

regard to freedom of private property on the sea from capture during war—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, petition of the Regular Army and Navy Union, Garrison No. 8, favoring amendment to the Navy personnel bill providing for the organization of the clerical force of the Navy—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. MIERS of Indiana: Petitions of citizens of Knox County, D. H. Hooley and 200 citizens of Topeka, H. W. Schroeder and 208 citizens of Westphalia, Ind., urging the establishment of postal savings banks—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

Also, petitions of citizens of Bloomington, Vincennes, Worthington, Monroe, and Mitchell, 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. OSBORNE: Petitions of Thomas McGrath and 221 citizens of Miners Delight, Wyo., in favor of the establishment of postal savings banks—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. PAYNE: Resolutions of Myron M. Fish Post, No. 406, Grand Army of the Republic, Department of New York, for amendment of the pension laws—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. ROBB: Petitions of Solon J. Upton and 223 citizens of Licking, Mo., favoring the establishment of postal savings banks—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. STEPHENS of Texas: Petition of Alexander Jamison and other fourth-class postmasters of Palo Pinto County, Tex., urging the passage of House bills Nos. 4930 and 4931, for increase of compensation—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. TERRY: Petition of W. M. Wright and 16 other letter-carriers, of Little Rock, Ark., asking that the law be so amended as to allow forty-eight hours for six days' service—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. TONGUE: Petition of Simpson Chapel and Monroe Methodist Episcopal churches, of Benton County, Ore., to prohibit the reproduction of prize fights and the interstate transmission of devices for the same—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of Simpson Chapel and Monroe Methodist Episcopal churches, of Benton County, Ore., favoring the passage of a bill prohibiting the sale of alcoholic liquors in Government buildings, etc.—to the Committee on Alcoholic Liquor Traffic.

By Mr. VINCENT: Petition of postmasters in Republic County, Kans., asking for the passage of a bill increasing the compensation of fourth-class postmasters—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. WALKER of Massachusetts: Petition of 8 fourth-class postmasters in the Third Congressional district of Massachusetts, urging the passage of House bills Nos. 4930 and 4931, relating to the compensation of fourth-class postmasters—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. WEYMOUTH: Petition of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Gardner, Mass., protesting against the seating of Brigham H. Roberts as a Representative from Utah—to the Committee on Elections No. 1.

By Mr. YOUNG: Resolutions of the Merchants' Association of New York, in reference to freedom of private property on the sea from capture during war—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

## SENATE.

TUESDAY, February 7, 1899.

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

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Secretary will read the Journal of yesterday's proceedings.

Mr. ALLEN. Mr. President, I think there ought to be a quorum present. There ought to be at least more Senators present than are here now.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The absence of a quorum is suggested by the Senator from Nebraska. The Secretary will call the roll.

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

Allen,	Gorman,	Martin,	Roach,
Allison,	Hanna,	Mitchell,	Ross,
Berry,	Hansbrough,	Money,	Sewell,
Burrows,	Harris,	Morgan,	Shoup,
Butler,	Hawley,	Murphy,	Smith,
Carter,	Jones, Ark.	Nelson,	Stewart,
Chandler,	Jones, Nev.	Pasco,	Teller,
Clark,	Kennedy,	Perkins,	Tillman,
Cookrell,	Lindsay,	Pettigrew,	Turley,
Cullom,	Lodge,	Pettus,	Warren,
Davis,	McBride,	Platt, Conn.	Wellington,
Deboe,	McEnery,	Platt, N. Y.	Wolcott.
Gallinger,	Mallory,	Pritchard,	
Gar,	Mantle,	Rawlins,	

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Fifty-four Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present. The Secretary will read the Journal of yesterday's proceedings.

Mr. LODGE. I ask unanimous consent that the reading be dispensed with.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Is there any objection? The Chair hears none, and the order is made.

### ABSTRACT OF MILITIA FORCE.

The VICE-PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of War, transmitting an abstract of the militia force of the United States, according to the latest returns received at the Office of the Adjutant-General of the Army, for the year 1898; which, with the accompanying papers, was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs, and ordered to be printed.

### CREDENTIALS.

Mr. SPOONER presented the credentials of Joseph Very Quarles, chosen by the legislature of Wisconsin a Senator from that State for the term beginning March 4, 1899; which were read, and ordered to be filed.

Mr. PLATT of Connecticut presented the credentials of JOSEPH R. HAWLEY, chosen by the legislature of Connecticut a Senator from that State for the term beginning March 4, 1899; which were read, and ordered to be filed.

### MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE.

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. W. J. BROWNING, its Chief Clerk, announced that the House had passed the following bill and joint resolutions:

A bill (S. 2768) to grant lands to the State of Alabama for the use of the Industrial School for Girls in Alabama and of the Tuscegee Normal and Industrial Institute;

A joint resolution (S. R. 218) authorizing the Secretary of the Navy to receive for instruction at the Naval Academy, at Annapolis, Ricardo Yglesias, of Porto Rico; and

A joint resolution (S. R. 219) authorizing the Secretary of the Navy to receive for instruction at the Naval Academy, at Annapolis, Alberto Valenzuela Montoya, of Colombia.

The message also announced that the House had passed the following bills; in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

A bill (H. R. 321) for the relief of the Berdan Firearms Manufacturing Company;

A bill (H. R. 4382) to establish a national military park to commemorate the campaign, siege, and defense of Vicksburg;

A bill (H. R. 8694) to enable the city of Albuquerque, N. Mex., to create certain indebtedness, and for other purposes;

A bill (H. R. 11247) to extend the anti-contract labor laws of the United States to Hawaii;

A bill (H. R. 11815) to provide for taking the Twelfth and subsequent censuses; and

A bill (H. R. 12009) to provide for the removal of snow and ice in the city of Washington, in the District of Columbia.

The message further announced that the House had agreed to the concurrent resolution of the Senate to print 3,000 copies of the Proceedings of the National Fishery Congress, held at Tampa, Fla., January 19 to 24, 1898.

### ENROLLED BILL SIGNED.

The message also announced that the Speaker of the House had signed the enrolled bill (H. R. 11487) making appropriations for the diplomatic and consular service for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1900; and it was thereupon signed by the Vice-President.

### PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS.

Mr. LODGE presented a petition of the Board of Trade of Lowell, Mass., praying for the retention of the Philippine Islands; which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

He also presented the petition of Susan B. Anthony and 15 other citizens of Rochester, N. Y., praying that the right of suffrage be granted to women in Hawaii; which was referred to the Select Committee on Woman Suffrage.

Mr. NELSON presented a petition of local union No. 361, United Brotherhood of Carpenters and Joiners, of Duluth, Minn., praying for the passage of the eight-hour bill; which was referred to the Committee on Education and Labor.

Mr. PLATT of New York presented petitions of the congregations of the Methodist Episcopal Church of Brownville, of sundry churches of Sandy Hill and Glens Falls, and of the Summer School of Social Problems, of Saratoga, all in the State of New York, praying for the enactment of legislation to prohibit the transmission by mail or interstate commerce of pictures and descriptions of prize fights; which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also presented a petition of local union No. 67, United Brotherhood of Carpenters and Joiners, of New York City, N. Y., and a petition of local branch No. 549, Amalgamated Society of

Engineers, of Buffalo, N. Y., praying for the passage of the eight-hour bill; which were referred to the Committee on Education and Labor.

He also presented a petition of the Summer School of Social Problems, of Saratoga, N. Y., praying for the enactment of legislation to limit absolute divorce; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also presented petitions of 18 citizens of the United States engaged in mission work in Bulgaria and Macedonia, of the congregations of sundry churches of Sandy Hill, the First Congregational Church of Lockport, the Methodist Episcopal Church of Brookfield, of sundry churches of Glens Falls, and of the Summer School of Social Problems, of Saratoga, 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 a petition of the congregations of sundry churches of Sandy Hill and Glens Falls and of the Summer School of Social Problems, of Saratoga, all in the State of New York, 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 the petition of John A. Barhite and sundry other citizens of Rochester, N. Y., praying that women be granted the right of suffrage in Hawaii; which was referred to the Select Committee on Woman Suffrage.

Mr. HARRIS presented the petitions of D. W. Duskin and 103 other citizens of Narka, William Hay and 17 other citizens of Scandia, A. Brown and 16 other citizens of Guilford, O. C. Axtell and 21 other citizens of Plevna, Elwood Coate and 13 other citizens of Heber, George Barnwell and 41 other citizens of Harper County, J. A. Lanman and 34 other citizens of Womer, George Meinhardt and 25 other citizens of Goveland, Jacob Rabel and 202 other citizens of Richter, George Hill and 27 other citizens of Independence, W. L. Johnson and 20 other citizens of Council Grove, S. Van Nortwick and 12 other citizens of Republic, George B. Blair and 39 other citizens of Mulvane, L. Reese and 17 other citizens of Marion County, J. T. Manning and 195 other citizens of Goddard, Frank Rogers and 13 other citizens of Newington, and John Cato and 7 other citizens of Washington County, all in the State of Kansas, praying for the establishment of postal savings bank depositories; which were referred to the Committee on Post-Offices and Post-Roads.

Mr. GALLINGER presented petitions of the Woman's Christian Temperance unions of Ashland, Derry, and Epping, all in the State of New Hampshire, 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.

Mr. WARREN presented a memorial of the Wyoming State Medical Society, remonstrating against the passage of the bill (S. 1063) for the further prevention of cruelty to animals in the District of Columbia; which was ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented a petition of Local Branch No. 543, National Association of Letter Carriers, of Laramie, Wyo., and a petition of Local Union No. 563, United Brotherhood of Carpenters and Joiners, of Galveston, Tex., praying for the passage of the eight-hour bill; which were referred to the Committee on Education and Labor.

Mr. McMILLAN presented a petition of Local Union No. 7, Metal Polishers, Buffers, Platers, and Brass Workers' Union, of Grand Rapids, Mich., and a petition of Local Union No. 526, United Brotherhood of Carpenters and Joiners, of Galveston, Tex., praying for the passage of the eight-hour bill; which were referred to the Committee on Education and Labor.

Mr. SEWELL presented a memorial of the congregation of the North Baptist Church of Camden, N. J., remonstrating against the reopening of the question of sectarian appropriations for Indian schools; which was ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented petitions of the congregations of the Zion Wesley African Methodist Episcopal Church, the Wynn Memorial Baptist Church, the First Methodist Church, the Second Presbyterian Church, the Wiley Methodist Episcopal Church, the Kaighn Avenue Methodist Episcopal Church, the Memorial Methodist Protestant Church, the Bethel Methodist Episcopal Church, the Mount Zion Baptist Church, the Prairie Avenue Methodist Episcopal Church, and the First Baptist Church, and of Fidelity Lodge, No. 3, Ancient Order of United Workmen, all of Camden, in the State of New Jersey, praying for the passage of the eight-hour bill; which were referred to the Committee on Education and Labor.

Mr. PERKINS presented a telegram in the nature of a petition from the legislature of California, praying that an appropriation be made for the dredging of a shoal in San Pablo Bay between

Lone Tree Point and Point Pinole, in that State; which was referred to the Committee on Commerce, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[Telegram.]

SENATE CHAMBER, Sacramento, Cal., February 4, 1899.

In accordance with resolution to-day adopted, I am instructed to telegraph senate joint resolution No. 12, as adopted this day, which is as follows:

"Whereas it has been determined as a result of an official survey of the Coast and Geodetic Survey, as shown on their chart of August, 1898, that a shoal exists in San Pablo Bay between Lone Tree Point and Point Pinole; and

"Whereas San Pablo Bay is the waterway between the Golden Gate and Carquinez Straits, having commerce aggregating millions of dollars annually; Therefore, in the interest of commerce, the development of the State as a whole, and to insure the safety of our naval vessels going to and coming from Mare Island Navy-Yard, be it

"Resolved by the senate and assembly jointly, That our Senators in Congress be instructed and our Representatives requested to use all their efforts to have the necessary dredging done and to secure an appropriation therefor.

"Resolved, That a copy of these resolutions be forwarded by the secretary of the senate to our representatives in Congress."

Very respectfully,

F. J. BRANDON,  
Secretary of Senate.

HON. GEORGE C. PERKINS,  
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

Mr. QUAY presented a petition of the Woman's Club of Pittsburgh, Pa., praying for the enactment of legislation to prevent the desecration of the American flag; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also presented a petition of 350 citizens of Williamstown, Pa., praying for the enactment of legislation to prohibit the sale of intoxicating liquors in all Government buildings; which was referred to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

He also presented a petition of 350 citizens of Williamstown, Pa., praying for the enactment of legislation to validate State anti-cigarette laws; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also presented a petition of 350 citizens of Williamstown, Pa., praying for the enactment of legislation to prohibit the interstate transmission of lottery messages and other gambling matter by telegraph; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also presented a petition of 350 citizens of Williamstown, Pa., praying for the enactment of a Sunday-rest law for the District of Columbia; which was ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented a petition of 350 citizens of Williamstown, 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 350 citizens of Williamstown, Pa., praying for the enactment of legislation to prohibit the kinetoscope reproduction of pugilistic encounters in the District of Columbia and the Territories, and the interstate transmission of materials for the same; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also presented a petition of Local Lodge No. 7, Association of Amalgamated Iron, Steel, and Tin Plate Workers, of New Kensington, Pa., and a petition of Local Union No. 1, Hard and Soft Wheel Grinders and Strappers, of Toledo, Ohio, praying for the passage of the eight-hour bill; which were referred to the Committee on Education and Labor.

He also presented a petition of Local Lodge No. 908, Patrons of Husbandry, of Cranberry, Pa., praying for the passage of the bill to amend an act entitled "An act to regulate commerce;" which was ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented a petition of the Chamber of Commerce of Pittsburgh, Pa., and a petition of the Oil Trade Association of Philadelphia, Pa., praying for the enactment of legislation to increase American shipping; which were ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented a petition of Col. S. W. Black Post, No. 59, Department of Pennsylvania, Grand Army of the Republic, of McKeesport, Pa., praying for the speedy ratification of the treaty of peace; which was ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented petitions of the congregations of the Presbyterian Church of Lansdowne; the Rimersburg and Widnoon Presbyterian churches, of Clarion and Armstrong counties; the Creek Presbyterian Church, of Washington County; the United Presbyterian Church of Stewart Station; the Oak Methodist Episcopal Church, of Norristown; the First Baptist Church, of West Newton; the Oakland Methodist Episcopal Church, of Armstrong County; the Putneyville Methodist Episcopal Church, of Armstrong County; the Presbyterian Church of Avalon; the United Presbyterian Church of Avalon; the Reformed Presbyterian Church of Wilkinsburg; the United Brethren Church of Wilkinsburg; the United Presbyterian Church, of Allegheny; the Presbyterian Church of Wilkinsburg; the Methodist Episcopal Church of Wilkinsburg; the Baptist Church of Wilkinsburg; the Christian Church of Bellevue; the Central Reformed Presbyterian Church, of Allegheny; the Twelfth United

Presbyterian Church, of Pittsburg; the Mount Washington Methodist Protestant Church, of Pittsburg; the First Pentecostal Church, of Pittsburg; the Mount Washington Baptist Church, of Pittsburg; the North Avenue Methodist Episcopal Church, of Allegheny; the Methodist Episcopal Church of Ensforth; the Presbyterian Church of Ensforth; the United Presbyterian Church of Ensforth; the First Congregational Church, of Allegheny City; the First Christian Church, of Allegheny; the Eleventh United Presbyterian Church, of Allegheny; the Ninth United Presbyterian Church, of Allegheny; the Nixon Baptist Church, of Allegheny; and the First United Presbyterian Church, of Allegheny; of James L. O'Neill Post, No. 537, Grand Army of the Republic, Department of Pennsylvania; the Cookport Young People's Society of Christian Endeavor, of Erie; the Lititz Union, of Lancaster County; the Manheim Union, of Lancaster County; the Pen Argyle Union, of Northampton County; the Prohibition League of Williamsport; of Post No. 11, Grand Army of the Republic, Department of Pennsylvania, of Norristown; of James O'Donnell Post, No. 281, Grand Army of the Republic, Department of Pennsylvania, of Kellersburg; of Myrtle Cress Lodge, No. 176, of Wilkensburg; of Anchor Lodge, No. 30, Independent Order of Good Templars, of Pittsburg; of Pioneer Tent, No. 1, Order of Rechabites, of Pittsburg; of Our Young People's Christian Union, of Carnegie; of the Woman's Christian Temperance unions of Wyalusing, Delaware County, Williamsport, Solebury, Allegheny City, and Allegheny County, all in the State of Pennsylvania, 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.

Mr. ALLEN presented a petition of sundry enlisted men of the First Nebraska Volunteers, praying that they be accorded the same treatment as enlisted men who were discharged from other regiments in the volunteer service, and who received full travel pay and commutation of rations from Manila to their homes, etc.; which was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

He also presented a petition of Local Branch No. 12, United Brotherhood of Leather Workers on Horse Goods, of Omaha, Nebr., praying for the passage of the eight-hour bill; which was referred to the Committee on Education and Labor.

He also presented a petition of the president and faculty of the Farmers' Institute of Wescott, Nebr., praying for the enactment of legislation to increase American shipping; which was ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented a memorial of sundry citizens of New York, remonstrating against the annexation of the Philippine Islands; which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. HANSBROUGH presented the following petition of the legislature of North Dakota, praying for the establishment of a national lazaretto for the care and maintenance of citizens of the United States afflicted with leprosy; which was referred to the Committee on Public Health and National Quarantine, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Memorial and concurrent resolution of the house of representatives and senate of the State of North Dakota to the Congress of the United States, praying for the establishment of a national lazaretto for the care and maintenance of citizens of the United States afflicted with leprosy.

To the honorable the Congress of the United States:

Whereas there are now residing in this State a few citizens of the United States afflicted with that most loathsome disease, leprosy; and

Whereas owing to the contagious and incurable nature of the disease, which baffles the skill of medical science and endangers the safety of the public; and

Whereas the care, cure, and maintenance of these unfortunate people by the local authorities is impracticable and dangerous: Therefore, be it

Resolved by the house of representatives (the senate concurring), That your honorable body be requested and urged to take prompt action in establishing and maintaining a national lazaretto for the cure and treatment of citizens of the United States afflicted with leprosy.

Resolved further, That engrossed copies of the memorial, duly signed by the speaker of the house and president of the senate and countersigned by the chief clerk of the house and secretary of the senate, be sent to each of our representatives in Congress, the Hons. HENRY C. HANSBROUGH and WILLIAM N. ROACH, members of the United States Senate, and MARTIN N. JOHNSON, member of the House of Representatives.

THOMAS BAKER, Jr.,  
Speaker of the House.  
J. M. DEVINE,  
President of the Senate.

Attest:  
J. G. HAMILTON, Chief Clerk.

Attest:  
S. K. ESTABROOK, Acting Secretary of the Senate.

Mr. HANSBROUGH presented a petition of the legislature of North Dakota, praying that an ample appropriation be made for a suitable American exhibit at the Paris Exposition in 1900; which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Concurrent resolution in behalf of an ample fund for suitable exhibit at the Paris Exposition in 1900.

Whereas it has been determined by the Government of the United States that it participate in the exposition to be given at Paris in the year 1900; and

Whereas there is now pending before the Congress of the United States an appropriation bill for the payment of the expenses of such exhibit to be made at said exposition; and

Whereas the people of North Dakota are interested in the success of the exhibit to be made by this Government, and of the different States: Therefore, be it

Resolved by the members of the house of representatives (the senate concurring herein), That the Hons. HENRY C. HANSBROUGH and WILLIAM N. ROACH, United States Senators, and MARTIN N. JOHNSON, Member of the House of Representatives, be respectfully requested to use their best endeavors to have said appropriation so increased as that it will give sufficient and ample funds to make a creditable exhibit by the Government of the United States.

THOMAS BAKER, Jr.,  
Speaker of the House.  
J. M. DEVINE,  
President of the Senate.

Attest:  
J. G. HAMILTON, Chief Clerk.

Attest:  
J. O. SMITH, Secretary of the Senate.

Mr. HANSBROUGH presented a petition of the legislature of North Dakota, praying for the appointment of a commission to confer with the Sioux Indians; which was referred to the Committee on Indian Affairs, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Concurrent resolution relating to the appointment of a commission to confer with Sioux Indians.

Be it resolved by the senate (the house of representatives concurring):

To the honorable the Congress of the United States of America:

Resolved by the senate (the house of representatives concurring): Whereas there appears to be a dissatisfaction among the Sioux Indians on the Fort Totten Reservation, growing out of alleged grievances; Therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Congress of the United States be asked to appoint a commission to confer with said Indians regarding said grievances.

Resolved, That said commission, when appointed, be directed and instructed to proceed with said conference at as early date as possible and report to Congress; and

Resolved, That the secretary of state is hereby instructed to forthwith transmit this memorial to Congress and to send copies hereof to the Secretary of the Interior, Commissioner of Indian Affairs, and to the Senators and Representative of the State of North Dakota.

J. M. DEVINE,  
President of the Senate.  
THOMAS BAKER, Jr.,  
Speaker of the House.

Attest:  
J. O. SWEET, Secretary of the Senate.

Attest:  
J. G. HAMILTON, Chief Clerk.

I hereby certify that the within concurrent resolution originated in the senate of the Sixth legislative assembly of the State of North Dakota.

J. O. SWEET,  
Secretary of the Senate.

Mr. HOAR presented the petition of William Anthony and sundry other citizens of Rochester, N. Y., praying that women be granted the right of suffrage in Hawaii; which was referred to the Select Committee on Woman Suffrage.

He also presented the memorials of Thomas F. Myles and 6 other citizens, Helen Bigelow Bangs and 1 other citizen, Lewis G. Janes and 1 other citizen, Ruth Anne Freeman and 5 other citizens, and James A. Bailey, all in the State of Massachusetts; of John P. Leonard and 18 other citizens, J. Ausdenmore and 40 other citizens, Tony Welmer and 65 other citizens, and Daniel Hamilton and 60 other citizens, all in the State of Ohio; of Franklin A. Becher and 30 other citizens of Wisconsin; of M. J. Kropp and 50 other citizens of Pennsylvania; of Lynden Evans and 14 other citizens and of Lucelia W. Learned and 3 other citizens, all of the United States, remonstrating against any extension of the sovereignty of the United States over the Philippine Islands in any event and over any other foreign territory without the free consent of the people thereof; which were referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

#### REFEREES AND TRUSTEES IN BANKRUPTCY.

Mr. HOAR. I present a petition of the referees in bankruptcy, within and for the district of Massachusetts, appointed under the act approved July 1, 1898, praying for the enactment of legislation to increase the compensation of referees and trustees in bankruptcy.

I ask unanimous consent to say a word upon the subject of the petition. It will take but one moment.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. No objection being made, the Senator from Massachusetts will proceed.

Mr. HOAR. As I stated, it is a petition from the referees in bankruptcy in Massachusetts, praying for an increase of the compensation to those officers. The committee on conference, in order to make the bankruptcy law acceptable, pared down to the quick the allowances for services in administering estates, and I am getting from all parts of the country letters from prominent lawyers and these officials asking for an increase, stating that it is very difficult for them to discharge their duties with justice to themselves without an increase of the compensation.

I desire to say that it does not seem to me practicable, in the short time that remains of the present session, to revise the policy adopted by Congress last year on that subject; and if it were it seems to me that it is better to wait until the public experience

has shown whether there be any other important amendments needed in the bankruptcy legislation, certainly until next year, before taking up any revision or reconsideration. I hope these officials will be patient and will get along, if they can, for another year without further attempting to have the matter revised at this session.

The petition is signed by gentlemen whom I know personally, and they are highly esteemed. One of them shares my own law office at home. I am disposed to do anything that I can for them, and I make this statement so that they will understand the difficulty.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The petition will be referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

#### REPORTS OF COMMITTEES.

Mr. MITCHELL, from the Committee on Pensions, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. 4446) granting an increase of pension to Ellen Charlton, reported it with amendments, and submitted a report thereon.

Mr. LINDSAY, from the Committee on Pensions, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. 11017) granting a pension to Jesse Everly, reported it without amendment, and submitted a report thereon.

He also, from the same committee, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. 80) providing procedure in certain pension cases, reported it with amendments.

He also, from the same committee, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. 11115) granting a pension to Allen Meeks, reported it without amendment, and submitted a report thereon.

Mr. GALLINGER, from the Committee on Pensions, to whom was referred the bill (S. 5435) granting a pension to Emma J. McIntire, reported it without amendment, and submitted a report thereon.

He also, from the same committee, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. 10688) granting an increase of pension to John J. Bowen, reported it with amendments, and submitted a report thereon.

He also, from the same committee, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. 10013) to increase the pension of Joseph H. McGee, reported it without amendment, and submitted a report thereon.

He also, from the same committee, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. 5796) granting an increase of pension to Peter E. Shippler, reported it without amendment, and submitted a report thereon.

He also, from the same committee, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. 3307) to increase the pension of Andrew S. Evans, reported it with amendments, and submitted a report thereon.

He also, from the same committee, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. 2617) granting a pension to Mary E. Sessions, reported it with an amendment, and submitted a report thereon.

He also, from the same committee, to whom was referred the bill (S. 5036) granting a pension to James C. Delaney, reported it with amendments, and submitted a report thereon.

Mr. THURSTON, from the Select Committee on International Expositions, to whom was referred the joint resolution (S. R. 225) relative to the Greater American Exposition to be held in Omaha, Nebr., in the year 1899, and to encourage the same by providing, without expense to the Government, for exhibits from Cuba, Porto Rico, the Ladrone Islands, and the Philippine Archipelago, and for the use of the Government buildings erected for exposition purposes in 1898, and for other purposes, reported it without amendment.

Mr. McMILLAN, from the Committee on Naval Affairs, to whom was referred the bill (S. 5221) for the relief of Lieut. Horace P. McIntosh, reported it with amendments, and submitted a report thereon.

Mr. SHOUP, from the Committee on Pensions, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. 4982) granting an increase of pension to Harriet Tubman Davis, reported it with an amendment, and submitted a report thereon.

Mr. GALLINGER (for Mr. BAKER), from the Committee on Pensions, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. 1279) granting a pension to Barbara C. Lowe, reported it with amendments, and submitted a report thereon.

He also (for Mr. BAKER), from the same committee, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. 6810) granting a pension to Mary Luella Steele, reported it without amendment, and submitted a report thereon.

Mr. PLATT of Connecticut, from the Committee on Indian Affairs, reported an amendment directing the Secretary of the Interior to cause an investigation to be made of the alleged cutting of green timber on the Chippewa ceded and diminished reservations, in the State of Minnesota, to inquire as to the present method of "estimating" timber on said lands, and authorizing him to suspend the further cutting of timber on said reservation, intended to be proposed to the Indian appropriation bill; which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. RAWLINS, from the Committee on Indian Affairs, to whom

was referred the bill (H. R. 8480) providing for the sale of the surplus lands on the Pottawatomie and Kickapoo Indian reservations in Kansas, and for other purposes, reported it without amendment.

He also, from the same committee, to whom was referred the bill (S. 5291) to put in force in the Indian Territory certain provisions of the laws of Arkansas relating to corporations, and to make said provisions applicable to said Territory, reported it without amendment.

Mr. WOLCOTT, from the Committee on Finance, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. 10253) to amend the internal-revenue laws relating to distilled spirits, and for other purposes, reported it with an amendment.

Mr. HANSBROUGH, from the Committee on Pensions, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. 4806) granting an increase of pension to Bonaventura Heinz, reported it without amendment, and submitted a report thereon.

#### REPORT ON CUBA AND PORTO RICO.

Mr. LODGE. I am directed by the Committee on Printing, to whom was referred the joint resolution (S. R. 230) providing for the printing of the report of Robert P. Porter, special commissioner of the United States, on the industrial and commercial conditions of Cuba and Porto Rico, to report it without amendment, and I ask for its present consideration.

There being no objection, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the joint resolution. It provides that there shall be printed in one volume 9,000 copies of the special report of Robert P. Porter, special commissioner of the United States, on the industrial and commercial conditions of Cuba and Porto Rico; 3,000 copies for the use of the Senate, 5,000 for the use of the House of Representatives, and 1,000 for the use of the Treasury Department.

Mr. ALLEN. I should like to have the Senator from Massachusetts state the character of the report of Mr. Porter.

Mr. LODGE. It is a report, as stated in the joint resolution, on taxation and present industrial condition of Cuba and Porto Rico. It is a report of great value, I understand.

Mr. ALLEN. How long was Mr. Porter in Cuba making the investigation?

Mr. LODGE. The report was made some little time ago.

Mr. ALLEN. I infer from the press dispatches that he was not in Cuba to exceed two or three weeks, or a month at most.

Mr. LODGE. That is the last visit—his second visit. He made a previous visit.

Mr. ALLEN. Was the first visit made before the war?

Mr. LODGE. No; both were made since the war.

Mr. ALLEN. Both have been made since the war?

Mr. LODGE. The last visit, the one to which the Senator refers, was the visit made to Gomez.

Mr. ALLEN. Was the report made to the President of the United States?

Mr. LODGE. No; it was made to the Treasury Department. Mr. Porter went there as an agent of that Department, I understand. The report contains a good deal of valuable information, from what I have been told.

Mr. ALLEN. I hope it will be much more valuable and accurate than his census of 1890.

The joint resolution was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

#### BILLS INTRODUCED.

Mr. GORMAN introduced a bill (S. 5453) providing for the execution of new bonds by officers, employees, and clerks in any of the Executive Departments of the United States, and for the release of sureties on original bonds; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. MCENERY introduced a bill (S. 5459) for the relief of the estate of William P. Williamson, deceased, late of Iberville Parish, La.; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

Mr. LINDSAY introduced a bill (S. 5460) for the relief of John C. Browder; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. TELLER introduced a bill (S. 5461) for the relief of James C. Howard; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. JONES of Arkansas introduced a bill (S. 5462) to authorize certain persons who have intermarried with Cherokees to sue for their interest in certain moneys of the tribe from which they were excluded; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

Mr. PETTUS introduced a bill (S. 5463) to equalize the pay of letter carriers; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Post-Offices and Post-Roads.

Mr. MORGAN introduced a bill (S. 5464) to establish and erect a military post at Huntsville, Ala.; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

AMENDMENTS TO APPROPRIATION BILLS.

Mr. McENERY submitted an amendment proposing to appropriate \$36,000 for the construction and maintenance of a suitable boat to be used in removing the water hyacinth from the navigable waters of the State of Louisiana, intended to be proposed by him to the river and harbor appropriation bill; which was referred to the Committee on Commerce, and ordered to be printed.

Mr. SEWELL submitted an amendment proposing to increase the appropriation for the improvement of Mantua Creek, New Jersey, from \$10,000 to \$50,000, and also providing for a preliminary survey of Maurice River and Oldmans Creek, New Jersey, intended to be proposed by him to the river and harbor appropriation bill; which was referred to the Committee on Commerce, and ordered to be printed.

Mr. PRITCHARD submitted an amendment proposing to appropriate \$200,000 for the improvement of the harbor of refuge at Cape Lookout, North Carolina, and authorizing the Secretary of War to enter into contracts for material and labor for the completion of said project, as appropriations may be made from time to time, not to exceed the sum of \$3,500,000, intended to be proposed by him to the river and harbor appropriation bill; which was referred to the Committee on Commerce, and ordered to be printed.

Mr. NELSON submitted an amendment proposing to appropriate \$3,000,000 annually to provide arms, ordnance stores, quartermaster stores, and camp equipage for issue to the militia, intended to be proposed by him to the Army appropriation bill; which was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs, and ordered to be printed.

Mr. MORGAN submitted an amendment extending the franking privilege to all mail matter transported between any of the Hawaiian Islands and the United States, intended to be proposed by him to the Post-Office appropriation bill; which was referred to the Committee on Post-Offices and Post-Roads, and ordered to be printed.

Mr. BURROWS submitted an amendment authorizing the Secretary of the Navy to pay 50 per cent additional for all work in excess of eight hours performed by laborers, workmen, and mechanics at United States navy-yards and naval stations between March 18, 1898, and October 31, 1898, intended to be proposed by him to the naval appropriation bill; which was referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs, and ordered to be printed.

Mr. KENNEY submitted an amendment proposing to appropriate \$550 for a survey of the St. Jones River, Delaware, intended to be proposed by him to the river and harbor appropriation bill; which was referred to the Committee on Commerce, and ordered to be printed.

He also submitted an amendment proposing to increase the appropriation for improving Murderkill River, Delaware, from \$5,000 to \$65,000, and authorizing \$1,500 of said appropriation to be used in reopening the mouth of the St. Jones River, intended to be proposed by him to the river and harbor appropriation bill; which was referred to the Committee on Commerce, and ordered to be printed.

Mr. GEAR submitted an amendment proposing to appropriate \$50,000 for continuing the improvements on the Missouri River at Sioux City, Iowa, intended to be proposed by him to the river and harbor appropriation bill; which was ordered to be printed, and, with the accompanying paper, referred to the Committee on Commerce.

Mr. PETTUS submitted an amendment proposing to appropriate \$400,000 for continuing the improvement of the Tennessee River at the Colbert Shoals and Bee Tree Shoals, Alabama, intended to be proposed by him to the river and harbor appropriation bill; which was referred to the Committee on Commerce, and ordered to be printed.

Mr. TELLER submitted an amendment proposing to appropriate \$1,000 to reimburse J. B. Holloway for the preparation of the House omnibus claims bill and statistics relating to war claims, intended to be proposed by him to the sundry civil appropriation bill; which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

Mr. SEWELL submitted an amendment providing that the act of May 16, 1888, relating to anchorage of vessels in the port of New York be extended to include the waters of Kill van Kull, Newark Bay, Arthur Kill, and Raritan Bay, intended to be proposed by him to the sundry civil appropriation bill; which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

He also submitted an amendment relative to the compensation of the engineer member of the Deep Waterways Commission, appointed from the Corps of Engineers, United States Army, intended to be proposed by him to the sundry civil appropriation bill; which

was referred to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

BRUNSWICK, GA., HARBOR IMPROVEMENT.

Mr. BACON submitted the following resolution; which was considered by unanimous consent, and agreed to:

*Resolved*, That the Secretary of War be directed to call upon H. L. Marinden, the officer of the Coast and Geodetic Survey appointed by the Secretary of War, under the provisions of the river and harbor act of 1893, to make survey of the work of C. P. Goodyear on the outer bar of Brunswick, Ga., for a report of the value of such work to the Government, based on his report of survey of April 28, 1893, and transmit the same to the Senate.

BUREAU OF ENGRAVING AND PRINTING INVESTIGATION.

Mr. MASON submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Printing:

*Resolved*, That 2,000 copies of the letters of transmittal, the report of the Treasury Department committee which investigated the Bureau of Engraving and Printing in 1897, the reply of the Director of the Bureau thereto, and the rejoinder of Mr. Lyman, chairman of the investigating committee, be printed for the use of the Senate.

HEARINGS BEFORE COMMITTEE ON MILITARY AFFAIRS.

Mr. HAWLEY submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate:

*Resolved*, That the stenographer employed to report the statements of Maj. Gen. Leonard Wood, United States Volunteers, and Maj. Gen. M. C. Butler, United States Volunteers, before the Committee on Military Affairs, be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate; and that said committee, in considering matters coming before it during the present session of the Senate, is authorized to employ a stenographer to report any hearings that may be held, and to have such hearings printed for the use of the committee, such stenographer to be paid from the said contingent fund.

RESERVOIRS FOR IRRIGATION PURPOSES.

Mr. CARTER submitted the following resolution; which was considered by unanimous consent, and agreed to:

*Resolved*, That the Secretary of the Interior be, and hereby is, directed to furnish in concise form for the use of the Senate a general statement of the origin, character, and extent of the surveys of reservoir sites made by the United States Geological Survey, with brief memoranda as to present conditions of water storage and the more important sites in each large hydrographic basin, also a summary of estimates as to probable cost of constructing suitable dams at points where the stored water will be of most immediate value to the public.

HEARINGS UPON RIVER AND HARBOR BILL.

Mr. FRYE. Mr. President, I should like to have the attention of Senators for just one moment.

I am instructed by the Committee on Commerce to inform Senators that that committee is now considering the river and harbor bill; that it will meet this afternoon at 2 o'clock and continue in session until adjournment; that it will meet every morning at half past 10 and continue in session until adjournment each day, with an intermission from 12 to 2; that to-day and Wednesday and Thursday Senators who desire to be heard touching any items in the river and harbor bill will be given the opportunity; that after Thursday there will be no more hearings at all. The limitation of time at which the present session is to close compels us to make this rule. So Tuesday, Wednesday, and Thursday Senators will be heard at any time except during the intermission from 12 to 2.

CHOCTAW, OKLAHOMA AND GULF RAILROAD.

Mr. JONES of Arkansas. I ask the unanimous consent of the Senate to call up the bill (S. 5388) granting the right of way through Indian reservations to the Choctaw, Oklahoma and Gulf Railroad Company. It will only take a minute to dispose of it.

There being no objection, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill.

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

EXPENSES OF STATES IN RAISING VOLUNTEER ARMY.

Mr. ALLISON obtained the floor.

Mr. FORAKER. I introduce a joint resolution and ask for its immediate consideration.

Mr. ALLISON. If it takes no time I will yield.

Mr. FORAKER. If there is any objection of course it will go over.

The joint resolution (S. R. 241) declaratory of the true intent and meaning of an act of Congress approved July 8, 1898, was read the first time by its title and the second time at length, as follows:

*Be it resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled*, That the act of Congress approved July 8, 1898, entitled "An act to reimburse the governors of States and Territories for expenses incurred by them in aiding the United States to raise and organize and supply and equip the Volunteer Army of the United States in the existing war with Spain," shall be held and construed to apply to expenses incurred as well after as before the day of the approval of said act.

Mr. COCKRELL. A similar bill is pending before the Committee on Military Affairs, and it has been referred to the War Department and the Auditor for the War Department for consideration and report. It was discussed by a subcommittee in charge of another matter this morning. I think the joint resolution ought to go to the Committee on Military Affairs, so that we can have the whole matter covered.

Mr. FORAKER. Very well. I did not know that there was another measure pending. In view of what has been stated by the Senator from Missouri, I have no objection to the joint resolution being referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. COCKRELL. The committee will act on the matter promptly.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Without objection, the joint resolution will be so referred.

## HOUSE BILLS REFERRED.

The bill (H. R. 321) for the relief of the Berdan Firearms Manufacturing Company was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

The bill (H. R. 4382) to establish a national military park to commemorate the campaign, siege, and defense of Vicksburg was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

The bill (H. R. 8694) to enable the city of Albuquerque, N. Mex., to create certain indebtedness, and for other purposes, was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Territories.

The bill (H. R. 11247) to extend the anti-contract labor laws of the United States to Hawaii was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Territories.

The bill (H. R. 12009) to provide for the removal of snow and ice in the city of Washington, in the District of Columbia, was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

## TWELFTH AND SUBSEQUENT CENSUSES.

The bill (H. R. 11815) to provide for taking the Twelfth and subsequent censuses was read twice by its title.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. In the absence of the Senator from Montana [Mr. CARTER], who is not now in the Chamber, the bill will lie on the table.

## INDIAN APPROPRIATION BILL.

Mr. ALLISON. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the Indian appropriation bill.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Senator from Iowa asks that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the bill (H. R. 11217) making appropriations for the current and contingent expenses of the Indian Department and for fulfilling treaty stipulations with various Indian tribes for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1900, and for other purposes. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the bill is before the Senate as in Committee of the Whole.

Mr. TILLMAN. Is the morning business closed?

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The morning business is closed.

Mr. TILLMAN. I gave notice last evening that at the expiration of the morning business I would call up the joint resolution introduced by the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. MCENERY] and ask leave to address the Senate on it. I do not presume it is the intention of the Senator from Iowa to antagonize me in my right to do that.

Mr. ALLISON. If the Senator from South Carolina desires to make some observations of which he gave notice, I do not wish to interfere with his purpose. I am perfectly willing that the joint resolution shall be called up for the purpose of enabling him to make some observations.

Mr. TILLMAN. There was an additional notice given by the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. ALDRICH], that he would try to get a vote on the joint resolution before 2 o'clock.

Mr. ALLISON. I have no objection to a vote on the joint resolution, if it can be taken without debate, after the Senator from South Carolina has concluded.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Chair understands the position to be that House bill 11217 is taken up by unanimous consent, and the Senator from Iowa in charge of that bill consents that the Senator from South Carolina shall proceed to make the remarks of which he gave notice last night.

Mr. PLATT of Connecticut. Let the appropriation bill be informally laid aside.

Mr. ALLISON. And the joint resolution is to be taken up for that purpose.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. For that purpose.

Mr. MASON. I desire to understand the parliamentary situation. I do not understand that there was unanimous consent to take up the appropriation bill until after the disposition of the joint resolution.

Mr. ALLISON. There is no unanimous consent respecting ap-

propriation bills. It is understood that they have the right of way. I am perfectly willing to give way, as the Senator from South Carolina states that yesterday he gave notice that he would desire to make some observations upon the joint resolution this morning. I do not object to the joint resolution being taken up for that purpose.

Mr. HALE. Why not have it understood that a vote shall be taken?

Mr. WOLCOTT. The unanimous consent is given as to the remarks to be made by the Senator from South Carolina.

Mr. HALE. In accordance with the understanding yesterday and the notice given by the Senator from South Carolina and also by the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. ALDRICH] that the joint resolution would be called up, why not let the Senator from South Carolina proceed with his remarks with the understanding that a vote shall be taken on the joint resolution without further debate?

Mr. GALLINGER. I shall have to object to that, Mr. President.

Mr. WOLCOTT. I object to that.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Objection is made.

Mr. JONES of Arkansas. I think the matters had better be disposed of one at a time. It would be very unusual for the Senate to refuse to allow the Senator from South Carolina to proceed with his remarks of which he has given notice. The question as to whether the Senate will then consider the joint resolution and vote on it can be decided by the Senate after the Senator from South Carolina concludes.

Mr. ALLISON. I can not give way for general debate upon the joint resolution this morning.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Senator from South Carolina will proceed.

Mr. TILLMAN. I will only remark before I begin that the Senator from Iowa knows very well that if a Senator can not debate any proposition here upon a measure pending he can debate it anyway on any measure that may be up, and the Senator from Iowa gains no time by pressing matters unduly.

Mr. ALLISON. I have yielded to the Senator from South Carolina.

## POLICY REGARDING THE PHILIPPINE ISLANDS.

Mr. TILLMAN. I ask that Senate joint resolution 240 be read.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The joint resolution will be read.

The Secretary read the joint resolution introduced yesterday by Mr. MCENERY, as follows:

A joint resolution (S. R. 240) declaring the purpose of the United States toward the Philippine Islands.

*Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled.* That by the ratification of the treaty of peace with Spain it is not intended to incorporate the inhabitants of the Philippine Islands into citizenship of the United States, nor is it intended to permanently annex said islands as an integral part of the territory of the United States; but it is the intention of the United States to establish on said islands a government suitable to the wants and conditions of the inhabitants of said islands to prepare them for local self-government, and in due time to make such disposition of said islands as will best promote the interests of the citizens of the United States and the inhabitants of said islands.

Mr. TILLMAN. Mr. President, but for the fact that I had given notice that I would speak I would not do so this morning, because I have been unwell all night. I am here now only after having passed a sleepless night, and I am suffering at this time great pain.

I have listened to the long and able debate on the general proposition of annexation or expansion, and have never at any time intended to obtrude my views upon the Senate, but to content myself with an occasional foray into the mêlée, or, in other words, to performing a little guerrilla warfare. But there has been such a radical change in the situation since Saturday evening, and things have now assumed such a shape, that I feel constrained to present some views on this question that have hitherto failed to strike the attention of those Senators who have addressed themselves to it.

The first thing, Mr. President, which strikes one who will read the joint resolution with an analytical mind is the absolute uselessness, and the cold-blooded purpose its language conveys. It is simply an assertion of power and of right on the part of this Government to buy and sell those islands for our interest, not for theirs, and to ignore in toto every consideration which those people have a right to expect at our hands.

I do not think anyone can justly charge that there is any politics or that there has been any politics in the determination of the vote of Senators on this question. It has been determined from other reasons than partisan purposes. While most of those who have opposed the ratification of the treaty belong to the party to which I belong, it may be said as a fact, upon which every American citizen can congratulate himself, that the other party gave to the opposition two of its ablest men, who have stanchly and from the very beginning stood here opposed to this new idea

of imperialism. If I were actuated or had been actuated by any political purpose I should have been glad to see the treaty ratified, because, if I do not mistake the trend of public events, the results of the ratification of the treaty promise to bring but disaster to the party which is mainly responsible for it.

There are some things connected with the ratification which merit a little comment, as I pass along, in relation to the resolution which I am now discussing. I will not say, though I have seen it asserted in the newspapers, that the resolution is being pressed by the Senator from Rhode Island for the purpose of redeeming a pledge. I do not know whether that is true, and I do not care. I demand for myself here the recognition of the fact that I am a Senator and claim to exercise my functions as such from high and patriotic motives, and I do not presume to deny to every other one of my colleagues a similar high motive. I can only say that from my point of view, if it was right to defeat the treaty on Saturday, it was right to defeat it on yesterday.

I have never in my legislative experience in this body or in any other assemblage, heard so many speeches giving the most cogent reasons why a man should not vote for a proposition, followed by the acknowledgment that the speaker, notwithstanding, intended to give his vote in its support. So at least a great many votes that have gone to the treaty and have enabled it to become the law of the land, have been cast by men who have been in great doubt as to their duty, and have at last yielded rather to pressure than to any conscientious or calm consideration of the result.

There has been another phase or peculiarity connected with the discussion which we have had. Learned and able lawyers have exhausted themselves in the contention pro and con as to the constitutional right to annex those people in this way. Mr. President, as far as my observation goes, and as I understand the present status of the American people, we have no Constitution left. The only rule which governs Congress now is the rule of the majority. We had an illustration of that when the Hawaiian treaty was rejected by the constitutional one-third, more than one-third refusing to ratify it, and the majority brought in and passed its resolution of annexation by which the Constitution was overridden.

I will qualify the statement I have just made as regards our having no Constitution left, which the majority are bound to respect, by saying that the two-thirds vote to ratify a treaty is the only scintilla of the original instrument which now remains to hamper the majority.

But, Mr. President, while this is a cold-blooded fact which must excite surprise and cause forebodings in the minds of patriots, I wish to address myself to the merits of this question rather than to deal with the accompanying circumstances which have been surprising and in some degree disgusting.

If we are to pass any resolution at all—and I desire that the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. ALDRICH] who has this matter in charge shall give me his especial attention now—I think that resolution ought to be one which will pave the way to peace in the Philippines, rather than one which will be an aggravation of the war which has begun there. I know that it is natural for the American blood to flame up in anger when the flag is fired upon; I know it is natural for our race to want to fight, very often whether we have provocation or not, and whether we are right or wrong; but, sir, in this great crisis in which so much is involved, it does seem to me that those Senators who have contended from the beginning that our policy should be to ratify the treaty first, and then deal with the results of that cession afterwards, should cause those who are responsible for the existing condition to take up carefully and calmly and seriously consider the proposition which I have just advanced: that we should either pass a resolution which may pave the way to peace, or that we should pass none at all.

This resolution, if it shall pass and be approved by the President, is nothing more, as I have said, than the cold-blooded enunciation of our power; and a declaration that we will deal with this question from the standpoint of our interests, regardless of the rights or the wishes of those 10,000,000 Asiatics who have come under our sway. And above all, notwithstanding the assertions which we heard here yesterday, that we "could not take time to enter into negotiations with the men who had pistols at our breasts, or with those who had fired upon the flag," it appears to me that of all times in our history we could and should at this moment give forth a sound that would be generous and worthy of the great American people.

Mr. President, what caused this last battle of Manila? The reports which we receive through our newspapers all come from American sources; they charge that the Filipinos wantonly attacked the American army, and that that army had a right to defend itself, which nobody assumes to deny. But when we recollect that the telegraph lines from those islands are in charge of the American commander there, or of those whom he designates to control them, it is natural for us to suppose that nothing would be let out under the censorship which has existed for the last

three months or more that would be in the slightest degree derogatory to the good faith or the honor of the American army there. Time alone will tell whether this battle was provoked by the Filipinos for purposes of their own, or by the Americans for the purpose of endeavoring to sway men in this Senate to ratify the treaty and change the status.

I recall one of Æsop's fables in which a painter had depicted a lion lying on his back prone beneath the heel of a man, and when he showed the painting to the lion the lion said, "Yes, you painted that; but if you will let me paint it, the situation will be just the opposite."

I come now to make a statement, upon which I base what I have just said, to this effect: That I have seen in the last forty-eight hours an invalided officer of the American Army, one of the regulars, who has just reached this city from Manila. From what he told me of the situation before he left there, I dare to assert that the American Army has been in a state of siege in that city for three or four months; that the lines surrounding the city have been in the possession of the Filipino army outside; that no American was allowed to cross them; and that those Filipinos, while they had not been actively engaged in firing upon our troops, have enforced a strict recognition of the fact that they were in an attitude of antagonism, that they did not recognize this Government as having any rights outside of the city of Manila. If that be true, Mr. President, the question recurs as to who may be responsible or who was responsible for the battle of Saturday night last.

As I understand the legal status the ratification of the treaty will bring about this result: That in the eye of the law the Philippine Islands are ours and the inhabitants thereof are to-day rebels; they are now ours by right of cession from Spain, ratified yesterday by this body, and to be ratified soon by the Spanish Government; they are American subjects; and since they have fired upon the flag they are "rebels." That is the law of the situation as we see it and possibly as the world sees it.

Now, considering the fact, which can not be denied—for our consul, Mr. Williams, reported the fact as far back as February, 1898, before Dewey sailed into Manila Bay—that there was a rebellion against Spain: that the Filipino army was lying outside of the city of Manila and hostilities were active; considering the fact that they organized a government as far back as last June; considering the fact that they have been actively engaged in collecting munitions of war and have recruited their army until, as this officer told me, they have not less than 40,000 men outside of Manila to-day, we are brought face to face with the consideration as to whether it was not wise and proper and the best thing from their point of view for the Filipinos to make the attack which they did, or which it is said they did, on Saturday night last.

If they went to war with the United States before the United States had a title to those islands in law, what is their legal status in international law? They can not be called rebels to us except from the extreme standpoint of legal technicality. We had no right in Manila so far as they were concerned; we only had rights there so far as Spain was concerned; and if, after they had their representative here pleading and begging for some word of comfort, some promise as to our policy, or some dim outline even as to the purpose of recognizing their right to local self-government, they grew desperate at last and fired upon our troops, the firing upon those troops before we had any legal title must give them the right of belligerents in war, although they have been subjects of Spain, because by the cession to us we simply fall heir to Spain's residuary title in those islands, subject to the rights of the natives who were struggling for freedom before we went to war with Spain on an entirely different issue.

We may say they are rebels, and in strict legal interpretation they may be rebels, but, Mr. President, let this war terminate how it will, history will declare that they are to-day patriots striving for what we fought for in our struggle with Great Britain in the last century; and we can not escape from the condition at least of doubt as to the course we ought to follow when we consider this fact. They were fighting for their freedom against Spanish tyranny two years ago, and they continued to fight up to the time when Aguinaldo left the islands and went to Singapore; they continued the fight, as our own consul said, after he left; they never did cease, some of them; there never was peace; and now the question which addresses itself to every American who loves his flag and loves his great country and loves the great principle upon which that flag rests and that country is founded is this: Are we to take the place of Spain as their taskmasters and oppressors? Do "governments derive their just powers from the consent of the governed"?

I have looked back down the vista of what history I have read, and I appeal to any Senator here who may be versed in history to correct me if I am wrong when I say there never has been in the history of mankind a precedent for the existing condition now at Manila between the United States and the Filipino insurgents. The transition or transfer of the legal title to the islands during

the period of their rebellion against one government and their effort to throw off the yoke and establish an independent government has never, so far as I recall, occurred before in the history of the world, and I would ask the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE], himself a historian, if he recalls any?

Mr. LODGE. I did not hear the Senator's question.

Mr. TILLMAN. I say the present situation in Manila is unique, it is sui generis, it is the first one of the kind that has ever existed in the history of the world where a colony of another nation at war with that nation for its freedom has been sold in the meantime to another power and their allegiance or sovereignty transferred.

Mr. LODGE. I think the situation is unique in the fact that the people whom we liberated down there have turned against us.

Mr. TILLMAN. Well, Mr. President, the question of liberation is one which will present two points of view. We can look at it from our side and then look at it from theirs. I have just presented a few of the ideas which have occurred to me as having actuated the Filipinos in firing upon the American flag, as they did last Saturday, and that was that they desired to obtain in the eye of international law the rights of belligerents and not become rebels after the cession, as would have occurred if they had fired yesterday evening or this morning, after we had ratified the treaty.

But, as strange as this condition and situation is, as anomalous as it may seem to those who think with the Senator from Massachusetts that we went to Manila for the purpose of liberating the Filipinos—

Mr. LODGE. I did not say we went there for the purpose of liberating the Filipinos; we went there to make war on Spain; but as a matter of fact, we did liberate them. They were absolutely helpless before the Spanish power and remained so until the destruction of the Spanish fleet by Admiral Dewey.

Mr. TILLMAN. I will grant that, if the Senator wishes to contend for it; but the question is whether that liberation carries with it the right of this country to take the sovereignty of those islands and control them against their will and against our own traditions and principles? That is the point.

I wish now to present for the consideration of Senators, and especially of those Senators who stand committed here to a proposition that they are opposed to expansion and are opposed to annexation, but desired to ratify the treaty in order to close the condition of war with Spain and then address themselves to what shall be done in the Philippine Islands afterwards—I say I wish to address to those Senators some remarks in regard to what appears to me our plain and bounden duty at this time, our duty not only to them, but more especially to ourselves.

Senators will recall the fact that some twenty years ago the South African Republic, known as the Transvaal, inhabited by the Boers, was annexed to the British Empire by proclamation. A British diplomatic agent had gone into that country to spy out the land, so to speak, to feel the temper of the people. Having notified his Government that it was advisable to do so, a proclamation was issued, simply reaching out and swallowing the whole Republic, putting them under the British flag, and sending a British governor, accompanied by a regiment of soldiers, to take possession of the cities, towns, and forts, and lo, the thing was done; the Transvaal became a part of the British Dominions!

The Boers, a sturdy Dutch stock, who had fled from Natal and from the Orange Free State to get rid of the Englishmen, numbering only about 50,000 souls all told, met in mass meeting and in assembly time and again. They protested, they supplicated, they negotiated, they begged. In the meantime, while these proceedings were going on, there was a transfer of power in England from the wily, brilliant, but unscrupulous Disraeli to that grandest of English statesmen of this century, William Ewart Gladstone. But even Mr. Gladstone, though he felt that the incorporation of the Boers into the British Empire was wrong, did not feel called upon to say so officially or to take any action; and in the Queen's address to the Commons, written, of course, by the prime minister, it was stated that their request could not be granted.

They were put under the British yoke in 1877. In December, 1880, three years afterwards, the machinery of the Government had begun to move, and the British taxgatherer came around and levied on a wagon belonging to one of the Boers who had refused to pay taxes. He put it up for sale, but, instead of selling it, several Boers rode in on horseback, took charge of the wagon, and gave this British official notice to get out, and in a week's time the entire province was in rebellion against the British Crown—in rebellion from the standpoint of English law, as were our forefathers in 1776, but struggling for that inherent right of man, as Americans have been brought to believe—self-government.

The British troops began to move; reinforcements were rushed from Cape Town, from the adjoining territory belonging to England. The Boers were farmers who had never drilled, but the best riflemen in the world. The result was that in the conflicts

with the British regulars these undrilled farmers whipped the redcoats, although they were officered by trained soldiers; and under the lead of one of their number, whose name was Joubert, they won some notable victories. Reading the history of his brilliant military deeds last night, I came to think that possibly under similar conditions, extended a thousandfold as to this man Aguinaldo, who is now called an upstart and an organizer of a "tin-horn government" in Manila, in the Philippines, it may come to pass that under his inspiration and leadership a similar result will happen in those islands.

The last conflict between these Dutch farmers—half civilized if you choose to term them so—and the British army was at Majuba Hill, where a thousand picked British regulars had taken an impregnable position, as they thought, in the cup of an extinct volcano, a natural fortification with a rim around it. The Boers surrounded them, crawled up to the rim of the cup, and shot to death over half of their number, put the rest to flight—those they did not capture—and "all the world wondered." Of course the British bulldog barked and the British lion roared. The demand from the rabble was, "Rush more reinforcements down there and shoot those rebels to death. England's honor demands it."

What did Gladstone say and what did Gladstone do? Realizing that a continuation of the war involved the loss to Great Britain of many soldiers, but more clearly still feeling that his predecessor in office had committed a grave wrong, he sent a negotiator, Gen. Sir Evelyn Wood, with instructions to bring about an honorable peace by the restoration to those people of their republic, reserving only to the Queen of England the right of suzerain and the right to control the foreign policy of the republic.

When Parliament met, the leader of the opposition, Sir Michael Hicks-Beach, moved a resolution censuring the Government for its disgraceful surrender to these struggling Boers in South Africa and the return to them of their inheritance of self-government. The English press—that portion of it which belonged to the opposition—clamored for punishment of the rebels and for their annihilation and extinction. Mr. Gladstone, in defending his conduct, made a speech in Parliament, an extract from which I shall read; and I would to God that it could be framed and hung up in every legislative chamber where the rights of man are discussed and passed on by legislators, as a guide as to what true statesmanship demands. Here is what that great Englishman said:

Our case is summed up in this: We have endeavored to cast aside all considerations of false shame, and we have felt that we were strong enough to put aside those considerations of false shame without fear of entailing upon our country any sacrifice at all. We have endeavored to do right, and to eschew wrong, and we have done that in a matter involving alike the lives of thousands and the honor and character of our country. And, sir, whatever may be the sense of gentlemen opposite, we believe that we are supported, not only by the general convictions of Parliament, but by those of the country. We feel that we are entitled to make that declaration, for from every great center of opinion in Europe, from the remotest corners of Anglo-Saxon America, have come back to us the echoes of the resolution which we have taken, the favoring and approving echoes, recognizing in the policy of the Government an ambition higher than that which looks for military triumph or for territorial aggrandizement, but which seeks to signalize itself by walking in the plain and simple ways of right and justice, and which desires never to build up empire except in the happiness of the governed.

There is no parallel for the action of the English prime minister. He was the first who had the greatness of soul to rise up and do what was right regardless of consequences. Can the American nation, which we claim to be the home of liberty, a nation of free men, imbued with ideas of self-government from their cradle—can we do less?

It was said that English honor demanded that these colonists should be punished. Everybody knows that England could have sent troops enough there to have killed the last man of them, just as we can send troops enough to Manila to kill, as the Senator from Montana [Mr. CARTER] said the other day, "to shoot them to death," if need be, to make them respect our flag and our authority. We can do it. Nobody doubts that. The question is ought we to do it? Is it honorable to do it? Is it right to do it?

What more do we want in the Philippines than the right of a protectorate, which will give us the control of their foreign policy, will keep away from those islands any outside interloper, or land-grabber, or robber who might desire to gobble them up and enslave the people? What right, or what advantage will it be to us to do more than to occupy as to those islands a similar position as that existing in the Transvaal?

As though coming at the most opportune time possible, you might say, just before the treaty reached the Senate, or about the time it was sent to us, there appeared in one of our magazines a poem by Rudyard Kipling, the greatest poet of England at this time. Mr. President, this poem, unique, and in some places difficult to understand, is to my mind a prophecy. I do not imagine that in the history of human events any poet has ever felt inspired so clearly to portray our danger and our duty. It is called "The White Man's Burden." With the permission of Senators I will read a stanza, and I beg them to listen to it, for it

is well worth their attention. This man has lived in the Indies. In fact he is a citizen of the world, and has been all over it, and knows whereof he speaks.

Take up the White Man's burden—  
Send forth the best ye breed—  
Go, bind your sons to exile,  
To serve your captives' need;  
To wait, in heavy harness,  
On fluttered folk and wild—  
Your new-caught sullen peoples,  
Half devil and half child.

Mr. President, I will pause here. I intend to read more, but I wish to call attention to a fact which may have escaped the attention of Senators thus far, that with five exceptions every man in this Chamber who has had to do with the colored race in this country voted against the ratification of the treaty. It was not because we are Democrats, but because we understand and realize what it is to have two races side by side that can not mix or mingle without deterioration and injury to both and the ultimate destruction of the civilization of the higher. We of the South have borne this white man's burden of a colored race in our midst since their emancipation and before.

It was a burden upon our manhood and our ideas of liberty before they were emancipated. It is still a burden, although they have been granted the franchise. It clings to us like the shirt of Nessus, and we are not responsible, because we inherited it, and your fathers as well as ours are responsible for the presence amongst us of that people. Why do we as a people want to incorporate into our citizenship ten millions more of different or of differing races, three or four of them?

But, Mr. President, we have not incorporated them yet, and let us see what this English poet has to say about it, and what he thinks.

Take up the White Man's burden—  
No iron rule of kings,  
But toil of serf and sweeper—  
The tale of common things.  
The ports ye shall not enter,  
The roads ye shall not tread,  
Go, make them with your living  
And mark them with your dead.

Ah, if we have no other consideration, if no feeling of humanity, no love of our fellows, no regard for others' rights, if nothing but our self-interest shall actuate us in this crisis, let me say to you that if we go madly on in the direction of crushing the Philippines into subjection and submission we will do so at the cost of many, many thousands of the flower of American youth. There are 10,000,000 of these people, some of them fairly well civilized, and running to the other extreme of naked savages, who are reported in our press dispatches as having stood out in the open and fired their bows and arrows, not flinching from the storm of shot and shell thrown into their midst by the American soldiers last Sunday.

The report of the battle claims that we lost only 75 killed and a hundred and odd wounded; but the first skirmish has carried with it what anguish, what desolation, to homes in a dozen States! How many more victims are we to offer up on this altar of Mammon or national greed? When those regiments march back, if they return with decimated ranks, as they are bound to come, if we have to send thousands and tens of thousands of reinforcements there to press onward until we have subdued those ten millions, at whose door will lie these lives—their blood shed for what? An idea. If a man fires upon the American flag, shoot the last man and kill him, no matter how many Americans have to be shot to do it.

The city of Manila is surrounded by swamps and marshes, I am told. A few miles back lie the woods and jungles and mountains. These people are used to the climate. They know how to get about, and if they mean to have their liberties, as they appear to do, at what sacrifice will the American domination be placed over them? Here is another verse of Kipling. I have fallen in love with this man. He tells us what we will reap:

Take up the White Man's burden,  
And reap his old reward—  
The blame of those ye better,  
The hate of those ye guard—  
The cry of hosts ye humor  
(Ah, slowly!) toward the light—  
"Why brought ye us from bondage,  
Our loved Egyptian night?"

Those peoples are not suited to our institutions. They are not ready for liberty as we understand it. They do not want it. Why are we bent on forcing upon them a civilization not suited to them and which only means in their view degradation and a loss of self-respect, which is worse than the loss of life itself?

Mr. President, I am nearly done. Nobody answers and nobody can. The commercial instinct, which seeks to furnish a market and places for the growth of commerce or the investment of capital for the money making of the few, is pressing this country madly to the final and ultimate annexation of these people regardless of their own wishes and at whatever cost to them or us.

We are face to face with the question as to whether we will be content to pass a resolution here which might be sent to the Filipinos as a flag of truce and a means of bringing about pacification and ultimate relinquishment of everything except the protectorate and such commercial advantages as we ought to keep, and which they will gladly give us. We are at a crisis in our own history, when we must turn our faces away from this temptation, turn our backs upon the incentive which has led us thus far, or we must move forward remorselessly and relentlessly, doing our own country and our own people more harm than can result to those people, though we exterminate them from the face of the globe. We have within our grasp, and possible of attainment, a glory and honor such as has never come to another nation in the history of the world—the honor of having fought a war for the love of liberty and humanity, animated by no greedy, selfish purposes hidden under the declaration.

We are still an undegenerate people. We have not yet become corrupted. We have in our veins the best blood of the northern races, who now dominate the world. While we make no pretenses—and it is a pity that we do not even stand up to the few we do make—we have here a religion whose essence is mercy. We have had an experience in free government, government based on the will of the governed—for government by majority is government with the consent of the governed—and we have been taught by that government what so few people of this world have learned, both the firmness to rule and the power of obedience to that rule. We are a Christian people, and our missionaries, or those imbued with the missionary spirit, clamor for the annexation of these islands for the purpose of shedding over them the light of the gospel. We are asked to do as Mahomet did with his creed—carry the Christian religion to these people upon the point of a bayonet, as he spread Islamism over western Asia and eastern Europe and northern Africa on his scimitar.

There are two forces struggling for mastery here, and the better instincts of every Senator within the hearing of my voice lead him to side with me in the proposition that we do not want to shoot people into a civilized condition if we know how to get around it. The two forces to which I have referred as struggling for mastery are liberty, light, and morality—in a word, Christianity—contending against ignorance, greed, and tyranny, against the empires of Mammon and Belial. In the summer seas of the Tropics in both hemispheres two flags are afloat to-day above two ancient cities. They both bear the emblem of this great Republic, the Stars and Stripes. One goes to Havana and is floating in the free air as a harbinger of peace, order, prosperity, happiness, liberty. The other floats in Manila as an emblem of power, cold-blooded, determined to do what? To subjugate those people and force on them such a government as we think is best for them, and then, according to the language of the resolution, determine afterwards as it may be to "our" advantage whether we will sell them or whether we will rule them in our "own" way, without regard to their rights or wishes.

Gladstone "hauled down" the English flag in the Boer Republic. He preserved the semblance of empire, but gave to them what they sought—local self-government. It is a question here whether we will "haul down the flag" in the Philippines or whether we will advance it until we have conquered the last island at whatever cost. It was planted there in honor and now it is proposed to fix it there in dishonor. Why not tell these people now before further blood is shed? "We do not intend to do with you differently from what we do with the Cubans. We went into the war for the purposes of freeing a nation oppressed beyond all historical precedent almost. By accident or without premeditation you have fallen in our grasp. We bought you from Spain and have title. We only want enough of your territory to give us a harbor of refuge, a naval station, the right to protect you from outside interlopers, and to get such commercial advantages as you of right ought to give us." Pass a resolution of that kind, and then if those people will not listen to reason and continue to fire on the flag, I for one will say their blood be on their own heads. Let slip the dogs of war and teach them to respect the Stars and Stripes. But we are there now upon a false pretense. We are there wrongfully. We are there without any justification to ourselves or to the civilized world.

Mr. President, I yield to no man in loyalty to the sentiment, "my country, may it ever be right, but right or wrong, my country." But, oh, my God! when I think how dishonorable the prosecution of the war promises to be to us as a people, how little justification for it we have, even to ourselves, I would that you, my brother Senators on this floor, would pass a resolution which could bring about immediately a cessation of hostilities and a condition which might give the Philippine people the same right to bless us as Cuba will possess, and command for us the admiration and respect of the civilized and pagan world!

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, it seems to me that some of the statements of fact made by the Senator from South Carolina [Mr.

TILLMAN] need at least a brief reply, and I desire to state in a very few words just what happened in those islands as a matter of history.

There was an insurrection in the Philippines under the lead of Aguinaldo. The insurrection was dealt with ruthlessly by the Spaniards and was substantially put down. They made an agreement with Aguinaldo and the other chiefs by which on the payment of a certain sum of money and the establishment of certain reforms the chiefs were to withdraw and the insurrection come to an end. In a perfectly characteristic manner, in fact just as they behaved in Cuba in 1878, after the chiefs had yielded and the insurrection was substantially over, the Spaniards failed to make the reforms and paid only half the money. With that money Aguinaldo and his chiefs retired to Hongkong, and, although there was guerrilla warfare here and there in the outlying districts, the insurgent Filipinos were absolutely at the mercy of the Spaniards and the Spanish authority was complete as it always had been over those islands. There was no other sovereignty there. There was no belligerent there.

Aguinaldo was brought to the islands on the 19th of May in the steamer *Nanshaw*, under American auspices. There was at that time no organized Filipino force. At first the results of his appeal were so discouraging that he was disinclined to continue. But he did remain, on representations of support made by our commanders. Then the Filipinos began to come in. They found a very great difference between the situation when they had last faced it and the situation after Admiral Dewey's destruction of the Spanish fleet. So long as there were Spanish ships of war in Manila Bay it was absolutely hopeless for the insurgents to think for one moment of besieging the city or of making any effective attack upon the capital which was the center of the whole Philippine system. But with the Spanish fleet destroyed, with the bay in the hands of the American fleet, they were enabled to draw their forces gradually about the city, and they did so. When Aguinaldo first came into connection with our consuls he said to them that his desire was for annexation to the United States and for freedom from the Spanish rule. After he had got over again to Luzon and found how much the situation had changed, he gradually began to increase his ideas of his own importance. He had never adjusted his own relations to the universe, and they remain unadjusted, I think, at the present time.

But the essential point I desire to make is simply this: The insurgent force, as an effective force, and the insurgent rebellion, as an effective rebellion, existed solely because of the victory of Admiral Dewey, and the Admiral, as you may see by reading his dispatches, said to our Government, "I have been extremely careful in all my dealings with these people. I have never made them the allies of the United States. I have never recognized them. I have simply aided them because they were fighting the common foe." Admiral Dewey can be trusted, I think, to manage a matter of that sort without committing the United States to any position to which it should not be committed.

Now, to-day we are there in the city of Manila rightfully by all the laws of war and by all international law. We hold it, as we have a right to hold it, under the agreement with Spain. There was no sovereignty there whatever except the sovereignty of Spain, and we succeeded to that sovereignty in the city of Manila and its suburbs. There has never been an act of oppression against the Filipinos by any American soldier or by the American forces of any kind in the Philippine Islands. Those patriots have never been oppressed by any American in the active service of the country, or by any American act. Their oppression exists solely in speeches in the United States Senate. They have been treated with the utmost consideration and the utmost kindness, and, after the fashion of Orientals, they have mistaken kindness for timidity.

Now, Mr. President, there were the American forces in Manila, where they had a right to be, and, more than that, stringent orders had gone from the President of the United States to General Otis and Admiral Dewey that under no circumstances whatever should any attack be made upon the Filipinos. More than that, Mr. President, over a fortnight ago Aguinaldo was informed officially by General Otis that the President of the United States had ordered him not to attack the Filipinos, so that he knew we had no intention of attacking him. He knew it a fortnight ago.

This idea that he had no notion of our intentions, Mr. President, is a totally mistaken one. He knew absolutely and officially what the intentions of the United States Government were. He knew what the orders of the President of the United States were to the General and Admiral.

But, Mr. President, knowing all that, the Filipinos deliberately precipitated this attack upon the American forces in Manila, where our army had a right to be. They precipitated an attack upon the forces of the country which had given them their existence as a fighting force, upon the forces of the country which had liberated them from the power of Spain. They did it in the face of the declared intention of the United States, conveyed to them

from the President by the officers in command of the army and navy.

What caused them to make that attack, what encouraged them to do it, I do not know; but I do know that their representative here fled from this city to Canada and started on that flight before any news had reached this city of an attack at Manila. He knew that that attack was coming, and his flight was a confession that he knew it, and I believe that he incited and advised it. He knew the dispatches that he had sent, and whatever reason they may have had for making the attack, they believed they were going to produce a great effect in this country and upon the fate of the treaty by assailing the troops and the ships of the United States.

Now, Mr. President, the Filipinos made that assault upon our troops, upon the friendly nation, upon people who had never oppressed them, and the attack was met as American soldiers and sailors will always meet every attack. And while they are there in arms assailing American troops, when they have shed American blood, I do not think it is the time to help or to encourage them either by speech or in any other way. Let us bring them back to order and to peace. When they return to their senses, when they have learned their lesson, when they are ready to meet us in the spirit in which we went to them, then will be the time to negotiate and deal with them.

But when they attack American troops, attack them with an attempted surprise, attack without one reason or a single provocation for doing so, while that state of things continues, while they, as Spanish subjects, have broken the truce that exists between this country and Spain, and put themselves in the light of public enemies of the United States, there is to my mind but one thing to do, and that is to sustain our Army and Navy. When they return to the ways of peace, then we can deal with them in the ways of peace; but when they of their own motion attack us in the ways of war, then there is but one way to deal with them, and that is by the way of war. They are in collusion with Spain. Spanish soldiers, as General Otis reports, served their guns, and they have been met, as they deserved to be met, with swift and overwhelming punishment.

But the one point I desired to make above all others, Mr. President, and which I now repeat, was that the Filipinos and Aguinaldo knew the generous and peaceful intentions of the United States. They knew that the President had given orders not to attack them, and under those circumstances they themselves made the attack, and made it wantonly. Therefore I do not think that this is the moment to flatter or to coddle or to praise them.

Mr. TILLMAN. Mr. President—

Mr. ALLISON. I hope we will now have the regular order.

Mr. TILLMAN. I hope the Senator will just allow me to put in here—

Mr. ALLISON. Well, Mr. President—

Mr. TILLMAN. It is not 2 o'clock yet.

Mr. ALLISON. Two o'clock has no relation whatever to the question. If we are to pass these appropriation bills, with but twenty-two days now remaining, there must be time for their consideration. I yielded to the Senator from South Carolina to make his observations. I will yield to him now if he desires to put into the RECORD any document or paper.

Mr. TILLMAN. I simply wish to quote what I have quoted once before, but it comes in this immediate connection.

Mr. LODGE. I will say to the Senator from South Carolina that I have read every one of those reports. I know what is in them.

Mr. TILLMAN. I do not doubt that, but I simply desire, if the Senator from Iowa will permit me, to let the people of this country know that by our own officers, sent there specifically to find out the conditions which existed and the probable action of those people, we had notice nearly six months ago—last August—that Aguinaldo and the Filipinos would not permit us or anybody else to set up a colonial government there.

Mr. ALLISON. I am willing the Senator shall have inserted in the RECORD the paper he desires.

Mr. TILLMAN. It is an extract from a letter of Major Bell, major of engineers, and I will ask the kind permission of the Senator to have it read.

Mr. TELLER. Oh, no; put it in the RECORD.

Mr. TILLMAN. I will read it myself. You can not force me to do what I do not want to do, and you can not ride over me when I wish to have a subject discussed. I will discuss it upon the appropriation bill if you will not allow it to be discussed upon the resolution.

Mr. ALLISON. Mr. President—

Mr. TILLMAN. I do not want to be discourteous.

Mr. ALLISON. I do not wish to treat discourteously the Senator from South Carolina or any other Senator. I yielded to him because he had given notice that he desired to make some observations to-day. It is no more my business than it is his business to

deal with these questions that must be considered now. I have yielded now to him to put into the RECORD any paper he desires.

Mr. TILLMAN. I want to have it read. It is only about ten lines.

Mr. ALLISON. I will yield to have it read if the Senator will mark it and send it up to the desk or read it himself.

Mr. TILLMAN. I will read it myself.

Mr. ALLISON. I hope the Senator will.

Mr. TILLMAN. As I said, it is a letter from Maj. J. F. Bell, who was sent to the Filipinos by General Merritt last summer, and who visited various points on Luzon Island, to which he had a safe conduct from Aguinaldo. His report is to this effect in part:

There is not a particle of doubt but what Aguinaldo and his leaders will resist any attempt of any government to reorganize a colonial government here. They are especially bitter toward the Spaniards, but equally determined not to submit any longer to being a colony of any other government. What they would like best of all would be a Filipino republic with an American protectorate, for none realize their inability more clearly than they to maintain a republic without protection of some stronger power.

That is Major Bell's report to us. We have had fair notice. We were told by our own officers that those people would fight us; but in the face of that, our President sent his honorable commissioners to Paris and bought those people like sheep, and now you propose to slaughter them.

Mr. MONEY. Will the Senator from Iowa kindly allow me to read about one minute from a letter from a private soldier, which I have just received, with one other? It is from a young man of the very highest character, a son of one of the most distinguished men in my State. I will read it if the Senator will permit me to do it. It will take about one minute.

Mr. ALLISON. Certainly, I will permit it.

Mr. MONEY. I rely upon the Senator's courtesy, and will not abuse it. Some of the letter is interesting to the general public. I will state that it is dated Manila, Philippine Islands, December 24, 1898. It has been a long time on the way. The writer says:

Have been quite busy recently, as there have been almost daily (and senseless) alarms that the insurgents were going to make an attack. At this writing I believe it only a matter of time when there will be a clash, for the two armies' outposts are within a mile or two of each other, and a single shot from either side would precipitate a general engagement.

That is the opinion of a young man who is a private in the ranks and who, as I said, is absolutely reliable as to truth, and is of sufficient intelligence to form an opinion that ought to be of some value. That letter was written nearly a month and a half ago. It shows the conditions which existed at that time. I thank the Senator from Iowa for his courtesy.

Mr. ALLISON. Now, Mr. President, I call for the regular order.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The regular order is called for, which is the Indian appropriation bill.

#### INDIAN APPROPRIATION BILL.

The Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 11217) making appropriations for the current and contingent expenses of the Indian Department and for fulfilling treaty stipulations with various Indian tribes for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1900, and for other purposes.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The pending question is on the amendment offered by the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. QUAY].

Mr. QUAY. I desire to withdraw the amendment that I offered when the bill was last before the Senate, and, at the suggestion of the Senator from Iowa in charge of the bill, in lieu thereof I move, in line 12, page 34, to strike out the word "ninety" and insert the words "one hundred," which will accomplish the same purpose.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The amendment heretofore proposed is withdrawn, and the Senator from Pennsylvania offers in lieu thereof an amendment which will be stated.

The SECRETARY. On page 34, line 12, before the word "thousand," strike out "ninety" and insert "one hundred;" so as to read:

For subsistence and civilization of the Arapahoes and Cheyennes who have been collected on the reservations set apart for their use and occupation, \$100,000.

Mr. ALLISON. That amendment is in accordance with the suggestion of the Secretary of the Interior, and I do not object to it.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. QUAY. I desire, while I have the floor, to call the attention of the Senator from Iowa to the provision on page 37:

For the purchase of teams, farming implements, seeds, and other necessary articles for the Mexican Kickapoo Indians, known as the "Kicking Kickapoos," in Oklahoma Territory, in the discretion of the Secretary of the Interior, \$3,000.

That amendment is insufficient. Two thousand was allotted to them last year, which proved to be altogether insufficient. I ask the Senator from Iowa to agree to an amendment increasing the appropriation from \$3,000 to \$5,000.

Mr. ALLISON. The committee authorized me to propose to increase the amount from \$3,000 to \$5,000, and to make it immediately available. Therefore I move to strike out "three" and to insert "five" before "thousand," and to add, after "dollars," "to be immediately available."

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The amendment will be stated.

The SECRETARY. On line 8, page 37, strike out "three," before "thousand," and insert "five;" and insert at the end of line 9 the words "to be immediately available;" so as to read:

For the purchase of teams, farming implements, seeds, and other necessary articles for the Mexican Kickapoo Indians, known as the "Kicking Kickapoos," in Oklahoma Territory, in the discretion of the Secretary of the Interior, \$5,000, to be immediately available.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. TURNER. I ask the Senator from Iowa to yield to me to offer an amendment to the pending bill for reference to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

Mr. ALLISON. I desire to propose some amendments on behalf of the committee. Before doing so I yield, of course, to the Senator from Washington.

Mr. TURNER. I wish to get the amendment to the Committee on Indian Affairs and to get a report on it before the bill passes. I send the proposed amendment to the desk.

Mr. TURNER's amendment authorizing the Indians of the Yakima Indian Reservation to lease their lands allotted for agricultural purposes for a term not exceeding five years, etc., was referred to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

#### TICKET BROKERAGE.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The hour of 2 o'clock has arrived, and it is the duty of the Chair to lay before the Senate the unfinished business, which will be stated.

The SECRETARY. A bill (S. 1575) to amend an act entitled "An act to regulate commerce."

Mr. ALLISON. I ask that the unfinished business may be informally laid aside so as to proceed with the consideration of the Indian appropriation bill.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Senator from Iowa asks that the consideration of the Indian appropriation bill be continued, laying aside the unfinished business informally.

Mr. ALLEN. Is the unfinished business the bill commonly known as the anti-scalping bill?

The VICE-PRESIDENT. So the Chair understands.

Mr. ALLEN. How does it become the unfinished business?

The VICE-PRESIDENT. It was made so by a vote of the Senate.

Mr. CULLOM. Two weeks ago.

Mr. ALLEN. I was not here at the time, and therefore I did not know it.

#### POLICY REGARDING THE PHILIPPINE ISLANDS.

Mr. LINDSAY. With the consent of the Senator from Iowa, I will inquire what becomes of the joint resolution of the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. McENERY] which has been under discussion this morning?

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The joint resolution goes to the Calendar.

Mr. ALLISON. The joint resolution was taken up this morning by unanimous consent in order that the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. TILLMAN] might make some observations upon it.

Mr. LINDSAY. I desire to give notice that on Thursday, after the morning business has been disposed of, if I do not interfere with any appropriation bill, I will submit some remarks on that joint resolution.

Mr. ALLISON. I should be very glad if two or three days now could be devoted to the consideration of pressing appropriation bills that must go back to the House.

Mr. LINDSAY. I shall not interfere with appropriation bills.

Mr. ALLISON. I assure the Senator from Kentucky that there will be ample opportunity for him and other Senators to discuss the joint resolution which was introduced by the Senator from Louisiana, and I hope we may have a vote upon it.

Mr. MASON. Mr. President, I desire to give notice that I intend to make some remarks upon the pending resolution, unless it is disposed of, and I do not consider the appropriation bills of so great importance as the pending resolution. I intend to be very respectful to the budget of annual appropriation bills; but there has been an agreement running now for weeks, and finally upon the last vote an agreement was made by many of the Senators, that we were to have a vote upon the joint resolution yesterday immediately after the adoption of the treaty. I do not say that we were all taken into the agreement. I say that that agreement was made, and upon that agreement the treaty was ratified. I mean to say—

Mr. JONES of Arkansas. Will the Senator from Illinois inform the Senate when that agreement was made?

Mr. MASON. I refer to what came to my attention in the

course of ordinary conversation with my colleagues upon the floor immediately before the vote was taken.

Mr. JONES of Arkansas. I had not noticed anything of it in the RECORD, and I did not know when the agreement was made.

Mr. MASON. If the Senator had been attentive he would have observed that I said it was not an agreement to which we were all parties. I do regard it as more important than any appropriation bill. I happen to have that opinion, and I differ very materially with very many of my colleagues on both sides of this Chamber. When I get ready to be heard I will promise the Senate to be silent, if that will be any inducement, in order to get a vote upon these resolutions.

There seems to be, however, a manifest disposition not to have a vote after having the treaty adopted, and after having reached a state of war with the natives, which I believed would take place and which I stated in this Chamber would take place, and for which I was sneered at by distinguished gentlemen who now refuse us a vote. Having reached a state that was as clear to be seen as that the night was to follow the day, and having reached the point when you agreed that we should have a vote to declare upon what basis those people should be treated, at least to hold out some ray of hope, some peg where they could hang a hope of ultimate independence, if we are to go on now day after day with every promise made broken and disregarded, I say very respectfully to the Senator who has charge of the appropriation bills that I do not consider the appropriation bills half as sacred as the keeping of the promise made between ourselves that there should be a vote upon the resolution. I make this reply to his suggestion. I shall not permit the appropriation bills to interfere with me when I am prepared to speak upon the resolutions, and I announce now that I shall not speak upon them if there is any disposition to give us a vote.

It looks to me as though the Senator from South Carolina, or rather the Senator from Louisiana who introduced the resolution, and who had an agreement absolutely with the gentlemen in charge of the treaty, is to be treated for the next thirty days as I have been treated when I respectfully asked for a vote upon my resolution. I desire to give notice, respectfully, that I have no special consideration and no interest in appropriation bills compared with the interest I believe the people have in the passage of one of these resolutions, or the defeat of the resolution, if you please.

Mr. ALLISON. Mr. President, I have no other interest in the business of the Senate than every other Senator has. These appropriation bills are bills of great detail and usually require conferences between the two Houses respecting them. Since I have been in the Senate they have taken precedence, by unanimous consent, of all other business of the Senate.

I do not know what contract or agreement or arrangement the Senator from Illinois suggests, but, so far as I am concerned, I am ready any moment to vote upon his resolution or any other. The difficulty respecting this resolution and kindred resolutions is that they are debated and debated, and no vote seems possible. I am willing at any moment to have a vote taken, and now, if Senators will vote upon the resolution, I am willing to vote upon it.

But it is absolutely essential, if we are to transact the business of the Senate during this session, that the appropriation bills shall be disposed of. I am willing to sit here at night and to have long sessions during the day to consider the resolutions that are cognate to the one proposed by the Senator from Louisiana, but I submit to Senators that we will get along much more rapidly with the business of the Senate by taking up the appropriation bills when they are ready for consideration and taking up the important matter suggested by the Senator from Illinois at other times.

Mr. TILLMAN obtained the floor.

Mr. MASON. Well, Mr. President—

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Senator from South Carolina has been recognized.

Mr. MASON. I ask unanimous consent that the vote upon the resolution of the Senator from Louisiana be taken—

Mr. TILLMAN. I have the floor, I believe, Mr. President.

Mr. MASON. I beg the Senator's pardon.

Mr. TILLMAN. I wish to ask the Senator from Illinois a question if he will be kind enough to answer it. I understood him a moment ago—if I did not understand him rightly, I hope he will correct me—to state that an agreement was reached or a pledge made to the Senator from Louisiana and the Senator from South Carolina, my colleague, prior to their voting for the treaty that if they did vote for it they would be given a resolution of this character or a vote on it. Was that it?

Mr. MASON. No.

Mr. TILLMAN. What was it that the Senator said?

Mr. MASON. You did not understand me. I said an agreement was made to which we were not all a party. It was not an agreement made in open Senate by unanimous consent, but an agreement was made and brought to my attention by different colleagues upon the floor that it was agreed, and agreed all around,

that the moment the treaty was passed we were to have a vote upon the resolution of the Senator from Louisiana. It was not agreed, so far as I know, with either the junior Senator from South Carolina or the Senator from Louisiana. I had no talk with them on the subject.

Mr. TILLMAN. "Allaround." Where, Mr. President? Around the Senator from Illinois?

Mr. MASON. Well, that is a good deal—about twice around the Senator from South Carolina and once around the junior Senator.

Mr. TILLMAN. I was simply trying to arrive at a knowledge of what had been agreed upon and by whom the agreement had been made.

Mr. MASON. Oh, it was a statement. I made it very plain. It was not a unanimous agreement in open Senate, such as we usually make, whereby we fix a time to vote. It was the general talk among my colleagues. I was not managing—

Mr. TILLMAN. If the Senator does not get that vote, he will consider that he has been buncoed?

Mr. MASON. I am getting used to it since I came into this body. But what I want to give notice of is that I am getting a little bit tired of it, and I want a vote upon one of these resolutions. I do not want to ask any Senator to vote contrary to his judgment. I claim that I have a right to express myself, and if I can not get a vote upon it I want to inflict the Senate and the country once again.

Mr. ALLEN. Mr. President, I would like to ask—

Mr. MASON. I ask unanimous consent that the vote upon the resolution offered by the Senator from Louisiana shall be taken at 1 o'clock to-morrow.

Mr. WOLCOTT. I object to any unanimous consent being given.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Senator from Nebraska [Mr. ALLEN] was recognized.

Mr. MASON. I suggest the absence of a quorum. I do not think the Senator would make that suggestion if there was a full house.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Chair has not yet put the request of the Senator from Illinois, because the Senator from Nebraska has been recognized. The Chair will put the request later.

Mr. MASON. I suggest the absence of a quorum. I want a full Senate.

#### SPEECHES AT A JACKSONIAN BANQUET.

Mr. ALLEN. I desire to interrupt the Senator from Iowa long enough to ask permission to place in the RECORD certain speeches published in the Omaha World-Herald of January 8, 1899, at the Jacksonian banquet held in Omaha. The speeches were made by ex-Vice-President Stevenson, ex-Governor John P. Altgeld, Hon. WILLIAM SULZER, of New York, Dr. A. H. Hipple, Judge Robinson, and Hon. T. J. Doyle, of Nebraska, and bear upon important political issues now before the country. I ask unanimous consent to have them printed in the RECORD.

Mr. MASON. I object.

Mr. ALLISON. I was not able to hear a word the Senator from Nebraska said, so I do not know what he desires.

Mr. WOLCOTT. I could not hear a word.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Unanimous consent is asked by the Senator from Nebraska to print in the RECORD certain speeches.

Mr. ALLEN. I do not desire to make a speech myself and attach these speeches as a part of my remarks, but they are speeches delivered by such men as ex-Vice-President Stevenson, ex-Governor Altgeld, and men of that character, and they bear—

Mr. MASON. Mr. President—

Mr. ALLEN. I will yield to the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. MASON. I objected. I followed the lead of the distinguished Senator from Colorado. I am opposed to unanimous consent.

Mr. ALLEN. I could not tell at this distance whether it was a protest or an approval.

Mr. MASON. There are very few things you can tell so far as they are off now.

Mr. ALLEN. I see the Senator, however, very well. They are speeches by such gentlemen as I have named and—

Mr. MASON. Mr. President, I call for the regular order.

Mr. ALLEN. I yield again to the Senator from Illinois.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Senator from Nebraska is in order.

Mr. ALLEN. Such men as Dr. Hipple—

Mr. MASON. Then I am not in order when I object to the unanimous consent asked?

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The question has not yet been put to the Senate. The Senator from Nebraska has not finished his statement.

Mr. MASON. Mr. President, I rise to a question of order. The Senator from Nebraska asked for unanimous consent, and I objected.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Chair holds that the Senator from Nebraska can not be taken from the floor in that way. The Chair will put his request to the Senate in a moment.

Mr. ALLEN. I have made the request I desired, if I have been able to make it clear to the Chair.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Unanimous consent is asked of the Senate that certain papers referred to by the Senator from Nebraska be published in the RECORD. Is there objection?

Mr. MASON. I object.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Objection is made.

Mr. ALLEN. Mr. President, I think the resolution which has just been so ably discussed—

Mr. MASON. Mr. President, I rise to a point of order. There is no quorum present to transact business.

Mr. ALLEN. I trust the Senator will observe the rules and not attempt to take me off my feet while I am upon the floor.

Mr. MASON. I am anxious to have a full house while the Senator speaks.

Mr. ALLEN. That suggestion can not be made while I occupy the floor.

Mr. MASON. I ask for a ruling of the Chair upon the question whether it is not proper to make that point at any time.

Mr. ALLEN. I decline to yield to my amiable friend from Illinois. I will be through in a few moments.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Chair will recognize the Senator from Illinois as soon as the Senator from Nebraska yields the floor.

Mr. MASON. Then do I understand the rule to be that while a Senator is speaking the point of no quorum can not be made?

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Chair so understands the rule.

Mr. ALLEN. It has been the ruling since I have been here that a Senator can not be taken off the floor by another Senator suggesting the want of a quorum.

When interrupted by the Senator from Illinois I was endeavoring to say that I think the resolution introduced by the Senator from Louisiana ought in good faith to be adopted by the Senate without any further debate or dissent. It has developed this morning that in some kind of a conclave or caucus or conference, from which some of us were excluded and of which we knew nothing, it was determined yesterday to take up the resolution of the Senator from Louisiana and adopt it after the ratification of the treaty of peace with Spain.

Mr. President, that resolution is expressive of very important doctrine. It declares a policy on the part of the Government of the United States. It is in perfect harmony and keeping with the doctrines of the Declaration of Independence; it is in perfect accord with the fourth subdivision of our declaration of war with Spain, introduced by the senior Senator from Colorado [Mr. TELLER]; and in so far as it touches the question at all it is expressive of a true American doctrine.

The questions of expansion and of imperialism are important questions in this country at this time. There is a broad distinction between natural, peaceful, and proper territorial expansion where territory is ceded to this country through peaceful means and by mutual agreement, and that other kind of expansion which finds its chief prototype in Napoleon I, and which believes in the forcible colonization and subjection of alien peoples and their territory to our country against their protest.

I understand that to be in substance the distinction between expansion and imperialism. This distinction is made very clear by certain speeches made at the Jacksonian banquet at Omaha on the 8th of January last, delivered by our late honorable Vice-President, Mr. Stevenson; ex-Governor Altgeld, of the great Commonwealth of Illinois; Hon. WILLIAM SULZER, of New York; Dr. Hipple, Judge Robinson, and Hon. T. J. Doyle, of my State. These speeches are exceptionally able; they were delivered by a class of orators and thinkers equal, I can say without any disrespect or disparagement, to any Senator in this Chamber; and now, without reading the speeches, I ask that the usual course be pursued, and that they be printed as a part of my remarks. I offer them.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request made by the Senator from Nebraska?

Mr. MASON. I object.

Mr. ALLEN. Then I will read them myself. I trust the Senator will not go to that length. Such a thing has never occurred in this Chamber before to my knowledge. I send these speeches to the desk and ask the Secretary to read them in their order, and I also send the order in which they were delivered.

Mr. MASON. I have no desire to inflict any physical punishment upon the Senator from Nebraska. I am perfectly willing the speeches shall be read, if everybody else is agreeable. I have often heard these speeches myself, as I come from the State of Illinois; but if the Senator wants to give them to the country in this way, and no one else objects to their reading, I shall not object.

Mr. ALLEN. I have not had the benefit of them myself. The Senator resides in one of the most populous cities of the United

States, where they enjoy all the facilities and opportunities for an education.

Mr. MASON. Did the Senator say "populous" or "Populist"?

Mr. ALLEN. I reside in a Populist city of about 1,600 people, 75 miles west of the Missouri River, and only having one little branch railroad, and so my opportunities of education are very limited. If I had the opportunities the honorable Senator from Illinois has, I have no doubt that in the course of twenty-five or thirty years I might acquire as much information as he possesses.

Mr. GALLINGER. Will the Senator permit me?

Mr. ALLEN. Yes, sir.

Mr. GALLINGER. I desire to ask the Senator if he would not be satisfied to have the speeches referred to printed as a document? They would then be available to all Senators.

Mr. ALLEN. They are short, and I think they ought to take the ordinary course.

Mr. GALLINGER. Of course I shall not object to the Senator's request; I wish, however, that he would not put them in the RECORD, but have them printed as a document.

Mr. ALLEN. I prefer the ordinary course of printing them as a part of my remarks.

Mr. HAWLEY. I object to the speeches going into the RECORD, if that is the request.

Mr. ALLEN. Then I will put them into the RECORD myself.

Mr. HAWLEY. I do not object captiously; but these are the ordinary Jacksonian banquet speeches, which in excellence and eloquence are probably not different from the numerous other speeches delivered at such banquets held in the last fifty years. They cover a large space, four newspaper pages of speeches of the Senator's particular personal friends, no more eloquent, no more able, than a great many others which have been delivered. I think it is a calamity to burden the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD with matter of that kind. The RECORD is coming to be for an ordinary Congress an enormous mass of volumes, and it is getting to be so that no ordinary library in the country will consent to take them for a series of years, as they will not have room for them. They are rarely looked at again after the morning they appear.

Mr. ALLEN. This is the first time in the six years I have served here that I have ever heard objection to the attaching of speeches or documents to the remarks of a Senator.

Mr. HAWLEY. I have myself before made objections.

Mr. ALLEN. I have the power to put these speeches in the RECORD in spite of the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. HAWLEY], and if he wants to consume the time of the Senate that it will take me to read the speeches, he may do so. I will read them.

Mr. HAWLEY. The Senator speaks as if the crime would be mine of reading those speeches here. I will withdraw my objection and let the Senator put them in the RECORD, but I shall protest hereafter against this shameful crowding of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD with foreign matter.

Mr. ALLEN. I thank the Senator.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Nebraska?

Mr. MASON. I have no objection to the speeches being read, but I object to their being printed without being read.

Mr. ALLEN. I submit that it is the ordinary courtesy of the Senate.

Mr. MASON. I say I do not ask the Senator to read the speeches. I am perfectly willing to relieve the Senator from any physical effort of that kind. I do not intend to inflict the Senator to the extent of compelling him to read those speeches which he has so often pondered on.

Mr. ALLEN. I want to appeal to the Senator from Illinois not to stand here and badger me about this matter. I am not a mere tyro. I know something about the courtesies of the Senate. I have been here for a few years, and I have yet to see an instance in which there has been an objection made to a Senator publishing speeches or documents as a part of his own remarks.

Mr. MASON. I do not object to that.

Mr. ALLEN. Now, does the Senator want me to stand here and kill the valuable time of the Senate and delay the passage of the Indian appropriation bill and the passage of the resolution of the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. McENERY] by reading these speeches? I appeal to the Senator to pursue the ordinary courtesies of the Senate, and to permit these speeches to be published without reading, as a part of my remarks.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none.

Mr. MASON. Mr. President, I beg your pardon. I do object.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Senator from Illinois objects.

Mr. MASON. I object. I want the speeches read. I had some intimation of some agreement and I asked unanimous consent for a vote, and I have tried it for thirty days while the distinguished Senator has been looking after his fences—which was all right—for a vote upon one of these resolutions, and yet we are further off from a vote to-day than we were thirty days ago. I consider those

resolutions of greater importance than that the speeches of distinguished United States Senators, ex-Representatives, or the ex-governor of the State of Illinois should be read here, or than the appropriation bill, if the Senator pleases.

Mr. ALLEN. I hope the Senator will not undertake to punish me for the sins of his party. Let the Senator turn his wrath upon the Senator from Iowa [Mr. ALLISON] or some other distinguished leader of his party in this Chamber, and not undertake to reach his own side of the Chamber by heaping his discourtesies upon me.

Mr. MASON. Is it a discourtesy to you to ask that the public and the Senate have the benefit of the reading by one of the clerks at the desk?

Mr. ALLEN. No; but, Mr. President—

Mr. MASON. I fear the Senator is looking for some discourteous treatment where none is intended.

Mr. ALLEN. I am not looking for any discourtesy at all—not the slightest.

The Senator from Illinois said a moment ago that some kind of agreement was made yesterday, I believe, respecting a vote to be taken upon the resolution of the honorable Senator from Louisiana now pending before the Senate. I did not know such an agreement was made. I had never heard of it before. I infer from what the Senator from Illinois says that it was an agreement made on the Republican side of this Chamber. Now, if the Senator and his Republican associates are recreant to their agreement, if they fail at this time to keep their pledge that the resolution shall be promptly brought before the Senate and voted upon, I insist I am not a party to that transaction, and that the Senator, instead of undertaking to prevent my having these speeches printed in accordance with the precedents of the Senate—a thing which has never been done before to my knowledge—ought to turn his batteries upon his own political associates who have been guilty of this supposed treachery.

Mr. GALLINGER. If the Senator will permit me, I desire to say that as one very insignificant Republican Senator, I was not a party to any agreement and know nothing of it.

Mr. ALLEN. Mr. President, I do not like to be made a poodle dog in a play of this kind.

Mr. ALLISON. If the Senator from Nebraska will allow me—he suggested that the Senator from Illinois should turn his vials of wrath upon the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations rather than upon his side of the Chamber—I wish to say that I know nothing of any such agreement. So I want to absolve myself from the wrath of the Senator from Illinois, if I can.

Mr. ALLEN. I want to make one more appeal to the Senator from Illinois to extend me the ordinary personal courtesy, which has never been denied in this Chamber, of having these speeches published in the RECORD without their being read.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. ALLEN] that he be permitted to print as part of his remarks in the RECORD the papers he has sent to the Secretary's desk?

Mr. MASON. I object, Mr. President.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Objection is made.

Mr. ALLEN. Well, Mr. President, I do not know that I can do anything but to bide my opportunity when the Senator is absent from the Chamber to have the speeches published, or to ask the Secretary to read them now.

Mr. MASON. I have no objection at all to having them read. I should enjoy them very much.

Mr. ALLEN. I do not like to be put in the attitude of antagonizing or being made the conscious instrument through the capricious conduct of the Senator from Illinois of delaying the public business.

Mr. TILLMAN. Will the Senator yield to me for a question? I desire, if I can, to find out what the hitch is.

Mr. ALLEN. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. TILLMAN. I rise to a parliamentary inquiry, Mr. President. I desire to know just what is before the Senate—not the appropriation bill, but the immediate trouble.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. A request for unanimous consent to have certain matter printed in the RECORD as a part of the remarks of the Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. MASON. Printed without reading, Mr. President.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Printed without reading.

Mr. TILLMAN. I understood the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. HAWLEY] to withdraw his objection to having the matter printed.

Mr. ALLEN. Yes. The objection comes from the Senator from Illinois [Mr. MASON].

I will withdraw these speeches, Mr. President, for the time being, or my request for their publication, until the atmosphere clears a little, when I will attempt it again.

Mr. ALLEN subsequently said: I desire to offer these speeches as a part of my remarks made a few moments ago, and I ask unanimous consent that they be published without reading.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. GALLINGER in the chair). The Senator from Nebraska asks unanimous consent that the documents he has sent to the desk be inserted as a part of his remarks. Is there objection? The Chair hears none.

The speeches referred to are as follows:

THE DEMOCRATIC PARTY.

[Speech of Hon. Adlai E. Stevenson in response to the toast, "The Democratic Party," at the annual banquet of the Jacksonian Club, at Omaha, Nebr., January 7, 1899.]

Mr. President and Gentlemen: I count it indeed a high privilege to join my voice with yours to-night in this magnificent city of the West in doing honor to the memory of one of the patron saints of Democracy, Andrew Jackson. During the century now drawing to a close America has given to the world its best lessons in liberty and in law. Near its beginning to Great Britain—no less than to Spain at its close—it has given a never-to-be-forgotten lesson in the dread art of war. The brilliancy of recent victories, the splendid achievements of our arms upon foreign shores and upon distant waters, can not obscure or dim the glory of the triumph of American valor at New Orleans upon the proud day of which this is the anniversary. The 8th of January is one of the sacred days of our calendar.

Each recurring anniversary recalls a bloody struggle which will for all time hold its place in history. Upon that day Jackson, with a handful of militia, with a loss of 7 killed and 6 wounded, defeated and captured the splendidly equipped regulars of the British army. The disgraceful surrender of Hull at Detroit, the wanton destruction by fire of the public buildings at Washington, with all the insults and wrongs which had precipitated the second war with Great Britain, were more than atoned for by the victory we celebrate. It was the last battle of the war; the last fought—the last, I trust in God, that will ever be fought—by England against the United States. The events which inspired, together with the glorious culmination of a struggle forced by a powerful upon a weak nation, belong now to the domain of history. No American will forget that the British courage, before which a few months later the old guard of Napoleon went down at Waterloo, was unable to cope with Jackson and his heroic comrades at New Orleans.

The treaty of Ghent, establishing peace—which I trust will endure with the ages—between Great Britain and America, had been signed on the 24th of December, fourteen days before the great battle was fought. For many days thereafter its existence was unknown to the real actors in the great drama. We stand in awe as we contemplate the marvels which have been wrought out by man in the years that lie between that great event and the present hour.

We celebrate each returning 8th of January—as each returning Fourth day of July—in no spirit of unfriendliness to the land from which we derive our language and in a measure our laws, but that the noble deeds of the illustrious dead, the founders and defenders of the Republic, may not perish from the memories of the living. Responding and rejoicing as we do at every manifestation of good will upon the part of the mother country toward her once dependent colonies, yet it is not meet that the truths of history be forgotten. Earnestly as we desire that for the future the battle flag be furled between us and our kindred beyond the sea, yet may the day be far distant when the recurrence of our national anniversaries fail to touch a responsive chord in the American heart.

Upon this historic anniversary and this coming together of such as are of the political faith of Andrew Jackson, it may not be out of place to note in brief words some of the achievements of the great party of which during a stormy career he was the acknowledged chief and defender. The Democratic party, under the leadership of its immortal founder, Thomas Jefferson, after a memorable contest, came into power on the 4th day of March, 1801. The intervening years that stretch back to that masterful hour make up almost a century of our national life. No age nor country within so brief a span has witnessed events so stupendous, achievements so marvelous along all pathways of human thought and endeavor. All that genius in the ages past has contributed to the world's treasury of knowledge—to whatever tends to human comfort and to the lessening of human distress—dwindles in the presence of the marvelous achievements of the nineteenth century.

The United States of America—its form of government still an experiment—containing a few millions of people, with but scant population west of the Alleghenies, its frontiers in constant menace from the savage, without army or navy, was struggling for place among the nations. The hour that witnessed the inauguration of Jefferson witnessed the first advent to power of the great political party which for more than one-half the years that make up our constitutional history has controlled the destiny of the Republic. In his brief address to his countrymen upon his induction into the great office Jefferson gave expression to his views upon the salient principles of government, and formulated that confession of political faith which for almost a century has been the touchstone of all Democratic platforms and creeds.

As the key to constitutional interpretation, as the corner stone of our governmental fabric, he proclaimed: "Equal and exact justice to all men of whatever state or persuasion, religious or political; peace, commerce, and honest friendship with all nations, entangling alliances with none; the support of the State governments in all their rights as the most convenient administration for all our domestic concerns; the preservation of the General Government in its whole constitutional vigor as the sheet anchor of our peace at home and safety abroad; absolute acquiescence in the decisions of the majority, the vital principle of republics; a well-disciplined militia, our best reliance in peace and for the first moments of war; the supremacy of the civil over the military authority; economy in the public expense, that labor may be lightly burdened; the honest payment of our debts and sacred preservation of the public faith; encouragement of agriculture and of commerce as its handmaid, freedom of religion, freedom of the press, freedom of person under the protection of the habeas corpus, and trial by juries impartially selected."

During fifty-six of the ninety-eight years that have passed since this "creed of our political faith" was declared, the Democratic party has been in control of the General Government. With the deathless principles here enunciated as its evangel, it has kept the faith. In victory and in defeat it has held inviolable the tenets of its great apostle. It celebrated its advent to power by the repeal of the odious alien and sedition laws, enacted by the Federal party during the Administration of Adams. The champion of "equal and exact justice to all men," it stands to-day, as in the past, the relentless foe of special privileges, of organized greed, of high protective and prohibitory tariffs, of all unlawful combinations, monopolies and "trusts"—of whatever tends to oppress or to enrich a class at the expense of the people. Deprecating whatever deprives the accused of his guaranteed right of trial by jury, it held with our great court—amid the storm and stress of civil strife—"The Constitution of the United States the supreme law of the land, in war as well as in peace." Recognizing the wisdom of the fathers in the creation of the great coordinate departments of the Government, the Democratic party, at a critical moment in our history, defeated the mad efforts of the dominant party in Congress to remove from his high office by impeachment the President of the United States for the exercise of clearly defined executive duties.

The antagonist at all times of religious tests and religious intolerance, the Democratic party—amid the excitement and passion born of Know-Nothing fanaticism and proscription—stood, the bulwark of liberty and conscience—of the right to worship God according to the dictates of individual judgment and reason. To the end that "labor be lightly burdened" and commerce, "the handmaid of agriculture," encouraged, the Democratic party stands now, as in the past, for "tariff for revenue only," for the reduction to the minimum of the cost of all necessary articles of consumption. Experience has demonstrated that high tariffs have deprived the Government of its needed revenues, secured to the favored beneficiaries colossal fortunes, and largely increased to the people the cost of the necessities of life. The baleful but logical results of so-called "protection" are seen in the sudden growth of giant monopolies, combination in restraint of lawful trade, and "trusts," more perilous than foreign foe to the existence of popular government.

"Economy in the public expense" has been and will continue the party shibboleth of democracy. "Subsidies" and all unnecessary expenditures of the public money have ever found untiring foes in those who hold the political faith of Jefferson. Recognizing the imperative obligation to maintain intact State as well as Federal authority—each within the limits prescribed by the Constitution—the Democratic party, with Jefferson, would maintain the rights of the States "as most convenient for the administration of all domestic concerns," and recognize as paramount the sacred obligation "to preserve the General Government in its constitutional vigor as the sheet anchor of our peace at home and our safety abroad." "Honest payment of our debts and sacred preservation of the public faith." It was during the wise and economical Administration of President Jackson that the last dollar of governmental indebtedness was paid and our national debt wholly extinguished.

The Democratic party would mete out even-handed justice alike to creditor and debtor. It is the antagonist of whatever, either in legislation or administration, would impair the sacredness of existing obligations or render their discharge more difficult by augmenting or by lessening the debt-paying power of money. "A well-disciplined militia—our best reliance in peace and for the first moments of war." True at the beginning of the century, with a few millions of population, no less true at the close, as we stand in the forefront of the nations, with a population of 70,000,000. The result of our recent conflict with Spain gives emphasis to the prophetic words of Jefferson. Existing conditions in continental Europe, entailing taxation and misery to the verge of human endurance, illustrate by sad object lessons the inevitable results of large standing armies in time of peace.

Shall we still give heed to the warning of the great sage of the revolution or enter upon a new century with European monarchies as our model? Shall we be deaf to the teachings of one hundred years of our own history? Without a large standing army, but relying upon the patriotism and courage of American manhood, we were victorious in the war with Great Britain, with Mexico, in the great civil strife, and with Spain. In the light of history, can it be possible that the American people will consent to the creation of a large standing army and its consequent continuing and ever-increasing burden of taxation? Shall this be the response of the free Republic to the appeal that comes from despotic Russia for the disarmament of all the nations?

"Peace, commerce, and honest friendship with all nations—entangling alliances with none." At no period in our history have these words of Jefferson possessed a deeper significance. Before we abandon the traditions of the fathers it is well that we deliberate upon the possible consequences of a departure from the settled governmental policy of more than a century. Not in the "delirium of victory," but only after calm discussion of what may follow, should the momentous question now presented be determined. Nations as well as individuals may "do that in their zeal which their calmer judgment dare not approve." It would be difficult to conceive of a question more vital, more far-reaching in its consequences, than that now confronting us as to the disposition of recent conquered territory.

Is it too much to say that the enforcement of the proposed policy of the expansionists in a large measure involves the question of a change in our form of government? It can hardly be contended that the measure proposed for the control or government of the Philippine Islands finds warrant in the Constitution. Shall the closing hours of the century witness the American people abandoning the pathway in which past generations have found prosperity and happiness, and embarking upon that of aggression and expansion, against which we are warned by the wrecks which lie along the entire pathway of history? Even if true that "imperialism" would open up a new and larger field for our commerce and make us an important factor in the great affairs of nations, even these would be purchased at too dear a price. Standing out against the new policy of expansion, of absorbing distant islands, with their 10,000,000 mongrel population, into our body politic, with all it involves of European complication, are the warnings of the founders of the Republic. It was Jefferson who said, "Our first and fundamental maxim should be never to entangle ourselves in the broils of Europe."

Washington, when retiring from his great office, left these farewell words to be read and pondered by the oncoming generations of his countrymen: "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. 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. Our detached and distant situation invites and enables us to pursue a different course. Why forego the advantages of so peculiar a situation? Why quit our own to stand on foreign ground? Why, by interweaving our destiny with that of any part of Europe, entangle ourselves in the toils of European ambition, rivalry, interest, or caprice?"

To those who, in the exuberance of feeling produced by suddenly discovered kinship, would "interweave our destiny" with that of England, counting on her friendship and aid in whatever continental entanglements may result from imperialism, it may be well to recall the suggestive words of Washington: "There can be no greater error than to expect or calculate upon real favors from nation to nation. It is an illusion which experience must cure, which a just pride ought to discard." Is it asking too much of the American people to solemnly ponder the warnings of Washington and his compatriots before venturing upon an untried pathway beset with foreign jealousies, complications, and antagonisms?

As precedents for the proposed policy of expansion we are referred by its advocates to the Louisiana purchase and to the vast area added to our Republic by the treaty of Guadalupe Hidalgo. Neither the purchase from France in 1803 nor the cession by Mexico half a century ago furnish a precedent for the policy now proposed to be inaugurated. By the Louisiana purchase the United States acquired the vast territory stretching northward to the British possessions and westward from the Mississippi to the domain of the Spaniard. Out of this vast area, purchased for \$15,000,000 from the great Napoleon, have been carved 14 sovereign States. As the result of the masterly statesmanship of President Jefferson and the unrivaled diplomacy of Monroe and Livingston the free navigation of the Mississippi was secured forever, and a magnificent area, an empire in extent, made a part of our national domain. This grand achievement is the glory of Jefferson and of the great historic party of which he was the founder.

Under a later Democratic Administration, and as the result of the treaty

which terminated our war with Mexico, we acquired California, Nevada, Utah, a portion of Arizona, and New Mexico, thus bringing under our flag, to remain forever, the vast expanse stretching from the eastern seaboard to the Pacific Ocean. The territory thus acquired was the fit abode for men of our own race. Either at the period of annexation or soon thereafter it passed under the rule of the Anglo-Saxon, who had carried with him our language and our laws. It was territory contiguous to our own, and acquired with the intention at the proper time—when population and conditions would justify—of carving it into States. The wisdom that inspired all this seems more than human. The result: Millions of happy American homes, increase beyond the dreams of avarice of our national wealth, and the United States chief among the nations of the earth.

Are we to be told that history is but repeating itself, and that the contemplated annexation or absorption of the Philippine Archipelago finds precedent in the historic events I have mentioned? The answer is found in the bare statement of facts. The acquired territory is contiguous; the Philippine islands, 8,000 miles distant. The former adapted to the residence, comfort, and happiness of our own people; the latter the fit abode for the half-civilized and degraded races, its only occupants amid poverty and wretchedness for centuries. The acquisition of the territory upon our own continent added little to the national expense; to maintain sovereignty over the distant islands will necessitate immense expenditures upon our Army and Navy. The people of the former were of the self-governing races; the latter know no rule but that of force.

We are told that "Trade follows the flag," and that untold commercial advantages will result from the proposed acquisition. Trade knows no sentiment; it goes where it is profitable. What of our products will find market in these remote islands? Ninety per cent of our exports reach European markets "because only the civilized man is the consumer." Whatever of commercial advantage may result from annexation will be as the dust in the balance to the immense naval expenditure it entails.

The graver questions involved in the proposed scheme of annexation are yet to be considered. What is to be the permanent form of government for the Philippine Islands? I do not controvert the power of the National Government to acquire new territory. The power incident, of establishing for it temporary government, is alike unquestioned. The instances already cited, of the Louisiana purchase and that by treaty from Mexico, are well established precedents. In these cases, however, it was never questioned that, with suitable boundaries and division and under proper regulations, the entire territory would ultimately attain to statehood.

The question recurs, What form of government do the expansionists propose for the Philippine Islands? Are the Territorial or colonial governments which Congress may possibly establish to be only preliminary to the creation of sovereign States to be admitted into the Federal Union? This of necessity contemplates the admission of many additional Senators and Representatives to seats in Congress, the aggregate population of the islands now being double that of our entire country at the first inauguration of Washington. In view of the degraded character of the population, their total unfitness for self-government, the proposition is monstrous. Its consummation would be a crime against civilization.

If it be the intention to establish our political institutions in these remote islands, then what becomes of the "Monroe doctrine?" This vital international policy, announced by the President of the United States seventy-five years ago, was: "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." Immediately following this, and as part of the declared intention of our Government, so clearly enunciated by Monroe, was the solemn declaration: "With the existing colonies or dependencies of any European power we have not interfered and shall not interfere."

The Monroe doctrine is wholesome and enduring. It is the faith of Americans of every creed and party—is of the very warp and woof of our political being. It was promulgated at the critical moment when the "Holy Alliance" was attempting to stifle the republican spirit and reestablish the despotism of Spain upon her revolted colonies in South America and Mexico. The essence of the doctrine, as understood by the world then, was, while we forbid the establishment of despotic governments upon the American continent, we recognize the corresponding obligation to refrain from any attempt to force our political system upon any part of the Old World. This has been our settled rule of faith and practice for seventy-five years. Its promulgation defeated the purpose of the Holy Alliance and destroyed forever the power of Spain upon this continent. Under it Louis Napoleon, a third of a century ago, was obliged to withdraw the French army from Mexico and leave the ill-starred Maximilian to his fate. Under it the empire established by foreign bayonets disappeared and the Republic was restored. Are we now to say that we still recognize the binding force of this doctrine upon other nations, but not upon ourselves?

If ultimate statehood for these remote islands be disclaimed, how, then, are they to be held and governed? The only alternative is by force—by the power of the Army and the Navy; and this not for a day or for a year, but for time. What then becomes of the bed-rock principle that "governments derive their just powers from the consent of the governed?" If they are to be held permanently, as conquered provinces, then it will not only be in absolute disregard of all the traditions of the past, but in direct antagonism to the letter and spirit of our Declaration of Independence. It is no less true now than in the days of our Revolution that "government by arbitrary power is still despotism."

A question yet more grave can not escape our serious consideration. It is one that touches the good faith, the honor of our nation. Events have crowded in such rapid succession that we seem to have forgotten the avowed purpose of the war with Spain. It was declared to be a war solely in the interests of humanity—solely for the relief of the oppressed and starving at our door. An eminent Republican Senator a few months ago voiced the sentiments of the entire country when he said: "It is a war in which there does not enter the slightest thought or desire of foreign conquest or of national gain or advantage." Alas, what a change has come in so brief a time! The wrongs of the poor Cuban are forgotten, and the dream of the imperialist is now of untold commercial gain and of the United States becoming chief among the factors in European politics. "We can not escape history." For all time we will be judged by our solemn disclaimer, immediately following the formal declaration of war:

"The United States hereby disclaims any disposition 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."

It was this solemn disclaimer by the American Congress that justified the war at the bar of our own conscience and that of the world. To say now that our disclaimer applied only to Cuba and not to other Spanish dependencies would be only "to palter with words in a double sense." It is a subterfuge unworthy of the greatest of nations. Is it too late even now to demand of those whose hands hold power to make good our solemn declaration that our war with Spain was waged not in the spirit of aggrandizement but solely in the interest of humanity?

In the retrospect of a century it is our glory that the absolute faith of Jefferson in the people was well-founded; that the great historic party of which he was the founder has ever been true to the fundamental principles of popular government. "New conditions impose new duties." Grave questions of domestic and foreign policy have been discussed and wisely determined during the century now closing. Others, possibly of yet more difficult solution, lie along the pathway of the century soon to open before us. May we not abide in the belief that whatever conditions may arise or dangers may menace, the Democratic party, true to the traditions of the past, true to the faith of Jefferson, will stand in the near and in the remote future the faithful guardian of the Constitution, the tireless defender of the deathless principles of free government?

#### THE SITUATION.

Ex-Governor John P. Altgeld, of Illinois, in responding to the toast assigned him, said:

#### THE REPUBLIC THREATENED.

This club has won fame through its struggle for higher politics—for higher standards of justice and for more honest economic and financial policies. But great as are your achievements, much as you have accomplished, your work has barely begun. This Republic has been the beacon light of the world for more than a century.

It has not only lifted the hopes of all men but by its example it has turned the face of nearly all nations toward liberty. Since the first reading of the Declaration of Independence over 250 constitutions that were republican in form have been adopted. Most of them perished, but they will rise again. Now the foundations are being pulled from under our own institutions. The very altars of liberty are being betrayed by the men set to guard them. Two years ago, when we turned the face of our party toward the sun, we protested against economic policies that robbed, against financial policies that paralyzed, and against judicial usurpation that enslaved. Every day's development since that time has shown not only that we were right but that the situation was far more serious than we supposed.

#### LOOK ABOUT YOU, AMERICAN CITIZENS.

Look about you! Nearly all of the wealth of this land is passing into a few hands, and not one of these hands favorable to the freedom of the citizen. Every great industrial, commercial, mining, or transportation enterprise is passing into the hands first of corporations, and then by further consolidation into the hands of trusts, which thus have an absolute monopoly—a monopoly which can arbitrarily fix prices, fix wages, and regulate output—a monopoly which has no soul, and whose chief purpose is to plunder the public. The monopolist and the speculator prosper, but the masses wither. Men of moderate fortunes and of fair incomes, who were the bulwark of the Republic, are slowly but surely being wiped out. We are being reduced to two classes. In the first stage these will be known as the very rich and the moderately poor, and in the second stage as the masters and the slaves. We have established a moneyed aristocracy, and are now fastening a yoke on posterity. A standing army is to be enthroned and bayonet argument is to govern.

#### WEALTH THE ENEMY OF LIBERTY.

Republican institutions can not live amid these surroundings. Wealth has never been the friend of liberty. Concurrently with the progress of these changes we hear the snarling voices of men who deride the doctrines of Jefferson and Lincoln that made our country great and mighty. Already we see magazine articles urging the establishment by law of a permanent aristocracy in our system of government, and from high quarters we hear a demand for Hamiltonism. Hamilton believed in monarchy and aristocracy bottomed on corruption.

He was in love with the English system, thoroughly rotten from top to bottom, and he labored to transplant whatever he could of that system. He once said to John Adams: "Purge the British constitution of its corruption and give to its popular branch equality of representation and it would become an impracticable government. But as it stands at present it is the most perfect government that ever existed." He did not advance a single new thought, did not promulgate a single new principle; and he sneered at the idea that the people were capable of self-government.

#### HAMILTON WAS AGAINST OUR CONSTITUTION.

England herself has since that time repudiated corruption and established equality of representation. Hamilton favored the adoption of the new Constitution, but was not satisfied with it, and openly expressed the hope that some future war would centralize the powers of the Government. When he was made Secretary of the Treasury, the new Constitution had been adopted, Congress had been given power to raise money, everybody could see that the new Republic could now easily pay its debts, and that it was not necessary to introduce corruption of any sort. But, true to his theory, he once secured the establishment of a national bank and introduced the British funding and bond-issuing system, coupled with its limitless opportunities for plunder. A short period of unparalleled speculation and speculation followed. The sharks and financial birds of prey made fortunes, and Hamilton became the hero of the hour.

The whole system collapsed in a few years, and scattered ruin and misery over the country. Yet for a whole century the men who use the Government to plunder the country have shouted for Hamilton. Whether Hamilton himself shared in the plunder is immaterial. He expressed his belief in the system, and deliberately furnished the opportunity to others. During the Administration of Mr. Adams Hamiltonism ran wild. Almost every principle of the Declaration of Independence was trampled under foot, and those provisions of the new Constitution that were intended to protect the individual were ruthlessly brushed aside. No man dared to criticize the Administration. Scores of good men were denied trial by jury and languished in prison for exercising the rights of free speech.

A tyranny was established that surpassed anything existing in England. Four years of this regime was all that the American people could stand; they declared that they had not cast off a foreign yoke to take up a more galling home yoke, and in 1800 they arose and overthrew it so completely that it has taken nearly a century for a resurrection.

#### DEATH OF HAMILTONISM.

Had Hamiltonism prevailed at that time the whole history of the Republic would have been different. The brains, the industry, the skill, and the enterprise of the earth would not have flocked to our shores.

The genius of man being cowed would have withered here, as it had in Europe, and the American Republic would to-day be simply an oligarchy, stretching in small settlements from the Mississippi to the Atlantic. Hamilton was a member of the Constitutional Convention, and succeeded in establishing that aristocratic branch of our Government known as the Federal judiciary, unrepresentative and undemocratic. It is not chosen by the people and is not accountable to them. In fact, for practical purposes, is not accountable to anybody. Jefferson opposed this manner of creating a judiciary with all his might, and he pointed out that here would ultimately be found the tomb of American liberty. How prophetic was that vision! During its whole career this branch of the Government has never been on the side of

the weak, but always on the side of power. First it stood for federalism and usurpation.

When General Jackson tried to protect the American people from the clutches of the great rotten bank the Federal judiciary used all its power to help that institution. After the bank went down this same judiciary did the bidding of the mighty slave power, and after this went down these courts took the corporations under their wings and many of them seemed to become mere side-door conveniences for concentrated and even corrupt capital. For the last thirty years the corporations have fled to the Federal courts like ancient murderers fled to cities of refuge—there they felt safe.

Recognizing that the construction of the laws is more important than making laws, these powerful influences have allowed no man to be appointed judge whom they did not believe friendly to them. They do not buy Federal judges, because it is not necessary. In their eagerness to serve the corporations these judges have in recent years established government by injunctions in this country, under which a judge becomes legislator, court, and executioner. They brush free speech—the liberty of the citizen—and trial by jury away with a contemptuous sneer.

#### A TRUTHFUL JUDGE.

The Anglo-Saxon race has shed its blood to maintain these bulwarks of liberty, and our Constitution guarantees them to every citizen. But they have already been stabbed to the vitals. For several years we have beheld the spectacle of some supreme court and other Federal judges dragging their ermine around over the land to act the part of advocates for those interests which are destroying republicanism in this country. What are the liberties of America worth when committed to the guardianship of such men? During the recent campaign Mr. Depew came to Chicago under the auspices of the Hamilton Club to deliver a partisan address at the Auditorium. Federal Judge Peter S. Groscup mounted the rostrum for the purpose of introducing the orator, and told the audience, among other things, that the light of Jefferson was waning—that on the dial plate of our nation's history this hour was Hamilton's; that Hamilton's great name exactly fitted these times, etc.

#### HANNA, QUAY & CO. ARE HAMILTONIANS.

My friends, must we admit that Judge Groscup was right? Let us look around again. The senate of the great State of Ohio has just indicted a Hamiltonian senator for bribery and debauchery in securing a high office. A grand jury in Pennsylvania has just indicted another Hamiltonian senator for robbing the treasury of the State. Almost every great trust appears to have one or more Hamiltonian senators as standing conveniences. In the House of Representatives, where the voice of the people was supposed to be heard, we find a pensioned ringmaster of monopoly stifling the voice of the people's Representatives and reducing Republican Congressmen to a condition of pity and contempt.

Two years ago a horde of Hamiltonian statesmen went to the capital of Illinois and not only sold out the people but robbed the State of everything in sight. Wherever you find dirty finger marks in the temple of justice or a foul odor in the halls of legislation, there you will find Hamiltonianism. Verily, the spirit of Hamilton fits these times. But what shall we say of a judiciary that openly rejoices over the fact that an era of corruption has enveloped the land; that the betrayal of the people has become a science, and that the robbing of the people has become a fine art? And now we are to widen the sphere of this class of statesmen by giving them a chance to rob the Filipinos! Heaven pity those poor people. The Spaniard took what was in sight, but the Hamiltonite, with his bond jobbery, enters the womb of the future and plasters his mortgage on remote generations.

#### THE TONGUE OF TREASON IS WILDLY WAGGING.

During the political and partisan peace jubilee recently held in Chicago the President of the United States went to the Chicago University for the purpose of being dubbed doctor of laws. In handing him the parchment, Prof. A. K. Parker, who made the presentation speech, said, among other things: "The doctrine of sovereignty of the people leads a precarious existence in the mouths of men who love long-sounding words and have not stopped to consider that it is only a specious form of the ancient blasphemy that might makes right." Stop here a moment and reflect. The President of the United States, standing under the wing of the Standard Oil Company, accepts a proffered honor which is coupled with the declaration that the doctrine of popular sovereignty is a specious form of blasphemy, and he utters not one word of protest, but by his silence and by his acceptance nods his approval.

#### GLORIES IN THE SPECTACLE OF LINCOLN AT GETTYSBURG.

Come now to another scene. On November 19, 1863, Abraham Lincoln stood on the battlefield of Gettysburg, and with tears in his eyes asked the American people to dedicate themselves anew to that cause for which the heroes, living and dead, had fought on that field, so "that government of the people, for the people, and by the people should not perish from this earth." Consider these words; they embody the most complete form of popular sovereignty; yet only thirty-five years later we behold a Republican successor of Lincoln nodding assent to a doctrine which characterizes the above utterance of the great martyr President as a specious form of blasphemy. Yea, Hamiltonism fits these times. Jefferson and Lincoln stood on the platform of the common people, and as the light of Jefferson wanes the work of the great liberator passes into the shadow.

#### QUEEN AND PRESIDENT.

About two months ago the New York Chamber of Commerce gave a banquet, and the president of that body asked the assembled guests to drink to the health of the British Queen before drinking the health of the President of the United States, and it was done. He said the President would consent to this if he was there. To be sure, this will not shake our Republic, but it does show the tendency of thought among certain classes. It shows that the stock jobbers, the speculators, and the financial wolves have no more love for our institutions to-day than they had in 1776, when they sided with England, or 1861, when they sided with the Confederacy.

#### MAUDLIN TALK OF ANGLO-AMERICAN ALLIANCE.

From this same source comes the maudlin talk of an alliance with England. We are to repeat the experience of the lamb and lie down with the lion, and we have toadies and flunkies in America who would consider it a privilege to lie down inside of the lion.

#### HOW TO CALL A HALT.

But, say you, these things are not new to us; tell us what to do? My friends, no mortal can tell you in advance. In all great conflicts the first thing is to ascertain the principle involved and the ultimate object aimed at. The campaign will then be shaped by conditions and events. We wish to prevent the enslavement of our people and the establishment of an aristocracy. We see that no aristocracy, either of birth or wealth, can be established or maintained where the great masses are prosperous and independent. It can exist only amid cheap property, cheap labor, and cheap men. A cowed and a poor people are the soil in which it grows. When they gave us a financial system which paralyzed our country, which cheapened property, which

crushed labor, and which cheapened manhood and destroyed independence, they laid the first stone for an American aristocracy. If these conditions are to continue, then the star of the Republic has set.

But if we can overthrow this system, if we can reestablish bimetalism, if we can found a scientific monetary system and restore the price of products and of property, if we can raise the spirit of labor and renew the independence of the masses, then the beginning of the next century will crush this aristocracy to atoms and cast it to the four winds, and a liberated people, bowing only to the God who made them, will leap forward with a joy that shall gladden the earth. You see the money question confronts us at the door. It is not of our choosing; we can not make issues. Issues grow out of wrong; grow out of injustice; grow out of human suffering. Cowards and weaklings evade them, but men must meet them.

#### THE FINANCIAL QUESTION.

Other great questions vital to our existence have been evolved by the age and must be met. But the financial question is basic and central. It is the mother of a whole brood of evils. The financial speculators of the east of Europe want the absolute power to control average prices. Therefore they want silver and greenbacks wiped out so as to make everything rest on gold—this they can easily corner—then with a monopoly of issuing paper money they can concentrate everything into a few hands. A few gigantic banks can then control. When it suits their speculative purposes they can expand and raise prices, and then contract and lower prices, and thus catch the country coming and going. These great and unscrupulous interests always move secretly and in the dark. They bridge every chasm with a bribe and catch the political highwayman with an official uniform. The gold standard has never drawn an honest breath nor taken an honest step in this country, and its success so far shows the venality and the apostasy of American politicians.

#### RATIO OF METALS.

What about 16 to 1? Well, my friends, it is not in our power to change this; it is impossible to get anything along any other line. Change the ratio and the whole case dissolves. To be sure, theoretically this is not so, but we have to deal with fearfully sad facts. For twenty years both of the great parties denounced the gold standard and demanded the free coinage of silver at the old ratio. It looked as if the question would be settled in a week. But instead the gold standard got more firmly seated in the saddle. How? By corruptly controlling the Government and manipulating Congress. Open the question of ratio and you will get no action in a century. To drop the ratio is to betray the cause. We are for the old ratio because it is right, because it will undo a great crime, because it will make prosperity possible, because we can not succeed in any other way, and because the suggestions for a change come only from the enemy.

#### PRIVATE MONOPOLIES.

Now, gentlemen, time never stands still, and evolution is eternal. Now, questions affecting our very existence have arisen; while they are old elsewhere, they are new here. This is an age of concentration in all things, and the formation of private monopolies in particular. Competition has been wiped out. In harmony with the law as it has stood for centuries, we have denounced this, but to no purpose; we have legislated against it, but in vain. When they could not defeat legislation by bribery, they went before some subservient Federal judge and had it declared unconstitutional. Our remedy has failed. Private monopoly is as injurious and as much of a crime as ever, and we can not stop its birth; we must change our tactics and convert private monopolies into public monopolies. Give the whole public the benefits of the monopoly instead of a few individuals. Let the Government take them. This is not state socialism; it is simply protecting the people, and therefore is democracy in its broadest sense. The European people fight socialism, but get the greatest benefits from collective ownership.

#### GOVERNMENT OWNERSHIP WOULD KILL MONOPOLY.

There seems to be no other way to protect the public, and it involves our very existence as a party. The Democratic party must always stand for the great masses, or else it has no mission. The Republican party stands for private monopoly and rottenness, and the monopolies will always support it and try to crush us. It is a fight not only for humanity but for our very existence.

#### MUNICIPAL OWNERSHIP.

There are hundreds of things that the public can not do. But there are a great many that it can, should, and must do. It has been demonstrated that municipalities can successfully and very profitably own and operate water, gas and electric light plants, street-railway systems, and a number of other things, and the American people are prepared to move forward along this line, and every such step by helping the people will help the Democracy.

#### TELEGRAPH AND TELEPHONE MONOPOLIES.

The American people are also prepared to take the telegraph and telephone monopolies and make them a part of the Post-Office, and thus not only cheapen the service by one-half, but make the telegraph neutral in politics. Ours is almost the only great Government in the world that does not own the telegraph lines.

#### POSTAL SAVINGS BANKS.

I believe that our people are also prepared for postal savings banks and widening the functions of the postal department. It is safe and very cheap to the public. The English post-office runs savings banks, issues fire insurance, sells annuities, and does many other things at greatly reduced rates, and it does what is almost a general carrying or express trade of small articles at greatly reduced rates. A man once said: "You can send a sawmill through mails there."

#### CONTROL OF RAILWAYS.

But the greatest question is the control of our railroads. Nearly all the governments of the earth own the railroads; and railroad service, both passenger and freight, costs their people on the average about one-half what our people must pay. However, it is not the economic feature that I wish to discuss at present. The railroads and corporations now run our Government. They control the appointment of Federal judges, they meddle with the election of Congressmen, Senators, State legislators, governors, and aldermen. They dictate the policy of government, and they do it by corruption. Years ago I wrote some articles favoring governmental control or regulation of railroads, but not ownership. Observation has satisfied me this is all futile. Instead of a board regulating the corporations the corporations regulate the board, and if they run against an honest board some friendly judge flies to their rescue and kicks the board clear off the highway.

#### INTERSTATE-COMMERCE FARCE.

It was lately suggested that the law should require the interstate commerce commissioners to shut their eyes when drawing their salary, so as to lessen the moral shock of getting something for nothing. At present there seems to be no way of protecting the public and restoring to the people their government except by having the Government own the railroads. As between having the corporation own the Government or having the Government own the corporation, the American people will prefer the latter.

#### DUTY OF THE PARTY.

To the Democratic party it is a question of vital interest. It can never become a corporation party without abandoning its mission and becoming contemptible in the eyes of men. Therefore the corporations will always furnish the boodle to MARK HANNA with which to debauch the American voter and defeat that party. If the Government owned the roads it would be different. True, it would create a large patronage. This, however, might be regulated by civil service; but even if it were not, the Government could not possibly coerce its men more than the corporations do now, and it could not pay the large sums for corruption purposes which the corporations now advance and then indirectly get back from the Government. If the Government owned the railroads many trusts now made powerful by railroad distribution would dissolve.

The great and criminal corporations are the incubators which have been hatching the little bantams that talk aristocracy. Destroy the incubators and the brood will die out. These, my friends, are the issues, this our high purpose.

We are not interested in cheap politics. We are trying to establish a higher justice and bring mankind a day's march nearer to the great high plane of human brotherhood. Two centuries ago the world struggled for religious liberty; to-day it is in the birth throes of industrial liberty.

Religious liberty could not live amid superstition, but demanded liberal institutions. Political liberty could not live amid kings and aristocracies, but demanded republican institutions. Industrial liberty can not live amid monopoly and injustice, and it is calling for higher standards. Democracy established religious and political freedom, and it must now establish industrial freedom by giving the public the benefit of all monopolies.

How is this to be done? By the same means by which every great reform and moral advance in the history of the world has been carried forward. The soul of the hero and the spirit of the martyr are the twin guides of human progress. James Russell Lowell summed up the whole history of civilization when he penned the lines:

"Truth forever on the scaffold,  
Wrong forever on the throne,  
But that scaffold sways the future,  
And behind the dim unknown  
Standeth God within the shadow,  
Keeping watch upon His own."

To-day Truth is on the scaffold, and Wrong is on the throne. The forces that support crime in high places are masters, and as they live by the breath of falsehood, we must expect every possible indignity and we must expect temporary reverses.

#### RIGHT IS ETERNAL.

Howard Taylor said: "Over a century ago the British drove the Pine Tree flag off of Bunker Hill, but God retreated with it till he brought it back to Bunker Hill." My friends, justice is not abdicating; have no fear about our cause. Its ultimate success is written on the prog' amme of destiny.

"Yes," says some one, "but the wilderness is dreary; when shall we reach the promised land?" I do not know. On the dial of progress time is not indicated by months or even years, but by epochs—some long, some short. In our country they have been short, and the change has always been like a sunrise when things look most gloomy.

"But," says another, "are not most of the powerful forces arrayed against us?" Yes; the same forces that have fought every reform made are also against us; but when the time is ripe they disappear from the earth.

A century ago Hamiltonism seemed to be permanently entrenched and supported by all the strong forces of society, but in a few years it went down.

#### POWER OF THE MONEY POWER.

When the powerful national bank controlled nearly all of America and tried to coerce President Jackson, it had its slimy finger in every neighborhood, dominated the drawing-room, the countingroom, the schoolhouse, the press, the church, the politicians, and the Government. Yet a couple of years were sufficient to overthrow it and expose its awful rottenness. Hear what George W. Curtis said of the slave power in even the Northern States in his day:

"Slavery sat supreme in the White House and made laws at the capital. Courts of justice were its ministers and legislatures its lackeys. It silenced the preacher in the pulpit, it muzzled the editor at his desk, and the professor in his lecture room. It set a price upon the head of peaceful citizens, it robbed the mails, and denounced the vital principles of the Declaration of Independence as treason. In States where laws did not tolerate slavery it yet ruled the club and the drawing-room, the factory and the office. It swaggered at the dinner table and scoured with scorn a cowardly society. It tore the golden rule from schoolbooks and from the prayer book the pictured benignity of Christ."

#### AN AWFUL PICTURE TO BEHOLD.

My friends, this is an awful picture of supreme power. The men and the women who opposed this institution did not expect a change for centuries, but the great clock in the chamber of the Omnipotent never stands still; it ticked away the years as it had formerly ticked away the centuries, until finally it struck the hour. The world heard the tread of a million armed men, and slavery perished from America forever. Mr. Curtis's description exactly fits these times. The money power sits supreme in the White House and makes laws at the Capitol. Courts of justices are its ministers and legislatures are its lackeys. It silences the preacher in his pulpit, the editor at his desk, and the professor in his lecture room.

#### INTELLIGENCE OF THE COUNTRY WITH DEMOCRACY.

But the infallible finger of its growing insolence shows that the hour of its destruction is near. Remember that 30,000 votes properly distributed in 1896 would have elected Mr. Bryan. The patriotic intelligence of the land is already with us. Deduct from Mr. McKinley the negro vote, and he is lost; deduct the ignorant city slum votes which he got, and he is lost; deduct the vote purchased with Hanna's boodle, and he is lost; deduct the false returns made by corrupt election judges, and he is lost. He was elected by tainted dollars, and his future must rest on them. The elements of corruption are his mainstay, and nothing can stand long on a rotten foundation. Remember, too, that not a single devotee of 1896 has deserted. Flesh-pot patriots may weary, but our mighty army still has its face to the sun, and our only course is forward.

#### THIS IS GOD'S FIGHT.

Ah, say you, this is a fight against money, and we have none. This is true. But no great moral and political reform ever yet rested on money. The Almighty has never yet tried to sprout the seeds of justice in the garden of lucre. Only poisonous vines will grow there. Noble manhood perishes there. It is moral force that, in the end, moves the world. Had Christ been furnished a million dollars by a syndicate to introduce his religion it would have been a failure. True, we must have money for hall rent, printing, etc., but we must get it from those who give with a blessing, and not from the men who demand the selling of souls and the surrender of manhood.

## MONEY CAN NOT WIN.

If the sugar trust or the Standard Oil trust would give us \$10,000,000 to make a campaign with, our cause would be lost. It would be Clevelandism over again. Even if we won the election, our moral force would be gone and we would accomplish nothing. It is the ardor of devotion that shakes empires, and we must win this fight by a self-sacrificing manhood. Men with flesh-pots can not help us. I hear the derisive laughter of MARK HANNA at the mention of manhood. But, my friends, American manhood will yet survive to throw the deodorizing lime of oblivion upon his polluted grave.

## NO TIME, NO PEACE, FOR TRIMMERS.

We are in a crisis. The liberties of a mighty people are at stake. There is no neutral ground; trimming and trading can no longer be tolerated. The world demands earnestness and candor. I do not believe in the black flag; give every honorable enemy quarter. But we must have a sacred black motto which we must keep to the front, and that is, "Woe unto him who trifles with the confidence of the American Democracy." Grover Cleveland is dead, and he left no friend to whom to send the obituary notice. Scores of wobbling statesmen are to-day looking through the fence into the graveyard for a burial place, because they were hit with the wrath of a deceived people. Each age furnishes a weapon for the people. The weapon for this age is the initiative and referendum. Through it we can restore Democracy.

Then fill our people with the spirit of Andrew Jackson, and the corruption of Hamiltonism, as well as the hypocrisy of McKinleyism, will no longer threaten or disgrace our land.

## WHY WE HONOR JACKSON.

Why do we honor the memory of Jackson? He was not a great scholar, not a great orator, not a great publicist, not a great military man, and yet he stands like a mighty rock in the ocean, towering high in air, while thousands of scholars, orators, publicists, generals, and statesmen who have come since his time are lost in oblivion. It is because of his character. Amid temptation and threats of destruction he fixed his eye upon the star of justice, shook his fist in the face of power and delivered the American people. This country needs more Andrew Jacksons, and the people believe that they have found one in William J. Bryan.

## THE DAY WE CELEBRATED.

Congressman WILLIAM SULZER spoke as follows:

Mr. President and Gentlemen: It is a matter of much personal gratification to me to be with you to-night and participate in your joyous and magnificent celebration of Jackson's day.

I would be false to myself and to every sentiment of gratitude I possess and hold dear if I did not at the very beginning of my remarks express to you how deeply and sincerely I appreciate the honor and the distinguished compliment of your invitation. I accepted it, of course. I could not do otherwise. Coming from whence it did, and how it did, I could not refuse. I am very glad, indeed, to be with you, and as long as I live I shall never forget your courtesy, your reception, your consideration, and your hearty and genuine hospitality.

I like the Democrats of the great West, and I hope they will like me.

I stand squarely on the Chicago platform, and as a Democrat, tried and true to every tenet of our party and to its fundamental principles, I come to you from the tolling, throbbing, earnest Democrats of the East, and bring you their fraternal greeting, and their message of hope for union and harmony in our ranks, and for the triumphant victory of our grand old party for years to come.

In my judgment, we are destined to triumph if we religiously adhere to our principles, fearlessly and vigorously promulgate them, and honestly and tenaciously strive to enforce them. We must be true to ourselves and to the teachings of the fathers of Democracy, and if we are and continue to have faith in the justice of our cause, we must and will succeed, and signal victory must and will crown our efforts.

We celebrate to-day one of the most important epochs in the annals of our history.

This is Andrew Jackson's day, sacred to the memory of the hero of New Orleans, sacred to the memory of the grand old man, the old hickory of the Democratic party, sacred to the memory of one of the most unique, one of the most stalwart, and one of the most magnificent figures and characters in all American history.

Andrew Jackson was a hero from his cradle to his grave. Irresistible events and circumstances beyond his control made him so.

The fascinating story of his life reads like a romance and demonstrates that truth is stranger than fiction. That story is a part of the most stirring and eventful period in our history, an incentive to every hopeful schoolboy, a beacon to every sincere patriot, a star of hope to every struggling toiler, and a conclusive proof of the stability and the opportunity of democratic institutions.

Andrew Jackson from his birth to his death was a remarkable personage. He was a man of iron will and of indomitable spirit. His veins were filled with good red blood, but his nerves were of steel. He never knew fear. He never turned his back on friend or foe. He knew the right and never hesitated to do it. He hated cant, despised hypocrisy, and cared naught for consequences.

He was a plain man. He loved the plain people; they understood him and they loved him.

He was a forceful man, a direct man, a positive man, an honest man, and a truthful man. He hated a liar, and he spurned with contempt a coward.

His life began with the struggles of a brave people to cast off the tyrannous yoke of oppression, and when it went out his last look witnessed the greatest and the grandest Republic the world has ever seen.

His life was a part of the Republic, and demonstrated its opportunities and its possibilities.

Andrew Jackson was not born to the purple; he was no child of pampered fortune; he knew woe and want, poverty and misery, trial and trouble.

He was schooled in the school of adversity, but learned to surmount all difficulties.

He was a soldier in three wars and a hero in each.

His parents came from the north of Ireland. He was of Scotch-Irish origin, and had that blood in his veins with all that it means and all that it implies.

He first saw the light of day in Carolina in March, 1767. It was a new and sparsely settled country. Shortly after his birth his father died, leaving a widow and three orphan children. Andrew Jackson was the youngest.

His early days were days of hardship and privation, but they were trial days to school him and to fit him for the part he was to play in life.

At that time the Revolution smoldered, and when it finally blazed forth in all its fury, the greatest and the grandest Revolution that ever shook the earth, all the Jacksons were in it and a part of it.

Andrew Jackson, then a mere lad, was a soldier and a hero in those dark and stormy days. He was a warrior for the right, a soldier for freedom. He was captured, made a prisoner of war, and while such, because he refused to blacken the boots of an English officer, was struck a cruel blow on the head

with a sword. He carried the terrible scar to his grave, but he avenged the insult at New Orleans.

The Revolution passed and the Republic dawned. During the heroic struggle Jackson's mother and his brothers died, all martyrs to the sacred cause. The close of the contest vindicated the principle that governments derive their just powers from the consent of the governed found Andrew Jackson homeless, penniless, and friendless, with neither kith nor kin, but nothing daunted. The ordeal of the Revolution made him a man, a patriot, and a Democrat.

Andrew Jackson loved his mother with a passion almost divine. His devotion to her memory is the noblest trait in his heroic character, and his undying fame her greatest monument.

Napoleon asked, "What is wanting to save the youth of France?" Madame Champau answered, "Mothers." No man was ever truly great whose mother was not really great.

Andrew Jackson's mother intended him for the ministry, but fate willed otherwise. He studied law, practiced it successfully, was a judge and a good jurist, a member of both branches of Congress, molded the Constitution of Tennessee, was the greatest and most successful Indian fighter who ever lived, crushed at New Orleans the greatest invading forces which ever desecrated our sacred soil, humbled in the dust the flower of the English army, and destroyed for all time the power and the prestige of Great Britain on the Western Hemisphere.

Andrew Jackson was the hero of the war of 1812 and won its most decisive victory. We celebrate that triumph to-night. He was a great citizen-soldier, but a greater civilian. He was a volunteer and believed in and stood for the volunteer forces of the Republic. He was opposed to a great standing army and had no sympathy with imperialism.

He was a Democrat, reared in the Democratic school of Thomas Jefferson. He stood for the freedom of the press, freedom of speech, freedom of conscience, for civil and religious liberty, for the Constitution, for all that Jefferson stood for. He believed in our cardinal principle of special privileges to none, equal opportunities for all.

He stood for advancement, for progress, for personal liberty, for the school-house and the home. There was nothing illiberal, nothing narrow-minded, about Andrew Jackson. He was broad-gauged and broad-minded. He believed in the ability of the plain people to govern themselves. He stood for their rights, their hopes, their aspirations, and he vindicated them while he lived.

He brought about the annexation of the Floridas and was their first American governor. He accomplished what he purposed; he did things.

He was twice President of the United States, stamped his personality indelibly on her history, and when he died he was the popular idol of the American people. He will always be one of the most interesting figures in our history.

He vindicated American institutions, crushed treason, pilloried nullification, and dethroned the United States Bank, the greatest trust and monopoly of his day.

He stood for the home and the hearthside, the sanctity of the family, and for the blessings of Christian civilization.

He stood for internal improvements, for commerce, the American merchant marine, and he loved his country with an intensity that was patriotism personified.

No one ever questioned the purity of his patriotism, or challenges the integrity of his motives, and yet no public man in all our history was ever more bitterly assailed by his enemies or more justly loved by his friends and adherents.

Andrew Jackson had his faults and his foibles. He was not a demigod—he was only human. He hated and he loved in human ways like other human beings. He triumphed and he suffered. He was a man of force and of passion, the man for every crisis, and yet no man could be calmer under more trying circumstances—no man suffered more and complained less. His whole life was a heroic struggle mentally and physically. But amid all the storms of his tempest-tossed career his heart beat true, and was ever warm; his hand was always steady, his head was ever cool, and within his stern exterior there dwelt a Christian spirit and a noble nature as gentle as a woman's. He was a great Democratic leader, and no man ever had more loyal followers.

He stood for the true democracy, the rule of the plain people, the democracy which unfetters trade, fosters commerce, establishes industry, aids enterprise, maintains equal opportunity, unshackles the mind and the conscience, and defends liberty.

He was a great man, the representative of two centuries. He was the embodiment of true American manhood, the personification of the genius of our free institutions, and the incarnation of Jeffersonian Democracy. He always subordinated personal interest to his sense of public duty.

We are Americans, we are Democrats; and as Americans and Democrats we love and revere the memory of Andrew Jackson, the illustrious patriot of the Hermitage, the hero of New Orleans, and the sage of Tennessee.

It is not my purpose to eulogize the hero of New Orleans. Nothing I can say will add to his greatness or his glory. History has done Andrew Jackson ample justice. His monument, more enduring than marble or brass, is in the grateful and patriotic hearts of his loyal countrymen.

It is fitting and proper, however, that this day should be celebrated by the Democrats of our country and by the plain people, whose friend Andrew Jackson ever was.

To-day we want and the Republic needs men with the indomitable spirit, the magnificent courage, and the patriotic zeal of Andrew Jackson. The preservation of our free institutions and the perpetuity of the Republic would be absolutely safe if we had an Andrew Jackson in every hamlet, every county, and every State of the Union.

To-night, as Democrats, we invoke the name and fame of the hero of New Orleans, in our fight to reestablish the American merchant marine. Under his Administration our shipping and our commerce flourished as it never did before. During the Democratic days of Jackson nine-tenths of American commerce was carried in American ships, flying the American flag. To-day more than nine-tenths of American commerce is carried in foreign ships flying foreign flags. Republican legislation has driven our flag from the seas, and destroyed our foreign carrying trade. We pay over \$300,000,000 every year to foreign shipowners. Why? Because we have legislated in their interest, and against the true interest of our own people. Because the Republican party has legislated our flag off the seas.

It is the duty of the Democratic party to restore our merchant marine. We must combat the disastrous policy of the Republican party against our merchant marine and repeal its vicious legislation. We must revive our great shipping industries, and thus give employment to thousands of idle men, re-create the American sailor, and ere long again witness the gladsome sight of the American flag flying on every sea and kissing the sky in every foreign port. The Democratic party, the party of Andrew Jackson, must and will restore and reestablish the American merchant marine.

To-night as Democrats we invoke the spirit of Andrew Jackson in favor of the volunteer forces of the Republic and against a large standing army in time of peace composed of men who are not taxpayers, but are tax-eaters. Andrew Jackson was a citizen-soldier, and he believed in the citizen-soldiery of the land. As Democrats we should do all in our power to defeat

the now avowed project and policy of the Republican party to increase the Regular Army of our country to 100,000 soldiers. We do not need this vast army in time of peace any more than we need a king. We should favor a great navy to protect our coast and our commerce, but we should, if we are true to the people and our principles, vigorously oppose this enormous increase of the Regular Army. A large standing army in a republic is always a menace to civil liberty and free institutions.

To demonstrate this we have only to look to-day to the pitiful condition of France. We have no need of an immense standing army in time of peace. The Regular Army is the most undemocratic institution we have. In time of trouble, in case of war, the Republic should rely on its citizen-soldiers and its volunteer forces. It is contrary to the true principles of the Democratic party to permit the military power to become supreme and paramount to the civil authority. A desperate effort will be made by the Republicans to pass the act to create a great standing army, and if it succeeds it will burden the taxpayers of the country for its maintenance \$150,000,000 a year. Every Democrat in the land should be alive to the dangers of this Republican movement, and do all in his power to frustrate it.

To-night, as Democrats, we invoke the memory of the hero of New Orleans against any alliance with Great Britain, especially when the agent of that Government is the Benedict Arnold of the home-rule cause. We need no alliance with Great Britain. All we need now, as in the past, is a firm reliance on our own greatness, our own ability, our own integrity, our own power to defend our rights, protect our citizens, and legislate for ourselves on every proposition regarding our own welfare, our own happiness, our own well-being, and our own prosperity.

If Andrew Jackson were alive to-day he would never sanction an alliance with Great Britain. The spirit of 1776 and 1812 still lives. The Republican party is in favor of this alliance; the Democratic party should be strenuously opposed to it. Its consummation means national disintegration.

To-night, as Democrats, we invoke the memory of President Andrew Jackson against the encroachments on the rights of the people of the national banks. They menace our Republic to-day. Jackson waged the most bitter and relentless war of his life against the United States Bank, and finally destroyed that gigantic monopoly. If he had not it would have destroyed the Republic. One of the greatest acts of his life was the veto of the bill extending the charter of that bank trust. In the light of what is going on to-day that veto message should be read by every citizen in our land. There is a bill now pending in Congress which gives to the national banks of the country far greater powers and privileges than were ever enjoyed by the United States Bank. It is a Republican bill, and the Republican party stands sponsor for it and is committed to its passage.

If it should become a law it would give the monopoly of issuing money to the national banks, and hence the right to expand or contract the currency of the people whenever it suited their convenience. No corporation should have this power to make or destroy. It would deprive the Government of one of its greatest attributes of sovereignty and give to the national banks the right to paralyze, at their own will, every industry in the country. It is the most daring attempt the banks have ever made by law to seize one of the greatest weapons for good or evil known to civilized man. For the Government to surrender this prerogative and delegate away this power would be a crime against every citizen in this land and work woe and misery to millions yet unborn.

As a Democrat, and a follower of Andrew Jackson, I am opposed to the Government delegating away its powers to the national banks. The Democratic party should vigorously oppose conferring any additional powers on or granting any greater privileges to the national banks. In my judgment they already possess entirely too much power. They are doing precisely to-day, only to a greater extent, what the United States Bank did in the days of Andrew Jackson. The right to coin and issue money is one of the greatest prerogatives of the Republic and one of the highest attributes of its sovereignty. It should not be delegated, transferred, assigned, or set over to any national bank, to any trust, or to any monopoly. As Democrats and believers in the meaning of this day, we should resist the encroachments of national banks on the liberties of the people with the same zeal and the same courage that Andrew Jackson resisted the audacious claims of the United States Bank in his day. And when the national banks impudently declare that the Government should go out of the banking business, we should answer that the banks should and must go out of the governing business. And we should make that answer good now and for all time to come.

In Jackson's day there was only one Nick Biddle. To-day there is a Nick Biddle in every national bank in the land.

Let me say here, it is a matter of gratification for me to tell you that the recent attempt of the Republicans to pass through Congress an international bank charter met with the signal and the overwhelming defeat that the scheme deserved. It was one of the most iniquitous bills ever presented to Congress. According to its terms there was no limit to its powers for self and no end to its possibilities for evil. If it had been enacted into law it would have created the greatest trust the world has ever seen. By virtue of its provisions it would monopolize, own, and control almost everything under the sun. It was the most colossal scheme ever devised by the ingenuity of man to rob and swindle the people and to enslave for all time to come the industrial masses.

Under the provisions of that bill this gigantic financial trust, with unlimited capital, unrestricted powers, and unparalleled opportunities, would soon absorb, monopolize, own, and control the wealth, the treasure, and the commercial and industrial business enterprises of the land. The bill was so cleverly drawn that the men behind it could practically do anything from buying and holding land to loaning money on personal property, and they could do it all on their own terms and fix their own rates of interest. It would have been the trust of trusts. It was the greatest trust franchise Congress was ever asked to give away, and I am happy to state that by a very decisive vote Congress placed its seal of condemnation on the colossal scheme. But it will come up again. The forces of corruption are always active, never conquered. Eternal vigilance is the price of liberty.

As Democrats to-night we should also invoke the patriotic spirit of the great destroyer of the United States Bank monopoly, Andrew Jackson, and, following in his footsteps, every Democrat in our land should enlist in the war of the people against the trusts. Andrew Jackson was the implacable foe of monopoly. Were he alive to-day he would be the implacable foe of the trusts.

To-day the great trusts of the country are practically supreme. Many of them are so entrenched in power that they are to all intents and purposes above the law and no longer amenable to legislative action. The crying evil of the times is the power and the sway of the trusts. They endanger not only our free institutions but our free men. The battle cry of the Democratic party should be, "The trusts must go!"

To-day about 200 trusts control, wholly or in large part, every conceivable product and industry of the country.

These gigantic combinations constitute, in my judgment, the greatest menace at the present time to our democratic institutions. They control the supply, monopolize the product, and dictate the price of every necessary of life. They force out of legitimate employment thousands and thousands of honest toilers. They enhance prices, reduce wages, and write the terms of

their own contracts. They destroy competition, paralyze opportunity, assassinate labor, and hold the consumers of our country in their monopolistic grasp. They levy tribute on every man, woman, and child in the Republic. They blight the poor man's home, darken the hearthside of his children, cloud the star of legitimate hope, and destroy equal opportunity. They control legislation, escape taxation, and evade the just burdens of government, while their agents construct and maintain tariffs to suit their selfish ends and greedy purposes. They imperil trade, stagnate industry, regulate foreign and interstate commerce, declare quarterly dividends on watered stocks, and make fortunes every year out of the people. Their tyrannical power, rapid growth, and centralization of wealth are the marvel of recent times and the saddest commentary on our legislative history. Prior to the civil war there was not a trust in the country except the United States Bank trust, which Jackson killed.

They practically own, run, and control the Government to-day, and defy successful prosecution for violation of law. If their power of centralization is not speedily checked, and they go on for another quarter of a century like they have in the past few years, I believe our free institutions will be destroyed, and instead of a Government of the people, by the people, and for the people, we will have a Government of the trusts, by the trusts, and for the trusts.

How much longer will the people humbly consent to be robbed and submissively permit a continuation of this outrageous policy of favoritism by class legislation? All legislation bestowing special benefits on the few is unjust, and against the masses and for the classes. It has gone on until less than 8 per cent of the people own more than two thirds of all the wealth of our country. It has been truly said that monarchies are destroyed by poverty and republics by wealth. If the greatest republic the world has ever seen is destroyed, it will fall by this vicious system of robbing the many for the benefit of the few.

The total population of the United States is about 70,000,000. The total aggregate wealth of the United States, according to the best statistics that can be procured, is estimated at about \$12,000,000,000, and it appears, and no doubt much to the surprise of many, that out of a total population of 70,000,000 less than 40,000 persons in the United States own more than one-half of the entire aggregate wealth of the land. And this has all been brought about by legislation during the last twenty-five years.

The centralization of wealth in the hands of the few by the robbery of the many during the past quarter of a century has been simply enormous, and the facts and figures are appalling. Three-quarters of the entire wealth of our land appears to be concentrated in the hands of a very small minority of the people, and the number of persons constituting that minority grows smaller every year. The legislative schemes which have been most favored for checking this growing centralization of wealth are generally the most elusive and the most impotent.

Impartial students of these startling facts and statistics can hardly escape the irresistible conclusion that a conspiracy exists, and has existed for some time, to convert the Government of the United States into a powerful oligarchy of wealth. The millionaires, the plutocrats, the trusts, the monopolies, and the syndicates seem to be supreme and legislate for their own interests, benefit, and protection. If it continues, the yeomanry of our country will soon be reduced to a condition of industrial serfdom more pitiable than ever existed before in the history of the world.

The money power, the trusts, the syndicates, and the favored few of the land threaten the perpetuity of our free institutions by subsidizing the pulpit, buying the press, seating well-paid attorneys in legislative halls and courts of justice, stifling free speech and the right of lawful assembly and stretching out their tentacles to the colleges of the land to crush professors who have the courage of their convictions and dare to tell the truth regarding economic and social principles.

My friends, to crush the trusts, now and forever, is the highest duty, and the true mission to-day of the Democratic party. In this war of extermination against the octopus which is enslaving our industrial masses, and destroying our free institutions, we should invoke the aid and the support of every lover of liberty, and every disciple of Andrew Jackson, whose memory we revere and celebrate to-day. He said: "The Union must and shall be preserved." Let us to-night as firmly resolve and proclaim that the rights and the liberties of the people must and shall be preserved from the insidious encroachments of aggregated wealth.

#### THE JACKSONIANS.

Dr. A. H. Hipple, in responding to his toast, "The Jacksonians," spoke as follows:

Those of you who regularly attend the banquets of this club know that the toast to which I have the honor to respond always forms a part of our programme. A decent respect for the opinions of the great Democratic party, of which we form a part, and of the people whom we seek to influence, impels us to proclaim from time to time the principles upon which we base our actions, and the policies founded upon those principles which we think ought to be adopted. The principles for which we contend are few in number and easy to understand. We believe that every individual should be allowed the greatest possible freedom consistent with the maintenance of public order.

We believe in local self-government, and are opposed to centralization of power in any form as being dangerous to the liberty of the people. We believe in the right of every man to worship his Creator in any manner that he may choose, and we denounce as un-American any attempt to place a man in office or keep him out of office because of his religious faith. We believe that it is the duty as well as the privilege of every citizen to take an active interest in public affairs and use every honorable means to secure the nomination and election of good men to office. And finally we believe that the duties of every public office, however great, and of every public service, however humble, should be performed by a Democrat. In case no Democrat is available for an office we have no particular objection to a Populist or a Free-Silver Republican, but it is not in accordance with our principles.

#### POLICIES AND PRINCIPLES.

In the matter of doctrine I can speak for the Jacksonians with assurance, knowing as I do that we are all united in support of the fundamental principles of true Democracy; but when I speak of policies I realize that I am dealing with questions in regard to which there may be honest difference of opinion within our own ranks. As time progresses new issues arise and old ones perish. It is the duty of the Democratic party to apply to these new issues the precepts laid down by the fathers of Democracy, which time has shown to be the only security of a free government. But I am not one of those who believe that the sages are all dead, and that the words of Jefferson and Jackson are oracles from which an answer can be obtained to every question. No truer patriots than they ever lived; but patriots just as true are living now. Every age produces its own great men. Nebraska to-day has a Jackson of its own; let us hear him.

The Jackson whom we are proud to call our patron saint buckled on his sword and went out to fight for the liberty of his own people; the Jackson of Nebraska whom we are proud to call our leader buckled on his sword and

went out to fight for the liberty of an alien race, bound to him only by the common ties of humanity. The former saw the danger that confronted the Republic from nullification; the latter sees the danger that confronts it from expansion. The elder Jackson saw a United States bank in operation, and as President used all his power to crush it; the younger sees a United States bank in process of formation, through the medium of an infamous currency bill, and, if I mistake not, within a very few years he, too, will be using the power of the Presidency to crush it. I do not know what the historian of the future will say in regard to him, but if he is elected to the Presidency, as every Jacksonian hopes he will be, I believe the verdict will be that no nobler statesman ever occupied the Presidential chair than Col. William J. Bryan.

#### STAND ON CHICAGO PLATFORM.

The Jacksonians stand squarely upon the Chicago platform. When we find a member who does not believe in that kind of Democracy, we lead him out to the edge and gently drop him down among the Republicans, where he belongs. We realize that the issues growing out of the war will have to be met and that the next national Democratic platform will have to be framed accordingly; but regardless of any new planks that may be adopted, we want the old financial plank to occupy the former prominent position. We are in favor of the free and unlimited coinage of silver, because we believe it furnishes the only solution of the great financial problem, and we will never consider the money question settled until it is settled right.

There is one question, however, which was alluded to in the Chicago platform and discussed to some extent during the campaign of 1896 to which I think more attention should be paid in future. I allude to the subject of trusts. The Democratic party has always regarded capitalistic combinations as dangerous to our institutions, and within the last few years these combinations have increased at an alarming rate. The World Almanac for 1898 gives a list of 110 leading trusts, with statistics in regard to them. The capital stock of these 110 trusts amounts to considerably more than \$3,000,000,000. Some idea of the immensity of this capitalization may be obtained from the fact that it exceeds the total assessed valuation of all the real and personal property in the States of Illinois, Iowa, Missouri, Kansas, Nebraska, Colorado, and the Dakotas, according to the census of 1890.

When we realize that the trusts of this country have capital enough to buy at its assessed value all the property in eight of our most prosperous States, including such cities as Chicago, St. Louis, Kansas City, and Omaha, and when we realize further that so long as the Democratic party remains true to its principles these trusts will be arrayed against us, we can form some idea of the forces against which we have to contend. Were it not that public sentiment is in our favor, we would never be able to overcome them, but the trusts themselves, by their iniquitous methods and infamous practices, have brought about a condition of affairs which the American people will not tolerate much longer. In these days of commercial injustice and industrial tyranny rich men are afraid of poor men, poor men are afraid of starvation, armed hirelings take the place of peace officers, and injunctions against free speech and the use of public highways are enforced with bayonets. History teaches us that the oppression of the many by the few has been common in all ages, but history also teaches us that sooner or later the oppressors meet their just reward, and if I read aright the signs of the times, the trusts will meet theirs when they encounter, in open battle, the Democratic party.

#### NO REASON TO FEAR.

Our political opponents profess to see in the recent elections a vindication of the position taken by them in 1896, and a presage of Republican victory in 1900. The Jacksonians interpret them differently. It is true, we sustained some losses, and these we deplore; but our sorrow has caused no feelings of dejection. In the eloquent language of the Apostle Paul, "We are troubled on every side, yet not distressed; we are perplexed, but not in despair; persecuted, but not forsaken; cast down, but not destroyed." Experience teaches us that the political pendulum can swing one way as easily as the other, and now that the Republicans have complete control of the executive and legislative branches of the Government, they can be depended upon to enact legislation in the interests of the banks and trusts, which will alienate from them much of the support which they have hitherto received.

If no mistakes are made, we have no reason to fear the future. With a party united in the cause of good government, with a platform framed in the interests of the people, with a leader who enjoys the confidence of his followers, we believe that the opening of the twentieth century will see the Democrats again returned to power. But whether we achieve victory or sustain defeat, the Jacksonians will remain loyal to the principles of true Democracy.

#### NEBRASKA'S DEMOCRACY.

Judge John S. Robinson, of Madison, responded as follows: In responding to the toast "Nebraska's Democracy," let me say at the outset that no claim will be made by me that the principles of Democracy are different in Nebraska from any other State in the Union. There is but one kind of Democrats and but one Democracy in this nation, and no matter in what part of the land they may dwell, they are those who believe in the Democratic faith as taught by the great founders of the Democratic party. Democracy believes in a form of government which makes every man equal before the law; a government which will give to every man equal voice and equal powers in the selection of the nation's rulers and lawgivers; a government which will protect the weak against oppression from the powerful and the strong; a government which will so shape the laws of a country that every man who toils shall have a fair share of the wealth which his industry has created.

In view of the charge that is made, not without foundation, that of late years many of the great corporations existing under the laws of this country have undertaken to dictate how their employees shall vote, and that their efforts in this direction have caused many of the wage-workers of this nation to manifest less of that freedom in the exercise of the right to use their own judgment as to how their ballot should be cast, it is proper for me to say that no such influence surrounds the voters of this State.

#### TILLERS OF THE SOIL.

The Democracy of Nebraska is largely composed of men who plan their own labor and sell the products of their industry in the markets of the world in free and open competition with all mankind. Its voters are to be found in the towns and cities of this State; in the farmhouses which dot her broad prairies and nestle among her fertile fields, where can be found the fulfillment of the promised seedtime and harvest, and bounteous fields of grain ripen in the sunlight of God. They are not dependent upon the order or command of any trust or syndicate for the right to toil. The power as yet is vested in no man or set of men to dictate to its voters how their ballots shall be cast, or to cause them to hesitate from any fear of want or hunger when they approach the sacred precincts of the election booth.

It is to be expected that, situated as they are, the free voters of an agricultural State, that the Democracy of Nebraska would be true to itself and bold and outspoken in advocating its beliefs; that they should be free to oppose all things which are wrong in this Government, and uphold and advocate every measure which Democracy believes to be right. We ask nothing

from this Government but equality and justice to all; we seek protection for no favored industry within our borders. The Democracy of Nebraska is opposed to the existence of any form of trusts, which in defiance of a nation's laws exact from the people of this nation vast sums of money by controlling the necessities of life, and in this way build up immense fortunes in the hands of a few while they take from the weary hand of labor the morsel which is its own.

#### HUMAN LIBERTY.

The Democracy of Nebraska stands firm for the great principle of human liberty as set forth in the Declaration of Independence. "That governments derive their just powers from the consent of the governed." This principle Democracy had accepted as true for more than a century of time, and no greed for commerce, no thirst for power, no clamor for spoils, no desire for conquest, has ever caused the Democracy of Nebraska for one moment to doubt its truth. Across the waters of the ocean there came to the listening ears of humanity the cry of the oppressed. The eagle of liberty went forth and panted in his flight above a land whose people were struggling to be free.

Valor called her sons from mountain, plain, and city, from palace and from cottage, and placing above them the flag of human liberty bade them go forth and stay the hand of tyranny. Amidst the bell of battle and the fierce carnage of war that mission was performed. The sound of conflict has ceased; the cannon has grown cold; and now there has arisen in this Republic a class of people who, under the protecting shadow of the eagle's wing, would send the vulture of greed and in the shining path of humanity's victory would themselves march the monsters of oppression and tyranny, who would proclaim to the world that this is a nation of hypocrites and liars, that the flag which went forth from its borders with the promise of carrying liberty to other lands is to become an emblem of oppression and tyranny.

#### OPPOSES IMPERIALISM.

To all this the Democracy of Nebraska stands opposed. The liberator must not become the oppressor. We know the cry of the eagle from the shriek of the vulture, and the roar of the lion from the jackal's whine. We love our flag too well to ever wish to see it float above a people or a land where those who rest beneath its shelter would not rise in its defense.

When in recent years leaders proved false, and men high in the councils of the Democracy of this nation betrayed the trust reposed in them, and sought to lead the party of Jefferson and Jackson into the camp of organized greed, the Democracy of Nebraska was among the first to raise the banner of true Democracy and reach forth its hand to remove from power the leaders who were false, and in that contest she gave the bravest and the best of all her sons to lead the fight.

Arrayed against Democracy in that struggle was every man who would coerce and threaten the vote of labor, every corporation whose greed for gain demands of the Government that the many be taxed for the benefit of a few, every trust which seeks to fatten by controlling the necessities of life, every money changer who demands that this Government should surrender the great power of a nation's credit to banking corporations. Out of that struggle Democracy came defeated, but bearing in the grasp of her great leader the banner of a pure Democracy. At the end of that contest Democracy knew its friends and knew its foes. The alignment was made, and now with ranks unbroken she is waiting to again renew the battle. She has no compromises to offer. We want nor seek nor barren victory. We stand for a victory which will mean the carrying out a form of government in this Republic tending to the advancement of human liberty and the happiness and prosperity of the entire people.

#### PROPHECIES FOR 1900.

Attorney T. J. Doyle, of Lincoln, in responding to the toast "1900," spoke as follows:

It is due to Democracy that I should give the assurance that the prophecies which I make and horoscope which I cast shall not unalterably commit the party to the policy which I portray. The two years of Republican nightmare which is to ensue between now and 1900 must be placed behind you. The things which have been declared settled will bear evidence of having been settled with an emetic which is continually effervescing.

The monetary policy of Secretary Gage and the so-called sound-money scions of Indianapolis will have crystallized into law. The drain upon the Federal exchequer caused by outstanding Treasury notes, the great menace to the maintenance of the gold standard, will have ceased, and there will be substituted in its stead a drain upon all industry, and, instead of issuing bonds to be redeemed by future generations, the toiling masses will pay the expense of maintaining the gold basis in the reduction of prices, which will induce gold to return to the country.

Republicanism, emboldened by the respect paid by a loyal people to the high office of the Chief Executive of the nation, will have become unqualifiedly committed to that fad of the dreamer, an English alliance and territorial control of the Philippines. The slogan of the loyal champion of the trust will be, "Unlimited march of the star of empire, a formidable standing army, government out of the banking business, a flexible system of currency controlled by a monetary commission." To ape and point with pride to the achievements of the British Empire. What a spectacle! What fealty to the grand spirit of the Republic of republics! Ye sons and descendants of the fathers of the Revolution, will you march under the banner of modern Tories or will you hearken to the voice of warning coming down through the centuries, the accumulated wisdom of ages, warning you against a policy which wrecked and caused the downfall of the ancient republics?

#### STANDS BY FIRST PRINCIPLES.

True to her mission since the formation of the Republic, the party of Jefferson and of Jackson, in the battle royal of 1900, shall place Americanism and the true principles of representative government, as set forth in the Declaration of Independence, in happy contrast with the English policy of the Republican party; shall proclaim anew the wholesome truths and enduring principles set forth in the Chicago platform of 1896; that the principles of our Declaration of Independence are, as was triumphantly asserted by the immortal Lincoln, universal in their application; that this inspired declaration of the freedom and liberty of man will admit of the inhabitants of no land, whose souls yearn for freedom and government emanating from the consent of the governed, being held as the vassals of the great Republic whose proudest boast has ever been that it is the land of the brave and the home of the free.

#### ENGLAND'S POLICY.

The policy of Great Britain in her modern alliances will be portrayed by Democracy as a warning to all who love their country and forget their duty. It will be recalled that in the Crimean war Great Britain formed an alliance with France and Sardinia and Turkey, to protect the Sultan of Turkey in the same policy as his successor has since carried on in Armenia, with the sheltering connivance of Great Britain, the policy of settling the internal troubles by wholesale massacre, rape, and robbery. The Russian Emperor sent his armies to the Turkish frontier to stop the butchery, and initiated the principle upon which we ourselves carried on our triumphant war with Spain, taking up the sword for the cause of humanity. Is the free and moral United

States to be bound by treaty to join hands with Great Britain for the protection of the murderer and the ravisher—the libel on human nature—the being whom Mr. Gladstone justly described as the unspeakable Turk? Shame, eternal shame, upon the thought!

Attention will be directed to the fact that Lord John Russell, speaking on behalf of the English ministry, encouraged Denmark to fight her big neighbor, Prussia, by declaring that if the troops of that power crossed the Elbe to seize the Duchy of Schleswig-Holstein, they would find British bayonets opposed to them. This was the signal for the ruin of the Danes. They resisted the Prussian claims, were mowed down in thousands by the newly invented needle gun, and lost their territory in the bargain. British bayonets were conspicuous for their absence.

The sons of liberty will be reminded of the alliance, under which the Confederate States had a fleet of commerce destroyers built in British ports. While we remember the *Maine*, we should not forget the *Alabama*.

The infamous compact with Louis Napoleon for a joint intervention in Mexico for the purpose of placing an Austrian prince upon the throne of Montezuma, with the title of emperor, will not be forgotten. It will be retold how the English withdrew from the alliance when the United States showed disapproval in her characteristic fashion. That France was left in the lurch and withdrew her troops on the breaking out of the war with Germany. The miserable puppet emperor paid the penalty of his ambition with his life, and his beautiful and blameless widow became the inmate of an insane asylum.

#### JUDAS CHAMBERLAIN.

The man who proposes this alliance on behalf of Great Britain is the same party whose perfidy to his former chief, Mr. Gladstone, broke up the Liberal party. He is universally despised as a dastardly renegade. His political treachery is of so black a dye as to have earned for him among his former colleagues in the House of Commons the sobriquet of Judas Chamberlain. It will be told with telling effect that the whole purpose of this proposed alliance is foreshadowed in the formation of the South African Chartered Company, with its object to establish, by fair means or foul, British dominion over the whole of South Africa. This involves the destruction of two existing republics, the Orange Free State and the Boer Republic.

In the thousand logical unanswerable arguments which shall be advanced against this un-American idea of alliance, the millionaire theft hunters, who are constantly on the lookout for princely matrimonial alliances for their families, will remain steadfast to this tenet of the Republican party. The introduction of titles would be the first fruit of an alliance with England. "The Earl of Bowery" or the "Marquis of Tenderloin" would sound so much better than Colonel Jones or Judge Smith.

It will be told that this proposed alliance is direct effrontery to 20,000,000 American citizens, through whose veins courses the blood of Irish ancestors. The Irishman has dearly learned the lesson of what an alliance with England means. It has meant for Ireland absorption and robbery and depopulation. Therefore, he means, and rightly, for America would mean English supremacy, destruction of the Republic, and national dishonor. He has not renounced his allegiance to England and sworn to uphold this Republic for such a consummation as this. He will draw the sword and pour out his blood for the Stars and Stripes, but for the Union Jack, never.

No conflict fought with such momentous consequences to future generations, since the American revolution, has been submitted to the American people as the issue of 1900.

#### TRIBUTE TO W. J. BRYAN.

It will involve the question of the dignity of American citizenship. No higher encomium, no greater honor can be done the individual than to say of him: "He is a true American citizen." When this policy culminates of degrading the Senate, dignified by the splendid genius of a Webster, Clay, and Calhoun to the semisavagery characterized in the predilection to wear bells upon the fingers and rings upon the toes, it will mean many centuries of retrogression. In this great conflict Democracy will be synonymous with patriot. The great underlying principles which make this the only true Republic that ever existed will be set forth in all their strength and cogency. It will be a battle for the liberty of man; a contest involving the purification of the flag of country. The great central figure in this triumphant march of the people will be America's foremost citizen and statesman whose matchless oratory, superb logic, and unflinching devotion to the principles of patriotism shall cause the people to rally to the standard bearer of Democracy, W. J. Bryan.

When this great battle is over and the glad tidings are flashed to the liberty-loving world that the principles of Democracy have triumphed, that the great commoner, who was enthroned in the hearts of the people, has been chosen Chief Executive of the nation, it will come as a new birth of freedom to the Republic.

It will be received as one of the colossal triumphs which the womb of the future now holds in store for the blessing of the twentieth century.

It will come as a new hope and promise to the liberty-loving world. It will conclusively establish the stability and perpetuity of a representative form of government.

In the benign administration which follows we will hail with delight a return to the simplicity which characterized the Administration of Jefferson. The true spirit of the great Republic will assert itself until the noble spirit of the fathers will seem to live again in directing the happy, lofty, triumphant course of the Administration, giving to mankind a lesson of wisdom, prudence, and patriotism which will stand as the crowning glory of the new century.

#### POLICY REGARDING THE PHILIPPINE ISLANDS.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Illinois made a request for unanimous consent that the vote be taken to-morrow on the joint resolution introduced by the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. McENERY].

Mr. MASON. That was objected to, as every other request I have made for thirty days has been objected to, by some one. I suggest that there is not a quorum present, Mr. President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Illinois suggests the absence of a quorum. Under the rules the Secretary will call the roll of the Senate.

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

Allison,	Clay,	Hansbrough,	McEnery,
Bacon,	Cockrell,	Harris,	McLaurin,
Bate,	Cullom,	Hawley,	Mallory,
Burrows,	Deboe,	Heitfeld,	Mantle,
Butler,	Elkins,	Jones, Ark.	Martin,
Caffery,	Fairbanks,	Jones, Nev.	Mitchell,
Chandler,	Foraker,	Kenney,	Money,
Chilton,	Gallinger,	Lindsay,	Morgan,
Clark,	Gear,	McBride,	Pasco,

Perkins,	Quay,	Smith,	Tillman,
Pettus,	Rawlins,	Stewart,	Turley,
Platt, Conn.	Ross,	Sullivan,	Warren,
Platt, N. Y.	Sewell,	Teller,	Wellington,
Pritchard,	Shoup,	Thurston,	Wolcott.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Fifty-six Senators having answered to their names, a quorum of the Senate is present.

#### INDIAN APPROPRIATION BILL.

The Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 11217) making appropriations for the current and contingent expenses of the Indian Department and for fulfilling treaty stipulations with various Indian tribes for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1900, and for other purposes.

Mr. ALLISON. I offer the amendment which I send to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated. The SECRETARY. On page 15, after line 8, it is proposed to insert:

For additional amount for buildings for additional schools at points on the Chippewa Reservations in Minnesota, to be selected by the Commissioner of Indian Affairs, \$20,000, to be immediately available and to be reimbursable.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. ALLISON. On page 38, line 9, in the appropriations "For support and civilization of Shoshone Indians in Wyoming," I move to strike out the word "twenty," before the word "thousand," and insert "twenty-five;" so as to make the appropriation \$25,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. ALLISON. After line 9, on page 38, I move to insert what I send to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated. The SECRETARY. After line 9, on page 38, it is proposed to insert:

For support and civilization of the Arapahoes in Wyoming, \$5,000. For the construction of a telephone line to connect the Arapahoe subagency with the Shoshone and Arapahoe main agency in Wyoming, \$750.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. ALLISON. On page 42, after line 15, I move to insert what I send to the desk.

The SECRETARY. On page 42, after line 15, it is proposed to insert:

That the Secretary of the Interior is hereby authorized, in his discretion, to pay to such Alsea and other Indians on the Siletz Reservation in Oregon, parties to an agreement made October 31, 1892, ratified by the act of Congress approved August 15, 1894 (28 Statutes, page 323), as shall be found to be competent and capable of managing and taking care of their own affairs their pro rata share of the permanent fund of \$100,000 appropriated by said act of August 15, 1894, and now to their credit in the Treasury of the United States.

Mr. JONES of Arkansas. Will the Senator from Iowa explain by whom it is to be ascertained that these people are capable of taking care of themselves?

Mr. ALLISON. By the Secretary of the Interior. I will say to the Senator that this amendment is offered in accordance with one of the articles of the agreement, and that the Secretary of the Interior has already, through an inspector, made an investigation into this matter.

Mr. JONES of Arkansas. Ought not the words "by the Secretary of the Interior," be inserted in the amendment after the word "found"?

Mr. ALLISON. I have no objection to that. Let it read "to be found by the Secretary of the Interior." I thought that was the phraseology employed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be modified, as suggested, by inserting the words "by the Secretary of the Interior" after the word "found." The question is on the amendment as modified.

Mr. PETTIGREW. I should like to know what tribe of Indians this refers to?

Mr. ALLISON. This refers to the Alsea and other Indians on the Siletz Indian Reservation, in Oregon.

Mr. PETTIGREW. I have no objection to that.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. PETTIGREW. I ask unanimous consent for the adoption of an amendment which I send to the desk, which has passed the Senate as a separate bill. It ratifies an agreement, and I think it has the unanimous support of the Committee on Indian Affairs and the subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations. I offer it, and ask unanimous consent to have it adopted. It passed the Senate heretofore by a unanimous vote.

Mr. ALLISON. I wish to say respecting the amendment that it is in the nature of an agreement. It is legislation which the Committee on Indian Affairs unanimously recommends, and I believe the Secretary of the Interior also desires its ratification. It can be put on this bill by unanimous consent, and I hope no objection will be made to it.

Mr. JONES of Arkansas. To what does it relate?

Mr. PETTIGREW. To an agreement between the Lower Brules and the Rosebud Indians.

Mr. JONES of Arkansas. Is it recommended by the Secretary of the Interior?

Mr. PETTIGREW. Yes; it is recommended by the Department.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment proposed by the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. PETTIGREW] will be stated.

The SECRETARY. It is proposed to insert:

Agreement with the Lower Brulé band of Sioux Indians in South Dakota and the Indians of the Sioux tribe on the Rosebud Indian Reservation in said State.

Whereas James McLaughlin, United States Indian inspector, did, on the 1st day of March, 1898, make and conclude an agreement with the male adult Indians of the Lower Brulé band of the Sioux tribe, occupying or belonging on the Lower Brulé Reservation, in South Dakota, which said agreement is as follows:

AGREEMENT.

This agreement made and entered into on the 1st day of March, 1898, by and between James McLaughlin, United States Indian inspector, on the part of the United States, and the Lower Brulé band of the Sioux tribe of Indians occupying or belonging on the Lower Brulé Reservation, in South Dakota, witnesseth:

ARTICLE 1. The said Indians belonging on the Lower Brulé Reservation hereby consent and agree that those of their tribe now south of the White River on the Rosebud Indian Reservation, S. Dak., may remain thereon; that they may take with them and have converted into the permanent fund of the Indians belonging upon the Rosebud Reservation their proportional or pro rata share of the funds now in the Treasury of the United States to the credit of the Indians belonging upon the Lower Brulé Reservation; and that the Lower Brulé Indians who have so removed may become and are hereafter to be considered Indians of the Rosebud Reservation.

ART. 2. In consideration of the lands upon the Lower Brulé Reservation abandoned by the Indians who have removed to the Rosebud Reservation, and in order that the United States may reimburse itself for the lands purchased for the Indians last mentioned upon the Rosebud Reservation, the said Indians of the Lower Brulé Reservation do hereby cede and relinquish to the United States a tract of territory constituting a portion of the Lower Brulé Reservation, and estimated to contain about 120,000 acres, described as follows:

Townships 107, 108, and 109 N., range 79 W. of the fifth principal meridian; also sections 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, 27, 28, 29, 30, 31, 32, 33, and 34, and west half of sections 2, 11, 14, 23, 25, and 35, in township 109 N., range 78 W. of fifth principal meridian; also sections 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, 27, 28, 29, 30, 31, 32, 33, and 34, in township 108 N., range 78 W. of fifth principal meridian; also sections 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, 27, 28, 29, 30, 31, 32, 33, and 34, in township 107 N., range 78 W. of fifth principal meridian; also north  $\frac{1}{2}$  of sections 3, 4, 5, and 6 of township 106 N., range 78 W. of fifth principal meridian; and north  $\frac{1}{2}$  of sections 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, and 6 of township 106 N., range 79 W. of fifth principal meridian. The same being the western portion of the Lower Brulé Indian Reservation from its northern boundary to its southern boundary, as herein described.

ART. 3. It is hereby further agreed that a reallocation shall be made by the United States to the Indians remaining upon the Lower Brulé Reservation within the diminished portion thereof: *Provided*, That all children born prior to the time of making such reallocation shall receive allotments of land in manner and quantity as provided in section 8 of the act of Congress approved March 2, 1889: *And provided further*, That instead of giving an allotment of 320 acres of agricultural or double that quantity of grazing land to the head of a family, as provided in said section 8, one-half of that quantity shall be allotted to the husband and one-half to the wife, where both are living and otherwise entitled to the benefits accruing to Indians belonging upon said reservation.

ART. 4. The United States hereby agrees to maintain and continue the Lower Brulé Agency and Agency Boarding School as at present for those Indians who remain of the Lower Brulé Reservation.

ART. 5. This agreement shall not take effect and be in force until ratified by act of Congress of the United States.

Dated and signed at the Lower Brulé Agency, S. Dak., on the 1st day of March, 1898.

JAMES McLAUGHLIN, [SEAL]  
United States Indian Inspector.

- 1. BIG MANE (his x mark) [SEAL]
- 2. BLACK ELK (his x mark) [SEAL]
- 3. CHAS DE SHEUQUETTE (his x mark) [SEAL]  
and two hundred and forty (240) others.

I hereby certify that at the request of Indian Inspector McLaughlin I read the foregoing agreement in open council to the Indians of the Lower Brulé Agency, parties thereto, and that it was explained to them through the interpreters, paragraph by paragraph.

B. C. ASH,  
United States Indian Agent.

LOWER BRULE AGENCY, S. DAK., March 1, 1898.

We hereby certify that the foregoing articles of agreement were fully explained in open council to the Indians of Lower Brulé Agency, parties hereto, and were thoroughly understood by them before signing the same, and that the agreement was duly executed and signed by said Indians.

ALEX. RENCOUNTRE,  
Official Interpreter.  
GEORGE ESTES,  
Special Interpreter.

LOWER BRULE AGENCY, S. DAK., March 1, 1898.

Witnesses to the foregoing agreement, signatures of inspectors and the 243 Indians whose names appear as parties thereto.

B. C. ASH,  
United States Indian Agent.  
GEORGE S. STONE,  
Agency Clerk.  
J. R. COLLARD,  
Agency Physician.

LOWER BRULE AGENCY, S. DAK., March 1, 1898.

I certify that the total number of male Indians over 18 years of age belonging on this reservation is 268, of whom 243 have signed the foregoing agreement.

B. C. ASH,  
United States Indian Agent.

LOWER BRULE AGENCY, S. DAK., March 1, 1898.

I certify that the official records of the Lower Brulé Agency show 268 male adult Indians over 18 years of age, residing on or belonging to the Lower Brulé Reservation, 243 of whom have duly signed the foregoing agreement.

JAMES McLAUGHLIN,  
United States Indian Inspector.

LOWER BRULE AGENCY, S. DAK., March 1, 1898.

And whereas James McLaughlin, United States Indian inspector, did on the 10th day of March, 1898, make and conclude an agreement with the male adult Indians of the Sioux tribe on or belonging on the Rosebud Indian Reservation, in the State of South Dakota, which said agreement is as follows:

AGREEMENT.

This agreement, made and entered into on the 10th day of March, 1898, by and between James McLaughlin, United States Indian inspector, on the part of the United States, and the Sioux tribe of Indians belonging on the Rosebud Indian Reservation, in South Dakota, witnesseth:

ARTICLE 1. The Indians of the Rosebud Indian Reservation hereby give their permission and consent for the Indians of the Lower Brulé Reservation, in South Dakota, who have left the same and settled upon the Rosebud Reservation to remain thereon and take allotments of lands in severalty, as provided in section 8 of the act of Congress approved March 2, 1889, modified as hereinafter provided.

ART. 2. In consideration for the permission and consent aforesaid it is hereby agreed that the United States shall pay the Indians of the Rosebud Reservation, as now constituted, excluding the said Indians who have removed to the Rosebud Reservation from the Lower Brulé Reservation, pro rata, in cash, at the rate of \$1.25 per acre for the lands allotted to the Indians of the Lower Brulé Reservation, as provided in article 1 of this agreement; and it is understood and agreed that the Indians of the Rosebud Reservation shall not be dependent upon the funds of the Lower Brulé Indians for such payment, but the same shall be made to them directly by the Government of the United States.

ART. 3. It is further provided and agreed that the Lower Brulé Indians who have permanently located upon the Rosebud Reservation shall have their pro rata or proportional share of the tribal funds now in the Treasury of the United States belonging to the Indians of the Lower Brulé Reservation transferred to and consolidated with the funds of the Indians belonging on the Rosebud Reservation, and that hereafter they shall be regarded in all essential respects as Indians of the Rosebud Reservation, and their annuities and other benefits from the Government, whether derived from treaty provisions or otherwise, shall be distributed to them at the Rosebud Agency, or a sub-agency connected therewith: *Provided*, That the Lower Brulé Indians who have so located upon the Rosebud Reservation shall have no further interest in the Lower Brulé Reservation, or the lands comprising the same, after their interest in the tribal funds has been transferred to the Rosebud funds as above stipulated.

ART. 4. It is hereby agreed on the part of the United States that allotments in severalty shall be made to all children born prior to the date of the ratification of this agreement then living, in manner and quantity as provided in section 8 of said act of March 2, 1889: *Provided*, That in future allotments upon the Rosebud Reservation, instead of allotting 320 acres of agricultural or double that quantity of grazing land to the head of a family, as provided in said section 8, one-half of said quantity shall be allotted to the husband and one-half to the wife, where both are living and otherwise entitled to the benefits accruing to the Indians belonging upon said reservation: *Provided further*, That the allotments heretofore made on the Rosebud Reservation shall be revised in conformity with the preceding proviso: *And provided further*, That where any Indians to whom allotments in severalty have been made in the field have since died such allotments shall be duly completed and approved, and the land shall descend to the heirs of such decedents in accordance with the provisions of section 11 of said act last above mentioned.

ART. 5. This agreement shall not take effect and be in force until ratified by act of the Congress of the United States.

Dated and signed at the Rosebud Agency, S. Dak., on the 10th day of March, 1898.

JAMES McLAUGHLIN, [SEAL]  
United States Indian Inspector.

- 1. CHARLES C. TACKETT, [SEAL]
- 2. I. P. BETTELYOUN, [SEAL]
- 3. CLEMENT WHIRLWIND SOLDIER, [SEAL]  
(and 1,020 others).

I hereby certify that at the request of Indian Inspector McLaughlin I read the foregoing agreement in open council to the Indians of the Rosebud Agency, S. Dak., parties thereto, and that it was explained to them through the interpreters paragraph by paragraph.

CHAS. E. McCHESNEY,  
United States Indian Agent.

ROSEBUD AGENCY, S. DAK., March 10, 1898.

We hereby certify that the foregoing agreement was fully explained by us in open council to the Indians of the Rosebud Agency, S. Dak.; that it was fully understood by them before signing, and that we witnessed the signatures of the Indians thereto; and we further certify that the foregoing names, though similar in some cases, represent different individuals in every instance.

LOUIS ROULIDEAU,  
Official Interpreter.  
THOMAS FLOOD,  
Special Interpreter.

ROSEBUD AGENCY, S. DAK., March 10, 1898.

We certify that we witnessed the signatures of Indian Inspector McLaughlin and Indians to the foregoing agreement, parties thereto.

FRANK MULLEN,  
Agency Clerk.

H. B. COX,  
Assistant Clerk.

J. FRANKLIN HOUSE,  
Day School Inspector.

H. J. CATON,  
Farmer, Cut Meat Creek District.

JOHN SULLIVAN,  
Farmer, Black Pipe Creek District.

FRANK SYPAL,  
Farmer, Butte Creek District.

ROSEBUD AGENCY, S. DAK., March 10, 1898.

I certify that the total number of male Indians over 18 years of age belonging on this reservation is 1,160, of whom 1,023 have signed the foregoing agreement.

CHAS. E. McCHESNEY,  
United States Indian Agent.

ROSEBUD AGENCY, S. DAK., March 10, 1898.

I certify that the official records of Rosebud Agency, S. Dak., show 1,160 adult male Indians over 18 years of age belonging on the Rosebud Reservation, 1,023 of whom have signed the foregoing agreement, being 153 more than the three-fourths majority of the adult male Indians of Rosebud Agency.

JAMES McLAUGHLIN,  
United States Indian Inspector.

ROSEBUD AGENCY, S. DAK., March 10, 1898.

Therefore, it is hereby provided that the agreement made and entered into on the 1st day of March, 1898, by and between James McLaughlin, United

States Indian inspector, on the part of the United States, and the Lower Brulé band of the Sioux tribe of Indians in South Dakota be, and the same hereby is, accepted, ratified, and confirmed.

That the agreement made and entered into on the 10th day of March, 1898, by and between James McLaughlin, United States Indian inspector, on the part of the United States, and the Sioux tribe of Indians belonging to the Rosebud Indian Reservation in South Dakota be, and the same is hereby, ratified and confirmed.

That for the purpose of making the payment to the Indians of the Rosebud Reservation stipulated for in article 2 of the foregoing agreement with the Sioux tribe of Indians belonging to the Rosebud Indian Reservation the sum of \$148,600 be, and the same is hereby, appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated: *Provided*, That the said payment is to be in full for all lands required by the said Lower Brulé Indians for allotments in accordance with the provisions of article 1 of the aforesaid agreement.

**The PRESIDING OFFICER.** The question is on agreeing to the amendment proposed by the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. PETTIGREW].

The amendment was agreed to.

**Mr. RAWLINS.** I offer the amendment which I send to the desk.

**The SECRETARY.** Between lines 3 and 4, on page 46, it is proposed to insert:

That the waters of the streams in the Uintah Indian Reservation, in Utah, are hereby declared open to appropriation for useful purposes according to the laws of the United States and the local laws and customs of the State of Utah, either on or off said reservation, subject at all times to the paramount right of the Indians on said reservation to so much of said waters as may have been appropriated, or may hereafter be appropriated, used, and needed by them for agricultural and culinary purposes; and the right is hereby granted for the construction and maintenance of all necessary dams, ditches, and canals on or through said reservation for the purpose of diverting and appropriating said waters as aforesaid: *Provided*, That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he hereby is, authorized to prescribe such rules and regulations as he may deem necessary to secure to the Indians the quantity of water needed by them for domestic and agricultural purposes.

**Mr. ALLISON.** I am not clear but that the amendment should be modified in some respects, but I am willing that it shall go into the bill as proposed by the Senator from Utah, and if a modification is necessary it may be made later.

**Mr. RAWLINS.** I have already modified it.

**The PRESIDING OFFICER.** The question is on agreeing to the amendment proposed by the Senator from Utah.

The amendment was agreed to.

**Mr. PLATT of Connecticut.** I offer the amendment which I send to the desk.

**The SECRETARY.** After line 18, on page 23, it is proposed to insert:

That all chattel mortgages executed in the Quapaw Agency, in the northern district of the Indian Territory, shall be recorded in the town of Miami by the clerk of the said northern district of the Indian Territory or his duly appointed deputy in a book or books kept for the purpose.

The amendment was agreed to.

**Mr. PLATT of Connecticut.** I propose another amendment, which has been reported by the Committee on Indian Affairs.

**The SECRETARY.** It is proposed to add, after line 16, on page 14, the following:

The Secretary of the Interior is hereby authorized and directed to cause an investigation by an Indian inspector of the alleged cutting of green timber under contracts for cutting "dead and down" on the Chippewa ceded and diminished reservations in the State of Minnesota, and also whether the present plan of estimating timber on said lands is the best that can be devised for protection of the interests of said Indians; and also in his discretion to suspend the further cutting of timber on said reservations.

**The PRESIDING OFFICER.** The question is on agreeing to the amendment proposed by the Senator from Connecticut.

The amendment was agreed to.

**Mr. DAVIS.** I desire to offer an amendment to the pending bill.

**The SECRETARY.** On page 14, it is proposed to strike out all after and including line 17, and all on page 15 from lines 1 to 8, both inclusive, and insert:

For the erection of suitable buildings for schools upon the Indian reservations in Minnesota, as follows:

At Cass Lake, \$3,000.

At the Narrows, on the north shore of Red Lake, \$5,000.

At White Oak Point, \$10,000.

At Twin Lakes, on the White Earth Reservation, \$3,000.

For enlarging the present school at Wild Rice River, on White Earth Reservation, \$3,000.

For building schools similar to those above appropriated for at such points in Minnesota as may be selected by the Secretary of the Interior, the additional sum of \$9,000.

**Mr. DAVIS.** Mr. President, I have been convinced for a long time that the methods of education in the Indian reservations referred to in the bill are imperfect and insufficient. They build large schoolhouses for a widely scattered people, and not one-tenth of the instrumentalities of education to which those children are entitled ever reaches them. I have accordingly offered this amendment. It has not been reported from any committee, and I suppose a point of order will be made against it. I desire, as a part of my remarks, to have inserted in the RECORD a letter upon the subject from a gentleman who has passed many years in that country and whose judgment is entitled to most implicit reliance. I ask unanimous consent that the letter which I send to the desk may be inserted as a part of my remarks.

The letter referred to is as follows:

916 WESTMINSTER STREET NW., WASHINGTON, D. C.,  
January 10, 1899.

HONORABLE SIR: I respectfully ask your influence toward procuring additional school accommodations for the Indian children in Minnesota.

It appears by the latest Government report to which I have access, namely, that for 1897, that there were then belonging to the White Earth Agency children of school age—females, 6 to 14 years; males, 6 to 16 years—1,936 children. But the school age is really for both sexes from 6 to 18 years, and persons are often kept in school till 24. Reckoning, then, from 6 to 18 years, there are about 2,580 children on White Earth Agency.

Out of the 2,580 the agent reports 466 children as being in eight schools on the agency during that year, or only 1 in 5½ of the school population.

Those 466 are about all the present schools can accommodate; so more than 4 out of every 5 of those unfortunate children have to stay out of school, starve, freeze, and suffer every misery and grow up vagabonds, because no schools are provided for them on their reservations.

It is true there are schools at a distance, as Carlisle, and others nearer home, but their parents will not allow them to go to those distant schools, because they are afraid they will be sick or something happen to them while out of their sight. Those who go to those distant schools are generally French half-breeds, sometimes almost white. They get all the benefits, but the full-blooded Indian children whom we wish most to educate are at home, out of school, growing up in ignorance and vice, there being no schools for them.

Yet they have, as you know, ample means in their pine to provide schools and schoolhouses for their children; it need not cost the white people a cent. According to my calculation it would not take more than one dollar out of fifty of what they own to build the necessary schoolhouses. The Government has already advanced \$2,000,000, on the security of their pine, to pay the salaries of the Chippewa commissioners, etc., and could easily advance them the small sum of \$33,500 spoken of below for schools. And the Chippewas are most anxious to have the small amount of their money needed for schools used in that way; nothing would please them so much. While they are unwilling to send their children away to a distance to school, they are very anxious to have them educated among them, where they live, and there is no disposition of the money that would be so good for the white people of Minnesota as this.

If those Indian children are not educated now, they will be forced to grow up vagabonds, nuisances, and almost criminals. We know that such people are very expensive to take care of. Far better to prevent them from becoming such by giving them a proper start in life now. It will be a thousand times cheaper in the end. If kept in school from 6 to 16 or 18 they will speak English as well as we—they will be very much like other children. As one proper solution of the Indian problem every one of the 2,580 Indian and mixed-blood children belonging to the White Earth Agency should, next summer, be put in school and kept there, and to that end schoolhouses should, next summer, be built for all of them.

For this purpose we do not need an expensive plant, where trades, etc., are taught. Such things are desirable, but not necessary. A plain frame boarding-school building will do very well. If we wait to get those expensive plants, such as are now designed for White Earth, Red Lake, and Leech Lake, it will take too long, and while the grass will be growing the horse will starve. Already twenty-five years have elapsed, almost a generation, and notwithstanding all the effort I have been able to make by appeals, etc., the Government has not established one new school. It adopted two out of four that I started, and that is all.

I would say here that as a general thing day schools will not do, not even when a dinner is given at noon and the children clothed free. We have found by experience that they will not come, nor will their parents send them, unless they are boarded. Then many of them live too scattered. At the narrows on Red Lake they might attend a day school, with dinner and clothing, but nowhere else would they do it.

Beneath, then, I shall give a list of six new schools that ought to be built, and the cost of all of them combined would be only a little over three-fifths that of one school such as the Government is now building at White Earth, yet I believe each one of them will do as much good as that expensive school, and the number of children they will provide for will be, I think, six times as great. I have built three Indian boarding schools myself, and carried on four boarding schools for four years in these very localities, with 200 pupils, so I think I ought to know something about it.

First. At Cass Lake are about 49 children; no school there and not one child being taught. The poor Indians there are always begging for a school, but their children are forced to grow up in ignorance. The proposed new school at Leech Lake will not meet their need; it would not hold their children with the others whom it is proposed to put in it. There are 518 children reported by the agent as belonging at Leech Lake, White Oak Point, and Cass Lake, the children of which places it is proposed, I suppose, to put there, but 150 will probably be the capacity of that school, the same as of the White Earth, even if \$50,000 is used in its construction. Then they would not send their children to a distant school, away from home, as Leech Lake, as they would send them to one right among them. By all means give them the common, plain school they ask, out of their own money.

I will make the Government a present of the school building in which I carried on a boarding school there for four years, and which cost \$720, if it will carry on a school there; also land for a beautiful site for a school will be furnished. Cost of frame school boarding house at Cass Lake, \$3,000.

Second. At the Narrows, on the north shore of Red Lake, in one village there are 80 fine full-blood Indian children, close together. No school, no child being taught; all forced to grow up in ignorance. Many are most anxious for a school, and there is no place where a school would do more good. It is true \$90,000 have been appropriated for a school at Red Lake Agency, but that new school would not begin to hold the 470 children between 6 and 18 at Red Lake. Besides, as usual, their parents would not send them away from home in great numbers across the lake, where they can not see them. What a blessing a school would be to that Indian village, even to the old people! For a frame boarding school at the Narrows, Red Lake, \$5,000.

Third. About White Oak Point are reported by the agent 173 children, girls 6 to 14, boys 6 to 18. A school should be built somewhere in their midst next summer, and every child should be put in it and kept there. The new Leech Lake school will not hold their numbers with the Leech Lake and others whom it is intended to place there. Cost of boarding school for White Oak Point, \$10,000.

Fourth. At Mille Lac, near Minneapolis, there are about 800 Indians living. The little children there are starving, freezing, brought up in every vice and seeing only evil—whisky drinking, gambling, and debauchery of all kinds. The same is true of White Oak Point Indians. There is no school there; not one child in school; all forced to grow up to that horrible life. A school should be built somewhere for them and every one of those children put in it. Cost of boarding school for them, \$7,500.

Fifth. The new school at White Earth will not be nearly large enough to contain the children there. It is to have accommodation for 150 children.

But the agent reports there 364 children, boys 6 to 16, girls 6 to 14, or about 484 children between 6 and 18 years.

To provide for those unable to get in the new school, a boarding school to hold 60 children should be built at Twin Lakes, on the White Earth Reservation, 18 miles northeast of the agency. There are 60 children tributary to that point. There I have built a new frame schoolhouse, with all modern improvements, to hold 60 children, at a cost of over \$900, the use of which I will give to the Government free if it will carry on a school there. A school would be a great blessing to that locality.

Cost of a new school boarding house at Twin Lakes for 60 children, \$3,000. Sixth. The present Wild Rice River School, on White Earth Reservation, should be enlarged to hold 60 more children, at a cost of \$3,000. Great numbers are refused admittance there every fall.

The above-enumerated schools would provide the Indians everywhere with pretty good school accommodations at a cost in all of only \$33,500. That is only a little over three-fifths of the cost of one school like that at White Earth, and it would build six for six very destitute localities, most of them having at present no school and not one scholar.

Those schools would provide for 500 children at least, against the 150 in the much more expensive single school at White Earth. When the schools are once built the Government is perfectly willing to carry them on. With the outside nonreservation schools to which some would go, they would give every Indian child a chance in life and a good start.

If it be objected that these schools would not give room enough, ventilation enough, etc., the answer is that for four years I carried on such schools and found them perfectly sufficient. There never was any sickness or evil effects or overcrowding. I believe they would do almost or quite as good work as more expensive plants.

We can not wait to get those expensive plants—\$50,000 schools. We want to put every child in school at once; next summer; not to allow another generation to pass, as one has already. If we have to wait for \$50,000 everywhere, it will be a great many years before we will get them. It is not the building nor the plant that makes the school, but good, kind, capable, Christian teachers inside, and those are just as likely to be found in a three-thousand-dollar as in a fifty-thousand-dollar school.

I would mention also that the new Foston Branch Railroad has just been built through that country, which is a lumber country, and building can now be done very cheaply and very easily.

For the sake, then, of the poor, suffering, innocent children of our State, who are compelled by hundreds to live a most horrible life, while their parents have ample means to provide them with a good Christian upbringing, I beg of you to use all of your influence and efforts to have school boarding houses provided for them all next summer. Those children must always live in our State. They can never be transported elsewhere. They must be mingled with our people and our descendants. Some of those children will be living seventy years hence, either as respectable producers or as vagabonds and criminals, a disgrace and a burden, according to what we now do with them in the formative period of youth. If we let them alone they must become the latter. In money cost it will be a thousand times cheaper to do a little preventive work.

We have pressed a bitter cup of woe to those people, and have horribly abused them; but a great reparation, and the best we can now make, will be to give their little children, whom they love so much, a good start in life. That will make amends for a great deal. It will cost us no money; only a little effort. Any man of ordinary sense could go there and by midsummer have the necessary modest school building in every settlement or village of Indians. If the Government wishes me to supervise it, I will do it without salary and pay my own expenses.

Our present Commissioner of Indian Affairs is trying to do the very best he can for the Indians and for schools. But the traditions of the Indian Office seem to be in favor of \$50,000 and \$30,000 plants only; and I feel that in that way we shall not get around quick enough. We need those schools at once—next summer; and we need, where necessary, compulsion to put every one of those children in school and keep them there.

At present our school accommodations for only one child in five is deplorable. Dr. Hallmann, the late superintendent of Indian schools, told me that the reason he had no school accommodations was because our Congressional delegation took no interest in it; never asked for any; that if they did as the South Dakota delegation and Mr. Pickler did, we would have all the schools we wanted. Knowing your sympathetic kindness to the unfortunate, I thus lay before you the sad case and deplorable situation of many hundreds of poor children, guilty of no crime, but only the victims of unfortunate circumstances, who are cold, hungry, and unspeakably wretched to day, and who have only the gloomiest and most forbidding future to look forward to (if they survive the hardships they now have to bear), and all for want of what we have it easily in our power to give them out of their own funds—the comfort and warmth of a home in a Christian school.

If you think it would do any good to have me meet the Minnesota delegation and make a personal statement to them about the matter, I am ready to do so.

Hoping I have not trespassed on your time too long, I am,  
Very respectfully, yours,

J. A. GILFILLAN.

Hon. C. K. DAVIS, *United States Senate.*

Mr. DAVIS. At a future time, during the next session of Congress, when objection can not be made, I shall take occasion to press very zealously the consideration of that letter. The amendment which I offered does not, nor will anything I may propose hereafter, interfere with the building of the larger schools, but it is intended to supplement them by smaller ones.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair will take the liberty to suggest to the Senator from Minnesota that as the amendment for which he offers a substitute has been agreed to as in Committee of the Whole, it will be necessary to reconsider that action or else to withhold the amendment until the bill is in the Senate.

Mr. ALLISON. I wish to say to the Senator from Minnesota that on my motion an amendment has already been agreed to, in addition to the amendment printed in italics, which appropriates \$20,000 for four schools in the Leech Lake Reservation, to be established at places to be designated by the Secretary of the Interior. I will ask the Senator at a later period to examine the amendment, and the whole question can be considered in connection with those two amendments without striking out and inserting what he proposes.

Mr. DAVIS. I will withdraw my amendment for the purpose of considering what the Senator from Iowa suggests. I will state, however, that what has been done in the Senate with re-

spect to the \$20,000 is all well enough as far as it goes, but the Leech Lake Reservation—

Mr. JONES of Arkansas. I wish to ask the Senator from Minnesota, as a matter of information, whether the amendment he proposes has been considered by the Committee on Indian Affairs, or whether there is any recommendation by the Secretary of the Interior?

Mr. DAVIS. There is none whatever.

Mr. JONES of Arkansas. I think amendments of this kind ought to have the approval of the Indian Office, and while this matter is under consideration I would suggest to the Senator from Minnesota to call the attention of the Department to it, and let us have a recommendation, if possible.

Mr. DAVIS. Living in the State and having had intimate connection with those people for so many years, I know enough about it myself to feel entire confidence in the strength of the position when the matter shall be properly before the Senate, without present reference to the Indian Office.

Mr. JONES of Arkansas. If the Senator from Minnesota does not wish to satisfy other Senators by the opinion of the Department, very well.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment of the Senator from Minnesota is withdrawn.

Mr. MANTLE. I offer an amendment which has been reported to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

The SECRETARY. It is proposed to insert on page 61, as a new section, the following:

SEC. 9. That the following-described tract of land be, and the same is hereby set aside as a reservation for the permanent use and occupancy of the Indians now occupying or belonging upon the Northern Cheyenne Indian Reservation, which reservation shall be known as the Northern Cheyenne Indian Reservation, namely:

Beginning at the point in the middle of the channel of Tongue River at its intersection with the southern 40-mile limits of the grant to the Northern Pacific Railroad Company, thence west on the said southern 40-mile limits to its intersection with the eastern boundary line of the Crow Indian Reservation; thence south on said boundary line to its intersection with the line dividing townships 5 and 6 S.; thence east on said dividing line of townships 5 and 6 S. to its intersection with the line dividing ranges 40 and 41 E.; thence north on said line dividing ranges 40 and 41 E. to the line dividing townships 4 and 5 S.; thence east on the line dividing townships 4 and 5 S. to its intersection with Cook Creek; thence down Cook Creek to its confluence with Tongue River; thence down the middle of the channel of Tongue River to the place of beginning.

Provided, however, That if upon the survey or resurvey of the boundary lines already established it shall be found that the main stream of Cook Creek on or near the range line between ranges 40 and 41 lies south of the line dividing townships 4 and 5 S., then in that case the line running north on the range line between ranges 40 and 41 shall extend north only to the intersection of said line with the main stream of Cook Creek, and thence down Cook Creek as hereinbefore provided: *Provided further*, That in the erection of the reservation boundary fence along said Cook Creek the same shall be so erected as to divide the waters as near as may be between the north and south sides thereof: *Provided further*, That certain tracts, approximating 65 acres, lying west of Tongue River, in sections 20 and 24 in township 4 S. of range 43 E., owned by Joseph Scott, and the northeast quarter of section 3 in township 3 S. of range 44 E., belonging to St. Labra's Mission, and the south half of the northwest quarter of section 10 in township 2 S. of range 44 E., belonging to R. P. Colbert, shall be excepted from and not included within the reservation boundaries named.

SEC. 2. That the following sums be, and they are hereby appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, namely:

For the payment of settlers within the said boundaries for lands and improvements, \$150,445: *Provided*, That the Secretary of the Interior shall and does, in his discretion, ratify and approve, under the provisions of section 10 of the Indian appropriation act approved July 1, 1893 (30 Statutes, pages 596 and 597), the agreements entered into thereunder by United States Indian Inspector James McLaughlin with the settlers included within said boundaries, submitted by him to the Secretary, with his report, dated November 14, 1898, and shall find, upon investigation hereafter to be made, that the improvements of the settlers referred to remain intact and in good condition: *Provided further*, That the settlers shall remove immediately from the reservation upon the payment of the sums, according to their respective agreements as ratified and approved by the Secretary of the Interior;

For payment of Indians residing east of Tongue River for improvements, \$1,150;

For the construction of 65 miles of wire fence around a portion of said reservation, \$7,150;

For the purchase of 1,000 2 year-old native Western heifers for the use of the Indians of said reservation, \$35,000;

For the purchase of 40 2 year-old Hereford or Durham bulls for the use of the Indians, \$3,200;

For buildings at the Tongue River Agency, on said reservation, \$10,000;

For subsistence station, farmer's residence, and blacksmith's shop at Tongue River, \$3,055;

In all, \$200,000.

SEC. 3. That the Secretary of the Interior is hereby authorized and directed to purchase the heifers and bulls herein provided for at such time as he, in his discretion, may deem best, and to prescribe such rules and regulations as he may deem necessary to secure a just and equitable distribution of this stock among the Indians residing or belonging upon the Northern Cheyenne Indian Reservation; and he shall cause such portion of the reservation to be fenced as he, in his judgment, may deem necessary; and in like manner to construct or repair buildings at the Tongue River Agency, establish and build a subsistence station, a farmer's residence, and blacksmith's shop, as herein provided for.

SEC. 4. That the Secretary of the Interior shall pay to the Indians residing east of Tongue River the respective sums for their improvements as ascertained by Inspector McLaughlin in agreement submitted with his said report upon condition that they shall remove to the reservation hereby established.

Mr. ALLISON. That I understand is an agreement made between the Interior Department and the Indians of Tongue River.

Mr. MANTLE. That is correct.

Mr. ALLISON. The amendment has the support of the Committee on Indian Affairs and was examined by the Committee on Appropriations. I will ask the Senator from Montana if it contains any legislation other than the ratification of the treaty?

Mr. MANTLE. That is all. It simply contains a ratification of an agreement made by the Interior Department with the Northern Cheyenne Indians.

Mr. PLATT of Connecticut. It requires an appropriation.

Mr. MANTLE. It requires an appropriation to carry it into effect.

Mr. ALLISON. It requires an appropriation, of course. The amendment can be put on the bill only by unanimous consent. I shall not object to it, nor to another agreement which has been made with the Indians on the Fort Hall Reservation. The amendments are said to be necessary in order to complete agreements with those Indians at an early period. Therefore they must go on the pending bill if they are to pass into law at the present session. I deprecate the placing of these agreements upon appropriation bills, and unless they can go on by unanimous consent I shall object to their consideration, but I shall not myself make the point.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment proposed by the Senator from Montana.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. SHOUP. I offer the amendment which I send to the desk.

The SECRETARY. On page 61, after the amendment just adopted, it is proposed to insert the following:

AGREEMENT WITH THE SHOSHONE AND BANNOCK INDIANS OF THE FORT HALL RESERVATION, IN IDAHO.

SEC. 10. The following agreement made and entered into between Benjamin F. Barge, James H. McNeely, and Charles G. Hoyt, duly appointed commissioners on behalf of the United States, and the headmen and a majority of the male adults of the Bannock and Shoshone tribes of Indians upon the Fort Hall Indian Reservation, in the State of Idaho, is hereby accepted, ratified, and confirmed, namely:

ARTICLE I.

That the said Indians of the Fort Hall Reservation do hereby cede, grant, and relinquish to the United States all right, title, and interest which they have to the following-described land, the same being a part of the land obtained through the treaty of Fort Bridger on the 3d day of July, 1868, and ratified by the United States Senate on the 16th day of February, 1869:

All that portion of the said reservation embraced within and lying east and south of the following-described lines: Commencing at a point in the south boundary of the Fort Hall Indian Reservation, being the southwest corner of township 9 south, range 34 east of the Boise meridian, thence running due north on the range line between townships 33 and 34 east to a point 2 miles north of the township line between townships 5 and 6 south, thence due east to the range line between ranges 35 and 36 east, thence south on said range line 4 miles, thence due east to the east boundary line of the reservation; from this point the east and south boundaries of the said reservation as it now exists to the point of beginning, namely, the southwest corner of township 9 south, range 34 east, being the remainder of the description and metes and bounds of the said tract of land herein proposed to be ceded.

ARTICLE II.

That in consideration of the lands ceded, granted, and relinquished, as aforesaid, the United States stipulates and agrees to pay to and expend for the Indians of the said reservation \$600,000, in the following manner, to wit:

Seventy-five thousand dollars, or as much thereof as may be necessary, shall be expended by the Secretary of the Interior in the erection of a modern school plant for the Indians of the Fort Hall Reservation at a point near the present agency, said point or site to be selected by the Secretary of the Interior, and the surplus remaining, if any, of the above \$75,000 may be expended by the Secretary of the Interior for the educational needs of said Indians.

One hundred thousand dollars shall be paid in cash pro rata, share and share alike, to each man, woman, and child belonging to and actually residing on said reservation, within three months after the ratification of this treaty by the Congress of the United States. The remainder of said sum total shall be paid pro rata in like manner, as follows:

- Fifty thousand dollars one year after the first payment.
- Fifty thousand dollars two years after the first payment.
- Fifty thousand dollars three years after the first payment.
- Fifty thousand dollars four years after the first payment.
- Fifty thousand dollars five years after the first payment.
- Fifty thousand dollars six years after the first payment.
- Fifty thousand dollars seven years after the first payment.
- Fifty thousand dollars eight years after the first payment.
- Twenty-five thousand dollars nine years after the first payment.

The deferred payments shall bear interest at the rate of 4 per cent per annum, said interest to be placed annually to the credit of said Indians, and shall be expended for their benefit by the Secretary of the Interior at such times and in such manner as he may direct: *Provided*, That none of the money due to said Indians under this agreement shall be subject to the payment of any claims, judgments, or demands against said Indians for damages or depredations claimed to have been committed prior to the signing of this agreement.

ARTICLE III.

Where any Indians have taken lands and made homes on the reservation and are now occupying and cultivating the same, under the sixth section of the Fort Bridger treaty hereinbefore referred to, they shall not be removed therefrom without their consent, and they may receive allotments on the land they now occupy; but in case they prefer to remove they may select land elsewhere on that portion of said reservation not hereby ceded, granted, and relinquished and not occupied by any other Indians; and should they decide not to move their improvements, then the same shall be appraised under direction of the Secretary of the Interior and sold for their benefit, at a sum not less than such appraisal, and the cash proceeds of such sale shall be paid to the Indian or Indians whose improvements shall be so sold.

ARTICLE IV.

So long as any of the lands ceded, granted, and relinquished under this treaty remain part of the public domain, Indians belonging to the above-mentioned tribes, and living on the reduced reservation, shall have the right

without any charge therefor, to cut timber for their own use, but not for sale, and to pasture their live stock on said public lands, and to hunt thereon and to fish in the streams thereof.

ARTICLE V.

That for the purpose of segregating the ceded lands from the diminished reservation, the new boundary lines described in Article I of this agreement shall be properly surveyed and permanently marked in a plain and substantial manner by prominent and durable monuments, the cost of said survey to be paid by the United States.

ARTICLE VI.

The existing provisions of all former treaties with the Indians of the Fort Hall Reservation not inconsistent with the provisions of this agreement are hereby continued in force and effect; and all provisions thereof inconsistent herewith are hereby repealed.

ARTICLE VII.

The existing main traveled roads leading from McCammon to Blackfoot and from McCammon to American Falls are declared public highways, and the proper use of such is hereby granted to the general public.

ARTICLE VIII.

The water from streams on that portion of the reservation now sold which is necessary for irrigating on land actually cultivated and in use shall be reserved for the Indians now using the same so long as said Indians remain where they now live.

ARTICLE IX.

This agreement shall take effect and be in force when signed by the commissioners and by a majority of the male Indians of the Fort Hall Reservation over 18 years of age and ratified by the Congress of the United States.

Signed on the part of the United States Government by the commissioners aforesaid and by the following Indians of the Bannock and Shoshone tribes, residing and having rights on the Fort Hall Indian Reservation.

BENJAMIN F. BARGE, *Commissioner*.  
JAMES H. MCNEELY, *Commissioner*.  
CHARLES G. HOYT, *Commissioner*.

FORT HALL INDIAN AGENCY,  
Ross Fork, Idaho, February 5, 1898.

(1) Jim Ballard (x); witness, Mary W. Fisher. (2) Pocatello Tom (x); witness, Chas. M. Robinson. (3) Kunecke Johnson (x); witness, Mary W. Fisher, (and 247 others.)

\* \* \* \* \*  
We certify that we interpreted the foregoing agreement with the Bannock and Shoshone Indians and that they thoroughly understood the entire matter; that we truly interpreted for the commissioners and for the Indians at all the councils held to discuss the subject, and to individual Indians.

J. J. LEWIS.

KENNEKE (his x mark) JOHNSON,

*Interpreters.*

Witness:

CHAS. M. ROBINSON.  
J. H. BEAN.  
ALBERT W. FISHER.

ROSS FORK, IDAHO, February 5, 1898.

FORT HALL AGENCY, IDAHO, February 5, 1898.

I hereby certify that 227 Indians constitute a majority of male adult Indians on or belonging on the Fort Hall Indian Reservation, Idaho.

F. G. IRWIN, JR.,

*First Lieutenant, Second Cavalry, Acting Indian Agent.*

For the purpose of making the first cash payment stipulated for in article 2 of the foregoing agreement, and for the purpose of a new school plant, as provided in the same article, \$175,000.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment submitted by the Senator from Idaho.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. JONES of Arkansas. I desire to move an amendment on page 44, which I hope will meet with the approval of the chairman of the committee. I send it to the desk to be read.

The SECRETARY. After line 19, on page 44, it is proposed to insert:

That it shall be unlawful, after July 1, 1899, for any tribal government or officer thereof in the Cherokee, Creek, Choctaw, or Chickasaw Nation, in the Indian Territory, to collect or receive any permit, merchant, ferry, or other taxes imposed on noncitizens or on citizens for employing noncitizens; but all such taxes or revenues, according to the laws of said nations, together with all taxes and revenues due from citizens, shall be collected by the Secretary of the Interior, who shall employ and pay from such receipts all necessary force to enforce this law, and the remainder shall be used for the benefit of said nations or tribes, respectively.

Mr. ALLISON. I ask the Senator from Arkansas if this amendment has the approval of the Committee on Indian Affairs?

Mr. JONES of Arkansas. It has not been submitted to the committee.

My purpose in offering the amendment is to get rid of an abuse that exists in that country which ought not to be allowed to exist longer. As is well known to members of the Senate, there are a number of taxes collected by those tribes on noncitizens for the privilege of living in the Territory, and persons employing noncitizens are required to pay a tax of 50 cents a month, or some such sum. Complaints are numerous that the amounts paid into the Treasury are very much less than the amounts that ought to be collected. There are constant complaints coming up that where the taxes on merchants, which are considerable in the different tribes, ought to amount to several thousand dollars a year, an insignificant sum, amounting to only a few hundred dollars, is collected and paid in.

I believe that an efficient system of collecting those taxes ought to be organized by the Secretary of the Interior, that he ought to have full control of the entire matter, and that the money collected, after paying the expenses of collection, ought to be held by him subject to the tribe in which it is collected.

Mr. ALLISON. May I ask the Senator if this amendment has been submitted to the Secretary of the Interior?

Mr. JONES of Arkansas. It has not.

Mr. ALLISON. Does it in any way interfere with the act known as the Curtis law?

Mr. JONES of Arkansas. It does not.

Mr. ALLISON. Is it in support of it?

Mr. JONES of Arkansas. I think it is strictly in line with the Curtis law.

Mr. ALLISON. I am not especially familiar with the method of dealing with these taxes. I dislike to make a point of order upon the amendment, but I very much fear it may have some injurious effect.

Mr. JONES of Arkansas. I will suggest that I have no objection that the committee of conference shall strike it out of the bill if it goes in, if upon investigation at the Indian Office there is any doubt about the wisdom of its adoption. I am perfectly willing that the matter shall be referred to the Secretary of the Interior and the Commissioner of Indian Affairs, and if it does not receive the cordial and hearty support of both of those gentlemen I am willing that the conference committee shall drop it out of the bill.

Mr. ALLISON. With that understanding I shall not make a point of order. The Senator from South Dakota [Mr. PETTIGREW], the chairman of the Committee on Indian Affairs, is perhaps more familiar with the matter than I am.

Mr. PETTIGREW. Mr. President, under the old tribal government among the Five Civilized Tribes they levied a tax upon every merchant who did business in that country, upon every physician and every lawyer who was not a citizen of the tribe, and also upon every laborer and upon every renter of land. This money was used, I suppose, to maintain an Indian school system and to support a tribal government, and perhaps it was necessary and proper. But we have by legislation substituted United States courts for the tribal courts, and we have also substituted the laws of Arkansas for the tribal laws of that country in a large measure. We have obviated the necessity of collecting this tax.

Under the old system the white people who lived in that country, some 350,000, had no provision made for the education of their children. Their children were not allowed to attend the Indian schools, and there was no method by which they could raise money for the purpose of supporting schools themselves.

Under the existing condition of affairs those people can now pay taxes for the purpose of educating the children of that country, and therefore the necessity for collecting this tax has disappeared.

Instead of adopting this amendment we ought to adopt an amendment prohibiting the tribe from collecting from these people a single dollar in the future. We have provided for the organization and incorporation of towns in that country, and the towns are largely inhabited by the outsiders whom the Indians have permitted to come into that country. We have provided that they can tax their property for the purpose of sustaining a city government, sustaining schools, suppressing crime, and managing their affairs. There should not be taken from these people, in my opinion, a single dollar for the benefit of this tribe in the way of taxation. Therefore the amendment ought to be defeated on its merits, and I hope to defeat it in that way. If I can not, I shall make the point of order against it.

Mr. JONES of Arkansas. The taxes are in force in the nations now. There has been no proposition before that made by the Senator from South Dakota at this moment on the floor to repeal those taxes. There has been no suggestion from anybody anywhere that these people have not the right to levy this tax upon persons from the outside, not citizens of their country, for the privileges of exercising trade in their country. Nobody has said it was not right. The taxes are now on the books. They are enforceable in the tribal courts by this tribal government.

The simple proposition in the amendment is that we shall provide that the taxes shall be collected by the Secretary of the Interior by machinery which he shall arrange and organize, and not by the old tribal inefficient method of collecting heretofore. It does not change the taxing laws. I agree that we have no right to change their tax laws under the rights that we give those people under the Curtis law. We have made agreements with them about the division of their land, and especially providing that their tribal government shall continue in force for eight years; and these were a part of their laws. They have been their laws for years past.

We have no moral right, we have no legal right, to deprive those people of the right of levying this small tax upon people who go into that country and exercise privileges of trade. Merchants going there pay no taxes unless they pay taxes under this provision. They are scattered all through the country everywhere, and we have no right now by any means to prevent the collection of that tax.

This is not a question whether the tax shall be collected or not. It will be collected in a sort of pro forma way by the tribal authorities. These taxes remain in force. The means of collecting

them will be just as effective under the laws as they exist now as after we adopt this amendment. It simply provides an efficient means of collecting the taxes, that they shall not be used for fraudulent and corrupt purposes, not to be misappropriated by dishonest collectors, but that they shall find their way into the hands of the officials of the United States and be used for the benefit of the nations and tribes.

I am astonished at the position taken by the Senator from South Dakota. I am amazed that he is unwilling to have an efficient system of collection there instead of the inefficient and utterly untrustworthy system that has existed heretofore.

Mr. PETTIGREW. The Senator from Arkansas, in his remarks previously made, stated that they were unable to collect the tax and that therefore it was not being collected.

Mr. JONES of Arkansas. If the Senator understood me to say that they collected none of these taxes I want to disabuse his mind. In one of these nations, where there are said to be perhaps fifty merchants engaged in business, there are two merchants in one town whose taxes amount to \$1,200 a year each on account of the amount of their business. The total tax accounted for in that nation by the tax collector was less than \$2,000, although two merchants in the town in which they lived paid \$2,400 into his hands, as is well known, taking no account of the collections that were made from other merchants. It is for the purpose of stopping that abuse, the failure to get the money into the treasury of the nation and not on account of its not being paid by the citizens, that I have offered the amendment.

Mr. PETTIGREW. It appears, then, that the tribes are now unable to enforce this tribal law. In their condition as separate, independent, and sovereign nations they enacted these laws by which outsiders, citizens of the United States, who had come there by their invitation, could be taxed, could have this burden put upon them; but as we have wiped out their courts absolutely in two of the tribes, and have provided that in those tribes where we have not entirely wiped the legislative function out their legislative acts are subject to revision by the Government, and in view of the fact that we have supplied them at the expense of the Government with courts, I think it is about time that we paid some attention to the 350,000 citizens of the United States who are living in that country. If this tax is to be collected, instead of turning it over to the tribal treasury, it ought to be turned over to the American citizens, to the 350,000 people who have gone into that country for the purpose of assisting them in establishing schools.

Already there are bills before the Committee on Indian Affairs to appropriate large sums of money for the purpose of educating the white children who have had no facilities whatever for securing an education heretofore. It seems to me an absurd proposition—and I am astonished that the Senator from Arkansas should present such an amendment to the bill—to lay this burden upon the Arkansas settlers who have gone into that country, and turn this money over to the Indians when the necessity for it has ceased. On the contrary, the citizens of Arkansas who have moved into the Indian Territory ought to have the careful consideration of the Senator from Arkansas, and their interests should be guarded and protected rather than sacrificed by insisting upon laying this unjust and unfair burden upon them.

It is a matter of surprise to me that the Senator from Arkansas should present this proposition at this time and undertake to secure its enactment. I would rather have expected from him the presentation of an amendment in order to regulate the abuse of which he speaks, by repealing the Indian law by which these taxes have heretofore been collected, and providing that they never should be collected hereafter.

In view of the fact that these people can now be taxed for the purpose of furnishing schools for their children, in view of the fact that we have taken the place, so far as the tribes are concerned, of the tribal government and the tribal courts, and are now supplying them a government and a court at the expense of the Government of the United States, the necessity for this tax has disappeared, and therefore I object to the unfair burden.

It is true we have made agreements with the Chickasaws and Choctaws, and also with the Seminoles, by which their tribal government continues for eight years under certain restricted conditions, and their courts have jurisdiction over some of the minor offenses; but as to all serious questions, both of life and of property, and as to the rights of persons and property, the Government of the United States supplies the courts even in those tribes where we have perpetuated in a limited way tribal government. However, as to the greatest number of these Indians, as to the Cherokees and Creeks, we have made no agreement which has been ratified by Congress, but we have enacted a law of Congress which wipes out almost absolutely their tribal government and their tribal courts and puts in their place the laws and the courts of the United States. So the necessity for claiming this money from the people who are living in that country has disappeared and ceased to exist.

Therefore, as I said before, this amendment ought to be defeated

upon its merits, or else it ought to be changed so as to repeal the tribal law absolutely and prohibit the collection of this tax altogether from any of the citizens of that country.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the amendment of the Senator from Arkansas.

Mr. PETTIGREW. I shall make the point of order against the amendment, Mr. President.

Mr. JONES of Arkansas. I hope the Senator from South Dakota will not do that. This is not a question as to whether the tax shall be collected or not. The tax is collected.

Mr. PETTIGREW. Not much of it.

Mr. JONES of Arkansas. The only question is whether the money shall be used for the benefit of the nation, or whether it shall be misappropriated by tax collectors.

The statement made by the Senator from South Dakota as to there being no necessity for this tax is not sustained. As I understand, there is not money enough in the treasury of these nations now to maintain their schools. They need this tax for the purpose of maintaining their school system, and the tax ought to be maintained for that purpose. They will get a part of the tax whether this thing is done or not, but it will be collected by their collectors and it will not be paid in.

I hope the Senator from South Dakota will allow the amendment to go in. He himself will probably be a member of the committee of conference, and at least the conference committee can strike it out. If upon examination and consultation with the Indian Office and the Secretary of the Interior they believe it is unwise and that the policy of it is doubtful, they can strike it out of the bill. I have no objection to that being the understanding, leaving it absolutely to the discretion of the conferees, but I hope the Senator will not make the point of order.

Mr. PETTIGREW. Mr. President, the proposition of the Senator is, practically, that we shall leave this matter to the clerks of the Interior Department, because they will determine it. I believe that the Committee on Indian Affairs is better able to judge of this question than the clerks in the Department. All questions of minor importance that are referred to the Indian Department and the Interior Department (I speak of those because I am more familiar with those Departments, and I presume it is true as to all the others) are passed upon by \$1,200 and \$1,500 clerks, and then, in a formal way, without examination or investigation by the heads of the Departments or the Secretaries, they are sent up to us.

Too much credit is given, as a rule, by Congress to these recommendations. We can not shirk our duty by putting the responsibility there when we understand the system as it is operated. Of course if a very important question goes to the Department and the attention of the Secretary is particularly called to it, he will give it his care and attention, but in the multitude of his duties it is impossible to examine all these small and minor questions. We can not shirk the responsibility of our acts by saying it is recommended by the Department.

Therefore I am not willing to leave it to the Department or to the committee of conference. A measure of this sort should come in here, go to the Committee on Indian Affairs, be thoroughly and carefully investigated and looked into, and then if it goes upon an appropriation bill it should be reported back from that committee with a favorable recommendation.

Mr. President, I shall insist upon my point of order. Let this matter go over another year, and let it come up in a proper and regular way, and have the committee investigate it and have some responsibility behind it or facts and figures with regard to the case. By this I do not mean to say that the Senator from Arkansas is not responsible. Neither do I mean to say that he is not prompted by the best of motives. But I think he has lost sight of the 350,000 people who have gone into that country, most of them from Arkansas and Kansas and Texas, and therefore I feel that it is my duty to endeavor to protect their interests in this connection.

Mr. ALLISON. Now, Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from South Dakota makes a point of order against the amendment. The point of order is sustained on the ground that it is general legislation on an appropriation bill.

Mr. ALLISON. I have a few amendments on the part of the committee that I desire to offer at this stage. I offer the amendment which I send to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be read.

The SECRETARY. After line 20, page 42, insert:

For the purpose of making certain repairs on the Government bridge across the Niobrara River, near Niobrara, Nebr., also one span of 60 feet over the back channel of the Niobrara River, and three spans of 60 feet each over the Bazile Creek, the sum of \$3,000, said sum to be expended by the United States Indian agent at the Santee Agency, Nebr., for said purpose.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. ALLISON. I offer another amendment which is in the nature of legislation, and therefore I ask unanimous consent that

it may be inserted in the bill. It is an amendment that is very much desired by the Indian Office and by the Secretary of the Interior. It relates to the leasing of pasture lands upon the San Carlos Reservation. It is said that this amendment is necessary in order to enable them to make leases. I ask unanimous consent that it may be inserted.

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

The SECRETARY. On page 36, after line 12, insert:

Provided, That the provision in section 3 of the act approved February 28, 1891 (26 U. S. Statutes at Large, page 794), namely, "That where lands are occupied by Indians who have bought and paid for the same, and which lands are not needed for farming or agricultural purposes and are not desired for individual allotments, the same may be leased, by authority of the council speaking for such Indians, for a period not to exceed five years for grazing, or ten years for mining purpose, in such quantities and upon such terms and conditions as the agent in charge of such reservation may recommend, subject to the approval of the Secretary of the Interior," be, and the same hereby is, extended to include and to apply to the White Mountain Apache and San Carlos Indian Reservation, in the Territory of Arizona: *Provided*, That nothing herein contained shall be construed as recognizing title or ownership of the Indians in or to any part of said White Mountain Apache and San Carlos Indian Reservation.

Mr. ALLISON. I ask leave to modify the amendment. I see that it may be held to include mining leases.

Mr. PETTIGREW. That is what it is for.

Mr. ALLISON. Then I withdraw it, Mr. President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment is withdrawn.

Mr. JONES of Arkansas. I offer an amendment to come in at the proper place. I suppose page 44, after line 19, is as good a place as any.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be read.

The SECRETARY. After line 19, page 44, insert:

That the Delaware Indians residing in the Cherokee Nation are hereby authorized and empowered to bring suit in the Court of Claims of the United States, within sixty days after the passage of this act, against the Cherokee Nation for the purpose of determining the rights of said Delaware Indians in and to the lands and funds of said nation under their contract and agreement with the Cherokee Nation dated April 8, 1867; or the Cherokee Nation may bring a like suit against said Delaware Indians; and jurisdiction is conferred on said court to adjudicate and fully determine the same.

SEC. — That the persons known as Chickasaw freedmen, residing in the Chickasaw Nation, are hereby authorized and empowered to bring suit in the Court of Claims of the United States, within sixty days after the passage of this act, against the Chickasaw Nation, for the purpose of determining their rights to citizenship in the Chickasaw Nation and to an interest in the lands of the Chickasaw tribe, under provisions of the treaty made in 1866 between the United States and the Choctaw and Chickasaw tribes of Indians and the laws of the Chickasaw Nation and of the United States pursuant to said treaty; or the Chickasaw Nation may bring a like suit against said Chickasaw freedmen; and jurisdiction is conferred on said court to adjudicate and fully determine the same.

SEC. — That the Chickasaw Nation of Indians in the Indian Territory be, and they are hereby, authorized and empowered, in the name of the governor of said nation, within ninety days after the passage of this act, to institute suit in the United States Court of Claims against the United States to recover any and all arrears of interest claimed to be due them on their trust funds. Said suit may be instituted in said court by petition in the name of the governor of said nation, which petition shall simply state the facts constituting their cause of action; and the Court of Claims of the United States is hereby invested with full jurisdiction and powers exercised by courts of equity so far as may be necessary to give full relief in said suit; and it may consider all questions involved in any of the treaties between the United States and the Chickasaw Nation of Indians and awards of the Secretary of the Interior under any of said treaties and the acts of Congress in relation thereto.

Said court shall pass upon all claims or cross claims proposed or asserted by either party, touching said claims for arrears of interest, so as to adjudicate all matter of dispute arising therein and do what equity and justice require between the parties to the suit. All reports, records, and other papers in any Executive Department of the Government, including any award made by the Secretary of the Interior touching any claim provided for in this act, and all acts of Congress in relation thereto, as well as any papers, reports, or records before Congress or the committees thereof, bearing upon said claims, may be used before the said court; and such weight may be given to them by said court as to it may seem just; and to the end that perfect justice and equity may be done between the parties. Notice of such suit shall be executed by delivering a true copy of said petition to the Attorney-General of the United States, whose duty it shall be, for and in behalf of the United States, to demur or answer the petition therein within thirty days after the service of such process upon him, unless the court for good cause shall grant further time for filing the same.

SEC. — That persons known as Mississippi Choctaws, of Choctaw Indian blood, who claim rights as Choctaw citizens in the lands of the tribe in the Choctaw Nation, are hereby authorized and empowered to bring suit in the Court of Claims of the United States, within sixty days after the passage of this act, against the Choctaw Nation, to determine their rights aforesaid under treaties made between the United States and the Choctaw tribe of Indians, and particularly under article 14 of a treaty concluded on the 27th day of September, 1830; or the Choctaw Nation may bring a like suit against said Mississippi Choctaws; and jurisdiction is conferred on said court to adjudicate and fully determine the same.

SEC. — That white persons who have intermarried with Cherokee citizens according to Cherokee laws, and white persons who have intermarried with Choctaw or Chickasaw citizens according to their laws and provisions of treaties between the United States and the Choctaw and Chickasaw tribes, are hereby authorized and empowered to bring suits in the Court of Claims of the United States, within ninety days after the passage of this act, against their respective nations, for the purpose of determining, according to law and equity, all their rights and claims under such laws and treaties in and to the lands and funds of the respective tribes into which they have so intermarried; or said nations may bring like suits against such intermarried persons within their respective nations; and jurisdiction is conferred on said court to adjudicate and fully determine all such rights: *Provided, however*, That nothing herein shall in any manner impair or disturb any rights acquired by such persons by virtue of the findings and judgment of the Commission to the Five Civilized Tribes of Indians or of the United States courts

in the Indian Territory upon appeal in proceedings had under the jurisdiction and authority conferred by act of Congress approved June 10, 1896.

SEC. — That the Delaware Indians residing in the Cherokee Nation are hereby authorized and empowered to bring a suit in law or in equity against the United States Government in the Court of Claims to recover and collect from the United States Government any money that in law or equity may be found due to the said tribes under treaty stipulations and for reimbursement of their tribal fund for money wrongfully diverted therefrom. That the Peoria tribe of Indians are hereby authorized and empowered to bring a suit in the Court of Claims of the United States, within six months after the passage of this act, against the United States Government for the purpose of determining what, if any, moneys or lands are due said Peoria tribe from the United States, particularly under treaties of 1854 (10 Statutes, —) and 1867 (15 Statutes, 513), and jurisdiction is hereby conferred on said court to hear and determine the same.

That the Seminole Nation of Indians in the Indian Territory be, and is hereby, authorized and empowered to institute in the United States Court of Claims against the United States a suit or suits to recover any and all moneys and arrears of interest claimed to be due said nation under or in pursuance of law or treaty stipulations. Also the persons known as the loyal Seminole Indians in the Indian Territory be, and they are hereby, authorized and empowered, within ninety days after the passage of this act, to institute suit in the said Court of Claims against the United States to recover any and all moneys claimed to be due them in pursuance of treaty stipulations. Also the persons known as the loyal Creek Indians are authorized to bring suits as herein provided for any loss of property under the provisions of the treaty of 1866. All reports, records, and documents relative to said claims on file in any of the Executive Departments of the Government and any awards made by the Secretary of the Interior in relation thereto may be used before said court, to the end that justice may be done to all parties in interest.

SEC. — That any suit, except such suit as is provided for in section 3 herein, so authorized may be brought by any party other than said tribes in their own behalf or in the name of any trustee or delegate selected by them, with approval of the Secretary of the Interior, and by any one of said tribes in the name of the principal chief, acting principal chief, or governor of the tribe; and the law and practice and rules of procedure in such courts shall be the practice and law in all such cases; and copies or petitions filed in any case at commencement of suit shall be served on the principal chief or governor of the tribe, or on the trustee or delegate so appointed, or on any other person suing, or on his representative, by a marshal of the United States court in Indian Territory, and on the Attorney-General of the United States, who shall designate and appoint, from the Department of Justice, a competent person to defend for the tribe and for the United States in each of said suits, and said court shall have authority, in its discretion, to enforce its judgments in all such cases by proper process. Should any of such persons recover against any one of said nations, the court shall render judgment for the amount and order the same paid by the United States and deducted from any funds due such nation, and shall direct to be paid out of the sum so recovered reasonable fees to attorneys of record, the amount to be determined by the court: *Provided*, That any suit brought under provisions of this act shall be by said court advanced on the docket and determined by the court as early as practicable, and the judgment of said court shall be final.

Mr. ALLISON. That is legislation upon an important matter and general legislation. I make a point of order on it.

Mr. JONES of Arkansas. It has been passed by the Senate as a bill at this Congress.

Mr. ALLISON. That does not make it in order unless there is an appropriation connected with it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is the point of order insisted upon?

Mr. JONES of Arkansas. There are features in the amendment that are of great importance and of absolute merit. I do not think a bill of the sort ought to be disposed of on a technical point of this kind. There are a number of people in the Indian country who have rights that ought to be adjudicated in the courts. The amendment simply provides that the Delaware Indians, the Mississippi Choctaws, and the intermarried white people in that country shall have the right to bring suit in the Court of Claims to determine what are their legal rights and their relations with the tribes. It is just and fair. We can not take the rights that these people have away from them. They are entitled to rights of citizenship among those tribes or they are not. If they are, their rights must be determined by the courts. We can not hold that they are not by simply denying them an opportunity of a hearing in the courts.

The bill which the amendment embodies was passed months ago, and it has gone to the House. It has not had an opportunity to be heard in the House; and it is not right to deprive a large number of citizens of legal vested rights simply because of the impossibility to get time to have a bill considered in Congress. I hope the Senator from Iowa will not insist on his point of order.

Mr. ALLISON. I think the matter is too important to be considered on this bill. I insist upon the point of order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair sustains the point of order made by the Senator from Iowa.

Mr. ALLISON. On page 40, line 22, after the word "employees," I move to insert what I send to the desk.

The SECRETARY. After the word "employees," line 22, page 40, insert:

Including physician for the Walker River Reservation, at \$900 per annum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the amendment.

Mr. PETTIGREW. I have no objection to the amendment. The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. ALLISON. I offer another amendment, which is merely to correct a ruling of the Comptroller, that Indian agents specially assigned to duty at Washington for a brief period may receive their per diem for the future as is provided in this bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The SECRETARY. In line 9, on page 9, after the word "days," it is proposed to insert:

And the accounting officers of the Treasury are hereby authorized to allow per diem pay to such special agents while remaining at the seat of Government under orders and direction of the Secretary of the Interior for a period not exceeding twenty days at any one time during the fiscal year 1898-99.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. CARTER. I offer an amendment, which I send to the desk, which I presume will not be objectionable.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The SECRETARY. On page 45, at the end of line 16, it is proposed to insert:

*Provided*, That the Secretary of the Interior may, in his discretion, discontinue said commission prior to the date named, or remove any member thereof and appoint a successor for the member so removed.

Mr. CARTER. I believe that is a beneficial amendment, and that it should be adopted.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. PLATT of Connecticut in the chair). The question is on the amendment of the Senator from Montana.

Mr. ALLISON. Is that the amendment the Senator from Montana showed me this morning?

Mr. CARTER. Yes, sir. It relates to the commission appointed to negotiate with the Crow, Flathead, and other Indians, and permits the Secretary of the Interior to suspend the entire commission or remove any member of it and appoint another person in lieu.

Mr. ALLISON. Does it change the date?

Mr. CARTER. It contemplates changing the date from the 1st of November, 1899, to the 1st of January, 1900.

Mr. ALLISON. Very well, with those modifications I do not object to the amendment.

Mr. CARTER. I suggest as part of the amendment that the words "November, 1899," in lines 13 and 14, on page 45, be stricken out, and in lieu thereof that the words "January, 1900," be inserted.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will state the proposed modification.

The SECRETARY. It is proposed in line 13, on page 45, after the words "day of," to strike out "November, 1899," and insert "January, 1900."

Mr. CARTER. I ask that the amendments may be separated, and that the one first presented be first voted upon by the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Montana asks that the amendments be separated and that both be separately voted upon. The Secretary will read the first amendment of the Senator from Montana.

The SECRETARY. After the word "made," at the end of line 16, on page 45, it is proposed to insert:

*Provided*, That the Secretary of the Interior may, in his discretion, discontinue said commission prior to the date named, or remove any member thereof and appoint a successor for the member so removed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the amendment which has just been read.

Mr. PETTIGREW. Mr. President, I do not know that there is any harm in this amendment. Of course none of the members of the commission will be removed, and the commission will not be discontinued, as it ought to be. Under the existing law the commission terminates on the 1st of April, but it ought to terminate before.

Notwithstanding the remarks made by the Senator from Montana [Mr. CARTER] the other day, in which he said this commission had been absolutely useless and never performed efficient or valuable service, he now seems to desire to perpetuate it, so that its members may draw their pay. I am quite surprised that he should desire to continue their existence even for a day, and I am much more surprised that he should seek to continue their existence until January, a year from now.

I agree with all the Senator said on this subject. The commission is absolutely inefficient, utterly worthless, and exists simply that its members may draw their pay, draw their per diem, and draw the perquisites that go with the position. It is a very nice position. It ought to be abolished, and abolished to-day, and I, of course, shall object to perpetuating it any longer than it is possible to prevent it.

Mr. CARTER. I understand that the amendments have been separated, and that the proviso I offered is not objected to by the Senator from South Dakota, the last clause of which provides merely that the Secretary of the Interior may discontinue this commission at any time or may remove at his pleasure any member of the commission. I think it is very important that that provision should be agreed to.

Mr. ALLISON. I have no doubt that that can be done without any such provision, but I have no objection to that intimation being given to the Secretary of the Interior.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the first part of the proposed amendment, which has been read by the Secretary.

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question now is upon the remainder of the amendment, which will be stated.

The SECRETARY. On page 45, line 13, after the words "day of," it is proposed to strike out "November, 1899," and insert "January, 1900."

Mr. PETTIGREW. I should like to hear from the Senator from Montana on that subject, and have his reasons why this should be done. Then I should like to have him also read his speech of a few days ago on the same subject.

Mr. CARTER. Mr. President, I felt very well convinced a few days ago, and I am convinced now, that this commission is not an efficient commission for the accomplishment of the end it has in view—the negotiation of treaties with these various Indian tribes. I believe now, as I stated then, that this work can be more efficiently and expeditiously done by special commissioners selected from persons who are familiar with the work to be accomplished than by a standing commission continued from year to year as experts in Indian negotiation.

But, Mr. President, as we are advised by the Department that this commission will in the very near future bear some fruit, and that, if discontinued on the 1st day of April, its labors, long since commenced and partially completed, would be rendered entirely valueless to the Government, in view of that aspect of the case, I am perfectly willing that the commission shall be allowed until the month of November to demonstrate whether they can or can not render service to the Government somewhat commensurate with the pay they are receiving under a previous law.

Mr. GALLINGER. How long has the commission existed?

Mr. CARTER. It has existed for a number of years.

Mr. ALLISON. Since 1896.

Mr. PETTIGREW. Mr. President, I certainly hope this amendment will be withdrawn. I think the Committee on Appropriations determined last year to abolish the system of appointing commissions to negotiate with Indians. We found by experience that whenever we appointed a commission it existed so long as there was money to pay them, and that they would contrive to prevent the accomplishment of anything, so that their job would last. We have paid out very many thousands of dollars and even hundreds of thousands of dollars for these commissions and received no service worth mentioning in return.

But this commission has been one of the most worthless, if not one of the most extravagant, of all those we have had heretofore. Knowing these facts fully, appreciating the situation, the Committee on Appropriations increased the number of Indian inspectors from 5 to 8, with the understanding that hereafter all the negotiations with Indian tribes should be through an inspector who has a salary and has no possible inducement to perpetuate the particular work upon which he is employed. The inspector goes out to make a treaty with a tribe of Indians; he makes it promptly; and our experience is that he usually makes a treaty in from thirty to sixty days, while if we send out a commission to make a treaty with a tribe of Indians they will be from one to three years about it. These commissions, consisting of three or more men, are not as well able to deal with Indians as one man, on account of the conflict of counsel, and, above all, by reason of the inducement to perpetuate their existence, which can only continue so long as their work lasts.

This commission is a very shining example of that sort of proceeding. They have perpetuated their existence, making only one or two treaties in several years' time, and making a very unimportant agreement with the Indians. Last fall they visited the Crows in Montana for the purpose of making an agreement with those Indians, and after spending all the fall—for it is very pleasant to live in that country in the fall—they adjourned for the winter and came to Washington, and have been here ever since December doing nothing.

They made an agreement with the Indians that they would hold a council with them next April or May, when the weather gets pleasant again. They are going to go to Montana to spend the summer and return to Washington to spend the winter. It will be rare indeed if we are able to get a report out of them once a year; and for all this they are to receive not only \$10 a day apiece, but also traveling expenses, board bills, clerks to wait upon them, etc. So there is not one argument that can be made in justification of their continuance in office or their existence.

In the last Indian appropriation bill we declared this commission should cease on the 1st day of April next. That was a concession to the people who are interested in their appointment. The Senators who are interested in the appointment of these men and who want to continue their existence because they are constituents of theirs persuaded the committee to continue the commission until the 1st of December.

Now, here is an effort to add two months more to their life. There is no pretense that they are of any value to the Government or that their service will accomplish any good. The only reason in the world why the commission is continued for a day is to furnish places for three men; to pay them out of the Treasury of the

United States, and collect the money from the people of the United States by taxation to do it. It seems to me, before we continue their existence longer, there should be some reason given here why the money should be paid out of the Treasury. There should be some laudable, proper purpose to be accomplished by the continuance of this junketing commission, or else it ought to be wiped out of existence at once.

The Senator from Montana, two or three weeks ago, when this bill was last under consideration, told us how utterly worthless this commission was, and said he would offer an amendment to abolish it absolutely; and he now comes and wants to continue it two months longer.

Mr. CARTER. If the Senator will permit me to inject a remark at that point, the amendment presented by me on my own motion was that which permitted the Secretary of the Interior to exercise authority without any equivocation or question, discontinuing this entire commission if he elected so to do. The amendment proposing to extend the time or the life of the commission to January 1, 1900, was presented in behalf of an absent Senator, the Senator from Indiana [Mr. FAIRBANKS], and I think I ought, in justice to myself, to make that statement at this time as a part of the Senator's very appropriate remarks.

Mr. PETTIGREW. And the member of the commission from Indiana is, I understand, the most worthless member of the whole commission. [Laughter.] It is reported that in Montana last year when employed upon this work he was constantly intoxicated and utterly unfit to fill any position under the Government. I have this information from a very prominent and important citizen of the State of Montana, and yet it is proposed to perpetuate this commission and continue this commissioner two months longer, in order that he may continue to draw \$10 a day, spend his summers in Montana and his winters in Washington, and do nothing.

Mr. ALLISON. Mr. President, in justice to the absent Senator from Indiana, I think I ought to say that that Senator regards the member of the commission from the State of Indiana as one of the most efficient members, if not the most efficient member, of the commission, who ought to be continued, whatever may happen to the other members of the commission. So I trust the Senator from South Dakota will not too freely indulge in criticism against a person who is not able to defend himself here.

Mr. PETTIGREW. Mr. President, I withdraw my remarks [laughter]—which are undoubtedly true—for the purpose of protecting—I do not know whether it is the Senator from Indiana or the commissioner from Indiana that I ought to protect. Certainly, if the Senator from Indiana thinks this man is one of the most efficient members of this commission, there is an additional argument why the commission should be abolished, for I can not imagine what kind of men the other two can possibly be if this man is the most efficient member of the commission. However, I withdraw my remarks.

Mr. ALLEN. I should like to ask the Senator from South Dakota if this is the commission that was before the Indian Committee some time ago, and which has been endeavoring for a year or two to negotiate a treaty with some Indian tribes?

Mr. PETTIGREW. It is the same commission. They have been swinging around through the West for several years, spending their summers in the mountain regions, where it was cool, and their winters here in Washington.

Mr. ALLEN. Their mission has been, as I understand, to educate the Indians up to a point where they will treat with the Government?

Mr. PETTIGREW. Yes, sir.

Mr. ALLEN. An ordinary treaty can be obtained through the instrumentality of an Indian inspector within two or three weeks, and why not send an inspector there to treat with those Indians?

Mr. PETTIGREW. Certainly, we could send an inspector there and abolish this commission now; and that is what should be done. We should send an inspector to treat with those Indians.

Mr. ALLEN. What will become of these gentlemen if we abolish the commission?

Mr. PETTIGREW. That is the trouble.

Mr. ALLEN. Where will they get their salaries from then?

Mr. PETTIGREW. That is the trouble. That is all the reason in the world and the only argument that can be advanced why they should be continued.

Mr. JONES of Arkansas. On the statement made by the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. PETTIGREW], it seems to me in all seriousness he ought to move to strike out the whole business, and move an amendment to abolish the commission. If the statement made here be true, it is little short of shameful to continue the commission in existence.

Mr. PETTIGREW. There is no question about it, and I move to strike out the whole provision. Then the existing law will stand, this commission will cease on the 1st day of April, and that is the motion I did make in another place.

Mr. SHOUP. I hope the Senator will not insist on that amendment now.

Mr. ALLISON. I trust the Senator from Montana will withdraw his amendment and allow the provision to stand as we fixed it in the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. CARTER. I withdraw the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair desires to know whether he is correct in supposing that this amendment to the bill has been passed over and is now pending?

Mr. ALLISON. It was passed over without action.

Mr. CARTER. I withdraw my amendment fixing the date on the 1st of January, 1900.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Montana withdraws that part of the amendment.

Mr. ALLEN. What is the balance of the amendment?

Mr. PETTIGREW. The question will be on adopting the committee amendment. It is not necessary to move to strike it out. If we reject that amendment, the existing law will stand, which will carry the commission through until spring.

Mr. JONES of Arkansas. What is the committee amendment?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will state the amendment.

Mr. ALLEN. Let the original paragraph be read, and then let it be read as it will stand if amended.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will state the amendment, and then the amendment as proposed to be amended.

The SECRETARY. The original committee amendment is to insert on page 45, after line 2, the following:

For continuing the work of the commission appointed under the act of Congress approved June 10, 1896, to negotiate with the Crow, Flathead, and other Indians, \$10,500, the same to be available for the payment of salary and proper expenses of said commission from and after the date when the appropriation of \$15,000 made by the Indian appropriation act of July 1, 1898, was exhausted; and said commission shall continue its work and make its final report thereon to the Secretary of the Interior on the 1st day of November, 1899, and upon that date the commission shall cease; and no liability shall be incurred under this provision in excess of the appropriation herein made.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment which has just been read has been amended in the way which will now be stated by the Secretary.

The Secretary read as follows:

Provided, That the Secretary of the Interior may, in his discretion, discontinue said commission prior to the date named, or remove any member thereof and appoint a successor for the member so removed.

Mr. ALLEN. Now, is it proposed to change this amendment and to fix the date on the 1st of April when the commission is to expire?

Mr. PETTIGREW. If the Senator will permit me, I will explain. This is a committee amendment. If it is rejected by the Senate the existing law will stand. The existing law provides that this commission shall cease to exist on the 1st day of April. A year ago this question was up for discussion in the Committee on Appropriations. The commission ought to have been abolished then, but there was sufficient influence brought to bear to secure a compromise, by which the committee agreed that the commission should cease on the 1st of April. This year influence is brought to bear again, and it is proposed to continue the commission until November next. If the committee amendment is rejected, the commission will cease to exist when the grass begins to grow in the spring.

Mr. ALLEN. What the Senator proposes is to strike out the date when the commission is to expire?

Mr. PETTIGREW. No; to reject the committee amendment entirely; and then the commission will stand under the law as it is at present.

Mr. ALLEN. I merely want to make this suggestion, because this matter has been before the Committee on Indian Affairs and has been discussed: Why not have a proviso inserted in this bill that the Secretary of the Interior may, in lieu of this commission, employ an Indian inspector to negotiate this treaty?

Mr. PETTIGREW. The Secretary of the Interior has that power now. If we abolish the commission he would send an inspector to continue the work, and he would do it much better than this commission will ever do it.

Mr. ALLEN. If that is done, we will then get the work finished in a few weeks.

Mr. ALLISON. This matter was fully considered by the Committee on Appropriations. I agree there was some difference of opinion respecting what should be done with this commission. The final result was that the committee reported an amendment providing that it should be abolished on the 1st day of November of this year.

I desire now to have reread at the Secretary's desk the opinion of the Secretary of the Interior in relation to this question, which governed me and, I think, several members of the Committee on Appropriations, as to the propriety and justice of extending the time of the commission until the 1st of November. I hope Senators will pay attention that letter.

The Secretary read as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR,  
Washington, December 22, 1898.

SIR: I have the honor to transmit herewith a copy of a letter of even date

from the Commissioner of Indian Affairs, who recommends the continuance for another year of the commission provided for by the act of July 1, 1898, (30 Statutes, 592), to negotiate with the Crow, Flathead, Northern Cheyenne, Fort Hall, Uintah, Ute, and Yakima Indians.

This commission was organized under the provisions of the act of June 10, 1896 (29 Statutes, 341), and continued by the act above mentioned, which limits its existence to the 1st day of April, 1899. As stated by the Commissioner of Indian Affairs, the commission has performed very important service, resulting in agreements with two of the tribes; their duties have been onerous and exacting and often perplexing, and it is expected that they will be successful in their negotiations with the remaining tribes—the Crows, Flatheads, and Yakimas—with all of whom preliminary work has already been done; but it is not expected that they will be able to complete negotiations with these tribes within the time fixed by the act of July 1, 1898.

I therefore concur in the recommendation of the Commissioner of Indian Affairs that provision be made in the pending Indian appropriation bill for continuing the aforesaid commission for another year, and respectfully request that the inclosed draft of an item to effect that purpose be embodied in the bill, believing that it would be extremely unfortunate if the work of the commission be suspended by the limitation of law before negotiations with the tribes named should be fully and finally concluded.

Very respectfully,

C. N. BLISS, Secretary.

Hon. WM. B. ALLISON,  
Chairman Committee on Appropriations,  
United States Senate.

Mr. ALLISON. It was upon that letter, Mr. President, that the Committee on Appropriations recommended that this commission should continue until the 1st of November of this year. That will give them an opportunity of completing their work, which the Secretary says has been so successfully begun, and to make their report before the beginning of the next session of Congress. I hope the provision will be allowed to stand as reported by the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. JONES of Arkansas. Mr. President, with this commission as inefficient as it has been stated to be on the floor of the Senate, and with the fact staring the Senate in the face that while the commission has been in existence for three years it has not yet accomplished an agreement to be made with these Indians, seems to me a sufficient argument why the suggestion of the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. PETTIGREW] should prevail.

The Secretary of the Interior has the power under the law to appoint an inspector to do this work. The Indian inspectors are, as a rule, trained in connection with Indian affairs. They are familiar with all these matters, and they will do this work very much better, much more efficiently, more expeditiously, and more cheaply than it can be done by a commission. I think, after the statements made here and after the showing made of the inefficiency of this commission, that the amendment of the committee ought not to prevail. For one I am not willing to go on record as being in favor of continuing so utterly inefficient and incompetent a body of men in the public service.

Mr. ALLISON. I ask the Senator if the letter of the Secretary of the Interior has any weight with him?

Mr. JONES of Arkansas. It has, and I have the greatest respect for the opinion of the Secretary of the Interior; but I know in many of these things it is utterly impossible for the Secretary of the Interior to give personal attention to them; that he must trust to the subordinates who are below him. These men bring letters to him which he signs in the hurry of the moment. If the attention of the Secretary of the Interior was called to this question, and if, after careful examination, he should say that he believed this commission should be continued, I for one would vote for it. I do not believe there has been a more efficient, a more capable, or a better Secretary of the Interior in the public service than the present one. I have as much respect for him as for any man I have ever seen in that position. I have the greatest confidence in his judgment, but I do not believe he understands the facts of this case as they have been brought to our attention to-day.

Mr. ALLISON. Evidently the Secretary of the Interior did not consult the Senator from South Dakota respecting the work of the commission, as they very much differ as to what has been done. I do not know, of course, what the commission has accomplished, except that they concluded a treaty last year with the Uintah Indians, which was a very important treaty, and it was ratified.

Mr. RAWLINS. The treaty with the Uintah Indians in Utah was utterly insignificant. The law required the commissioners to treat with those Indians for the cession to the United States of all lands not needed for allotments, and they in no sense accomplished the object of that law. They accomplished nothing of any importance whatsoever. What little they did accomplish has not commended itself at all to the Senate or even to the Interior Department. It is not true that that commission or any other commission has accomplished anything in the way of negotiations with the Indians on the Uintah Reservation. There are bills now pending in the Senate to accomplish the object which that commission has utterly failed to accomplish.

Mr. ALLEN. I only speak, Mr. President, in my capacity as a member of the Indian Committee. The letter that was submitted by the honorable Senator from Iowa [Mr. ALLISON] from the Secretary of the Interior, it occurs to me, is not entitled to the weight sought to be given to it. It is evident to every Senator here that the

Secretary of the Interior never did personally examine this question. The matter referred to in the letter the Senator from Iowa, that had read was referred to the Commissioner of Indian Affairs and by him evidently referred to some clerk in that department of the service. It reflects the sentiments of the clerk and not those of the Commissioner of Indian Affairs or of the Secretary of the Interior. We all understand that is the way the public business of this country is transacted, and while it appears upon the surface to be the result of the investigation of some officer in high authority, it is no more than the result of the investigation of some subordinate.

This commission has existed for several years—about three years. It has accomplished practically nothing, and if the evidence that was before the Committee on Indian Affairs is to be believed, or the representations which were made are to be credited, the commission is absolutely worthless so far as concerns accomplishing any result for this Government. Experience proves that we speedily bring about good results through the instrumentality of experienced Indian inspectors, and perhaps no man in the United States has negotiated more treaties and secured more agreements from the Indians than Major McLaughlin, a man who has spent over thirty years in the Indian service and who is familiar with the tribes.

I venture the remark that if the Secretary of the Interior will send Major McLaughlin among these Indians it will not be six weeks from the day he reaches the ground until he has a perfect and complete treaty with them, and that, too, without additional expense to the Government.

Now, why should this commission be continued in existence for a year longer, three men drawing large salaries from this Government and their expenses besides, to negotiate a treaty which they have failed to secure in the three years of their existence, when that work can be accomplished in three weeks?

Mr. PETTIGREW obtained the floor.

Mr. CARTER. Mr. President—

Mr. PETTIGREW. I yield to the Senator from Montana.

Mr. CARTER. Mr. President, the members of this commission are estimable gentlemen, undoubtedly, and as to the men personally I have nothing whatever to say in the way of criticism. Whatever they may have accomplished in other sections of the country stands to their credit according to the testimony that may be borne by the Senators representing the respective States, but so far as concerns their performances in the State of Montana, where they were commissioned and directed to negotiate with three distinct Indian tribes, I feel constrained to say that their work was inefficient, wholly unsatisfactory, and not to be continued, based upon what they have attempted to accomplish in the past.

They spent the entire summer out there without accomplishing anything at all except to get up a misunderstanding between the Indians on one reservation and their agent. That was done by the chairman of the commission coming to Washington, spending a number of days in the autumn and winter here, and explaining to the Indians, by letter and otherwise, that their agent had not been attending to their business, and that he had secured, by and through his own magnificent efforts, the recognition of certain claims the Indians had against the Government which the agent had neglected.

I do not anticipate any agreement by or through this commission with any tribe in the State of Montana between now and the 1st of April. I do not anticipate the consummation of any agreement by and through them between now and the 1st day of November. I have suggested an amendment which will clearly empower the Secretary of the Interior to remove them at any time, and I am perfectly free to say, judging these men on their merits, according to the record they have made to my knowledge, if I were Secretary of the Interior I would remove them the day after this bill passes and would designate an inspector, as suggested by the Senator from Nebraska, to go out and in a businesslike way negotiate these desirable agreements.

In that State, Mr. President, the Secretary of the Interior directed Major McLaughlin to go forth and negotiate with one of these tribes of Indians, with which tribe negotiations were to be conducted by the commission. The two reservations, the Cheyenne and the Crow reservations, are side by side. McLaughlin concluded a treaty between the Indian tribe and, I believe, 25 or 30 white settlers—my colleague will correct me as to the number; probably 30 white settlers—within a period of from four to six weeks. The agreement has been presented, and is in such excellent shape as to meet the entire approval of the Committee on Indian Affairs of this body, and has been incorporated into the pending bill. During the same season this same Indian inspector, McLaughlin, proceeded to the State of South Dakota, and there rounded up an entire tribe of Indians and concluded another complicated agreement, and that agreement is embodied in the present bill and will be ratified to-day.

Mr. ALLEN. That is one of the most refractory tribes in the United States.

Mr. CARTER. Most assuredly. In both cases complicated questions arose and had to be determined, such as did not exist in either of the other cases. From a businesslike point of view there is no question whatever that the expense relating to this commission ought to be discontinued at this hour if it is in the power of Congress to discontinue it. I have offered an amendment not extending the time, but opening the way for the discontinuance of the commission by Executive order if in the judgment of the Secretary of the Interior such action would comport with the public interest.

Mr. PETTIGREW. Mr. President, in this case there is no public interest. That is perfectly apparent. Why should we tell the Secretary to continue these people? That is practically what we do when we make the appropriation and fix a time when they shall cease to be employed. Of course the Secretary will not act if we do not act. How could he be expected to assume the responsibility if we will not act, possessed with all the facts in the case.

I read the letter of the Secretary of the Interior, and I have great respect for him, and I say with the Senator from Arkansas that the outgoing Secretary, Mr. Bliss, is unquestionably one of the best officers that ever occupied that position since I have been engaged in public duties in Washington.

I do not believe any man has greater ability, integrity, and comprehension of all the duties of that great office than he. But the letter which comes here is simply a pro forma affair. The Indian Department has been solicited by people who are interested in the continuance of these men in some position, perhaps prompted by a desire to keep them out of their States, for it is well known that the distant offices under our system are generally filled by men of little or no character, like the offices in the Territories of the United States, which are filled with broken-down members of Congress, etc. People go to the Commissioner of Indian Affairs and solicit and urge a recommendation that these men be continued in office, and he writes the letter influenced by the prominence and power of the person who comes to solicit the favorable recommendation. It goes to the Secretary of the Interior; is reviewed there by a bureau called the Indian division; is presented to the Secretary, and he signs it without ever seeing its substance at all.

I apprehend that if the facts were known the only service these men have performed for the last twelve months is the securing themselves of this letter, for they have been in Washington. They come here as soon as cold weather sets in and the mountains are unpleasant; and I presume the sum total of all their toil, for which we have paid them \$10 a day besides clerical hire and traveling expenses, is the securing of this letter recommending their continuance in office.

Mr. ALLEN. And signing vouchers.

Mr. PETTIGREW. Of course they did that promptly. They kept up with that work. That was never left over for their trip to Washington. That was attended to every thirty days, beyond all possible question. They did not have to spend any time upon that work when they arrived here.

The same question was up a year ago, and the Appropriations Committee was so thoroughly convinced of the worthlessness of this commission that it put on a provision that it should cease on the 1st day of April, and with that compromise, without a controversy in the Senate, those who were opposed to continuing the commission yielded. This year persons interested in keeping these people out of their States, I suppose, and in having them secure a job a long ways off which would not bring discredit upon their administration, succeeded in getting the committee to continue the commission until November next. I submit that under these circumstances there can be no possible justification on our part for continuing them a day, and that we at least ought to turn them loose with the coming of spring, by the 1st day of April.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. PLATT of Connecticut in the chair). The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the committee as amended.

The amendment as amended was rejected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair is informed that there is one other amendment which has been passed over, which will be stated.

The SECRETARY. On page 46, after the word "Alaska," in line 17, the Committee on Appropriations propose to insert the following:

*Provided, That the Secretary of the Interior may make contracts with contract schools—*

Mr. JONES of Arkansas. Before the amendment is read, I wish to offer an amendment to the amendment, to come in after the word "ninety-five," in line 1, page 47, as follows:

The same to be divided proportionately among the said several contract schools.

Mr. GALLINGER. That seems to be provided for on page 46: apportioning as near as may be the amount so contracted for among schools of various denominations.

I should think that covers it.

Mr. JONES of Arkansas. Where is that language?

Mr. GALLINGER. On page 46, lines 19, 20, and 21.

Mr. JONES of Arkansas. I had not noticed that provision. I withdraw the amendment to the amendment.

Mr. CARTER. Before this proposition is taken up I have an amendment to offer to which I desire to direct the attention of the chairman of the committee. On page 60, line 1, after the word "herein," insert the words "or heretofore;" in line 3, after the word "persons," insert the words "or for annuities;" after the word "articles," in the same line, insert the words "or money;" and at the end of the paragraph to insert the following proviso:

*Provided*, That nothing contained in this section shall be construed to authorize the diminution of the trust funds of any tribe by per capita or other payments direct to the Indians.

Mr. President, the purpose of the proposed amendment I will briefly state. The amendment suggested will have application to a case which arises on the Crow Indian Reservation in Montana. A certain large canal has been completed partially. Funds for its completion are not available. However, certain annuities are paid in cash to those Indians each year. It is desirable that the Government, with the consent of the Indians, may divert the annuities to the construction and completion of the canal project.

My experience is that the payment of small sums of money to Indians in the way of annuity allowance is, in the main, of little advantage to individual Indians and of no advantage to the tribe. The traders usually get all the annuity payments in cash. It is desired by and through this amendment to secure a condition whereby the Government may take the annuity money for one or two years and complete the canal system with those amounts. I think it will prove advantageous to the Indians. The proviso, which will prove a safeguard in another direction, was suggested by the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. PLATT].

Mr. ALLISON. I ask to have the amendment read as it will read if the alterations proposed by the Senator from Montana are agreed to.

The SECRETARY. If the amendment be adopted, that portion of the bill beginning on page 60, after the word "engaged," in line 1, would read as follows:

And that the several appropriations herein or heretofore made for millers, blacksmiths, engineers, carpenters, physicians, and other persons, or for annuities, and for various articles or money provided for by treaty stipulation for the several Indian tribes, may be diverted to other uses for the benefit of said tribes, respectively, within the discretion of the President, and with the consent of said tribes, expressed in the usual manner; and that he cause report to be made to Congress, at its next session thereafter, of his action under this provision: *Provided*, That nothing contained in this section shall be construed to authorize the diminution of the trust funds of any tribe by per capita or other payments direct to the Indians.

Mr. CARTER. The proviso is inserted at the suggestion of the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. PLATT], for the purpose of preventing a possibility of the increase of annuities of certain other tribes.

Mr. ALLISON. Why does the Senator apply the amendment to appropriations heretofore made?

Mr. CARTER. Because the annuities have heretofore been provided for in the ratification of treaties.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment proposed by the Senator from Montana.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. PETTIGREW. Mr. President, I do not understand the amendment. Does the Senator from Montana mean that those annuities can be diverted for other purposes?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from South Dakota desire the amendment to be considered as still before the Senate?

Mr. PETTIGREW. I do.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It will be so understood.

Mr. CARTER. I will say to the Senator from South Dakota that it is with the consent of the Indians.

Mr. PETTIGREW. It seems to me it is a pretty large power to allow these annuities to be diverted even with the consent of the Indians. The question is how that consent can be obtained, whether it will take a majority of the adult males or three-quarters. As to some of the tribes you can not purchase their reservation or make an agreement with them which is binding unless three-quarters of the male adults sign the treaty. In other tribes a majority of the male adults suffices. Here is a provision which would now allow these annuities to be diverted with the consent of said tribes. Under many of our treaties we simply consulted the chiefs and headmen of the tribes, and under this provision a treaty might be made with a very few men, who would gain a personal advantage. I doubt the wisdom of giving that great power and that great latitude unrestricted.

Mr. CARTER. This must be in pursuance of an agreement which shall meet the approval of the President of the United States and the approval of the Indian tribes, expressed in the usual way. In the case I have in mind, the condition which will be met by this amendment meets the approval of all the Indians. After the money has been paid out to them in annuities it is found quite impossible to collect it again into a fund for the purpose of completing a piece of canal work, but they are perfectly willing to sign an agreement that the Government may use the annuity money for the purpose of completing the canal system, so as to bring certain lands under irrigation. I think it is a good amendment.

Mr. PETTIGREW. I should like to have a little further light on the subject. Is this amendment, then, for the purpose of diverting the fund now in the Treasury belonging to the Crows, so as to complete the large ditch which is to irrigate a large portion of their reservation?

Mr. CARTER. A treaty was made with the Crow Indians in 1889 for the cession to the United States of about 1,000,000 acres of land. A considerable portion of the purchase price was used for the purchase of cattle, and a considerable portion of the purchase price under and by virtue of the treaty provisions was to be used for the construction of canals and ditches for the irrigation of their land. The fund set apart for the irrigation of lands has become exhausted, and the system has not been completed.

Unquestionably, if it had been known at the time when the treaty was negotiated that a certain amount in excess of that set apart for irrigation would be necessary to complete the system, the amount would then have been set apart out of the purchase price of the land; but they believed that the amount set apart for that express purpose was adequate. Consequently, a certain sum was set aside to be used for annuities to the tribe. I think each Indian receives about \$12 a year in the form of cash annuity. I am informed that the Indians are entirely willing that the Government, instead of paying annuities for two years, shall employ the money in completing the irrigation system which they so much need in order to establish permanent homes upon allotments in the reservation.

Mr. PETTIGREW. I will state that if the purpose of this amendment is to allow the use of the \$500,000, I believe it is, belonging to the Crows, in order to complete the irrigation system, I have no objection to it whatever. But I would rather have it put in that form. I think there can be no better use of their money than to complete such a system, and then let them be employed in raising crops for their own subsistence and existence. It will be far better for them, and they will be far more likely to advance in civilization if they have no annuity money whatever, but simply the facilities for securing a living by tilling the soil.

There is no question but that we are paying too much money to the American Indians. There is no doubt that we are gradually making them worthless, and, in fact, destroying the American Indians by keeping them in idleness and feeding them. It is true that under the guise of treaties which we have made with them, purchasing their lands, they are lawfully entitled to all they receive, but it seems too bad that we can not make some arrangement by which they would be obliged to earn the money they secure.

There is no doubt in this case that it would be much better for the Crow Indians if the fund were all expended in completing a thorough irrigation system, so that that country would produce the crops to sustain the tribe. I should like to have stated in plain terms the purpose intended to be accomplished rather than to open the door for the making of agreements in this very loose manner, affecting perhaps the annuities of all the tribes. I do not like to have legislation so loose as to allow a diversion of the funds of these people generally. I think that matter ought to be kept within the reach of Congress and under our control.

Mr. ALLISON. My memory is not very clear as respects the irrigation project at the Crow Reservation, but my recollection is that to complete the system which is proposed and as begun will cost a very large sum of money, and I have also an indistinct recollection that it was stated that when this system was completed there would not be sufficient water available to irrigate the land proposed to be irrigated.

I do not like to have a specific appropriation made here for that purpose. I am willing that the amendment proposed by the Senator from Montana shall be inserted here for the purpose of further examination, in conference, as to its effect upon the funds belonging to the Indian tribes. I would not like to have a specific appropriation made.

Mr. CARTER. If it meets with the views of the committee and of the Senator from South Dakota, I should be perfectly satisfied with an amendment, to be inserted in lieu of the amendment heretofore proposed, which would read as follows:

*Provided*, That with the consent of the Crow Indians in Montana, to be obtained in the usual way, the Secretary of the Interior may use the annuity money or any part thereof due or to become due said Indians to complete the irrigation system heretofore commenced on their reservation.

Mr. ALLISON. Say "the Secretary of the Interior may, in his discretion" —

Mr. CARTER. "The Secretary of the Interior may, in his discretion."

Mr. ALLISON. Complete that system or any part of it. The Senator from Montana is certainly familiar with this proposed system of irrigation. If I am correctly informed, the beginning of this system is upon a very large scale.

Mr. CARTER. There is no question of that.

Mr. ALLISON. It will cost a large sum of money to complete it. If that be true, I think there ought to be an investigation first by an engineer or some proper authority of the Interior Department as to the propriety of expending money upon this system as proposed.

Mr. CARTER. I suggest that the amendment be permitted to stand as made, and the committee of conference can, I presume, with the approval of the Indian Affairs Committee, substitute some other amendment to accomplish the purpose if this is not entirely satisfactory.

Mr. PETTIGREW. I think, under the circumstances, I will withdraw my opposition to the amendment, as suggested by the Senator, with the understanding that it will be put in some form so as not to leave the power in the hands of the Secretary to treat with the different tribes for all the annuity funds in this country. The purpose is to reach this Montana case, and I am willing to do that, because I think it is the right thing to do.

Mr. ALLISON. If that is the only object the Senator from Montana and the Senator from South Dakota have in view, I suggest that the last amendment proposed by the Senator from Montana be inserted in the bill for the purpose of further examination. I will not be willing to insert even that provision without a full investigation of the question through information derived from the Interior Department.

Mr. CARTER. I then withdraw the amendment now pending, and in lieu of it I offer what I send to the desk.

Mr. ALLISON. I will try to take care of it. This is a matter that has not been submitted to either committee; it is proposed on the floor of the Senate, and I do not wish to assent to it, except that it may be examined further by the committee of conference of the two Houses.

Mr. CARTER. Let the amendment I now offer come in on page 60, after line 9.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The amendment now offered by the Senator from Montana will be read.

The SECRETARY. Insert at the end of line 9, page 60, the following proviso:

*Provided, That with the consent of the Crow Indians in Montana, to be obtained in the usual way, the Secretary of the Interior may use the annuity money due or to become due said Indians to complete the irrigation system heretofore commenced on said Crow Indian Reservation.*

Mr. ALLISON. In his discretion, I should say.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. JONES of Arkansas. A few minutes ago I proposed an amendment at the top of page 47. One of the Senators on the other side suggested that the amendment was already covered on page 46, and in hastily glancing at the language I thought it was, but I do not think so now. I offer the amendment that I proposed at that time. I move, after the words "ninety-five," in the first line on page 47, to insert the words "the same to be divided proportionately among the said several contract schools." The provision on page 47 provides that it shall be divided proportionately among the denominations. This would make it apply to a division among the schools.

Mr. GALLINGER. Let the committee amendment on page 46 be first read. It was passed over and I am anxious that it should be taken up. Then the Senator's proposed amendment to the amendment can be read.

Mr. JONES of Arkansas. Yes; I offer it as an amendment to the amendment.

The SECRETARY. The committee propose, on page 46, line 17, after the word "Alaska," to insert the following proviso:

*Provided, That the Secretary of the Interior may make contracts with contract schools, apportioning as near as may be the amount so contracted for among schools of various denominations, for the education of Indian pupils during the fiscal year 1900, but shall only make such contracts at places where nonsectarian schools can not be provided for such Indian children, and to an amount not exceeding 20 per cent of the amount so used for the fiscal year 1895: *Provided further, That the foregoing shall not apply to public schools of any State, Territory, county, or city, or to schools herein or hereafter specifically provided for.**

Mr. JONES of Arkansas. I proposed to amend the amendment by inserting, after the words "ninety-five," in line 1, page 47, the words:

The same to be divided proportionately among the said several contract schools.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The amendment to the amendment will be read.

The SECRETARY. It is proposed to amend the committee amendment by inserting, after the word "ninety-five," line 1, page 47, the words:

The same to be divided proportionately among the said several contract schools.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President, I have no objection to the amendment to the amendment, and I am not going to interpose any factious opposition to the amendment of the committee.

Mr. JONES of Arkansas. Then let the amendment to the amendment be adopted.

Mr. GALLINGER. Certainly.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The question is upon agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Arkansas to the amendment of the committee.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The question now is upon agreeing to the amendment of the committee as amended.

Mr. GALLINGER. Before the amendment is acted upon I want to say that I had hoped that this question of making appropriations of public funds for sectarian institutions among the Indians had come to an end. We legislated in that direction and we made a declaration in that direction. We appropriated money liberally to provide Government schools for the Indian children.

Mr. President, I wish to call attention to the testimony that was taken on that subject before the Senate Committee on Appropriations when they had the Commissioner of Indian Affairs, Mr. Jones, before them. The chairman, Senator ALLISON, said:

We pay now to contract schools 90 per cent of the amounts that we paid in 1895. The House has made no provision for those contract schools. The question with us is, whether we ought to follow the House or whether it is not too sudden a cutting off of the contract schools.

Commissioner JONES. That is for you, gentlemen, to say. All I have to say is, as I told you last year, that we can take care of all the Indian children.

The CHAIRMAN. But that would require their being moved from where they now are to other places.

Commissioner JONES. Some of them might be moved, but in practice I think you would find that there would be no removals—that the schools would go right on.

The CHAIRMAN. At the same places?

Commissioner JONES. Yes; or that if they were removed we would agree to take care of them with the same appropriation.

There is the testimony of the Commissioner of Indian Affairs that under existing conditions the Indian children can all be taken care of in Government schools. The House of Representatives, doubtless with that information before it, left out a provision for the continuance of the appropriation to which I have objected so often in the Senate, and to which I shall continue to object as long as I am a member of this body, if I have occasion to do so. The Senate committee in its wisdom has seen fit to continue this matter in the present bill, and to make an appropriation for contract schools, providing that it shall be apportioned among the denominations, which, of course, is meaningless, inasmuch as there is only one denomination that is now the beneficiary.

Mr. President, I have no disposition, as I said in the beginning, to enter any factious opposition to this amendment. If the House conferees can be brought to agree to it, it will continue for one year more. But I take it, Mr. President, that it is understood, and I ask the distinguished Senator in charge of the bill, if it is not understood pretty generally, that this appropriation is going to be the last appropriation made by Congress for this purpose? That was practically understood last year, I know, but I want it to go on record again that this is to be the last appearance.

Mr. ALLISON. It was understood last year that we would make one further appropriation, and, as I understood it, this is the last appropriation that is expected to be made under the arrangement made some years ago.

Mr. GALLINGER. With that understanding I shall make no further objection. I simply desire to call the attention of the Senate to the fact that we are reaching the end of what I think has been a very pernicious practice.

Mr. ALLISON. I should like to say one word in response to the testimony read by the Senator from New Hampshire. It is true the Commissioner of Indian Affairs did say that they could provide for these schools at this time, and yet we found in the bill not only the usual appropriation of \$200,000 for additional school buildings, a general fund, but an insistence upon his part in the same testimony that \$100,000 should be added to that appropriation of \$200,000 in order to provide buildings for Indian school children.

Mr. PETTIGREW. Mr. President, this is not a new subject. It has been discussed considerably in the Senate. As far as I am concerned, I do not want it understood that I am bound by the statement of the chairman of the committee in any way that this shall be an end of this appropriation.

Mr. GALLINGER. Then let us have a vote on the amendment.

Mr. PETTIGREW. For my part, I expect next year to advocate the continuance of the appropriation for this purpose, and I believe there is justice in it. I presume that ultimately we shall cease to appropriate for sectarian schools; but many years ago we invited the churches to build schools to educate the Indian children, the Government itself not being willing to go into the work with sufficient appropriations to cover the field.

These people built valuable, excellent school buildings—two, I think, splendid brick buildings—in the State of South Dakota, and gathered these children together. They have been educating them for \$108 per capita per year, and they have been doing splendid work. I doubt whether the Government does as good work as they are doing. After erecting the building, furnishing the building, its furniture, etc., it costs the United States in every one of our schools \$167 per capita to educate these children; and yet the clamor is set up to take them out of the schools where it costs \$108 (and, I believe, gives them better education) and put them into schools where it costs \$167.

While I believe that we should divorce church and state, that that is the policy of this Government and the genius of our institutions, I think that justice should be done and that this appropriation should be wiped out gradually enough to enable these people to continue their schools and raise by private collections the amount necessary to do it, if they desire. Therefore, next year, I think, while there should be something of a reduction, the appropriation should be continued, and perhaps the year after.

I want it distinctly understood that I am not bound by any proposition to discontinue this appropriation. The Senate of the United States ought not to act upon this question as a mere matter of prejudice or a mere matter of sectarian zeal. We ought to be governed by what is right and just and fair between us and the people whom we have invited to go into this business, and not say that the appropriation shall arbitrarily be cut off, if a great injustice is going to be done by cutting it off.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President, the Senator from South Dakota has precipitated a controversy that I have no hesitancy in meeting. I will say now that if it is his purpose, as chairman of the Committee on Indian Affairs and a member of the Committee on Appropriations, to have this matter continued, I shall do what I can to defeat this amendment.

Mr. PETTIGREW. Will the Senator from New Hampshire allow me just one word?

Mr. GALLINGER. Certainly.

Mr. PETTIGREW. I do not desire to precipitate a controversy. If the Senator had not asked the question which he asked I should not have risen to my feet or said anything on this subject.

Mr. GALLINGER. We had a distinct understanding last year, and the RECORD will show it, that certainly not more than one further appropriation should be made for this purpose. That appropriation is contained in the pending bill. I am, of course, wrong, because the chairman of the committee says I am, but my recollection was that it was understood last year we were not to have any further appropriations. I good-naturedly said that if we had an understanding last year that there should be one further appropriation I should coincide in having it made, but if we are to be notified in advance that this controversy is to be continued I shall not shrink from it now or hereafter.

Mr. HOAR. Will the Senator from New Hampshire allow me to make a suggestion to him before he proceeds?

Mr. GALLINGER. Certainly.

Mr. HOAR. I have taken great interest in this matter. I remember very well, as I suppose the Senator from Iowa does—there are probably only three or four members of the Senate who remember it—the inauguration of this policy by General Grant.

Mr. GALLINGER. We have all read of it.

Mr. HOAR. Yes; we all understand it. It was not because the Government did not want to spend the money wholly, but there was at that time the difficulty of getting trustworthy agents. Whether the difficulty would exist now I do not at the moment know. The Government had been very unfortunate in some places in the character of the agents, and it was thought that at least by turning it over to the religious denominations we would get agents whose honesty and zeal would be assured, whether their capacity were greater than that of others or not. The policy was entered into by President Grant, as I am sure the Senator from New Hampshire agrees with me in thinking, with the purest public motives.

Mr. GALLINGER. Undoubtedly.

Mr. HOAR. It is well known that General Grant himself was a member of a religious denomination the furthest possible removed from the great religious denomination that now is carrying on some of these schools.

What I wish to suggest to my honorable friend from New Hampshire is that in considering the fact that it is understood the Department and the Commissioner of Indian Affairs have given assurance that it is their policy to discontinue this appropriation at the end of this year, and there will be but one more, in accord-

ance with the desire of the Commissioner, and that assurance has also come from the chairman of the committee who has charge of the appropriation bill, whether the mere fact that one Senator, however conversant with this matter, is not quite ready to say that he thinks the time will come next year, though he thinks it will come within a year, would not justify him in adhering to his original purpose to let this matter go without a debate now.

Is it not absolutely certain, with all these authorities in favor of discontinuing the appropriation after twelve months, that it will be discontinued, even if it should happen that the Senator from South Dakota is not quite ready to express his opinion that the time will then have quite arrived?

The Senator will pardon this suggestion, made simply for the sake of saving time and saving strife over a matter which will be apt to lead to strife.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President, the suggestion of the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts can not be treated lightly by me, and I have no disposition to treat it lightly. I have no disposition whatever to have a controversy over this matter, and I may conclude to accept the suggestion so kindly offered. But before doing that I want to call the attention of my friend from South Dakota, who is very conversant with Indian affairs, but who sometimes makes very broad statements on some points, to the fact that when he says it costs \$167 per capita to educate Indian children at the Government schools, that statement is not quite borne out by the record.

I have in my hand the testimony before the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate when a Mr. Slater was before the committee. The Senator doubtless will tell me who Mr. Slater is. I do not know.

Mr. PETTIGREW. He is one of the clerks in the Indian Office.

Mr. GALLINGER. He is one of the clerks in the Indian Office, and he knows all about the money that is appropriated. He shows that it does not cost \$167, but that a very considerable portion of that money is turned back into the Treasury.

Mr. PETTIGREW. That is, in some cases.

Mr. GALLINGER. In some cases, and those are the cases the Senator did not think it worth while to allude to.

Mr. PETTIGREW. I will call attention, if the Senator will permit me, to this provision on page 47, just below the paragraph we are considering:

For support and education of 300 Indian pupils at Albuquerque, N. Mex., at \$167 per annum for each pupil, \$50,100.

Mr. GALLINGER. Yes; but if it is not spent it is not used.

Mr. PETTIGREW. In some cases it is not all spent, but in very many every dollar of it is spent, and more, too.

Mr. GALLINGER. It seems that at the Grand Junction school we had \$5,000 left over last year, and I think it is shown furthermore that they carried more students.

Mr. PETTIGREW. No, at that school they had less students than the number.

Mr. GALLINGER. That does not appear in the testimony.

Mr. PETTIGREW. It appears in the report.

Mr. GALLINGER. Commissioner Jones, who is not a clerk in the Interior Department, says that "Haskell, one or two years ago, turned in about \$18,000" of this money.

Mr. PETTIGREW. There they fell very much short of having the number.

Mr. GALLINGER. But Commissioner Jones did not agree, in answer to your question, that they did fall short. He said they did not. Now, Mr. President, I think the Senator ought to be fair about this matter. Commissioner Jones says it costs about \$140 a pupil. He says that in express terms, and we had better have the record correct on that point.

Mr. PETTIGREW. Well, Mr. President—

Mr. GALLINGER. I recognize—

Mr. PETTIGREW. I will wait until the Senator concludes.

Mr. GALLINGER. I want to read that part of the testimony, if the Senator takes issue with it. Let me read it:

Senator COCKRELL. Would they spend it if the appropriation were increased?

Commissioner JONES. The cost is but about \$140.

I do not know anything about it myself. I take the testimony. Mr. President, I know the power the Senator from South Dakota exercises in these matters connected with the Indians. He holds the responsible position of chairman of the Indian Affairs Committee and he holds a position upon the Committee on Appropriations. The Senator's views and wishes are doubtless deferred to to a very considerable extent, as they are by me in most matters. It is a matter of regret to me that the Senator has announced publicly here to-day that he is to use his influence and power to have this appropriation continued. It is a matter of record well known to every Senator that a very powerful ecclesiast in this country has recently undertaken to reopen this entire matter and that in his fulmination he has very severely criticised the Government schools, and has said some things that I think ought not to

have been said in that declaration, because I think his statements are subject to proper criticism and complete refutation.

But, Mr. President, I am reminded by the Senator from Massachusetts that the Interior Department is on record as desiring to put an end to this matter. The Commissioner of Indian Affairs certainly is, and the chairman of the Appropriations Committee of the Senate is, and I am content to let the matter go.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The question is on the amendment of the committee as amended.

The amendment as amended was agreed to.

Mr. KYLE. I offer an amendment which I send to the desk. I think it will be acceded to by the chairman of the committee.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The amendment will be read.

The SECRETARY. Insert on page 44, after line 19, the following: That not exceeding one-third of the principal sum of \$168,335.10, now in the Treasury to the credit of the Sioux Indians of the Crow Creek Reservation, in South Dakota, drawing interest at 4 per cent per annum, may, in the discretion of the Secretary of the Interior, be used for the purchase of stock cattle, or in any other manner that will best promote their welfare and civilization.

Mr. KYLE. I will state that this passed the Senate last year in the form "all or in any part of the principal sum." This year we have stricken out the first part of the phrase and inserted in lieu thereof—

An appropriation not exceeding one-third of the total sum of \$168,335.10 for the purchase of stock cattle for the people of this reservation.

It is recommended by the Secretary of the Interior and the Commissioner of Indian Affairs, and, I believe, will be accepted by the chairman of the committee.

Mr. PETTIGREW. I should like to hear the amendment read again.

The Secretary again read Mr. KYLE's amendment.

Mr. PETTIGREW. Mr. President, I shall not oppose this amendment if it provides for paying this money to these Indians in cash, but I shall oppose it if it proposes to expend it for the purchase of cattle. These Indians are citizens of the United States. They live upon a reservation in one of the counties of South Dakota, and they are entitled, in my opinion, to all the rights of citizenship, the right to vote, etc. This money in the Treasury of the United States is a trust fund. It belongs to them, and they know as well as anybody what they wish to do with it.

I have received a protest from the chiefs of this tribe against expending their money for the purchase of goods or cattle, or expending it in any other way; but they do desire that a portion of it shall be paid to them in cash. I believe if it is disposed of it should be paid in cash, and they should be allowed to handle their own money. If they are said to be citizens of the State of South Dakota, they have reached a point in their civilization when they ought to be allowed to manage their own affairs; the parental system of guidance and control should be abandoned, and their money—trust money—should not, without their consent, be expended in the purchase of cattle or in the purchase of anything else.

If the amendment is amended so as to pay the money in cash to these people, I shall not object to it. Otherwise I shall raise the point of order against the amendment that it changes existing law and provides for a way of disposing of these funds other than is now provided by law.

Mr. KYLE. Mr. President, I want to say that I entirely agree with my colleague in this proposition; and were I sure that it would go through in that form, I certainly should present it in that way, because at the time this agreement was made with this tribe of Indians, in 1889, they could not consummate it until they had reached the agreement I read in these words, which I incorporated in my speech in June of last year:

Unless the Government pay us in cash in our hands—

Notice the phraseology—

Unless the Government pay us in cash in our hands \$187,000 in lieu of the 187,000 acres of land reserved for us and extend the treaties of 1868 and 1877 for the term of fifty years (this to be in addition to Sioux bill), our names will be taken from the contract and our reservation (Crow Creek) shall lie unopen to settlement.

That was the agreement made with this tribe of Indians. The money was not set aside for them until 1895. By an act of Congress it was then covered into the Treasury, drawing 4 per cent interest, and it remains there to-day. Under the terms of the agreement they can not get it out. They have wanted the money from that time to this, but it still remains unpaid.

Last year a provision was inserted in the Indian appropriation bill, in the form recommended by the Secretary of the Interior, to spend all or any part of the sum for the purchase of stock cattle, which seemed a very wise provision in his judgment. I do not know but that the Indians will accept that. I had an intimation last year that they would. The chairman of the committee is disposed to accept the amendment in case we provide this year that one-third of the amount shall be expended for the purchase of stock cattle, etc., meaning, I suppose, that next year another third shall be so expended, the following year another third, and so on until ultimately they get all that the agreement calls for.

It was thought unwise by the Secretary of the Interior to give

it to the Indians in cash, because they are not supposed to understand how to expend the money after they get it; but if the equivalent should be furnished to them in stock cattle, they will get by this means a start in stock raising, and will probably ultimately be better off as a result.

If the amendment can not go through in the form I have offered it, I should like to have it go through so that the amount may be paid in cash. I certainly would like to have it go through in that way, because I believe it will result to the good of the Indians.

Mr. PETTIGREW. I will say in regard to this matter that in 1889 we made a treaty with the Sioux Indians. They then occupied a region of country in South Dakota larger than the State of Indiana. They were one aggregation of tribes, owning that vast region in common. By the treaty of 1869 they were located at six different points upon this area. We entered into an agreement, which was signed by three-fourths of all the males over 18 years of age, by which their reservation was divided into six parts, and an area amounting to about 9,000,000 acres was thrown open to settlement.

The Indians who resided upon the east side of the Missouri River received in that agreement an area of land much less than their kindred people, the Lower Brulés, received who resided on the opposite side of the Missouri River. Therefore they said they would not sign the agreement unless they could receive a dollar an acre in cash for every acre which they received per capita in their diminished reservation less than the Lower Brulés received, who were really members of the same band.

Among the commissioners who made this agreement was General Crook, who was a man highly regarded among the Sioux, because he kept his word and because he never lied to them—and an Indian keeps his word, unless he has been corrupted by civilization. General Crook told these people he would go to Congress, that he had no power to modify the terms of the agreement, and if they would sign, he would come here and recommend that the \$187,000 be paid to them in cash. He came here and made a report, and the President of the United States and the Secretary of the Interior recommended that this agreement, or this promise on the part of General Crook, should be carried out; and I offered an amendment to the Indian appropriation bill in 1890 to carry out this agreement, which was adopted by the Senate and rejected in conference.

In 1891 I offered a similar amendment, which was adopted by the Senate on the Indian appropriation bill and was rejected again in conference, the House refusing to agree to it. In 1892 I offered it again, with the same success; in 1893 again; in 1894 again, and in 1895 it was finally adopted with a provision that the money, instead of being paid in cash according to the agreement, should be put into the Treasury of the United States and held as a trust fund for the benefit of these Indians and that they should be paid 4 per cent upon it.

I insist if this money is ever paid it shall be paid according to the contract, according to the promise. I believe in keeping our agreements with these Indians and with all the Indians of this country—a thing which the United States has scarcely ever done. For years, Mr. President, from 1803 to 1889, there was never an agreement made with the bands of Indians called the Sissetons and Wahpetons and Medawakantons that was not altered by this body to the disadvantage of the Indians, and then ratified, and then we proceeded to enforce it. In some instances we took away nearly the entire consideration for which the Indians had made the treaty, then ratified it, and proceeded to enforce it.

These Indians are part of those same bands or tribes on this reservation to-day. With that history before their eyes, because of their great confidence in General Crook they signed this agreement. I insist that even at this late day, if anything is done with that fund, it shall be disposed of as we promised it should be disposed of.

I have received a letter from the chief of this band and signed by several of his council urging that this money be paid in cash and protesting against it being expended for the purchase of cattle or anything else; and he is right about it. Therefore, this amendment will have to be amended, so far as I am concerned, so as to provide for paying this money in cash; and we ought to pay it all.

Mr. ALLISON. Mr. President, the statement of the Senator from South Dakota, the chairman of the Committee on Indian Affairs, discloses an understanding between this band of Sioux Indians and the Government respecting what should be done with this money. I certainly would not be in favor of forcing upon those people, out of their annuity funds, stock cattle if we have promised in any way or if we are under any obligation to pay this money to them per capita. Therefore, I suggest to the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. KYLE] to allow this matter to go over and have it considered with care by the Indian Committee, which is the proper committee to consider this question; and if there is an understanding that this money shall be paid to the Indians per capita, let a bill be brought in providing for such payment.

I remember now, although it had for the moment escaped my mind, that the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. PETTIGREW] has on several occasions insisted that this particular fund should be paid to these Indians per capita in accordance with the agreement made with General Crook. I think we ought to do quite as well as the Indians themselves; and if we have made such an agreement we ought to abide by it.

Mr. PETTIGREW. I will say that my colleague read an extract from that agreement, in which the Indians said, "We will not be bound by this treaty unless the amount is paid in cash." Yet we have taken their land and we have held it since 1889, for ten years; we have covered it with settlers; the Indians have had no use of it; and still we have not kept our agreement with them.

Mr. ALLISON. Now, I hope the bill will be reported to the Senate.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Chair does not understand that the amendment of the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. KYLE] has yet been withdrawn.

Mr. ALLISON. I supposed the Senator from South Dakota had withdrawn the amendment.

Mr. KYLE. I want to say that I am always reluctant to force anything upon the Indians which is not agreeable to them; but it was the judgment of the Secretary of the Interior, Mr. Bliss, that they ought to have stock cattle in preference to cash, and that it would be a great deal better for them than to have the cash. For that reason I accepted the amendment last year and offered it. At the same time, I am a stickler for carrying out the exact provisions of all our agreements with all of the Indian tribes. These Indians want cash. They asked for it last year, and they ask for it again this year. If by deferring the matter a short time we can get the cash for them, I am perfectly willing that that shall be done, and will withdraw the amendment.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The amendment is withdrawn.

Mr. TURNER. I offer the amendment which I send to the desk.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The amendment submitted by the Senator from Washington will be stated.

The SECRETARY. On page 46, line 9, after the amendment already adopted, it is proposed to insert:

That the Indians of the Yakima Indian Reservation, to whom lands have been allotted under the laws of the United States, may lease their lands so allotted for agricultural purposes for a term not exceeding five years, under such rules and regulations as are or may be prescribed by the Secretary of the Interior, anything in the law now limiting the term to a shorter term notwithstanding.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The question is on the amendment which has been read.

Mr. PETTIGREW. I have no objection to that amendment. I think the reasons for it are good. The existing law provides for three years' leases for agricultural purposes. This amendment will increase the term of a lease to five years; and upon this reservation irrigation is required in order to raise crops. It is on the east side of the Cascade Mountains, in the State of Washington—close to the mountains on the east side; in fact, right up against the mountains, where the range is intersected by a high mountain range 8,000 feet high.

Next to the mountains on the east side there is a little range, and the irrigation comes from streams flowing from those mountains. It is impossible, as I understand it, to make leases for three years and secure the building of the necessary lateral ditches to cover the land with water. It is therefore important that this amendment shall be adopted. It will do no harm at least to try the experiment under the supervision of the Secretary of the Interior.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The question is on the amendment submitted by the Senator from Washington [Mr. TURNER].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. PETTIGREW. I offer the amendment which I send to the desk.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The amendment will be stated.

The SECRETARY. After the committee amendment already adopted, following line 15, on page 42, it is proposed to insert:

The Secretary of the Interior is hereby authorized to appoint a register of deeds for each of the Five Civilized Tribes in Indian Territory, said appointees to be residents of Indian Territory; and the registers of deeds so appointed shall have power, with the approval of the Secretary of the Interior, to appoint deputies, and they shall possess and exercise all the powers of registers of deeds as provided by the statutes of the State of Arkansas; and the statutes of the State of Arkansas in relation to all records kept by registers of deeds shall be in full force in said Indian Territory. The Secretary shall make the rules and regulations necessary to carry this provision into effect.

Mr. JONES of Arkansas. This amendment is legislation and ought not to be on an appropriation bill. It ought not to be passed. It is rather too late in the afternoon for the reasons to be discussed, but if the amendment is to be discussed, I hope the Senate will adjourn and let the matter come up to-morrow.

Mr. ALLISON. I hope the Senator from South Dakota will withdraw the amendment if there is objection to it. It is legis-

lation and subject to the point of order. I suppose the Senator from Arkansas intends to make the point of order against it.

Mr. JONES of Arkansas. Of course I will make the point of order, but I do not want to make it if the Senator from South Dakota wishes to discuss the amendment. If he can show any substantial reason why this legislation ought to be had I shall be glad to hear it. I am not opposed to it captiously, but I do think it ought not to be passed. It proposes a radical change in the condition of affairs in the Indian Territory without any sufficient reason being given for it.

Mr. PETTIGREW. I should like very briefly indeed to state the reasons why I have offered the amendment. I do not care to take more than a very brief portion of the time of the Senate.

Mr. JONES of Arkansas. I hope the Senator from Iowa will allow us to adjourn, and in the meantime I will confer with the Senator from South Dakota regarding the amendment.

Mr. ALLISON. I will make the point of order myself after the Senator from South Dakota concludes his observations. I want to finish the bill to-night if possible. I think it will take only a few minutes now.

Mr. HOAR. I hope the Senator from Arkansas will allow a brief executive session, whenever the time comes, of two or three minutes, for matters of importance.

Mr. JONES of Arkansas. I do not wish to interfere with the convenience of other Senators, but it is now twenty minutes after 5 o'clock.

Mr. ALLISON. It will take but a few minutes now, I think, to finish the bill.

Mr. PETTIGREW. I shall not be over five minutes in making my statement in regard to the amendment.

Mr. JONES of Arkansas. I do not like to make the point of order arbitrarily against the proposition of the Senator from South Dakota, but I do think that it is a proposition which is not wise, and that it ought not to become a part of this bill. At the same time, if I have an opportunity to go over the matter, I might change my mind. I will have no objection to an executive session so as to let this matter be taken up to-morrow morning and then disposed of. In the meantime I will look into the question involved in the amendment, and probably may be willing to have it disposed of without any delay. I certainly shall not delay the Senate longer than will be absolutely necessary. So I suggest to the Senator from Iowa to let us have an executive session.

Mr. ALLISON. I hope we shall finish the bill before we go into executive session. It will only take a few moments now.

Mr. JONES of Arkansas. Mr. President, we have done amazingly well with the bill to-day, and it seems to me the Senator from Iowa ought not to insist on longer continuing its consideration. It will certainly take only a short time to conclude it to-morrow morning. I do not like to take any arbitrary course as to the amendment suggested by the Senator from South Dakota, but I should like to have an opportunity to look into it. I think it will take only a few minutes to-morrow, and the bill can then be easily disposed of. I hope the Senator from Iowa will let the bill go over, so that we may have an executive session now, and dispose of the bill to-morrow. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

Mr. ALLISON. I am willing to make any reasonable arrangement respecting the bill. I desire to get it into the Senate and have the amendments already agreed to as in Committee of the Whole concurred in. Then I shall be willing to adjourn until to-morrow, or to go into executive session, but just on the completion of the bill it seems unwise for us to now go into executive session. I hope the Senator from Arkansas will not press that motion at this moment.

Mr. JONES of Arkansas. It seems to me that we have done well this afternoon with the pending bill. We have gotten along rapidly. We have done more than could have been reasonably expected when the afternoon began, and I do not think it will take more than a few minutes to dispose of the bill to-morrow. I do think the proposed amendment of the Senator from South Dakota is of sufficient importance to be examined carefully. I am in good faith about it. I should like to have an opportunity to examine the matter before it is disposed of, and that can not be done now. We have not the time to do it now unless we sit very much longer than I think any Senator is willing to stay here to-day. So far as I am concerned, I am willing to stay if the Senate wants to stay here a sufficient time to examine this question.

Mr. ALLISON. I ask unanimous consent that immediately after the routine business to-morrow morning the pending Indian appropriation bill shall be taken up for consideration and continued until it is completed.

Mr. GORMAN and Mr. JONES of Arkansas. That is right.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Is there unanimous consent to the request from the Senator from Iowa that the pending bill be taken up immediately after the routine business to-morrow morning? The Chair hears no objection, and that is the order.

The Senator from Arkansas [Mr. JONES] moves that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.  
Mr. CARTER. I hope the Senator will withdraw that motion.  
Mr. JONES of Arkansas. I withdraw that motion.

DENNIS FITZPATRICK.

Mr. LODGE. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill (H. R. 375) to remove the charge of desertion standing against Dennis Fitzpatrick. It is a bill of only a few lines.

There being no objection, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill. It directs the Secretary of the Navy to amend the records on file in the Navy Department so as to show that Dennis Fitzpatrick was honorably discharged as a seaman in the United States Navy from the U. S. S. *Wanderer*, and to issue to him an honorable discharge, to date from the 17th of July, 1863.

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

#### TWELFTH AND SUBSEQUENT CENSUSES.

Mr. CARTER. I ask the Chair to lay before the Senate House bill No. 11815 for the purpose of a motion.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Chair lays before the Senate the bill (H. R. 11815) to provide for taking the Twelfth and subsequent censuses.

Mr. CARTER. I move to strike out all after the enacting clause of the bill and insert in lieu thereof all after the enacting clause of Senate bill 4545, which was passed by the Senate on the 8th of June last.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The question is on the motion of the Senator from Montana.

Mr. HAWLEY. Let us understand distinctly what the motion is.

Mr. PLATT of Connecticut. I suggest to the Senator from Montana that he had better have the House bill printed.

Mr. CARTER. It is desirable to get the bill into conference and have it disposed of as promptly as possible. I will explain the legislative situation which leads to this motion.

Instead of amending the Senate bill, the House of Representatives passed a separate and distinct bill, practically in all respects like unto the Senate bill. The amendments are not of a material character, except in one particular, where the House bill proposes the establishment of an independent bureau. The desire is to get the bill into conference, and for that purpose I move to strike out all of the House bill after the enacting clause, and to insert the Senate bill, which has heretofore passed this body.

Mr. ALLISON. If the House has inserted a bill as a substitute for the Senate bill, all that is necessary is to disagree to the House amendment and then the bill can be got into conference.

Mr. CARTER. But the House of Representatives passed a separate and distinct bill, I will say to the Senator—a House bill—and I desire to get the matter into conference.

Mr. PASCO. This subject is one too important to take up when the Senate is so thin as it is now, and I object to the consideration of the bill at the present time.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Objection is made.

WILLIAM D. KURFISS.

Mr. CULLOM. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill (H. R. 8336) to correct the military record of William D. Kurfiss, which was reported unanimously from the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. PLATT of Connecticut. What has become of the motion of the Senator from Montana [Mr. CARTER]?

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Objection was made to the consideration of the bill referred to by the Senator from Montana at this time.

Mr. CULLOM. I hope the bill named by me may now be taken up.

There being no objection, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill. It proposes to correct the record of William D. Kurfiss, private, Company F, First Ohio Cavalry, so as to show his honorable discharge from the service on December 1, 1864.

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

#### IOWA AGRICULTURAL COLLEGE.

Mr. ALLISON. I wish to report from the Committee on Finance a local bill relating to a matter in my own State. It is the bill (H. R. 10398) providing for the entry, free of customs duties, of certain bells presented by Edwin M. Stanton to the Iowa Agricultural College, of Ames, Iowa. As it will take but a moment, I hope unanimous consent will be given to have it considered now.

Mr. COCKRELL. Let it be read.

Mr. ALLISON. It will explain itself.

The Secretary read the bill; and the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to its consideration.

Mr. COCKRELL. What kind of bells are they?

Mr. ALLISON. They are chimes, purchased by Mr. Stanton abroad and presented to the college.

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

#### EXECUTIVE SESSION.

Mr. GORMAN. I renew my motion that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business. After five minutes spent in executive session the doors were reopened, and (at 5 o'clock and 40 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until to-morrow, Wednesday, February 8, 1899, at 12 o'clock meridian.

#### NOMINATIONS.

*Executive nominations received by the Senate, February 7, 1899.*

##### COINER.

Mayer Cahen, of Louisiana, to be coiner of the mint of the United States at New Orleans, La., vice H. Gibbs Morgan, removed. The nomination of Mayer Cohen to the above-named office, which was delivered to the Senate on the 4th instant, is hereby withdrawn.

##### PROFESSOR OF MATHEMATICS.

Mr. Thomas J. J. See, a citizen of Minnesota, to be a professor of mathematics in the Navy (subject to the examinations required by law) to fill a vacancy existing in that grade.

#### CONFIRMATIONS.

*Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate February 7, 1899.*

##### COLLECTOR OF CUSTOMS.

John W. Mix, of Connecticut, to be collector of customs for the district of New Haven, in the State of Connecticut.

##### POSTMASTER.

Guy C. Toye, to be postmaster at Northwood, in the county of Worth and State of Iowa.

#### HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

TUESDAY, February 7, 1899.

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

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

##### CHANGE OF REFERENCE.

Mr. BROMWELL. Mr. Speaker, House bill 11195 having been inadvertently and improperly referred to the Committee on Ways and Means, I ask consent that this bill, with all the papers on file relating to it, be withdrawn from that committee and referred to the Committee on Claims.

The SPEAKER. The Committee on Ways and Means can change the reference through the box.

##### NATIONAL FISHERY CONGRESS.

Mr. RICHARDSON. Mr. Speaker, I have a report from the Committee on Printing.

The SPEAKER. Is it a privileged report?

Mr. RICHARDSON. It is not privileged.

The SPEAKER. Then it is by unanimous consent of the House.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

*Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That there be printed 3,000 copies of the Proceedings and Papers of the National Fishery Congress, held at Tampa, Fla., January 19 to 24, 1898, as contained in the Bulletin of the United States Fish Commission, volume 17, for 1897 (Document No. 561, Fifty-fifth Congress, second session), of which 500 shall be for the use of the Senate, 1,000 for the use of the House of Representatives, and 1,500 for the use of the Fish Commission.*

Mr. RICHARDSON. Let the report be read. It is very brief, and shows that it will cost only \$580.

The Clerk read the report (by Mr. RICHARDSON), as follows:

Your Committee on Printing, having had under consideration Senate concurrent resolution No. 50, to print 3,000 copies of the Proceedings and Papers of the National Fishery Congress, held at Tampa, Fla., January 19 to 24, 1898, as contained in the Bulletin of the United States Fish Commission, volume 17, for 1897 (Document No. 561, Fifty-fifth Congress, second session), recommend that the same be agreed to.