution held the reverse doctrine, and therefore consented to the permissive clause now in the Constitution. I think I ought to say that to my mind the opponents of annexation are entitled to congratulations for that progress that has brought them up to 1803. Glancing at the map of our country, considering for only a moment what annexation has done for us, what our condition would have been to-day but for annexation, and any fair-minded man ought to be satisfied that one possessed of a disposition and mental arrangement that leads him to stand to-day where the opponents of annexation stood in 1803 has "come up through great tribulation;" and I am glad that he is within ninety-six years of the promised land—Porto Rico and the Philippine Islands. With the history of what took place in the convention that framed the Constitution before us, with the record before us of the views entertained on the subject of annexation in connection with the Louisiana Territory in 1803, coupled with the further fact that ever since the adoption of the Constitution we have continuously held, governed, and controlled territory, I think it apparent that the contentions by the opponents of annexation and the treaty have no justification in law or practice.

A word in reply to what is often suggested by the enemies of annexation, that if the Philippine Islands are annexed there will be danger to our toilers by reason of the right that may accrue to the inhabitants of those islands to come here and labor. I assure gentlemen who are preaching that doctrine that it is an idle waste of breath, first, because the laborers of this land have confidence in the Republican party, that by its works and legislation has always cared for them and their interests, and they know it. What do the opponents of the treaty tell us about the inhabitants of the Philippine Islands? Let me quote some of their choice stock-in-trade language by which they describe those people: "Cannibals," "untamed and untamable savages," "wild, ferocious barbarians, that we can only civilize by killing."

They tell us that Christian Spain, impelled only by love and mercy, has been trying for centuries to civilize them, and has endured a humiliating failure; that they prefer to die rather than by annexation become a part of this country. And in the next breath they ask us to believe that those people are so industrious, so ambitious to better their condition, that by an inherent and irrepressible desire to become Yankees they will abandon their native land, their homes, and loved ones, and flock to our shores. To such ridiculous contentions are the enemies of annexation driven. The "wild, ferocious, untamed, and untamable barbarians" that the Administration is "subjugating," "robbing of their liberties," "reducing to vassals," "wickedly" and "unconstitutionally"—these people who "prefer to die" rather than to live under our form of Government will, if we permit, come here in such numbers that they will be injurious to our laboring people! These directly antagonistic propositions, either of which being true would make the others impossible, constitute the most logical plank in the anti-annexationists' platform:

The last stand taken by the opponents of annexation is remarkable for its novelty. I am not informed that it is borrowed from the sepulcher of 1803. They contend that we can not give independence and freedom to the people of Porto Rico and the Philippine Islands without violently wrenching and, perhaps, disjoining our Declaration of Independence, which in substance declares that all men ought to be free. To the authors of this new-born delusion I have only to say, "Your last condition is worse than your first." They quote from the preamble. I desire to quote from the closing paragraph of that Declaration, to evidence what seems to me to have unquestionably been the opinion of the men who gave to the world that Declaration and immortalized the truth it contains—that a nation founded on that Declaration has all the rights that properly grow out of the right of sovereignty:

We therefore * * * do, in the name and by the authority of the good people of these colonies, solemnly publish and declare that these united colonies are, and of right ought to be, free and independent States; * * * and that as free and independent States they have full power to levy war, conclude peace, contract alliances, establish commerce, and do all other acts or things which independent States may of right do.

The tender solicitude the opponents of the treaty and of this measure to increase the Army have lest the President may use it to deprive the "wild, untamed, and untamable, ferocious barbarians" that they tell us the Philippines are of their liberty would have impelled them, had they been in a position to have done so, to have voted, as one member of Congress from New Hampshire did, against making the slave-trade piracy. Quoting from the Declaration of Independence the words "and the pursuit of happiness," he declared that such an enactment would be a violation of an "inalienable right" which the slave trader possessed in "the pursuit of happiness" to steal men, women, and children in Africa, transport them to America, and sell them as slaves.

Mr. Chairman, I have occupied much more than my share of time in this debate. A few words in conclusion and I am done. Our opponents point to Rome and Greece and tell us that colonial possessions ruined them. What nonsense! They were not republics like ours; they were oligarchies. Only the few had a voice in the government; the masses were serfs or slaves, and their conduct toward the inhabitants of acquired territory was invariably that of spoliation. England, the most powerful of nations, with a population in the British Isles of 38,000,000, holds in subjugation to-day, without allowing them any self-government whatever, more than 358,000,000 people. Does anyone imagine that those people are or have been a source of weakness to Great Britain? We have no purpose of that kind. I point to this fact to illustrate that the reverse of our opponents' contention is true, not only in the case of England, Germany, and other imperial powers, but in that of the Republic of France as well, that governs more people in her colonies and outlying territory than she has at home.

On the morning of May 1, 1898, Admiral Dewey, in the Bay of Manila, thousands of miles from a friendly port, standing upon the bridge of the *Olympia*, with the flag of "imperial" liberty above him, challenged the Spanish admiral in command of a fleet that carried double the number of guns that Dewey's carried, supported by land batteries, to a fight to the finish. The treaty of Guadalupe Hidalgo, the Declaration of Independence, and the Constitution of the United States were not much in evidence on

that bay that morning; but American ships, American guns, American prowess and heroism were there actively, and there to stay. [Applause.] Every man in our fleet knew that it was victory or the bottom for him. There was not a man under our flag who would have hauled it down or turned his back on our foe in defeat to save his life. Every man was a hero, every hero an expansionist. That victory immortalized our heroes as the Spartans did Thermopylae. Had those who now shout "Imperialism," "Colonial possessions," "Robbers of the Filipinos' liberty" been there, would they have turned their backs to the Spaniards? If so, mankind would have branded them as cowards. If we turn away and surrender what their matchless valor won, if we leave the Filipinos to be robbed by tyrants or adventurers, the people of every nation on earth, pointing to America, will say: "Her sons are brave in war; her legislators are cowards." I hope and trust they will not have that opportunity.

With a flippancy that evidences lack of thought and inaccuracy of statement our opponents quote a sentence or two from the Farewell Address of George Washington and proceed to arraign us for ignoring and trampling upon the advice of our first President. Let me quote from that same Address:

With me a predominant motive has been to endeavor to give time to our country to settle and mature its yet recent institutions and to progress without interruption to that degree of strength and consistency which is necessary to give it, humanly speaking, the command of its own fortunes.

To our opponents I say we have got there; we have reached that point in our development to which the author of the words quoted was anxiously looking forward.

I submit that it is patent from the language used that Washington regarded the policy of seclusion as temporary only.

Vast domain is not essential to empire or imperial and despotic rule. The most cruel of tyrants have reigned over but small territory and comparatively few people.

The fact that territory is not contiguous does not make it more desirable for imperial rule, but less so. I am not favoring empire. I desire to add imperial domain to our Republic, and give the inhabitants thereof the blessings we enjoy in the same way and manner that we have acquired territory from the day France ceded Louisiana and have added to and brought under the flag of imperial liberty many times multiplied that we originally possessed.

It is a misfortune that we have so many Rip Van Winkles in this country who can not be made to believe that time passes, progress advances, and trade and commerce increase while they sleep, unconscious of the change. They speak of the distance to the Philippine Islands, 7,000 miles, as something of sufficient importance to deter us from discharging a duty that conscience and the laws and rules of civilized nations make it imperative upon us to perform.

These sleepers, who never dream of what is transpiring in the world to-day, are not aware that Russia has nearly completed from St. Petersburg to the Pacific coast a railroad 6,600 miles in length.

I desire to place in the RECORD a copy of a letter written by Benjamin Franklin in New York City on his way to England to plead the cause of the American people before the privy council. I am indebted to Hon. Charles Marseilles, of Exeter, N. H., for the privilege of making this copy from the original in his possession:

NEW YORK, June 4, 1757—Saturday.

DEAR BROTHER & SISTER: We are now told that we are certainly to sail to-morrow Morning. I wish it may be so, for I am now quite tired with waiting, having been here above 8 Weeks.

I enclose you an Order of Cousin James's on Mr. Collins for 35 Dollars. Please to receive them, and send them by first Safe Hand to my Wife. If you can get it in Gold, it may be enclosed in a little Pacquet & sent by Post.

I pray God to preserve you both, & that I may find you well at my Return. I remain, as ever,

Your affectionate Brother,

B. FRANKLIN.

My object in introducing this letter is twofold. First, to show that Franklin was "a goldbug;" and secondly, to prove that Manila is not so far away from San Francisco to-day in point of time as Franklin had to wait in New York for a craft to sail for England. I repeat what I have before said, that, practically speaking, time and distance have been eliminated in the affairs of men, and that our commercial relations with Asiatic people, constantly increasing in volume and profit, compel us as a prudent nation to use all means that we may rightfully to encourage and defend the same.

It is asked, "Why does not the President declare his policy?" He has a duty to perform, and not a policy to enforce. His duty is clear, well defined, and free from doubts. He must, with the military arm of the Government, protect the inhabitants of those islands in all their rights, as it would have been the duty of Spain to do had not her forces stacked their arms pending the ratification of the treaty. If the treaty be ratified, he must continue to use the land and naval forces of the United States to preserve order and enforce obedience to law until such time as Congress shall see fit to legislate. How idle the query, "Why does not the

President declare his intention and purposes toward the Philippine Islands and the inhabitants thereof?" The same journals and individuals that urge this question would, if he should express an opinion as to what, in his judgment, would be wise and best to do in the future, rend the air with denunciations and charge that he desired to usurp the power of Congress. Until the treaty is ratified and the war is at an end no such question as that concerning which these men desire an opinion from the President can possibly arise.

We to-day hold those islands by the military arm. If the treaty is ratified, we shall possess them in our sovereign right. Then the President, as Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy, must govern them as best he can by means of our military and naval forces until Congress provides some other form of government or we dispose of them.

Do men forget that the President, by instructions to the commanding general of our forces in the Philippines, stated what our duty and purpose were pending the ratification of that treaty, and directed that the greatest possible publicity be given to the same, and that that adventurer who twice sold himself to Spain and who, if, as some say, he was once our ally is now a traitor, as was Benedict Arnold, ordered that proclamation burned? He is a pirate on land and sea, a betrayer of every cause he ever espoused. They who encourage and admire him must mourn the fate of Captain Jack, the Modoc chief, who shot General Canby under a flag of truce. And they who are denouncing the President for the faithful performance of a duty imposed upon him by law as a public servant are more to be despised than Aguinaldo, for they sin against greater light. [Loud applause.]

[During the delivery of the foregoing remarks Mr. SULLOWAY was interrogated, but declined to yield.]

Mr. MARS. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. FLETCHER] such time as he desires.

Mr. FLETCHER. Mr. Chairman, this bill to increase the regular standing army of the United States to 100,000 men is, in my opinion, the most important question before Congress and the people.

We are asked to enact legislation which will, if this bill is passed by Congress, place the United States upon a war footing, so that whatever emergency may arise this Government will not find itself again unprepared to meet a situation which may demand quick and aggressive action.

Those who support the bill as originally reported from the Committee on Military Affairs have told us with patriotic promptings that the passage of the bill is a necessity; that we can no longer maintain our rights and our dignity as a nation unless we have an army of this magnitude.

Mr. Chairman, while I indorse and agree to much that has been said along this line during the debate, I believe we should take up this question not alone as a patriotic measure, but we should consider it as a business proposition also, and carefully examine into all existing conditions in order to determine whether or not this Government should go upon a permanent war footing. I believe we should also look at the future and ascertain so far as may be possible the reasons for establishing and maintaining a large standing army. I know full well the value of being prepared, and of being so situated that it will be comparatively an easy matter to take advantage of an adversary. But should we not consider that the very fact of making too great preparations to meet a situation will tend to bring that situation about?

I want to go just as far as any member of this House in strengthening and aiding the War Department and the Administration in having well-trained soldiers enough to guard and defend every right of the most humble citizen of the United States against the most hostile or unwarranted and unjustified action of any nation in the world.

But I do not want to go to the extent, to use a somewhat familiar phrase heard by most of us when we were schoolboys, of walking around with a chip on our shoulders.

If I can gauge the sentiment of the American people right, they are a peace-loving and a peace-giving people. I well remember the day when the \$50,000,000 emergency bill was up here in the House. One of my colleagues from Minnesota in a very short speech embodied a great deal of truth. He said that America means peace and that our Government rests upon the solid foundations of peace and righteousness.

But when forced into a quarrel and our cause is just, then we will fight for peace and to vanquish a foe with more aggressiveness than any other country.

Do we want to maintain an Army of sufficient size and number for the mere purpose of fighting somebody? Or do we want to maintain an Army that will be sufficiently large and well enough equipped to defend every outpost of our territory, protect every foot of our soil from any foreign invasion at the outset of any war, and to hold our position until such time as the national militia—the volunteer forces—could be called into service for action?

In my judgment, Mr. Chairman, it is not necessary to call into

service 100,000 men, to keep and maintain such an army, in order to preserve the peace and take care of our possessions.

I believe that 50,000 regular soldiers will be sufficient for all purposes. We are not entering upon any aggressive policy anywhere. We propose to give free and independent government, the same as we enjoy, to Cuba, Porto Rico, and the Philippines. We are bound to do it by a most solemn declaration, which made the war with Spain so justifiable and well grounded that not one of the powers of Europe or any other nation, although they sought for some cause, some circumstance, upon which they might take exception, could say aught against the policy of this Government in its declaration of war and its prompt prosecution of it to an early finish.

It sounds very nice to talk patriotism, and we are easily swayed by sentiment. But it is not at all necessary to increase the Regular Army to 100,000 in order that the American flag shall not be hauled down anywhere where it is now floating. The gunboats of Dewey's fleet and the other squadrons of our Navy, after the record made, is a guarantee that our flag and our citizens will receive due protection. [Applause.] Therefore, this matter of maintaining a large standing army comes down more to a business than a patriotic proposition.

From the information I have been able to obtain and from my observations during the past year, I am satisfied that a regular army of 50,000 men will be sufficient for all purposes. But I am willing to be liberal with the friends of the bill, who are my friends and in whose policies I believe. I will be willing to vote for 60,000 as the limit, but I do not want more officers than are actually needed. I prefer to leave room to promote meritorious men from the ranks.

During the late war thousands of the volunteers were chafing and impatient in the various home camps. There are many regiments that have prayed and petitioned for the honor of going over to Cuba.

I am sure that I will find many who will agree with me in the statement that there are far more officers and soldiers in the Volunteer Army who are complaining because they did not see active service than there are those who are complaining because they did see some fighting. The average man who enlists wants to fight. And I want to say now while the occasion offers that the overzealous efforts of friends at home, in seeking discharges and furloughs for our volunteer boys in the field, did more to create trouble for the War Department than did the volunteers themselves.

I will admit that it costs a great deal more to handle and take care of a volunteer command than it does a Regular Army command.

That is why I am advocating a reasonably fair proposition to give the country a substantial and safe standing army.

But I want to say for the Minnesota volunteer regiments, that it was not their desire or wish, as an organization, to be mustered out of the service until after it was positively known that there would be no more fighting this side of the Philippines.

And no State has made a prouder record than Minnesota in that far-distant land. Much has been said concerning the bringing home of the Thirteenth Volunteer Regiment from Minnesota. That regiment was in at the hardest of the fighting at Manila August 13 last.

They came from the colleges, the high schools, the office, the shop, and the farm. No more patriotic spectacle was ever witnessed than when the young men—the flower of our State—took up the cause of the oppressed and marched forth to do their duty as their forefathers did in the war of the rebellion, and it shall ever be the pride of Minnesota to recall the valor and glory of her citizen soldiers in every emergency.

I hope this bill may be amended along the lines I have suggested and speedily be enacted into law. [Applause.]

Mr. JETT. Mr. Chairman, I now yield to the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. TALBERT] such time as he desires.

Mr. TALBERT. Mr. Chairman, when the war revenue bill was up for consideration last summer I made a speech against it, in which I took the ground that the war then on hand was used as a pretext for its passage, because there could be no chance to pass such a measure in time of peace with its bond provision. Now it is that the party in power again undertakes to pass a measure in this bill under consideration for increasing the standing army, under the pretense that this country will have to continue embroiled in wars in the future. Another false pretext for getting through another measure which could not otherwise pass.

I feel it my solemn duty to oppose this bill—a duty alike to the constituency that I immediately represent and to the great people of whom my constituents form a part. It is not my purpose to make a long and elaborate speech, but merely to record briefly and as clearly as I may some of the reasons which underlie my opposition and to put myself on record against the measure.

No intelligent man will deny that something in the way of a regular army is needed by the United States and no patriotic

member of this body will ever vote to withhold support for such military force as the legitimate necessities of the country require. But, in my judgment, the force provided by this bill is far and away beyond the needs of the country. It certainly is, unless it be for the purpose of carrying out a policy entirely new in our national affairs, altogether at variance with our time-honored traditions, one, as I believe, that is contrary to the best interests of the great body of the American people, fraught with danger to the Republic, and striking at the very foundations of free government the world over.

For what reason, Mr. Chairman, should the Army of the United States, on a peace footing, be suddenly raised from about 26,000 men to more than 100,000? Granting that perhaps two or three regiments of artillery could be used to good advantage in garrisoning the forts along our extended seaboard; granting that from time to time small additions may, with propriety, be made in the form of skeleton organizations to protect our varied and growing interests, as well as to serve as a nucleus for a larger army in time of war; conceding all this, where or what is the emergency that calls for the quadrupling of our military force at a single step? Are the people by whose suffrages we hold our seats in this body showing signs of restiveness under the boundless prosperity (?) which certain classes claim is now throwing its refulgent gleams of sunshine over the land?

Can it be that men who are riding the heaving billows of Republican prosperity actually require a strong Republican army to convince them of the fact? Or is it the truth that the prosperity of which we hear so much is, after all, the exclusive property of the trusts, the speculators, and the money changers, who are anxious for a strong army to protect them in their "vested rights." These are classes that naturally turn to the Republican party to shield them and aid them in every abuse, that never fail to respond freely to the calls of Republican campaign managers whenever the people are to be educated in the principles of "sound money," "business integrity," and "exalted political morality."

Can it be that these classes are to any extent responsible for the sudden conversion of so large a proportion of the Republican party leaders to the idea of a great standing army? Surely this can not be. It seems incredible that the Republican leaders, acting at the dictation of the "money power," are deliberately forging chains of oppression for the American laborer by increasing the burden of his taxes, and with the money thus wrung from him creating a vast army to shoot him down if he should manifest any unpleasant signs of discontent.

But what is the reason for this marvelous change in Republican sentiment? Are we threatened with foreign war? Not at all. On the contrary we have just finished up the war with Spain, and are now apparently entering upon a long period of peace, unless we by our own action bring about a struggle with some foreign nation or people. The question, then, arises against whom are these 100,000 men to be employed? And who are to pay the countless millions of taxes thus imposed upon the people?

Mr. Chairman, so far as our internal affairs are concerned there is absolutely no reason for such an increase of the Army. Unless there is a purpose to trample upon the liberties of our own people, this measure is manifestly designed to enable the Administration to strike down and strangle the spirit of freedom in some other land.

This, sir, is the legitimate result of that wild, unreasoning fever of "expansion" or "imperialism," call it by whichever term we may, that has temporarily blinded the vision, warped the judgment, and blunted the sense of justice of so many of our people. There can be no earthly doubt that the Administration has entered upon the policy of holding in subjection the people of distant lands, with or without their consent, and wants an army to enforce such action if they resist. The closest scrutiny of the world's political horoscope suggests no other use for such an army. I do not stand here for the purpose of making an unreasoning and senseless onslaught upon the principles of expansion.

Some there are who assume that expansion is so good a thing that we must take and hold every foot of territory that we can get, no matter to whom it rightfully belongs or what principles of natural justice we must trample upon in order to do so. Others go to the opposite extreme and profess to see danger in any expansion, no matter where or under what circumstances. I think that every case should stand upon its own basis of facts. Up to a certain point I am an expansionist. It is perfectly obvious that the tendencies of civilized men are to unite into great nationalities. This is the result of the warlike spirit and ambition which has hitherto prevailed even among the most advanced and intelligent peoples.

Under such conditions the countries which fail to expand and increase in power will almost certainly fall a prey to the ambition and rapacity of those which do. But no such conditions exist in this country to-day. We have already "expanded." From a narrow fringe of sparsely settled colonies along the Atlantic seaboard we have moved with giant strides to the west, over the

Alleghanies and across the fertile prairies of the Mississippi Valley. We have climbed the lofty slopes of the Rocky Mountains, traversed the great basin, mounted the heights of the snow-crowned Sierras, and pressed on to the westward, until the waters of the vast Pacific barred our farther progress.

Lying in one massive block, with the Atlantic on the east and the Pacific on the west, secure from either European or Asiatic aggression, with no present or prospective enemy either north or south that we need fear, with a vast domain almost in the infancy of its development, our territory has been expanded to the fullest limit of necessity. The moment we pass the limit of necessity we enter a field of unknown dangers. Many doubted the wisdom of the Alaska purchase, and others seriously questioned the policy of annexing Hawaii.

It remains to be seen, when some emergency arises, whether those possessions are elements of strength or weakness. There is, perhaps, room for honest differences of opinion as to whether we should permanently hold Porto Rico, and the question of the future acquisition, with the consent of its people, of course, of Cuba may hereafter become a fairly debatable question. But the case of the Philippines is altogether different from either and radically different from any of the precedents upon which the extreme advocates of expansion rely. If there is a single valid argument in favor of our permanently holding the Philippine archipelago, I have never yet heard it. It is shouted that the islands are very rich and that we want them. That is the alpha and omega of the expansion cry, save as it is embellished by abuse of those who venture to think that it is neither wise nor just to take and hold the islands against the wishes of the people who inhabit them.

The only argument made in favor of holding the Philippines may be met and disposed of by simply quoting the divine command, "Thou shalt not steal." If the inhabitants of those islands were clamoring for us to take them, it would be bad policy for us to do so. They are already densely populated by heterogeneous races, at least nine-tenths of whom are not and never will be fit for "friendly assimilation" with the citizens of this Republic. Such an assimilation means either the subjugation of the weaker races or the moral and social degradation of the stronger. Standing as we do, face to face with the race problem in the South, the American who will deliberately enter upon the policy of "friendly assimilation" with eight or ten millions of Filipinos is either woefully lacking in intelligence or he is not a true friend of his country. The next and logical step would be to assimilate fifty or a hundred millions of Chinamen.

But, Mr. Chairman, "friendly assimilation" is wholly out of the question, for the simple reason that the Filipinos refuse to be thus "assimilated." If they were ready to accept our sovereignty and take their chances of fair treatment, would Mr. McKinley's Administration, his friends and supporters in Congress, be now vociferously demanding a vast standing army? Is an army of 100,000 men, armed with Mauser guns and Krag-Jorgensen rifles, intended as an instrument of "friendly assimilation?"

Mr. Chairman, one of two things is certainly true: Either this great army is intended to be used against our own people or it is designed for use against some other. Which is it? We challenge the friends of the measure to tell us against whom it is to be employed. It is no answer to say that conditions may arise in which it may be needed. The same contention could be made in favor of an army of a million, for it may be that some time we shall need such a military force. But so far as the defense of our own territory is concerned, no man having a just conception of the character of the American people can doubt that they will be equal to any emergency that may arise. Their courage and patriotism have never yet failed, and they never will unless they be destroyed by the inauguration of a policy which teaches them to rely upon a standing army of soldiers for protection, which standing army will, according to different estimates, saddle upon the people an annual expense of from \$98,000,000 to \$150,000,000, in addition to billion-dollar Congresses already fastened upon them.

In any possible aspect of the question this measure is utterly indefensible. If the Army is intended for home defense, it is an unnecessary burden; if designed for the subjection of some other people to our rule it is an abomination in the sight of God and all honest men. If the purpose be to hold the Philippines against their will or to deprive the people of Cuba of the free and independent government that we have solemnly promised them, then the force proposed is entirely too small. Let gentlemen remember that 200,000 Spanish troops were insufficient to crush the spirit of liberty in Cuba alone. Let them remember that during three centuries of nominal ownership Spain obtained actual possession and control of but a small portion of the Philippine Archipelago.

Let them remember that those islands lie 7,000 miles from San Francisco, almost under the equator, and that except under the most favorable circumstances they are practically uninhabitable by men of the Anglo-Saxon race. No matter what force we might send there, the natives could retreat into the mountain fastnesses and carry on a desultory guerrilla warfare for years. Two hun-

dred thousand men would not suffice to effect a complete conquest of the islands if the natives intelligently make use of the natural advantages of their position. How many thousands and tens of thousands of our young men would be sacrificed in this insensate crusade I would not venture to say.

That our losses would be terrible no intelligent man will deny, and for what purpose? Simply to prove that we can whip the Filipinos and secure some imaginary commercial advantages. Even if the right were upon our side, it would be nothing less than national idiocy on our part to attempt it. The proposition brings up clearly and forcibly Burke's famous simile about shearing the wolf. "What! Shear a wolf?" "Yes," was the reply; "it is my wolf and I have a right to shear him." "But have you considered how little wool you will get?" "I care nothing about that; he is my wolf and I will shear him." "Think, though, of the danger and difficulty of shearing this wild beast." "No matter; he is my wolf. I have the power to shear him and I will."

My word for it, Mr. Chairman, the shearing of the Philippine wolf will be quite as difficult, quite as dangerous, and quite as profitless as was the shearing of the wolf in which Great Britain was then engaged.

Mr. Chairman, a year ago had the proposition been made for us to take the Philippine Islands, even with the free consent of their people, it would have been rejected as an action fraught with danger to the Republic. Such a thing had never been thought of. What has happened to bring about the apparent change in public sentiment? Nothing, save that Admiral Dewey destroyed the Spanish fleet in Manila Bay. But that in no manner affects the merits of the question. It makes the islands no more valuable than they were; it gives us no right to deny freedom to the people who denied the rightful sovereignty of Spain.

If Dewey had found the Spanish fleet somewhere else, he would have destroyed it just the same. The mere circumstance that the battle was fought at Manila changes no principle of international law, no rule of natural justice, and it should not lead us to depart from the foundation principle upon which the American Republic was organized, namely, that "governments derive their just powers from the consent of the governed."

I have no desire to paint too gloomy a picture of the possible results of our holding the Philippines by force. We might do it and survive; we might trample out liberty there and preserve something like liberty at home. But no fair-minded man can deny that it brings us face to face with dangers new and unknown. Not only are we asked to make war upon a people whose only wrong is the desire to be free, but we are asked to load ourselves down with burdens of largely increased taxation in order to enable us to do so.

Besides all this, it is quite certain to give rise to complications with other great powers, the results of which no man can foretell. At this juncture, when our President, from a timid and shrinking opponent of the war for humanity in Cuba, seems to have developed an insatiable appetite for conquest and territorial aggrandizement, it may not be out of place for me to read briefly from the remarks of another great Ohioan on the subject of expansion. They are a little overdrawn in their application to the question then before the country, but well worthy of consideration in the light of the situation as it exists to-day. I read from a speech of the Hon. Thomas Corwin:

Mr. President, this uneasy desire to augment our territory has depraved the moral sense and blunted the otherwise keen sagacity of our people. What has been the fate of all nations who have acted upon the idea that they must advance? Our young orators cherish this notion with a fervid but fatally mistaken zeal. They call it by the mysterious name of "destiny." "Our destiny," they say, is "onward," and hence they argue, with ready sophistry, the propriety of seizing upon any territory and any people that may lie in the way of our "fated" advance. Recently these progressives have grown classical: some assiduous student of antiquities has helped them to a patron saint. They have wandered back into the desolated Pantheon, and there, among the Polytheistic relics of that "pale mother of dead empires," they have found a god whom these Romans, centuries gone by, baptized "Terminus."

Sir, I have heard much and read somewhat of this gentleman, Terminus. Alexander, of whom I have spoken, was a devotee of this divinity. We have seen the end of him and his empire. It was said to be an attribute of this god that we must always advance and never recede. So both republican and imperial Rome believed. It was, as they said, their destiny. And for a while it did seem to be even so. Roman Terminus did advance. Under the eagles of Rome he was carried from his home on the Tiber to the farthest East on the one hand, and to the far West, among the then barbarous tribes of western Europe, on the other. But at length the time came when retributive justice had become "a destiny."

The despised Gaul calls out the contemned Goth, and Attila, with his Huns, answers back the battle shout to both. The "blue-eyed nations of the north," in succession or united, pour forth their countless hosts of warriors upon Rome and Rome's always-advancing god Terminus. And now the battle-ax of the barbarian strikes down the conquering eagle of Rome. Terminus at last recedes, slowly at first, but finally he is driven to Rome, and from Rome to Byzantium. Whoever would know the further fate of this Roman deity, so recently taken under the patronage of American Republicanism, may find ample gratification of his curiosity in the luminous pages of Gibbon's "Decline and Fall."

Such will find that Rome thought as you now think—that it was her destiny to conquer provinces and nations—and no doubt she sometimes said, as you say, "I will conquer a peace," and where now is she, the mistress of the world? The spider weaves his web in her palaces; the owl sings his watch

song in her towers. Teutonic power now lords it over the servile remnant, the miserable memento of old and once omnipotent Rome. Sad, very sad, are the lessons which time has written for us. Through and in them all I see nothing but the inflexible execution of that old law which ordains as eternal that cardinal rule, "Thou shalt not covet thy neighbor's goods, nor anything which is his."

For the reasons which I have thus briefly generalized, and many others that I have not the time to touch, I feel it my duty to oppose this measure in the interest of the people I have the honor to represent upon this floor.

I commend this language to the earnest and prayerful attention of those who are pressing this measure as being appropriate to the present occasion. I can not conscientiously support the bill under consideration, but will vote for the substitute offered by the gentleman from Virginia, as being the choice of evils as they exist to-day. [Loud applause.]

Mr. MARSH. Mr. Chairman, I now yield twenty minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. WHITE].

Mr. WHITE of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I supported very cheerfully all measures tending to bring about the recent war for liberating a very much oppressed and outraged people. I supported with equal cheer all appropriations that were necessary for the successful prosecution of that war to a final termination. I thought it was necessary then; I think now that it was a necessity. It has been the province of the people of the United States at all times to extend a helping hand to the oppressed, to the outraged—I mean, of course, without the borders of the United States.

Being a member of this great Republic and one of the Representatives on this floor, I gave my support in voice and in every way that I could to all measures tending to the liberation of these poor people in Cuba. I now favor the acquisition of all of the territory that is within our grasp as a result of that war. [Applause.]

To say that we will not accept, to say that we will not take these acquisitions, and to say that we will not extend to the people thereof the civilization of our country, the Christian manhood and womanhood we enjoy, is to do them a wrong and to take steps backward. I therefore favor the annexation of the Philippine Islands, and I also favor the bill now pending before this House for the extension of our standing Army commensurate with our new conditions.

Our Army up to the time of this recent war was a mere bagatelle. It was not at all in keeping with the great nation that we are. Our Navy consisted of only a few crafts hanging around our shores, and the condition we were found in at the beginning of the American-Spanish war is too well known to us all to require any discussion on my part.

In times of peace it is well to prepare for war. We are now at peace, but it may not be thirty days before we shall be thrown into another war. Who can tell? Certainly if this discussion goes on, the treaty being considered in the other end of the Capitol being transferred, in part, to this end of the Capitol, and being of such character so as to encourage and inflame those of the Philippines opposed to annexation, it is most likely that it will not be thirty days before we will be at war again. Therefore I favor action upon this bill and extending our Army so that it will be ample for all emergencies that may arise.

Mr. Chairman, it is not so much on account of the recent war with Spain, or the money it took to carry on that war, or the annexation of Cuba, or Porto Rico, or the Philippine Islands that I desire to speak, nor is it so much the pending bill we have before us that I desire to address myself to this House.

But it is another problem, possibly more vexing than the one we have now under consideration. I know that you will pardon me if I do not address myself to the question before us when you recollect that I am the only representative on this floor of 10,000,000 people, from a racial standpoint. They have no one else to speak for them, from a race point of view, except myself. I shall therefore address the remainder of my remarks to another phase of the situation in this country—to another great problem that confronts us, and one which I trust ere long we shall have the manhood to stand up in our places and meet like American citizens, not like sectional cowards. I refer to the race problem. I have sat here in my place and heard discussions pro and con; I have heard my race referred to in terms anything else than dignified and complimentary. I have heard them referred to as savages, as aliens, as brutes, as vile and vicious and worthless, and I have heard but little or nothing said with reference to their better qualities, their better manhood, their developed American citizenship. It is therefore in reply to those seemingly unguarded expressions that I wish to speak.

I have listened to gentlemen here—particularly one of the gentlemen from the State of Mississippi [Mr. WILLIAMS] in his great eloquence about "white supremacy"—just here permit me to say that I have no respect for a "supremacy," white or black, which has been obtained through fraud, intimidation, carnage, and death—"white supremacy" in the great State of Mississippi; about the Anglo-Saxon ruling this country. I did not know that it required any specific reference of this kind for the world to

know the fact that the Anglo-Saxon will rule the United States. We constitute as a race less than one-seventh, possibly, of the population. We have been enslaved; we have done your bidding for two hundred and forty years without any compensation; and we did it faithfully. We do not revert to it grumblingly or regretfully, but we refer to it because it seems ungracious in you now, after you have had all this advantage of us, after you have had all this labor of ours, to be unwilling, at this late day, to give us a man's share in the race of life.

That is the only sense in which I refer to it. It is not with a view to digging up the past. It is not with a view of kindling renewed animosity between the races, but only in answer to those who slur at us and remind us of our inferiority. Yes, by force of circumstances, we are your inferiors. Give us two hundred and forty years the start of you, give us your labor for two hundred and forty years without compensation, give us the wealth that the brawny arm of the black man made for you, give us the education that his unpaid labor gave your boys and girls, and we will not be begging, we will not be in a position to be sneered at as aliens or members of an inferior race. Not at all.

We are inferior. We regret it. But if you will only allow us an opportunity we will amend our ways, we will increase our usefulness, we will become more and more intelligent, more and more useful to the nation. It is a chance in the race of life that we crave. We do not expect any special legislation. We do not expect the mythical "40 acres and a mule."

The mule died long ago of old age, and the land grabbers have obtained the 40 acres. We do not expect any of those things. But we have a right to expect a man's chance and opportunity to carve out our own destiny. That is all we ask, and that we demand.

This problem is confronting the nation. We seem as a race to be going through just now a crucible, a crisis—a peculiar crisis. It is not necessary, nor have I the time, to enter into any explanation as to what brought about this crisis. I may say, however, in passing, that possibly more than by any other one thing it has been brought about by the fact that despite all the oppression which has fallen upon our shoulders we have been rising, steadily rising, and in some instances we hope ere long to be able to measure our achievements with those of all other men and women of the land. This tendency on the part of some of us to rise and assert our manhood along all lines is, I fear, what has brought about this changed condition.

Shall the nation stand by listlessly, or shall it uphold the principles that it has established? Shall it recognize, as declared in the organic law, that all men are born free and equal and are endowed with certain inalienable rights, among which are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness?

During the discussions here since the pendency of the treaty of peace I have heard a good deal said, both in this House and at the other end of the Capitol, about the Declaration of Independence and the Constitution of the United States. I have heard a good deal said about Thomas Jefferson and others who had to do with the drafting of that instrument. And it has been alleged that they did not mean what they said in that declaration, for the reason that at the very time it was promulgated they owned slaves, and therefore when they spoke of all men being free and equal they did not mean the black population. The Constitution is a very elastic instrument when you have a purpose to serve. Public sentiment is law, and law, when properly executed, is public sentiment.

I heard once of a learned old lawyer who was instructing his class preparatory to their examination before the supreme court of the State for license. He said to them one day, "My dear boys, whenever you have a case in regard to which the law is in your favor and the facts against you, you must lean hard on the law; but if the law is against you and the facts in your favor, then lean hard on the facts." One bright young fellow said, "Well, Judge, suppose both the law and the facts are against us, then what must we do?" "Ah, my boys," said the Judge, "then you must beat about the bush." It occurs to me, sir, that every time a construction of the Constitution or an interpretation of the law is made with reference to the humble race with which I am identified, the principle of that old judge's instruction is brought into play. If the law is in favor of the negro and the facts rather against him, they lean hard on the facts. If the reverse is true, they lean hard on the law in the construction of a statute with reference to him; but if the negro happens to have both the law and the facts on his side, all the decisions touching his rights seem to be beating around the bush. I regret to say it, and I say it with respect, with no intention of reflecting upon anybody or any branch of this Government.

Now, the problem to which I refer not only touches my people, but in my humble judgment it reaches out and ramifies and affects every citizen of the American Republic. How long will we sit—I say "we." I will sit here only two years longer, should I live, and I am going to try mighty hard to live that long. How long

will you sit in your seats here and see the principles that underlie the foundation of this Government sapped little by little, but nevertheless surely sapped away? I took the pains this afternoon to run over one or two of the States that have been harping, through their representatives, most about the colored man on this floor since I have been in Congress.

I took up Mississippi, because I recall that two gentlemen from that State especially—I have reference to Congressman ALLEN and Congressman WILLIAMS—have taken special pains on several occasions to refer to the negro; they referred to him in a slurring way, referred to him as something to be managed, referred to him as something to be gotten rid of, referred to him as somebody that must be—oh, well, Congressman ALLEN told a yarn here one day—“transferred,” I believe he called it. He must be “transferred.” Well, now, here is the situation. I could not say much with reference to him, but here is the situation, taking his district in the State of Mississippi.

I deal with 1896, because I could not get the figures of last November. I find in the gentleman's district there were only 8,418 votes cast for all the candidates in that district, while the estimated vote of the district is 28,663. I found in the Second district that the estimated vote was 34,102. The Congressman said that he got a plurality of 254 over his opponent, but did not give us the benefit of how many he got. I presume a few thousand. In the Third district the estimated vote is 36,859, and 4,050 were cast in the Presidential election of 1896. I found in the Fourth district there was an estimated vote of 42,647. There were votes cast for all the candidates, Democrats, Republicans, Populists, Free-soilers, hottentots, and everybody else, 11,737.

In the Fifth district the estimated vote is 44,923, and there were 13,700 votes cast for all the candidates.

In the Sixth district there were 33,882 votes estimated and there were cast nobody knows how many. Here is the note in the Directory:

Elected as a Democrat, practically without opposition, to fill out an unexpired term—

and so forth. Practically without opposition!

In the Seventh district the estimated vote is 37,338, and there were cast 8,647 votes.

The total vote cast for Congressmen in the State of Mississippi in the year 1896, leaving out the Second and Sixth districts, where the vote is not given, was 45,867 out of a total vote of between 250,000 and 300,000.

Mr. BRUCKER. Was that at the Presidential election?

Mr. WHITE of North Carolina. That was at the Presidential election in the year 1896. These were the votes cast for Congressmen as they themselves have given them in the Congressional Directory. Here they are. Where are the others? Echo answers “Where?” White supremacy to get rid of negro domination? I do not know whether the negroes ever dominated in Mississippi or not. If they did, it is the only State outside of South Carolina for a while that they ever did dominate. They certainly never dominated the State wherein I live. We have no ambition to dominate, but we would like to be given a chance by the side of other men to work out our destiny and paddle our own canoe.

I find in the State of South Carolina, adjoining the State that I hail from, a similar situation of affairs. I suppose I might give these facts and figures, because the public would like to know these things, and everyone can not get hold of a Congressional Directory.

In the First district of South Carolina the estimated vote is 34,664; the vote cast, 7,303. In the Second district the estimated vote is 29,265; the vote cast, 8,634. In the Third district the estimated vote is 30,412 and the votes cast 10,536, or about one-third.

In the Fourth district the estimated vote is 40,000; the vote cast, 12,180. In the Fifth district the estimated vote is 28,350, and the vote cast is 8,833.

In the Sixth district the estimated vote is 30,770, and we have this entry, no figures being given at all:

Elected as a Democrat without opposition, having received the entire vote cast.

A popular man! In the Seventh district the estimated vote is 35,736, while the vote cast was 9,407. The total vote cast, leaving out those two districts where the gentlemen did not give the public the benefit of the votes cast for them—the total vote cast for Congressmen in that State in that election was 56,953, while the estimated vote of the State of South Carolina is about 250,000, about one-fifth of the entire voting population having actually voted.

Now, I am not going to grumble about the number of votes that you cast down there in South Carolina, but I want to say to the Congress of the United States, and through Congress to the people of the United States, that South Carolina, Louisiana, Mississippi, and every other State in this Union ought to have the benefit of the votes that are allowed to be cast in their representation on this floor, and no more.

It is not fair to the other States of the Union to say that one

gentleman shall come here from a district giving 30,000, 40,000, 50,000, or even 60,000 votes, and that a district in Mississippi or a district in Louisiana or a district in South Carolina, or possibly pretty soon a district in North Carolina, shall come here with a like population with only five or six thousand votes cast, with the others disfranchised and not allowed to vote. If we are unworthy of suffrage, if it is necessary to maintain white supremacy, if it is necessary for the Anglo-Saxon to sway the scepter in those States, then you ought to have the benefit only of those who are allowed to vote, and the poor men, whether they be black or white, who are disfranchised ought not to go into the representation of the district or the State. It is a question that this House must deal with some time, sooner or later.

It may seem a little strange to hear me speak, but nobody else has tackled this question because the boot does not pinch anybody else as it does me and my race. But it will come home to you. You will have to meet it. You have got this problem to settle, and the sooner it is settled the better it will be for all parties concerned. I speak this in all charity. I speak this with no hostility. I am not a pessimist. I take rather the other view. I am optimistic in my views and believe that these problems will adjust themselves one day. I believe that the negro problem in less than fifty years will be a thing of the past.

When it is recalled that thirty-three years ago, one generation ago, four and a half millions of these people were liberated on the plantations of their former masters, and that right by their side they have worked out their destiny thus far, have arisen from poverty to a taxation of four hundred millions of property in the United States; when it is remembered that they have arisen from no homes to the purchase, in many instances, of decent tracts of land, with splendid homes and good property, I think I am justified in saying that this problem will work itself out. Many of them have acquired professions. We are ramifying and stretching out as best we can in all departments of life, with a view to making ourselves good citizens.

And my plea is not against Mississippi, not against South Carolina, not against Louisiana, but for justice—simple justice. Unmitigated justice is what we ask. You are not afraid of the black man overriding and overawing you. He is your neighbor. He is your friend. The chord that exists between some of the whites and the blacks of the South can not be severed by all of the bloody assassins of the world. But you have got the wrong conception. You have got the idea that any means that will disfranchise him and prevent him from exercising the rights which are given him under the Constitution is legitimate, that the end justifies the means. It is a wrong conception of a civilized government. It is the wrong conception of American citizenship, and the sooner we all reach the conclusion that we are here together, here to live and here to die, the better for all concerned, because the black man is here to stay for all time to come.

The Indian has been driven to the West. He has been driven to the little reservations, and he numbers now only a few hundred thousand. He has died and has been killed and his numbers reduced to a minimum, and in a hundred years hence a few mummies in the Smithsonian Institution or somewhere else will represent an extinct race that was once very distinct in the United States. Not so with the negro; never. He did not come to this country of his own motion; he is not here of his own act; but being here, and his planting upon this soil being coequal with his white neighbor, he is here to stay from now henceforth and forever. He will not die out. I know that some of our friends have consulted the statistics and find that the mortality of the negro in some large cities is very great, and they think he will soon die out. They forget that the bulk of the negro race have never seen a large city, but are healthy and hearty and prolific on the plantations throughout the country.

Yes, we are on the increase. The war emancipated four and a half millions. The census of next year will register ten millions. The proportion that we occupy with reference to the white people will never increase, but will gradually diminish; but the number of negroes in this country will continually increase.

I say it will never increase, because we do not import negroes into the United States. It is an evident fact that the “riffraff” of all the nations of the earth enter this country except negroes. And, strange to say, they find open doors and find open hearts, and soon mingle and commingle with all the people of this country and are lost in the great civilization of this country. We do not ask to be assimilated; we do not ask to be amalgamated; we do not ask for anything but to remain a distinct and separate race as we are, and to be permitted to work out our own manhood and womanhood. We do not expect anything else.

Now, gentlemen, what are you going to do with this problem, with this question? I believe the time is coming very soon when the color of a man's skin, so far as business relations are concerned, so far as citizenship is concerned, will cut no figure at all. A man will be regarded as a man whether wrapped in a white or a black skin. I believe the time will come when we will have no more

riots in the South on account of color, when civilization will so develop all over this nation that there will be no more lynchings and barbarity and mobocracy, now so prevalent in some portions of this country.

When the black man, through toil and economy, shall have acquired property and wealth and all those things that make a good American citizen, and when all the barriers of legislation now in the way shall disappear, he will be taken by the hand as a man. I believe the time will come—yes, soon—when the condition that prevails to-day in Boston, in grand old Massachusetts, where all are recognized, both black and white, will prevail in South Carolina, North Carolina, Louisiana, and Mississippi. We can not live on the dead ashes of the past. Slavery and its institutions, racial distinctions and wrongs will come to an end. We are going forward; we are looking out; we are stretching out our arms all over the United States. The nation must care for those at home as well as those abroad.

Our ratio of representation is poor. We are taunted with being uppish; we are told to be still; to keep quiet. How long must we keep quiet? We have kept quiet while numerically and justly we are entitled to 51 members of this House; and I am the only one left. We kept quiet when numerically we are entitled to a member of the Supreme Court. We have never had a member and probably never will; but we have kept quiet. We have kept quiet while numerically and justly, according to our population as compared with all the other races of the world, so far as the United States are concerned, we should have the recognition of a place in the President's Cabinet; but we have not had it. Still we have kept quiet, and are making no noise about it.

We are entitled to 13 United States Senators, according to justice and according to our numerical strength, but we have not one, and possibly never will get another; and yet we keep quiet. We have kept quiet while hundreds and thousands of our race have been strung up by the neck unjustly by mobs of murderers. If a man commits a crime he will never find an apologist in me because his face is black. He ought to be punished, but he ought to be punished according to the law as administered in a court of justice. But we keep quiet; do not say it, do not talk about it. How long must we keep quiet, constantly sitting down and seeing our rights one by one taken away from us? As slaves it was to be expected; as slaves we were docile and easily managed; but as citizens we want and we have a right to expect all that the law guarantees to us.

We are passing, as we trust, from ignorance to intelligence. The process may be slow; we may be impatient; you may be discouraged; public sentiment may be against us because we have not done better, but we are making progress. Do you recollect in history any race of people placed in like circumstances who have done any better than we have? Give us a chance, and we will do more. We plead to all of those who are here legislating for the nation that while your sympathy goes out to Cuba—and we are legislating for Cuba—while your hearts burst forth with great love for humanity abroad, remember those who are at our own door. Remember those who have worked for you; remember those who have loved you, who have held up your hands, who have felled your forests, have dugged your ditches, who have filled up your valleys and have lowered the mountains, and have helped to make the great Southland what it is to-day. We are entitled to your recognition. We do not ask for domination. We ask and expect a chance in legislation, and we will be content with nothing else.

In the language of another, who has put it possibly very much better than I can:

We are passing from the ignorance and superstition fostered by years of thralldom to the intelligence which freedom predicated; from the immorality of two hundred and forty years to the higher standard of morality which ever characterizes the daily life of the highest social and scholastic circles; from the muscle and sinew power of the past to the multitudinous appliances of the improved machinery of the present.

We are living in a grand and awful time. We are measured not by the number of pounds which we are able to lift from the earth, but by that other power which is required to move the world.

Man's importance has been most beautifully delineated by Dr. Watts, who says:

"Were I so tall to reach the pole,
Or mete the ocean with my span,
I must be measured by my soul;
The mind's the standard of the man."

It is that standard, it is that measurement that we are willing to be measured by. It is by that standard we would like you to gauge us, and not the texture of our hair, not the color of our skin, not our flat noses, but the standard of the man that we would like to be measured by. This broad problem of giving us a man's chance confronts us; it is one well worthy of you.

I was up in Saratoga a few years ago, and in conversation with a gentleman there inquired how the people got along. I went before the season opened. Everything looked barren and bleak. He said, "Well, in the summer we live by skinning the visitors who have come here." I said, "I can very well understand that; but how do you get along in the winter?" "Then," said he,

"we skin each other." [Laughter.] Gentlemen, the process of skinning the negro is nearly over. You have about completed the job. Gentlemen of the North, of the East, and of the West, yes, and you of the South, when that is done you have got to have somebody to skin, and you will turn on each other, and then possibly the negro will get his just deserts. [Laughter.]

It is well to stop and consider; you can not always keep a free man down. When he is once made free, it will be difficult to ever enslave him again, either physically or intellectually. Physical slavery is a thing nobody wants. The most ignorant of our Southern sand lappers out in the woods do not want actual slavery again; but there is a slavery that is even worse than manual slavery—the slavery of the mind, the beclouded intellect. It is there that we ask you to help lift the curtain of darkness, the curtain of ignorance, the curtain of vice that you helped to nail and foist upon us, to help break the shackles, that we may look forth in the noonday of life, in the tide of progress and beauty, that we may go up the hill with you, that we may leave the miasmatic valley of vice and degradation and climb to the top of the mount, where we can breathe God's pure air as American citizens.

Recognize your citizen at home, recognize those at your door, give them the encouragement, give them the rights that they are justly entitled to, and then take hold of the people of Cuba and help establish a stable and fixed government among them; take hold of the Porto Ricans, establish the government there that wisdom predicated, which justice may dictate. Take hold of the Philippine Islands, take hold of the Hawaiian Islands, there let the Christian civilization go out and magnify and make happy those poor, half-civilized people; and then the black man, the white man—yes, all the riff-raff of the earth that are coming to our shores—will rejoice with you in that we have done God's service and done that which will elevate us in the eyes of the world. [Prolonged applause.]

Mr. VINCENT. Mr. Chairman, as between the bill under consideration and the substitute offered by the minority of the committee, it seems to me that no member of this House should hesitate very long in deciding in favor of the substitute. Everything that can be said in favor of this bill will apply with equal force to the substitute bill, while the latter has many good features which are not contained in the former.

This bill provides for a permanent standing army of over 100,000 men—four times as large as we had at the close of the civil war. Nobody has shown and no one can show why the Army should be increased fourfold for an indefinite period. It is conceded that the Regular Army as at present constituted may possibly not be sufficient to meet the conditions that now exist and the contingencies that may arise during the next year or two, but the bill offered by the minority provides for 50,000 volunteers, to be mustered out at the end of two years. Possibly it might be better to make this three years. It also provides for 30,000 permanent troops, so that there is only a difference of about 20,000 in the number of soldiers provided for in the two bills. Better increase the number of volunteers to 70,000 than to provide for a permanent standing Army of three or four times as many as we need under ordinary circumstances.

Mr. Chairman, it has been a long cherished desire among certain classes in this country that the standing Army should be greatly increased, and those who have carefully watched public events for the past twenty years know why this is so. It is the opinion of some persons who have the temerity to reason from cause to effect that our soldiers may be used some time to shoot down Americans, without just cause, instead of foreigners. It is a significant fact that since the era of corporation rule set in and since our beneficent social system developed the tramp, the lock-out, and the strike, the Army has never been called out to suppress or hold in check the corporation, but always to suppress the striker.

While it is true the strikers have often been in the wrong, the corporations have not always been right. Whether the necessity exists or not, whether right or wrong, it is not disputed that the great corporate interests of the country have been and are now demanding a large standing army. The sentiment has prevailed from the very foundation of our Government down to the present hour, and that sentiment is based upon the history of other nations and upon common sense and reason, that large standing armies are dangerous to the people's liberties. In those countries where tyranny is most oppressive and where the common people are looked upon as little better than beasts of burden, there you will find the largest standing armies. Liberty of the press and freedom of speech are suppressed in exact ratio with the increase of the army.

The gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HEPBURN] in his speech this afternoon referred to the fact that our standing army is not as large in proportion to population as it was in Jefferson's time, in the attempt to prove not only that this bill ought to pass, but that Thomas Jefferson was in favor of a large Army. Apparently the gentleman had forgotten that when Mr. Jefferson was President

probably nine-tenths or more of what is now the United States was inhabited by roving bands of blood-thirsty savages. To assume, as several gentlemen have done, that our Army should be increased with our increase in population—in the same ratio—is simply schoolboy talk. If population were the only thing to consider, we could get along with a smaller Army now than we could have done one hundred years ago, because the danger of attack from outside nations is not so great in a country containing 75,000,000 people as it is in a country with 5,000,000 of people. In proof of this I cite you to what is about to take place in the Philippine Islands. If Aguinaldo had 75,000,000 people behind him it would not take us long to pull down the flag.

The minority report has well said that such an army as this bill provides for is not necessary because of our relations to the islands of the sea nor because of any necessity which in the past year has arisen. I can not bring myself to believe that the Administration will dare to attempt the forcible annexation of the Philippine Islands. The President himself has said that forcible annexation would be criminal aggression. But, Mr. Chairman, that was a year ago, and we are told that great changes have taken place. True, but just what day and hour forcible annexation ceased to be criminal and commenced to be the pure extract of Christian civilization our imperialistic friends fail to inform us.

Since the President wrote that message he has said the flag was planted in two hemispheres, and then he asks: "Who will pull down that flag?" So far the President's friends have failed to give a satisfactory explanation of what he meant if he did not mean that the flag which was then floating over the Philippine Islands should remain there regardless of the wishes of the Filipinos. I suppose if we had found it necessary during the late war with Spain to plant the flag in some of those countries inhabited and controlled by man-eaters it would have to stay there, and we would have to adopt those countries as a part of ours, and it would be treason to pull down the flag.

In that event, Mr. Chairman, instead of addressing the Chief Executive of this nation as "His Excellency the President of the United States," I suppose it would be appropriate to address him as "King of the Cannibal Islands." If we are yearning for an opportunity to institute better government for other people and give them the "blessings of law and liberty" at the point of the bayonet, whether they want them or not, why not exercise our civilizing process upon those who need it most? But we are told that the Filipinos are little, if any, better than cannibals. If this be true, I submit that it is an additional reason why we should not make them citizens of the United States.

I submit that our experience with the American Indians is not such as to encourage us in undertaking to civilize a people 8,000 miles away, who, according to our opponents, are much inferior and less deserving. It is an old and perhaps a true saying that "the only good Indians are dead ones." At the end of more than one hundred years' experience we find that we have civilized Lo, the poor Indian, by teaching him how to use cuss words and drink bad whisky, and incidentally convincing him that if Indian agents and Indian traders were fair samples of the white race he was justified in sending them to their "happy hunting grounds" with the least possible delay. It does seem, Mr. Chairman, that the race problem, which was so ably discussed last evening by the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. LINNEY] and which was shown to be such a perplexing one in some parts of our country, ought to be sufficient without inviting new ones of still greater magnitude.

We started the war with Spain upon a high moral plane. We declared that it was a war for human rights and not a war of conquest, but scarcely had the brave boys who fell at Santiago grown cold in death before a certain class of our citizens who represent the so-called "business interests" of the country commenced to settle upon a plan for dividing the spoils. "We have planted the flag in Manila," they said, "and the 2,000 Philippine Islands are ours."

Visions of wealth sprang up before their eyes, and the cry for liberty and independence was drowned by the more noisy and hypocritical plea for "expansion and patriotism." Those who were prompted by greed succeeded temporarily in making many who were less selfish forget the purpose for which the war was instituted. Unthinking people were carried away by the catchword "expansion." They were told by campaign orators that they must support the President's foreign "policy," though nobody knew then and nobody seems to know now what that policy is. I doubt whether he knows.

The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BROMWELL], who made one of the most convincing pleas that has been made in favor of the pending bill and in defense of the President, admitted in his speech to-day, in so many words, that the President has no policy. Nobody but MARK HANNA knows where he will stand to-morrow regarding the Philippine question. He has already been on both sides of the question. If his friends know where to find him they refuse to tell. They seem to be guessing, and I have as much

right to guess as they have. My guess is that he wants to annex the islands—forcibly, if necessary—if he is assured that it will not defeat his party for reelection in 1900; otherwise he is opposed to it.

Some people indorsed his "policy" at the polls last fall without stopping to inquire what it was or whether he had any; but the war excitement is not running so high now, and as voters gradually reach a more normal state of mind they will be less inclined to accept everything as good because it is called "patriotism" and offered by a "war administration." The people are to be congratulated upon the fact that they are slowly but surely recovering from the epidemic of hysterics which in the excitement they foolishly imagined was patriotism. They are already convalescing—to use a more classical phrase, they are getting back to earth again, and when they do find themselves in a normal condition they will be ashamed of their childish talk about the flag and of their boast that we were going to take all the territory within our reach and hold fast to all we could get possession of.

Mr. Chairman, it is somewhat amusing that nearly every partisan of the Administration in this House and in the Senate who has made a speech upon this subject has advocated and argued in favor of forcible annexation, at the same time denying that the President has ever said or done anything to indicate that he was in favor of it. Following the example of their illustrious leader, they get on both sides of the proposition. If we have the right to subordinate the Filipinos, and if it is such a good thing to do, why are they so anxious to make us believe the President is not in favor of it?

They remind me of the man who was charged with stealing a bay horse, and after denying that he was guilty, said the horse he stole was a black one and not a bay horse at all. If it is such a good, Christian act, prompted only by the loftiest feelings of philanthropy—good for us and good for the Filipinos—why should the President's friends become so indignant when he is charged with favoring such a policy? Our friends on the other side should at least cultivate the virtue of consistency, in view of the fact that they are so destitute of logic and reason.

Mr. Chairman, I believe it is as true to-day as it was one hundred and twenty-three years ago that governments derive their just powers from the consent of the governed, and I do not believe that this great principle will apply only to the people of the United States. When this declaration was promulgated the so-called great statesmen of all the other nations of earth said it was the wild dream of misguided theorists and self-constituted leaders. England said, as some of us are saying of the Filipinos, that we were incapable of self-government.

We are asked now to repudiate the Declaration of Independence, and later on, I suppose, we will be expected to substitute therefor some famous Spanish statepaper. Perhaps we may be asked to read at our Fourth of July celebrations in future General Weyler's reconcentrado order instead of the Declaration of Independence. If we settle upon this contemplated policy of conquest, surely no honest man would care to call attention to the immortal Declaration except as a reminder of the former greatness and goodness of the United States Government.

We are told that if we pay Spain \$20,000,000 for the islands, as provided by the proposed treaty, they would be a part of our country, and we would have a perfect right to do with them as we please. Pray, sir, when did Spain acquire the right to deed us those islands? Spain has no more right to sell them than has England or China. Her title is no better than theirs. She is selling us something she has been trying for two hundred years to steal, with only partial success. To pretend to buy these islands of Spain the United States would deliberately and willingly become the receiver of stolen goods, and the receiver would be equally guilty with the thief.

Spain has been trying for hundreds of years to become the absolute master of those people. She has robbed them year in and year out to the full extent of her ability, and this proposition simply means that we are to become their masters instead of Spain. They are to become our subjects instead of the subjects of Spain, and they are not to be consulted regarding the transfer. That such a cold-blooded scheme should ever have been openly advocated by men high in the councils of our Government should bring the blush of shame to the cheek of every true American. If we insist upon this high-handed scheme of coercion we will violate every principle of self-government and repudiate every tradition we have cherished from the beginning of the nation's history.

It seems to be the policy of the Administration to give Cuba her independence. Nobody in this debate has dared to oppose it, for the reason, I suppose, that it seems to be inevitable. If the imperialists could find any excuse, and if there was a reasonable possibility of success, there is scarcely a doubt that Cuba would suffer the same fate that it is proposed to inflict upon the Philippines. And why not? The gentlemen who are so anxious for good government in the Philippines have been asked over and over again since this discussion commenced why the same rule would not

apply to both. They have been urged and defied to give some reason why forcible annexation is not good for Cubans if it is good for the Filipinos, but they persist in ignoring the question, because they know there is no answer to it.

It is said the Filipinos are not capable of self-government; but it is only a cheap assertion, not borne out by any evidence presented. Let them have an opportunity, as we had, and we will know then whether they can govern themselves. Are you afraid to give them a chance for fear that they will demonstrate that you have misrepresented them? Do not say that they can not govern themselves, when you are standing over them with muskets, swearing they shall not do it. It is time enough to say they can not when they have tried and failed. You say we can give them a better government than they can give themselves. I believe we can, and possibly we would do it; but this can truthfully be said of all other countries.

There is no doubt in my mind that we could give England and France better governments than they now have. Is that any reason why we should go over there and compel them to accept our rule? Oh, you say, that is a different thing. Yes, indeed, it would be a different thing. We would then be jumping upon somebody a little nearer our size. We can conquer the Filipinos because they are weak, and in doing so we only add the crime of cowardice to the crime of theft. Because we think we have the best government on the face of the earth are we going to sail around the world subduing other nations in order that they may receive the benefits of our enlightenment and our system of government?

Are we going to cram our religion down their throats whether they want it or not, because we think it is a better religion than theirs? Why not? It will do them good, we think, and therefore we ought to make them take it. Why not gobble up one nation after another for the same reason until we own the world? That might slightly interfere with the protective tariff, but it would be Expansion with a big E, and that is only another word for patriotism.

If we must steal something, why go 8,000 miles from home to do it? Why not take in one or more of the South American Republics? They would, perhaps, be worth something to us, and we can soon make an excuse for doing it. We can plant the flag there under some pretext, and then "Who will dare to take it down?" There is no end to the possibilities—to the good we can do to other nations—if we will only carry this "expansion" policy, this new brand of "patriotism," to its legitimate conclusion. Patriotism under the old order of things, before the Declaration of Independence was expunged from the record, meant love of one's country. Under the new régime it means love for the other fellow's country.

"But what are we going to do with the Philippines?" you ask. "Are we going to turn them over to Spain?" Nobody proposes to do anything of the kind. What are we going to do with Cuba; turn it over to Spain? Gentlemen assume that we must either shoot the Filipinos or turn them over to be shot by Spaniards. It is neither necessary, humane, nor wise to do either one. Turn the islands over to the men who own them—the men who have been fighting for years, like the Cuban patriots fought, for their freedom. Do with them as we say we are going to do, and as every honest man says we ought to do, with the Cubans. The Filipinos are as well and better able to take care of themselves as they were before we took possession of Manila. We can leave them now in better condition than we found them, because we have prostrated their ancient enemy, and it is only a pretext when we say we must adopt them for their own good when they are protesting that they do not want and will not have such protection.

Even if the inhabitants of the islands were willing and anxious to come with us; even if it were not everlastingly wrong from a moral standpoint; annexation would still be unwise because of the enormous expense. These islands will cost us hundreds of dollars for every dollar we get in return. This can be demonstrated and has been demonstrated over and over again upon this floor without any attempt to refute it. But if there were "millions in it," that would not justify the outrage. No doubt there will be millions in it for a few speculators and syndicates, and these are at the bottom of the scheme of annexation. There will be Federal positions at good salaries and long-drawn-out mileage for scores of carpetbaggers, but the great mass of our people will pay the bills in increased taxation.

Forcible annexation means government without the consent of the governed; it means continued oppression to those who have so bravely fought against it; it means injustice from every standpoint; it means increased taxation; it means an increase in the standing Army; it means that we are going 8,000 miles from home to invite trouble; it means everything that is bad and nothing that is good, and it is a public confession to all the world that the war with Spain was fought under false pretenses. [Applause.]

Mr. BAKER of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, though the question before us is a very great one, I purpose being very short, for I think I can condense in few words much of the meaning of what we are about to-day.

There is now a population of about 75,000,000 people in the United States and its continental territories, and we have a permanent standing army of about 26,600 men. These are facts utterly unequaled in the entire past history of the world and constitute the crowning glory of our Republic at the close of the first and at the beginning of the second century of its existence; and nothing can be more certain than that this small permanent military force is all that is needed for our vast home population at the present time. This should be the fundamental basis of our thought in connection with the great expansion of our standing Army which is proposed by the bill before us. This proposal can not reasonably rest upon any actual internal need, but must rest upon the results of the war with Spain. That war grew out of the situation in Cuba and was prosecuted in the name of humanity and liberty, with an open declaration by our Government to the world—

That the United States hereby disclaims any disposition or intention to exercise sovereignty, jurisdiction, or control over said island, except for the pacification thereof, and asserts its determination, when that is accomplished, to leave the government and control of the island to its people.

This declaration sets the die for the whole policy of our Government in connection with all the territories wrested from Spain. In principle it applies equally to Cuba and to the Philippine Islands, for it is demanded by the republican genius of our institutions, which forbids wars of conquest and subjugation, but favors the upbuilding of popular governments among men.

Assuming, then, that we are to carry out this declaration in good faith and according to its spirit and meaning, the general situation is this: That for the purpose of pacifying the islands wrested from Spain and aiding their people to determine their own destiny in their own way, and to set up such governments for themselves as they may desire, it is assumed by the bill before us that it is necessary to make provision for the increase of the permanent standing Army of the United States to about 100,000 men.

This appears to me to be eminently unreasonable in a double sense. In the first place, the Filipinos, who are the principal subject of trouble, seem to be clamoring for the very liberty which is guaranteed by the declaration which I have quoted—that is, the liberty to organize a government for themselves. In the second place, the needed work of pacification, in preparation for the establishment of self-governments, must, in the very nature of the case, be quite limited in time, and it seems certain that any additional military force should by all means be alike limited in time. The object being accomplished, the additional force should be disbanded. These considerations appear to demonstrate that the wise thing to do is to provide for any temporary exigency which may really exist, instead of providing for a large and permanent increase of our military establishment, which will uselessly and injuriously continue after the exigency has passed.

When we add to this that the annual cost of our permanent standing Army is about \$23,000,000, and that the provisions of the bill before us, according to the estimates of its friends, would increase this annual cost from nearly three times to about three and a half times the present annual cost, it appears to me that the case made out against the enactment of this measure is overwhelmingly strong, at least in the forum of reason and good public policy. I will only add that in States really free it has ever been a fundamental maxim of policy that the standing military force should be strictly limited to the actual needs of the State; and the crossing of this boundary line by the permanent military element has ever been inimical to the spirit and genius of republics. I believe that this bill proposes a great and dangerous step across this safety line, and that it should by no means be enacted into a law of our Republic. [Loud applause.]

Mr. JETT. Mr. Chairman, I now yield to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. BARTLETT].

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

Mr. JETT. I yield two minutes to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. MADDOX].

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

Mr. JETT. I now yield to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. NORTON].

Mr. NORTON of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I desire to protest against the passage of the Hull bill, not because I am opposed to a standing army in the United States, for I have an admiration and a love for all the institutions of my country, and I would protect them from the defiling hand of any other nation and from destruction by internal foes. I have an admiration for the Regular Army, and I fear that the American people have more admiration for the Regular Army at this time than some of the generals of the Regular Army have for themselves. At this hour, Mr. Chairman, when the eyes of America are turned to the capital, waiting and listening for the result of a court-martial, it does not become gentlemen upon the other side of the House to glorify

and exalt the Regular Army as the only hope and safeguard of the American people.

I love the institution at West Point. I glory in the men that she has sent out from her doors. I love the Academy at Annapolis, and I am as proud of her graduates as any man living. But I love the American people too, and I love the boys upon the farm, and those in the factories and shops, who volunteered; and when I think of the hours they have just passed in misery, in bloodshed, in trial and tribulation, I know the volunteer to be equally as great and equally as grand as the man who has been educated at either of those institutions. [Applause.] A man may die an educated soldier, but his pain is no greater to him than to one who dies because he has come from the farm or the workshop at the call of his country. I look upon the Regular Army in admiration, but I look upon the volunteers with love and amazement, and I wonder that such things can be in any spot on God's green earth, where he comes at his country's call, asking no pay, ready at all times to yield up his life and to stand side by side with those who make war the calling and business of their lives.

Mr. Chairman, there is no good in casting aspersions upon either of these. You need only a standing army of men sufficient to guard your ports, your coast lines, and your outposts, if you will generate an honest, heartfelt patriotism, such as you had at the breaking out of the war with Spain. Our present Regular Army is large enough, but if you conduct your wars in the manner in which that war was conducted, then patriotism will be dead; if you should call to-night for a hundred thousand men, it would require not the opening of the doors for enlistment, but it would require enforced enlistment. You speak of that war as glorious and honorable. Yes, victories were won at Manila, at Santiago, and at San Juan, but Spain won her victory in Paris; and well has one of her commissioners said that "the Philippines will avenge Spain."

The hour has come when that prophecy is upon the floor of this House confronting you as a deliberate fact. You commenced this war not for acquisition. You upon that side of the House say that "the king can do no wrong." If that be true, then his words ought to be words of truth and soberness. In the very opening of this Congress the President advised you that forced aggression and annexation were criminal and disgraceful in the eyes of the world and against the moral policy of our Government and our nation. Yet to-night the very reason that you are discussing this measure is that you may have power to force annexation.

When the Senate shall have ratified the treaty, what have they done? They have belied the words of the President of the United States before the world, and they will have consummated an act that he charged as being "criminal" and against the whole theory and moral principles of our Government. You have taken the Philippines by force, and then, by strategy and bargaining such as was beneath the dignity of diplomacy, you paid twenty millions of the people's money for them, and now demand an army of 100,000 men to force that whole bargain through. I say that it is disgraceful, and I say that section of the treaty which, when ratified, makes necessary the use of arms to forcibly annex the Philippines is not less than what the President declared it to be—criminal. [Applause.]

You have assumed \$100,000,000 in the payment of personal indebtedness. You want to take \$20,000,000 of the people's money to pay for the Philippines. You have gone along with a war more expensive than was ever waged since the world began, and in one hundred and three days you spent more money—and I say it fearlessly upon this floor—you scattered the people's money unreasonably and unnecessarily; and the victory you bring back to us is that we assume Spain's indebtedness, assume the transportation of her soldiers back to her territory, and then raise a standing army to shoot down the Filipinos, because they have that same spirit which we claim for ourselves—the love of human liberty.

You say that Aguinaldo is a thief. If he be a thief, Dewey took him from Hongkong and placed him in the Philippines. You say he is a traitor; if he is a traitor, you placed 80,000 stand of arms belonging to the United States in the hands of a traitor. You loved Aguinaldo when he was necessary. If men with freedom in their hearts and courage in their veins go back into the islands and stand and suffer and die, they are men; but the moment that you accomplished what we started to do—to give freedom to Cuba—no, you did not accomplish that—(while you were pretending your love for the glory of my country, reaching out its hands for the starving Cubans, Dewey struck at the Philippines, and from that hour there was not a reconcentrado ever received a cracker from the United States)—when you no longer needed the aid of the insurgents, then they were rebels and traitors.

It would have been better for my country, more honorable for my flag, if when Dewey had sunk to the bottom of the ocean that Spanish fleet, he had sailed away and moored in front of Morro Castle, where the pledges of the President of the United States to

his people expected him to be—to do what? To establish peace and order and a stable government in Cuba. You have not only bought the Philippines, but you have assumed the Philippine indebtedness. Think of the glory of this war. Yes, the men—veterans and the volunteers, God bless them!—they will live forever in the memory of my country; but when that war had been honorably closed by them and Spain was upon her knees, think of what followed then!

Who came to our doors then? The agents of Spain and the representatives of the owners of the Cuban bonds. What followed then? Then came a peace commission of five Spaniards and five Americans. In common decency I beg that you may forget it, and that the people of my country may not remember the shame of that. Why, think of this peace commission bartering and bargaining! Spain was upon her knees. Why not, like Emperor William, when he had conquered France and placed the German eagle over Paris, lay down your terms—"A thousand millions, Alsace and Lorraine, and you have nothing to say about it"?

Why did not we, having this victory, which we ought to have won, not in the name of humanity, but because of insult to the flag, the murder of our citizens, the destruction of our property, the blowing up of the *Maine*, every principle that ought to actuate a brave nation had been outraged; and yet upon the pitiful plea for humanity, humanity that stirs every human heart that can be reached by humanity. This whole movement, which had been dictated by the patriotism of the American people, inspired the President, whom I believe to be honest, but it has been manipulated upon the political chessboard of the Republican party from start to finish; and what is it to-day that is invoked? It is not patriotism, it is not love of country, but solely for the aggrandizement and indorsement of the Republican party in its doctrine of imperialism. [Loud applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. Chairman, I do not fear the destruction of this great American Republic as an immediate result of the annexation of the Philippine Islands, if such an event shall take place, even though the history of the past shows the extreme likelihood of that being the finale of such a course. Experience is far safer to rely upon than popular clamor, and experience justifies my belief; therefore I am not moved by the hysterical ravings or extravagant claims and denunciations of wild-eyed, demagogic expansionists, who even try to drive aside those who, while agreeing with them, seek to maintain their position by reason and logic. In opposing the adoption of an imperialistic expansion policy by my Government I am not attempting to turn back the hands of the clock of destiny, but, rather, to brush away, as far as in my power, the obstacles to the advance of liberty and freedom placed there by these expansionists.

The lessons of history, all down through the ages, go to establish the fact that it has not been vast accumulation of wealth, not aggregation or centralization of military force and power, that has created and maintained the supremacy of any nation, but that the character of its people has ever been the foundation stone upon which their fate has rested. The true Americanism of those who are not carried away with enthusiasm, or who do not lose their balance by the quick-moving and ever-shifting scenes of war and its attendant excitement and resultant consequences, will be recognized when the people have taken their sober second thought and calmly and dispassionately reviewed existing facts.

Believing as I do in the patriotism, the honest integrity, and sterling character of the people of the United States, I am content to leave my justification in their hands, knowing well that when they come to a full realization of the condition sought to be imposed upon them, there will be no faltering or hesitation on their part, but they will speak in no uncertain tones, and woe be to the man or measure they condemn.

There is great satisfaction in fighting for right principle, even though temporary defeat be certain and sure. It is far better and more glorious to stand for truth and justice and lose, than to temporize with wrong and win, for eventually principle and right must win, as they are based on the eternal truths of God.

Political history, as shown in the birth, rise, and fall of parties as well as of governments, has ever demonstrated the fact, though, that something besides high and lofty ideals, generous, noble, and humanitarian motives, is employed to bring results sought to be accomplished. If in this late war the principle laid down at its beginning, that we were "entering upon a struggle solely in behalf of outraged humanity"—if, I say, this principle could have been conscientiously carried out, we to-day would not have the vexing questions to solve that are now thrust upon us; but the truth is, that idea, that *pronunciamento*, was but a juggle with words, a mask used to hide and conceal the real designs of crafty men, who found in the war an opportunity to enrich themselves at the expense of the Government.

The great heart of the American people was right; it was touched by the terrible suffering of an oppressed people; the balmy breezes that were wafted northward from Cuban shores bore on their wings the moans and groans of dying patriots and

the shrieks of female virtue outraged by Spanish soldiery, while the sky was darkened by the smoke of burning homes and factories laid waste by the devastating torch of Spanish authorities. These all appealed to our liberty-loving people, and voicing their feelings, we, their Representatives, on this side of the Chamber pleaded that the struggling Cubans be given recognition. Had this been done the Spanish yoke would have been broken, the heel of Spanish oppression would have been removed from the neck of Cuban patriots, and Cuba would have been free, without the loss of the *Maine*, and without the necessity of a war that has extended our national debt the life of another generation, as well as carried sorrow and woe to the hearthstones of thousands of American homes, laid thousands of the brave, stalwart sons of our country in martyrs' graves, and shattered forever the health of thousands more by the gross negligence and criminal incompetency of officials in charge. [Applause.]

But that war is over, and it is meet and fitting that a survey of the situation be taken to know what we have gained and what confronts us, especially as we are called upon to legislate to meet the new conditions forced upon us, conditions that for good or for evil are in our immediate present and must be met. In this bill there is proposed to us the adoption of a policy which not only leads us away from the principles upon which our Government was founded, away from the teachings and traditions of our fathers, but is in direct contravention of all the ideas laid down as safe landmarks by all our statesmen down to this last régime, a policy which not alone affects the present with dire and portentous evils that alarm every true minded, conservative, and patriotic lover of his country, but the results of which will reach out, extending into the future, imposing upon our children and our children's children a malignant incubus that will crush every spark of hope from their lives, and consign the American freeman to the bondage of despotism and render him the serf or the subservient tool of an imperial oligarchy, which already seeks to bring under its damning control these United States.

The United States to-day as a nation has no equal. It is the wonder of the age. In all that goes to build up a great nation it stands without a peer. Its foundation stones rest deep on the bed rock of national honor and the intense loyalty of the people. On its highest pinnacles floats the Stars and Stripes, the emblem of human liberty and freedom. Its growth has been phenomenal, and the wildest flights of imagination are but nothing compared with the marvelous achievements our energy, our inventive ingenuity, our wondrous ability, and the development of our boundless resources have already shown, and still there is the promise yet to produce realizations almost beyond the power of the human mind to conceive; but this has been the result of the freedom of our people.

The corner stone of our Republic is the individual as a sovereign. This being the fact, the question must occur upon the addition of any new peoples to our Government, do the individuals among these peoples possess the proper and necessary attributes and qualifications of individual sovereignty? If they do, then they can be annexed with safety, other things being of such nature as to render it politic; but if they do not, then the annexation of such peoples, they becoming sovereigns with us by such annexation, must weaken our whole Government to the extent that they are weak. So well was this understood by the framers of our Constitution that they inserted a clause in that instrument providing for a restriction upon the influx of foreign immigration, to stop the addition of new peoples to our population, and it is a matter of fact that we have been compelled to legislate for the shutting out of dangerous elements from other nations, and have passed the Chinese-exclusion and the alien-labor acts.

In our development as a nation the greatest strides have been taken during the past generation. When the fearful gale and tremendous surge of the storm of civil strife in our land was ended and the rainbow of peace bedecked the political sky, when our united country was freed from the blighting curse of negro slavery, then the genius of liberty found full expression, progress, commercial enterprise, inventive thought, and intellectual activity leaped ahead as never had entered the wildest dream of the most enthusiastic prophet. Our growth was but the logical development of the fact that our nation's grandeur is based upon the high moral character of its people.

Mr. Chairman, we have entered upon a period in our nation's history fraught with grave results, threatening its progress and challenging its perpetuity. It is well, in the light of recent history, to look with critical gaze upon the policy of the Administration and its friends in regard to the course to which it is sought to commit us. The suspicious delay that has attended every move made during the past year has given just cause to every true, patriotic citizen to examine closely into its recommendations. Democratic opposition has not been based on factious partisan feeling or prejudice, but upon the fear, justified by results, that the Republican policy would be a base surrender of the rights of the people to designing syndicates who would force countless schemes for

their own aggrandizement upon the Government, and at the expense of the people.

The proposal of a standing Army of 100,000 men means an expenditure of over \$150,000,000 additional each year, which is but an incident in the scheme they have in hand. This feature alone means that the present war-revenue tax will not be repealed, but that in time of peace the tax will be increased. This is to maintain the power of the military government in the islands abroad, that the valuable rights and franchises of these lands may be bartered away under direction of high officials who arrogate to themselves rights and functions wholly outside those given them by law and whose only check is the limit their insatiate greed can obtain. [Applause.]

Mr. Chairman, there is danger ahead. The watchman on the tower, the lookout at the masthead, he who looks with prophetic vision into the future history of nations, has caught a glimpse of the huge and fearful doom that lies before us. Senator Morrill, crowned with long years of ripe experience and rare wisdom, standing even then on the borderland of the beyond, gave to his countrymen ere he passed over into the summerland of a bright and glorious hereafter, this message of warning, these words of wise admonition:

We can not afford to denounce and forbid all acquisitions of territory in the Western Hemisphere by European governments, even at the peril of war, and forthwith embark in a thus be-damned enterprise ourselves. If our fidelity to the well-ripened statesmanship of the Father of his Country shall be perpetuated for the next hundred years as in the past, the honor, prosperity, and power of our Republic, it may safely be predicted, will light and lead all nations.

And ex-Senator Sherman joins:

I do not hesitate to state that this expansion business will ruin the American people, and that the extravagance of the Administration will ruin the Republican party. Just think of it! The debt of the country has been increased within the last few months \$200,000,000. I had hoped to live to see the entire civil-war debt wiped out. I have no hope of that now.

Then listen to Hon. George S. Boutwell:

The President proposes to take jurisdiction of the Philippines and then consider how they are to be governed. Thus he announces the essential doctrine of an unlimited tyranny. We are to pursue the policy which we condemned in Spain and which has ended in unmitigated disaster.

Clear-headed and wise-reasoning Senator HOAR says:

My opinion is, that if the United States acquire the Philippine Islands, to govern them as a subject or vassal state, the destruction of the American Republic will date from the administration of William McKinley.

Then, too, there is the utterance of President McKinley in a message sent to this body within the last twelve months, and one which is a strange and striking commentary on proceedings now taking place and conditions sought to be fastened upon this country by a band of conspirators:

I speak not of forcing annexation, for that can not be thought of. That by our code of morality would be criminal aggression.

These are but a few of the danger signals raised before us, but they present truths that it were well for this country to heed, even if they do emphasize the utter inconsistency of the Republican party. The good of our country is at stake, and should be considered, whatever may be the result to the coterie directing the affairs of the Administration. Presidents come and go, and are soon forgotten, but the country remains, and all legislation should be for the preservation of its liberties and the perpetuity of its free institutions.

The Republican policy of expansion, that of extending our Government over distant provinces inhabited by an entirely different race, a race of savage and semi-civilized people, means a government by force of an unwilling people, "criminal aggression" in reality, and the necessary enlargement of our standing Army. The first call is for 100,000 men; but when these are scattered in the various parts of the globe there will come the call for more, and again the Army must needs be strengthened and increased. How will we secure the men to fill the demand? In the light of the disclosures and revelations made of the conduct of this last war, the treatment of the private soldiers, the subordination of their welfare and comfort to the greed and profit of heartless contractors and inefficient officials at the head of important departments, given their authority by this Administration on the principle of toadyism and favoritism—in the face of all this, there would be but a tardy response to a call for volunteers, and a system of conscription would be forced upon our country to raise the required levy.

Where will they be needed? Surely not in Porto Rico. A few hundred troops will be amply sufficient for that vassal isle of ours. Not in Cuba, for those who are best posted in the internal affairs of Cuba inform us that 10,000 of our troops are more than enough to insure the speedy formation of a "stable government" in Cuba. Shall they be sent to the Philippines? If they go there to forcibly annex that island territory, it is true they must go in force and remain there for years, subject to all the deteriorating influences of the worst phases of the hell of war. The history of English troops in these tropical stations, among half-civilized races, has been one

of the most awful and terrible degradation of their moral, physical, and social conditions. To send the gallant troops of America to those climes would be to send them to the fountain head of physical corruption and vice, which would communicate its evil results to the third and fourth generations. But this is not the true reason. These additional men are not needed abroad. Before the war with Spain our Regular Army consisted of some 28,000 men, and was amply sufficient to protect every interest in all our vast domain; and surely twice that many men are not honestly needed to assist the people in territory no greater than Texas to form a "stable" government.

There is an ulterior motive in the minds of those who are planning all this, and urging upon the Administration expansion as an argument for a large standing Army. The liberties of the people are endangered; the foundations of our Government are being assailed; deep mines are laid to encompass the downfall of the Republic. The annexation of the island of Sardinia to the Republic of Rome was the first act in the downfall and destruction of the Republic, and marked the beginning of the Empire. The annexation of the Philippines gives the conspirators the opportunity to ask for a large standing Army, to be used as the nucleus of a military despotism. As an entering wedge, the Executive now has and seeks to prolong a military government in all our vassal and occupied territory abroad, while the Secretary of War takes upon himself the parceling out of rights, grants, privileges, and franchises with all the independence of a military dictator.

Soon we will have a horde of hired professional soldiers, perhaps recruited from the savage tribes among the Filipinos, wholly out of sympathy with the American people and American interests, at the behest of the bosses; there will be the gradual restriction and the final abolition of the elective franchise by the employment of Federal bayonets at the polls; the complete subjugation of labor, the suppression of unions or labor organizations, the complete disregard of constitutional rights, and a government without the consent of the governed. All this is in their plan; and then follows the full military dictatorship, the Republic perishes, the empire is enthroned, while the syndicates rejoice and profit by the possession of gain their ill-begotten schemes have brought to them. [Applause.]

For expansion, on their terms, they bring into play glittering generalities, catch phrases, and fine words, but utterly ignore plain practical argument.

They propose to annex and bring into our domain and as part of our dominion over 8,000,000 Malays and Negritos, races wholly alien and incapable of assimilation with our race and form of government. Throughout all the years of our history we have proclaimed our right to the title of being the land of the free, the refuge of the downtrodden, the asylum for the oppressed of every clime, and to our shores have come English, Irish, French, German, Jew and Gentile, Greek and barbarian, from nearly every land, but when have we ever had any immigration from the Philippines? When have any of the lusty sons of Luzon or Mindanao displayed their Adamite forms on America's soil, except perchance as they may have disported on the gay Midway during the World's Fair?

What folly to think of Americanizing these cannibalistic sea islanders. And unless they were brought into full understanding and comprehension of our institutions and an appreciation of the beneficent results attendant upon their preservation, it would be suicidal policy on our part to bring them in. Why are these Republican schemers so anxious now for annexation? Let me recall how, in days past, Canada, Mexico, Yucatan, Cuba, Hayti, and San Domingo knocked at our door for admission into our Union or annexation as provinces, and the Republican party said them "nay." Let me remind you how for years you have faced the immigration question, and insisted that there shall not come to our shores from civilized Caucasian Europe any who can not read a few lines of our Constitution, and now propose to open wide your arms and admit with loving embrace and make citizens of the wild and naked savages of the Orient.

This nation, with all its glory and grand achievements, has not yet learned how to deal with the race question within the confines of our present territory. Our conduct toward the American Indian shows this. The hundred years of our treatment of them has fittingly been characterized as a "century of dishonor," and our "humanitarian" policy has reduced their number from a score of millions to less than a quarter of a million, while in Alaska, another place where our humanitarian process has been in operation but comparatively a few years, but a feeble remnant of a once flourishing native population remains. Then take the negro race. We have not learned the alpha of our duties toward them, or the beginning of the solution of the problem their presence among us creates. Faulty and blamable as the Democratic party may be in this respect, its record gleams in snow-white purity when contrasted with the hypocrisy, the systematic betrayal of trust and base ingratitude of the Republican party toward that race.

If, then, this nation has so completely failed in its duty to its

wards and fellow-citizens at home, what can we expect it to accomplish in the uplifting of thrice their number who are possessed of not one-third their natural endowment and civilization?

The expansionists speak of destiny, and a Providence that opens the way to the salvation of the heathen in the "isles of the sea," forgetting or ignoring the grander opportunity for their missionary zeal afforded by the "heathen nearer home." They hurl their taunts at patriotic citizens who do not see the leading of "manifest destiny" in crooked schemes, or believe that Divine Providence has revealed His plans to a band of corrupt political conspirators. They ask if we wish our country to remain a "hermit" and an "isolated" nation, and then declare "we are coming to our own; we are stretching out our hands for what nature meant should be ours; we are taking our proper rank among the nations of the earth."

What senseless bombast; how false and utterly misleading! If we should become a hermit or isolated nation, it would simply be for the reason that we stand so much the higher, on so much superior a plane than any other nation that there would be none that could rank in the same class with us. [Applause.] The United States a hermit nation! From the uttermost parts of the earth there comes to our domain people to do us homage and pay us tribute. Science, art, manufacture, commercial enterprise, all have from our land dominated conditions everywhere. Our political influence is recognized wherever there is a government on the face of the globe.

"Coming to our own, and taking what nature meant should be ours." When were the Philippines ever our own? By what manner of descent do we come into them as a heritage? By what right do we acquire title? Not by conquest, for we have neither conquered them nor have we the right to do so, for it was most solemnly proclaimed that this was not a war of conquest, but of humanity, so that, in keeping with the pronouncements of this Administration and its friends, we can not take them by conquest, and even as a matter of fact, we have not captured or conquered them. Dewey with his fleet remains at Manila, tied up by cable instructions from vacillating Washington, and the control by American power extends no farther than the guns of Dewey's fleet will carry. Spain can not give us a clear title, for her own title rested on no good tenure. It is only by the most exaggerated development of the Darwinian theory that there could be found a conception to serve as the foundation for this crazy freak of a notion, and our only claim to a title comes to us through our relationship by the remote but common origin of species. If nature intended the Philippines to be ours, why were they planted 7,500 miles away, instead of at our shores? Out upon such foolish assumptions. [Applause.]

We are told by these leaders, these syndicate bankers, that American commerce needs new markets, and only expansion of territory in the direction of Malaydom can open new markets for us. In what way can American control of these islands create trade for us? The people there are not people who would buy anything of us. Compare them with civilized folk. Canada, last year, with 5,000,000 population, bought over \$85,000,000 of our goods, while the whole oceanic archipelago, including the Philippines, with over 20,000,000 inhabitants, bought of us \$162,446 of our products and manufactures. If we want to extend our trade and open new markets by the annexation process let us proceed on a common-sense basis and annex first Canada, and then take in everything from "Greenland's icy mountains" to Patagonia's rocky shores.

We can not ship the products of our farms to Manila, even using that as a base of supplies for China and Japan, for the freight charges are so high that it would be impossible for the American farmer to compete successfully with the farmer of Australia or India. Last year the records show we purchased from the Philippines \$4,982,857. Now, contrast this with the increased cost of maintaining a large standing Army, the swelling of the pension roll, all the added expense of the Navy, and the civil administration list, and tell me, Where is the gain? Against the imperial Republican doctrine of expansion, the head of the largest iron manufacturing concern in the world and the largest exporter of goods in the United States says: "I know that the acquiring of the Philippines would be detrimental to commercial expansion." We have no need, however, of enlarging our borders. Mr. Carnegie says:

Without distant possessions the Republic, solid, compact, safe from the zone of war disturbance, has captured the world's markets for many products and only needs a continuance of peaceful conditions to have the industrial world at its feet.

It is admitted by the advocates of expansion that peaceful conditions will not prevail, but that we would more than likely become involved in war. Already there is talk of the "next great war." It is urged that we must mix in the turbulent conditions of the East in order that we may take our proper rank among the nations of the earth; that we must let the people of this country feel the advancing waves and be swept into the eddying currents of direst want and woe, in which the Old World has been

tossed and whirled for ages. I for one do not want such to be the doom of my countrymen. I am opposed to entanglement or alliance with any other nation, and no one denies that we would be compelled to form alliances with some of the powers of the East if we enter upon this imperialistic plan of colonial expansion, and compelled to share in international complications.

A few years ago, when the Democratic party was laboring for tariff reform and seeking to provide a system of revenue that would have permitted a degree of prosperity to have become a reality in our country, the Republicans shouted that we were copying English free trade, and England was held up as a bugaboo to frighten voters away from the Democratic party. But for years the hand that has pulled the strings and moved Republican puppets has been an English hand, and to-day it is because the English head of the syndicate prompts the move that the Republican is favoring expansion.

We as a nation do not want any alliance with, nor do the people wish to be used as a catspaw of, England. The diplomacy of England has always been against American interests and against the true welfare of this country.

Scarce a generation ago, during our civil war, to go no further back, England, as in all her history, was against the Union and did all in her power without open declaration, to effect our ruin. In her shipyards were fitted out cruisers to prey upon and destroy our commerce; blockade runners carried arms, ammunition, and supplies to the South, and while in this way assisting it, at the same time robbed it of the stores of cotton raised on its soil. No alliance with a nation whose entire history has been in entire keeping and perfect accord with her conduct toward us while we were still British colonies! To-day the dealings of England with Ireland are sufficient to justify our intervention on humanitarian grounds. No; let us have no alliance with any nation. Let us hold fast to the admonition of Washington and not "quit our own to stand on foreign ground." England is anxious that we annex the Philippines so that she may hold over us the threat that if we do not yield to her commercial demands, she will take these islands away from us or compel us to fight.

Beware of the hungry lion
Whenever he speaks you well;
His words are fair, at the mouth of his lair,
And as smooth as the road to hell,
But his deeds are dark and dastard,
And his thoughts are of his maw;
And his chops dip red with the blood he's shed,
And greed is his only law.

The Democratic party has ever advocated the doctrine of "no entangling alliances with foreign powers," it has always been the party of high and noble principle, and is to-day the party standing for the interests of the people, and I am standing on Democratic principles when I declare that imperialistic expansion is repugnant and abhorrent to true Americanism.

We need no colonies. There are countless acres in every State of the Union undeveloped. Within an hour's ride of this Capitol there is room for a thousand more farmers to bring under subjection idle and unimproved ground, and between the two oceans lies an enormous territory, whose natural resources are unequalled, and capable of supporting the entire population of the civilized world.

According to the census of 1850 there were then 180,538,000 acres of unimproved land embraced within farms in the United States. In 1890 there were 265,601,864. This does not include wild land. At the rate that land has been cultivated for the past forty years, it would take two hundred years for the land fenced in as farms in the United States to be cultivated as closely as the land in Porto Rico is now.

Taking a dozen countries, we have a population to the square mile as follows:

Saxony	605
Belgium	551
Great Britain	315
Italy	278
Prussia	223
Porto Rico	212
Austria	206
France	188
Spain	88
Philippines	66
Cuba	32
United States	21

This shows that the Philippines already support a population three times as dense as that of the United States, and that we have no surplus population that we need an outlet for, and we have abundant room without annexing foreign acres to cultivate. Let us develop our own land, open the mines, till the farms, start the mills and shops closed by the blighting policy of the Republican party, which is now preaching imperial expansion. If we do this, we will have in addition to the foreign market, the foreign trade we can scarcely satisfy now, an increased and enlarged home market, and we shall find in this fair land of ours the best and grandest spot on earth for the employment of our capital and labor.

The leaders among the laboring people in their conventions and deliberative assemblies have ranged themselves against expansion as being opposed to their interests. These are the men who represent the American laborer, possessing the intelligence and recognizing the wants of a high civilization, and ready at all times to join hands with that commercial enterprise which would lead us to and maintain us in the business supremacy of the globe.

The Central Labor Union of New York thus puts itself on record:

Resolved, That we are opposed by every means within the Constitution to the policy of imperialism and expansion beyond the limits of this continent and the islands that are within its natural and legitimate sphere of influence, and every other form of expansion everywhere not in strict accord with the Declaration of Independence. * * *

Resolved, That we indorse the preservation of the wise and time-attested policy of George Washington of avoiding all entangling alliances with European powers, and especially all alliances or undertakings looking to joint action with England, that might involve the United States in territorial, commercial, or other disputes between powers of the Old World.

The laboring people of my own district are opposed to expansion. My mail is full of protests, individually and in collective bodies. Union No. 79, the Cigar Makers' Union of America, at Sandusky, Ohio, adopted these resolutions:

We do most emphatically protest against the annexation of the Philippines. We are opposed to any foreign expansion policy, believing in self-government and against any acquisition of new territory.

The interests of every American industry are in direct antagonism to the annexation of the Philippines. There is no sentiment in trade; people buy and sell where they can do the best. Trade does not follow the flag. The shrieking of silly, addle-pated individuals about commerce and the flag going hand in hand betrays the ignoramus who knows nothing of the methods of commerce. The trade of nations is the same as the trade of individuals, and goes where it can obtain the greatest advantage and profit. Wild talk about the flag does not indicate any special degree of patriotism, and the declarations made that the flag will never be hauled down where it has once been raised excite the smile of pity from those conversant with the history of our country and its flag. On the opening day of this year of our Lord the Stars and Stripes were raised at Havana, and for several months our flag has floated over Santiago, and yet by the solemn pledge of this Government it must be hauled down when Cuba has a "stable" government, and there are a score of instances in our history where Old Glory has been raised and hauled down again.

It swings to the breeze at Manila at the masthead of Dewey's ship and over the barracks of our troops, but there will be no stain, no dishonor to it if it should leave those waters, flying over the heads of our soldiers and marines as they come back to their native shores. I do not want the flag to stay there. I prefer to have the American flag—the flag of my country, the flag for which I fought, the flag which stands the emblem of hope and freedom, the banner of a united people—I prefer rather to see that flag float over my native land, where its pure folds may be kissed by the soft breezes of liberty, rather than have it stained by raising it as the insignia of the slave driver's power over savage slaves! [Applause.]

The test of civilization is the substitution of law for war, courts for brute strength, right for might; and what a travesty on civilization, on all law, justice, and right is the assumption of our sovereignty over 10,000,000 people whose consent we have not secured, or even asked, when our own Government is founded on the principle that "all government should derive its just power from the consent of the governed." It is time that the Declaration of Independence should be reread and studied by some of our people. It is true that the Republican party in its latter-day policy and practice pays not the slightest attention to the interest of the people. It has wandered away from the ideas and principles upon which it was founded, and directs all legislation along the lines of subserviency to the dictates of organized avarice and greed. For years it has sought to bring about the centralization of power in the hands of the Federal Government. In 1868 there was started in the city of New York a paper called *The Imperialist*, through which advocates of this scheme for the destruction and overthrow of democratic institutions might give expression to their views and rally those in sympathy with them.

For a while it worked independently, but at last suspended, giving as its reason that "owing to the love of the people for the Constitution, the Imperialists could accomplish their designs better through the Republican party," and the Republicans have continually shown that such is the object at which they are aiming.

They have sought to maintain a Federal force around the ballot box and thus prevent the free expression of the will of the people at the polls; they tampered with the courts and prostituted justice to base ends and the subversion of the rights of American labor; they have placed the burden of taxation upon the shoulders of the poor and the working classes, absolving the corporations and the wealth of the nation from bearing their just share; they robbed the people of their money and doubled the load of indebtedness under which the nation already groaned.

The per capita expense of government depends upon the density of population, and is greater in sparsely settled countries than in those that are thickly settled. When the United States was sparsely settled, the expenditures for Federal purposes varied from \$1.35 per capita to \$2.20, which was the highest point reached prior to 1860. As our country increased in population the expenditures, instead of decreasing, increased, until now, with the most economical administration of affairs, it requires \$5 per capita, while the average is above that sum. The per capita expenses of the United States are already in excess of those of any other nation. The German Empire, including the municipal expenses, has a per capita of \$5.90; the British Empire, including colonial expenses, \$2.97; Russia, \$2.75; Mexico, \$3.85; Japan, \$1.60; Austria has \$1.51; Portugal, \$1.08; China has only 19 cents, while the United States has a Federal expense of \$5, and including State expenditures mounts up to \$14.10 per capita.

By the extravagance and abuses that have crept into the administration of public affairs under Republican management the people of the United States are taxed from three to four times more heavily than the people of any other government. The masters of the Republican party dictated the nomination of their candidate for President, and by the expenditure of a vast corruption fund, reaching into millions, by bribery, coercion, and fraud, they elected him. They saw in this war an opportunity to further enrich themselves, and they kept back the declaration, retarded its conclusion until their plans were perfected, and now, under cover of the war necessities and results, seek to fasten upon this country a standing army of from 100,000 men to no one knows how many more, and their tools and organs all over the land cry out against anyone who dares to call a halt or suggest a doubt as to the expediency or wisdom of the measure, and denounce them as traitors and maniacs. [Applause.]

All through the campaign of 1898 Republican speakers and the parrot Republican press boiled over with the maudlin stock phrases, "Stand by the President," "Hold up the hands of the Administration," and the same cries are now ringing through the land. We are willing and ready at all times to stand by the President whenever he will declare a policy, if it is right and is on the side of the patriot and freeman. We are willing to help hold up the hands of the Administration, but we want him to turn the open palm of his hand in friendship toward the American people, not with clenched fist to strike down their interests. Let him be open and frank toward the people; let him declare his policy in regard to the Philippines; and if in harmony with principles of right and justice, we will stand by him and hold up his hands as long as his most ardent supporter in the land.

We do not, however, propose to sacrifice our independence as Representatives, members of a coordinate branch of the Government, or crawl in obsequious or abject slavery at the behest and dictation of the masters of this Administration. We have the right on this question to ask, Can we afford it? The annexation of the Philippines, the establishment of a colonial system with our Republic, is used as an argument for the need of a large standing army. It would increase our per capita tax. With our already large pension list, it would cost for our military establishment over \$295,000,000 per annum, even without taking into consideration the Navy expenses.

In addition to this we would be forced to the assumption of over \$8,000,000 of Spanish bonds issued for the improvement of Manila Harbor. In 1892 the Spanish debt was funded, and to guarantee the payment of that debt the resources of all her colonies were pledged, and the proportion of the Philippines was over \$8,000,000. We have declared our position on this question. When Mr. Adams was Secretary of State, August 10, 1818, he instructed Mr. Everett:

No principle of international law can be more clearly established than this, that the rights and obligations of a nation in regard to other states are independent of its internal revolutions of government. It extends even to the case of conquest. The conquerors who reduce a nation to their subjection receive it subject to all its engagements and duties toward others, the fulfillment of which then becomes their own duty.

Article VII of the Paris treaty provides: "The United States will adjudicate and settle the claims of its citizens against Spain relinquished in this article." Under this clause for damages to personal property alone the United States has assumed a liability of \$100,000,000. If Spain could be whipped about three times on the same terms, she would be free from debt and could resume her former grandeur. About three more such victories would make our public debt greater than it has ever been in the history of our nation. Spain receives directly \$120,000,000 and probably \$430,000,000 more on the bonds, and virtually but two battles were fought.

Now, we have to bear a tariff law, a "protective" tariff, which is producing even in these days of boasted "prosperity" an increasing deficit each month—a tariff which its friends make no pretensions of its bringing in sufficient revenues upon a peace basis and without a colony. What will be the result with increased expenditures and decreasing importations, and decreased

receipts at the custom-house? It will force our Republican friends to the adoption of the "unconstitutional" income tax. We have also the policy or suggestion from this Republican Administration of an "open door," that all nations shall be entitled to an equal chance to the trade of these islands, while our Constitution provides that there shall be uniformity in excises, imposts, and duties everywhere within the domain of the United States.

We also have to consider the objection of the Filipinos to our sovereignty. A peculiar situation is before us. The insurgents of Luzon have an organized government; its armies have been in actual warfare against Spain; thousands of prisoners have been taken and are now held; cities have been besieged and Spanish troops compelled to surrender. Now, in direct violation of the Constitution, with unwarranted usurpation of power and authority, the President steps within the exclusive province of Congress and directs our Army and Navy to make war upon this Philippine government, a government de facto, no matter how crude or incomplete. This, though, is in perfect keeping with the tenets of the Republican party ever since the present leaders thereof obtained recognition in its counsels through the death of patriotic statesmen who once were at its head. The Philippines, the Hawaiians, and the Cubans are to be trampled under foot by the administration of HANNA, Alger, and others, carrying out the dictates of the Republican lords; the Spanish-Cuban bondholders are to be placed in charge, and the Spanish yoke exchanged for Republican chains, under guise of military law and beneath the American flag. [Applause.] The Army of the United States will be used to enforce the carrying out of these schemes, and the stalwart sons of America will be drafted to do police duty and act as tax collectors in the fever-infected climes, and the expense will be gathered from the sweat and toil of American labor.

The anti-American, unpatriotic syndicates controlling the Republican party govern and direct the actions of its members, as was shown when, by an indelicate exposure of the operation of his mind, one of their oracles exclaimed, "You may stand by the law if you will, but I prefer to stand by the friends who stood by me;" and so whatever this gigantic combination of syndicates that stood by them by contributing their millions to the success of the Republican party and the election of its candidate as President—whatever this octopus directs the Republican partisans are ready to stand by and uphold.

They seek, however, by glib, high-sounding phrases to deceive the people. "Military government," "commercial expansion," "manifest destiny," "lifting Old Glory a little higher," "the ways of Providence"—these are expressions they roll like a sweet morsel under their tongues to conceal their schemes, but—

In vain they call old notions fudge,
And give to sin some other name;
The Ten Commandments will not budge,
And stealing is stealing just the same.

And that is exactly what the Republican policy means, the wholesale plundering of the colonies abroad and the robbing of the Republic at home. It was officially announced some years ago by one high in Republican councils that "the Ten Commandments have no place in politics," and in perfect accord with that statement has been the Republican course, until it has laid its hands on as many rights of the people as it could grasp, has ignored the Constitution, and enthroned treason. [Applause.]

Let me repeat a few sentences that perchance have been lost sight of by some of the rabid friends of the Administration. Let me cull a few choice extracts from what was hailed by the same expansionists as the wisest and most patriotic document ever emanating from the executive department.

In his message to Congress April 11, 1898, President McKinley asked for the use of the Army and Navy "to secure full and final termination of hostilities between the Government of Spain and the people of Cuba," for "it is especially our duty, for it is right at our doors," and the maintenance of neutral relations "entails on this Government an enormous expense;" therefore, "in the name of humanity, in the name of civilization, in behalf of endangered American interests, which give us the right to speak and to act, the war in Cuba must stop." These are the central thoughts, the keynote of that message. Search it through and through, and you will find only Cuba mentioned. Very few, indeed, are there in all this land who believe that President McKinley ever desired to see Cuba free. Forced to action by the spontaneous demand of a great and patriotic people, he sent his message, but all through the history of those days, and between the lines of that message, was revealed his desire for Spanish autonomy in Cuba; but it was all Cuba, and all in the interest of humanity. Never a word of the isles across the sea or of conquest.

Now, how reads the declaration of war? "That the Government of Spain at once relinquish its authority and government in the island of Cuba, and withdraw its land and naval forces from Cuba and Cuban waters." And in the final summing up of the

resolutions, which were to lay before the nations of the earth the solemn purposes of this Government, we declared: "That the United States hereby disclaims any disposition or intention to exercise sovereignty, jurisdiction, or control over said island, except for the pacification thereof, and asserts its determination, when that is accomplished, to leave the government and control of the island to its people."

That was the official act and declaration of this the highest legislative body of the nation, and it stands unaltered and unchanged in any of its wording to-day.

It would seem that our Republican friends have either very short memory or seek to read new meaning into the English language. This was a great humanitarian conflict with the object to expel the Spaniards from Cuba, and yet, before a single soldier was started for Cuba from our shores, an army, fully equipped, was sent by President McKinley on a mission of conquest 10,000 miles away to the Philippines. Again, even after the peace protocol was signed, under the orders of the Chief Executive, the Commander in Chief of our Army and Navy, another army was sent to Manila. What for? Not to fight Spain, not to free Cuba, not "in the name of humanity, in the name of civilization, in behalf of endangered American interests;" no, but to drive from dominion native insurgents who, under General Aguinaldo, were fighting Spain for their liberty and the permanence of their established government.

Never was there a more monumental betrayal of national trust, placing the United States before the world as a conscienceless liar and grasping thief. He had no more right to send an army against the Filipinos than he had to send troops to Ireland. The declaration of war gave us no right to interfere with these insurgents. How about the peace protocol? Listen to the only provision of that document relating to the Orient. It is Article III:

The United States will occupy and retain the city and bay of San Juan de Porto Rico, and the port of Manila, pending a treaty of peace, which shall determine the control and form of government of the Philippines.

Let me say right here that all the talk of this having been a war for humanity is the veriest sham and hypocrisy. It was a war for revenge and castigation. We whipped Spain, and it was our right then as victors to dictate terms and demand reparation and a war indemnity. [Applause.]

But the scheming band of conspirators, the holders of Spanish bonds, who stand so near the seat of power in this Government, they who are the Warwicks, the "power behind the throne," dictated and controlled the affairs of state from the inauguration of this Administration down through all the hell of war, through the sittings of the Peace Commission at Paris and down to the present time, so manipulated that only their own interests were conserved. Under direction and in obedience to their orders, it was declared to be a war for humanity, and we were estopped from demanding indemnity; but where, in all the records, in message, resolutions, or protocol, is there a word or syllable relative to or permitting the United States to pay an indemnity?

Why should we pay out \$20,000,000 for the Philippines, and especially why pay it to Spain? If the islands were the property of Spain to dispose of, we came into possession of them by virtue of conquest. But Spain had no power to dispose of them, and the high-priced Peace Commission of Paris had not one iota, not the least scintilla of a shadow of right, power, or authority to bind this Government to the payment of a single penny or peseta for any territory, Cuba, Porto Rico, or the Philippines. That commission of five Americans and five Spaniards was the outcome of a provision in that protocol which was inspired by the holders of the \$400,000,000 Spanish Cuban bonds, and future generations will hold the American members of that commission in just execration as the betrayers of their country. [Applause.]

These imperial expansionists now arise and with uplifted hands and streaming eyes ask, "What can we do?"—meaning, What can we do to recoup ourselves for this \$20,000,000 paid out? and also, How can we get rid of the Philippines if we do not keep them? In the first place, we have not as yet paid out our \$20,000,000, and there is no reason or obligation, moral or legal, why we should, and we will do so, if we do at all, only because the godless greed of hybrid bondholders, without nationality, honor, or patriotism, heart, or soul, dictates the policy of the Republican party. How shall we get rid of them? As yet we do not actually have them, and will not unless imperial ukase and edict goes forth that the price must be paid and the foul bargain consummated.

It would harmonize with the commercialized politics of the day, as represented by Republican leaders, to put them on the bargain counter or auction table and sell them to competing nations, or perchance compel the Philippine Islanders to purchase the liberty they have already won. But the best thing to do is to say to Aguinaldo and other representative leaders, "We are going to get out of here; go ahead and establish your government; take your liberty and make the best of it; we will not force upon you any 'military government' extending over ten or fifteen years, or until the favored syndicates can obtain full control of all valuable fran-

chises and privileges in your islands; we intend to be consistent, honest, and patriotic; we will do as President McKinley promised he would do by Cuba, 'leave the control of the islands to the people therein.'"

What higher glory could there be than in taking this manly, straightforward, and Christian course? Let them alone, keep our money, and save what little of honor there is left to us out of the whole infamous deal at Paris. There is no occasion for hysterics about turning them over to Spain. No one proposes such a course. We could not if we would. Spain could not hold control of them forty-eight hours if our Army and Navy were removed. Let them go and take care of themselves. To keep them would "entail on this Government an enormous expense," and "it is (not) especially our duty, for they are (not) right at our door." Let them alone. It is not incumbent upon us to look after them. Duty to no high principle demands our interference. There never comes to any nation the obligation to perform any duty the performance of which is impossible of realization.

If it is our duty to take these islands and impose upon ourselves and our posterity an enormous, grievous burden for the sake of their redemption and civilization, then it is just as strongly our duty to open up business as the scavengers of the world, and interfere with the domestic relations of the Hottentots, the Kaffirs, the Hindoos, the unspeakable Turk, and everywhere on the globe wherever a human heart may be that is bowed down with oppression, woe, misery, ignorance, or barbarism.

No! We have not these islands now, and to say that we must take them as the only resort left is simply begging the question. We are not in the slightest degree responsible for the condition of the Filipinos, morally, legally, or otherwise. They were struggling for liberty long before Dewey entered Manila's harbor and vanquished the Spanish squadron there, and now, thanks, indeed, to Dewey's guns, they have their freedom from Spain.

If we remain there, we stay for their reenslavement. Let them alone; give them a chance, an opportunity to build up a stable government of their own. Doing this, we will secure their friendship and gratitude; and if we desire their trade we will secure more of it than would come to us under the proposed "open-door" policy of this Administration, and if we want a coaling station, they will gladly give it to us. But perchance this plan would not afford the syndicates opportunity to reach in and filch from the Treasury to their heart's content. "Ah, there's the rub!" [Applause.]

It is not Providence, it is not the condition of the Philippine Islanders, it is not our country's needs that demand the creation of a large standing army. It is the domination of the imperialists in the Republican party, who seek their own aggrandizement at the cost of the destruction of the Republic.

As at the outset I said, I do not believe that the simple annexation of the Philippines would be our ruin, but the success of the conspiracy of which that is one of the moves would bring about its downfall. The conscience of the people is sought to be debauched, the character of the nation undermined, the defenses of virtue and justice weakened, an imperial oligarchy created and maintained by force, and freedom doomed. God grant that the sight of the people may be loosed, their eyes opened to the great danger that lies before them; that truth and reason, justice and right speedily prevail, and our beloved country go forward on its triumphant course, maintaining in her proud supremacy "that this nation, under God, shall have a new birth of freedom, and that government of the people, by the people, and for the people shall not perish from the earth." [Applause.]

Mr. JETT. I now yield to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. ROBB].

Mr. ROBB. Mr. Chairman, I am opposed to the whole plan and purpose for the reorganization and increase of the Army.

I am opposed to it, first, because it is the development of a new system, unnecessary in my opinion, which will largely increase the expenses of our Government and the taxes of those who can least afford to bear its increased burden.

Any new departure involving an increased expenditure of public money should be supported by the soundest reason and justified by unavoidable public necessity. Any additional burdens imposed upon the people, whether in the form of taxation or otherwise, should emanate from the highest conceptions and considerations of public interest and public good. Especially should this be so when the proposition carries with it the expenditure of hundreds of millions of dollars annually, a direct charge upon the resources of our country, and which in time will be augmented rather than diminished.

If there were no other objections to the measure than the enormous cost which it will entail; if there were no other objections to a large standing army than the one of expense, this, in my judgment, is sufficient at this time to warrant the rejection of this bill. The national necessities and national duties are not commensurable with the increased burdens which it will impose. The new responsibilities which we should assume as a result of the

war can be met and the public safety guaranteed without thus menacing the liberties of our own people.

I am willing to admit that if we are, as an outgrowth of the war, to enter upon and become committed to a policy of imperialism; if we are to assume responsibilities foreign to the declared purposes of that war as well as to the fundamental principles of our Government; if we are to establish the colonial system and maintain it, the occasions will not be infrequent when we will need the services of a hundred thousand men in arms and of possibly more. But I have indulged the hope that public opinion, the builder and wrecker of political fortunes, may become so aroused and the voice of popular disapproval so pronounced as to turn from their mad purpose those who would launch us upon a course the end of which and good of which no man can foretell and the most far-seeing can not foresee.

If the original and fundamental principles of the Government are adhered to and the counsels and high purposes of its founders observed, we are absolutely secure; in fact, more secure without than with an increase in the Regular Army. If this bill becomes a law, it is estimated in the report of the minority of the Committee on Military Affairs that it will cost the people annually \$150,000,000. If it costs this much, and I have no doubt but what it will, our annual expenditure on account of the Army will almost equal the cost of our war with Spain. Should we do this? Should we inaugurate a system which will in the end, as one of the abuses growing out of the war, magnify its cost and make it more burdensome to the people in time of peace than in time of war when exposed to actual public danger?

Why not allow it to be proclaimed to the country, that the people may again rejoice over our remarkable achievements in this war, that it is not to be followed by a long train of unnecessary abuses, reckless expenditures, and increasing taxation? If that war demonstrated anything, it was that we need no large standing army. We need not shape our policy after that of European powers and burden our people with this increased expenditure. It had been more than thirty years since our civil conflict, and we had been at peace with every foreign power for over half a century, when suddenly summoned to conflict with a foreign foe, on foreign land and in foreign waters. Yet our victory was as overwhelming as was the response of our people to the call to arms—complete and instantaneous—and the prowess of our seamen and citizen soldiery unquestioned.

When we stop to consider the magnitude of the established objects of expenditure and the new ones proposed by the present Congress, and what it means to the taxpayers of our country, it is little short of alarming.

Let us see. The Senate has recently passed a bill, which will in all probability pass this House at the present session, for the construction of the Nicaragua Canal, which carries with it \$125,000,000.

If this bill increasing the Regular Army becomes a law it will cost \$150,000,000 annually. Our expenses for pensions will reach \$145,000,000 annually. If to these we add the other expenses of our Government, including the interest on our national debt, and to this we add \$20,000,000 more which we are asked to pay to Spain for unloading upon us a group of islands populated by several hundred thousands of savages and several millions of semi-civilized people; indeed, if even then we have reached the high-water mark of national expenditures, which is problematical and exceedingly doubtful, the aggregate is so enormous and so disproportionate to the means and ability of those upon whom is laid most heavily the hand of taxation as to lead to the inquiry whether it is the part of wisdom to subdue our own people by governmental exactions in order to respond to a sentiment which some gentlemen have been pleased to call "expansion," but which President McKinley but a short time ago denominated "criminal aggression," what will it profit us if we gain the Philippines and lose the proud spirit of American freemen?

Mr. Chairman, if the price of the annexation of the Philippines is the establishment and maintenance of a large permanent standing army, and the increased burdens which the people will have to bear—that is, those of the people who can not hide themselves from the taxgatherer behind a Supreme Court decision—we had better forego the ambition to adopt this child of the Orient, vote down this bill, muster out our volunteers as soon as practicable, resume our peaceful pursuits under civil authority, and in the future, as in the past, encourage by our example other countries and other nations to adopt a republican form of government.

This is not the first time that attempts have been made to increase the Army since the close of the civil war. At different times numerous and varied pretexts and excuses have been offered in support of propositions and measures looking to this end. For coast defenses, and the protection of our frontier from the Indians have been urged; and in the discussion some of its advocates have been frank and bold enough to admit that it was for the purpose of controlling local disturbances in our own country. The pending measure can not be justified for any such purpose. Our present Army, with the militia, is all that is necessary.

There is an old statute (section 1625, Revised Statutes of the United States, 1878) which reads as follows:

Every able-bodied male citizen of the respective States resident therein, who is of the age of 18 years and under the age of 45 years, shall be enrolled in the militia.

Other sections provided how they should be armed and equipped, etc. While this statute has fallen into disuse, it has been continued in our revision and serves to indicate the idea of the earlier lawmakers with respect to that part of our military force. They had faith in the militia, trusted in the ability and bravery and patriotism of our citizen soldiery as contradistinguished from those of the Regular Army, looked to them as our best reliance then, as they and our volunteers are now, and will be in the future, if they be not discredited and that spirit which moves men to action be not destroyed.

Among the express powers conferred upon Congress by our Constitution is the power "to provide for calling forth the militia to execute the laws of the Union, suppress insurrections, and repel invasions."

And Washington in his sixth annual address, in recognition of the wisdom of this power, said:

The devising and establishing of a well-regulated militia would be a genuine source of legislative honor and a perfect title to public gratitude. I therefore entertain a hope that the present session will not pass without carrying to its full energy the power of organizing, arming, and disciplining the militia, and thus providing in the language of the Constitution for calling them forth to execute the laws of the Union, suppress insurrections, and repel invasions.

What has Congress done in this respect? Read section 5297 of the Revised Statutes of the United States:

SEC. 5297. In case of an insurrection in any State against the government thereof, it shall be lawful for the President, on application of the legislature of such State, or of the executive, when the legislature can not be convened, to call forth such number of the militia of any other State or States, which may be applied for, as he deems sufficient to suppress such insurrection; or, on like application, to employ, for the same purposes, such part of the land or naval forces of the United States as he deems necessary.

And section 5298:

SEC. 5298. Whenever, by reason of unlawful obstructions, combinations, or assemblages of persons, or rebellion against the authority of the Government of the United States, it shall become impracticable in the judgment of the President, to enforce, by the ordinary course of judicial proceedings, the laws of the United States within any State or Territory, it shall be lawful for the President to call forth the militia of any or all the States, and to employ such parts of the land and naval forces of the United States as he may deem necessary to enforce the faithful execution of the laws of the United States, or to suppress such rebellion, in whatever State or Territory thereof the laws of the United States may be forcibly opposed or the execution thereof forcibly obstructed.

And section 5299:

SEC. 5299. Whenever insurrection, domestic violence, unlawful combinations, or conspiracies in any State so obstructs or hinders the execution of the laws thereof, and of the United States, as to deprive any portion or class of the people of such State of any of the rights, privileges, or immunities, or protection named in the Constitution and secured by the laws for the protection of such rights, privileges, or immunities, and the constituted authorities of such State are unable to protect, or, from any cause, fail in or refuse protection of the people in such rights, such facts shall be deemed a denial by such State of the equal protection of the laws to which they are entitled under the Constitution of the United States; and in all such cases, or whenever any such insurrection, violence, unlawful combination, or conspiracy opposes or obstructs the laws of the United States, or the due execution thereof, or impedes or obstructs the due course of justice under the same, it shall be lawful for the President, and it shall be his duty, to take such measures, by the employment of the militia or the land and naval forces of the United States, or of either, or by other means, as he may deem necessary, for the suppression of such insurrection, domestic violence, or combinations.

Is not this power all-sufficient, if in the judgment of the constituted authorities in any State the exercise of Federal power and Federal authority be required for any purpose whatsoever?

Again, should we be threatened with an invasion, the power of the President is ample, his authority complete. It is provided in sections 1642, 1643, and 1644, Revised Statutes of the United States, as follows:

SEC. 1642. Whenever the United States are invaded, or are in imminent danger of invasion from any foreign nation or Indian tribe, or of rebellion against the authority of the Government of the United States, it shall be lawful for the President to call forth such number of the militia of the State or States most convenient to the place of danger or scene of action as he may deem necessary to repel such invasion, or to suppress such rebellion, and to issue his orders for that purpose to such officers of the militia as he may think proper.

SEC. 1643. When the militia of more than one State is called into the actual service of the United States by the President, he shall apportion them among such States according to representative population.

SEC. 1644. The militia, when called into the actual service of the United States for the suppression of rebellion against and resistance to the laws of the United States, shall be subject to the same rules and articles of war as the regular troops of the United States.

Mr. Jefferson taught that the militia and the volunteers were our safest and best reliance. In his first annual message, speaking of the number of men required to garrison certain posts and stations, he said:

For defense against invasion their number is nothing; nor is it conceived needful or safe that a standing Army should be kept up in time of peace for that purpose. Uncertain as we must ever be of the particular point in our circumference where an enemy may choose to invade us, the only force which can be ready at every point and competent to oppose them is the body of neighboring citizens as formed into a militia.

And again, in his sixth annual message, he said:

We were armies to be raised whenever a speck of war is visible in our horizon we never should have been without them. Our resources would have been exhausted on dangers which have never happened, instead of being reserved for what is really to take place. * * * A militia so organized that its effective portions can be called to any point in the Union, or volunteers instead of them to serve a sufficient time, are means which may always be ready, yet never preying on our resources until actually called into use.

The first political platform ever promulgated by any party in this country, the one upon which Jefferson was nominated and elected, declared in opposition to a large standing Army. Washington was opposed to a large standing Army, as was also Jefferson, the Adamses, Monroe, Jackson, and as has been the entire policy of our country.

President Monroe, in his first inaugural address, said:

But it ought always to be held prominently in view that the safety of these States and of everything dear to a free people must depend in an eminent degree on the militia. Invasions may be made too formidable to be resisted by any land and naval force which it would comport either with the principles of our Government or the circumstances of the United States to maintain. In such cases recourse must be had to the great body of the people, and in a manner to produce the best effect.

Andrew Jackson considered standing armies dangerous to free institutions. In his first inaugural address he said:

Considering standing armies as dangerous to free governments in time of peace, I shall not seek to enlarge our present establishment, nor to disregard that salutary lesson of political experience which teaches that the military should be held subordinate to the civil power.

We should not increase our military establishment now. We should profit by the lessons of the past. We should heed the warning of our wisest and best statesmen. We should not surrender the essential principle upon which republican institutions must rest—a reliance upon and trust in the people.

But we are told that we have, or are about to have, Cuba, Porto Rico, and the Philippines on our hands; that as a result of the war new and unforeseen responsibilities and obligations have been thrust upon us which require this increase in the Regular Army. What are those responsibilities and obligations? In the war resolutions it is declared:

That the United States hereby disclaims any disposition or intention to exercise sovereignty, jurisdiction, or control over said island except for the pacification thereof, and asserts its determination, when that is accomplished, to leave the government and control of the island to its people.

Our duty and responsibility as to Cuba is the pacification thereof, and when that is accomplished our responsibility ceases. It is for the people of the island to form their own government in their own way. And as to Porto Rico, the island whose people welcomed the approach of our army, what is a large military force going to do there among people at peace with each other and in sympathy with our country? I can see no need of it, and am unable to understand why the native police or military force organized from the citizens of that island will not do all that is required.

Mr. Chairman, as to the Philippines, it might take 50,000 or 100,000, but more likely 200,000, men if we undertake to subjugate and hold those islands, to say nothing of what it may cost in the way of blood and treasure as a result of being exposed to European jealousies, becoming involved in European broils and European struggles.

I am opposed to the annexation of the Philippines and am opposed to an increase of the Army as a step in that direction. The Filipinos were in rebellion against Spain when Dewey sailed into Manila Bay and sank the Spanish fleet; they were in rebellion against Spain when the city of Manila was taken. Our purpose in going there was not the subjugation of those people, but to weaken the power of our enemy with which we were at war. Having for that purpose stricken down the hand of the oppressor in our own behalf, and not in behalf of those in rebellion, I can not understand wherein lies our duty to Spain, to the Filipinos, or to ourselves to become the future guardians and responsible for the future conduct of those people.

Would I turn them back to Spain? No. Neither would I pay Spain \$20,000,000 in consideration of her cession of sovereignty or relinquishment of authority over them. I would leave them to themselves to establish their own government, encouraging them in the idea of republican institutions, and bid them godspeed in their undertaking. To do otherwise, to annex the Philippines, to subjugate the inhabitants and hold them in military bondage is to violate every principle upon which our Government was established and to expose us to danger for a generation to come. Never was there a time when the words of Washington in his Farewell Address should appeal to the Executive, to the legislative branch of the Government, and to the people with so much potency. 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 and 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 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 advantages 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?

Let us, of all other things we may do or refuse to do during this Congress, not invite conditions which will involve us in disasters against which he warned us.

I notice in a London correspondence to the Washington Post of January 11 that it is the dread of Queen Victoria's dying days that Europe will be involved in a bloody war that will darken the close of her long reign.

If that dread time comes, Mr. Chairman, may it be said to the honor, glory, and peace of this nation and to the everlasting credit and felicitation of the statesmanship of this time that we are but interested spectators of the general upheaval. [Applause.]

Mr. Chairman, it is the proud boast of the Britons that the sun never sets on the Queen's dominions. But it is equally true that there is always sunshine on Uncle Sam's vast possessions, and this, too, before the annexation of Hawaii. When it is 6 p. m. on Attu Island, Alaska, it is 9.30 a. m. of the day following at Eastport, Me. And it is said that there are not two consecutive months in the year in which there is not both seedtime and harvest within the confines of our immense territory. Need we, therefore, now thirst for more, at the risk of exposing our institutions and the peace of the nation for generations to come? [Applause.]

Mr. MARSH. Mr. Chairman, I yield twenty minutes to my colleague [Mr. CONNOLLY].

Mr. CONNOLLY. Mr. Chairman, when I cast my vote, I shall be compelled to cast it against this bill. [Applause.] I thought it proper, inasmuch as my naked vote standing in the RECORD would not show any reason why I voted different from the probable majority of my party colleagues in the House—that it would be proper for me to put something in the RECORD to show some of the reasons that actuated me. There has been for years a growing sentiment among the people of the United States—the plain people, not the Army officers, but those who bear the heat and burden of the day in this great Republic—in favor of settling the questions in dispute with foreign nations by arbitration instead of by arms. We in this House now, at the close of the nineteenth century, are proposing to answer that appeal that comes up from the people of the United States by quadrupling the size of our Regular Army.

What kind of an answer is that that the representatives of the people propose to give to the demands that have been growing yearly in favor of the peaceful settlement of all questions of difference with foreign nations?

Again, a most singular thing presents itself. The autocrat of Russia, the sole head of that great nation, invites the nations of the world to a conference for the purpose of agreeing upon a plan to reduce the armaments that are bearing down his nation and all the nations of Europe with the tremendous burdens of taxation that are being piled upon the shoulders of those people in preparing the armaments that have been quoted to us in this debate as something to be followed in this country. We in this republican government of the people, for the people, and by the people, answer that call of the Czar of Russia by proposing to quadruple the fighting forces of the American Republic. What must the world argue from this but that the heads of the people of the United States are turned by this paltry victory they have won from a feeble enemy? [Applause.]

Mr. Chairman, the Army as it stands to-day, with its twenty-six thousand and odd men, has been large enough from the beginning of this Government down to to-day. We have lived more than a century under it. That Army, together with the volunteers, have made the flag of the United States respected within our own borders and respected throughout the world. When the day comes that the Republic must depend upon hired men to carry its flag and do its fighting, men professionally engaged in that business, the beginning of the end of this Republic has come. All the successful wars this nation has fought have been fought by the volunteers [applause]; and I have been tired in this debate of hearing so many disparaging remarks upon the volunteers, and talk that the volunteer can not be depended upon.

Now, I am sorry to say that advantage is sought to be taken of the temporary martial spirit that has been aroused by the late war with Spain to seek to do what could not have been done twelve months ago or two years ago; seeking to do that which in time of ordinary peace, when our people are engaged and their thoughts are turned to peaceful avocations in life, never could have

been considered one hour in this House of Representatives—an attempt to increase the size of our standing Army, and to do it by taking advantage of the temporary martial spirit that has been aroused.

Mr. Chairman, I look beyond this year, I look beyond the next two or three years from now. Our nation will still be here; we will be, I hope, in profound peace. We will have no need for a standing Army of any account any more than we had last year or the year before. I look to see the people of the United States bending their backs under the burdens of taxation that will be imposed upon them in case we quadruple this Army. Can we justify ourselves in doing it? It is all very well, in making patriotic speeches, to talk about the glory of the flag, the glory of our armies, and what the regulars have done and what the volunteers have done; but, Mr. Chairman, when the day of sober judgment and sober thought comes, the people of the United States have to pay the expenses for all these glorious things. They are looking to us to-day, and I apprehend that every member in this House has received letters from constituents inquiring when they will be relieved of the revenue taxes that were cheerfully borne in the support of the Spanish war and its expenses. Pass this bill, and you can answer those constituents confidently that never during this generation, nor in the generation to come, will the people of this country get rid of the revenue stamps that are stuck all over them. [Laughter.] We must consider these things.

Now, the pretext is being made in this House by many that because of the condition of things in the Philippine Islands we must have a largely increased standing Army. Why a standing Army? Is that condition of things to remain forever in the Philippine Islands? Will the close of the next century see an American standing army of 100,000 men there? I am ready to vote to furnish all troops necessary now to bring about peace there. I want to see that treaty ratified. I want to see the money paid to Spain. And then I want to see the American Government enforce order there against Mr. Aguinaldo and all his followers. I want them to be taught that we are not to be trifled with. But when we get rid of that adventurer and the adventurous gang that is following at his heels, then I want to appeal to the people of the Philippine Islands and let them make their government as we propose to let Cuba make hers.

What a singular spectacle we have to-day. Here in this end of the Capitol we are seeking to increase the Regular Army to 100,000 men, because we have obtained possession of the Philippine Islands. In the other end of the Capitol, at the very same time, they are insisting that we have not obtained and shall not obtain possession of those islands; that they will not confirm the treaty. Which is right? If gentlemen at the other end of the Capitol have control of this matter, then the settlement is as they say, not as the President says. It is as they say whether we shall have the Philippine Islands or not. We have probably the actual pedis possession of 10 square miles of land and water. That is all we have.

Now, why seek to quadruple the Regular Army and to add 25 per cent to the retired list of the Army—increase the number of pensioners that are to be perpetually supported by the United States—under the pretense that we must have this Army to maintain order in the Philippines? I am willing to give the President all necessary authority to maintain order there; to give him the right to have all the troops that he in his judgment may find necessary. I have perfect faith and confidence that he would not abuse a trust of that kind reposed in him. But I do not want to force him, in order to get the power which he ought to have, to approve a measure which hangs a yoke around the necks of the American people in the shape of a large standing Army—something that has always been abhorred in this country; something that is fundamentally out of accord with republican institutions. An Army I regard as simply a necessary evil. I want to keep that evil as small as possible. [Applause.]

[Here the hammer fell.]

Mr. JETT. I now yield to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BENTON].

Mr. BENTON. Mr. Chairman, I have paid close attention to the debate on this bill, yet I have not heard a clear statement from a single advocate of the bill as to what the need for a large standing army is in the United States. I have not heard what we are to do with a standing army of 100,000 men. The hint comes from the chairman of the Committee on Military Affairs that we must quadruple our standing or Regular Army because of our new possessions in the sea, while the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. LINNEY] seems to think that we must get ready to meet European trouble.

Mr. Chairman, if the Government of the United States is going into world politics, if we are to be ready for all comers, and it takes a standing army to make us ready, then 100,000 men will not suffice. England has the smallest standing army of any of the great European powers, and she keeps under arms constantly over 230,000 soldiers, while Russia leads with a regular army of

750,000 men, closely followed by France and Germany. If a great imperial policy is to prevail, if these United States must take a place in world politics, then our standing Army must be equal to the best; and to be the best, or among the best, we must have 500,000 regular soldiers, to say nothing of the other need—a \$500,000,000 Navy.

And, Mr. Chairman, the plain producer must pay the bill. But, Mr. Chairman, the drift of expression among those who are for this bill is that we need this army of 100,000 men to keep peace and order in Cuba, Porto Rico, and the Philippines. Why, Mr. Chairman, Cuba is to set up a free government, and we have pledged the Cubans, pledged ourselves, and pledged the world that we will help them do it. There can be but slight need for an army in Cuba. I venture the assertion that history has no parallel to the orderly behavior of the Cubans since the cessation of active hostilities. They are poor, homeless, with a devastated country, yet so eager are they for the blessings of liberty that they obey every command of our officers. Half a dozen regiments will preserve order in the cities of Cuba, and the country will settle down to peaceful pursuits, unless they begin to believe we mean to keep "Punic faith" with them. We have been led to believe that Porto Ricans came to us with outstretched arms and will be proud to become American citizens. Surely two or three regiments will suffice there.

Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HEPBURN] speaks authoritatively, that it is the purpose of the Administration to pacify the Philippine Islands, "give them an opportunity to establish order and law under such form of government as they choose," then we can not need a large standing army in those islands. Is there a member on this floor who believes there would be danger to our little Navy or to the few thousand soldiers we have over there if the Congress should declare the purpose of our Government to be to aid those people to organize a stable government and then leave the people there to enjoy liberty? If our purpose is to aid the Cubans and Filipinos to establish governments of their own, then a regular army of 30,000 men is all we need for all purposes. But if by any accident a greater force is needed at any time, the substitute of the minority for this bill gives the President the right to call out 50,000 volunteers when they may be needed.

Mr. Chairman, to return to the first proposition, What do we want with a standing army four times as large as the one we have had for more than twenty years? The Indian question has been solved; we have no dangerous border to defend. Besides, it is a costly proceeding. A standing army of 100,000 men, one-half of them to be used outside of the territory of the United States, will cost us \$115,000,000 annually. Add to this our pension list of \$150,000,000, and the probable pension list of the war we have just finished, and we will expend a grand total of \$300,000,000 on our Army each year. Are we rich and powerful enough for that when there is no need of it? Again, I am opposed to this bill because it is a forward step toward imperialism. It is the beginning of militarism. It will be the beginning of the election of Congressmen, governors, and Presidents by military influence.

A large standing army tends inevitably to centralization of government and to decay of individual liberty. A large regular army in time of peace is contrary to the teachings of the fathers. Mr. Jefferson said, "A well-disciplined militia was our best reliance in peace," and even "for the first moments of war." President Jackson said, in his first inaugural address:

Considering standing armies as dangerous to free governments in time of peace, I shall not seek to enlarge our present establishment, nor to disregard that salutary lesson of political experience which teaches that the military should be held subordinate to the civil power.

Our Government was builded upon the notion that each individual would be free, but would yield something to the general good. Force of arms was not to be tolerated as in opposition to civil authority. I believe in staying close to the doctrines of the fathers. Whenever we wander away from their views we get into deep water. By this bill we more than double the number of officers. This will build up and organize a military aristocracy, and all experience, all history teaches the lesson that this tends to the overthrow of the civil power. The Regular Army officer does not study constitutional questions. If the Constitution stands in the way of what he wants, then he thinks it should be suspended. This desire to enlarge the Regular Army has been the dream of plutocrats, aristocrats, and militarists for years, and they are taking advantage of the patriotic spirit of the people, aroused by the war with Spain, to thrust on us the aristocratic, un-American, and undemocratic idea of a large army being necessary to the safety of the Republic.

Mr. Chairman, I am against this bill because the strength and character of the militia or citizen soldier is to be minified. We saw enough of this in the war just closed. But few regiments of volunteers saw active service. The excuse was that they had no experience, that they were raw troops. Neither had the regulars

seen much service. I have no patience with this scheme of putting the regular soldier above the volunteer as being a veteran. Mr. Chairman, the citizen soldiers of the States have been tried on many battlefields. I declare that sixty days of regular drill in camp and one time under fire makes an American volunteer a veteran. The American volunteer is proud of his individuality, loves his country, his State, his home. His heart is fired with patriotic love of the flag, of the institutions of his country, and he does not need to be made a slave, a drilled machine, to become a safe and sturdy soldier.

Mr. Chairman, strip off the disguises, lay bare all the facts, and the purposes of this bill are threefold, to create a military aristocracy, to have an army large enough to overawe and bully labor in these United States, and to hold with the "mailed hand" of military power Porto Rico, the Philippines, and Cuba as well. Some gentlemen who are supporting this bill are frank and open. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MARSH] insists that he "would hold the Philippine Islands not as a part of the United States, but as the property of the United States." Then, Mr. Chairman, what is to become of our much-boasted Declaration of Independence, "that all men are created equal, that they are endowed with certain inalienable rights, that among these are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness; that to secure these rights governments are instituted among men, deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed"? If the Philippine Islands are to be "the property of these United States," are the Filipinos also to be our property? Are they to have no rights of liberty except what Congress sees fit to give them? This is the view of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MARSH], who speaks plainly what he thinks, and does not veil his thoughts and intentions as do some others.

This position is bold and frank, yet it is brutal, un-American, and violative of every sentiment—every tenet that lies at the foundation of the American Republic. But gentlemen say we must govern the Filipinos because they are not capable of self-government. Who knows this to be true? They have been fighting for liberty against the merciless power of Spain; they have protested with voice and force against the despotism of Spain. Are we Americans to declare a people can not govern themselves? After long centuries of kingcraft, Americans declared for self-government, insisted that "consent of the governed" was essential to "just governments," and with courage undaunted and patience unparalleled maintained their declaration. Americans established a government founded on consent of the governed, and for more than a hundred years our Government has been a beacon light to liberty lovers the world over. It does not lie in our mouths to say that any people are incapable of self-government. Every people are entitled to try the experiment.

Mr. Chairman, we have fallen upon strange times. We hear now that we must expand, must go into world politics, must make alliances with other powers in the Old World. We are told by generals, statesmen, and newspapers that the doctrines and counsel of Washington and Jefferson and Jackson are obsolete and no longer wise. It is insisted that a friendly alliance with England will be of great service. It would be to England, not to us. There is not a nation on earth and never has been that knows better how to take care of herself than England. But her labors, her legislation, her diplomacy, her wars, and her alliances are always for England's benefit. She has given us the "gold standard," she owns our securities and much of our property, and is doubtless willing to make a temporary ally of the "Giant of the West."

A very potent reason for enlarging the standing Army is to keep labor in subjection in this country. In a small way it has been tried. Make the Army four times as large as it has been for twenty-five years, put the soldiers under control of Federal courts, and government by injunction, enforced by the "Regular Army," will bully labor till in all the centers of population capitalized trusts can absolutely and completely control labor with an iron hand. But, Mr. Chairman, since this debate has been on we hear some mutterings of discontent with the bill by gentlemen in the majority, and the members of the Committee on Military Affairs from the majority side of the House are now proposing to make the standing Army of only 50,000 men, but authorizing the President, in his discretion, to augment it to 100,000 men. Worse and worse! I will not vote such discretion to this President or to any man who may be President. Let the Congress boldly do what it intends. It is a power that should not be given any one man, however wise, honest, or patriotic he may be. The power given the President in time of peace to call out 50,000 men and double the standing Army at a cost of from \$50,000,000 to \$70,000,000 per annum is without precedent. This is centralization of power with a vengeance. Congress may as well surrender its constitutional right to declare war and authorize the President to go to war when he chooses.

Mr. Chairman, I may be driven from public life, but I will not consent to shut my mouth and not protest against militarism, centralization, and all that I believe to be undemocratic and subversive of

the liberties of the plain, common people. I am willing to vote for fortifications along our seacoast, guns to put on the forts, and for soldiers to man the guns; I am willing to vote money to build up a respectable Navy; I am willing to support a small standing army, as a nucleus for a great army if the need comes; but I will not vote for any bill that I believe will curtail the liberty of an American citizen, pile up additional burdens in the way of taxation upon the producer, or in the least be subversive of the Constitution of my country or in violation of any of the doctrines of the Declaration of Independence or of Thomas Jefferson's first inaugural address. [Applause.]

Mr. JETT. I now yield to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. PIERCE].

[Mr. PIERCE of Tennessee addressed the committee. See Appendix.]

Mr. JETT. I now yield to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. LEWIS].

Mr. LEWIS of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, the increase of our former peace standing army of 26,000 and the present Army of 57,000 to that of 100,000 men is a serious and momentous question in which every American citizen, from the various standpoints, feels the deepest interest.

The American people may be accused of sometimes acting from sentiment, but they are just, and as a rule are a nation of practical people; therefore they will demand their right to know of this Congress its reason for so rapid and so radical a change in the military status of this country. In their calm, deliberate, and matured moments the American people move and act from sound reasoning.

NO DEFINITE POLICY.

Congress is called upon to pass a bill for the reorganization of the Army which proposes a hazardous innovation upon the ancient and fixed policy of this Government touching a standing army in times of peace, with no idea of what the policy of the President is with reference to the Philippine Islands and with no good reason for the increase of the Army. Has it come to this, that the Congress of the United States must make laws without reference to the purpose for which they are made? Are we a nation of dreamers? Republican members of the House have been repeatedly asked what the policy of the Executive is that demands so large a permanent standing army. Senators at the other end of the Capitol have, in the discussion of the Paris treaty, urged their Republican colleagues to disclose the Administration's policy with reference to the Philippine Islands.

These earnest inquiries have never been answered by any member in the confidence of the President. And in this great, free, and independent Republic, the birthplace and cradle of Liberty, we behold this strange spectacle: The Congress of the people assembled, the Senate urged to ratify a treaty of peace, the House of Representatives at the same time importuned to pass a bill for the reorganization of the Army, increasing the present peace standing Army of 26,000 to a permanent standing Army of 100,000 men. One branch of the lawmaking power engaged in the discussion of peace, the other branch preparing for war by seeking to increase the standing Army to 100,000 men. The Congress is called upon to legislate on these important and far-reaching questions with no fixed purpose in view. If the citizens of this country have not the right to know the policies of an administration, certainly the lawmaking power has the right to know.

THE PEOPLE TIRED OF VACILLATION AND UNCERTAINTY.

The Americans have had enough of the drifting and vacillating policy of this Government. I recall the course of the Executive prior to the declaration of war with Spain, how he was driven by his own party, which, grown restive over his indecision and uncertain policy, had begun to hold caucuses, to the course he pursued in sending to Congress his war message. The President's conduct with reference to the Filipinos is but a repetition of his vacillating and drifting policy with reference to the Cubans prior to the declaration of war. But our brave soldiers emerged from the conflict victorious and without a stain, subject to no criticism, and this country will not stop to inquire whether the history of that memorable struggle was the result of deep-seated forethought on the part of the Executive or whether his course was inspired by deference to public opinion.

THE COST OF THIS INCREASED ARMY.

Under the provisions of the pending bill the standing Army is increased to 100,000 men. It is estimated that each soldier serving in the United States will cost the Government \$1,000 annually. The bill under consideration provides for an increase in pay of 25 per cent to all officers and men serving in foreign countries. Then for each soldier who serves in the Philippine Islands the Government must pay not less than \$1,500 per annum. It will, on a conservative estimate, require 50,000 men to force the President's imperialistic policy on the Filipinos, which would cost us \$75,000,000, the cost of transportation, which is a considerable item not

being considered. The depletion of armies serving in tropical countries by death and sickness, as shown by the experience of the English in India and other tropical climates, is alarming, equaling in some instances 20 per cent of their entire strength. Such heavy loss by death and sickness will swell the pension roll to an amount we can not reckon.

The Navy must be strengthened, if this policy of imperialism is adopted, at an enormous cost. Already the Secretary of the Navy has submitted estimates for the construction of fifteen battle ships, at a cost of \$38,000,000.

But the cost of this imperial experiment, which the pending bill is put forth to further and defend, can not be measured in money. It will cost the lives and health of countless young American soldiers; it will cost saddened and broken homes; and if history repeats itself, it will cost the domestic peace and happiness of our country.

HOW WILL THE PROPOSED INCREASE OF EXPENSE BE MET?

We should consider how the burdens of taxation which the pending bill proposes to impose on the people are to be borne and by whom they are to be borne. We can not suppose the increased taxation is to be met by revenue collected from the Philippine Islands, for they never yielded Spain in any one year over \$13,000,000. These additional burdens on the people can only be met by a higher tariff, which levies oppressive tribute on the consumer and protects and enriches the manufacturer, by increased internal revenue, or by an issue of bonds, which furnishes a safe and remunerative investment for capital at the expense of honest toil. These additional taxes should not be imposed upon a people who are already taxed to death.

ADMIRAL DEWEY'S MATCHLESS VICTORY IN MANILA BAY.

The splendid victory of Admiral Dewey in Manila Bay dates the beginning of our foreign entanglements and alliances. Had Dewey never landed there and had no troops been sent to the Philippine Islands, it would have been a great event for the domestic tranquility of this country.

If the Paris commission had not insisted on the cession by Spain of the Philippine Islands, for which we are to pay \$20,000,000, we would not to-day be annoyed with these perplexing questions and our Army in the Philippine Islands would not be drawn up in battle array against an army whose forces they were presumably sent to strengthen against a common foe.

THE QUESTION OF SELF-GOVERNMENT FOR THE FILIPINOS.

I feel that it would be best to pay Spain \$20,000,000 and decree the Filipinos a free and independent people. They are capable of self-government. I quote the following from Mr. Andrew Carnegie, a gentleman of extensive travel in the oriental countries and a man of wide and accurate information:

Do you think the Filipinos capable of self-government?

Well, Admiral Dewey reports them much better qualified for self-government than the Cubans, and he knows both races well. President McKinley differs from swearing Shafter, and thinks the Cubans fit to be promised independence at the earliest possible moment. But I go further than this. No people who ever felt the divine impulse for independent nationality should be denied a fair trial. It will be impossible for us to help the Filipinos establish a stable government unless we are needed, desired, and welcomed by the people. Forcible interference, besides being criminal aggression, would mean continual rebellion. National aspirations are rarely quenched. You would make rebellion patriotic, and never could establish a reign of peace in the Philippines. We have only 56,000 regular soldiers. If we send them all to shoot down these people they could only occupy some of the ports, never possess the interior, and a worse enemy than even the Filipinos would be the climate, slowly wasting away the soldiers.

As to American influence elevating and civilizing the Filipinos, what kind of American influence can you send there? Would 50,000 soldiers be good missionaries? Does not every one know that soldiers in foreign lands require the strictest discipline themselves? Is not 46 per cent of the British troops in India to-day officially reported as diseased so terribly that we can not even mention their condition? Will ours be better in the Philippines? No! You can not establish American homes there; no wife and children, no sweet, holy influences are possible there. On the contrary, only demoralization. It is not true that a superior race governing an inferior race in the Tropics elevates or improves the inferior when the superior race can not take with it the wives and children and create homes there. If President McKinley ever had been, as I have been, in the far East, he would have known better than to be deluded in this matter. It is time to cease talking vaguely of elevating or improving the Filipinos by soldiers and adventurers, who will corrupt and demoralize them.

There are about 25,000 European residents in the islands, composed of English, French, and German people. They are capable of self-government, and desire the opportunity of governing themselves. Let us depart from the island and leave them to the responsibility of their own government.

No other government in the world will undertake to subdue them. It will be time enough for us to act when some other nation offers to conquer the islands.

THE PRESIDENT SHOULD BE FRANK WITH THE AMERICAN PEOPLE AS WELL AS WITH THE FILIPINOS.

If it is the policy of the President not to hold the Philippines permanently, he ought to be frank with the American people as well as with the Filipinos, and say so. If the Executive would declare his intention not to hold the Philippine Islands, the Paris treaty would be ratified in twenty-four hours and this bill for the reorganization of the Army would be withdrawn from the House and the Army of the United States again put upon a peace footing.

THE VALUE OF THE PHILIPPINE ISLANDS TO US.

Of what value are the Philippine Islands to us—a group of some 2,000 islands, distant 7,000 miles from our nearest port, and inhabited by about 8,000,000 people? The climate of the islands is such that our race can not thrive there. History teaches that the white race can not thrive in tropical climates. I desire to insert in my remarks a letter from Mr. Carnegie, a gentleman whose views are entitled to great respect by reason of his personal observations in the Orient:

To the EDITOR OF THE WORLD:

The ablest administrator yet cast up by the recent war is General Wood, of Santiago fame.

He told the Congressional committee the other day that "50,000 troops are required for Cuba, this number being necessary because of the climate, for only 35 to 40 per cent will be found effective as a rule. A day's active service would cause half of any military force to drop out. This is the reason Spain needed 228,000 troops in Cuba." The approaching yellow-fever season will swell the long death roll. So much for Cuba.

Professor Worcester, a member of the Philippine Commission, says in his book upon the archipelago, where he resided for years: "It is unfortunately true that the climate of the Philippines is especially severe in its effects on white women and children. It is very doubtful, in my judgment, if successive generations of European or American children could be reared there."

"If a man is permanently situated in a good locality where he can get suitable food and good drinking water, if he is scrupulously careful as to his diet, if he avoids excesses of all kinds, if he keeps out of the sun in the middle of the day, if he refrains from severe and prolonged physical exertion, he is likely to remain well, always supposing that he is fortunate enough to escape malarial infection," which he says "is especially prevalent where forest land is being cleared or new ground broken. It is often very bad near poddy fields during the dry season."

What chance have our troops to fulfill all these necessary ifs to render it likely they will escape, provided only they escape malaria? Very little indeed.

So much for this coveted possession for which President McKinley invites us to pay \$20,000,000 and perhaps spend a thousand millions shooting down the natives in order to impose upon them our foreign yoke against their desire.

It is to such conditions the President recklessly proposes to expose our soldiers during the coming summer.

An epidemic among the troops is probable in one or both of these foreign lands, and what will the American people have to say to the President then? God help the President! Who is there in all this land who would share his responsibility? And for what, Mr. Editor, for what? Only that we may meddle and muddle in other people's affairs, our interference only tolerated in the one case and forcibly resisted in the other.

ANDREW CARNEGIE.

NEW YORK, January 22.

The chief products of the Philippine Islands are hemp, tobacco, and sugar, all of which would come in competition with our like American products. The total business of the Philippine Islands, including exports and imports, for 1896 was only of the value of \$90,000,000. The imports into the Philippines from the United States in 1897 were but \$94,597.

Then let us not possess ourselves of distant territory which in time of war we would be compelled to defend, and which may involve us in perpetual entanglements with foreign countries, when we get so little in return.

I will never, as long as I occupy a seat on the floor of this House—and I believe I voice the sentiment of the people whom I am commissioned to represent—consent to vote for a bill increasing the regular peace standing Army of 26,000 men to a permanent standing Army of 100,000 men, and saddling heavier burdens of taxation upon a people already taxed beyond the power of endurance for the purpose of forcing an experimental imperialistic project upon a people struggling to be free. If I occupied a seat in the Senate Chamber, I would never vote for the ratification of a treaty of peace when it is the manifest purpose of the political party seeking its ratification to force upon the Filipinos a government they do not want, a political party that would subvert the doctrine that is the very basic principle of the greatest Government the world ever saw. "All Governments derive their just powers from the consent of the governed," and substitute therefore, as the rule of their conduct, the principle that has strewn the highway of time with the wrecks of monarchies and republics, "Might makes right."

Let us remain solid and compact, and we will remain impregnable and indestructible. [Applause.]

Mr. JETT. I now yield to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. STEPHENS].

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I shall vote against the bill under consideration.

It provides for increasing our Regular Army to 100,000 men. Each man will, it is estimated, cost the Government \$1,000, making a total of \$100,000,000. It will cost much more than this per man in any of our islands. This estimate does not include the salary of officers in the actual service or on the retired list; it does not include transportation, and many other things. From the best estimates on the subject I believe the Army provided for by this bill will cost us one hundred and fifty millions per annum.

This bill is the most extravagant Army bill ever proposed by this or any other government. It is far more extravagant than the present law. It is now proposed to promote the retiring officer to the next highest grade and give him three-fourths of the pay of that grade. Thus in many cases he would draw more pay after he was retired and doing nothing than while he was in the actual service. This is a willful robbery of the taxpayers, and

aids in building up an Army aristocracy. This bill provides for 100 Army dentists with rank of first lieutenant, and 34 horse doctors with the rank and pay of second lieutenant.

In short, it provides offices for 2,083 more men than the present law provides for, and also adds immensely to the retired list of Army officers.

This bill provides that assistant surgeons shall pass a satisfactory examination instead of a competitive examination, as the present law now requires. This is done so that Department pets and political ward heelers who know nothing of their profession may be appointed. The lives and health of the soldiers are overlooked by the framers of this bundle of iniquity called an Army reorganization bill. The satisfactory examination only means that the doctor has voted the Republican ticket in the past and will do so in the future, and that he has a political pull.

On page 9 of the majority report on this bill, made by the Republican part of the committee, I find this statement, viz:

The committee inserted a new section in regard to the Record and Pension Office, believing that the present chief of that office has by his wonderfully efficient service made it only proper for him to have the rank of brigadier-general.

The new section is section 16 and is as follows:

That the Record and Pension Office of the War Department shall consist of a chief, who shall have the rank, pay, and allowances of a brigadier-general, and an assistant chief, who shall have the rank, pay, and allowances of a lieutenant-colonel.

On the same page this report says:

The retired list is right and proper for men who devote their lives to Army work. It should not be used as an asylum for men who have spent their active life in civil employment.

I agree with the committee that the retired list should not be an asylum for men who have spent their active life in civil employment. Yet, with audacity that is amazing, this committee does the very thing in the bill that they condemn in the report. For instance, the chief and assistant chief clerk mentioned in section 16 may easily be appointed from civil life one year and retired the next year as an Army officer for life. So may the horse doctors, dentists, etc.

There should be no retired list of Army officers, for it makes a privileged class of people, who, from the day they secure an Army appointment to the day of their death, are aristocrats and supported by the public purse. The law permitting this iniquity was passed by the Republican party just after the civil war, at first for the benefit of a few ex-Union generals. Then it was extended to all officers. Not satisfied, the same party, by this bill, propose to create a great army, and add a host of new Army officers thereto, including horse doctors, dentists, and clerks in the War Department. They propose to reduce the age of retirement from 64 to 50, as they have done in the Navy, and thus retire hundreds of officers at once for life on three-fourths pay.

Not satisfied with this (for greed is never satisfied), the officer, when he reaches the retiring age, is first promoted to the next highest grade and receives three-fourths the pay of that grade for life. We will in a few years, if this bill becomes a law, have to support a greater list of retired Army officers than any nation on earth. If all men are equal before the law in this Republic, why does this bill not permit privates who are discharged from the Regular Army to be promoted to some petty office and then retired on three-fourths pay? Why do you not place the privates on the same footing as their officers, who are first promoted and then retired on three-fourths pay for life? What answer will the Republican party make to this question?

If all men are equal, why do you give a greater pension to officers' wives and children than to the wives and children of privates? If all men are equal, why do you require some men seeking Army appointments to stand competitive examinations while others are only required to stand satisfactory examinations, as is the case with assistant surgeons, horse doctors, and dentists?

Mr. Chairman, I have listened patiently through this debate, hoping that some good reasons would be given for enlarging our Regular Army from 25,000 to 100,000 men—for taking six dollars from our taxpayers, instead of one, for the support of our enlarged Army. Yet no excuse has been or can be given for this outrage on our people. Twenty-five thousand men have been found sufficient as a standing army from the foundation of our Government down to this hour. We have been victorious in four foreign wars. We have subdued multiplied thousands of savages on our frontiers, and to-day there is not a hostile Indian in our country.

The Indian problem has been solved, and an army is no longer needed to keep them in subjection. If we will break up their tribal relations, allot to them their lands in severalty, and treat them as we do our own citizens, we can make them support themselves.

The States and Territories where they reside should control them. We can then use our soldiers elsewhere. No soldiers are needed in Hawaii or Porto Rico, except a few companies for garrison duties. We are pledged to withdraw our army from Cuba as soon as the Cubans establish a stable government of their own. If they are given an opportunity, they will do this at once.

Short-time volunteer soldiers can garrison the islands of Cuba and the Philippines just as well as the regulars.

We have no use for all the regular soldiers we now have at home, and can use most of them in the islands. The bone of contention in this debate is whether or not we shall subjugate and hold the Philippine Islands as a conquered province. If we commit this blunder and crime, we must have and use a large standing army.

A coaling station is all the land we need or should have in the Philippine Islands. The city and bay of Manila is all the land we captured on these islands from the Spaniards, and is the only place where our flag floats. We need not pull our flag down from Manila or its harbor and bay. The Philippine Islanders will gladly cede these to us if we will make a treaty with them and permit them to establish a government of their own and in their own way control the rest of their islands. We should treat the Filipinos just as we have proposed to treat the Cubans. If we undertake to conquer the islands, we will have a desperate war on our hands.

I would not give the life of one of our soldiers for the whole of the islands. We need the soldier to build up and protect our own country. We do not need the Philippine Islands for any purpose. If we will be content with what we now have in our possession in the Philippines, we will have no trouble whatever with Aguinaldo or his followers. A small garrison, say one regiment, and a few war vessels is all we would need there. If we must conquer new territory and develop it, our own wild, undeveloped arid region in the West presents a most inviting field for the use of men and money. Both sides of the Colorado of the West and of the Rio Grande River, from their sources in Colorado to the gulfs of California and Mexico, present a grand field for irrigation plants and improvements.

The people living on the Rio Grande River from El Paso to the Gulf would be very greatly benefited by building a high storage dam a few miles above El Paso, where the river passes through a range of mountains. The water impounded by this dam would easily irrigate 1,000,000 acres of land that is now worthless and desolate. The cost of one battle ship would build this reservoir.

The citizens of Texas on one side of the river and of Mexico on the other have been deprived of the natural flow of the water of the Rio Grande River, when they most need it, for irrigation purposes in the spring and summer months, by the citizens of Colorado and New Mexico, who have taken out all the water flowing in the river by ditches and led it onto their own lands for irrigation purposes. They thus deprive their neighbors below, both Texans and Mexicans, of any water for irrigation, and crops can not be raised there without water.

Mexico has filed claims for damages against the United States for many millions of dollars for using all the water flowing in the river, to which the Mexicans claim a prescriptive right. The people of Texas are damaged in the same way as the Mexicans. Why should the United States neglect to build this reservoir and to let the citizens of Mexico have one-half the water impounded? Is it not better to use our money in doing a simple act of justice to a neighboring, friendly nation and in developing our own country than it is to raise a great standing army to conquer and annex the Philippine Islands?

If we would send an industrial army composed of the 100,000 men provided for in this bill to reclaim the 71,000,000 acres of arid land that we already own in the West, and arm them not with rifles and cannons, but with the implements of husbandry, with machinery, with spades and scrapers, with which to dam up rivers and streams, to dig ditches and canals to furnish water to irrigate this vast territory and turn it from a desert into the garden spot of our country, future generations would rise up and bless the Fifty-fifth Congress.

But if we fasten on the taxpayers a large standing army for purposes of conquering other nations and intermeddling with the affairs of the world, future generations will curse the Fifty-fifth Congress for entering into the imperialistic policy. Mr. Chairman, we have come to the Rubicon. Will this Congress cross this dreadful river of expansion and imperialism? Shall we change our name from the United States of America to the United States of America and Asia, and live by plundering weaker nations? May God save my countrymen from so great a crime.

The district I have the honor to represent in this House has more land above tide water than the whole of the Philippine Islands. My district has less than 3 persons to the square mile. The Philippine Islands have 60 persons to the square mile. My district has twenty times the room for expansion that the Philippine Islands have. The Geological Department estimates that the United States Government now own 71,000,000 acres of unreserved public lands that could be put under irrigation ditches. Mr. F. H. Newell, Chief of the Hydrographic Division of our Geological Survey, writing on the subject of Western irrigation, says:

One-third of the area of the United States is owned by the General Government, or about two-thirds of the territory between the one hundredth meridian and the Pacific coast. This land is the most fertile in the world, and

water, the only thing which it lacks, can be supplied under proper irrigation. Four acres of land, producing from four to five crops a year, can support a family.

In nearly all of the arid regions irrigation is not only feasible, but has been proved successful. It is not always financially profitable to the private corporation looking for 8 per cent dividends; but in the same sense that a light-house, the dredging of a harbor, or the improvement of a river is profitable, it will pay the community or the General Government to open this great area for agricultural use, and so make it the comfortable home of millions of prosperous people.

About eight hundred millions of the people of the earth to-day are kept alive on irrigated land. It has been carried on successfully for many centuries in Egypt, China, India, Spain, and Hawaii. Would it not be a wise policy to develop our own waste lands and let the Filipinos keep their own lands and use them in their own way? There is no room there for our American people.

There are twenty times more people to the square mile in the Philippines than there are in the arid part of America. Taking the United States as a whole, we have only 21 people to the square mile, while the Philippine Islands have 60 to the square mile. These islands are now three times more densely populated than the United States. When California was purchased from Mexico she only had one inhabitant to the square mile; the Philippines have sixty times as many. A few years after California was purchased it was a State in the American Union.

To-day it is the home of several millions of our own race of people. The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. GROSVENOR] gives the purchase of California, for which we paid only \$15,000,000, as a precedent to justify the purchase of the Philippines for \$20,000,000.

If any better reason can be found for purchasing the Philippines this able debater would have found it. California could be purchased without destroying the Monroe doctrine. The subjugation of the Philippines will destroy it. California became a State in a few years. It is not the intention of the Republican imperialists that the Philippine Islands ever shall become a State in this Union. Only 2 per cent of the Filipinos are Europeans or Americans; and these islands never can be peopled by the white race—first, because of climatic conditions; and secondly, because white labor can not compete with the cheap labor of the yellow races of the Orient. Hence our laborers never can live in these islands or compete with these islanders.

Cheap Asiatic labor will raise sugar and hemp to come into our country free of duty and compete with our sugar-beet, cane, and hemp raisers, thus bringing our farmers in direct competition with the cooly labor of Asia. Our laws prevent Chinamen from coming to our country one at a time or by retail. If we annex the Philippines, we annex its present inhabitants, among whom are thousands of Chinamen, whom we will make citizens by the wholesale. The jewel of consistency seems to have been lost sight of in our mad rush for Spanish spoils. If we annex or attempt to annex these islands, Spain will be avenged, and the object of our greed will be our scourge and Spain's avenger.

Our flag has always been and should ever remain the emblem of peace, justice, and freedom. If we forcibly annex the Philippine Islands by war and conquest, our flag will then become the emblem of force, of war, of conquest, of greed and slavery.

The red will represent the blood shed in subduing the islands. The white will represent the present Administration now engaged in the whitewashing business to cover up the mistakes made in that whited sepulcher—the White House—during the war with Spain.

The blue will represent the feelings of the American taxpayers when imperialism shall have doubled their taxes. The blue will also represent the Republican politician after the voters at the next Presidential election shall have retired their whitewashing chief to private life; shall have condemned imperialism, their standing-army steal, their gold standard, their trust-fostering policies, and their forcible annexation of the Philippines.

The Czar of Russia has recently proposed a general conference of nations for the purpose of securing a lasting peace, and the prevention of future wars, and a reduction of the present standing armies of the world. The Republican party is meeting this proposition by quadrupling our standing army, by ordering a number of our war ships and an army of men to the Philippine Islands for the purpose of forcibly annexing the islands to our Government.

Dewey was right in destroying the Spanish fleet, in capturing Manila, in driving out the Spaniards, and in holding Manila to force Spain to make a treaty of peace. These were war measures, and right and necessary. But we are now considering the problems of peace, not of war. The question is, Can we withdraw now from these islands honorably?

This question was answered by the President when he said that forcible annexation would be criminal aggression. If he was right then, he is wrong now. He now proposes to forcibly annex the Philippine Islands, and if war results from his proposed criminal aggression, then every Philippine Islander that dies fighting to prevent forcible annexation will be a martyr, and every drop

of blood shed by our country to subjugate these people will be shed because we covet our neighbors' land. In such a war the United States would occupy the place held by Great Britain in our own Revolutionary war.

The Filipinos would occupy the position of Washington and the rebel colonists. We thus become the conquerors of a race of people who have never injured us, and whose only crime is their desire to be free. The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. GROSVENOR], on this floor a few days ago, said that if we left the Philippine Islands now, "coward" would be written on our backs. I had infinitely rather be branded "coward" on the back than "murderer" on the brow. If forcible annexation is criminal aggression, then the crime would be murder if we take human life in the war to annex the Philippines.

We fought the Revolutionary war with Great Britain because of her military despotism, because she quartered soldiers among us in times of peace, and because she taxed us without representation. Shall we now set up in the Philippine Islands a military despotism, quarter our troops among these people, tax them without representation, and shoot them down if they resist?

Washington and his rebels made our great Republic what it is to-day. They gave us a written Constitution to guide us. Washington, Jefferson, and Monroe warned us against foreign alliances and entanglements. Out of this advice arose the famous Monroe doctrine, by which we pledge ourselves that America is for Americans, and that no European nation shall annex any territory on this hemisphere. When France, during our civil war, invaded Mexico and put Maximilian on the throne, our Government asserted the Monroe doctrine and drove the French from Mexico.

Mr. Cleveland in his last Administration again asserted it against British aggression in Venezuela, and Great Britain yielded to his demands. By this doctrine we assume a protectorate over two of the five continents on earth. Surely two-fifths of this whole earth for expansion ground should satisfy the greed of the most rabid expansionist. Even the lion of Athens, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. GROSVENOR], who so generously brands every man opposed to the annexation of the Philippines as cowards, should be satisfied with two-fifths of the earth.

We declared war with Spain to free Cuba and give her a stable, republican form of government. Why should we treat the citizens of the Philippine Islands worse than the Cubans? Why give freedom to Cuba and make slaves of the Philippine Islanders? They were our allies and fought side by side with our troops at Manila. They hailed Dewey as their deliverer. Shall we turn their joy to sorrow by making him their conqueror?

The Times, an imperialistic journal published in this city, speaking of the Philippines, said on the 29th of last month:

It has been decided to assert our authority at once. The insurgents will be compelled to choose between absolute submission, with the surrender of Iloilo, and war; of course the enemies of expansion will make the most of any compulsion regardless of the fact that it proves the folly of their scheme of independence.

This statement of the Times shows that the Republican party is following in the footsteps of Great Britain, and have abandoned the wise and patriotic teachings of the fathers of our Republic. In the early part of this century Great Britain demonetized silver. In 1873 the Republican party did likewise in this country. Great Britain has sent her armies and navy to every part of the earth and sought out the weak and unprotected nations and forcibly annexed them to the British Empire.

The Republican party now has an army and additional war vessels on the way to the Philippines to forcibly annex them. England has enslaved the Irish people. Not to be outdone by England, the Republican party now propose to first conquer and then govern according to their own sweet will the Filipinos, to whom the great God of this universe has given the inalienable right of self-government, or else our Declaration of Independence and our Constitution are a tissue of falsehoods. But let one of our generals testify to the fact that the imperialism of Great Britain has caused him to forget his country and to sneer at its Constitution. I will read from a New York paper the report of his speech:

SAYS WE HAVE OUTGROWN THE CONSTITUTION—GENERAL MERRITT SPEAKS AT THE ANNUAL DINNER OF THE NEW ENGLAND SOCIETY.

NEW YORK, December 22.

Over four hundred sons of New England sat down to-night at the ninety-third annual dinner of the New England Society of New York City at the Waldorf-Astoria. President Howland presided, and above his chair was the seal of the society, flanked on either side by the American and English flags. The guests included many men prominent in public and private life, among them being Brayton Ives, Elihu Root, J. P. Morgan, Joseph H. Choate, Gen. Hamilton S. Hawkins, Gen. William R. Shafter, Governor Elisha Dyer, of Rhode Island, Admiral William T. Sampson, Governor Theodore Roosevelt, Gen. Joseph Wheeler, Gen. Wesley Merritt, former Governor Roswell P. Flower, C. P. Huntington, and former Vice-President Levi P. Morton.

"Forefathers' Day" was responded to by Governor Dyer. Governor-elect Roosevelt was greeted with loud cheers when he rose to respond to "The State of New York." General Merritt, in the course of a short speech, said: "We have a great work before us. What we have done and what the Administration has done has been in the interests of the country. There is a great deal that approaches us from every side in the Tropics. We can extend our commerce there and we can extend the trade of America, which is now

three-fourths of it limited to the Tropics, to an enormous extent. We have the English feeling with us when we are in the colonies of England. A great many people have insisted that the Constitution forbade it. To these I have said, 'We have outgrown the Constitution. It is not worth while to discuss it.' We are here and we are here to stay."

We should be too wise to adopt England's foreign policy and to thus destroy the Monroe doctrine and invite foreign wars and complications. We should be too alert to colonize a group of islands more than 7,000 miles from our shores, at the very doors of the nations of Europe, thus inviting an attack on ourselves so far away from home that our defeat and humiliation would be greatly facilitated. A chain is no stronger than the weakest link in the chain, and the weak link in our chain of empire would (if we adopt imperialism) be the Philippine Islands. We would have to protect them with every man, every gun, every ship, and every dollar that this country could command.

We would be taken at a great disadvantage. Our loss of life and treasure under such circumstances would be fearful if attacked by any strong European power. If we adhere to the Monroe doctrine and remain on this hemisphere, the combined powers of the world could not defeat our armies. Therefore, viewing the annexation of the Philippine Islands from the standpoint of expediency, we must reject them. Viewing it as a moral and social question, we must reject forcible annexation. Christianity would be a failure if we can make people good by fighting them.

Another objection to this bill is the enormous expense it will perpetually saddle on our people. Secretary Alger asks for the modest sum (modest, I mean, for a Republican) of about \$166,000,000. The minority report on this bill estimates that if the bill passes it will cost the people of our country \$150,000,000 per annum. Let us compare this expense with like expenses of other nations. Russia has a standing army of 1,000,000 men, and it costs her only \$155,000,000 per year for all purposes, and less for each than any other country. France comes next, with 580,000 men, and spends for her army \$145,000,000 per year.

Germany has an army of 585,000 men, which costs her \$135,000,000 per year.

Austria-Hungary has an army of 360,000 men, that costs \$90,000,000 a year.

Italy has an army of 270,000 men, that costs her \$55,000,000.

These estimates, obtained from the Ohio State Journal, are for the Army alone and do not include the expenses of the Navy. According to Secretary Alger's request, we must pay \$11,000,000 more for an army of 100,000 men than Russia does for 1,000,000 men. I therefore assert that this bill if passed should be styled a bill to perpetually rob the American people, to build up an American aristocracy, to overawe labor, and protect trusts and corporations, to provide offices for political pets and the sons of millionaires. It is my deliberate judgment that this bill is demanded by the moneyed interests of this country, who own and control the Republican party. Plutocrats claim that the Army is to be used in the Spanish islands. Plutocracy intends to use it in the sovereign States of this Union to enable capital to control and overawe labor. When this Army bill passes—then, and not until then, will the Administration unfold its foreign policy.

The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. WALKER], a Republican, a banker and manufacturer, and, of course, an imperialist and expansionist, speaking of this bill on this floor, urged an increase of the Army, and said that it is needed, "not to keep in subjection law-abiding citizens, not to keep the workingmen from committing acts of violence when there are strikes, but to prevent those men who take advantage of strikes to do acts of violence in spite of the strikers, and to create a condition of war." This is a frank admission that the Army is intended to be used in the States and against our own people in case of strikes. And this is the real purpose of the advocates of this bill.

The spirit of imperialism and plutocracy is seeking to enslave the white citizens at home as well as to conquer and annex yellow ones in the islands of the ocean. The American people should be aroused to the great danger now confronting them in imperialism and a large standing army. What will it profit the people of the United States to conquer the Philippine Islands and annex the rest of the world if in the end they lose their own liberty?

The moneyed plutocrats have joined the Army aristocrats in an effort to raise the standing army to 100,000 men for their joint use and benefit, the moneyed men to control and coerce labor, the Army officers to draw large salaries for life and to live in luxury and ease at the taxpayers' expense. The annexed statement of Mr. Edward Atkinson, an expert statistician, shows that the mad policy of imperialism will soon bankrupt and ruin our country:

In the fiscal year ending June 30, 1897, deducting from the receipts the amounts recovered for bonds advanced to the Pacific railroad, and applied to the payment of those bonds and interest, the deficit was	\$103,000,000
The Secretary computing the deficiency in the fiscal year ending June 30, 1899, at	112,000,000
Total	215,000,000

The proceeds of the war loan and \$15,000,000 over will therefore have been expended within the six months after January 1, and on June 30, 1899, another

deficit will be drawing cash from the Treasury reserves. This Congress will expire March 4, and the new Congress will not meet unless in extra session until December, 1899, in the middle of the fiscal year ending June 30, 1900.

The Secretary computing the revenue from taxation in the fiscal year ending June 30, 1900, at	\$510,000,000
Expenditures at	540,048,378
Deficit	30,018,378

The population for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1900, will be somewhat less than 78,000,000, but, adopting that number, the normal revenue and expenditure at \$5 per head would come to \$390,000,000.

According to the Secretary's estimate all the existing taxes will yield per head \$8.52, while the computed expenditures will come to over \$7 per head.

Additional taxation will therefore become necessary, even if the Secretary's sanguine estimates of revenue and expenditure are justified. It will, however, be observed that he assumes that the revenues now derived from sugar and tobacco will continue as they are. But if the imperialist or annexation policy prevails, the islands of Cuba and Porto Rico can not be treated on any other basis than the Hawaiian group; hence a necessary loss of revenue in 1900, computed by myself at not less than 80 cents per head, or \$82,000,000, to be added to the deficit computed by the Secretary of \$30,000,000, making \$92,000,000. This sum must be provided from new sources of direct internal taxation.

But it will be remembered that the Secretary's estimates of expenditure in the fiscal year ending June 30, 1900, are wholly inconsistent with the increase of the Army recommended by the Secretary of War or the increase of the Navy recommended by the Secretary of the Navy. Neither is any provision made in these estimates for the construction or renovation of coast defenses in Cuba, Porto Rico, or Hawaii, nor is there any provision made for public buildings in these islands. The Philippines are also wholly ignored.

The only safe computation that can be made for the fiscal year 1900, if the imperialist policy prevails, would be as follows:

Revenues as compiled by the Secretary	\$510,000,000
Deduct loss of revenue on sugar, tobacco, rice, and fruits	62,000,000
Net revenue under existing laws, less loss on sugar, etc., at \$6 per head, or \$1 above the normal rate of \$5	448,000,000

EXPENDITURES.

As per Secretary's estimate	540,000,000
Add for proposed increase of Army to 100,000 men, increase of Navy, coast defenses in Cuba, Porto Rico, and Hawaii, only \$1 per head	78,000,000
Total at a fraction under \$3 per head	618,000,000
Deficit	170,000,000

This deficit of over \$2 per head must be provided by direct taxation. 78,000,000 persons taxed at \$8 per head pay \$624,000,000. If taxed at the nominal rate of \$5 per head, which has sufficed for twenty-one years, the sum would be \$390,000,000.

Cost of imperialism, \$3 per head 234,000,000. This policy will raise the tax on every family of five persons from \$25 to \$40 a year.

But the whole cost is not even yet disclosed. The increase of the Army from 25,000 to 100,000 men can only contemplate service in Cuba, Porto Rico, and the Philippines of a force of at least 60,000 out of the 100,000, leaving 40,000 for home service where 25,000 have amply sufficed.

At least one-half the force of 60,000 will either die or become disabled every year. According to English experience in India and French experience in their tropical colonies of a death rate of 100 in each 1,000, 5 per cent will be sent home every year to be supported in hospitals or at the public cost from venereal diseases only, by which more than half the Army is infected.

Yet the Secretary of the Treasury reduces the estimate for pensions in 1900 below that of the present year. This can only be due to inadvertence, but how much must be added no one can compute.

In my previous guarded analysis I overestimated the income from the war-revenue act now in force. All my other computations are more than sustained by the report of the Secretary of the Treasury.

The money cost of the national crime which the advocates of imperialism propose to commit in the face of the declaration of President McKinley that such an act would be one of "criminal aggression" will be not less than \$3 per head, \$15 per family, in amount \$334,000,000, in the next fiscal year, and probably more.

The pretexes upon which this so-called policy of imperialism is promoted consist of mixed motives of profits and patriotism.

Mr. JETT. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. KITCHIN].

Mr. KITCHIN. Mr. Chairman, had I sufficient time I would gladly discuss the incidental race question which has been often mentioned in this debate, but, sir, I am compelled to limit my few remarks more closely to the main features of the pending measure. Scorning the misrepresentations of ignorance and bigotry, rejoicing in the victory of our Army and Navy, and responsible to the descendants of the first proclaimers of American liberty for my conduct, I shall vote against increasing the standing army of the United States from 30,000 to 100,000 men in time of peace.

The memories that cluster around the battle grounds of Alamanca and Guilford, in my district, and the sacrifices made by my native State in the recent war with Spain, when brave Bagley fell at Cardenas and gallant Shipp expired on the hill of San Juan, impress me with honor for heroes and with respect for military preparations. But, sir, my knowledge of the conditions of the plain people of this land and my confidence in the innate powers of my country forbid my aid to this unnecessary increase of expense for military purposes in time of peace from \$25,000,000 to \$100,000,000 annually, a sum sufficient to buy three districts, according to their tax books, such as I have the honor here to represent. This increase has knocked at the doors of Congress for twenty years, but the wisdom and patriotism of our statesmen

have refused it admittance; but under the infatuation resulting from our recent victories it has crept into these halls.

The King of Israel, in a moment of infatuation, yielded to temptation, committed a double crime, and in his old age mourned his conduct. Let Congress heed the moral and save the country from this error, sprung upon us in a moment of exultation, which our wisest and most honored statesmen have heretofore resisted.

Mr. Chairman, in the interest of millions we should deny the demands of the few, and we should continue in the future, as in the past, to rely upon the volunteer soldiery of this land for our safeguard.

Do gentlemen on the other side think that the treatment of the volunteer soldiers in this recent war will deter patriots from volunteering hereafter? In my judgment that treatment has been wrong. The volunteers upon application should be discharged and others should be enlisted for garrison work. The brave men who left their occupations and families to engage in active fighting for our country should not be required against their wishes to do garrison duty, to incur sickness, disease, and death under the tropical sun of distant Luzon. There are men who are willing to do garrison duty, and they should be allowed to enlist for that purpose. To keep the present volunteers in service to while away time and expend their manhood in garrisons is a violation of their contract as they understood it at the time of their enlistment.

However, hereafter when the rights of the people are involved, so strong is the patriotism and so high the courage of the citizenship of our land that gleaming steel will flash against the enemy from millions of volunteer soldiers if need be.

I think, Mr. Chairman, the result of the recent war with Spain clearly shows that this country does not need a large standing army. If for thirty years past we did not need a larger regular army than 30,000 men, why do we now need 100,000, when the Indian problem is well-nigh settled and when the victories of Manila and Santiago have added luster and prestige to our power? [Applause.]

If gentlemen take refuge behind the increased responsibilities of the war and convince the country that these responsibilities mean future wars, then, Mr. Chairman, the country will say at once, "Dispose of and withdraw from Porto Rico and Hawaii as well as from the Philippines."

In my opinion, danger, great danger lurks in the acquisition of the Philippines; and if the people thoroughly understood this matter, a wave of protest would come from the farms and the shops, the fields, the mines, and the offices of this land that would compel a patriotic Executive to change his course upon it. And I hope, Mr. Chairman, that even now, while we have this bill under consideration, these protests are making our administrative officers change their views upon the policy of annexing the Philippines.

If a just conception of the mission of this Republic, if a proper regard for the interests of our toiling masses, if a manly love for humanity's rights, are not sufficient to forbid the forcible annexation of these islands, then I trust the fear of the wrath of the American electors at least will stay the powers of the President in his grasping after Asiatic acquisitions.

It is futile for gentlemen on the other side to deny that the Executive has had the intention to permanently retain the Philippines.

Is there a lawyer here who would not expect to convict a defendant if he had the same evidence against him as we have in this matter in favor of that position being held by the Executive? Are we to suppose that our peace commissioners acted without any consultation with the Executive? Are we to suppose that a treaty of peace would be submitted to the Senate of the United States ceding the Philippines to our country without the consent of the Executive? Are we to suppose that the Executive would have made the speech that he made in a Southern city, in which he opposed "pulling down the flag," unless he had been sincere in his statements?

You will certainly not charge him with trying to involve the public in a misconception of his position by this treaty and by these expressions, and unless you think that he intended to mislead the people you can not resist the conclusion that when he made that speech at Atlanta he then intended to perpetually hold and occupy the Philippines. While the country knows this, yet the annexation proposition is so novel and perilous that so far not a single Republican has boldly advocated it in this House. Yet all Republicans, with few exceptions, are drifting with the Administration and submitting to this threatening innovation of imperialism.

Mr. Chairman, I would keep the necessary coaling and naval stations in the Philippine Islands, but never would I shed a drop of American blood in destroying the hopes of independence among their population.

I admit the right of this country to acquire vast domains of uninhabited or practically uninhabited American territory. I would go further than that. I would admit its right to annex

populous adjacent territory, with the consent of the inhabitants thereof, as was done in the case of Texas; but I deny the moral right of any government, based upon the principles of our immortal Declaration of Independence, to purchase the opportunity to subdue 10,000,000 distant people who are struggling for the same rights that our ancestors wrung from British tyranny.

I protest against this Government undertaking these dangerous and expensive experiments while it shuts the Treasury to the rights of individuals and the needs of municipalities throughout this land. I protest against this threatened increase of the Regular Army as a menace to the rights of the States and the people in times of great moment, and we know not how soon those times may come. I protest against it as an unnecessary and therefore an unjust burden on the taxpayers of this country, who are now hoping for the early repeal of the present war taxes under which they are laboring. And I protest against it as a dangerous tendency to European or monarchic policies.

I wish that my distinguished colleague [Mr. LINNEY], who is rarely absent, were present, for I want also to protest against the "pussy cat" policy that my friend announced last night. I protest against our country elevating its back like a pussy cat, as my colleague demands, in order to keep the bulldogs of the world off of us.

Mr. CARMACK. We do not need to do so.

Mr. KITCHIN. We do not need to do so, as my friend from Tennessee remarks. On the contrary, I prefer to adhere to our fathers' policy in time of peace, to a standing army of 30,000 men, and to our Navy, and then in times of great emergency to depend upon the immeasurable resources, the indomitable courage, and the never-failing patriotism of the best people that the world has ever seen, for our defense, our strength, and our victories.

Mr. Chairman, gentlemen say we should not withdraw the flag. I would remind gentlemen that the German flag was withdrawn from the capital of France without dishonor; that the English flag was withdrawn from this very city in which we are without dishonor; that the American flag was withdrawn from the capital of Mexico without dishonor; and, more than that, I would remind them that the American flag was withdrawn from Pensacola, when Pensacola was Spanish, without dishonor. And, sir, I protest against the claptrap and humbug argument embraced in the question, "Who will pull down the flag?" and would answer that common sense and the welfare of our posterity demand that we withdraw from the Philippines at the earliest practicable moment, and not run the risk of fighting another war, a war which this Congress has not authorized, which the people do not approve, and which, with its succeeding evils, will be properly charged to this Administration.

The objects of the first war—the independence of Cuba and the avenging of the *Maine*—have been attained. If further bloodshed follows it will be upon the heads of those who have persisted and still persist in forcing our flag upon the Filipinos against their consent.

In conclusion I will say, in the sentiments that I have heretofore expressed on this floor, that if Dewey's great victory at Manila shall result in our country abandoning the principles of our fathers, shall result in the policy of imperialism, in a policy of territorial aggrandizement and colonial oppression, then the sweetness of that victory will be bitterness, the honor of that victory will be shame, and humanity may weep over it as the first blow by the country of Washington and Jefferson against the liberty of mankind, and may well pray that it prove not fatal. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. JETT. Mr. Chairman, I now yield to the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. STARK].

Mr. STARK. Mr. Chairman, the discussion upon this bill has very properly taken a wide range. A measure which proposes basic alterations in the system of government and established usage of the United States of America demands the exercise of our best thought and most critical discernment. The question directly submitted is whether in time of peace there is need to permanently increase our Regular Army to 100,000 men immediately after the conclusion of a war with Spain which required the active services of less than 60,000 men. The adoption of the substitute for the bill under discussion will provide sufficient military force until the conclusion of all differences with Spain.

In the earlier days of the Republic the laurel wreath of fame was placed upon the brows of brave men who left shops and fields at the call of their country, performed their full duty as soldiers, and when peace was declared resumed their places at the anvil or "beat their swords into plowshares," to again become producers and artisans. We are proud of our citizen soldiery. They have never failed us in our hours of need. The volunteer soldier of the United States has risen to every emergency and "acted well his part" whenever called into service.

I believe, in the language of the Constitution, that "a well-regulated militia is necessary to the security of a free state," and that a well-regulated, well-drilled, and well-equipped militia will

be perfectly adequate without further increase of the standing Army to answer every requirement of a Government that seeks only the good of its citizens, endeavors simply to execute the laws duly passed by the representatives of the people, and accords to other nations, weak or strong, the same treatment we have always asked for ourselves. It is my judgment that a greater appropriation to arm and equip the militia of the various States would effectively guard the Republic from any threatened danger and relieve the people from any apprehensions regarding the permanent establishment of an unnecessary military force or power.

As regards the question of "imperialism," with which this seems intimately connected, I apprehend there is little doubt that the provisions of the Constitution of the United States apply at once to all territory that becomes a part of the United States. This seriously affects our revenue and the industries of our people. It would be impossible to levy discriminating duties against their products, and the capital of the world can employ their semislave labor to the disadvantage of American workmen and farmers. As soon as the West and South realize that this policy diverts immigration and capital to the islands of the Pacific, and that development of their industries and the rise of land values are checked in consequence, it will have few adherents in either section.

The North and the distinctively manufacturing centers have begun to realize the trend of the intended legislation, and the protests of their representatives are being recorded. People are set to thinking by self-interest, and it requires but little thought to show the average man that the doctrines of "conquest" and "colonization" are foreign to the spirit of American institutions. There is as much of an "irrepressible conflict" between a government by "consent" and a government by "coercion" as has existed between freedom and serfdom since the first aristocrat conceived the idea of living in the sweat of some other man's face.

What is taxation without representation but a system of "involuntary servitude?" And it has been decreed after due submission to the grim arbitrament of war, it has been solemnly recorded by that court of highest resort, an earnest and awakened people, that from and after the passage of the thirteenth amendment "neither slavery nor involuntary servitude, except as a punishment for crime whereof the party shall have been duly convicted, shall exist within the United States or any place subject to their jurisdiction."

I know there are men who seem to be trying to create the impression that human liberties, national honor, and the great principles of justice are empty, meaningless phrases, to be juggled with and canted over until the distinction between right and wrong is entirely obliterated, and the doctrine of "manifest destiny" has been deftly substituted for the teachings of the Sermon on the Mount. To such the quotation from Lowell is strikingly applicable;

Think you truth a farthing rushlight to be pinched out when you will
With your deft official fingers and your politician's skill?
Is your God a wooden fetich to be hidden out of sight,
That his dull eyes may not see you do the thing that is not right?

It is easy to write the word "relinquished," as applied to Spanish dominion in Cuba, and "ceded" in the treaty provisions concerning the islands of the other hemisphere. It is easy to designate forcible annexation as "criminal aggression" when applied to Cuba, and "benevolent assimilation" in speaking of the Philippines, but are not the rights of these alien people identical. If either is to be discriminated against, why should it be the race of whom Admiral Dewey in his cablegram of August 28, 1898, said:

These people are far superior in their intelligence and more capable of self-government than the natives of Cuba, and I am familiar with both races.

Since July 4, 1776, certain great political theorems have been graven on the page of history by the people of the United States of America. "Taxation without representation is tyranny." "Resistance to tyranny is obedience to God." "All men are born free and equal, and endowed by their Creator with certain inalienable rights." "Governments derive their just powers from the consent of the governed." These are trite truths. Perhaps a little old-fashioned, but they have been held up to the children of America as worthy of acceptance for more than a hundred years. Who will take them down? [Applause.]

Mr. JETT. Mr. Chairman, I now yield to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. LAMB].

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

Mr. JETT. I now yield to the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. STALLINGS].

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

Mr. JETT. I now yield to the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. MAXWELL] fifteen minutes, or such time as he may desire.

Mr. MAXWELL. Mr. Chairman, the pioneer settlers of this country favored peace. The Puritans sought to establish a new home, where they would be free from the persecutions of their enemies. Connecticut and Rhode Island were settled by those

who sought freedom to worship God as they saw fit. These settlements and others aroused the jealousy of the Indians, then very numerous and strong, and who saw that the inevitable result, if the whites were permitted to take possession of their lands, would be their own extinction. Hence bloody wars followed, and the settlers were compelled to defend their homes. It was a matter of self-defense alone, although at times aggressive.

Early in the seventeenth century the French made settlements at Quebec and along the St. Lawrence, and had established trading posts along that river, around the Great Lakes, in the valley of the Ohio, and down the Mississippi, and claimed the entire country as a colony of France. Hence Indian raids upon the frontier settlements of New England, New York, and other colonies, apparently instigated by the French, were of frequent occurrence until the French were driven out of Canada. In all these wars settlers were mustered in as soldiers, although but militia, to defend their homes, and were brave, daring, and reliable.

Braddock's defeat, bad as it was, would have been an utter rout had not the Virginia troops, practically the militia of that colony, under the command of Washington, protected the rear. These colonists were jealous of their rights as freemen. Our fathers were opposed to tyranny in whatever form or by whom exercised. Hence, when it was sought by the English Parliament to impose taxes upon them when they had no voice in the election of its members and no representation, they rebelled. And the fact that the taxes to be raised in this manner were to be applied on the debt incurred by the English Government in driving the French out of Canada was held not to change the principle.

If Parliament could levy taxes upon the colonies for one purpose when they had no representation in that body, then they could levy them for all purposes and practically reduce them to the condition of a conquered people. If they submitted to this injustice, it would be but the beginning of British tyranny, and we glory in their manhood and courage and are thankful to them for their resistance and to God for the success of the Revolution that created this nation. In this connection it may be well to inquire if we are seeking to impose taxes without representation on any of the late colonies of Spain. The Declaration of Independence contains the clearest and most direct statement of the rights of men to be found in any state paper.

It is the foundation upon which this Government is placed, and the Constitution of the United States was framed and adopted to more effectually secure the blessings of liberty, and the Constitution itself is to be construed with reference to the Declaration of Independence. This Declaration has, since its promulgation, been a beacon light to every people who desire to be free. It is the watchword that points the way to liberty, and when carried into effect by any people will secure the downfall of tyranny and oppression. In connection with this Declaration of Independence, the long and arduous services of Washington in conducting the war to a successful termination and then voluntarily surrendering his power to those from whom he received it, stating that he made no charge for his services, was an example of patriotism and disinterestedness that commended him and the new Republic to every friend of the human race.

Byron, in writing after the battle of Waterloo, in commending Washington and the Republic, said:

Can tyrants but by tyrants conquered be,
And freedom find no champion and no child
Such as Columbia saw when she
Sprang forth a Pallas armed but undefled?
Or must such minds be nourished in the wild,
Deep in the unpruned forest, 'midst the roar
Of cataracts,
Where nature smiled on infant Washington;
Has earth no more
Such seed within her breast, or
Europe no such shore?

In his address in September, 1796, Washington said, in speaking of the duty of the nation:

Observe good faith and justice toward all nations; cultivate peace and harmony with all. Religion and morality enjoin this conduct; and can it be that good policy does not equally enjoin it? It will be worthy of free and enlightened (and at no distant period a great) nation to give to mankind the magnanimous and too novel example of a people always guided by an exalted justice and benevolence. Who can doubt that in the course of time and things the fruits of such plan would richly repay a temporary advantage which might be lost by a steady adherence to it?—*Bancroft's Life*, page 493.

In the same address he also said (page 498):

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 performed with perfect good faith. Here let us stop. Europe has a set of primary interests which to us have none or very remote relations. Hence she must be engaged in the 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 enables us to pursue a different course.

He also says (page 496):

So likewise a passionate attachment of one nation for another produces a variety of evils. Sympathy for the favorite nation facilitating the illusion

of an imaginary common interest in cases where no real common interest exists, and infusing into one the enmities of the other, betrays the former into a participation of the quarrels of the latter without adequate inducement or justification. It leads also to concessions to the favorite nation of privileges denied to others which is apt doubly to injure the nation making the concessions by unnecessarily parting with what ought to have been retained, and by exciting jealousy, ill-will, and disposition to retaliate in the parties from whom equal privileges are withheld; and it gives to ambitious, corrupted, or deluded citizens who devote themselves to the favorite nation facility to betray or sacrifice the interest of their own country without odium, sometimes even with popularity; gilding with the appearances of a virtuous sense of obligation a commendable deference to public opinion, or a laudable zeal for the public good the base of foolish compliances of ambition, corruption, or infatuation.

As avenues to foreign influence in innumerable ways, such attachments are particularly alarming to the truly enlightened and independent patriot. How many opportunities do they afford to tamper with domestic factions and practice the arts of seduction to mislead public opinion to influence or awe public councils? Such an attachment of a small or weak toward a great and powerful nation dooms the former to be the satellite of the latter. Against the insidious wiles of foreign influence, I conjure you to believe me, fellow-citizens, the jealousy of a free people ought to be constantly awake, since history and experience prove that foreign influence is one of the most baneful foes of a republican government.

These declarations of the future of the Republic are peculiarly applicable now for reasons that will be stated presently. Before the declaration of war against Spain last year, it was well known that Spain in the conduct of the war against the people of the island of Cuba had resorted to inhuman methods that shocked the sensibilities of our people, and as it was probable that this inhuman mode of warfare would continue indefinitely, there was a general demand on the part of our people that the war should stop. Acting upon this demand of our people, Congress, before a formal declaration of war, in effect declared war against Spain, and in the very act itself solemnly announced to the world that we "disclaimed any disposition or intention to exercise sovereignty, jurisdiction, or control over said island," except for the purpose of pacification, and when that was accomplished we would withdraw. In the first section of the bill we declared "that the people of Cuba are and of a right ought to be free."

The sole object of the bill was to compel the Spaniards to surrender their authority and get out of Cuba and leave the people of that island free to form a government of their own. This voluntary act was precisely like that of a neighbor who would assist another in distress with no thought or expectation of compensation. Had it been intended that this nation should be reimbursed for its expenses, a provision of that kind would have been put in the bill. There certainly was no suggestion of the kind either in the bill itself or on the floor of the House. The fair inference from our declarations as a nation is that the war was not waged for conquest but for humanity.

Porto Rico and the Philippine Islands were not mentioned, or, so far as I know, thought of. All these islands are thickly populated, much more so than Cuba, and the very act of declaring that the Cubans of right ought to be free and independent applies with greater force to Porto Rico and the Philippine Islands. According to our best information the Philippine Islands contain about 114,000 square miles and about 10,000,000 population, and the ratio of population per square mile in Porto Rico, I am informed, is about the same. How can we demand government of the people for Cuba and deny it to the other islands named? We can not do so without stultifying ourselves.

If we are to be indemnified by Spain, let us insist upon payment of an indemnity in money. The plea that she is unable to pay can not be sustained. France, a few years ago, when prostrate at the feet of her conquerors, raised \$1,000,000,000 as an indemnity to Germany. The national debt of France was very large at the time, but she had no difficulty in raising the amount demanded. And there is good reason to believe that Spain could raise the requisite amount. I think we have already expended in this war at least \$200,000,000, and it is proposed to pay Spain for the Philippines \$20,000,000; and what do we get in return? Practically nothing. There are supposed to be about 700 islands, big and little, in the Philippines. With this vast number the expense of policing the islands would be enormous, even if the natives were friendly; but if hostile, it would be greatly increased. The natives, as a rule, know nothing of our language, religion, or form of government, and are pagans, Mohammedans, and followers of Confucius. They wear but little clothing, and live almost wholly on the food of the Tropics. Will anyone contend that such a people is a valuable acquisition to any nation? I think not. The life of one of our soldiers or seamen is worth more to us than the islands.

As a nation we have the high sense of honor possessed by Washington, and I trust we will not depart from the ancient landmarks. But it is said our Army is already in the Philippine Islands and that it is confronted by a large force of the natives, who claim to have set up a government of their own. The answer to this is that we have no cause of war against the natives of those islands. Our troops were sent there to drive out the Spaniards, not to make war on the people. It is said, however, that these people are not fit to govern themselves and we should hold the islands as colonies, and we are referred to Great Britain, which, it is said, has

added greatly to her power and wealth by reason of her colonies and conquests.

Her rule in India, if reports apparently reliable can be credited, has been that of an absolute tyrant. The people have no voice in the government, and no salaried offices of importance are given to the natives. She rules India with a rod of iron, and while she has made many improvements there calculated to benefit the country, they have been made as investments and not as works of charity and good will to the people. But five years ago the council of state for India in London, without notice, in one day closed India's mints, discredited the money which had been almost exclusively in use from time immemorial, and caused intense suffering, sickness, starvation, and death among the poor.

Do the people of this country desire such colonies? If so, the plea should be placed on other grounds than humanity. But it is said that Great Britain is exceedingly anxious to have us hold the Philippines, and that her statesmen and public journals are doing all they can to promote this desire among our people, and that British influence all over this nation is being exerted in that behalf. If so, I commend the words of Washington which I have quoted to the attention of Congress and the American people. We wish to remain on friendly terms with England, as with all other nations, but to have no entangling alliances with her or any other nation.

One of the evil effects of annexation would be the influx of cheap labor from the Philippines. Being territory of the United States, their right to pass from State to State could not be denied. We are all interested in having labor well paid for its service, as a man or woman who receives enough to provide comfortably for his or her family and lay up something for a rainy day is a better citizen every way; and when all are employed at fair wages the country is prosperous. We sometimes hear it said that certain industries can be carried on successfully if wages can be reduced to a certain level. The proper mode of estimating such things would seem to be to fix wages at a fair rate and then make deductions as far as possible in other things. But we are gravely told that we need our Army of 100,000 men to meet any exigency that may arise.

The next census of this nation, to be taken next year, will show from 75,000,000 to 78,000,000 people herein, and in the next ten years we will in all probability pass the 90,000,000 mark. We have unbounded resources, and our people are active, industrious, intelligent, and patriotic, and ready at any time to defend the flag if occasion requires. No nation in the world can cope with us in a just cause. France has a population of about 40,000,000, and the birth rate is but little in excess of the death rate. Germany has a population of about 50,000,000; Austria-Hungary of 41,000,000. Russia, 113,000,000, and the British Isles nearly 40,000,000. In point of numbers Russia is the only nation that equals or exceeds ours, but she is deficient in both money and resources, and lacks the cohesion among her population possessed by ourselves. Of the other nations Great Britain is the only one that would be formidable, but she would have to succumb, and that speedily, to the young giant of the West. But we have no desire to go to war.

This is a Christian nation, and the Golden Rule is the standard of the highest character. We intend to treat every other nation courteously, fairly, and honorably. If our nation could be personified by the character of one individual, it would be that of a peaceable, active, intelligent, industrious, enterprising, reliable, honorable, and upright gentleman. We propose to give no cause of offense, and be honorable in our dealings, and anticipate no war. We have nothing to fear from the Indians in the United States. At the present time they are all on reservations or on their allotments of land, and need no troops to hold them in subjection. A standing army is always a menace to free government, and in a republic should not be maintained in time of peace. I admire the bravery and efficiency of our Regular Army, and I am in favor of a sufficient number of regular soldiers that the service may demand.

I think, notwithstanding the disparaging remarks as to its organization, that it will compare favorably with the army of any other nation. And in my view its organization, effected by our able generals, men skilled in the art of war, and that have made the Army strong and efficient, should not be radically changed for untried experiment. A free people, however, must rely upon volunteers in case an army is required. A volunteer soldiery possesses an energy, dash, vim, and staying qualities that are hard to excel. The volunteers tender their services to the Government for the purpose of fighting in the war in which the nation is engaged, and may be relied upon to use every effort to secure a victory. Cromwell, with his volunteers, although not so well drilled as the troops opposed to him, overcame the regular army under Charles I, and the volunteers in our civil war and the late war with Spain were brave, active, intelligent, efficient, reliable, and intensely patriotic.

Let a just cause of war arise between this nation and any other and a million men would spring to arms at once for offense or defense. But we will have no war with any other nation, and our

people are law abiding, and it is unnecessary to have an army to preserve the peace or enforce the law. In the early history of this nation, when the Indians, in armed bands many thousands strong, attacked our frontier settlements, carrying murder and devastation wherever they went, and foreign foes were threatening the nation from without, we had but a skeleton of a regular army, the principal reliance being the citizen soldiery, and it performed its duty well and restored peace to the nation. [Applause.]

Three thousand years ago a prophet declared that after a certain time the nations should study war no more. Now, on the eve of the twentieth century, the prophecy seems in a fair way to be fulfilled, and a desire exists among the nations to settle differences by arbitration, and there is a probable reduction of armies of the several nations in the near future. I hope we will not impede the march of universal peace. Our nation can easily support half a billion population. Our resources, which are almost without limit, are but beginning to be developed. We have exhaustless mines of gold, silver, iron, copper, and other minerals, and oils without limit. The waters which flow from the Rocky Mountains, if utilized for irrigation, would irrigate a large part of the semiarid lands of the nation, and an amount of money equal to that spent in this war with Spain would accomplish this result and add greatly to our production.

There are grave questions in our own nation to be settled in the near future that require wise statesmanship and dispassionate action. Let us see to it that our laws are just and equal, and are administered with impartiality and fairness, and that the rights of all and every class of citizens are fostered and protected, and our own people will be prosperous and happy without being embroiled in the contentions and controversies of other nations. [Applause.]

Mr. JETT. Mr. Chairman, I now yield to the gentleman from California [Mr. CASTLE].

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

Mr. MARSH. Mr. Chairman, I move that the committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

The committee accordingly rose; and Mr. CONNOLLY having resumed the chair as Speaker pro tempore, Mr. LACEY, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that committee had had under consideration the bill H. R. 11022, and had come to no resolution thereon.

Mr. MARSH. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to.

And accordingly (at 11 o'clock and 14 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, the following executive and other communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

A letter from the receiver of the Capital Railway Company, transmitting the statement of that company for the year 1898—to the Committee on the District of Columbia, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a copy of a communication from the Secretary of the Navy, submitting certain estimates for the navy-yards at Washington and League Island—to the Committee on Naval Affairs, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a list of the leases granted during the calendar year 1898—to the Committee on Military Affairs, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Secretary of State, transmitting a copy of the preliminary report of Mr. E. L. Corthell, representative of the United States at the Seventh International Congress of Navigation at Brussels—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting, with a letter from the Chief of Engineers, copy of a report containing estimate of the cost of improvement of Mystic River—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of a bill to extend the operation of "An act to provide for the examination and classification of certain mineral lands in the States of Montana and Idaho"—to the Committee on the Public Lands, 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. MILLS, from the Committee on the Public Lands, to which

was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 10831) for the relief of certain homestead settlers in Florida, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1838); which said bill and report were referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. CUMMINGS, from the Committee on the Library, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 11256) to provide for the erection of a memorial to the soldiers of the Second United States Volunteer Cavalry killed in a railroad accident at Tupelo, Miss., reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1850); which said bill and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS 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. MIERS of Indiana, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 4246) granting an increase of pension to Margaret Love Skerrett, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1829); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. WARNER, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 6810) for the relief of Mary Luella Steele, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1830); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. RAY of New York, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 10013) to increase the pension of Joseph H. McGee, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1831); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. WARNER, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 8610) granting a pension to Minnie B. Titus, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1832); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 5712) granting a pension to Sarah A. Luke, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1833); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. CASTLE, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 11017) to restore Jesse Everly to the pension roll of the United States, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1834); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. WARNER, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 5805) for the relief of Col. George G. Pride, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1835); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 10417) for the relief of James H. Nichols, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1836); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. STURTEVANT, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 5796) granting a pension of \$50 per month to Capt. Peter E. Shipler, late of Company G, Tenth Pennsylvania Reserve Corps, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1837); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. HENRY of Connecticut, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 2729) granting a pension to Lydia E. Bowers, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1839); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 2122) increasing the pension of William R. Christy, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1840); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. NORTON of Ohio, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 8445) granting a pension to Joseph N. Harmon, of West Union, Ohio, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1841); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 204) granting a pension to Ann E. Cooley, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1842); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. BREWSTER, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 8955) granting an increase of pension to Richard M. Hussey, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1843); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. SAMUEL W. SMITH, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 4622) granting an increase of pension to John S. Beaty, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1844); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. STURTEVANT, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 9415) granting an increase of pension to Dr. Henry Bullen, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1845); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. BOTKIN, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 4324) granting a pension to Martha Allen, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1846); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. KERR, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 1675) for the benefit of Alice Smith, of Newport, Ky., reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1847); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 10345) granting an increase of pension to Abram O. Kindy, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1848); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 9359) to pension Charles H. Barber, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1849); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. WEAVER, from the Committee on War Claims, to which was referred House bill 5278, reported in lieu thereof a resolution (House Res. No. 379) to refer the claim of Hamlin Caldwell to the Court of Claims, accompanied by a report (No. 1851); which said resolution and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. STALLINGS, from the Committee on Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 383) granting an increase of pension to William W. Tumbler, of Bradford County, Fla., reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1852); 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. 290) granting a pension to Charlotte Poe, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1853); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. STRODE of Nebraska, from the Committee on Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 4871) granting an increase of pension to Eleazer Smith, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1854); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. STALLINGS, from the Committee on Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 2786) granting a pension to Martha E. Huddleston, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1855); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. STRODE of Nebraska, from the Committee on Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 3002) to pension William Russell for services in Oregon Indian wars, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1856); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. SAMUEL W. SMITH, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 2092) granting an increase of pension to Byron R. Pierce, reported the same with an amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1857); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. CASTLE, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 6876) to increase the pension of George Alexander, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1858); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. STALLINGS, from the Committee on Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 304) granting a pension to Henry Farmer, reported the same with an amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1859); 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. 285) granting a pension to Mary L. Roderick, reported the same with an amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1860); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. BELKNAP, from the Committee on Military Affairs, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 1417) for the relief

of Thomas Mullen, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1861); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

PUBLIC BILLS, RESOLUTIONS, AND MEMORIALS INTRODUCED.

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

By Mr. DAVIS: A bill (H. R. 11812) providing for the erection of a public building at the city of Gainesville, Fla., and for other purposes—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. LESTER (by request): A bill (H. R. 11813) to establish a system of Indian medical service, and for other purposes—to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. SOUTHARD: A bill (H. R. 11814) to encourage the holding of an American fair in conjunction with the Ohio Centennial and Northwest Territory Exposition at the city of Toledo, Ohio—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HOPKINS: A bill (H. R. 11815) to provide for taking the Twelfth and subsequent censuses—to the Committee on the Twelfth Census.

By Mr. ALEXANDER: A bill (H. R. 11816) to authorize and encourage the holding of a Pan-American Exposition on the Niagara frontier, within the county of Erie or Niagara, in the State of New York, in the year 1901—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HILBORN: A joint memorial from the California legislature, requesting the completion of Port San Luis Breakwater, in the State of California—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

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. GRIFFITH: A bill (H. R. 11817) granting a pension to Mary A. McGowen—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. KERR: A bill (H. R. 11818) granting an increase of pension to Jesse Snyder—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11819) to remove the charge of desertion against Peter Mott—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. LACEY: A bill (H. R. 11820) granting a pension to Taylor Hux—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MADDOX: A bill (H. R. 11821) for the relief of W. L. Kinsey, of Catoosa County, Ga.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11822) for the relief of C. J. Shelverton, of Austell, Ga.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11823) for the relief of S. H. Martin, of Catoosa County, Ga.—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. MEEKISON: A bill (H. R. 11824) granting a pension to Smith Jewell—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. POWERS: A bill (H. R. 11825) correcting the military record of Z. A. Cornell—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. YOST: A bill (H. R. 11826) for the relief of George S. Day & Bro.—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. FARIS: A bill (H. R. 11827) increasing pension of Albert Morrison—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11828) granting a pension to Alsey E. Potts—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11829) increasing the pension of Levi Wright—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11830) increasing pension of Henry Staff—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SWANSON: A bill (H. R. 11831) for the relief of Kate Winter—to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. WEAVER: A resolution (House Res. No. 379) to refer the claim of Hamlin Caldwell to the Court of Claims—to the Private Calendar.

PETITIONS, ETC.

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

By Mr. ACHESON: Petition of the Claysville (Pa.) Woman's Christian Temperance Union, to prohibit the sale of liquor in canteens and in immigrant stations and Government buildings—to the Committee on Alcoholic Liquor Traffic.

By Mr. ADAMS: Petition of the State Association of Retail Grocers, at Reading, Pa., January 11 and 12, 1899, favoring the passage of the Brosius pure food and drug bill—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BELL: Resolutions of Companies B, D, E, and H, First Infantry, National Guard of Colorado, for an increase in the appropriation for the maintenance of the National Guard—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. BURLEIGH: Petitions of J. A. Adams and 75 citizens of Unita, Me., favoring the establishment of postal savings banks—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. BUTLER: Petitions of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Middletown, Pa., and Methodist Episcopal Church and Friends' Meeting of Lansdowne, Pa., to prohibit the sale of intoxicating liquors in canteens and in immigrant stations and in Government buildings—to the Committee on Alcoholic Liquor Traffic.

By Mr. CANNON: Papers to accompany House bill No. 10972, to increase the pension of Marie L. Apgar—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CAPRON: Resolution of Cigar Makers' Union No. 94, of Pawtucket, R. I., against the acquisition of the Philippines—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. COOPER of Texas: Petitions of G. M. Boynton, M. D., and 205 citizens of Swift, Tex., favoring the establishment of postal savings banks—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

Also, petitions of lumber dealers and other firms in the vicinity of Orange; pilots, merchants, and others, of Sabine Pass; and lumbermen, mill owners, and others, of Beaumont and vicinity, all in the State of Texas, asking for the passage of Senate bill No. 1114, for the establishment of a light-house and fog signal at Sabine Pass, Tex.—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. CUMMINGS: Petition of William Gleason and 17 citizens of Rochester, N. Y., for equal political rights to the women of Hawaii—to the Committee on the Territories.

By Mr. DALZELL: Resolutions of the Fourth Avenue Baptist Church, of Pittsburg, Pa., against the seating of a polygamist—to the Committee on Elections No. 1.

Also, resolution of the Boston Chamber of Commerce, in favor of the passage of House bill No. 10524, relating to the organization of the consular service—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. DAVIS: Petition of Mrs. Anna E. Rainey and 27 citizens of St. Augustine, Fla., to prohibit the sale of liquor in canteens and in immigrant stations and Government buildings—to the Committee on Alcoholic Liquor Traffic.

By Mr. EDDY: Petitions of John Foltz and 202 citizens of St. Lawrence, Minn., favoring the establishment of postal savings banks—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. ERMENTROUT: Memorial of Mrs. Winthrop Cowdin, and many other women, committee, favoring the employment of graduate women nurses in the hospital service of the United States Army—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. FARIS: Petitions of citizens of Montezuma, Terre Haute, Joseph, Jackson, Rockville, Poland, Brazil, Dana, Marshall, and Tilden, in the State of Indiana, to prohibit the sale of liquor in canteens and in immigrant stations and Government buildings—to the Committee on Alcoholic Liquor Traffic.

By Mr. FLEMING: Petitions of S. W. Whitfield and 89 citizens of Powells, Ga., in favor of the establishment of postal savings banks—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. FOWLER of New Jersey: Remonstrance of ladies of the Home Mission Society of the Central Baptist Church, of Elizabeth, N. J., against the seating of Brigham H. Roberts as a Representative from Utah—to the Committee on Elections No. 1.

Also, petition of the Board of Trade of Elizabeth, N. J., favoring the enactment of laws to regulate express companies—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, resolutions of the mayor and council of the borough of Undercliff, N. J., favoring a naval station on the banks of the Hudson River—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. GRAHAM: Petition of the State Association of Retail Grocers, held at Reading, Pa., January 11 and 12, 1899, C. E. Woods, secretary, urging the enactment of the Brosius bill to prevent the adulteration of food—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, resolutions of the Chamber of Commerce of the State of New York, asking for the passage of House bill No. 10524, relating to the reorganization of the consular service—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, resolution of the Manufacturers and Producers' Association of California, praying for the establishment of cable communication between San Francisco and the Orient, and also that the cable used in its construction shall be made in the United States and by American manufacturers—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. GRIFFITH: Petitions of C. O. Platt and 39 citizens of Manchester, A. S. Deputy and 51 citizens of Paris Crossing, Paul M. Greider and 48 citizens of Hope, D. A. West and 30 citizens of Decatur County, in the State of Indiana, favoring legislation to prohibit the sale of liquor in canteens and in immigrant stations and Government buildings—to the Committee on Alcoholic Liquor Traffic.

By Mr. HAGER: Petitions of the Methodist Episcopal Church, Sunday school and Epworth League of the Methodist Episcopal

Church of Little Sioux, Iowa, in favor of House bill No. 7937, for the abolition of the canteen system in the United States Army, Government buildings, etc.—to the Committee on Alcoholic Liquor Traffic.

By Mr. HILBORN: Resolutions of the Mechanics' Institute, of San Francisco, Cal., favoring a submarine cable from San Francisco to Honolulu, Japan, and the Philippines—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. HULL: Petitions of the Willard Woman's Christian Temperance Union, Pilgrim Congregational Church, and the North Park Congregational Church, all of Des Moines, Iowa; Baptist Church of Riceville, Iowa, and Presbyterian Church of East Des Moines, Iowa, to prohibit the sale of liquor in canteens and in immigrant stations and Government buildings—to the Committee on Alcoholic Liquor Traffic.

Also, petitions of the Willard Woman's Christian Temperance Union, Pilgrim Congregational Church, and North Park Congregational Church, of Des Moines, Iowa, and the Presbyterian Church of East Des Moines, Iowa, for the maintenance of prohibition in Alaska—to the Committee on Alcoholic Liquor Traffic.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Indiana: Petitions of citizens of Shelbyville and other towns in the State of Indiana, to prohibit sale of intoxicating liquors in canteens, in immigrant stations, and in Government buildings—to the Committee on Alcoholic Liquor Traffic.

By Mr. KNOX: Petition of Charles O. Noble and 201 citizens of Woburn, Mass., favoring postal savings banks—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. LACEY: Paper to accompany House bill relating to the pension claim of R. Taylor Hux, helpless child of John Hux—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LANDIS: Petition of citizens of Ladoga, Ind., and Prairie Center Christian Endeavor Society, of Frankfort, Ind., to prohibit the sale of liquor in canteens, in immigrant stations, and in Government buildings—to the Committee on Alcoholic Liquor Traffic.

By Mr. MCCALL: Petition of the executive officers of the missionary societies of the Baptist, Congregational, Episcopal, Methodist, Presbyterian, and Reformed churches, against the seating of Representative-elect B. H. Roberts, of Utah—to the Committee on Elections No. 1.

Also, petition of the executive officers of the missionary societies of the Baptist Church and others, against sectarian appropriations—to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. McLAIN: Petitions of the boards of supervisors of the counties of Yazoo, Amite, and Simpson, State of Mississippi, for the improvement of the harbor at Gulfport, Miss.—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. MAHON: Petitions of the Presbyterian Church of Alexandria, Pa., and the Methodist Episcopal and Presbyterian churches and Woman's Christian Temperance Union of East Waterford, Pa., praying for the abolition of the canteen system in the United States Army, Government buildings, etc.—to the Committee on Alcoholic Liquor Traffic.

By Mr. PACKER of Pennsylvania: Petitions of the Third Street Methodist Episcopal Church, Mulberry Street Methodist Episcopal Church, East End Baptist Church, Prohibition League, and three Woman's Christian Temperance unions, all of Williamsport, Pa.; Presbyterian, Methodist, Lutheran, and Baptist churches of Muncy, Pa., and Stillman Woman's Christian Temperance Union, of Eulalia, Pa., to prohibit the sale of liquor in canteens and in immigrant stations and Government buildings—to the Committee on Alcoholic Liquor Traffic.

By Mr. RAY of New York: Petitions of the First Baptist Church, State Street Methodist Episcopal Church, and First Congregational Church, of Ithaca, N. Y.; Baptist Church of Newark Valley, and union meeting of Methodist and Congregational churches of Newark Valley, N. Y., to prohibit the sale of liquor in Government buildings—to the Committee on Alcoholic Liquor Traffic.

By Mr. RICHARDSON: Petition of Mary E. Winn, now Richards, of Rapides Parish, La., praying reference of her war claim to the Court of Claims—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, petition of George Meek, of Alcorn County, Miss., praying reference of his war claim to the Court of Claims—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, petition of D. W. F. Peoples, of Washington County, Tenn., praying reference of his war claim to the Court of Claims—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. RIXEY: Petition of 114 citizens of Lincoln, Va., to prohibit the sale of liquor in canteens and in immigrant stations and Government buildings—to the Committee on Alcoholic Liquor Traffic.

By Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana: Petition of citizens of Maple Grove, Lagrange County, Ind., to prohibit the sale of liquor in canteens and in immigrant stations and Government buildings—to the Committee on Alcoholic Liquor Traffic.

By Mr. ROYSE: Petition of citizens of Millersburg and Plymouth, Ind., to prohibit the sale of liquor in canteens, in immigrant stations, and in Government buildings—to the Committee on Alcoholic Liquor Traffic.

By Mr. SHERMAN: Resolution of Clinton Grange, No. 30, in reference to restoring ocean carrying trade in vessels sailing under the American flag—to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. SIMPSON: Petition of the Methodist Episcopal, Baptist, and Cumberland Presbyterian churches and Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Mayfield, Kans., to prohibit the sale of liquor in Government buildings, etc.—to the Committee on Alcoholic Liquor Traffic.

Also, petition of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union and certain churches of Mayfield, Kans., to forbid the transmission of lottery messages by telegraph—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. SOUTHARD: Petition of Wright Chapter, Epworth League, and the Monroe Street Methodist Episcopal Church, of Toledo, Ohio, asking for the passage of the Ellis bill to forbid the sale of intoxicating beverages in Government buildings, etc.—to the Committee on Alcoholic Liquor Traffic.

Also, petition of Epworth League of the Methodist Episcopal Church of Toledo, Ohio, to forbid the transmission of lottery messages by telegraph—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. STARK: Papers to accompany Senate bill No. 5090, to authorize Victor Vifquain, colonel of the Third Nebraska Volunteer Infantry, to accept the decoration of the Order of the Double Dragon from the Emperor of China—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. STEELE: Petitions of Charles Davis and 40 citizens, George Washington and 45 citizens, all of Marion, Ind.; Christian Endeavor Society, George R. Hollingsworth, and 35 citizens, of Kokomo; R. F. Schuler and 65 members of the Christian Endeavor Society, J. M. Lowman and 26 members of the Christian Endeavor Society, all of Roann, Ind.; A. J. Wilson and 100 citizens of Fairmont; William Hale and 44 citizens of Fairfield; George W. Lybrook and 29 citizens of Honey Creek; George A. Yopst and 50 others, of the Christian Church of Huntington, Ind., to prohibit the sale of liquor in canteens, in immigrant stations, and in Government buildings—to the Committee on Alcoholic Liquor Traffic.

By Mr. STURTEVANT: Petitions of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union and Methodist Episcopal Church of McLane, Pa., and the Young People's Society of Christian Endeavor of Erie, Pa., to prohibit the sale of liquor in canteens and in immigrant stations and Government buildings—to the Committee on Alcoholic Liquor Traffic.

By Mr. SULLOWAY: Petition of the Congregational Church of Gilmanton Iron Works, N. H., praying for legislation to prohibit the sale of liquor in canteens of the Army and Navy and of Soldiers' Homes, and in immigrant stations and Government buildings—to the Committee on Alcoholic Liquor Traffic.

SENATE.

FRIDAY, *January 27, 1899.*

Prayer by Rev. STOWELL L. BRYANT, of the city of Washington.

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

CONTRACTS FOR ARMY SUPPLIES.

The VICE-PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of War, transmitting a letter from the Quartermaster-General of the Army calling attention to the necessity for continuing the suspension of the provisions of the act of June 7, 1898, entitled "An act to suspend the operations of certain provisions of law relating to the War Department, and for other purposes," which, with the accompanying papers, was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs, and ordered to be printed.

S. BOLTON & SONS.

The VICE-PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting, in response to a resolution of the 25th instant, the opinion of the Attorney-General in the case of S. Bolton & Sons, made in reference to an appropriation in the sundry civil appropriation act approved July 1, 1898; which, with the accompanying papers, was referred to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

REPORT OF CITY AND SUBURBAN RAILWAY.

The VICE-PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the annual report of the City and Suburban Railway, of the District of Columbia, for the year ended December 31, 1898; which was referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia, and ordered to be printed.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE.

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. H. L. OVERSTREET, one of its clerks, announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment to the Senate to the concurrent resolution of the House relating to the furnishing of one complete set of the Official Records of the Union and Confederate Armies to each Senator and Representative and Delegate of the Fifty-fifth Congress not already entitled by law to receive the same.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED.

The message also announced that the Speaker of the House had signed the following enrolled bills; and they were thereupon signed by the Vice-President:

A bill (H. R. 8882) for the establishment and reconstruction of a light-house at or near the mouth of Salem Creek, New Jersey; and

A bill (H. R. 10459) to amend section 5 of the act approved June 10, 1880, governing the immediate transportation of dutiable goods without appraisement.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS.

The VICE-PRESIDENT presented a petition of the trustees of the Public Library of Boston, Mass., praying that an appropriation be made for the Royal Society index of scientific publications; which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

He also presented a petition of the board of directors of the Chamber of Commerce of Cleveland, Ohio, praying for the passage of the Navy personnel bill; which was ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. PLATT of New York presented a petition of Local Grange No. 214, Patrons of Husbandry, of Marion, N. Y., praying for the enactment of legislation to increase American shipping; which was referred to the Committee on Commerce.

He also presented a petition of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Perry, N. Y., praying for the enactment of legislation to prohibit interstate gambling by telegraph, telephone, or otherwise; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also presented petitions of the congregation of the First Methodist Episcopal Church of Lockport, of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Lockport, and of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Perry, all in the State of New York, praying for the enactment of legislation to prohibit the sale of liquor in canteens of the Army and Navy and of Soldiers' Homes, and in immigrant stations and Government buildings; which were referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

He also presented sundry petitions of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Auburn, N. Y., praying for the maintenance of the prohibition law in the Territory of Alaska; which were referred to the Committee on Territories.

He also presented a petition of the Building Trades Council of Rochester, N. Y., praying for the passage of the eight-hour bill; which was referred to the Committee on Education and Labor.

Mr. PENROSE presented a memorial of Local Union No. 295, Cigar Makers' International Union, of Scranton, Pa., remonstrating against the annexation of the Philippine Islands; which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

He also presented a petition of the Young People's Temperance Society of the First Methodist Episcopal Church of Germantown, Philadelphia, Pa., praying for the enactment of legislation to prohibit the transmission by mail or interstate commerce of pictures or descriptions of prize fights; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also presented a petition of the Young People's Temperance Society of the First Methodist Episcopal Church of Germantown, Philadelphia, Pa., praying for the maintenance of the prohibition laws in Alaska, the Indian Territory, and to extend it to the new possessions of the United States; which was referred to the Committee on Territories.

He also presented petitions of the Board of Trade of Philadelphia; of sundry business men of Philadelphia, and of the Grocers and Importers' Exchange of Philadelphia, all in the State of Pennsylvania, praying that an appropriation be made to provide for the continuance of the pneumatic-tube system in that city; which were referred to the Committee on Post-Offices and Post-Roads.

He also presented petitions of the Agricultural Society of Perry County; of the Pennsylvania Retail Jewelers' Association; of the American Association of Flint and Lime Glass Manufacturers of Pittsburgh, and of the Commercial Club of Patton, all in the State of Pennsylvania, praying for the enactment of legislation to increase American shipping; which were referred to the Committee on Commerce.

He also presented petitions of the congregation of the First Baptist Church of Williamsport; of the Young People's Temperance Society of the First Methodist Episcopal Church of Germantown, Philadelphia; of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Canton; of the Young People's Society of Christian Endeavor