

SECOND REGIMENT VOLUNTEER ENGINEERS.

Second Lieut. Frank S. Clark, to be first lieutenant.
Sergt. George J. Harman, Company F, Second United States Volunteer Engineers, to be second lieutenant.

SEVENTH REGIMENT VOLUNTEER INFANTRY.

To be first lieutenants.

Sergt. John Fred James, Company A, Third Virginia Volunteers, to fill an original vacancy, July 19, 1898.

William H. Butler, of Missouri, to fill an original vacancy, July 13, 1898.

James G. Horton, of Missouri, to fill an original vacancy, July 26, 1898.

James B. Coleman, of Missouri, to fill an original vacancy, July 26, 1898.

John E. Perry, of Missouri, to fill an original vacancy, July 26, 1898.

Leon Jordan, of Missouri, to fill an original vacancy, July 26, 1898.

Thomas Campbell, of Missouri, to fill an original vacancy, July 26, 1898.

Edward G. McAfee, of Iowa, to fill an original vacancy, July 26, 1898.

James H. Sykes, of Arkansas, to fill an original vacancy, July 26, 1898.

William O. Emory, of Arkansas, to fill an original vacancy, July 26, 1898.

Charles H. Morgan, of Missouri, to fill an original vacancy (since honorably discharged), July 26, 1898.

Raphael T. Brown, of Tennessee, to fill an original vacancy (since resigned), July 26, 1898.

To be second lieutenant.

Stephen T. Guy, of Tennessee, to fill an original vacancy (since resigned), July 26, 1898.

SECOND REGIMENT VOLUNTEER CAVALRY.

To be chaplain.

Henry G. Golden, of Wyoming, to fill an original vacancy (since mustered out), June 19, 1898.

THIRD REGIMENT VOLUNTEER ENGINEERS.

To be captains.

Lyle F. Bellinger, of Georgia, to fill an original vacancy, July 13, 1898.

Frank L. Averill, of District of Columbia, to fill an original vacancy, July 13, 1898.

William B. Thomas, of Georgia, to fill an original vacancy, July 13, 1898.

Carleton W. Sturtevant, of Missouri, to fill an original vacancy, July 13, 1898.

George F. Stickney, of Kentucky, to fill an original vacancy, July 13, 1898.

John Henry Westerfield, of Kentucky, to fill an original vacancy, July 13, 1898.

William J. Hardee, of Louisiana, to fill an original vacancy (since resigned), July 13, 1898.

THIRD REGIMENT VOLUNTEER ENGINEERS.

Second Lieut. Samuel Dibble, jr., to be first lieutenant.

Sergt. Henry Gordon Strong, Company M, to be second lieutenant.

SECOND REGIMENT VOLUNTEER INFANTRY.

To be second lieutenant.

Bradner D. Slaughter, of Nebraska.

POSTMASTERS.

Thomas M. Morsey, to be postmaster at Warrenton, in the county of Warren and State of Missouri.

John H. Heath, to be postmaster at Pattonsburg, in the county of Daviess and State of Missouri.

Moses M. Adams, to be postmaster at Seneca, in the county of Newton and State of Missouri.

James A. McAvoy, to be postmaster at Lauder, in the county of Fremont and State of Wyoming.

Thomas Sharp, to be postmaster at Wellsville, in the county of Montgomery and State of Missouri.

Frederick C. Sasse, to be postmaster at Brunswick, in the county of Chariton and State of Missouri.

Harry L. Sack, to be postmaster at South St. Joseph, in the county of Buchanan and State of Missouri.

George E. Johnson, to be postmaster at North Tarrytown, in the county of Westchester and State of New York.

H. R. Every, to be postmaster at Athens, in the county of Greene and State of New York.

Justus B. Abbott, to be postmaster at Gouverneur, in the county of St. Lawrence and State of New York.

John D. Smith, to be postmaster at Catskill, in the county of Greene and State of New York.

Mary L. McRoberts, to be postmaster at Tompkinsville, in the county of Richmond and State of New York.

William B. Leroy, to be postmaster at Cohoes, in the county of Albany and State of New York.

Benjamin F. Boothe, to be postmaster at Brigham, in the county of Boxelder and State of Utah.

Van R. Sprague, to be postmaster at McArthur, in the county of Vinton and State of Ohio.

James S. Morley, to be postmaster at Andover, in the county of Ashtabula and State of Ohio.

Fred M. Kelly, to be postmaster at Needles, in the county of San Bernardino and State of California.

Thomas E. Byrnes, to be postmaster at San Mateo, in the county of San Mateo and State of California.

Lindley M. Baldwin, to be postmaster at Whittier, in the county of Los Angeles and State of California.

Cyrus A. Crislip, to be postmaster at Spencer, in the county of Roane and State of West Virginia.

H. H. Youngken, to be postmaster at Santa Paula, in the county of Ventura and State of California.

Francis M. Ordway, to be postmaster at Merced, in the county of Merced and State of California.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

FRIDAY, February 10, 1899.

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

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

BIG THREE RAILROAD COMPANY, INDIAN TERRITORY.

Mr. CLARDY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The bill (H. R. 11409) to entitle and authorize the Big Three Railroad Company to construct, own, and operate a main and branch of railway in Indian and Oklahoma Territories was read. It provides that the Big Three Railroad Company, a corporation created under and by virtue of the laws of the State of Arkansas, be, and the same is hereby, authorized, invested, and empowered with the right of locating, constructing, owning, equipping, operating, using, and maintaining a railway, telegraph, and telephone line through the Indian and Oklahoma Territories, beginning at a point to be selected by said railroad company at or near the west line of Little River County, Ark., and running thence over the most practicable and feasible route through the Choctaw, Chickasaw, Creek, and Seminole nations, Indian Territory; thence through the Territory of Oklahoma to Oklahoma City and Guthrie, in said Territory, with a branch line to begin at or near the line of Oklahoma and Indian Territories and running south through Oklahoma and Indian Territories to Sherman, Tex., with the right to construct, use, and maintain such tracks, turn-outs, sidings, and extensions as said company may deem to its interest to construct and maintain along and upon the right of way and depot grounds herein provided for.

The amendments recommended by the Committee on Indian Affairs were read.

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

Mr. TAWNEY. Mr. Speaker, I desire to ask the gentleman what railroad company this is?

Mr. CLARDY. The Big Three Railroad Company.

Mr. TAWNEY. What is the Big Three Railroad Company? I desire to know whether it was incorporated under that name, or whether several railroads are operating under that name by common consent.

Mr. CLARDY. My understanding is that it is incorporated by that name in the State of Arkansas.

Mr. McRAE. That is correct.

Mr. CLARDY. The president lives in my district. He is the only party whom I know anything about in connection with the matter.

Mr. McRAE. That is the name of the corporation.

Mr. TAWNEY. Mr. Speaker, I desire to ask if the gentleman would have any objection to the consideration of a general bill which has been reported from the same committee, and which will obviate the necessity of giving consideration to these private bills for rights of way through the Indian Territory? If that bill could be considered at this time, the whole matter could then be placed in the hands of the Department, and the rights of those interested could be protected. Otherwise—

Mr. CLARDY. A great many bills of this kind have already passed at this session.

Mr. McRAE. If the general bill can be passed, this bill need not be passed by the Senate.

Mr. TAWNEY. If the gentleman has no objection to the consideration of the general bill, I think we had better take that up first.

Mr. CLARDY. Let us get through with this first.

Mr. TAWNEY. This whole subject is a matter that ought to be carefully scrutinized by the House.

Mr. McRAE. You can take up the general bill after the passage of this one.

Mr. CLARDY. I wish to say that this bill has received as careful consideration as any bill could receive, in my opinion.

Mr. TAWNEY. I observe one thing, that the evidence of indebtedness need only be filed in the office of the Secretary of the Interior. That is no protection to creditors at all in the locality in which the road is operated. The general rule is that these evidences of indebtedness, such as mortgages, and so forth, shall be recorded in the several counties through which the road is operated.

Mr. CLARDY. This bill has been indorsed by the Interior Department and has been especially recommended by the Commissioner of Indian Affairs, and the amendments which he suggested have all been put in the bill.

Mr. McRAE. This is the Indian Territory, an unorganized government so far as the United States are concerned. Of course there must be some place where these mortgages should be recorded, and the universal practice in such cases has been to require them to be recorded in the office of the Secretary of the Interior, subject to the inspection of all concerned.

Mr. TAWNEY. But there is nothing in the act itself requiring the recording of these evidences of indebtedness in the several counties.

Mr. McRAE. There are no counties.

Mr. TAWNEY. Well, in the Territory.

Mr. McRAE. There is no place there, except for the Indians, and we have no right to require those officers to do anything.

Mr. TAWNEY. Surely there is a land office.

Mr. McRAE. Oh, no; there is no land office. This is the Indian country, and the lands are owned by the Indians.

Mr. TAWNEY. I understand it is the Indian country.

Mr. McRAE. There is no land office there at all.

Mr. CLARDY. This bill is recommended by the Department of the Interior, and especially by the Commissioner of Indian Affairs.

Mr. TAWNEY. Why not pass a general bill?

Mr. BRUCKER. Quite a number of bills have been passed granting rights of way through the Indian Territory and Oklahoma, and I should like to ask whether this bill is in the usual form?

Mr. CLARDY. It is. I think it is in a better form than most of them.

Mr. BRUCKER. It struck me in listening to the reading of the bill that there was much more to it than there has been to many of the bills of this kind which have passed.

Mr. CLARDY. Every point is safeguarded.

Mr. BRUCKER. This provides for mortgaging the road, condemnation proceedings, and the payment of awards and securities?

Mr. ALLEN. They all have that.

Mr. McRAE. This is a provision that they all have and should have.

Mr. BRUCKER. I do not remember that the other bills passed were as lengthy as this or that they contained these provisions.

Mr. McRAE. The compensation has been increased from what it was prior to this year. Prior to this year the amount of annual tax was \$15 per mile, but on account of the settlement of the country it has increased to \$25 per mile.

Mr. BRUCKER. With that statement, I have no objection.

Mr. TAWNEY. Mr. Speaker, I object.

ORDER OF BUSINESS.

Mr. CURTIS of Kansas. I ask unanimous consent for the consideration of this bill.

Mr. CANNON. I ascertain that the bill will take some time to consider.

Mr. CURTIS of Kansas. There are but a few pages of the bill.

Mr. CANNON. But a gentleman has said to me that he intends to discuss it.

Mr. CURTIS of Kansas. I withdraw my request.

Mr. CANNON. I move that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union on the sundry civil bill, and pending that—

Mr. CLARDY. Will the gentleman withdraw his objection?

Mr. TAWNEY. No.

The SPEAKER. Objection was made by the gentleman from Minnesota to the bill that was before the House.

Mr. CANNON. And pending that motion, I would be glad to know of the gentleman of the minority in charge of this bill [Mr. McRAE] if we can not agree for the closing of general debate? I would like to have as early a close as practicable at this stage of the session.

Mr. McRAE. In one moment I will answer. [After a pause.] I suggest seven hours.

Mr. CANNON. Well, I will say to my friend that it seems to me that general debate ought to be closed to-day. Suppose that we say—

Mr. McRAE. That would only give us four hours and a half.

Mr. CANNON. That is right; and still, after the general debate comes the five-minute debate; and I am very anxious to get on with this bill. I would be glad if my friend would say that general debate should conclude with this legislative day, and then the House, if necessary, could sit beyond 5.

Mr. McRAE. Well, I make this suggestion in answer to that, that we close general debate with this day, and that we have three hours debate on the twenty-million Philippine paragraph when we reach it.

Mr. CANNON. I would rather not make that agreement, because we may not desire it. I will say to my friend, touching the twenty-million paragraph, when it is reached in the five-minute rule, we all recognize the fact that if gentlemen desire we will take something of time; and I feel quite sure that any reasonable time—say thirty, sixty, or ninety minutes—my friend and I can agree about it without a motion to close debate.

Mr. HENDERSON. Can not that be debated to-day?

Mr. CANNON. I have no doubt it will be, somewhat.

Mr. McRAE. I hope the gentleman will agree now, so that those who desire to speak on that subject may reserve their remarks until then and give us, say, two hours—one on each side.

Mr. CANNON. I would not agree as to that time now, but I am quite sure my friend and myself, when we reach that point, could agree about it. There will be no desire to shorten debate arbitrarily unless there is a waste of time; but my friend can see, as well as I can, the importance of disposing of the bill as early as possible. Maybe one or both of us would want to have quite a short debate when we reached it, and here is the 10th of February. I think my friend had better—

Mr. HENDERSON. And four other general appropriation bills to pass the House?

Mr. CANNON. Yes.

Mr. McRAE. I understood from the gentleman from Illinois that there would be pretty long general debate upon this bill, and I have promised to try to secure time for a number of gentlemen, if I could, and they will be quite disappointed if they fail to get in. Let us have two hours on the twenty-million paragraph and we will be satisfied on this side.

Mr. CANNON. I would rather not agree to two hours.

Mr. BRUCKER. Mr. Speaker, I demand the regular order.

Mr. CANNON. Then, pending the motion that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, I move that all general debate on the sundry civil bill be closed with the end of this legislative day; and on that I demand the previous question.

Mr. DOCKERY. Pending that—

Mr. HENDERSON. Regular order.

Mr. DOCKERY. Leave the paragraph for twenty millions open for future agreement.

Mr. CANNON. I would rather not.

Mr. McRAE. Will you not leave the debate on the paragraph for twenty millions open, to be determined when reached?

Mr. CANNON. I prefer not. I am quite sure my friends will recollect the way these bills have been handled that we can agree about it when we reach it. I would rather not make any agreement now.

Mr. HENDERSON. Regular order, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. WALKER of Massachusetts. I would like to ask the gentleman—

The SPEAKER. The regular order is demanded. The gentleman from Illinois moves that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union on the sundry civil appropriation bill; and, pending that, moves that all general debate be closed with the legislative day; and on that asks the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question now is on limiting debate in Committee of the Whole with the end of the legislative day.

The question was taken and the motion of Mr. CANNON was agreed to.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, one word before the question is put. The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MOODY] desires very much that I shall ask unanimous consent that gentlemen may extend their remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. HENDERSON. And I want to add to that that it shall be done within five days.

The SPEAKER. The Chair understands that that will be limited to gentlemen who address the House. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois, that members may extend their remarks in the RECORD for five days? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

The question was then taken on Mr. CANNON'S motion, that the

House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole on the state of the Union for the consideration of the sundry civil bill.

The motion was agreed to; and accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole on the state of the Union (Mr. SHERMAN in the chair) for the consideration of general appropriation bills.

SUNDRY CIVIL APPROPRIATION BILL.

Mr. MOODY. Mr. Chairman, I yield such portion of my time as he may desire to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. BROSIUS], and I reserve the remainder of my time, if there be any.

Mr. BROSIUS. Mr. Chairman, the sum of \$20,000,000 appropriated by this bill to carry into execution the stipulations of the treaty, looked at with the natural eye, disconnected with all circumstances, seems like a large sum. But placed in the scale of the verities and weighed against those higher considerations which make for the duty, the moral grandeur, and glory of this Republic, it is a mere bagatelle and drops out of consideration.

I listened yesterday with unusual satisfaction to some brief remarks from the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. MIERS] which, in my judgment, were as sound in principle and as noble in patriotism as they were elevated in morals. I take great pleasure, Mr. Chairman, in directing public attention to those brief utterances, and I will read from the RECORD one passage from them as a sample:

"The world has been given the example of an unselfish Christian nation waging a war, expending her millions, and sending forth her great Army and Navy to suffer and to do battle for humanity's sake without any personal interest, without any motive of gain or aggrandizement."

There were other observations made by the distinguished gentleman equally sound, equally noble, and equally elevated. I take them for my text this morning to place the discussion of this transcendent theme on a higher plane than it has yet been placed by those who have debated it. I was pleased with the observations of my friend from Indiana, particularly because they did not revise, revamp, and reiterate the argument that I have heard so often from that side of the Chamber, and sometimes on this, that it would be very wicked and wrong and unpatriotic for this Republic to compel by force, against the will of the people, the annexation of the Philippine Islands to the United States. Since no one has ever proposed such a policy, I sweep from the floor of debate all that kind of argument in the simple language of Abraham Lincoln, in replying to his distinguished rival, Senator Douglas, when he said:

"Does the gentleman expect to stand in majestic dignity and pass through his apotheosis and become a god by his antagonism to a proposition which neither man nor mouse in all God's creation has ever advocated?"

I was pleased in another respect that the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. MIERS] did not invoke the stupendous argument which is so frequently invoked by gentlemen on that side of the Chamber, the traditions of the fathers.

TRADITION.

Have the traditions of the past any claim upon us that should cause us to falter in that forward movement to which we are counseled by the wisdom of the present? It was the wise reflection of the philosophic Buckle "that of all the ways in which truth has been distorted, there is none that has worked so much harm as an exaggerated respect for the past." As a guide to our footsteps it may be useful, but as a manacle on our limbs it can only cripple our movement and hinder progress. Jefferson, the original American expansionist, suggested that this country would not tolerate the Gothic idea of looking backward instead of forward for our improvements in government or religion, or consulting the annals of our ancestors for the duties we owe the present.

History abounds in illustrations of the fatality of submissive acquiescence in the traditions of the fathers. For ages the dicta of the ecclesiastical sages of the past were followed, under the delusion that they were superior in piety and excelled in wisdom all other men, and so the patristic errors in theology, science, and learning were perpetuated and human knowledge and progress halted for centuries. If I would assert that it is impossible there should be inhabitants on the opposite side of the earth, I would be adhering to the traditions of the fathers and could cite so notable an authority as St. Augustine.

After the obstacles the geographic traditions of the patristic fathers had thrown in the way of maritime adventure and discovery were overcome, says Dr. Draper, their ethnological traditions led to one of the monumental tragedies of history. It was believed by the Spaniards, for the fathers had so declared it, that the people of Asia, Africa, and Europe, descending through the sons of Noah, Shem, Ham, and Japheth, comprised all the people on the earth of Adamic descent. When they found the New World inhabited, a question arose: What was the lineage of these new people?

The voice of the fathers was altogether against their Adamic descent. St. Augustine had denied the globular form of the earth;

and there could be no human beings outside of Asia, Africa, and Europe, since none are mentioned in the Scriptures. So the Spaniards, following the traditions of the fathers, proceeded to treat the natives of South America as outside the pale of the Adamic race and enslaved and murdered them by the millions. Blind adherence to the traditions of the fathers made the Spaniards easily the greatest assassins of the human race the world has ever known. This suggests the admonition—and I only allude to it because it is so suggestive—that we shun the example of Spain lest by our adherence to the supposed traditions of the fathers we dishonor the American Republic and discredit American civilization.

The fathers themselves needed no admonitions of this character. They knew that each century must do its own thinking. They would have agreed with Dr. Abbott, that if one generation has no Washington or Jefferson or Hamilton it must create them or die. They were wise enough to judge opinions as they judged coins—considering much less whose inscriptions they bore than what metal they were made of; that soundness of opinions was more to be valued than their antiquity. Their minds were free from the shackles of the past. They knew that new occasions teach new duties; that blind adherence to tradition is neither patriotism nor wisdom nor courage, but intellectual slavery and moral cowardice; and they accordingly turned their backs upon the past, broke the tyranny of tradition, made their own precedents, blazed a new pathway, and gave to the family of nations a new birth. The lesson of it all which I desire to emphasize is that every great question must come to the touchstone of the present. To-day, and not a hundred years ago, is the judgment day for the question of American expansion.

EXPANSION HAS BEEN THE HABIT OF THE REPUBLIC.

But it remains to be said that this policy is not in violation of the traditions of the fathers of the Republic, as strenuously contended in some quarters. Our policy for a hundred years has been one of expansion. We have expanded from the Alleghenies to the Golden Gate and far out into the Pacific Sea. The eagle's wings have grown until they are 8,000 miles from tip to tip.

Mr. Seeley, a philosophic and discriminating English writer, says: "In the United States we have the most striking example of confident and successful expansion. Those colonies, which when they parted from us did but fringe the Atlantic seaboard, have covered with their States and Territories, first, the mighty Mississippi Valley, next the Rocky Mountains, and then the Pacific coast, and all this without shaking their political system." "The greatness of the United States," says he, "is the best proof that a state may become immensely large and yet prosper. The Union is a great example of a system under which an indefinite number of provinces are firmly held together without any of the inconveniences which have been felt in other cases."

It must not be forgotten that when the Union was formed the United States did not own a foot of land on this continent. The public domain was owned by individual States under grants from the British Crown. In 1780 Congress passed a resolution recommending to the several States to cede their unappropriated lands to the United States. Later in the same year Congress passed another resolution that the lands ceded to the United States by any particular State should be disposed of for the common benefit of the United States. This was the initial step in the American policy of expansion. Agreeably to this policy and under this legislative sanction Virginia, in 1784, ceded to the United States the territory northwest of the Ohio River. This extended domain was under Congressional government until the States carved out of it were admitted to the Union.

Wisconsin, the last of that splendid galaxy of States, was governed as a Territory sixty-one years, the inhabitants having no voice in their government save as Congress in its wisdom permitted them. Alabama and Mississippi, formed from territory ceded to the United States by South Carolina, were long governed as Territories. Louisiana, purchased of France in 1803, enjoyed nine years of Territorial pupillage. I need not pursue our later Territorial history. In all these and similar cases the President appointed the governors and judges, whose salaries were paid out of the public Treasury of the United States. No power was exercised by the people in their own government save as Congress in its wisdom permitted.

This Government was as absolute, as despotic as Congress chose to make it. They were possessions of the United States and were under the jurisdiction and sovereignty of the United States, domain and people alike. They had no independence, no right of self-government, no power to declare their own sovereignty or to choose whom their sovereign should be. They were in abject vassalage to a power, a sovereignty which they had no voice in choosing. The bulk of our domain has been acquired in the same way by cession from a foreign sovereignty.

The inhabitants came with the land as if attached to it, possessing themselves no attributes of sovereignty. The Philippines have come to us in the same way by cession of the sovereignty possessing them. In themselves they possessed none of the attributes of

sovereignty and are now under the sovereignty of the United States which succeeded to that of Spain. There is no more warrant for the contention that the people of the Philippines are vested with sovereignty than that the inhabitants of California were vested with sovereignty the day after the execution of the treaty with Mexico by which that territory was acquired.

FEDERAL SOVEREIGNTY ABSOLUTE OVER TERRITORY.

So that not only has it been the policy of the United States from the beginning to acquire territory, as illustrated by the instances I have named, together with more recent ones with which we are all familiar, but we have always exercised without question absolute sovereignty over the people occupying the acquired territory. Mr. Jefferson and many other able statesmen of his day, and some of later periods, held that this power of sovereignty was perpetual—necessarily so—for they denied any constitutional warrant for the admission of a State excepting such as were formed out of territory belonging to the nation at the time of the adoption of the Constitution. This view was strenuously insisted upon by many able statesmen in different periods of our history.

In 1811 Josiah Quincy, in the House of Representatives, in the debate on the bill for the admission of Louisiana, said: "This bill which is now proposed to be passed has this assured principle for its basis, that the Congress, without recurrence to conventions of the people in the States or to the legislatures of the States, are authorized to admit new partners to a share of the political power in countries out of the original limits of the United States. Now, this assumed principle I maintain to be altogether without any sanction of the Constitution. I declare it to be a manifest and atrocious usurpation of power, of a nature dissolving, according to undeniable principles of moral law, the obligations of our national compact, and leading to all the awful consequences which flow from such a state of things."

Mr. McMasters, speaking of this argument, says: "Mr. Quincy insisted that we had no right to throw the liberty and property of this people into hodgepodge with the wild men on the Missouri, nor with the mixed though more respectable Anglo-Hispano-Gallo-Americans who bask on the sands at the mouth of the Mississippi." The bill passed notwithstanding this speech, and everybody knows that 20 States lying without the original limits of the United States have since been admitted to the Union, and, singularly enough, the Constitution still lives and the Union survives.

When the bill to authorize the President to establish a Territorial government for Oregon was under discussion, Mr. Dickerson, Senator from New Jersey, said that Oregon could never become a State and would have to remain a colony, and that a colonization system was something the United States had never yet adopted, and he hoped never would adopt. "Is this Territory of Oregon," said he, "ever to become a State, a member of this Union? Never. The Union is already too extensive. The distance from Washington to the mouth of the Columbia is 4,650 miles. A member of Congress coming from Oregon would have to travel 9,300 miles, and this, at \$8 for each 20 miles, the sum allowed by law to Congressmen, would make his journey cost the Government \$3,720. If he were to travel 30 miles a day steadily he would spend 306 days in coming to the seat of Government and returning to his home."

Senator Benton in the same debate argued that this Republic should have limits. Westward the ridge of the Rocky Mountains was a natural and everlasting boundary. Along the back of this ridge the westward limit of this Republic should be drawn and "the statue of the fabled god Terminus should be raised upon its highest peak, never to be thrown down."

Senator McDuffie, of South Carolina, said: "I do not wish to tempt the people to form settlements there. I wish this to be a great empire grown up by the natural course of civilization and the natural extension of population. I thank God even more for placing the Rocky Mountains there. I believe if it had not been for those mountains we would have been already in the Pacific."

Mr. McMasters suggests in connection with these quotations that the drift of evil influence was mistaken. Even while he spoke the tide of immigration was beginning to set toward the uninhabitable country which lay beyond the impassable mountains. Seven years from the day on which Senator McDuffie addressed the Senate the Delegate from the Territory of Oregon was sitting in the House of Representatives.

So late as 1850, in a speech in this House, in the Thirtieth Congress, Mr. Stevens, of Pennsylvania, discussed the question of the right of sovereignty of the United States over territory and people acquired by cession. In that discussion he said:

"For sixty years and upward, after the passage of the ordinance of 1787 and the adoption of the Constitution, no one seriously doubted the right of Congress to control the whole legislation of the Territories, to establish territorial governments, create courts, fix the tenure of the judges and other officers, in short to exercise all acts of municipal as well as political legislation. For sixty years all that authority has been exercised over the North-

western territory, the Southwestern territory, over Louisiana, Florida, and Oregon. In the meantime the question had been definitely and conclusively settled by all the branches of the Government—by Presidents, by Congresses, by repeated decisions of the Supreme Court of the United States. Elementary writers—Story, Rawle, and others—had so laid down the law.

"By the law of nations, when a nation acquires territory, either by conquest or treaty, it becomes subject to the will of the acquiring power. The laws of such power, however, do not spread over it until some express legislation. In the meantime their own laws remain in full force. Not unfrequently such subject-provinces are for a long time governed by very different laws from the country to which they become attached. Canada and other British provinces are to this day. But the very fact of acquisition gives to the sovereign power of the acquiring State all power to legislate for such acquisitions. It requires no constitutional or treaty provision. Wherever the legislative power of the new sovereign is placed, whether in king, parliament, or Congress, there is the whole and only power to govern them.

"Our Constitution places the legislative power in Congress. Consequently, Congress has exclusive power over the territories newly acquired. The Constitution itself does not extend to them, and can have no influence upon them, except so far as it creates and defines the legislative organ of the sovereign will of the nation. None of the officers in the Territories hold by a constitutional tenure. No law of the United States was ever supposed to be extended to any of the Territories by the mere force of the Constitution. The provision for the return of fugitive slaves does not extend to the Territories. Any slave escaping or being taken into New Mexico or California would be instantly free. Hence by the act of 1793 express provision for the subject was made with regard to the Territories which we then had."

NO ABANDONMENT OF AMERICAN PRINCIPLES.

It may, then, be asserted with absolute confidence that to hold possession and exercise sovereignty over the islands in such form and by such agencies as Congress prescribes is not an abandonment of the American principle of self-government for the European principle of conquest. This mode of governing territories and possessions of the United States is as old as the Government itself. All our Territories have been the subjects of Congressional government, with but little regard to the principle of the consent of the governed.

The capital city of the Republic is so governed to-day. If they are not capable of self-government, we must govern them in the best way possible until they can govern themselves. If we can not govern them in accordance with the principles of a New England town meeting, as Colonel Roosevelt suggests, then it is our duty to find out the principles in accordance with which we can govern them, and apply those. The idea of government by any other than American ideals is not proposed by the Administration any more than is forcible annexation of the islands to the United States.

THE FATHERS COVETED TERRITORIAL ACQUISITIONS.

Jefferson not only desired Cuba, but Canada as well, and saw no insuperable difficulties in the Constitution to the attainment of so desirable an acquisition. Not only the fathers, but the sons of the fathers had the same hunger and thirst for the righteousness of empire. In 1854 President Pierce directed Buchanan, Mason, and Soule, our ministers at London, Paris, and Madrid, to meet in some European city to confer in regard to the best means of getting possession of Cuba. Accordingly they met at Ostend.

The result of their deliberations was transmitted to our Government in a dispatch known as the Ostend manifesto. In that dispatch it was said: "The time has arrived when the interests of Spain are as seriously involved in the sale as those of the United States in the purchase of the island, and that the transaction would be equally honorable to both nations. They said the United States ought to purchase Cuba with as little delay as possible, for it is as necessary to the North American Republic as any of its present members, and that it belongs as naturally to that great family of States of which the Union is the providential nursery. Indeed, without it the Union can never enjoy repose nor possess reliable security."

But I had not completed my observations on the traditions of the fathers. Jefferson had some scruples at first about the constitutional warrant for the purchase, but he soon disposed of them, and in his message to the special session of Congress convened to act on the treaty no allusion was made to the subject. He entertained no doubt of the wisdom of the purchase, and was not alarmed at the growth of our domain. Alluding to the apprehension some were under of danger to the Union from the enlargement of our territory, he said: "But who can limit the extent to which the federative principle can operate effectively? The larger the association the less will it be shaken by local passions."

Cuba he desired and confidently expected to obtain. He said: "When we have Cuba, I would go no farther in that direction."

I would erect a column in the southernmost limit of the island and inscribe on it a ne plus ultra as to us in that direction. We should then have only to include the North (that is, Canada) in our Confederacy, which would be, of course, in the first war, and we should have such an empire for liberty as she has never surveyed since the creation, and I am persuaded that no Constitution was ever so well calculated as ours for extensive empire and self-government. But if Spain, dead to the voice of her own interest, and actuated by stubborn pride and a false sense of honor, should refuse to sell Cuba to the United States, then the question will arise, What ought to be the course of the American Government under such circumstances?"

It was also declared in that memorable document "That self-preservation is the first law of nature with states as well as with individuals, and we must apply this great law to Cuba; and if we preserve our own conscious rectitude and our own self-respect we can afford to disregard the censures of the world." That reveals the character of the ethical principles governing the Democratic party. That was the way they poulticed their consciences before entering upon some piece of enormous rascality.

Buchanan, after his nomination for President, in 1856, said he was not opposed to territorial expansion; that our necessities might require us to make other acquisitions; that the acquisition of Cuba was very desirable now, and was likely to become a national necessity. "If," said he, "I can settle the slavery question and then add Cuba to the Union, I shall be willing to give up the ghost and let Breckinridge take the Government." The Democratic national platform of 1860, adopted at Charleston, contained this resolution:

"Resolved, That the Democratic party are in favor of the acquisition of the island of Cuba on such terms as shall be honorable to ourselves and just to Spain."

I trust I have made it clear what principle has been recognized through our entire history touching the power of the Government over Territories, as well as the policy and traditions of our people in respect to expansion. And if those who criticize and condemn the policy of the President would reflect upon the demonstrated wisdom of the expansion of our territory in the past and the glorious growth and splendid achievements it made possible, and would doubt a little of the fallibility of their views and defer a little to the judgment of others, they would come to the conclusion of a very excellent man who once opposed expansion but now says: "When I survey the past and recall the misgivings which far-sighted statesmen had at the time of acquiring new territory in the Mississippi Valley, of taking on fresh responsibilities with Louisiana, of contesting the Oregon line, of welcoming Texas, and crossing the Rio Grande, I am taught by the impressive lessons of our past that, in the language of Hosea Bigelow, 'We don't know all things down in Judee.'"

THE ETHICS OF EXPANSION.

But, Mr. Chairman, I desire to direct attention to some higher considerations. It may be true that there is no decalogue for nations, and that the Sermon on the Mount was not addressed to states. The Christian world, however, rejoices to know that in the evolution of international morals we have reached a time when nations can not dispense with a distinct ethical warrant for their treatment of each other. If we trace the stream of civilization from its first faint glimmering to the present splendor of its altruistic development, we can easily see how marked has been its growth on the ethical side. Steadily has the basis for social and political union widened with the lapse of ages, progressively extending the area of fraternal feelings and moral obligations. John Fisk has shown how the ideas of duty, humanity, and brotherhood, once confined to blood relationship and to the clan, have become expanded and ennobled until they embrace states, empires, mankind.

How marked the contrast between this side of the life of English-speaking nations and that of the most civilized peoples of antiquity. The most enlightened Greeks and Romans exhibited a revolting callousness and brutality toward the people of other nations. Mr. Mahaffy assures us that they were scarcely superior to the savages of the present day in those nobler and kinder feelings which are the redeeming side of human character. Plato, we are told, never recognized rights on the part of the barbarian; and Aristotle, the most sober and comprehensive thinker of antiquity, classed war with the chase as two species of the art of acquisition. When we see that it is amongst the races which have risen to the grandest preeminence that the greatest development of the humanitarian feeling has been observed; that it is a part of the progress of the most advanced people, and a chief constituent in their glory; when we note how sensible we have become that this is an ethical world, a divine universe, God's workshop, in which the moral law is as unfailling as the law of gravitation in the material world; when we see that the universal hope is that this Republic may be placed on the foundations of righteousness where the ages will not prevail against it, that it may become the foremost nation

to recognize that equity, justice, humanity, are the winning forces of civilization, the moral trade winds of the universe, we may well inquire what is the purpose, the function of this altruistic development in connection with the tendency to expansion which American civilization exhibits? Is there not warrant for the assumption that the United States have a mission to guide this force of humanitarian feeling to beneficent ends in the amelioration and civilization of the inferior people within the sphere of our influence?

History until recently has been largely the story of fighting. War at the beginning of the historical period was the normal, if not necessary, condition of nations. Leaping the ages, we behold an era in which it is not the trade of nations, and, indeed, but infrequently employed even as the ultima ratio in their disputes, which are mostly composed by peaceful arbitrament. For every war, every act of aggression, a civilized country feels it necessary to put forward justifying reasons based upon moral grounds. It is stated by a recent writer that in every modern instance of interference—those, for example, of the European powers with Crete, of Great Britain in the Soudan, and of the United States in Cuba—there was advanced a justification having to a greater or less extent an ethical basis, a humanitarian purpose, as the rescue of the oppressed, the cessation of cruelty, the stopping of intermittent massacres and the horrors of civil war.

We behold an era in which it is prosecuted for pacific ends, when "We draw the sword for peace and smite to save." The Revolutionary war, says Mr. Fisk, was fought for the pacific principle of equal representation; the war of secession in behalf of the pacific principle of federalism. The war with Spain we know was waged in behalf of the pacific principles of liberty, justice, and humanity. In each case victory advanced the principles of peace. This progressive development on the ethical side of civilization, based on the solidarity of the human race, is destined to go on in accordance with the providential order until war ceases upon the earth.

Already it is under the ban of Christendom. Civilized man, remembering its inhumanity, its "splendid murder," its ghastly terrors, its terrible compensations, contemplates it with undisguised horror. Yet there are occasions when it must be tolerated as the choice of evils. When the objects are such as engage the favor and secure the alliance of just powers in heaven and earth, when necessary to crush wickedness, destroy tyrants and rescue society from evils incomparably greater than itself, war becomes a high and responsible duty. When offered by the hand of necessity or commanded by humanity, said Sir Philip Sidney, not otherwise, it must be accepted.

Our encounter with Spain was no rash and fruitless war, waged for wanton glory, territorial aggrandizement, commercial gain, or other selfish or sordid purpose. We entered upon the undertaking for the grandest and noblest purpose that ever moved a nation to arms.

Rabbi Krauskopf did not put it too strongly when he said: "What monument, what inscription, will or can do justice to our American heroes and martyrs who fell on Cuban soil and died in American camps, not in our own country's defense, but for liberty for other nations and for the rights of other people and for the salvation of another continent?"

We struck the blow in the name of liberty, justice, and humanity. We took the sword to redress the wrongs of others, not our own, and gave the world a sublime illustration of how nations as well as men in their ascent pass from the plane of the struggle for their own lives to that of the struggle for the lives of others, from self-regarding to other-regarding motives, a distinctly higher level. Service for others at the call of humanity is the noblest exercise of power and marks the highest outlook of national purpose and conscience.

From this point of view the war with Spain appears to be unexampled in history, not alone in its origin, but in its results as well; and if our expectations are not disappointed, it can not fail to be regarded by the dispassionate judgment of mankind, as far as the United States are concerned, as one of the few totally disinterested, stainless, and wholly virtuous acts recorded in the history of the race. It may sound like rhapsody, but it is not when Edward Everett Hale declares "that in one hundred days God has set forward the civilization of the world one hundred years."

I have no doubt that even this extravagant hope will be, in a large measure, realized if we have the nerve to embrace our opportunity and the heroism to meet manfully the duties and responsibilities which the results of the war impose. If the same elevated purpose and altruistic spirit shall characterize the last as gave just renown to the first act of the drama, immeasurable good will come to ourselves, to the inferior peoples involved, and to mankind. To ourselves in raising our Republic into prominence as a coequal with the great world powers, and making it a conspicuous factor in the world problems which loom in the near future, giving us that influential place among nations which belongs to a people who stand distinctly for freedom, humanity,

justice, progress—the essential principles of Western civilization. To the people of the islands of the sea in their gradual instruction in the art of right living and in the principles of just government, in having planted among them the essential spirit of American institutions, education, law, order, industry, commerce, and self-control. To all mankind in the impetus it will give to the development of those principles and qualities which are the product of the ethical system on which Christian civilization is founded, and which have, through the ages and by the rivalries of races, advanced toward that altruistic ideal which is the goal toward which humanity has tended from the beginning.

THE SITUATION.

I need not dwell upon the facts which constitute the situation to which we are to apply the ethical principles which in this age of the world ought to regulate the conduct of nations. That the situation is one we did not see from the beginning does not lessen our responsibility. It is characteristic of important enterprises to lead to results not contemplated in the initial steps. It is a maxim of diplomacy that "no war ever left a nation where it found it." Our relations with Cuba and Porto Rico need not engage our attention at this time, for our duty in respect to them is so clear as to be free from difficulty. We must take care of them until they can take care of themselves. The policy of the Government for three-quarters of a century imposes this duty.

Under that policy no other European nation can succeed to the rights of Spain in any of her former dependencies in the Western Hemisphere. The Philippine Islands, however, present a different question in that it is free from some limitations which simplify the West Indian question and is complicated by some considerations from which the latter is entirely free. We can not be said ever to have had a policy with respect to possessions in the Pacific Ocean or elsewhere outside this hemisphere. It has never been conceived that changes in possessions or modifications in government in the Eastern Hemisphere could be dangerous to our peace and safety or a manifestation of an unfriendly disposition toward the United States. The Philippine Islands, therefore, present a new question, unhampered by traditional policy or preconceived opinion, and it is to be treated on grounds of general reasoning in the light of its own circumstances and conditions with absolute fidelity to good morals and to our obligations to our own people and the inhabitants of the islands.

I do not think there is any ethical warrant for the vain jingo boast that the American flag should never be hauled down. That depends on whether it was properly put up. The form of statement which is agreeable to reason and compatible with morals is that where the flag of freedom is once rightfully planted it shall never be replaced by an emblem of despotism, and at all times and in every place it must stand for just, humane, and righteous government.

The maintenance of this just and conservative attitude involves not only a change in the direction we have been sailing, but the putting on of more sail as well. My sense of the gravity of the situation can not be better expressed than in the words of Jefferson to Monroe, which were, no doubt, the origin of the Monroe doctrine:

"The question," said Jefferson, "is the most momentous which has ever been offered for my contemplation since that of independence; that made us a nation; this sets our compass, and points the course which we are to steer through the ocean of time opening on us." The ethical warrant, the humanitarian motive, and altruistic spirit of our undertaking set the compass that points the way we are to go. Indeed, it is not too much to say that the obligations of duty toward mankind as well as toward the people who have been brought within the sphere of our influence and our own future usefulness imperiously demand that we hold and defend our title to the possession and sovereignty of the Philippines until we have fully accomplished the moral purpose which inspired our undertaking in the beginning and rounded out the noble destiny upon which we are just entering.

That some rough surgery may become necessary, as Colonel Roosevelt suggests, must not deter us from a manifest duty. We had some rough surgery in our country in coercing a portion of our own people to acquiesce in the government of the Union. We must undergo this ordeal if necessity imposes it in any portion of our wide domain. We have never shrunk from it in the past and never will in the future. That our way is beset with dangers no one doubts, but these must be incentives, not deterrents. It may be as Judge Grosscup suggests, that a providential hand, gloved in the smoke of battle, is leading us out of our isolation on to a moral elevation where we can see more clearly the pointing of the finger of duty and destiny, and from which a wider outlook will open a view of the way we are to advance as the evangel of liberty, the messenger of civilization and hope to the inhabitants of our new possessions.

COMMERCIAL SPIRIT.

I have said nothing of the commercial advantage which the policy of expansion wisely pursued will bring to us, because no thrifty

policy of selfishness, no action with respect to the Philippines, whose motive is the pursuit of gain, without more, could justify the assumption of the stupendous responsibilities which the policy of expansion imposes. No results which are recorded in the merchant's ledger or on the balance sheets of commerce, without more, can give validity to the course we are pursuing.

But that course being justified by other and higher grounds, the fact that the situation carries on its wings a double blessing will not diminish the satisfaction with which we contemplate the new character we are taking on. That the gates of the East are open and all the possibilities of world commerce solicit us is a fact we can all look at with undisguised complacency. This, too, though incidental to our main purpose has its ethical side. Commerce is an apostle of peace, the forerunner of civilization. There is much truth in Judge Grosscup's reflections on this point. He says: "Civil liberty and better culture follow the lead of commerce. By creating new wants it stirs new aspirations. By giving to men new surroundings it quickens new character of thought. It reaches a people on their human side, and having thus obtained a permanent foothold, opens to them a higher civilization. If Anglo-Saxon law ever takes root in Asiatic soil, if the people of that far-off continent ever rise to the individual ennoblement and dignity that constitute the distinguishing feature of the English-speaking race, if true popular institutions ever come to supplant the present species of paternal despotism, if the religion of Christianity, like the light of the sun swallowing up in its effluence other lights, displaces their crude religions, these will come to pass because the primal germs will have been borne in upon the tide of commerce. In the character of her rising commerce is bound up the future civilization of the Asiatic people." This is indeed an alluring picture of the possibilities in the way of world beneficence which opens to the march of American expansion.

Henry Buckel shows how contact with nations removes ignorance, which is a powerful cause of hatred and war. It is the true bond of charity and an influential teacher of moral lessons. Every new railroad laid down, every new steamship which plows the wave, is a guaranty of peace. The advantages of what has been called oceanic civilization are not to be overlooked. Europe entered upon this after the discovery of America. Till then the ocean was a boundary; then it became a pathway. Till then the Mediterranean Sea was the seat of the world's industry and civilization. The maritime countries always enjoyed commercial supremacy and excelled in knowledge and progress, because, as Mr. Seeley says, they reaped the benefits of the "civilizing sea."

England achieved the commercial primacy of the world because she was mistress of the sea. Columbus transferred the seat of trade and civilization from the center to the western coast of Europe by making the Atlantic instead of the Mediterranean the highway of commerce. There is a lesson for ourselves as well as the Philippines in the fact noticed by historians that the sea gave an intellectual stimulus to the western nations. Holland took the lead in scholarship as well as commerce. Dr. Draper has shown that when the commercial Phœnicians were masters of the Mediterranean Sea, Europe was in a state of barbarism. When the early Greeks became endued with the commercial spirit their intellect awoke and expanded with their commerce.

The arts flourished, science had its birth, education was encouraged, and schools of philosophy established. Not only this, but the cause of the rapid propagation of Christianity in its first ages we are assured lay in the extraordinary facilities existing among the commercial communities scattered round the shores of the Mediterranean Sea. Through the ages commercial activity has been in a marked degree conducive to the propagation of thought through the constant excitement to intellectual activity. So, too, the history of the reaction of the New World upon the Old illustrates how the sea became the theater of some of the most stupendous results in the evolution of the world's commerce and civilization, and the star actors in that splendid drama were sea powers. Among all the powers of Europe which competed for the New World, success came to that one which most cultivated the sea and whose march, as the song declares, "was on the ocean wave."

THE ETHICAL REQUIREMENTS OF THE SITUATION.

Now what are the ethical requirements of the situation? There were four possible alternatives presented: either to send the Philippines back under the yoke of Spain or dispose of them to other powers, or abandon them to anarchy and misgovernment to become at last the prey of any government that deemed them worth a struggle to possess, or lastly, take care of them ourselves until they are capable of taking care of themselves. From a necessity arising from natural conditions they are wards of the civilized and enlightened powers whose duty it is to give them good government and promote their advancement in civilization. The United States being in possession legitimately are in honor and good morals bound to hold control in trust for civilization, and discharge the duties which dominion and responsibility impose.

The ratification of the treaty will make us responsible for law and order in the Philippines before all the world. This obligation we solemnly assumed when we destroyed Spanish authority and accepted a cession of Spain's title and sovereignty. We are morally bound to provide them with the best government their condition will admit of. This duty cannot be performed by leaving the people to govern themselves in any way they can. We must teach them the ways of good government. We must make conditions favorable to the growth of intelligence, integrity, and honest living. We must teach them self-control, obedience to law, and make them capable of self-government before we abandon them to the tender mercies of mercenary adventurers, unscrupulous military leaders, or to become a *casus belli* to involve the world in war. The national honor is involved in the manner in which we fulfill these responsible obligations. The eyes of the world are upon us, and for the character of our conduct and the elevation of our principles we must answer to the deliberate judgment of enlightened Christendom.

There is but one safe path. The conscience of the American people must control our policy and guide its administration. The problem is not how to escape our responsibilities—any coward can solve such a problem—but how to meet them; not how to use these new possessions for our own benefit, but for their own and the world's. We must be the most conscientious of all nations in our national actions. Scruples of conscience should deter us from a wrong act. Neither the interest nor the glory of the nation should be an excuse for an unjust act. We have duties to the weal of the human race. What we do may give a facility to commerce, a stimulus to shipbuilding, an encouragement to intercourse, and therefore to civilization, which would give our action just title to rank among those acts whose beneficence justify them, but that is not enough to justify us. We must find our justification in the higher motives of liberty, humanity, justice—duties we owe the people who have by the fortunes of war come under our protection—and the more sacrifice we make in discharging them the greater the glory that redounds to us.

This should be our guiding principle, for in it is lodged the power and potency of the humanitarian purpose in our Eastern policy. The government we set up must be for the benefit of the people governed, not the government that will conduce most to the benefit of the United States, nor to some fraction of the people of the islands, or to the revolutionary, adventurous, and ambitious leaders, but to the body of the people who inhabit the islands. Their peace, happiness, growth, education, and civilization are the first objects of our solicitude, and all the agencies employed should bend to these beneficent ends.

The government of an inferior race is a trust, and the ruling and protecting people must never forget that they are in a position of trustees and bound like them to serve the objects of the trust. I agree with Dr. Lyman Abbott that to attempt to govern these islands for our own benefit exclusively, to utilize them for our trade, and exploit them for our commercial advantage merely, would be to reenact the folly, if not to repeat the crime, of Spain. And any such attempt, however disguised, the patriotism and conscience of the American people should promptly repudiate and condemn.

But no such policy is proposed. No one is more sensible of the true nature of the problem of our Eastern policy than the President of the United States. He recognizes more perhaps than any other man the claims of our moral obligations to these weak people, dependent upon us for civilized modes of life, law, order, justice, and liberty, so that they may grow into civilization and become capable of self-government. He knows that all power to do this is lodged in the Congress of the United States, and he insists that it shall be exercised in subjection to the great principles of justice, humanity, and liberty, whose sanction is necessary to the validity of our administration. The agencies we employ are but means to an end, and that end the civilization of the people and their capability to maintain stable government themselves, after which, without their solicitation to remain, our helping hand should be withdrawn.

That the President does not promulgate a policy for the future, whose conditions and requirements no one can foresee, does not justify the criticism that he is taking a "leap in the dark." On the contrary, it shows the superior wisdom which guides his course. Happily for the country, he is not a man who is daunted by dangers. He is a man of nerve, capable, courageous, and conscientious, and I can easily hear his noble and undaunted spirit retorting upon cavilers and critics—

I accept the peril;
I prefer to walk in sublime dread,
Rather than crawl in safety.

These high considerations must be our guide in the Oceanic policy we are about entering upon. No maxims of prudence, no considerations of economy, no sordid purpose can stand in the way of those ethical principles which alone afford justification for our new departure. We enter upon no unholy rivalry for the posses-

sions of others. We have no adversary in all the world to which the old threat can be applied, "*Delenda est Carthago.*" Dr. Abbott expresses the full scope of our purpose—to put an end to foreign tyranny, to terminate domestic anarchy, to establish the foundations of just and stable government and build the superstructure as fast and as far as the conditions of population make it possible.

We seek to destroy no country that we may rear an empire upon its ruins. We propose only to take care of our own possessions and protect and safeguard the weak and defenseless until they are capable of self-government. We will be a knight of chivalry among nations, bringing valor, heroism, and statesmanship to the rescue of the victims of oppression and wrong and teaching the world that liberty and law, right and justice shall be lords paramount within the sphere of American influence.

In carrying forward our new and enlarged policy, which is made necessary by the new relations in which we stand to the world, and the new obligations to humanity and civilization we have assumed, we propose cultivating peaceful relations with all the world, so that the increased commerce, for which we are an honorable candidate, will not be a cause of disturbance or war, but will, as Adam Smith said it ought to be among nations, as individuals, a bond of union and friendship. We are advancing according to the higher altruistic law governing the development of States and nations and the growth of empire; we are moving in harmony with that providential order by which all races are to come under the reign of a higher social régime. Civilization can not spare any portions of the earth to the waste of barbarism; savage tribes can not forever cumber the richest parts of our heritage. They must become civilized or become extinct.

I accept the thought of Henry Wilson, uttered a quarter of a century ago in the Senate of the United States, when he said: "I believe, sir, that every race God has made is capable of improvement, of civilization, of elevation, of Christianity, whether they dwell in the temperate or tropical regions of the earth. I believe Christian civilization will not be limited to lines of latitude, but will make the tour of the globe—lifting up all races and conditions of men. * * * I have undoubting faith that every portion of this globe is to be the home of civilized man. * * * This doctrine that the Tropics are doomed, that the people who now inhabit or are hereafter to inhabit them are destined by the inexorable hand of nature to perpetual deterioration, that the men of other climes and races who go into these doomed regions to carry capital, science, skill, and Christianity are to go down with them, is a doctrine contrary to God's Holy Word, to the aspirations and hopes of humanity. It is anti-republican and anti-Christian, and ought never to be entertained by an American statesman or uttered in the Congress of a nation that believes in the fatherhood of God and the brotherhood of man."

So I believe this is the goal toward which the moral forces of this vital, organic, divine universe, the beneficent Power that is in and over all, is certainly tending. He who opposes this progress fights against the nature of things, contends with God, and must wage a losing battle. In this majestic march from height to height of world beneficence we must not forget that America can only establish the legitimacy of her title to that leadership which belongs to the English-speaking people by so minding her footsteps and guarding her action that every page of our annals will reveal elevation of mind, rectitude of purpose, integrity of principles, and supremacy of conscience, thus certifying to all the world that we are moving on the everlasting lines of equity, truth, humanity, and liberty, following the foreshadowings of the ethical method of God in human history.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I think I have said enough. At some length and some pains I have answered the leading arguments which from time to time have been advanced against the policy of the Administration in respect to "expansion," and I have tried to lift the great theme above the pages of the merchant's ledger or the balance sheets of commerce and place it in the companionship of those higher considerations upon which the true grandeur of the Republic must ever depend.

CONCLUSION.

If we adhere to these principles and aspire after these high ideals, the outcry of the alarmist, the shibboleth "imperialism" used by those who think it safe to sail by the light on the stern of the ship, can produce no terror in those who are not affrighted by the inviting prospect of our country's greatness. Imperialism is not incompatible with federalism. Germany is a federal, yet an imperial monarchy. We are a federal, but we may still be an imperial republic, deserving and holding the noblest primacy that can ever crown a nation, the primacy of humanity, justice, and liberty, going boldly forward to the completion of our destiny, carrying free thought, free speech, free press, free religion, and free government to every people under our flag who are capable of such blessings, and when they are not, making them so as speedily as possible by such civilizing agencies as have for their object the care, comfort, and culture of the human race, and then show the

world an example of the only imperialism suitable to this Republic, the imperialism of man.

This is the imperial spirit James Bryce advises us to cultivate, not a spirit of vain glory or aggression or defiance, but a spirit of pride and joy in the extension of our language, our literature, our laws, our institutions, our commerce over the vast spaces of the earth and the farthest islands of the sea, with a sense of the splendid opportunities and solemn responsibilities that extension carries with it.

I have faith to believe that we will be equal to our opportunities and worthy the grand and noble destiny that awaits us. We have but to remember what it is the primal duty of Americans never to forget, "That man is more than nations, that wisdom is more than glory, that virtue is more than dominion of the sea, and that justice is the supreme good."

Lord, God of hosts, be with us yet,
Lest we forget, lest we forget.

[Applause.]

In closing I give my countrymen this sentiment:

And so I give you all the ship of state,
Freedom's last venture is her priceless freight,
God speed her, keep her, bless her, while she steers
Amid the breakers of unsounded years.
Lead her through danger's paths with even keel
And guide the honest hand that holds her wheel.

[Applause.]

In the lap of the Orient, mother of nations, I fling this pearl of poesy:

Mother Asia, we stand at your threshold.
In far immemorial yore
We left you, great Mother of Nations,
And now we return to your door.
We have circled the seas and their islands,
We have found us new worlds in the main,
We have found us young brides o'er the alien tides—
Now we come to our mother again.

We wandered through ages unnumbered,
We were mad with the fever to roam,
But the new flag that waves at Manila
Proclaims that your sons have come home.
There are weeds in the Gardens of Morning,
There are mildew and dearth and decay,
And your blind days are drear and your heart has grown sere,
The years that your sons were away.

But turn your old eyes to the seaward
Where the flag of the West is discerned.
Be glad, gray old Mother of Nations,
The youth of the world has returned.
They come with the wealth of their wanderings,
They come with the strength of their pride;
Now, old mother, arise and lift up your dim eyes—
Behold your strong sons at your side.

They will toil in your Gardens of Morning,
They will cleanse you of mire and fen;
You shall hear the glad laughter of children,
You shall see the strong arms of young men.
New hope shall come back to your borders,
Despair from your threshold is spurned,
A new day shall rise in your Orient skies—
The youth of the world has returned.

—Sam Walter Foss.

[Loud applause.]

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

Mr. BROSIUS. I now desire to return the balance of my time to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MOODY].

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

Mr. BROSIUS. I have no time.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Massachusetts has fifteen minutes remaining.

Mr. FLEMING. I think he might allow me to ask him one question, if the gentleman from Pennsylvania would permit it. I only want to ask him if he does not—

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Pennsylvania does not seem to yield.

Mr. BROSIUS. If I had anything to yield, it would give me the profoundest satisfaction; but I have nothing to yield; and if anybody will yield it to me, I will be delighted to yield to my friend.

Mr. FLEMING. I want to ask the gentleman a question, if I can get the time.

Mr. DOCKERY. I will give you thirty seconds.

Mr. FLEMING. I simply want to ask the gentleman—

Mr. BROSIUS. I may not be able to answer it in thirty seconds.

Mr. FLEMING. I wanted to ask the gentleman from Pennsylvania—

Mr. MOODY. This does not come out of my time?

The CHAIRMAN. It does not.

Mr. FLEMING. If he does not think that the prose interpretation of this poetry is simply this, that the boys in Asia—old mother Asia—that went out to war, they want them to come back with rifles and cannon to shoot down the boys that stayed at home?

Mr. BROSIUS. I do not.

Mr. DOCKERY. Mr. Chairman, it is not my purpose at this time to make a complete exhibit of the Treasury situation. Later in the session I will do so. I desire, however, at this moment to congratulate the House and the country on the fact that the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Appropriations on yesterday performed a duty which, if it had been discharged earlier in the session, might have saved millions to the people of the United States. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CANNON] submitted a Treasury exhibit which disclosed a mortgaged Treasury and a rapidly decreasing Treasury surplus.

As I am to yield most of my time to one of my colleagues, I desire but a moment to emphasize one or two statements of that exhibit. We have now in the Treasury, as shown by the report of the Secretary, \$273,233,629.29. Two hundred millions of this cash balance was realized from the sale of bonds. The Secretary of the Treasury in his last annual report estimated the probable deficiency at the close of the current fiscal year at \$112,000,000. That estimate, as shown by the gentleman from Illinois on yesterday, is clearly an inaccurate one, because the deficiency on the 1st of this month amounted to \$93,151,000, and if the same rate of expenditure shall be maintained during the remainder of the fiscal year the deficiency will, as stated by the gentleman from Illinois, amount to \$159,000,000. This estimated deficiency is entirely exclusive of the \$20,000,000 carried in this bill for the payment due to the Spanish Government under the treaty which has just been ratified by the Senate.

The actual expenditures of the Government for the last fiscal year amounted to \$532,381,201.35. Of this amount, \$56,000,000 was on account of the war with Spain.

The Secretary of the Treasury estimates that the expenditures for the present fiscal year will be \$689,874,647.37, and for the ensuing fiscal year \$610,958,112.

The estimated deficiency of \$30,000,000 for the next fiscal year is manifestly an underestimate of at least \$37,000,000, as is shown by the gentleman from Illinois.

It is obvious, therefore, that if there be no unusual obligations imposed upon the Treasury there will be a deficiency of at least \$67,000,000 at the close of the fiscal year ending June 30, 1900.

Mr. Chairman, I desire to call attention to this deficiency because it is entirely exclusive of the \$20,000,000 for the payment on account of the Philippines, and is entirely exclusive of the increased expenditure authorized by the Navy personnel bill, which will add, it is admitted, \$2,100,000, and in my opinion \$2,500,000, annually to the cost of our expenditures. This deficiency is also exclusive of the cost of twelve new war ships, which, according to the newspaper reports, are included in the naval bill to be reported to the House in a few days.

Mr. SMITH of Kentucky. And what will they cost?

Mr. DOCKERY. A battle ship fully equipped costs from five to six million dollars, and a cruiser from three to four millions.

The naval bill, according to rumor, carries three battle ships. The deficiency is also exclusive of the Cuban claims which, under the treaty just ratified, may be filed against the United States, \$25,000,000 of such claims having already been filed against our Government. It is also exclusive of the \$10,923,900 liabilities for public buildings, which received favorable consideration in Committee of the Whole a few days ago. It is also exclusive of the amount necessary to meet the requirements of what is known as the Hanna-Payne ocean subsidy bill, a liability which will aggregate, if that legislation is consummated, not less than \$165,000,000 during the next twenty years, and probably reaching as high as \$300,000,000.

This deficiency is also exclusive of the amount necessary to construct the Nicaragua Canal, estimated all the way from \$115,000,000 to \$200,000,000. So that, Mr. Chairman, it must be obvious to the House that during the coming fiscal year, even though we should now call a halt upon lavish expenditures, there must be another bond issue to meet the obligations of the National Treasury.

It was with real pleasure, therefore, that I heard the belated statement of the gentleman from Illinois, the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations. It was with much pleasure that I heard "the voice of one crying in the wilderness" across the aisle, warning his party associates that the time had come for the application of rigid economy to the expenditures of this great Government.

Mr. LOUD. Would not that have been better if it had come before the appropriation for public buildings?

Mr. DOCKERY. I think so; and yet I do not desire to criticize my good friend, because he is not now present. Yes, I think it would have been more effective then than now. When the previous question was demanded on Wednesday last on the first bill reported from the Committee of the Whole, a bill to give Blair, Nebr., a public building costing \$43,000, I was permitted to make this statement:

Mr. DOCKERY. Just a moment. It is obvious to me, Mr. Speaker, that some of these bills are entitled to the favorable action of the House, but I am

fully satisfied that a good many of them should not be approved, especially in view of the fact that the deficiency in our current revenues for the present fiscal year will be perhaps \$150,000,000, and our expenses during the coming year will amount to not less than \$675,000,000.

I then estimated the deficiency at \$150,000,000. The chairman's estimate is now \$9,000,000 larger.

That warning, Mr. Chairman, I made when confronted with an overwhelming majority favorable to the public-building bills then pending. I knew then that the Treasury deficiency for this fiscal year would be at least \$150,000,000, and that the total expenditures would aggregate not less than \$675,000,000 for the coming fiscal year. I uttered that word of warning to the House when facing an organized raid upon the Treasury to secure the construction of public buildings—some of them worthy, but many of them absolutely without merit.

But, Mr. Chairman, I am glad even now to have the powerful and efficient aid of my friend from Illinois, the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations. My words have not been forceful enough to reach this House and perhaps not sufficiently potent to challenge the attention of the country, but, reinforced, as they are, by the gentleman from Illinois, I indulge the hope that during the remaining days of this session we may return to the principles of economy which command a reduction of expenditures wherever that result can be accomplished without injury to the public service.

Sir, I remember that just after the civil war Congress reveled and rioted for a time in the substance of the people; I recall that period when our expenditures reached startling proportions; I remember that, following that period, came the memorable Forty-fourth Congress. That Congress, in response to the command of the people (for they had been aroused), reduced the annual expenditures of the Government by \$30,000,000.

Let me predict, Mr. Chairman, there will be another Forty-fourth Congress soon. It will not, it is true, be designated technically by that number, and I do not know whether it will be the Fifty-seventh Congress or the Fifty-eighth; but, nevertheless, a Congress will be elected and sent here—perhaps the Fifty-seventh, certainly the Fifty-eighth—animated by the spirit of the Representatives who controlled that memorable Forty-fourth Congress; and it will reduce Federal expenditures so that labor may be less heavily burdened than it is under existing conditions. [Applause.]

Mr. JOHNSON of Indiana. I want to ask the gentleman this question: How is it going to be possible ever to cut down expenses under the foreign policy, the policy of expansion, inaugurated by this Administration? Does not the gentleman know that the necessary and direct effect of that policy is that we must greatly augment in the future our appropriations and our expenses?

Mr. DOCKERY. I will say to the distinguished gentleman from Indiana that I recognize that, so far as the military and naval establishments are concerned, this foreign policy necessarily involves a large increase of expenditure. Yet I do believe, if the people send a Congress here that will reenact the Holman rule, permitting the repeal of legislation upon appropriation bills, that Congress can succeed in largely reducing the expenses of the Government. I share with my friend from Indiana the apprehension of constantly augmenting expenditures on account of the military and naval establishments being placed upon a war footing to maintain the foreign policy of this Administration.

Mr. JOHNSON of Indiana. In other words, we are to cut down the necessary expenses of this people for their internal affairs in order to build up a great Army and Navy to sustain an iniquitous foreign policy.

Mr. DOCKERY. I think the gentleman from Indiana is substantially correct in that statement. But I want to say to him that somewhere—whether it be along the line of domestic expenditures or along the line of appropriations for our military and naval establishments—somewhere the pruning knife must be applied, else we must reach out again and lay additional tax burdens upon the people, who are already heavily weighted with taxation.

Congress can not lay the burden upon wealth, because the Supreme Court interposes a decision that an income tax is unconstitutional. If this policy of constantly adding to our expenditures by unwise legislation is continued and the present foreign policy maintained, Congress may be coerced into reducing the expenses of our domestic establishment so as to meet the demands of our Army and Navy upon a war footing in time of peace.

I do not agree with this policy of the Republican party. I do not expect, however, that any appeal of mine will influence the other side of the House. I do not think my appeals will avail much, although a number of gentlemen on that side of the Chamber during the recent public-building raid upon the Treasury stood valiantly for economy in national expenditures. I hardly expect to secure very many recruits from Republican Representatives here, but I do appeal to gentlemen on this side—especially to the Representatives from the South, descendants of the men who for sixty long years controlled and dominated the policies of this Government.

Sir, say what you may about "the old South," about its haughty and aristocratic leaders (as they are characterized by some), if nevertheless it is true that while they were oftentimes prodigal in their own personal expenditures, yet so thoroughly were they imbued with the fundamental doctrines of the Democratic party during the long period in which they guided its destinies they still guarded the National Treasury against extravagance and corruption. Mr. Chairman, I appeal to-day especially to the descendants of those illustrious men—members of the great party in which we are honored with membership—I appeal to them to stand by the cardinal tenets of our organization at this perilous time when there is a growing disposition to revel and to riot in the money of the people. [Applause.]

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE.

The committee informally rose; and Mr. GROSVENOR having taken the chair as Speaker pro tempore, a message from the Senate, by Mr. PLATT, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment bill of the following title:

H. R. 4382. An act to establish a national military park to commemorate the campaign, siege, and defense of Vicksburg.

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

S. 5355. An act to amend an act entitled "An act authorizing the Aransas Harbor Terminal Railway Company to construct a bridge across the Corpus Christi Channel, known as the Morris and Cummings ship channel, in Aransas County, Tex.;"

S. 5086. An act for the purchase or construction of a launch for the customs service at and in the vicinity of Astoria, Oreg.;

S. 5076. An act authorizing the Sioux City and Omaha Railway Company to construct and operate a railway through the Omaha and Winnebago Reservation, in Thurston County, Nebr., and for other purposes; and

S. 5003. An act to restore to their original status as to promotion officers of the Navy and Marine Corps losing numbers by reason of the advancement of other officers for exceptional and meritorious service during the war with Spain.

SUNDRY CIVIL APPROPRIATION BILL.

The committee resumed its session.

Mr. DE ARMOND. Mr. Chairman, my distinguished colleague [Mr. DOCKERY] has called the attention of the House and, I hope, of the country, to the state of affairs at present existing, which may be ignored here now, but which certainly must be made note of at no distant time. Ever since this Congress began there has been a degree of recklessness in public expenditure which, in ordinary times and under ordinary circumstances, truly would be appalling. It seems to make no difference to some gentlemen how great expenditures are, or how heavy may be the burdens upon the people in order to meet them.

My colleague, who is exceedingly well informed upon these matters, and whose remarks, however brief, deserve the careful consideration of those who would be enlightened on the subject treated, hopes that under the leadership of the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations there may be, in the declining hours of this session, a turning toward economy and from extravagance. That, in my judgment, is a vain hope. That leadership is a leadership toward economy in public expenditure when that economy does not interfere with the leader. But when economy does not serve his purposes, then he can lead or follow, as the case may be, in the direction of reckless and extravagant expenditure, as fast and as far as any.

The suggestion of the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. JOHNSON] that, by the imperial policy entered upon by the party in power, there will be created a necessity for extraordinary expenditures which must swell the total, is one, too, that may be ignored here and now, but one, Mr. Chairman, that certainly will challenge the attention of the people of the United States, when they come to pay the increased taxes, which surely will be necessarily imposed to meet the burdens fixed upon them by the increased outlay, and the issuance of bonds; and the question arises, How are these taxes to be raised? How are the extraordinary obligations of the Government made in this manner to be met? There is no one upon the other side of the House who has addressed himself to the question, who seems ready to answer it, or to be able to furnish information.

There is a blind crusade toward something, they know not what. They have started out on new paths; they are plowing strange fields; they seem to be intoxicated with the spectacle opening up before them; utterly indifferent to the facts, or absolutely ignorant as to whether they are nearing the precipice or the morass; led on by false lights and following devious ways, instead of going straight ahead under the guidance of that light which for a hundred years American statesmen have followed, with results so fruitful of good to our country and to the human race.

In this time, Mr. Chairman, of great extravagance, how strange it is that the party in power, if it wishes to deal fairly with the people, shows no thought of their burdens and avoids a recurrence,

so natural, to that species of legislation which will cast part of the load of taxation upon the wealth of the nation, upon the people who are best able to bear it. Why have we not tried, in this emergency, the raising of funds for the war by the agency of a just income tax? It is true that the Supreme Court of the United States decided—overruling the precedents and disregarding the principles of a hundred years to do it—that the income-tax provision in the Wilson bill is unconstitutional; and yet there is a saving clause even in that decision, which points to the fact that in times of public necessity, to meet war expenditures, such legislation would be constitutional.

When legislation to raise money to carry on the war was to be enacted, our friends on the other side scornfully rejected the proposition, which came from this side, for the imposition of this just, equal legislation—an income tax. Instead of that they are willing to place the additional annual burden of fifty millions, or a hundred millions or more, as the case may be, upon the heavily burdened taxpayers of the country, who are least able to bear the taxation, instead of applying a just principle which would operate equally and fairly upon all.

Now, when the plaintive cry of the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations is raised, urging simply a little economy here and there, but nowhere in the region where he is interested, the endeavor to turn to an available, a just means of taxation, which would meet the requirements without imposing any burden on the masses of the people—the income tax, so fruitful for the Treasury of the United States—we are met with a gleeful denial that such a provision shall ever be enacted into law by the United States.

I understand from the remarks of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. Brosius] that he favors this imperial policy which has been entered upon; that he fears that, within the narrow confines of the United States of America, there is not room enough to grow and expand; that population is becoming too dense; that there is too much jostling of man against man; that we need a broader field for our future operations; and that we must seek amongst those islands, thousands of miles away in the Philippine Archipelago, a new field in which to grow and expand and perform and work out the destiny which has been set before us.

We owe an extraordinary duty, it seems, to the Filipinos. A year ago, perhaps hardly one among twenty intelligent people of the country had more than the vaguest knowledge that such people existed at all; and, even at this hour, the wisest of the expansionists will differ by hundreds as to the number of islands embraced in this remarkable find. A few, it is true, may know something about the number, and little else; and yet, with the limited knowledge possessed upon so important a subject and all that it involves, we are to appropriate the money, \$20,000,000, to acquire the Spanish title to these almost unknown possessions.

We are about making an investment in real estate, and about purchasing some chattels expected to go with the real estate. Are we buying 2,000 islands? They do not know. Only a thousand? They can not tell you. But 500? Perhaps; but they must investigate further before they can say. At all events, we need them! At all events, we can not grow and expand and meet the requirements of "manifest destiny," unless we have those distant islands of the sea.

What are we to do with them? Oh, they do not know. They do not attempt to tell us. Every one of them, I believe, who has spoken in a way that might be regarded as oracular, with the exception of the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. Brosius], took especial pains to declare that he had no knowledge of the purposes of the Administration; that he knew not what was to be done; that especially he wished the House and the country to understand that he spoke only for himself.

An occasional one would be quite well satisfied that, pursuing this track of manifest destiny as he thought he saw it, we would achieve great success in the Orient; we would attach to this country permanently, with the blessed chains of affection and under the shadowing folds of the grand old flag, those distant islands and that distant people. Another, also without authority to speak for anybody, confining his remarks to himself and binding nobody else, was quite well satisfied that in a comparatively short time we would retire with honor from the Philippines, somehow, in some way, turning over those islands to the inhabitants.

Somebody suggests that the President ought to have a policy and ought to disclose it. Why, no, they say, the President ought not to have a policy. Simply give him the Army. Give him all the Army he wants. Give him all the Navy he calls for. Give him all the money that you can rake and scrape. "I have confidence in the President," say the gentlemen. That is an answer to everybody and everything. What is the President going to do, or what is to be the result? What is to be the cost? They do not know. They do not even speculate upon it except along the lines of glittering generalities. But they do say, as all-sufficient, "I have confidence in the President. I can trust the President."

Why, the Constitution and our constituents, Mr. Chairman,

have placed some trust in us. It may not be well reposed, but yet we came here of our own volition, and in many instances made a considerable effort to come. [Laughter.] And really we are charged with some duties, now that we are here.

I am not one of those who are going to indulge in harsh criticism of the President because he has not declared some policy. I believe that the Presidential policy ought to be the policy of the Congress of the United States; his duty, simply to execute the laws that we make. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

I believe the duty to declare a policy is here. The Congress ought to declare what is to be done. The Congress ought to fix the bounds and the limits. The Congress ought to confer power and withhold power. Instead of that, this gentleman and the other gentleman on the other side does not know anything about what the purposes are; but he has confidence in the President! Therefore he is in favor of making the Army a hundred thousand men; would make it 500,000 if the President suggested it. He is in favor of stumbling along in the dark blindfolded, because he has confidence in the President!

Here is a proposition now to appropriate \$20,000,000. A short little paragraph, but it means \$20,000,000 from the American people, when expenditures are outstripping receipts. It means a draft of \$20,000,000 upon the industries, the hopes, and the possessions of the people, not only in the present, but in the future. Twenty millions of dollars—a mere bagatelle! Twenty millions of dollars for the acquisition of that territory and that people.

The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. Brosius] suggests that we will remain over there a long time. We are to go as the pioneers of commerce, and commerce is to draw in its wake civilization and Christianity. Here is the grand procession, in the regular order. The flag of the United States of America, far away from its home, far away from republican territory, far in the Orient—the home of the race, the gentleman suggests. And then the beneficent march behind it of commerce, civilization, and Christianity! And what may happen here meanwhile? How shall our people here fare? Oh, it is enough upon that point to say, as gentlemen do say, "I have confidence in the President. I am willing to trust the President." [Laughter on the Democratic side.]

Mr. Chairman, if this \$20,000,000 is to be appropriated now, why ought not this House to fix the bounds and the limits? Do you propose to take in those Philippine Islands as a part and a parcel of our domain, part and parcel of the territory of the United States, to endure and to continue such as long as we can hold them? If you do, say so. If you do not, say not. If you do not know, then why the hot haste for your legislation; why the extraordinary demand for a very large army?

Why the imperious spirit here and in the other end of the Capitol, which rejects all suggestion of amendment; which at the same time that it proclaims that you know not whether your policy is to be temporary or permanent, that you know not whether you are to acquire this territory as a permanent acquisition or for a short time, yet demands the Army permanently; insists upon an army of a hundred thousand men; causes the huge expenditures that are made directly, and the greater expenditures that will follow in their wake, through the extravagance and recklessness and general demoralization which certainly must attend this loose legislation and looser policy? You want so many things permanently; but what will you do with them, how long will you use them? Oh, excuse you from saying anything about that! The President has not informed you, and you do not know.

It has been suggested that the President did not bring on this Spanish war. Perhaps not. Ought the President, therefore, to have an opportunity to make war perpetual? Has the President such an opportunity, or ought one to be made for him?

It is not quite true, however, that the President did not have anything to do with bringing on the Spanish-American war. The President had a great deal to do with it. The sentiment of the country, the sentiment of the Senate, the sentiment of the House, was overwhelming in favor of that measure of justice and decency which would have found expression in the recognition of Cuban belligerency.

The Administration stood against it, and against it stood its agent and henchman, the effective servant of the Administration here, the gentleman who presides over the deliberations of this House. Injustice has been done the Speaker, in the country. Of course I do not take upon myself the duty of setting him right, because he can set himself right, if he chooses to do so. It has gone to the country that the Speaker of the House was opposed to the war. On the contrary, no man in the country, no dozen men in the country, did so much to bring about the war, to make the conditions which made war inevitable, as the Speaker of this House. He did it by suppressing debate; he did it by suppressing the judgment and the sentiment and the conscience of men upon the other side of this Chamber. He did it here in this House, with the iron hand.

Some supposed that he would not be so subservient to the wishes

and so ready in compliance with the demands or the purposes of the Administration. Certainly they must have been mistaken about it. Had the President been here himself, he could not have done, and he would not have done, what was done for him by the representative of his party in the Speaker's chair. He would not have attempted to suppress the judgment and the conscience of the House, and to be himself the whole House. He would not have dammed up the waters until a flood was inevitable.

Why, two things, notwithstanding the opinion of my colleague on the subject—I refer to Mr. CLARK—two things, more than all other things, brought about the war; but really the prime one thing was the suppression of the House of Representatives by the Speaker of the House. The House of Representatives would have declared and done what was American and what should have been done; what was humane, patriotic, and noble; and the House of Representatives was prevented from doing it. And then indignation was abroad in the country. The desire to do what ought to be done increased with every obstacle placed in the way of its execution.

Then came about the condition of things that, in order to appease public sentiment, in order to allure the American people into the belief that something American was to be done, the ill-starred battle ship *Maine*, with the consent and approval of Spain, was sent to Havana; and, unforeseen by every American, the Administration and everybody in the country, that ship was sent to the bottom of Havana Bay, with the brave men who manned her. Then American patriotism and American courage and American manhood rose and swelled above all the petty bounds, above all the obstacles that could be thrown in the way. Then, with the wild tumult and outburst of American patriotism, the war came. Then we were hurried and carried into the war.

But no matter how we got into war; no matter who put us into the war, are we to continue perpetually in warfare? Who can tell when peace will reign in those islands, provided we take up the Spanish title, such as it is, and with it take up also the Spanish policy of repression and aggression; provided we throw to the winds as we cross the calm Pacific into tropical storms the principles which have made us great, and there impose upon a distant people a government which they do not desire?

Who knows how long this may last? Who knows how many gallant American soldiers may be laid in their last resting places close by the shore of this or that island, as vainly they attempt to push into the interior and conquer it, as for two hundred years Spaniards have fought and died and not conquered the interior of a single one of those islands? Then if you do conquer, if you do subdue, if you do bring peace to those islands, what have you? What are you going to do with islands or islanders? How are you going to deal with them, except under the Constitution of the United States? Can you, on the contrary, operate outside of the Constitution? Is that your design?

Are you going to throw the Constitution to the winds? Are you going to turn your backs on the teachings of your fathers? Is the experience of one hundred years to be thrown away, only to establish a new and distinct form of government from that our fathers made, and which it is our duty to uphold because we know well it is blessed? There is no easy stopping in the downward course if you once enter upon it.

Some gentlemen think a great work of patriotism was accomplished when the treaty with Spain was ratified, without the declaration of any policy, without amendment; that it is a mighty triumph of American patriotism. Why ought it to have been ratified without amendment, provided amendment would make it better? The question of whether amendment would make it better or not is a debatable one. The man who thinks it would, certainly displays as much character and ability, in standing for that which he believes is right, as the other man who accepts blindly, relying on the President in excuse for recklessly plunging into the dark, by ratification without qualification.

I feared, I fear now, that following the ratification of that treaty will come the appeal to American pride and American vanity: Shall we part with a portion of our territory? Shall we declare that what we have attempted we can not do? Shall we confess in the face of the world that we are unequal to the task we have assumed?

Gentlemen, what are you going to do? Are you going to perpetuate a military government in the Philippines? If not, how long is your reign to endure? Who is to fix its bounds; who is to terminate it? Upon what basis is it to be terminated?

Who is to make the laws for the Philippines? Who is to make the laws for Porto Rico? Who is to make the laws for Cuba? No power or agency is supplied or suggested so far, except the will of the President of the United States. You may be willing to transfer to him the legislative power, you may be willing to tear the Constitution to shreds, in your confidence in your present Chief Executive, but I certainly am not willing to do so. The harm done may not be so much in specific acts of the President as in the evils sure to flow from autocratic rule.

You are luring the American people into the belief and hope that

they can depart with safety, and probably with profit, from the principles to which they and their fathers before them adhered through storm and sunshine, in peace and in war, with this party and that party dominant, as parties rose and fell, for over one hundred years. When once you have broken the image in the heart of self-governing American manhood, when once you have torn down the altar at which American freemen have worshiped, it may be you can set up again the image, and it may be you can build anew the altar; but history is against it. Every milestone in the progress of the race, upward or downward, since the world began, is mutely eloquent in admonition to us. The chronicles of the ages are big with the lesson that when republics turn toward imperialism, turn backward, it is only a question of time when the end will come.

What a magnificent domain we have! How broad the area of the forty-five free States and the four or five Territories that constitute the birthright of American citizenship! And yet do we need more! What for? Who is crowded? Where does population press upon population? Where are our energies impaired or dwarfed because our population is too dense? Why, in many parts of the country the virgin soil is hardly yet broken. Primeval forests and prairie grass yet remain where a hundred millions could dwell unhampered. The bowels of the earth are full almost to bursting with their richness of mineral wealth.

Upon every hand, whether in the fullness of maturity or the virgin freshness of budding promise, the grandeur of American opportunity invites every American citizen, under the protecting folds of our own flag, within the sacred guardianship of our own Constitution, to renewed effort for expansion and growth and glory in our own home country and hemisphere. And upon all this, recklessly, in the dark, knowing not where you are going, having fixed for yourselves no bounds, utterly ignorant of the results that may follow, you are turning your backs. You take the road through the graveyard of republics without being able to tell, without caring even to ask, where, when, or how you will stop or be stopped.

Now, how much better it would be, it seems to me, for the party in control of the Government and for the nation if the President, its Chief Executive, were constrained to use his powers—if the Government in all its branches would employ its energies—toward holding the American people in loving trust in their own country; to help our countrymen to dwell upon the glories to be won here, in view of the glories that have been won here; to help them to look forward to the coming years of their own lives, and in blissful hope to the lives of their children and their children's children, anticipating the growth of our great Republic, with the Western Hemisphere big enough for it. That would be better far than chasing phantoms in the China Sea.

In this magnificent domain, this splendid heritage, this rich and glorious territory devoted and dedicated to freedom, we are working out the grandest experiment in free government and the elevation of mankind ever known or ever dreamed of by sage, seer, or poet. But all this is to be abandoned. Twenty million dollars for two thousand islands, or one thousand islands, or five hundred islands, and for eight or ten or twelve million people! Twenty million dollars! Twenty million dollars from these white American citizens—\$20,000,000 from these Caucasian freemen—\$20,000,000 from the toiling American patriots—to buy troubles far away, to be added to the troubles at home, and to intensify them!

Can there be no pause in this progress downward? Must you grope and plunge in darkness? Will you not stop? Will you not think? Will you not determine where you are going; whether you wish to go so far?

Mr. Chairman, how easy it would be even now, in this late day of the session, upon this very bill, to put into the law of the country what you desire to do. Do you wish to hold these islands permanently?

Then away with all this talk about getting out of them as soon as possible, about leading those people onward and upward until they shall be capable of taking care of themselves. Let the American public know, if you can, what they have to face. Let them see the worst from the beginning. If, upon the contrary, it be your purpose to depart from these islands in a year, two years, or five years—to depart from them in a reasonable time—why can you not declare it and make it law? Why can you not declare yourselves and assure the country, by legislation upon this bill?

Are you going to educate the Filipinos up until they reach the average of American citizenship? A hundred years—aye, a thousand years—any period this side of the millennium—will find your task uncompleted. Are you going to educate them up to the point when they shall be capable of self-government? What do you mean by self-government? Do you propose to hold those people until there can be formed in their islands a government the equal of ours? If so, vain is your task; idle is your dream.

Such a thing never can be accomplished, and you know it. But self-government does not involve the idea of having a government as good as the best. Self-government, as far as we are concerned with the Filipinos and their islands, if we will be just to our own

people and faithful to the principles which have been laid down for our government and which the fathers followed, means simply to let those people take care of themselves, free from interference on our part. "But," somebody says, "the islands will be overrun. A stronger power will come in and subdue the Filipinos." Are we to stand as guardians for them? Who limits our guardianship to the Philippine Islands? Why not stand guardian for the Chinese? Why not plunge into the jungles of Africa? Why not go into far Central America?

The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. BROSIUS] suggests that if we are to be the leading nation of the Anglo-Saxon race, we must undertake these tasks and perform them. Sir, our tasks are here. Our duty is to our own people. [Applause.] When we have builded a greater republic here, when we have advanced in the development of our resources, when we have furnished the steady light for the guidance of the world, then we shall have performed well our part in history. Here is our theater. Here Providence has cast our lot. Here is the scene of our duty. Here is the field of the glorious achievements of our fathers. Here is the arena for our children. Why seek to enlarge it in the Old World? Why seek to add to it that which never can be harmonized with it?

Some gentlemen suggest that the Filipinos shall not come in as citizens of the United States. That is a confession of the whole offense. What, then, do you want with them? What is to be their relation to the people of this country, if they are not to become citizens of the United States? I do not wish them to be citizens of the United States. I do not believe in lowering the level of citizenship so that they can reach it. I do not believe in adding to the bulk of illiteracy, of venality, of corruption, that which is to come in by the incorporation of the Filipinos.

But do you say, "Let us hold them?" What a magnificent spectacle that would be to the rest of the world! What a travesty upon republicanism for the giant Republic, the exemplar Republic, the Republic in the van, to go into the business of holding colonies and subduing and governing people as the monarchies, absolute and despicable, do!

What encouragement, Mr. Chairman, could we thus afford to struggling humanity the world over? How many thousands, aye, how many millions of people, have looked across the dark scenes of the present, hoping to see the brighter light of the future—hoping to see the gleam of the star of liberty blazing in the great Republic of America, in the western world, and trusting that thence the inspiration would come, teaching that man can govern himself, and inviting the brave, the resolute, the true, the generous, to escape from onerous conditions existing and partake of that liberty which we Americans long have enjoyed.

What message shall we send out to those people if, instead of continuing the champion of personal liberty, we now turn to be the oppressor? How shall we hope to maintain a Government such as we have so long boasted of—a Government of freemen by freemen—if the Government itself is to engage in the business of subjugating and oppressing the Filipinos, lately our allies, in another hemisphere? How shall we hope, after having taken up the business of protecting the oppressed and affording an asylum to the weak and suffering throughout the whole world, to escape condemnation, if in turn, we, ourselves, adopt a policy of subjugation and force rule?

But here are practical questions. What are the results to be? What the benefits? What is the return which is to come to us for the abandonment of the principles of our forefathers and the policy of our Government? The trade returns manifestly will be insignificant. We are told that we will secure "the trade of those islands." Ah, Mr. Chairman, if our people could have the opportunity which would come to them under just laws, to sail the seas with freedom, and participate in the commerce of other lands, under wise and proper legislation, there would be no trouble about commercial progress.

Under wise regulations the commercial instincts of the people will take care of our interests. Our manufacturers, our farmers, our tradesmen, our laboring people, all can win anywhere in the markets of the world, if the restrictions which now hamper them are removed. They need not fear competition with any other nation on the face of the earth. There is no necessity for the acquisition of these Asiatic islands. There is no menace to our present security, for lack of territory. The hopes for the future do not rest upon such course as the party in power blindly would force upon the people. There is nothing of an inducement in the future, to warrant us in incurring all of the dangers of this scheme in the far East, and flying from the inviting fields which are challenging our energies in the Western World.

Will you not, my friends, before going to a point from which you can not return, even if you would, declare in this very bill that your hold in the Philippines is only a temporary one; that we are there by the chance of war and the necessity of circumstances, rather than by design on our part, or in pursuit of a policy in the direction of imperialism; that soon, and we hope very

soon, the prows of our vessels will be turned toward our own land—"the land of the free and the home of the brave"—that soon the last of our heroic soldiers will be on their way to the American shores; that through us soon the Filipinos will have that liberty which we claim to prize so highly—freedom to govern themselves, well or ill, according to their own ability? If that be done now, the benedictions of the people of the land we leave will be mingled with the benedictions of our own people, to whose shores we return; and the President and the party in power will receive the approbation of the populace of the entire United States, simply for doing what it ought to be natural and easy to do.

But, on the contrary, you seem to be turning away from the opportunities which present themselves. You are trampling upon the opportunity fate has brought to you. You are refusing to do for humanity what seems to have been allotted to you to do. You are plunging into an unfathomed gulf, knowing not and seemingly not caring where your landing will be or what will happen.

If the President of the United States, if the Congress of the United States, would authoritatively proclaim to the entire world that we are not usurpers; that we believe in republican principles and the republican doctrines to which we have adhered for so many years; that we are not turning our backs on the ark of safety which so long has protected us—it would be well. In giving liberty to the yellow men of the Philippine Islands we would simply be acting in harmony with the traditions and policies of our own people. Our example then would be grand and unique in the history of the world.

Let us hope—although I fear the hope is vain, but I wish it were otherwise—let us hope that the shackles which bind the House may be riven, and the American Representative, realizing that he is here where he should speak and act for probably 200,000 American people, may rise to the dignity of the occasion and the honorable position in which he is placed, assert his manhood and, acting in behalf of the constituency behind him, sustain the principles and the doctrines of the Constitution of the United States. I am for free government here, opposed to oppression the wide world over.

No expressions about who will haul down the flag affect me. No talk about "manifest destiny," which is concealed from everybody, even those who speak upon it, amounts to argument or reason. If we are true to our trust we will hesitate, we will halt, we will turn back, before we hurl our American fellow-citizens into a sea of debt and overwhelm them with a flood of difficulties.

It is not too late to retrace the false steps taken in haste. Much of the vantage ground was lost, much was lost to America, when the treaty was ratified without amendment or condition. But all is not yet lost. But a little while hence, let this Congress expire, let matters drift on, and then, I warn you now, you will find men rising up here and there and everywhere, and out of pride, or vanity if you please to call it so, protesting against parting with territory "which belongs to us."

They will say, "It is ours. We bought it. We shed blood for it. We hold it. We will not confess that our venture is a failure. Perhaps we ought not to have entered upon this project; perhaps we ought not to have engaged in this enterprise; but we are in it, and we will fight it through. We will endure and suffer; we will risk our fabric of government and the hope not only of coming generations here, but of humanity upon it."

Let us not stumble along blindfolded until the fact, that we never have parted with any territory once regarded as our own, may be used as an argument and a sentiment against doing what is certain, if we persist in this course of imperialism, soon to be proved necessary for our own welfare—to get away from the Orient and devote our energies to our own country and hemisphere, to the protection and the upbuilding of our own institutions at home. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Chairman—

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. BENNETT). For what purpose does the gentleman rise?

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Whom does the Chair recognize?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will recognize the gentleman from Kentucky upon the other side [Mr. PUGH].

Mr. PUGH. Reserving the remainder of my time, I desire to yield thirty minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GILLETT].

Mr. GILLETT of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, as one who would much rather pay \$20,000,000 to be honorably rid of the Philippines than to pay \$20,000,000 for them, I wish briefly to state my reasons for voting for this appropriation, and I feel that I have the more title to do so because it seems to me rather a gross case of larceny on the part of the Appropriations Committee to control this resolution and to take it from the committee to which I belong.

The rules of this House provide that the relations of the United States with foreign nations, including appropriations therefor, shall go to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, which language would certainly include this payment; but I suppose the Committee

on Appropriations, with their natural proclivity for appropriating, seeing this little item of \$20,000,000 lying about, appropriated it; as they would a vacant clerkship, and I am ready to admit that it probably is the simplest and the best way to bring it before the House, and that it makes little difference.

I do not arise now because I have a speech to deliver, for I only reached here from a necessary absence this morning and unexpectedly find this subject up, so that I am entirely unprepared; but no one whom I have heard or read has exactly expressed my views, and as this is the last opportunity before the Philippines pass from the sphere of foreign affairs into that of territories, I wish to state my opinion of the transfer.

I have heard some abuse of the Administration here and some sarcasm even on this side of the House, with which I do not at all sympathize. Through the critical times before the breaking out of the war and during its magnificent progress the President had not only my hearty support, but my enthusiastic admiration. At the time of the signing of the protocol I considered the annexation of the Philippines undesirable and unwise, and I had good reason to think I was still in full accord with the Administration.

I have not at all changed my opinions, but I recognize that to continue always of the same opinion is no proof of being right and that new facts and changed conditions may properly alter conclusions. I have entire confidence in the high purpose and patriotism of the Administration; and although I have not approved its recent policy of ratifying the treaty without any declaration of our future intentions, yet that issue is now past and the future will determine its wisdom.

Originally I did not see why we should take anything more than the harbor of Manila, or at most the island of Luzon. The other islands we had not captured or invaded. We were under no obligation to them, and they could easily be ignored. Any acquisition there more than a harbor and port seemed to me a misfortune, bringing to us a half-civilized people impossible of assimilation, a country fertile indeed, but with a climate unfit for our citizens or soldiers, and a difficulty of administration which would put to test our republican virtues.

I fear that it will be difficult to maintain a pure government at such a distance without the restraining influence of an alert press and a powerful public opinion, and a general publicity such as obtains here. And I fear that the habitual denial of the equality of men and the consent of the governed, which will be necessary there, will react here at home, and may tend to make us less mindful of these fundamental bulwarks of our strength.

Every thoughtful American citizen will agree that our future safety and prosperity depend upon our respect for these inherited principles. And to hold territories when we can not apply these principles at all will be apt to raise at home questions of their vitality, and create a doubt whether here, too, caste and inequality and subserviency should not flourish. The expense of such possessions we are already feeling. I see that one of our prominent military authorities said yesterday in New York that our probability of war was increased a hundred per cent.

Our Army and Navy must grow in proportion. The war revenue is still insufficient for our expenses. And for it all I see no compensating advantage. To gain our share in the trade of the East a great port like Manila is sufficient without encumbering ourselves with other islands. So that on merely selfish grounds I was opposed to these larger acquisitions. But the argument was urged with force, Can we turn these people back to the tyranny of Spain? We owe a duty to them dating from our accidental connection which we can not ignore. That duty we could have well admitted and assumed and yet not incorporated these people into our Republic.

To my mind this has been the serious mistake. The treaty should have been so framed or so amended that we should only assume a temporary protectorate as in Cuba, so that when they were fit for self-government we could set them free if we wished it and must if they wished it. That would have been in strict accord with the humanitarian spirit in which we declared the war. It would have saved us the battle which I have just heard is raging to-day between our soldiers and the Filipinos.

Of course when the armed conflict is on, every American's sympathy and support is with the American soldier. We all glory in their bravery and perpetual success. Yet we all feel, too, that conflict with those to whom we wish to bring peace and freedom and improvement is deplorable and pitiful. It reminds us of the satirical remark of one of our colleagues months ago, "We are going to carry them the Bible in one hand and the shotgun in the other; and if they will not subscribe to one, we will shoot the down with the other."

I trust the blame for this collision is all with our antagonists. Certainly I shall believe so until the contrary is proved. And yet we must remember that one of the weaknesses of military administration is that the best soldier is not always also the most tactful diplomat. Indeed, we have recently had graphic illustration that a very high position in the Army does not always accompany temperance of language or self-restraint. [Laughter.]

Even in this House I have heard remarks about our allies whose wisdom I questioned. A fortnight ago the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. GROSVENOR] and the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. JOHNSON] had a controversy as to whether Aguinaldo was a second George Washington or a second Benedict Arnold. I do not know which was right; I do not believe either of them does, though both think they do. That is one of the troubles with our new venture, that although we have got beyond Mr. Dooley's uncertainty as to whether the Philippines are islands or canned goods, it is very difficult to get definite knowledge.

But inasmuch as Aguinaldo was at that time our ally, the most important personage in the island, the commander of a large force which his personality had assembled and with which we wished friendship, it seemed to me that it was much more politic to call him George Washington than Benedict Arnold; and though I should never have characterized the gentleman from Indiana as a diplomatic person, he was more discreet than the gentleman from Ohio.

The argument has been put forward elsewhere that although we do not want the Philippines permanently, and by holding them until they were fit for self-government we should be doing our whole duty to them and relieving ourselves, yet it was better not to bind ourselves to that in advance, but to wait until the time for release came.

But in that way we expose ourselves to the suspicion of acting selfishly and graspingly. Perhaps we can afford to be, regardless of the opinion of the rest of the world; but there was one people to whom we might well have given a formal pledge of our disinterestedness, and that was the Filipinos themselves. Then I greatly fear that unless settled in advance there will always be reasons for postponing the settlement. The selfish interests of investors and capitalists and speculators in the new territory will always oppose it.

Those who sincerely desire a great expansion of our power, who see us the center of a great colonial empire, will always oppose it. They say nothing now, except "Wait until the time comes;" but for them the time will never come. I do not wish to see this country a great military power. Before this war proved our martial skill and valor, we were the greatest world power, not by force of arms, but by the influence of our ideas and principles, which have acted more on other nations and achieved more change and progress in this century than all the armaments of the world.

Then, too, the cry, "Don't haul down the flag," will always be used to prevent abandoning the islands, but every successful nation has often hauled down its flag. It is not a mark of weakness or of cowardice, but often shows a loftier courage and a nobler heroism than was required to raise it. We shall haul down our flag in Cuba, but I suspect that unless we had made our declaration of that purpose at the beginning of the war we should never achieve it. I feel that if we were consulting only our own interests, Cuba would be a far more advantageous acquisition for us than all the other dependencies of Spain combined. But because of a resolution which had no binding force except on our honor no one has suggested yielding to that temptation, and no one, I trust, ever will.

If we should ever desire to separate from the Philippines, it is uncertain how under the present treaty we could accomplish it. Our Constitution provides for admitting new States, for taking new territory, and we have tested its provisions in that regard, but it does not provide for setting off portions of our territory, unless the provision "to dispose of" territory covers it. We have thus far no guide of experience. And we are similarly at a loss what constitutional rights the people of this new territory have.

Whether they have all the rights of citizens, including immigration, trial by jury, etc., whether customs duties there must be the same as here, are all unsettled and great divergence of opinion already appears. I think those who reserve their judgment are most discreet. On doubtful questions of constitutional law, applying the words of the Constitution to facts which its framers certainly did not have in mind, men always have been governed largely by their wishes.

If a question is very doubtful, one's mind may well be swayed by what he thinks is for the good of the State. Men might argue in opposition to annexation that it gave the natives all the rights of citizens, who, after annexation was accomplished, would hold it most undesirable that they should have a citizen's constitutional rights. Most important and difficult constitutional questions will now arise. One good result may be that it will turn men's thoughts again to the study of the Constitution, and possibly once more, as in former days, make party divisions depend on constitutional interpretations.

Albert Gallatin wrote in 1841:

The objects to which our faculties are applied have a necessary influence over our minds. How diminutive, nay, pitiful those appear which now engross public attention and for which parties contend when compared with those for which the founders of the Republic staked their fortunes and their lives.

Possibly the renewed study of the Constitution may do us more good than the harm I dread from our new territories.

I shall at the proper time offer an amendment declaring that we do not contemplate permanent sovereignty of the Philippines. I am aware it will be of doubtful efficacy, that the appropriate time was at Paris or in the Senate. By a statement then, it seems to me, all our duty to the Filipinos, our missionary purposes could have been effected, and most of our embarrassments avoided. But a declaration now might bind us in honor to free them if they wished.

I shall, however, at all events vote for this appropriation. I recognize that the Constitution gives the Senate power to make treaties; that by their vote this treaty is now a law of the land, and under it this twenty millions is due to Spain, and I shall vote to discharge that legal debt. I do it with regret that the form of the treaty is not different, that the slight changes which would have removed my objections and relieved us from such a permanent burden and made improbable our present state of war were not made, but I can only hope my forebodings may not be realized. [Applause on the Republican side.]

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT.

The committee informally rose; and Mr. GROSVENOR having taken the chair as Speaker pro tempore, a message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House of Representatives by Mr. PRUDEN, one of his secretaries, who also informed the House that the President had approved and signed bills and joint resolution of the following titles:

- On February 4, 1899:
- H. R. 312. An act granting a pension to Ellen Wright;
 - H. R. 2026. An act granting a pension to Sarah A. Halter;
 - H. R. 4973. An act granting a pension to Jacob N. Atherton;
 - H. R. 6625. An act granting a pension to George B. Stone;
 - H. R. 4973. An act granting a pension to May J. Brown;
 - H. R. 5069. An act granting a pension to Jacob N. Atherton;
 - H. R. 2867. An act granting an increase of pension to Henry C. Briggs;
 - H. R. 8037. An act granting a pension to Lizzie Waltz;
 - H. R. 5402. An act to increase the pension of Louis Hirsch;
 - H. R. 8892. An act granting an increase of pension to Jordan Thomas;
 - H. R. 4173. An act granting an increase of pension to Rebecca Otis;
 - H. R. 8299. An act granting an increase of pension to Thomas S. Tefft;
 - H. R. 9295. An act granting an increase of pension to Justin O. Hottenstein;
 - H. R. 6411. An act granting an increase of pension to Henry K. Opp;
 - H. R. 3790. An act to remove the charge of desertion against John Willoughby;
 - H. R. 7561. An act to correct the military record of William P. Brassington;
 - H. R. 11157. An act making appropriations for the payment of invalid and other pensions of the United States for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1900, and for other purposes; and
 - H. R. 11116. An act to authorize the Little River Valley Railway Company to construct and operate a railway through the Choctaw and Chickasaw nations, in the Indian Territory, and branches thereof, and for other purposes.
- On February 8, 1899:
- H. R. 637. An act for the benefit of J. C. Rudd;
 - H. R. 10666. An act authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to permit the use of the buildings of Fort Supply Military Reservation by Oklahoma Territory for an insane asylum;
 - H. R. 774. An act for the relief of Samuel D. Hubbard;
 - H. R. 2274. An act to remove the charge of desertion from the military record of Daniel Straw, late private, Company F, Twenty-sixth Massachusetts Volunteers;
 - H. R. 10912. An act for adjusting clothing account for deceased soldiers in certain cases; and
 - H. R. 6901. An act to prevent the abatement of certain actions.
- On February 9, 1899:
- H. R. 11487. An act making appropriations for the diplomatic and consular service for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1900;
 - H. R. 11036. An act to restore Capt. Robert W. Dowdy to the active list of the Army;
 - H. R. 967. An act to correct the war record of George W. McBride;
 - H. Res. 344. Joint resolution granting authority to the Republic of Venezuela to send a cadet to West Point Military Academy;
 - H. R. 10316. An act granting a pension to George Smiley; and
 - H. R. 10509. An act to authorize the Missouri and Kansas Telephone Company to construct and maintain lines and offices for general business purposes in the Ponca, Otoe, and Missouri Reservations, in the Territory of Oklahoma.

SUNDRY CIVIL APPROPRIATION BILL.

The committee resumed its session.

Mr. PUGH, Mr. Chairman, I yielded to my friend from Massachusetts for the purpose of addressing the committee, but I would not have it understood by the House that I therefore indorse his argument as to the policy of the Government with respect to the Philippine Islands, and much less would I have it understood that I approve the sentiment he has enunciated that the committee of which I have the honor to be a member has been guilty of grand larceny. In the hope that I may find an opportunity on some occasion to refute the charges, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HEPBURN].

Mr. GILLET of Massachusetts. Before the gentleman from Iowa proceeds, I only wish to say that I have no doubt that the gentleman from Kentucky understood how serious my charges were. [Laughter.]

Mr. PUGH. Of course I was not disposed to give a serious interpretation to the remark.

Mr. HEPBURN. Mr. Chairman, I will occupy the five minutes allotted to me to give notice that at the proper time in the consideration of this bill I will offer, as an additional section or otherwise, as may be deemed best, the following, which I send to the Clerk's desk and ask to have read:

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the President of the United States be, and is hereby, authorized to acquire, by purchase from the States of Costa Rica and Nicaragua, for and in the behalf of the United States, such portion of territory now belonging to Costa Rica and Nicaragua as may be desirable and necessary to excavate, construct, control, and defend a canal of such depth and capacity as will be sufficient for the movements of ships of the greatest tonnage and draft now in use, from a point near Grey Town, on the Caribbean Sea, via Lake Nicaragua, to Brito, on the Pacific Ocean; and such sum as may be necessary to make such purchase is hereby appropriated out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated.

Sec. 2. That when the President has secured the territory in section 1 referred to he shall direct the Secretary of War to excavate and construct a canal and waterway from a point on the shore of the Caribbean Sea, near Grey Town, by way of Lake Nicaragua, to a point near Brito, on the Pacific Ocean. Such canal shall be of sufficient capacity and depth as that it may be used by vessels of the largest tonnage and greatest draft now in use, and it shall be supplied with all necessary locks and other appliances to meet the necessities of vessels passing from Grey Town to Brito; and the Secretary of War shall also construct such safe and commodious harbors at the termini of said canal and such fortifications for defense as will be required for the convenience and safety of all vessels desiring the use of said canal.

Sec. 3. That in making surveys for and in the construction of said canal and harbors, the President may detail such number of engineer officers of the Army and Navy or employ such civil engineers as may be necessary, and may require of them the performance of such professional duties as he may desire. The Secretary of War shall have power to enter into contracts for the performance of all or such portion of the work as may be necessary to most speedily and advantageously complete the construction of said canal and harbors.

Sec. 4. That in the excavation and construction of said canal the San Juan River and Lake Nicaragua, or such parts of each as may be available, shall be used.

Sec. 5. That in any negotiations with the States of Costa Rica or Nicaragua the President may have, the President is authorized to guarantee to said States the use of said canal and harbors, upon such terms as may be agreed upon, for all vessels owned by said States or by citizens thereof.

Sec. 6. That the sum of \$15,000,000, or so much thereof as may be necessary, is hereby appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, for the completion of the work herein authorized, said money to be drawn from the Treasury from time to time, as the same shall be needed, upon warrants of the President made and verified by the chief engineer in charge of the work and approved by the Secretary of War.

Mr. HEPBURN. I desire, Mr. Chairman, as explanatory of the motive for offering this proposition as an amendment to the pending bill, to refer to the statement made on yesterday by the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, which I assume is an authoritative statement, although not made as such, that it was not the intention to allow this bill to which the amendment refers to be considered by this Congress. I shall therefore offer this amendment with a view to meeting what I regard as the necessities of the situation.

I know, sir, that it is entirely possible, under the rules of the House, to prevent the consideration of the measure as an independent proposition, and hence I desire to have it incorporated in this bill.

Mr. PUGH. I reserve the remainder of my time.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield twenty minutes to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. ADAMSON] and the remainder of the hour allotted to me to the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD].

Mr. PUGH. Will the gentleman from Georgia allow me a moment so that I may yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GROW], who wishes to make a single suggestion?

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Certainly.

Mr. PUGH. I yield two minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GROW].

Mr. GROW. Mr. Chairman, I do not rise to discuss the pending bill, but I take the floor only for the purpose of noticing a remark made by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GILLET], to which I desire to call the attention of the committee, namely, that if we take these islands and declare that we shall undertake to govern them temporarily, but shall leave them

when the people are satisfied that we should leave them, a condition is offered which places us in a very embarrassing position. Suppose they are never satisfied that we should leave them. How are you to get them out?

Mr. ADAMSON. Mr. Chairman, for many years the project of severing the American Isthmus to connect the two oceans by a ship canal has been a prolific subject of popular discussion, furnishing fine field for promoters, lively speculation in concessions, and the most thorough and comprehensive advertising that ever exploited any enterprise.

Rival projects have of course retarded one another, while it is suggested that transisthmian and transcontinental railroads have displayed considerable activity and probably some liberality in disseminating the impression that none of the canal projects ought to or could succeed.

It is not possible to exaggerate the magnitude nor the importance of the undertaking nor the glory of the achievement when completed.

The ancients regarded engineering skill as exhausted in the creation of Lake Moeris. Monarchy, genius, and wealth united all their power in the earth to pile stones into pyramids, and humanity gazed in awe and wonder at the supposed limit of human accomplishment. The Augustan age, favored by luxury and power as well as great learning, laid out splendid roads and erected handsome villas, created seas and demolished mountains, and compassed land and sea to increase the splendor and greatness of a people claiming to enjoy the highest condition of human civilization and progress. But it was reserved for the present century, dominated by the Anglo-Saxon race, to glorify the lofty achievements of that genius which demonstrates the kinship of man with Omnipotence. Having subdued and utilized all the elements, having harnessed the lightning to annihilate distance by instant communication and to operate vehicles, which, while warming, lighting, and transporting the passengers, almost typify a veritable chariot of fire; having pierced the granite base of the eternal mountains for the thundering passage of the engines of commerce; having bridled the ocean and the winds around us, and analyzed the stars in the heavens above us, we now prepare to rend in twain the mighty continent of the West by an interoceanic canal that will eliminate one-third of the voyage around the world and unite as in one place the eastern and western shores of this mighty country. Exhaustive surveys and estimates have demonstrated the practicability of opening a canal by the aid of Lake Nicaragua and the San Juan River, where is found the lowest depression in the Cordillera Mountains, about 110 feet above the sea level, coupled with the great advantage of vast lakes, thousands of miles in extent, occupying the summit and insuring abundant water supply to flood the necessary locks.

By the work of many promoters and agitators traversing this country and the world, a popular demand has been created that this canal be constructed, and legislative and civic organizations have taken action favoring its construction. But it is unfortunate that the method of its construction has not been definitely pointed out, nor is intelligent discrimination always had as to the different characters of canal, as to construction, ownership, and control. Great prominence has been given to the commercial benefits which are promised by the completion of the enterprise. That would be a good reason to induce commercial people to embark in the venture and construct the canal with their own money.

But, unfortunately, money is chary of risk. It is too conservative. Under the present financial system it does not embark in doubtful enterprises. It alone of all things requires government to provide for its safe investment and profitable use. When its holders venture for a profit less than outright robbery, they want the security of the Government's bond or bank stock. When any great enterprise is to be undertaken, even for individual emolument, they demand that the Government undertake it, though patriotically willing to take its bonds if they can be bought low at good interest, but they do not want any of the hazard of the enterprise. They are very solicitous about the honor and faith of the Government, to the end that it may maintain a standard that would augment in value while multiplying the dollars in their pockets, but they experience no qualms of conscience when many millions of dollars go out from their country's Treasury for the benefit of favorites.

True, capitalists organize companies and send out promoters, who are defined to be "men who sell what they have not to people who do not want it and who have nothing when they get it." They talk very largely about the honesty and wealth of the incorporators, thereby seeking to delude the people who do not know how these fraudulent corporations are organized, nor the difference between what a man owns individually and the little that he pays in or becomes liable for by taking stock in a corporation. The world has been full of this kind of stuff for years, the rich men speculating in concessions and talking about canals instead of putting their money in and constructing the canal, while

in the main the millions that have been expended and stolen were obtained by blarney from the poor; and while the Panama ditch stands as the grave where were buried the hopes and pittances of poor people who were beggared through their deluded investments, it also stands as a monument to incompetency and corruption which will perhaps deter similar private subscriptions for generations to come.

So, in my judgment, if a ship ever sails across the Isthmus, its way will have to be opened by this or some other government or combination of governments. I utterly repudiate as an economic and political heresy the idea that this Government has constitutional power, even with the consent of the Central American Governments, to construct that canal primarily for the use of commerce. If it were built by private capital or by other nations untrammelled by constitutional limitations, this Government could properly participate in a guaranty of neutrality, and in such case it is folly to confuse the subject by talking of our exclusive ownership and control. We could only exercise those rights in case our Government constructed the canal for its own use; and we could only justify its construction at the public cost on the ground that its use was a military and naval necessity.

I am willing that the Government should undertake it for that reason. If incidental commercial benefits result to our fellow-citizens, I will rejoice; and if we could remain at peace with the world so as to offer universal use of the canal and secure tolls enough to make profitable returns to the Government for its investment, it would be exceedingly fortunate. It is assumed that our Government would never undertake to penetrate with this canal the territory of any government which has not fully and voluntarily consented thereto.

That being true, the safe and honorable course to pursue is to proceed according to the Hepburn bill to negotiate directly and fairly with the isthmian Governments, which, understanding better than we do the obligations and complications arising out of the many concessions previously made, are much better prepared to judge the present status of those matters and deal intelligently, fairly, and conclusively with all the various concessionaires. If those Governments are willing that we should construct a governmental canal, they can find a way either by negotiation or by decree and arbitration to annul and conclude every concession hitherto granted, so as to remove all cloud from their right and power and enable them to authorize us to construct, maintain, control, and defend the canal.

They are sovereign as far as their strength will maintain their sovereignty, and have the right to vacate and brush away all unexecuted concessions upon indemnifying the grantees for loss or damage. Their sovereignty will be respected as much more potent if supported by our great Republic as the beneficiary thereof. Of course it is to be expected that whatever reasonable amount those Governments should properly expend in clearing their titles and enabling them to convey to us the desired rights could be reimbursed in the lump sums which we would pay to those Governments for the concessions granted us.

Mr. Chairman, while I have no objection to the construction of the canal by private and corporate capital if among the holders thereof honesty and courage to do so could be mustered up under the authority of any of the 124 concessions heretofore granted, in which case it would be right and proper for our Government to participate in guaranteeing the neutral and uninterrupted use of the canal by all people and all nations; yet I can never vote for this Government to embark as stockholder or partner in any of those enterprises, based on commercial and corporate plans, for various reasons, in discussing which it is perhaps immaterial to advert to any concessions antedating that of the Maritime Canal Company, though the shades of many supposed-to-be-defunct spirits are wandering about and enlivening the atmosphere with reminders of rights and privileges largely imaginary or entirely forgotten.

Those whisperings would be fanned into a tumult and those spirits would be transformed into insatiable demons of greed if the United States should commit the unpardonable folly of undertaking to satisfy all the claims which cupidity and the lobby could invest with apparent necessity to our construction of the canal. I understand that claims have been filed attempting to rejuvenate concessions musty from the decay and damp of half a century. For one I decline to involve my country in such a broil of contention and riot of corruption.

There is no good reason for placing the Government in a corporation to be looted by officials, harassed by litigants, obstructed and interfered with by courts—a proposed course wholly unjustified by principle if for commercial purposes, and entirely unnecessary if for governmental purposes. Whatever it may properly do for the public good the Government can do better in its own name and through its own instrumentality.

I refuse utterly to subscribe to the proposition to prosecute the enterprise under the charter and claims of the Maritime Canal

Company. Though I have sought diligently for some plausible pretext to adapt and extend that concession to meet the requirements of the situation, yet the more I have studied it the more surely has the conviction grown that that concession did not authorize, but utterly prohibited, the acquirement of necessary privileges and property by this Government. It is equally certain that it did not authorize the acquisition of stock in the corporation by any government except those in Central America, which were invited to take 5 per cent of the stock.

In Articles VII and VIII of the Costa Rican concession and Articles VIII and IX of the Nicaraguan concession it is made apparent that only isthmian governments are invited to take stock, and it is stipulated in language substantially identical that "in no case shall the concessions be transferred to any foreign government or any foreign public power," nor shall the association "transfer to any foreign government or public power any part of the lands granted." Such "transfers can be made to private parties only under the same restrictions." Both the spirit and language of the instruments would be violated by the proposed subterfuge of seeking through majority stock of the corporation the benefit of rights and franchises, ownership of which is utterly prohibited.

In some instances where corporate influence is potent with the judiciary that legal device has been used in judicial interpretation to nullify constitutional prohibitions. Even if the doctrine were technically tenable that prohibited ownership of a franchise may rightfully be made available by acquiring major interest in the stock of a corporation designed for its control, yet it would be the refinement of evasion, and could not be wise or honorable, for this great Republic to base its conduct in the greatest work of all the ages on so ungenerous and contemptible a subterfuge to evade the positive language and clear intent to protect two weak sister Republics, to which it is proposed to issue but 6½ per cent of the entire capital stock, which are not likely to acquiesce in such views of the matter, and would probably refuse to accept any stock in the corporation or participate in an organization in the management of which they would have no power.

Mr. Chairman, the scheme of involving the Government in the plans and fortunes, or misfortunes, of the Maritime Canal Company provides for securing the United States for money used in constructing the canal by declaring a lien upon the assets and franchises and empowering the President in case of default to forfeit everything to the United States without judicial or other action, thereby vesting full title in the United States. That raises several important questions. If the United States can legally own 93½ per cent of the stock, it should actually pay in, not merely loan, 93½ per cent of the capital stock ordinarily. But in this case the concessions themselves constitute full payment on the stock and all possible assessments as to the 6½ per cent reserved to the Republics of Nicaragua and Costa Rica.

All future assessments having thus been satisfied in advance, their stock is not answerable for any assessments, and the other stockholders must not only pay in all the capital stock but meet all future assessments. Then there could never be a debt or a loan for any money the owner of the 93½ per cent stock might see fit to invest in the canal. This is clearly in accord with the purpose of the stipulations of those two Republics. There can be no serious pretense that the possibility of loss or forfeiture of their interests was ever provided for or contemplated in the grants by those Governments.

Again, if valid title can not be acquired by transfer, how can it be done by forfeiture? And, furthermore, if title can not be legally acquired by transfer or forfeiture, how can a lien be valuable or available? It is by no means necessary to conclude that those Governments would not consent for us to construct a canal under a new concession imposing different terms and based on an adequate price; but the point is that that particular concession, considering its terms and the price paid for it, does not justify the construction of the canal by this Government on the lines proposed. Consent was obtained in 1884 for us to build a governmental canal for a price no greater than the amount now demanded by the promoters of the Maritime Canal scheme, something less than \$5,000,000. At a reasonable price and on fair terms another concession can be negotiated.

Waving considerations of principle, it is not wise to rely on the forfeited rights of that company and its hopes of extension. They are not tenable before a board of arbitration or a court of law. If we take them, we take them with notice that they have been declared forfeited by the decree of Nicaragua. The suggestion that we ignore that notice and override that decree, "holding a club over" that little Government, as often forcibly expressed, is unworthy the brain or the tongue of an American statesman. This Government can not honorably force upon a weak government recognition of a claim in support of which we would not with equal readiness go to war with the most powerful government or combination of governments on earth, and which no reputable lawyer would support in court.

The publication of such unworthy suggestions is taken advan-

tage of by rival powers and made the text and pretext to arouse the jealousy of our sister republics and fill them with misgivings as to our intentions with regard to their prerogatives, sovereignty, and permanence, they being constantly persuaded into distrust that in our peculiar combination of expansion as to territory and contraction as to currency, liberty, and opportunity we desire to absorb and utilize them as provinces in which to station, support, and reward an innumerable army of political favorites. Let us assure them that, while we have made a great noise about the acquisition of a few trifling, refuse islands that no other respectable nation has coveted for a thousand years, they were all wrested from the control and oppression of a despot professedly in the interest of liberty, and we will never deflower the liberty and prosperity nor disregard the rights and interests of any sister republic, however limited in territory or insignificant in military strength.

If we consume much time and spend \$5,000,000 of money to acquire the imaginary rights and assets of the Maritime Canal Company, who can tell how much time and money will be requisite to dispose of the Grace syndicate? It appears to have the only existing concession from Nicaragua of any value, but it has nothing from Costa Rica. Its contract for concession declares that the Maritime Canal Company has forfeited its right, and that its concession, together with its claims to property, will terminate next October, and that contract authorizes the Grace syndicate to negotiate with the Maritime Canal Company for an earlier termination and surrender of its claims. The Grace contract would allow a transfer to this Government by consent of Nicaragua, but we are left in the dark as to the possible cost of that consent. But that concession provides for a neutral canal for commercial purposes, and would require further negotiation to make it available for Government control.

It is stated without denial that the question of securing an extension by the Maritime Company has never so much as been mentioned in Central America. Its friends and the projects they suggest admit, and even the Senate bill provides, that further negotiation be had to make its concession available. Notwithstanding adroit efforts to keep it in the background, the question forces itself on us, after having reimbursed the Maritime Canal Company and taken possession of its so-called rights and assets, then how much more money and how much more time will be necessary to satisfy the Grace syndicate and secure their concession? Those people are evidently preparing for a hold-up of tremendous proportions. If "rats desert a sinking ship," their instinct also finds the cheese.

Hon. Warner Miller, who exploited this scheme throughout the world and knows more about it than any other man, tearfully regrets persuading poor men into the enterprise, but admits that he had placed "some eggs in another basket" himself by taking stock with the Grace syndicate. I do not mean to call him a rat, however "sly and old," but I think that he can be relied on as a weathercock, and when he spies a storm I should fear to put to sea. It is said, I do not know how truly, that \$100,000 furnished to Nicaragua in time of need, when the Maritime Canal Company was unable to respond to the call, secured this Grace concession. If that be true, it could not be difficult for Nicaragua, in case public policy demanded it, to make handsome indemnity to these people, cancel that contract, and arrange to have a canal constructed instead of permitting an eternal speculation about uncertain concessions and the greater uncertainty about raising money.

The worst feature about that Grace concession is that it was contracted for in violation of the stipulation in the canal company's concession not to grant another during its existence; and the only plausible ground on which the Maritime Canal Company could base a demand for extension is the bad faith apparently practiced by Nicaragua a year before the expiration of their concession by declaring it forfeited, negotiating another, and thereby placing an active competitor in the field to operate against all possibility of success if any existed. I oppose buying out anybody unless we are satisfied with the goods and find a clear title. Even if we knew how many millions the Grace syndicate is arranging to strike the United States Treasury for, and were sure that Nicaragua would consent, we are not certain that Nicaragua would agree to such amendment as would authorize a Government canal—the only kind we can rightfully construct—nor that Costa Rica would concur. Therefore we should go direct to those two Governments in the outset, negotiate for what we need, and leave them to deal with previous contracts and concessionaires.

I shall not discuss the diplomatic situation as affected by the Clayton-Bulwer treaty. It is assumed that if difficulties exist the State Department would proceed to remove them by proper and timely negotiation to amend or abrogate that treaty. Even if altered conditions have not rendered that treaty obsolete, and England still insists that it bars the construction of the canal under Government control, yet it is believed that with proper assurances of fair and universal use of the canal England would yield her consent to its construction by our Government. She knows what some of our people seem not to have learned, that in us looms up

her only rival in power and her only dangerous competitor in business. She knows that while friendly with us she will be satisfied, if accorded fair treatment, to risk her chances of dealing with the balance of mankind, and she feels confident that in the event of a quarrel with us she would be able with her navy to seize the canal and appropriate it to her own purposes. Whether correct or not, these are doubtless her opinions and would probably incline her consent to our construction of the canal.

Our committee eliminated the original provision for the acquirement of sovereignty, as I think, wisely, for our only object is to operate, control, and defend a canal, and does not necessarily involve the necessity and responsibility for governing additional territory. There ought to be little difficulty in arranging to police the canal, with its appurtenances and environments, in time of peace, while existing and possible treaties supplementing international law could be relied upon for the disposition of all criminal trials as well as the transaction of all civil business. If our citizens ramble into that section, they may take their chances of protection, if their conduct deserves it, just as they do when traveling in other foreign lands. There is no force in the contention that because Congress chartered the Maritime Canal Company it is incumbent on us to champion the claims of that company, regardless of their merits, and pay for the privilege. The promiscuous creation of corporations is a small business for Congress to engage in at best, especially when the courts and State legislatures afford such splendid facilities for their manufacture.

If it should be now determined that by assuming their paternity Congress also becomes responsible for the bantlings and is expected to wage their battles, regardless of right or wrong, and stand ready to buy out their promoters whenever they wish to unload, it will greatly strengthen the position of those who contend that the Government ought to abstain from such works of supererogation and confine itself to the business of governing within the powers delegated to it and limited to the purposes of its creation. If the General Government is to take up the cudgel in behalf of all exploded enterprises in which its adventurous citizens have embarked, and all other governments adopt the same policy, "pandemonium" would indeed "reign supreme" early and universal; and if all the concessionaires were backed by strong governments insisting on their rights to rend the Isthmus with canals and deplete the various governmental treasuries, imagination alone can depict the unutterable state of confusion, strife, and robbery. *Reductio ad absurdum* ought to place an everlasting quietus on that ridiculous argument.

If commercial interests would construct a neutral canal which our Navy and Army could in common with all other people and nations use, when necessary, on fair terms, it would remove the apparent demand for its construction by our Government. If we have anything to do with providing the means of construction, our Government must own and exclusively control. If the canal is not necessary to the naval use of the Government, we ought to dismiss the subject from consideration. If, as some conspicuous authority contends, we are not financially able to undertake the work, of course we will be driven to abandon the enterprise, however necessary.

I take no stock in the sensational claims that recent events and new territory have made the demand for the canal imperative. If that were the only argument, it would be more prudent to forego the pleasures and luxuries promised to some enthusiasts by our new possessions, and in that case we ought to lop off while we can, wisely and properly, those prolific and promising hotbeds of disease, speculation, patronage, expense, and corruption, thereby saving the cost of the canal, as well as the expense, slaughter, and humiliation of holding and governing vassal colonies.

If we undertake it from governmental necessity, we must beware of the increased temptations which its possession might offer us to enter upon a career of war and conquest. Increased facilities and opportunities afforded by its existence and readiness for use, rather than stimulate to reckless combat, ought to prove one of the elements of preparation which would discourage and avert the levying of wars against us. I believe with Jefferson that we have territory enough for our growth and glory for thousands of years. If we can return and adhere to our traditional policy of confining our attention to our own affairs and development, scrupulously abstaining from quarrel or alliances with foreign powers, while dealing justly and seeking to maintain friendship with all, "grim-visaged war" no longer will "lift his horrid front" to distract and destroy, but give place to the benign reign the dulcet strains and inviting opportunities of enduring peace.

True, we are expert and valorous in battle. Our wars, foreign and civil, have given to history revelations of genius and bravery unrivaled in military annals. We have little reason to doubt that success and glory would attend our arms if we could see in combat and carnage the fulfillment of our high destiny; but we, above all people, have capacity to demonstrate that "peace hath her victories no less renowned than war." Our fertile country, vast in extent, salubrious in climate, varied in products of field, mill, and

mine, invites every talent and inclination to pursue fortune and happiness in a labyrinth of industrial avenues, affording endless and numberless opportunities.

Despite restrictive laws limiting our trade and unequal financial legislation, discriminating against general business and production, our commerce, domestic and foreign, equals in volume the balance of the world combined. Our material force and resources exceed those of every other country. Our instructed citizens, equipped for mental work, surpass in grade and number those of any other nation, past or present. The stock from which our people descended—sturdy, honest, and intelligent—improved under the institutions of this favored land, has developed a population whose character and attainments will never find a rival beneath the stars. It has been remarked that in discovering America to revive and renew the energies and resources of a worn and wasted world, heaven exhausted its bounty to man. Our country combines the blessings, exempt from the disadvantages, of all others. Her mines rival Golconda. Her balmy sunlight and gorgeous sunsets and cloud pictures and draperies surpass the beauty and genial glow of Italian skies.

Our sparkling water and invigorating breezes insure health and delight, while our rivers enrich and water the land through which they bear our commerce to the seas; we love our towering mountains, heaven-kissed; we honor our noble men, heaven-blessed; and with unspeakable devotion we adore our matchless women, radiant in beauty, while excelling in virtue and every womanly charm of person, mind, and heart. While in the terrible art of war we shall maintain our prowess, it is only in the balmy sunshine of peace that we may reasonably hope to correct our politics by restoring government to the control of the people, reenacting the equitable laws of finance and tariff which permitted general prosperity, and so stimulate industry, genius, and good morals as to verify the melodious prophecy—

Columbia, Columbia, to glory shall rise,
The queen of the world and the child of the skies.

[Loud applause.]

Mr. LIVINGSTON. I yield the remainder of my time to the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD].

The CHAIRMAN. If the gentleman from Georgia will permit, the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. PUGH] desired to yield a few moments to the gentleman from Ohio, as the Chair understood. If that is satisfactory to the gentleman from Georgia—

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Perfectly.

Mr. MOODY. Mr. Chairman, I intended to yield to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. GROSVENOR].

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair understood that the gentleman from Ohio was anxious to have his time now.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. How much time does the gentleman from Massachusetts yield to the gentleman from Ohio?

Mr. MOODY. Fifteen minutes.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. That is satisfactory.

Mr. MOODY. I yield fifteen minutes, or so much thereof as he may need, to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. GROSVENOR].

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

Mr. PUGH. Mr. Chairman, I have an arrangement by which the gentleman from Georgia is to come next.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. I yield forty minutes, the remainder of my time, to the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD].

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Chairman, we are working in the twilight hour of a fast dying Congress. Before we return again to our constituents it may be well to consider what of good or ill has this Congress accomplished for the people of the United States. Two years ago, when the Republican party was returned to power, it came reeking with pledges and promises as to what it would accomplish for the people of our country.

I ask the gentlemen who control legislation, who occupy the other side of this Chamber, and who hold allegiance to the standard of the Republican party, whether or not they have fulfilled their pledges and kept their promises? In the brief time that is allowed me for this discussion I can not review all the issues that were prominent in the campaign of 1896 for which you gave your pledges of relief, but let me call your attention to one or two of the most important of these.

On account of the Supreme Court of the United States having declared the income tax unconstitutional our Wilson-Gorman tariff bill did not raise sufficient revenue to meet the expenditures of our Government. The cry raised by your party in the Fifty-fourth Congress and on the stump in the campaign that followed was that it was necessary for you to be returned to power in order that you might pass a high-tariff bill to wipe out the deficiency in the Treasury and to put the Government on a business basis.

What was the result? Immediately after the inauguration of President McKinley he called this Congress together in extraordinary session. We were in session over four months solely for the purpose of passing a tariff bill. After long and harassing delays the Dingley bill was enacted into law. It was promised by its friends

that within six months after its passage it would raise far more revenue than was necessary to meet the current expenses of the Government. What has been the result? Nearly two years have gone by, and not for one single hour since the Dingley bill became a law has it raised sufficient revenue to meet the current expenses of the Government.

I do not include in this the extraordinary expenses growing out of the war, but I mean those ordinary expenses that we had to meet before the declaration of war with Spain. Instead of the Dingley bill improving the condition of the Treasury, it has gone from bad to worse, until now it is not raising as much revenue as the Wilson-Gorman bill during the last month it was on the statute books, and to-day, according to the statement of the Secretary of the Treasury, there is a deficiency of \$112,000,000.

According to the statement of the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Appropriations [Mr. CANNON], there will be a deficiency at the end of this fiscal year of \$159,000,000. What has become of the promise you made to the country to pass a tariff bill that would meet the current expenses of the Government and put the Treasury on a business basis? You will return to your constituents endeavoring to hide your broken promise in the clamor for Asiatic expansion and the smoke and turmoil of battles in the Orient, where the men you have been chosen to represent are dying far away from home in an effort to conquer uncivilized and heathen tribes.

Again, one of the great issues in the campaign of 1896 was the question of establishing a monetary system for this country. The Democratic party promised that if it was returned to power it would reenact on the statute books an act for the free and unlimited coinage of both gold and silver. We were defeated. You promised that if you were returned to power you would bend your energies toward a reformation of the currency of this country. Have you kept the promise? Nearly two years have gone by and nothing has been done.

The Committee on Banking and Currency has not even reported a bill of any kind for the consideration of the House. You have pleaded guilty to the charge of your incapacity to legislate on this great and momentous question by calling your party together in caucus and resolving that you could do nothing and appointing a committee to advise some future Congress what it ought to do.

In other words, you have violated every pledge that you have made to the people of the United States in reference to granting relief by a reformation of the currency laws of our country; but there is one promise that you made before you were returned to power, and one that the chairman of the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries has repeatedly made on the floor of this House, and that was that you would so amend the navigation laws of this country as to increase the merchant marine of the United States and furnish the farmers and manufacturers of this country ships with which to carry their surplus products to foreign markets.

The surplus crops of those who have been engaged in producing wheat and cotton have always found their markets in foreign countries, and in recent years our great manufacturers who produce the steel and iron, the boots and shoes, the farming implements, the manufactured cotton and woolen goods, and other manufactured articles have been compelled to seek foreign markets for a portion of their output or close down their works and shut their doors against their employees for a portion of the year.

I am informed by those engaged in the business that there has not been a single day within the preceding year when a ship arriving in Mobile, Pensacola, or Savannah could not secure a cargo of pig iron from the Birmingham district for foreign markets. One of the greatest obstacles that have been in the way of our securing this foreign trade has been our inability to secure ships to carry our freight to foreign markets, and I therefore, representing as I do a district that is largely interested in the

export trade, awaited with impatience the promise that you made to increase the American merchant marine.

Finally, a few weeks ago, you did report a bill that comes before the House with the pretense that it was intended to build up the merchant marine to the position it occupied before the civil war when the American flag proudly carried our commerce to the four quarters of the globe.

What is this bill that is known to the public at large as the Hanna-Payne subsidy bill, and bears the title on the Calendar of H. R. 11312? It is a pretense and a fraud. Instead of its provisions being for the interest of the merchant marine of the country, its sole effective provision is to give an increased bounty to one single corporation.

Your glittering promises to aid the manufacturing and shipping interests of the country have resolved themselves into a raid on the Treasury in the interest of a corporation whose capacity for plundering the public Treasury knows no bounds. I make this assertion with the bill before me, and I intend to prove it by facts and figures that can not be disputed.

Let us consider the details of this bill, known as H. R. 11312. It proposes on its face to pay a subsidy to the owner or owners of any vessel registered by an American citizen or citizens, including corporations, that is sailing between ports in this country and ports of foreign nations, and it authorizes the Secretary of the Treasury to contract with said owners of said vessels for the payment for twenty years, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the following subsidies:

On each entry of a sail or steam vessel, not exceeding 16 entries in any twelve consecutive months, 1½ cents per gross ton for each 100 nautical miles not exceeding 1,500 nautical miles sailed outward bound, and 1½ cents per gross ton for each 100 miles not exceeding 1,500 miles sailed homeward bound, and 1 cent per gross ton for each 100 nautical miles over 1,500 nautical miles sailed either outward or homeward bound.

This is the first (a) clause in this subsidy bill. The second (b) is: Steam vessels which may be suitable for carrying the mails of the United States or as auxiliaries to the forces of the United States in time of war or other need, if of the following tonnage and capable of maintaining the following rates of speed under the conditions hereinafter provided, shall, in addition to the compensation provided in paragraph (a) of this section, receive compensation per gross ton, for each 100 nautical miles sailed both outward and homeward bound, at the following rates, namely:

- Vessels over 1,500 gross tons:
 - First. Fourteen knots and less than 15 knots, 1 cent per gross ton.
 - Second. Fifteen knots and less than 16 knots, 1.1 cents per gross ton.
 - Third. Sixteen knots or over, 1.2 cents per gross ton.
- Vessels over 3,000 gross tons:
 - Fourth. Seventeen knots and less than eighteen knots, 1.4 cents per gross ton.
 - Fifth. Eighteen knots and less than 19 knots, 1.6 cents per gross ton.
 - Sixth. Nineteen knots or over, 1.8 cents per gross ton.
- Vessels over 8,000 gross tons:
 - Seventh. Twenty knots and less than 21 knots, 2 cents per gross ton.
 - Eighth. Twenty-one knots or over, 2.3 cents per gross ton.

The bill provides that vessels receiving this subsidy shall carry the United States mails free, and also that any vessel now having a contract with the Government to carry the mails may, on application to the Postmaster-General, be released from such contract.

The following table shows the subsidies that will be received under the terms of the bill; for which I am indebted to the American Economist:

Compensation under (a), section 1.—Steam or sail of any tonnage.

Ports.	Distance in miles.	Each ton, cents. (Multiplier.)	Hundred miles. (Multiplier.)	Com-puted product.	Total per ton.	Per 1,000 tons.	Per round trip.	2,000 tons. Round trip.	3,000 tons. Round trip.	4,000 tons. Round trip.
Portland to Liverpool	2,778	1.5	15	41.67	35.28	\$352.80	\$705.60	\$1,411.20	\$2,116.80	\$2,822.40
Boston to Havre	2,942	1.5	15	44.13	36.92	369.20	738.40	1,476.80	2,215.20	2,953.60
Boston to Montevideo	5,738	1.5	15	86.07	64.88	648.80	1,297.60	2,595.20	3,892.80	5,190.40
New York to Liverpool	3,010	1.5	15	45.15	37.6	376.00	752.00	1,504.00	2,256.00	3,008.00
New York to Rio Janeiro	4,773	1.5	15	71.59	55.23	552.30	1,104.60	2,209.20	3,313.80	4,418.40
New York to Hongkong	16,000	1.5	15	240.00	167.5	1,675.00	3,350.00	6,700.00	10,050.00	13,400.00
Philadelphia to Liverpool	3,190	1.5	15	47.85	39.1	391.00	782.00	1,564.00	2,346.00	3,128.00
Baltimore to Liverpool	3,324	1.5	15	50.16	40.74	407.00	814.00	1,628.00	2,442.00	3,256.00

Compensation under (a), section 1.—Steam or sail of any tonnage—Continued.

Ports.	Distance in miles.	Each ton, cents. (Multiplier.)	Hundred miles. (Multiplier.)	Computed product.	Total per ton.	Per 1,000 tons.	Per round trip.	2,000 tons. Round trip.	3,000 tons. Round trip.	4,000 tons. Round trip.
Baltimore to Rio Janeiro	4,840	1.5	15	22.5	55.9	\$559.00	\$1,118.00	\$2,236.00	\$3,354.00	\$4,472.00
Charleston to Liverpool	3,500	1.5	15	22.5	42.5	425.00	850.00	1,700.00	2,550.00	3,400.00
Savannah to Havre	3,631	1.5	15	22.5	43.81	438.10	876.20	1,752.40	2,628.60	3,504.80
New Orleans to Liverpool	4,553	1.5	15	22.5	53.03	530.30	1,060.60	2,121.20	3,181.80	4,242.40
New Orleans to Havre	4,639	1.5	15	22.5	53.89	538.90	1,077.80	2,155.60	3,233.40	4,311.20
Galveston to Liverpool	4,730	1.5	15	22.5	54.8	548.00	1,096.00	2,192.00	3,288.00	4,384.00
Galveston to Havre	4,816	1.5	15	22.5	55.66	556.60	1,113.20	2,226.40	3,339.60	4,452.80
San Francisco to Yokohama	4,561	1.5	15	22.5	53.14	531.40	1,062.80	2,125.60	3,188.40	4,251.20
San Francisco to Hongkong	6,080	1.5	15	22.5	68.3	683.00	1,366.00	2,732.00	4,098.00	5,464.00
San Francisco to Manila	6,254	1.5	15	22.5	70.04	700.40	1,400.80	2,801.60	4,202.40	5,603.20
San Francisco to Melbourne	6,954	1.5	15	22.5	77.04	770.40	1,540.80	3,081.60	4,622.40	6,163.20
San Francisco to Batavia	7,613	1.5	15	22.5	83.63	836.30	1,672.60	3,345.20	5,017.80	6,690.40
Port Townsend to Nagasaki	4,746	1.5	15	22.5	54.96	549.60	1,099.20	2,198.40	3,297.60	4,396.80
Port Townsend to Canton	5,834	1.5	15	22.5	65.84	658.40	1,316.80	2,633.60	3,950.40	5,267.20
Port Townsend to Sydney	6,804	1.5	15	22.5	75.54	755.40	1,510.80	3,021.60	4,532.40	6,043.20
Port Townsend to Manila	5,968	1.5	15	22.5	67.19	671.90	1,343.80	2,687.60	4,031.40	5,375.20
Port Townsend to Batavia	7,323	1.5	15	22.5	80.78	807.80	1,615.60	3,231.20	4,846.80	6,462.40

Compensation under (b), section 1.

STEAMERS OVER 1,500 AND UNDER 3,000 TONS, 14 TO 15 KNOTS.

Ports.	Distance in miles.	Each ton, cents. (Multiplier.)	Hundred miles. (Multiplier.)	Computed product.	Per ton by (a). (Added.)	Per total ton by (b).	Per 1,501 tons.	Per round trip.	Per 2,999 tons.	Per round trip.
New York to Liverpool	3,010	1.5	15	22.5	37.6	67.7	\$1,016.17	\$2,032.34	\$2,030.32	\$4,060.64

ADDITION FOR 15 TO 16 KNOT SPEED.

New York to Liverpool	3,010	1.5	15	22.5	37.6	70.71	1,052.20	2,104.40	2,102.30	4,204.60
-----------------------------	-------	-----	----	------	------	-------	----------	----------	----------	----------

ADDITION FOR 16 KNOTS OR OVER IN SPEED.

New York to Liverpool	3,010	1.5	15	22.5	37.6	73.72	1,106.53	2,213.06	2,210.86	4,421.72
-----------------------------	-------	-----	----	------	------	-------	----------	----------	----------	----------

ADDITION FOR STEAMERS OVER 3,000 AND UNDER 8,000 TONS, 17 TO 18 KNOTS.

New York to Liverpool	3,010	1.5	15	22.5	37.6	79.74	a 2,392.99	4,785.98	b 6,375.37	12,750.74
-----------------------------	-------	-----	----	------	------	-------	------------	----------	------------	-----------

ADDITION FOR 18 TO 19 KNOTS SPEED.

New York to Liverpool	3,010	1.5	15	22.5	37.6	85.76	2,573.65	5,147.30	6,859.94	13,719.88
-----------------------------	-------	-----	----	------	------	-------	----------	----------	----------	-----------

ADDITION FOR 19 KNOTS OR OVER IN SPEED.

New York to Liverpool	3,000	1.5	15	22.5	37.6	91.78	2,751.31	5,508.62	7,341.48	14,682.96
-----------------------------	-------	-----	----	------	------	-------	----------	----------	----------	-----------

ADDITION FOR STEAMERS OVER 8,000 AND UNDER 10,000 TONS, 20 TO 21 KNOTS.

New York to Liverpool	3,010	1.5	15	22.5	37.6	97.8	c 7,824.97	15,649.94	d 9,779.02	19,558.04
-----------------------------	-------	-----	----	------	------	------	------------	-----------	------------	-----------

ADDITION FOR 21 KNOTS OR OVER IN SPEED.

New York to Liverpool	3,010	1.5	15	22.5	37.6	106.83	8,547.46	17,094.92	10,681.93	21,363.86
-----------------------------	-------	-----	----	------	------	--------	----------	-----------	-----------	-----------

a 3,001 tons.

b 7,999 tons.

c 8,001 tons.

d 9,999 tons.

On its face the above looks like it would increase and benefit American shipping; but we have tried an experiment along that line. Let us make a comparison of the experiment tried in the past with the results to be obtained under the present bill.

On March 3, 1891, the Congress of the United States passed a bill entitled "An act to provide for ocean mail service between the United States and foreign ports and to promote commerce." Under the terms of this bill the Postmaster-General was authorized to make contracts with steamships having an American register, for the term of ten years, to carry the United States mail to foreign ports. Under the provisions of this act the ships to carry the mail were divided into four classes:

The first class to be capable of maintaining a speed of 20 knots an hour and to have a gross registered tonnage of not less than 8,000 tons, to receive \$4 a mile for each outward voyage.

The second class to be capable of maintaining a speed of 16 knots an hour and to have a gross registered tonnage of not less than 5,000 tons, to receive \$2 a mile for each outward voyage.

The third class to be capable of maintaining a speed of 14 knots an hour and to have a gross registered tonnage of not less than 5,000 tons, to receive \$1 a mile for each outward voyage.

The fourth class to be capable of maintaining a speed of 12 knots an hour and to have a gross registered tonnage of not less than 1,500 tons, to receive 66½ cents a mile for each outward voyage.

The Postmaster-General was authorized to advertise for contracts for the carrying of the mail under this act, and, as shown hereinafter, endeavored to make contracts for the carrying of the mail to many ports in Europe, South America, and Asia; but at the present time there are only five of these contracts in existence, which will be referred to hereafter.

Before going into a comparison between the present law and the proposed law let me state that the miles paid for under the act of 1891 are statute miles, and the miles to be paid for under the Hanna-Payne subsidy bill are knots or nautical miles. This should be borne in mind in making the calculation.

One of the contracts in force under the act of 1891 is known as Route No. 36, "O. M. S.," between New York and La Guaira, Venezuela. The contractor is the Red "D" Line, with the *Caracas*, a vessel of 14 knots and 2,584 tons gross, and the *Philadelphia*, a vessel of 14 knots and 2,520 tons gross. It makes 36 trips a year of 2,258 statute miles outward bound, equal to a total of 81,288 statute miles, and as these vessels come under the third class, it receives a dollar a mile, or \$81,288.

The average tonnage of these two steamers is 2,552 gross tons, and under the Hanna-Payne bill for the same service they will receive the following amounts. The distance of 2,258 statute miles is equal to 1,963.4 knots, or nautical miles.

Under clause (a) these vessels will receive 1½ cents per gross ton for each 100 miles up to 1,500, or 22½ cents per gross ton, and 1 cent per gross ton for each 100 miles over 1,500, or 4.63 cents, a total of 27.13 cents under clause (a), but as the vessel is over 14 knots and 1,500 tons, it receives in addition 1 cent for each 100 miles per gross ton under clause (b), making 19.63 cents, or a total of 46.76 cents per gross ton, which, multiplied by the average tonnage of 2,552 tons, makes a total of \$1,159.32 for each single trip.

As there are 36 round trips or 72 single trips made by the line, it will receive, during the course of a year, \$83,471, from which subtract the \$81,288 now received under the present mail contract, and it shows that the increase compensation under the Hanna-Payne bill will be \$2,183 each year, or an average of \$60.60 for each round trip.

Therefore for a vessel of this class it will practically receive the same amount under either of these bills.

The Government also has a contract with the American Navigation Company for carrying the mail on route No. 74, "O. M. S.," from Boston to Port Antonio and from Philadelphia to Port Antonio. The contractor runs in this service four vessels—the *Dewey*, *Sampson*, *Schley*, and *Farragut*—each of 2,100 gross tons, the *Sampson* having a speed of 14 knots and the other three vessels having a speed of 15 knots an hour.

The distance from Boston to Port Antonio is 1,588 statute miles, and from Philadelphia to Port Antonio is 1,642 statute miles. These vessels come under the fourth class of the mail contract, and receive 66½ cents a mile for each outward-bound trip. They make 78 trips a year between Boston and Port Antonio and 26 trips a year between Philadelphia and Port Antonio. The compensation received under the present contract is \$123,569 a year.

Under the Hanna-Payne subsidy bill they will receive \$153,062, or an increase over the present law of \$29,000, or \$141.80 for each single trip, which makes the compensation paid under this, the fourth class of the present law, amount to practically the same that is paid under the Hanna-Payne bill.

The Government has no contracts made under the second class of the act of 1891, which is \$2 a mile for each outward-bound trip; but under the first class it has a contract with the International Navigation Company, carrying the mail between New York and

Southampton, England, known as route No. 57. Under this contract it makes 52 trips a year of 3,641 statute miles outward bound, or a total of 189,332 statute miles at \$4 a mile, and receives a total compensation of \$757,328.

The vessels employed in this service are the *New York*, 21 knots, 10,802 tons gross; the *Paris*, 21 knots, 10,794 tons gross; the *St. Louis*, 23 knots, 11,629 tons gross; the *St. Paul*, 20 knots, 11,629 tons gross. This makes an average of 21 knots and 11,213½ tons gross for each vessel. Under the Hanna-Payne bill the compensation received will be as follows:

The distance in knots or nautical miles is 3,166. Under clause (a) of the bill they will receive 1½ cents for each 100 miles up to 1,500, or 22½ cents, and 1 cent for each 100 miles above 1,500 miles, or 16.66 cents, making a total of 39.16 cents received under clause (a), but under clause (b) a vessel of this kind receives in addition 2.3 cents per gross ton for each 100 miles, which amounts to 72.81 cents, or a total compensation per gross ton of \$1.11¹¹/₁₀₀ for each single trip.

This amount multiplied by the 11,213 tons amounts to a compensation of \$12,553 for each single trip, or for the 52 round trips, or 104 single trips, amounts to \$1,305,740 for each year, or an increase compensation over the present contract of \$548,312 each year, amounting to \$10,544 for each round trip.

It will be seen from the above that vessels of the third and fourth class receive practically the same subsidy under the present law as they will receive under the proposed law, but that vessels of the first class will receive nearly double the compensation under the proposed law that they do under the present law. As the two laws are based on a different system, you can not make a fair comparison without examining the exact tonnage, as provided in the present law, and compare it with the same tonnage in the proposed law.

I have made an estimate of what would be received under the law of 1891 and under the Hanna-Payne bill by a vessel of each class making a single trip between New York and Liverpool—a distance of 3,010 nautical miles or 3,450 statute miles. The comparison is as follows:

First class, 20 knots, 8,000 tons, at \$4 each statute mile, 3,450 miles × by \$4—outward-bound trip—equal to	\$13,800
1.5 × 15 = 22.50 = 37.6 } = 97.8 cents × 8,000 tons = \$7,824—	
1 × 15.1 = 15.1 = 60.2 } round trip	15,648
Difference per round trip	1,848
Second class, 16 knots, 5,000 tons, at \$2 each statute mile, 3,450 miles × by \$2—outward-bound trip	\$6,900
1.5 × 15 = 22.50 = 37.6 } = 73.72 cents × 5,000 tons = \$3,686—	
1 × 15.1 = 15.10 = 36.12 } round trip	7,372
Difference per round trip	472
Third class, 14 knots, 2,500 tons, at \$1 each statute mile, 3,450 miles × \$1—outward-bound trip	3,450
1.5 × 15 = 22.50 = 37.60 } = 67.7 cents × 2,500 tons = \$1,692—	
1 × 15.1 = 15.10 = 30.1 } round trip	3,384
Difference per round trip (in favor of contract) ...	76
Fourth class, 12 knots 1,500 tons, at 66½ cents per statute mile, 3,450 miles × by 66½ cents outward-bound trip	\$2,297
1.5 × 15 = 22.50 } = 37.6 cents × 1,500 = \$564—round trip .	1,128
1.15 × 15.1 = 15.10 }	
Difference per round trip (in favor of contract)	1,069

From the above figures it is shown that although the compensation is largely increased under the first class, slightly increased under the second class, that vessels of the third and fourth class will not receive as much compensation for each trip under the proposed law as they do under the present law.

Again, to carry out the analysis, let me call your attention to the fact that during the time Mr. Wanamaker was Postmaster-General of the United States he advertised to make a contract for carrying the mail of the United States from San Francisco to Hongkong, a distance of 6,080 nautical miles, or 6,992 statute miles. The vessels were of the third class and received \$1 a mile for each outward-bound trip, or \$6,992.

I have not been able to ascertain what was the tonnage and speed of these vessels, but as they came under the third class they were required to have a speed of 14 knots and 2,500 gross tons. Such a vessel for this distance would receive 68.38 cents under clause (a) and 60.81 cents under clause (b) of the proposed bill, or a total of \$1.29¹¹/₁₀₀ per gross ton each 100 miles, a compensation of \$6,455 per round trip, or \$537 less than they receive under the present law.

Another contract made by Mr. Wanamaker was from New York

to Rio Janeiro, in South America, a distance of 4,778 nautical miles or 5,495 statute miles. The vessel receiving the contract was of the fourth class, and under the present law a vessel of this class would receive \$3,656.63; under the Hanna-Payne bill it would receive \$1,873.50, or a difference in favor of the present law for each round trip of \$1,783.16.

After these contracts between San Francisco and Hongkong and New York and Rio Janeiro had been in operation for some years the companies holding the contracts were unable to carry them out on account of losing money, and the contracts were canceled. To-day we have no mail route in operation under the act of March 3, 1891, to any Asiatic port or South American port.

What conclusion are we to reach from the comparisons above made? In my judgment there can be but one, and that is for vessels of the third and fourth class there will be no increased compensation under the Hanna-Payne bill above that of the present law, but for vessels of the first class there will be a very large increase.

Now, how does this affect commerce? We know that the great commerce of the world, the heavy freights, such as iron and steel, manufactured cotton and woolen goods, cotton, wheat, and lumber, are not carried by the "greyhounds of the ocean" that are intended for passenger traffic, but by steam or sailing vessels that have a speed of from 10 to 14 knots an hour and a tonnage of from 1,000 to 3,000 tons. This class of vessels occupies the same position in reference to ocean freight that the freight train does in reference to freight on land.

On the other hand, the great "ocean greyhounds," such as the *New York* and *St. Louis*, occupy the same position in reference to transportation that the modern express train does to land freight. Although they may carry some heavy freight, they are primarily intended for passengers, light express packages, and mail.

My contention is that a subsidy whose benefits will only be received by this class of vessels will not materially increase the American shipping or freight facilities. On the other hand, the Hanna-Payne bill gives no more compensation, nor as much, to the class of vessels that really carry the freight as does the present law, and the present law has proven a failure in that respect.

In 1892 Postmaster-General Wanamaker advertised for contracts to carry the mail from New York to Liverpool, from New York to Southampton, New York to Antwerp, New York to Buenos Ayres, New York to Rio, Newport News to Rio, New York to Tuxpan, New York to Havana, New York to Santiago de Cuba, San Francisco to Hongkong, Mobile to Colon, and many other foreign ports, until in the aggregate they have advertised for over seventy routes to carry the mail to European, South American, and Asiatic ports, with the result that we have only five of these routes in existence at present—No. 36, New York to La Guaira; No. 57, New York to Southampton; No. 69, New York to Tuxpan, and No. 74, Boston and Philadelphia to Port Antonio.

Can it be for a moment contended that, when we have strenuously endeavored for eight years to increase our commerce under a law on the statute book that provides that every vessel of from 12 to 14 knots and from 1,500 to 2,500 tons shall receive a greater compensation than that provided for under the Hanna-Payne bill and have utterly and disastrously failed in the undertaking, the Hanna-Payne bill will be successful as to this class of vessels?

Now, as to the first class of vessels, under clause b of the bill, there is no question that the compensation will be greatly increased, but this class of vessels are not serviceable and could not be operated profitably or successfully between Asiatic and South American ports and this country. I have no doubt that the Postmaster-General honestly endeavored to carry out the present law, but there was no chance to secure vessels of the first class to carry the mail to South American and Asiatic ports.

After eight years of experiment we find that they have made but one contract with vessels of this class for European ports, and the presumption is that on any other route vessels of that class did not find the contract profitable.

It may be contended that the present law is not intended to pay a subsidy to steamships, but merely to compensate them for carrying the mail. This is not true. I find in the report of the Superintendent of Foreign Mails that during the last year the International Navigation Company, under its contract with the Government, carried 68,000,000 grams of letters and 610,000,000 grams in prints, and received as compensation therefor \$580,800; that the Cunard line received compensation for carrying United States mail, but not under a subsidy contract, because it is an English line, and carried 110,000,000 grams in letters and 680,000,000 grams of prints, and received therefor \$172,000. In other words, the Cunard line carried more mail than the International Navigation Company, and yet the International Navigation Company received \$408,000 more for the same service than did the Cunard line.

Again, on page 17 of the report referred to above, I find that the Superintendent of Foreign Mails says: "The mails for Great Britain and the Continent of Europe are dispatched by every fast steamer; and when two fast steamers sail on the same day or suc-

ceeding days, the mails are, as a rule, assigned to the one whose previous speed record gives reason to believe that it will deliver the mails sooner on the other side of the Atlantic.

Other things being equal, preference is given to steamers sailing under the flag of the United States, and especially to those under contract with this Department, at a compensation of \$4 a mile traveled from New York to Southampton. Steamers flying the flag of the United States, but not under contract, are allowed for their service all the postage collected on the mails they carry from this country; that is to say, 5 cents a half ounce, \$1.60 a pound (or \$3,200 a short ton), for letters and post cards, and 1 cent for 2 ounces, 8 cents a pound (or \$160 a short ton), for other articles.

"In the case of a steamer conveying the mails under a foreign flag compensation is allowed at the rate of 44 cents a pound (or \$880 a short ton) for letters and post cards, and 4½ cents a pound (or \$90 a short ton) for other articles, calculated on the actual net weight of the mails conveyed."

In the light of the facts stated before, there can be no question that the bill now before the House known as the Hanna-Payne subsidy bill is brought here for one purpose, and for one purpose only, and that is to increase the compensation now paid to the International Navigation Company.

I have carefully read the hearings before the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries, that reported the bill to the House, and found that the witnesses examined were almost all of them interested in this company; that the attorney for this company, a man of distinguished ability, has prepared the bill, and that nearly every amendment that was offered in the committee and accepted by it was proposed by him.

There are other reasons that incline me to this belief. There is a claim made in the report of the committee that this bill is in the interest not only of American shipbuilders and shipping, but also in the interest of the American sailor. A comparison of the bill with the present law refutes that proposition.

Under the act of March 3, 1891, vessels carrying the mail are required for the first two years of their contract to have one-fourth of their crew Americans. For the next three years one-third must be Americans, and after that one-half must be American sailors. The contract with the International Navigation Company is over five years old, and therefore, under the law, they are required to have one-half of their crew American seamen; but as they are obliged to pay the American more than the French, Spanish, or Italian sailor, this provision of the law has become burdensome to them, and they provide in the new bill, the Hanna-Payne bill, that only one-fourth of the seamen must be Americans, which, of course, is a great reduction from the number they were required to have under the act of 1891. Yet, with unblushing effrontery, they claim in their report that the bill is intended to increase the number of American sailors.

Again, under the act of March 3, 1891, each vessel was required to carry one boy under the age of 21 for each 1,000 gross tons and one for each majority fraction, to be educated in seamanship and rank as petty officers. This provision of the law has also become burdensome to them, because in their bill, prepared by the officers and agents of the International Navigation Company and known as H. R. 11312, it provides that a vessel shall carry one boy for each 1,000 tons gross, to be trained in seamanship, engineering, or other maritime knowledge.

As each of the vessels of the International Navigation Company, as shown in the figures above, has a majority fraction over the division of 1,000 gross tons, they will be enabled to dispense with the training and education of four of these boys.

In other words, under the present law they are required to carry and educate 49 boys in seamanship and to give them the rank of petty officers, but under the new law they will be required to carry only 43 boys, give them no rank, and train them in engineering and other maritime knowledge. I suppose the "other maritime knowledge" includes washing the decks, waiting on the tables, or some other employment less expensive to the company than that given young men who rank as petty officers.

We might infer from the report made by the Republican members of the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries accompanying the Hanna-Payne bill that our Government has never tried the experiment of aiding the merchant marine with grants of money, when, on the contrary, it has done a great deal of this. From 1850 to 1858 it paid the Collins Line \$5,212,091, and the four steamers probably cost the company less than \$3,000,000, so that the Government in the course of eight years presented the company with its entire fleet and two and a quarter millions to operate it with, but yet the line collapsed.

From 1867 to 1877 the Pacific Mail received for its China and Japan service \$4,583,333. From 1850 to 1860 there was paid for the service between San Francisco and Panama \$3,467,763. Between New York and Aspinwall, from 1848 to 1860, there was paid \$2,889,510. From New York to Havre, Southampton, and Bremen there was paid between 1848 and 1858 \$2,893,900, and in the next ten years an additional sum of \$896,724.

From 1866 to 1876 John Roach's Brazil Line received \$150,000 a year, and the renewal of the subsidy was defeated in the Congress of the United States by the Republicans and Protectionists, with no prejudices against subsidies, on the ground that the line did not materially increase our exports, while our imports by it had immensely increased. In all, the Roach Line received a million and a half dollars in ten years, and down to 1899 the subsidies paid by the Government amounted to more than \$25,000,000.

It therefore can not be contended that the proposition to pay mail subsidies is a new experiment in this country. It has been repeatedly tried, and has repeatedly failed, but at this time the shipping interests, recognizing that the manufacturing interests of the country are demanding that the walls which prevent them from reaching out for foreign trade shall be battered down, are rushing to the front with the present bill, and are supporting it merely as a pretense and a disguise to attract the attention of the country in that direction and to prevent them from passing legislation that is really intended in the interest of our fast expanding foreign trade.

There is but one law that will answer the purpose, and that is the law that England has tried and which has proven a success. We must have free ships. Until we repeal the navigation laws of our country and adopt the same liberal policy that England and Germany have adopted we need not expect an improvement in our merchant marine.

Even our high tariff laws are detrimental to the increase of our foreign trade. To illustrate: I find that the iron and steel manufacturers of this country are competing successfully in the markets of England and Germany with the manufacturers of those countries at their own doors, and yet we are not able to compete with them in the markets of France. The French nation are large importers of pig iron, steel rails, and other iron and steel articles, but we are deprived of this market.

You ask why? It is because France has a maximum and minimum tariff rate, and the difference in the duty on pig iron amounts to about \$1.50 a ton and on steel rails about \$11 a ton. England, Germany, and Belgium, our great competitors, are charged the minimum rate, whereas the American manufacturers are charged the maximum rate. On account of this discrimination we are not able to compete with them in the French market.

You ask why France has thus discriminated against us? France has answered the question herself. They say that we do not give them the "favored-nation" clause in our commercial treaties with them, because we discriminate against them as to the importation of French laces and wines and other exports from that country. In other words, the great iron and steel manufacturers of America must be barred out of the French market in order that a few lace and wine merchants in this country may be protected.

Another reason why our merchant marine does not expand is on account of the discriminating port regulations charged at the ports in this country. Foreign ships are excluded from our coastwise trade, something that England has never done. A tramp steamer will not come to the United States, where it can only get a foreign cargo, if it can go to a South American or European port, where it has the chance of getting either a foreign cargo or a cargo for some other port in the same country.

The proposed bill is not intended to expand American shipping in the interest of American manufacturers. It is intended to give an immense subsidy to the International Navigation Company, and probably pay a subsidy to a few tramp steamers that are now owned by American citizens.

The vicious feature of the bill is that it will not increase American shipping, but that if it becomes a law we will not be able to get rid of it for the next twenty years, for according to its provisions Congress may only amend or repeal the act subject to the obligation of the contracts existing at the time of such amendment or repeal.

Therefore a contract made to-day, no matter of what little service it may be to the people of the United States, no matter how onerous it may be in its burdens, can not be repealed, and will have to be borne for the next twenty years.

I opened this speech by calling your attention to some of the pledges that you made to your constituents which are yet unfilled, but before concluding allow me to call your attention to a few things for which this Congress will live in history.

It will go down in history as the Congress that has increased the taxes on the people to a greater extent than any Congress since the civil war, as the Congress that has made greater appropriations and drafts on the public Treasury than any Congress since the civil war, and as the Congress that has authorized the only issue of bonds since the resumption of specie payments, the issue during Cleveland's Administration not having been issued with the consent of Congress, but under the old law.

With its numerous raids on the Treasury in the way of appropriations, and the burdens it has laid on the people by increased

taxes, we may well ask what are the principles that hold the Republican party together, what are the principles for which your followers contend? In the light of recent events we may well conclude that the only cord that binds your party together is the cohesive strength of public plunder. [Applause.]

Mr. McRAE. I would inquire of the gentleman from Kentucky if he desires to go on now?

Mr. PUGH. I desire to yield twenty-five minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

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

Mr. McRAE. I yield the ten minutes remaining to this side to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. LENTZ].

Mr. LENTZ. Mr. Chairman, yesterday the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CANNON] suggested an enormous deficit in the immediate future, and it occurred to me that it might be advisable to call attention to the fact that the Administration could within the past forty-eight hours have saved this Government \$78,375.

A short time since we saw the statement throughout the press of the United States that a brigadier-general in the regular establishment of our Army had said of the Commanding General of the Army the following. I read from the Washington Times of Wednesday last:

He lies in his throat, he lies in his heart, he lies in every hair of his head and every pore of his body; he lies willfully, deliberately, intentionally, and maliciously.

The man who uttered these words pleaded guilty to the offense, and upon that the President of the United States made this significant declaration:

The accused, after a trial by court-martial composed of officers of high rank and distinguished services, has been found guilty of conduct unworthy of an officer holding a commission of the United States and obnoxious to the highest degree to the discipline and good order of the military establishment.

Now, gentlemen, if General Sherman or General Grant or General Sheridan, after their distinguished services to the country, had asked for a leave of absence exceeding thirty days in a single year, to make a trip around the world or to investigate the military institutions of Europe, what would have been the law that would have been applied to them? I read from the military laws, section 621, these words:

Officers when absent on account of sickness or wounds, or lawfully absent from duty and on waiting orders, shall receive full pay; when absent with leave, for other causes, full pay during such absence not exceeding in the aggregate thirty days in one year, and half pay during such absence exceeding thirty days in one year.

The most distinguished officer in the Army of the United States can not receive a leave of absence exceeding thirty days without suffering a reduction of one-half of his pay.

Now, by way of punishment—aye, by way of reward for this obnoxious conduct on the part of the brigadier-general—the President of the United States says to him what the President could not have said to General Sherman or General Grant, "I give you six years' leave of absence; go act as a traveling man for the beef trust, if you choose; go tender your services to the plutocracy and money power for the next six years, and this Government will pay you \$5,500 a year." Thirty-three thousand dollars in the next six years will be taken out of the public Treasury for a man who has been guilty of the grossest insult that has ever been perpetrated in the American Army in the history of it from the days of Washington down to this hour. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

That is not all. It is stated by the Adjutant-General that the brigadier-general will have reached the retiring age within a few days after the six years are up. In other words, if he had reached the age of 64 in five years, then the suspension would have been five years; if he had reached it in four years, then the suspension would have been four years. But it is so arranged in this suspension that the brigadier-general comes back to the full glory of the American epaulets of a brigadier a few days before he is 64 years of age, and then he is to be retired under the law—section 620—which will pay him three-fourths annually of \$5,500, which will amount to \$4,125 a year.

As his expectancy from the age of 64 is eleven years, in that eleven years he will receive \$45,375 additional out of the Treasury of the public; in all, \$33,000 and \$45,375, making \$78,375 for a man who says to the Commanding General of the Army that "he lies in every pore, lies in every hair, lies in his throat, and in his heart" when the Commanding General had simply told the truth; and there are 50,000 privates that will testify that they were fed rotten meat that they could not stomach. [Applause.] That meat caused diseases and death, and we had it certified here in the enormous, outrageous death roll in the camps in our own home States. Seventy-eight thousand three hundred and seventy-five dollars to a man who will never render another day's service to the United States!

This suspension is so arranged that this man will draw \$78,000 out of your Treasury without being on duty a single day. Have

you ever heard of any such thing? Is there an American officer to-day in the service who could not afford to accept that punishment? There is not a lieutenant, not a captain, not a brigadier-general that would fail to accept a leave of absence until a few days before being 64 years of age and then retire and get to draw three-fourths pay for the rest of his life. My friends, there is not a Congressman on the floor of this House that could not afford to accept this punishment of \$5,500 a year for the next six years, without doing anything, and \$4,125 a year for the next eleven. [Applause.] There is not a Senator over at the other end of the Capitol that could not afford this punishment. There is not a man on the Supreme Bench of the United States that could not afford to be punished by such an enormous punishment as this! [Laughter.]

Let us all be punished to-morrow morning! [Laughter.] Seventy-eight thousand three hundred and seventy-five dollars for calling the Commander of the Army a "liar in every pore." Why, sir, if he had called the President of the United States a liar "in his throat and in his heart and in every pore," I suppose he would have got a million dollars! [Laughter.] What lieutenant in the Army will not read this report and think that the best way to promote himself will be to call his commanding officer a liar and take the discipline, take the punishment? Aye, my friends, it is apparent here that a reward has been given the man who attacks General Miles in such language as this. I am not a defender of General Miles, but I want to say that he took Porto Rico with a loss of three men in a campaign of nineteen days, when he was directed to meet 17,000 Spaniards, armed with Mausers, and directed to meet them on the military road; and instead of doing that he came in at the other end of the island and took Porto Rico almost without loss of blood on our side.

If we are to award military heroes for distinguished service and for saving the lives and health of our boys, then General Miles stands preeminent in this war, equaled only by Dewey and Schley. If we are proud of the history of America, and if we are proud of Andrew Jackson and his brilliant victory at New Orleans, we must couple with Andrew Jackson in military and naval services the names of Dewey and Schley and General Miles. The slaughter at Santiago was four times as large as they dared to report it. In the first report, the first day we were told we lost 600 killed and wounded; the next day we were told it was 1,100; the next day we were told it was 1,600, and finally we were told that the entire list of killed and wounded at Santiago was 2,000, to say nothing of the thousands that have been forever demoralized and diseased by the rotten beef that they had given them in the camps.

Truth forever on the scaffold;
Wrong forever on the throne.

Hence it is in order to hang General Miles. Let the inquisition begin. Let none but cuckoos speak about the President, and meanwhile do everything possible to discredit the Commanding General of the Army. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. MOODY. I move that the committee rise.

The motion was agreed to.

The committee accordingly rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. SHERMAN, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that committee had had under consideration the sundry civil appropriation bill, and had come to no resolution thereon.

CABLE COMMUNICATION BETWEEN UNITED STATES AND PACIFIC ISLANDS.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will lay before the House a message from the President of the United States.

The Clerk read as follows:

To the Senate and House of Representatives:

As a consequence of the ratification of the treaty of peace between the United States and Spain and its expected ratification by the Spanish Government, the United States will come into possession of the Philippine Islands on the farther shores of the Pacific. The Hawaiian Islands and Guam becoming United States territory and forming convenient stopping places on the way across the sea, the necessity for speedy cable communication between the United States and all these Pacific Islands has become imperative. Such communication should be established in such a way as to be wholly under the control of the United States whether in time of peace or of war. At present the Philippines can be reached only by cables which pass through many foreign countries, and the Hawaiian Islands and Guam can only be communicated with by steamers, involving delays in each instance of at least a week. The present condition should not be allowed to continue for a moment longer than is absolutely necessary.

So long ago as 1885 reference was made in an Executive message to Congress to the necessity for cable communication between the United States and Hawaii. This necessity has greatly increased since then. The question has been discussed in the Fifty-second, Fifty-fourth, and Fifty-fifth Congresses, in each of which some effort has been made looking toward laying a cable at least as far as the Hawaiian Islands.

The time has now arrived when a cable in the Pacific must extend at least as far as Manila, touching at the Hawaiian Islands and Guam on the way. Two methods of establishing this cable communication at once suggest themselves: First, construction and maintenance of such a cable by and at the expense of the United States Government; and second, construction and maintenance of such a cable by a private United States corporation under such safeguards as Congress shall impose.

I do not make any recommendations to Congress as to which of these

methods would be the more desirable. A cable of the length of that proposed requires so much time for construction and laying that it is estimated that at least two years must elapse after giving the order for the cable before the entire system could be successfully laid and put in operation. Further, deep-sea soundings must be taken west of the Hawaiian Islands before the final route for the cable can be selected. Under these circumstances it becomes a paramount necessity that measures should be taken before the close of the present Congress to provide such means as may seem most suitable for the establishment of a cable system.

I commend the whole subject to the careful consideration of the Congress and to such prompt action as may seem advisable.

WILLIAM MCKINLEY.

EXECUTIVE MANSION,

Washington, February 10, 1899.

Mr. MOODY. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

Mr. GIBSON. Give us a night session; we need it.

The question was taken; and the Speaker being in doubt, the House divided.

Mr. MOODY. Mr. Speaker, pending the announcement of the vote, I desire to submit a parliamentary inquiry. Under the order adopted to-day for the extending of general debate on this bill to the whole of the legislative day, my inquiry is whether, under the rules, if we do not adjourn, but take a recess, it would not be in order in the evening session to enter upon general debate on this bill?

Mr. McRAE. I will say that there is no disposition on this side to use the night session for general debate.

Mr. DOCKERY. We do not want to interfere with pension legislation.

Mr. SIMPSON. No; we are the friends of the soldier. [Laughter.]

Mr. CANNON. "I am an Englishman." [Laughter.]

Mr. ALLEN. I desire to say, Mr. Speaker, that there is no knowing what we may want to do by the time the night comes on. [Laughter.]

The SPEAKER. In answer to the parliamentary inquiry, the Chair thinks that under the vote of the House general debate would be in order.

Mr. McRAE. By unanimous consent could not that be modified?

The SPEAKER. It could.

Mr. DOCKERY. There is no intention to use the night session for general debate.

The SPEAKER. That may be, but the Chair thinks the expression used was "the legislative day."

Mr. McRAE. I am sure the language of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CANNON], when he said that he would be willing to extend the time beyond 5 o'clock, clearly indicated that general debate was to close at 5 o'clock.

Mr. CANNON. I did not think of this being Friday.

The SPEAKER. I do not think any member of the House thought about it.

Mr. CANNON. Well, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that general debate be now closed.

There was no objection.

Mr. MOODY. Mr. Speaker, I want to say that in making the motion to adjourn, I supposed I was conforming to the desire of the Committee on Invalid Pensions. I had no other desire or intention.

The SPEAKER. On this question the ayes are 22 and the noes are 52, and the House determines not to adjourn.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will lay before the House the report of the Committee on Enrolled Bills.

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

H. R. 5019. An act for a light vessel off Tail of Horse Shoe, Chesapeake Bay.

The SPEAKER announced his signature to enrolled bills of the following titles:

S. 5088. An act to amend section 27 of the Revised Statutes, relative to the apportionment and election of Representatives;

S. 3684. An act for the relief of Joseph Tousaint, alias Touzin; and

S. 2673. An act for the relief of William A. Cowles.

SENATE BILLS REFERRED.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, Senate bills of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and referred to their appropriate committees as indicated below:

S. 5355. An act to amend an act entitled "An act authorizing the Aransas Harbor Terminal Railway Company to construct a bridge across the Corpus Christi Channel, known as the Morris and Cummings Ship Channel, in Aransas County, Tex."—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

S. 5086. An act for the purchase or construction of a launch for the customs service at and in the vicinity of Astoria, Oreg.—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

S. 5076. An act authorizing the Sioux City and Omaha Railway Company to construct and operate a railway through the Omaha and Winnebago Reservation, in Thurston County, Nebr., and for other purposes—to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

S. 5006. An act to restore to their original status as to promotion officers of the Navy and Marine Corps losing numbers by reason of the advancement of other officers for exceptional and meritorious service during the war with Spain—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

APPOINTMENTS UNDER CIVIL SERVICE.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will lay before the House the following resolution.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That the Senate be requested to furnish the House of Representatives a duplicate copy of the engrossed bill of the Senate (S. 3256) in reference to the civil service and appointments thereunder, the same having been lost or misplaced.

The resolution was agreed to.

EULOGIES ON THE LATE HON. JUSTIN S. MORRILL.

Mr. GROUT. Mr. Speaker, I ask present consideration of the resolution which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That Wednesday, the 23d day of February, 1899, be set apart for the purpose of paying tribute to the memory of Hon. JUSTIN S. MORRILL, late a Senator from the State of Vermont.

The resolution was agreed to.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE.

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows:

To Mr. BISHOP, for one week, on account of important business.

To Mr. GRIFFITH, for four days, on account of sickness.

To Mr. OTEY, indefinitely, on account of sickness.

The SPEAKER. The hour of 5 o'clock having arrived, under the rules the House stands in recess until 8 o'clock this evening, and the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. LACEY] will act as Speaker pro tempore.

EVENING SESSION.

The recess having expired, the House, at 8 o'clock p. m., resumed its session, Mr. LACEY in the chair as Speaker pro tempore.

ORDER OF BUSINESS.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the rule under which this session is held.

The Clerk read as follows:

The House shall on each Friday, at 5 o'clock p. m., take a recess until 8 o'clock, at which evening session private pension bills, bills for the removal of political disabilities, and bills removing charges of desertion only shall be considered; said evening session not to extend beyond 10 o'clock and 30 minutes.

MRS. LUCRETIA TYLER SEMPLE.

Mr. LOUDENSLAGER. Having had a conference with the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. LAMB], who is interested in Senate bill 1576, I ask unanimous consent that the proceedings by which that bill was ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed, and by which a motion to reconsider was laid on the table, be vacated; that the bill be amended by striking out the word "fifty," in line 7, and inserting "thirty," and that thus amended the bill be put on its passage.

The title of the bill was read, as follows:

A bill (S. 1776) to increase the pension of Mrs. Lucretia Tyler Semple.

There being no objection, the proceedings by which the bill was previously ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed, and by which a motion to reconsider the vote on the passage was laid on the table, were vacated; and the bill, amended by striking out "fifty" and inserting "thirty," was ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

On motion of Mr. LOUDENSLAGER, a motion to reconsider the last vote was laid on the table.

ORDER OF BUSINESS.

Mr. TALBERT. Before the House goes into Committee of the Whole, I want to ask unanimous consent that during this evening all bills for the removal of charges of desertion or for the removal of political disabilities be passed over on the Calendar; also that all bills for the increase of pensions be passed over, and that we first take up bills asking for original pensions and afterwards take up bills for the increase of pensions and bills for the removal of charges of desertion—

Mr. RAY of New York. I trust my friend from South Carolina will not insist on the latter part of his proposition, that all bills granting original pensions be given a preference over those granting increase of pension. We can readily dispose of all these pension bills without undertaking to make any such discrimination. And the bills asking for increase of pensions are just as deserving as the others. In every case reported, those bills, if passed, will relieve actual suffering.

Mr. TALBERT. I submit to the chairman of the committee that if there are only a few—

Mr. RAY of New York. The gentleman does not understand me. The bills for removal of charges of desertion I care nothing about, but the gentleman from South Carolina has coupled with his request a proposition that first we take up cases of original pensions, passing over till afterwards bills for increase of pensions. Now, I say that such a provision would mix up our business. It would take more time to sort out the bills in the manner suggested by the gentleman than it would to pass those of both classes. I repeat that the bills reported for increase of pensions are deserving cases. Every such bill is one which, if passed, will relieve actual distress and misery.

Mr. TALBERT. Then, Mr. Speaker, I confine my request to bills for the removal of charges of desertion.

Mr. PACKER of Pennsylvania. Why should such bills be passed over? There are only a few of them on the Calendar, and some of them very meritorious—cases which have been very carefully considered by the committee.

Mr. TALBERT. I will say to my friend from Pennsylvania [Mr. PACKER] that I do not believe we should pass a single bill for the removal of charges of desertion or for the increase of any pension either until we have devised some means of putting a stop to the awful expenses of the Government, which are now being piled up mountain high. I am willing, however, when we come to a meritorious case, that it be passed without opposition.

Mr. PACKER of Pennsylvania. Very well.

Mr. TALBERT. I submit, however, that we ought not to stand here and consider bills for removing charges of desertion when we are now engaged in a war and pensions will be piled up mountain high.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from South Carolina asks unanimous consent that in the order of business for this evening private bills for the removal of charges of desertion be passed over. Is there objection?

Mr. BRUCKER. Reserving the right to object, I desire to say, in answer to a statement made by the chairman of the Committee on Invalid Pensions [Mr. RAY of New York], that with reference to cases of removing charges of desertion he cared nothing—

Mr. RAY of New York. The gentleman misunderstood what I meant to say. I do not have desertion cases in charge. I look solely to pension business.

Mr. BRUCKER. Now, Mr. Speaker, the request which the gentleman from South Carolina has just made has been submitted session after session, and been in a measure acceded to. I have a number of bills pending before the Committee on Military Affairs for the removal of charges of desertion. I have examined those cases. They are in the interest of old soldiers who live in my district. They are meritorious cases.

I have pressed their cases time after time before the Military Committee. I have been met by the statement by different members of that committee that there was no use in considering the cases in the committee, no matter how meritorious; that there was no use in reporting them to the House, because if they were reported, they would be passed over without consideration by that body. I was met by the statement that they could not be considered in the House, and hence my bills have been ignored.

Now, to me, and to many an old soldier who fought gallantly during the civil war, and now living in my district, their cases are of just as much importance to them and to me as some of the favored petty pension cases which are reported here to-night.

Why, Mr. Speaker, we have passed over six Friday night pension sessions during this session of Congress. I have looked over the Calendar and find—

Mr. RAY of New York. Mr. Speaker, is this question of unanimous consent debatable?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. It is not, except by consent.

Mr. RAY of New York. I raise the point of order that it is not debatable.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair sustains the point of order.

Mr. BRUCKER. Then I object to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina.

Mr. BELKNAP. I trust the gentleman from Michigan will except this member from the Committee on Military Affairs, for that statement at least.

Mr. BRUCKER. If I am in order, Mr. Chairman, I wish to say that I did not intend to include every member of the committee, and will except the gentleman from Illinois.

Several MEMBERS. Regular order!

Mr. RAY of New York. If this matter is settled, I move that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole House for the purpose of considering business on the Private Calendar under the rule.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. TALBERT) there were—ayes 22, noes 1.

Mr. TALBERT. No quorum, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will proceed to count the House.

Before the count was completed,

Mr. TALBERT. Mr. Speaker, if I may be permitted, I move, pending the question of no quorum—

Mr. BRUCKER. Regular order!

Mr. TALBERT (continuing). That we pass over the bills for the removal of charges of desertion, if that motion is in order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The motion is not in order, the Chair would state.

Mr. BRUCKER. I object, and demand the regular order.

Mr. TALBERT. I raise the point of order that the motion is in order.

Mr. RAY of New York. I would like to ask the gentleman from South Carolina if he would not agree to let members call up their own bills?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The House is dividing on the other question, and the point of no quorum is still pending.

Mr. BRUCKER. Then I demand the regular order.

Mr. RAY of New York. I would like consent to ask the gentleman from South Carolina—

Mr. BRUCKER. Regular order!

Mr. TALBERT. Then, Mr. Speaker, I withdraw the point of no quorum.

Now I renew the motion that we pass over all of these bills for the removal of charges of desertion.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will state the result of the question which has just been submitted to the House.

Mr. COOPER of Texas. I join with the gentleman from New York in asking that we proceed now with the Calendar.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will state the result of the motion just submitted.

The motion that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole House, to consider bills on the Calendar under the rule, is agreed to.

The House accordingly resolved itself into Committee of the Whole House, Mr. CONNOLLY in the chair.

The CHAIRMAN. The House is now in Committee of the Whole to consider bills under the rule which has been read.

Mr. RAY of New York. Mr. Chairman, before going into Committee of the Whole I would like to ask a question, whether the gentleman from South Carolina would not consent that only those cases be taken up where the member who introduced the bill is present to look after it?

The CHAIRMAN. What motion does the gentleman make?

Mr. RAY of New York. I desire to ask unanimous consent, and I appeal particularly to the gentleman from South Carolina, if he will not consent to allow those bills to be taken up for consideration for removal of charges of desertion where the member interested in the bill is present to take charge of it upon the floor of the House?

Mr. JETT. Mr. Chairman, I can not agree to the suggestion of the gentleman from New York, even if the gentleman from South Carolina consents. I would not like to sit here silently and see such an agreement entered into. I am not interested personally in any of the bills, and have reported one or two from the committee that I think are absolutely meritorious, and I would like to see some action taken on them if any action is to be taken upon any such bills to-night.

Mr. RAY of New York. Would it not satisfy the gentleman, then, to call up the bills for his friends who are specially interested in them?

Mr. JETT. Yes; that would satisfy me, so far as I am concerned.

Mr. TALBERT. Mr. Chairman, I am unwilling to sit here or stand here at this day and time, when our soldiers are being slaughtered, when we are engaged in a war, when men are being promoted for gallantry upon the battlefield—I am unwilling to be a party to pensioning those who have proved themselves to be cowards and who have turned their backs to the flag; and if gentlemen will consider the matter I do not believe they will insist to-night upon bringing up any measures here for the removal of charges of desertion.

We already have a tremendous pension roll, amounting to over \$150,000,000. We have passed a bill here for the increase of the Army which will call for possibly another \$150,000,000, making in the neighborhood of \$300,000,000 for the military establishment of this country, more than is paid by any nation upon the face of the earth for its military establishment. Yet we continue to go on here recklessly sitting as a court of appeals for those who do not deserve pensions, who can not get them at the Pension Bureau, who come here and ask alms at the hands of this House.

I am opposed to it, and I think it is nothing but right and proper that we should first consider those who are asking for original pensions, who have never had any increase, and who ought to have pensions. Then we can take up those cases in which the charge of desertion was illegally made and consider them and remove

the charge, if they deserve to have it removed, and let them also have pensions.

Only a few days ago, Mr. Chairman, I believe, a resolution was passed in the Senate relieving those soldiers who had gone into the Spanish-American war and letting them come back again onto the pension roll. If they were drawing pensions on account of being unable to earn a livelihood, I should like to know how it was that they were enabled to get into the Spanish-American war and yet at the end of that war come out and be restored to the pension roll. It is these fraudulent pensions and these outrageous claims that I have resisted here night after night, and I believe I am right.

A few days ago we had a combine here which passed a river and harbor bill, when men on both sides of this House joined together to rob the people and plunder the Treasury. Only a day or two ago we had what was termed the "hog combine" on public buildings, a still more flagrant robbery than the other combine.

We go on piling up these debts mountain high. I think the time has come when we should halt, when we should at least consider the advisability of acting as a court of appeals, to give pensions to those who do not deserve them and who can not get them under the general laws, which I think are sufficiently liberal to enable any man who ought to have a pension to go and get it.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from South Carolina objects.

Mr. RAY of New York. I think he will not object. I ask unanimous consent, and I trust I can have attention while I make the request. The gentleman from South Carolina is to be commended always for opposing any legislation which is improper.

Now, I ask unanimous consent that only those cases to remove charges of desertion be taken up to-night where the member interested is present, and such cases as the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. JETT] indicated that he had in charge for one or two of his colleagues.

I trust the gentleman will not object to that, because he can fight any bill if it appears to him to be unmeritorious.

Mr. TALBERT. I do not wish to appear in a rôle of contrariness, or obstinacy, or anything of that sort, and therefore I accept that as an amendment.

Mr. BRUCKER. Now, Mr. Chairman—

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York [Mr. RAY] for unanimous consent?

Mr. BRUCKER. Pending the unanimous consent, I desire to say that in the interest of many old soldiers who live in my district, whose claims are pending and have been pending for two years before the Committee on Military Affairs, and never have been reported out of that committee simply because the House would not consider them, because these objections to their consideration were raised, I object myself. I want these claims all to go together.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Michigan objects.

Mr. TALBERT. Well, Mr. Chairman, he is the most contrary man that I have ever struck. [Laughter.] I do not know what to do with him. I do not believe he wants to consider any pensions himself. That is what is the matter with Hannah. [Laughter.] I myself want every old soldier who deserves a pension to have one, even if he has to come here to the court of appeals, as I call it. If he can prove to our satisfaction that he ought to have it, I am willing that this court here should give it to him.

Mr. BRUCKER. I would like to ask the gentleman from South Carolina a question.

Mr. TALBERT. Certainly, my friend, my good-natured friend. I will answer a question.

Mr. BRUCKER. Has the gentleman from South Carolina during my two years' service ever noticed that I was absent on a Friday evening session?

Mr. TALBERT. I have never. I meant this as a piece of pleasantry. You are always present.

Mr. BRUCKER. Did the gentleman from South Carolina ever see me obstructing pension legislation?

Mr. WALKER of Massachusetts. I make the point of order—

Mr. TALBERT. I have been always able to understand the gentleman heretofore, but I must admit that I do not understand him to-night. Why, Mr. Chairman, we can not hear anything. [Laughter.]

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the first bill.

JOHN P. HENDERSON.

The first business on the Private Calendar was the bill (H. R. 8506) to remove the charge of desertion from the military record of John P. Henderson and to grant him an honorable discharge.

The bill was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of War be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to remove the charge of desertion standing against John P. Henderson, who enlisted as a private in Company H, One hundred and twenty-fourth Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and to grant to said John P. Henderson an honorable discharge.

Mr. TALBERT. Mr. Chairman, I would like to have the report read in this case.

The report (by Mr. BROWNLOW) was read, as follows:

The Committee on Military Affairs, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. 8506) for the relief of John P. Henderson, have had the same under consideration and beg leave to report as follows:

John P. Henderson was enrolled March 5, 1864, and mustered into service March 15, 1864, as a private in Company H, One hundred and twenty-fourth Indiana Infantry, to serve three years. He was captured by the enemy August 25, 1864, in front of Atlanta; was confined at Florence, S. C., whence he escaped November 26, 1864; was sent from Fort Columbus, New York Harbor, to Annapolis, Md., January 26, 1865; reported at Camp Parole, Maryland, January 27, 1865, and was transferred to College Green Barracks February 1, 1865. He appears to have been furloughed some time during the month of February, 1865, but failed to return from that furlough.

The committee further report that the testimony shows that at the time he was furloughed he went to Detroit, Mich., and from there to Lapeer, Mich.; then back to Detroit. From there he went to Chicago, to which place his aunt had removed while he was a soldier, and remained there until July, 1865. Before he enlisted his parents were both dead, and he was not 16 years of age, and the aunt he went to Chicago to find had brought him up since the death of his parents. At the time he was granted the furlough, and for some years afterwards, he was sick with the scurvy and with rheumatism and general debility, and at different times since, and by 1870 he had lost nearly all of his upper teeth by reason of the scurvy.

In July, 1865, the war was over, and his uncle, James Platt, was going to California, and took said John P. Henderson with him, thinking the climate would restore him to health. In 1886 or 1887 he applied to and received from the adjutant-general of Indiana a certificate of service, which he filed with his pension application.

The committee further report that the testimony shows that when he returned on a furlough and succeeded in finding his aunt, who had brought him up, he was not aware and did not know (the war being about over when his furlough expired, which was by the latter part of July, 1865) that it was necessary for him to return; that his aunt and uncle and friends all told him that nothing was necessary to be done, and that the Government had no further use for him and did not want him, and, being a boy and not knowing anything about military rules or order under such circumstances, he listened to and took the advice of his uncle and aunt and friends and went to California, where he remained for some years.

Your committee submit, in view of the testimony, that John P. Henderson is entitled to the relief prayed for, and the bill is therefore reported favorably, with a recommendation that it do pass with the following amendment:

Add after the word "discharge," in line 8, the following:
"Provided, That no pay, bounty, or other emoluments shall become due or payable by virtue of the passage of this act."

Mr. TALBERT. Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask if the gentleman who introduced this bill is present?

Mr. MERCER. Mr. Chairman, I take especial delight in informing my friend that I introduced it. Not being successful in the combine he referred to a few moments ago, I hope my genial friend will allow this bill to pass.

Mr. TALBERT. The gentleman stopped the mill too soon is the reason why he was not successful. I would ask the gentleman to make a statement, as I gather from the reading of the report there is just a statement from the supposed deserter, and no evidence accompanying it, but just simply his own statement.

Mr. MERCER. Oh, no.

Mr. TALBERT. It seems to me in a case of this kind the committee ought to be supplied with better evidence than the mere statement of the party interested.

Mr. MERCER. There are plenty affidavits on file which make out this case. It is on this evidence and testimony that the report is made. This man to-day is in very bad health. I saw him in Omaha last fall just before I left, and he is very badly debilitated now. He entered the Army in 1864, when 16 years of age, a mere boy.

He has lost all his upper teeth, as the testimony shows, walks with a cane, and is not long for this world. It is only a short time ago that he found out that this charge was against him at all; and the Grand Army people in Omaha have written me and the post to which he belongs has passed resolutions in his favor, and it seems a very worthy case, so far as I know. I hope the bill will be laid aside with a favorable recommendation.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment recommended by the committee.

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

Mr. MERCER. Certainly.

Mr. BRUCKER. I notice that this case was reported from the Committee on Military Affairs on April 11 last year.

Mr. MERCER. Yes, sir.

Mr. BRUCKER. And the case was reported to the House at that time, was it not?

Mr. MERCER. Undoubtedly. It says, "Committed to the Committee of the Whole House April 11, 1898."

Mr. BRUCKER. And that case has been on this Calendar ever since?

Mr. MERCER. It has been passed by right along, the House refusing to consider charges of desertion.

Mr. BRUCKER. And for that reason the Committee on Military Affairs have not reported these cases removing the charge of desertion?

Mr. MERCER. I did not know that until I heard the gentleman state it to-night.

Mr. TALBERT. I would like to ask the gentleman from Nebraska if the object of the claimant in this bill is to get a pension or does he just want this stigma removed?

Mr. MERCER. I understand it is to have the stigma removed.

Mr. TALBERT. Nothing else?

Mr. MERCER. That is all I know of. He does not like the stigma. [Laughter.]

Mr. TALBERT. I would ask if the gentleman would offer the usual amendment—that no pay or emolument shall accrue?

Mr. MERCER. The committee have reported that amendment with the bill.

Mr. TALBERT. He did not join any other command after he left his regiment?

Mr. MERCER. No, sir.

Mr. TALBERT. You do not know that he ever received any bounty?

Mr. MERCER. I move that the bill be laid aside with a favorable recommendation.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment recommended by the committee.

Mr. BRUCKER. Mr. Chairman, the fact that this bill was reported from the Committee on Military Affairs on April 11, 1898, simply confirms the statement I made a moment ago in support of my position that I did not desire to give my consent to passing over all these cases on the Calendar for the removal of the charge of desertion.

Now, I did not do that captiously nor for the purpose of hindering or delaying the consideration of cases. I did that, and do it for the purpose of protecting myself and for the purpose of protecting the old soldiers—my constituents. It has come to this pass, that the members of this House who have a particular pull upon some certain members of the Committee on Military Affairs or the Committee on Invalid Pensions can get bills reported from those two committees that those who have not can not.

I notice from this Calendar that there has been a few bills reported from the Committee on Military Affairs since January 1, even since I was informed the committee would not consider and report these bills. Why they should make this statement to me and then turn around and report a bill for some other member is beyond my comprehension. Let me say this, that the gentleman who introduced this bill, for whom this committee reported the bill, happened to be the chairman of the Committee on Public Buildings—

Mr. MERCER. I will say to the gentleman—

Mr. BRUCKER (continuing). I do not know why that should be any reason why the Committee on Military Affairs should consider a bill introduced by him sooner than a bill introduced by myself. I represent a constituency made up as largely of the old-soldier element as any constituency in the United States, and I think I have their confidence; and I am here, and have been here, looking after their interests, and that is what I am doing to-night. I propose, if this Committee on Military Affairs report bills removing the charge of desertion, they shall even up and report as many of my bills, proportionately to the number in there, as they report bills that have been introduced by any other member of this House, and the same is true with reference to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Mr. RAY of New York. Does the gentleman—

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Michigan yield to the gentleman from New York?

Mr. BRUCKER. Not at present.

Mr. RAY of New York. The gentleman had better not, because he knows he is not telling the truth.

Mr. BRUCKER. I did not yield for a question from the gentleman from New York, nor did I yield for an insult.

Mr. RAY of New York. You got that.

Mr. BRUCKER. Certainly, and nothing else could have been expected, nothing else from that source. No, I did not intend to go into any detailed statement with reference to the conduct of the chairman of the Committee on Invalid Pensions. But the House is aware of the fact—at least those who have taken any interest in pension legislation—that the honored chairman of that committee, during the dying hours of the second session of this Congress, took advantage of the opportunity to herald to the country that the Democratic side of this House had been opposing pension legislation. He took advantage of the situation to criticize a member on this side of the Chamber who was absent. And yet the fact is patent and stands out, admitted by all, that during this session of Congress the honored chairman who is such a "great friend" of the Union soldier, so anxious to pass these private pension bills, has allowed to slip by six different pension nights.

I say to the chairman of that committee, who undertakes to hurl the lie in my teeth, I simply say to him that a statement like that coming from him is simply beneath my contempt. I say to him that if he had been interested in securing pension legislation for the old soldiers of this country he would not have allowed six pension nights to go by without a session and have reported but 60 pension bills during this session out of 6,000 now pending before that committee.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I have not any interest aside from the one

common to us all in the particular case pending before the committee at the present time. I have not a doubt but what it is a meritorious claim for the removal of the charge of desertion, and that the bill ought to pass. God knows it slept long enough in the Committee on Military Affairs, and God knows it has slept long enough here. It would have slept beyond the period of this session had I not interposed an objection to unanimous consent that it go over again to-night, and I hope the bill will pass.

Mr. MIERS of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent, in order that we may get out of this trouble, that each member be permitted to call up one bill and let that be passed upon.

Mr. RAY of New York. Oh, no, Mr. Chairman; the bills are on the Calendar and they must be considered in their regular order, and I object.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I shall not let this opportunity go by to reply to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BRUCKER]. In the first place, he started out with a tirade against the Committee on Military Affairs. As to what has been done or not done by that committee I will say nothing, for I know nothing. I have not been a member of that committee, but it consists of eminent and honorable gentlemen. They have reported much valuable and important legislation.

Now, in regard to the Committee on Invalid Pensions, he turns his venomous tongue against that committee and insinuates that there has been favoritism in the reporting of bills from that committee, and that some man must have a pull to get a report from that committee. That I resent, and I resent it now and here. I say to the country and to the members of this House that among the bills introduced by the gentlemen of this House, first considered and first reported, were more than one presented by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BRUCKER] who made that insinuation against the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

He was treated better than some members of that committee in the reporting of bills, and his bills were put through the House early. Now, in his zeal and in his anger, and perchance in his ignorance, he has reiterated a charge that since the meeting of this session of Congress the Committee on Invalid Pensions has "reported out" some 60 bills only. We have passed already more than 60 bills reported during this session, and they now lie in the Senate unacted upon.

We have now upon the Calendar something like fifty more bills reported from the Committee on Invalid Pensions. Since the meeting of this session of Congress I have drawn with my own hand more than 125 reports from that committee upon pension bills. And it is fortunate for the gentleman and for the House and for the country that before he came here to-night to make the speech he has made against pensions and pensioners his constituents passed upon his case.

Mr. BRUCKER. Now, Mr. Chairman, I do not desire to reply to any of the mean, contemptible, underhand flings indulged in by the gentleman from New York. It seems that he desires, enjoys, and relishes the rolling of these invectives as sweet morsels under his tongue. I simply want to say this in reply to the statement of the gentleman from New York: He is well aware of the fact that of the bills reported from his committee a large number are bills that have come over from the Senate after passing muster through the Committee on Pensions of that body; and the large number of bills to which he calls our attention are not the work of this committee.

In conclusion let me say that the gentleman does not refute the statement I made that he deliberately allowed six Friday nights to pass by without any meeting of the House for pension business—no session held at all. He could have insisted upon the consideration of pension business upon every one of those six Friday nights. He does not dispute the fact that slumbering in his committee room to-day are something like five or six thousand of these bills. No; he prefers to make a personal attack, going outside of the record to indulge in street-gutter slang, and that, too, from a man occupying the "high and exalted" position of the chairman of the Committee on Invalid Pensions of the House of Representatives. And, with that, Mr. Chairman, I leave this matter.

Mr. TALBERT. Now, Mr. Chairman, this is just what I attempted in the beginning of the session to-night to avoid—this everlasting talk and talk and talk about the removal of charges of desertion. I knew it would come to that, and hence I wanted to keep these cases out of the way and let the deserving old soldiers come in. And now it may be that a half dozen of them have died while we are here trying to remove the stigma of the charges of desertion from this man. This is what I tried to prevent. And now I feel like saying:

Thou canst not say I did it; never shake
Thy gory locks at me.

[Laughter.]

And I want to say there is danger of talking too much. I am reminded of the story of a man who died in a far-off city. His brothers were telegraphed to come and get his remains. They

telegraphed to an undertaker to embalm the body, to put it in a nice casket with a nice suit of clothing upon it, and they would come after it. The undertaker did as directed. The brothers of the dead man came on. They went to the undertaker's shop; they looked through the glass of the casket, and lo and behold! the dead man's mouth was wide open, and he had no teeth. Then one said to the other, "Well, brother Tom, that is not our brother; our brother had teeth."

So they told the undertaker they would not take the body. Then the undertaker carried the casket into a back room, took out the body, took off the nice suit of clothes, and put the corpse into a pine box; and that undertaker was heard to say: "You damned fool! If you had kept your mouth shut, you might have had a decent burial."

Now, then, here you are with your mouth open, trying to remove charges of desertion from men who do not deserve it; men who were cowards, who turned their back on their country, while there may be some old soldier dying, in want and penury, while waiting for his pension.

Mr. WALKER of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I raise the question of order that it is out of order on the floor to introduce in the debates here a story that is so old as to be unsavory. [Laughter.]

Mr. TALBERT. I did not expect anything else from my venerable friend from Massachusetts, Mr. Chairman.

I have read somewhere in the Book of Proverbs about "a whip for a horse, a bridle for an ass, and a rod for the back of a fool." I do not want to put my friend from Massachusetts in either category, so I will leave him alone, because I do not know whether he is a horse, a jackass, or a fool, or a combination of all. [Laughter.]

Mr. GREENE of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, I hope I will have the attention of the committee for a few moments to make a proposition. I have taken up no time whatever in any Friday night meeting during the present Congress, although I think I have attended every meeting held. I have not had any lavish amount of bills reported of the many introduced by myself during the entire two years of my service here. But I have made no complaint of it and make none now. I have thought that the committee was doing the best it could under existing circumstances.

But I rise to a question, if it be in order, or to make a request. I feel sure that there are a number of very meritorious claims on the Calendar where soldiers ask pensions. I ask unanimous consent that we may first consider those cases.

Would it not be better—do we not all believe that it would be better, when we stop to think of it—to pass the pension cases first, and pass over the cases of desertion as they are reached and take them up another night, or to-night after we get through with the pension cases, if there is time? Or if anybody is to get a pension, is it not better that these old soldiers should be considered who are in want and whose demand has been pending before us for so long a time? If anybody is to wait, let it be these men who are desirous of having these charges against them removed, rather than the men who are absolutely suffering for the pension that is due them by the Government. I know of some instances where there are meritorious and deserving men absolutely helpless because of the delay in granting the pensions to which they are entitled. Now, I would like very much to see some relief given to these people.

Mr. BRUCKER. Is not that just what I have been trying to do for a year past?

Mr. GREENE of Nebraska. I ask that the bill under consideration be now disposed of and that we pass over the cases of desertion and take up the pension bills.

I will ask my colleague from Nebraska, in order to get the pension claims through, if he will not consent to withdraw the case now before the committee, for the removal of a charge of desertion, and let the cases of deserving pensioners be first disposed of?

Mr. MERCER. In response to my colleague, I will say I know this case personally. He is a man of family, with children, a good soldier, and we can pass this bill while we are talking about it. It is an entirely deserving case.

Mr. GREENE of Nebraska. But if we pass this there will be others behind it unless we make this order.

Mr. MERCER. Besides that, this bill is in order on the Calendar.

Mr. GREENE of Nebraska. It will not put a dollar in the pocket of this man nor a loaf of bread in his larder to pass it; while there are numerous meritorious cases of soldiers and their widows actually suffering for the necessaries of life, because they can not get the relief to which they are entitled.

Mr. MERCER. It will not take a minute to pass this bill through the committee.

Mr. GREENE of Nebraska. But there are thirty-five others, as I understand, to follow it in a row. And I wanted to ask unanimous consent, if the gentleman does not withdraw this case, in justice to these men, as I believe, that we then take up the claims of pensioners first, and then, of course, after the pension

claims are disposed of, if there is any further time, to take up these cases and act upon them.

Now I do not want to take up any time of the committee, but I ask unanimous consent that that course be adopted.

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

Mr. BRUCKER. I object.

Mr. VANDIVER. Mr. Chairman, it seems to me quite evident from what has transpired here to-night that we will not be allowed to transact any business at all except by unanimous consent.

Now I want to ask unanimous consent for a proposition that I do not think any man in the House will object to. I want to ask unanimous consent that we take up first on the Calendar all of those pension claims; and if there are any deserving claimants for the removal of charges of desertion growing out of the Mexican war—I think there are perhaps a few of the latter class of claims—it seems to me that if they are ever to be attended to at all it must be to-night.

I ask unanimous consent, then, that these bills, relating to the Mexican war pensions, and for the removal of the charge of desertion, if there be any on account of that war, be taken up for consideration.

Mr. RIDGELY. After this one is disposed of.

Mr. RAY of New York. I want to say to the gentleman that the pension bills on the Calendar, first in order, are those making provision for Mexican war pensions and Indian wars. They are ahead of all the others.

Mr. VANDIVER. But not ahead of the bills for the removal of the charge of desertion.

Mr. RAY of New York. That is probably so, but they are ahead of all of the other pension cases.

Mr. VANDIVER. Will not the gentleman consent to take up those cases growing out of the Mexican war before these cases of desertion?

Mr. RAY of New York. The gentleman seems to be under the impression that I am a member of the Committee on Military Affairs. I am not. Other gentlemen—

Mr. VANDIVER. I did not hear any member of that committee objecting.

Mr. RAY of New York. Other gentlemen have charge of those bills. The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BRUCKER] a few moments ago referred to the fact that I said I cared nothing for the bills relating to charges of desertion. What I meant was, that as chairman of the Committee on Invalid Pensions, I had no charge or control over those bills and no knowledge of them. Those gentlemen who are interested in the desertion cases must take care of them and take charge of them.

Mr. VANDIVER. Mr. Chairman, I do not yield for any further explanation. If the gentleman wishes to make an objection to the request I have made, he can do so.

Mr. RAY of New York. No, I do not.

Mr. VANDIVER. Let some other man object then, or let the request be granted.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request made by the gentleman from Missouri?

Mr. BRUCKER. What is the request?

The CHAIRMAN. Will the gentleman state his request again?

Mr. VANDIVER. I request simply that we first take up those pension claims growing out of the Mexican war. There are a few of them to be considered, and I do not think the gentleman will object to that.

Mr. BRUCKER. I understand the chairman of the Committee on Invalid Pensions has already stated that most of the cases that follow are claims arising out of the Mexican and Indian wars.

Mr. SIMS. They are the first.

Mr. McRAE. I ask that the cases arising out of the Indian wars be included.

Mr. VANDIVER. They come next. Then let the others come on. We will make provision for them as we get to them.

The CHAIRMAN. Will the gentleman state distinctly what his request is?

Mr. VANDIVER. My request is that those claims growing out of the Mexican war be taken up first.

Mr. MEYER of Louisiana. There are seventeen of them first on the Calendar and I hope the gentleman will not object to that.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

Mr. BRUCKER. Mr. Chairman, for the purpose of being consistent, I object. Let us clean up the Calendar as we go along.

Mr. SIMS. I want to make a request that I think the House will not object to; that is, that we take up such cases for the removal of charges of desertion as are represented by members here to-night who want them considered. That certainly is fair, and if there is objection to that we might as well move to adjourn.

Mr. TALBERT. That is already the order, as I understand it.

Mr. SIMS. No; that was objected to.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request made by the gentleman from Tennessee?

Mr. BRUCKER. Mr. Chairman, pending that request—the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. TALBERT] is correct in one portion of his statement and incorrect in the other. That request—

Mr. WALKER of Massachusetts. Never mind.

Mr. BRUCKER. Now, if the gentleman from New York wants the floor, I yield.

Mr. RAY of New York. The gentleman from New York has said nothing, sir.

Mr. BRUCKER. Well, some one on that side did.

The CHAIRMAN. The request is, Will the House give unanimous consent to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. SIMS]?

Mr. BRUCKER. Pending that, let me make this statement, that unanimous consent was asked that cases of desertion be passed over where the parties introducing the bill were not present, and I objected. Now, for the purpose of being consistent, I again object.

Mr. VANDIVER. Mr. Chairman—

Mr. COOPER of Texas. Mr. Chairman—

Mr. GIBSON. Regular order!

The CHAIRMAN. The regular order is demanded. The question is on the amendments to the bill read by the Clerk.

The amendments were agreed to.

The bill as amended was ordered to be laid aside to be reported to the House with a favorable recommendation.

JAMES GEISSINGER.

The next business on the Private Calendar was the bill (H. R. 5758) to remove the charge of desertion from the record of James Geissinger.

The bill was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of War be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to remove the charge of desertion now borne on the records of the War Department against the name of James Geissinger, formerly a member of Company A, Seventy-second Regiment of Ohio Volunteer Infantry.

Mr. TALBERT. I ask for the reading of the report.

The report (by Mr. BELKNAP) was read, as follows:

The Committee on Military Affairs, to whom was referred for consideration House bill 5758, respectfully report as follows:

This bill is for the purpose of removing the charge of desertion now borne on the records of the War Department against the name of James Geissinger, enrolled as private in Company A, Seventy-second Ohio Infantry. We have made careful examination of the records and sworn testimony submitted, and find that the said Geissinger enlisted October 18, 1861, at the age of 16 years, and served under such enrollment until January 1, 1864, when he re-enlisted as a veteran volunteer in the same company and regiment.

It is established that he was a brave, faithful, enthusiastic soldier, performing with cheerful fidelity every duty until October 19, 1864, when he is reported as "deserted" on the military records.

The evidence shows that Private Geissinger at that time was with his company in the State of Missouri, with other troops, in pursuit of the Confederate general (Price) and his forces.

For some time previous to this Geissinger had been suffering from diarrhea and consequent debility, but with indomitable spirit had kept up and remained in line with his comrades in their constant and continued marches through Arkansas and Missouri until on a forced march after night near Sedalia, Mo., his strength gave out. He reported to the officer in command of his company, Lieut. J. F. Herrington, who sent him to the major of the regiment. The major told him that every ambulance was full, that there were no other means of transportation, and advised him to do the best he could for himself.

For a while Geissinger struggled along with the troops until about midnight, when he sank from exhaustion and was left by the roadside in a semi-conscious condition. He fell asleep and did not awaken until the next day, alone and with no knowledge of the location of his comrades. He started to find them, but, weak with debility and hunger, could not go far. Applying at a house for food and information, he was told it would be impossible to reach his command on account of the guerrillas and bushwhackers infesting the region.

He, however, started out to make the attempt, wandering through woods and byways for several days, when his strength failed and he was compelled to give up the attempt, and found a stopping place with a kindly farmer, where he remained until January, 1865, when he started out again in search of his company, but the difficulties were so great—the country infested with scattered guerrilla bands; having no means, weak in body, and ignorant of the country and the location of the forces of either army—that he became discouraged from attempting to face the dangerous risk of trying to reach his regiment, and decided to wait until an opportunity should arise to either bring the Army near him or carry him in safety to the Union lines.

This he did until, within a few months, Lee surrendered and the war closed. In his youth and inexperience Geissinger was ignorant of the necessity of his being regularly mustered out of the service; hence did not after that seek to return to his regiment. While in one way it has no direct bearing on this case, we deem it well to say that Geissinger's father and three of his brothers served in the Union Army, and were honorably discharged, except two of his brothers, who were killed in battle.

Finally, your committee finds that James Geissinger was a patriotic youth, a diligent, faithful, conscientious soldier; that his separation from his company was beyond his control; that he imperiled his life in his attempt to rejoin his command, and made every reasonable effort to complete his full term of enlistment, and we therefore recommend that the bill do pass with the following amendment:

Add after the word "Infantry," in line 7, the following:

"Provided, That no pay, bounty, or other emoluments shall become due or payable by virtue of the passage of this act."

Mr. TALBERT. Now, Mr. Chairman, I ask if the gentleman who introduced the bill is present? If not, I ask that it be passed over and put at the foot of the Calendar.

Mr. SIMS. Pending that question, I ask unanimous consent

that all bills removing the charge of desertion be passed over for to-night and that we take up pension bills.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Tennessee requests that all other bills removing the charge of desertion be passed over.

Mr. BRUCKER. Mr. Chairman, I object to that.

Mr. SIMS. We may as well adjourn, then.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment recommended by the committee.

Mr. TALBERT. I move that the bill be laid aside with an unfavorable report. I ask unanimous consent to pass it over and put it at the foot of the Calendar, as there is nobody here to represent the bill.

Mr. GIBSON. Let us agree to that.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from South Carolina asks unanimous consent that the bill be passed over. Is there objection?

Mr. BRUCKER. I object to that.

The amendment recommended by the committee was agreed to.

Mr. TALBERT. I ask that the bill be laid upon the table.

The CHAIRMAN. That motion is not in order.

Mr. TALBERT. I move that it be reported to the House with the recommendation that it lie on the table.

The question was taken; and the Chairman announced that the yeas seemed to have it.

Mr. TALBERT. Division, Mr. Chairman.

The committee divided; and there were—ayes 1, yeas 20.

Mr. TALBERT. No quorum, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. Evidently there is not a quorum present.

Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana. Regular order!

Mr. HICKS. Mr. Chairman, this seems to be a meritorious case from the reading of the report. I think it would be a better plan that the request of the gentleman from South Carolina should be agreed to, and let the bill lie over by unanimous consent.

Mr. COOPER of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill H. R. 8179.

The CHAIRMAN. There is not a quorum present. The point has been made by the gentleman from South Carolina.

Mr. RIDGELY. Mr. Chairman, pending the count for a quorum I wish to appeal to the gentleman who raised the question of no quorum to withdraw the point.

Mr. TALBERT. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw the point of no quorum on the solicitation of gentlemen; but I would like the chairman of the committee to explain and state whether or not there are certificates bearing out the statements made by the claimant in this case, or if we are to pass it on the ipse dixit of this man himself, provided it suits the gentleman from Massachusetts; but if it does not, I withdraw the remark.

Mr. WALKER of Massachusetts. What was the gentleman's remarks?

Mr. TALBERT. I do not want to do anything that is not pleasant to my distinguished friend. [Laughter.]

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will state the question pending before the committee. The question is whether or not the bill shall be laid aside with a favorable recommendation.

Mr. TALBERT. A parliamentary inquiry. Is the regular clincher upon that, too?

Mr. BELKNAP. The amendment is on the bill.

Mr. TALBERT. That no pay or emolument shall become due by reason of the passage of the bill. He only wants the stigma removed.

Mr. WALKER of Massachusetts. We are only looking after the stigmas.

The bill was ordered to be laid aside with a favorable recommendation.

LEVI M. TRUITT.

Mr. COOPER of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent of the committee for its consideration of the bill H. R. 8179. Now, Mr. Chairman, I want to state to this committee—

The CHAIRMAN. What is the Calendar number?

Mr. COOPER of Texas. The Calendar number is 1132, a bill for the relief of Levi M. Truitt.

Mr. Chairman, I want to state to this committee that I have been a member of Congress six years. I never have had a pension bill passed, nor have I ever objected to the consideration of a bill. I ask the unanimous consent of the committee to consider this bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas asks unanimous consent for the consideration of the bill called up by him.

Mr. BRUCKER. Mr. Chairman, pending the request for unanimous consent I want to say that the gentleman from Texas who makes this request for unanimous consent is a member of my own political party, has a seat on this side of the Chamber, and there is no gentleman in the House to whom I would sooner grant a courtesy of that kind than the gentleman from Texas; but I am here for the purpose of cleaning up this Calendar and getting rid of bills that have been here for months and months; and for that reason I object.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Michigan objects. [Cries of "Regular order!"]

JAMES M'KENZIE.

The next business on the Private Calendar was the bill (H. R. 8904) for the relief of James McKenzie.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of War is authorized to remove the charge of desertion standing against James McKenzie, of Company D, First Battalion Eleventh United States Infantry, and issue to him an honorable discharge to date from August 23, 1865.

With the following committee amendment:

Add the following:

"Provided, That no pay, bounty, or other emoluments shall become due or payable by virtue of the passage of this act."

Mr. TALBERT. Mr. Chairman, I call for the reading of the report.

Mr. RIDGELY. Will not a statement from the chairman of the committee answer the gentleman's purpose as well?

Mr. BELKNAP. I will say to the gentleman from Kansas that this was so long ago that I can not remember the details. I do not remember whose bill it is, and I would ask the Chairman to state whose bill it is.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Iowa, Mr. HULL.

Mr. BRUCKER. I would like to ask the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. BELKNAP] when this bill was reported?

Mr. BELKNAP. Not at this session, but I can not give the date.

Mr. BRUCKER. Does not the Calendar, which the gentleman has before him, state when it was?

Mr. BELKNAP. It does; April 18, 1898.

Mr. SIMS. Mr. Chairman, if the motion is in order, the gentleman who introduced the bill is not here pressing it, and I move it be temporarily laid aside.

Mr. BELKNAP. I want to say to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. SIMS] that the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HULL] is chairman of the Committee on Military Affairs, of which I am a member. I went home with him in the street car to-night, and he is suffering from a very bad throat. Members all know that he is not strong now.

Mr. SIMS. Oh, well, if the gentleman from Iowa made the request of the gentleman from Illinois to look after his bill for him, all right.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Tennessee withdraw his motion?

Mr. SIMS. Certainly.

The Clerk read the report (by Mr. BELKNAP), as follows:

The Committee on Military Affairs, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 8904) for the relief of James McKenzie, would respectfully report the same back to the House with the recommendation that the bill do pass, with the following amendment:

Add after the word "sixty-five," in line 7 of the bill, the following:

"Provided, That no pay, bounty, or other emoluments shall become due or payable by virtue of the passage of this act."

The committee find the facts in this case to be as follows:

The soldier enlisted on November 8, 1864, in Company A, Third Battalion, Eleventh United States Infantry; he was subsequently transferred to Company B, First Battalion of the same regiment; the records show him to have deserted on August 23, 1865, and that he never returned to his command. On March 6, 1866, he again enlisted in Company F, Third Battalion, Twelfth United States Infantry, serving honorably until March 6, 1869, when he was discharged by reason of expiration of term of enlistment. On September 11, 1883, the War Department furnished the soldier a discharge to date from August 23, 1865. While this discharge was not in terms a dishonorable discharge, the Commissioner of Pensions in his ruling has decided that it is a discharge without honor.

The soldier states in his behalf that in August, 1865, he received a letter from his father stating that he (his father) was at the point of death and wanted to see the soldier before he died. The soldier states that his captain gave him a leave to go home for fifteen days. During this leave he was taken sick and unable to leave home for six months. He wrote to his captain to this effect, but received no answer.

In the spring of 1869, when he again became able for military duty, he went to New York City and reported to the recruiting officer that he was a member of the Eleventh Infantry, and asked the recruiting officer to notify the captain of his company in the Eleventh that it was his intention to enlist in the Twelfth United States Infantry, and he did so enlist, supposing the record would be properly made and it would be satisfactory.

Your committee, after a careful consideration of this case, are of the opinion that the soldier left his command with no intention of deserting, and that he voluntarily returned with the intention of going back into the Army without knowing that he was doing wrong by enlisting in another regiment instead of going back to his proper regiment.

Mr. TALBERT. Mr. Chairman, it seems from the reading of the report, if I heard it correctly—there was so much talking I could not hear very well—that this soldier deserted and reenlisted. The presumption is that he did that to receive a bounty. Possibly he may have enlisted two or three times and received a bounty each time. I submit that it is not a meritorious claim.

Mr. MIERS of Indiana. I would suggest to the gentleman from South Carolina that the report says that he had three years' service, which is a good, long, valuable service; and if the committee passed it, I would be willing to rely on the committee.

Mr. TALBERT. Lucifer was once an angel of light, but he turned to darkness. [Laughter.]

Mr. MIERS of Indiana. I do not quite see the application.

Mr. TALBERT. Benedict Arnold was once a good soldier, but he turned traitor.

Mr. CASTLE. Let me suggest to the gentleman from South Carolina that the United States Government never paid any bounty, and the report shows that this man enlisted in the Regular Army.

Mr. BELKNAP. He did, in the Regular Army.

Mr. CASTLE. Bounties were only paid by counties and States.

Mr. TALBERT. Mr. Chairman, I move that that bill be reported to the House with a recommendation that it lie on the table. The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. TALBERT) there were—aye 1, noes 18.

So the motion was rejected.

Mr. TALBERT. Mr. Chairman, I do not want to make the point of no quorum, but I want to suggest to members that this is quite a thin House for legislation. [Laughter.]

Mr. BOTKIN. I submit, Mr. Chairman, that we are not legislating very much to-night.

Mr. TALBERT. I should like to know what dictionary the gentleman gets his definition from.

The amendment recommended by the committee was agreed to.

The bill as amended was then laid aside to be reported to the House with a favorable recommendation.

JAMES ROCHE.

The next business was the bill (H. R. 2412) to amend the military record of James Roche.

The bill was read, as follows:

Be it enacted etc., That the Secretary of War be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to amend the military record of James Roche so as to show him honorably discharged from Company K, One hundred and fifty-fifth New York Volunteers, and to grant him such honorable discharge.

The Committee on Military Affairs recommend the following amendment:

Provided, That no pay, bounty, or other emoluments shall become due or payable by virtue of the passage of this act.

Mr. BURKE. Mr. Chairman, I have seldom ever obtruded myself or my views upon this House. I am going to make a motion, but before doing it, let me in all frankness and in candor say to each member here present that we have been here one hour and a quarter and there have been three bills removing the charge of desertion passed the House. There are, so I am told, 37 other bills, and it must be perfectly apparent to every member present that we can accomplish very little here to-night.

Every member who is present to-night is here for some object. Business has brought him here. I am here, my friend is here, we are all here for a certain object; and my motion is this, and I do trust that my friend from Michigan and the distinguished gentleman from New York will not object, in view of the surroundings. I move that every member present be permitted to call up one bill by unanimous consent, and after we shall have finished that we shall return to the Calendar where we have left it and proceed with removing charges of desertion. Gentlemen, that is fair; there is nothing wrong in that. If I thought there were, I would not submit it.

Mr. PACKER of Pennsylvania. Does that include all bills?

Mr. BURKE. One member shall call up any bill he wishes to on the Calendar.

Mr. RAY of New York. No; that can not be done to-night.

Mr. BURKE. While I am here I want to say this, Mr. Chairman: I agree thoroughly with the suggestions made by the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. TALBERT]. I have a contempt for a deserter, and I believe the House of Representatives and the American people ought to give relief first to the old soldiers and to the wives and children of the old soldiers before they are called upon to give relief to men who deserted the flag in the hour of danger.

I have a contempt for such a class of men as that. If it were left to me individually, I would never vote to remove the charge of desertion standing against the name of any man in the United States, I care not who he may be. I believe we ought to pass this bill in justice to the soldier, in justice to his widow, and in justice to his children. I ask the gentleman not to object.

Mr. RAY of New York. Now, Mr. Chairman, I have been here every Friday night, when we have had a meeting of the House, to take care of this legislation. I have noticed this—and I call attention to it emphatically—that when a gentleman gets a bill on the Calendar he attends these Friday night sessions; and he never attends them unless he has a bill on the Calendar.

Mr. BURKE. If that remark is intended to apply to me, I wish to say to the gentleman that I attended the meeting of this House last Friday night, and I had no bill on the Calendar.

Mr. RAY of New York. Then the gentleman has been here twice.

Mr. BURKE. Yes; twice. There have been only two or three meetings of the committee—I am not sure how many.

Mr. COOPER of Texas. I want to say to the gentleman from New York that it is very evident he is incorrect in his statement, because bills are now pending on the Calendar that have no one here to represent them.

Mr. GREENE of Nebraska. The gentleman from New York will allow me to say for one that I have been here, I think, every Friday night.

Mr. RAY of New York. And you have a bill on the Calendar to-night.

Mr. GREENE of Nebraska. But I have been here every Friday night when there has been a meeting of the House during the present session of Congress. That is my recollection. And certainly I have not had a bill on the Calendar every Friday night.

Mr. VANDIVER. Will the gentleman from New York allow me—

Mr. RAY of New York. I will yield to the gentleman in a moment. Let me say that last Friday night we had a meeting here, and we cleared up every bill on the Calendar. When we came here there was no time spent in talking except when the gentleman from South Carolina asked for some explanation of a bill; when the explanation was given, we went on. We passed last Friday night over fifty bills; and one night when we proceeded in the same way we passed over sixty. Now we came here to-night at 8 o'clock, and the very first thing that was started was talk, talk, talk, and quarrelings, and reflections, first upon the Committee on Military Affairs and then upon other committees, then reflections upon individual members.

There are on this Calendar about 20 bills for soldiers of the Mexican and Indian wars, nearly all of them from the South. I want to say to my Democratic friends on the other side of the House that they have nearly the same number of bills on the Calendar that the Republicans have. I know whom those bills represent. They come from Texas and Mississippi and almost every State of the South.

We have to-night spent an hour and twenty minutes in talk, each member trying to get his bill ahead of the others. Now, if we had spent this time in considering the bills in their regular order, the desertion bills would have been out of the way, the Mexican war pension bills would have been out of the way, and by 10 o'clock every bill upon the Calendar that could be considered here to-night would have been through the Committee of the Whole, and by half past 10 o'clock they would have been through the House and ready to go to the Senate.

Now, I appeal to gentlemen, as each case is taken up, to listen either to the report or to a statement of the case, and to pass the bill and then go on, thus doing all we can to-night; and next Friday night let us come here with a determination to pursue the same course, and by half past 10 o'clock you will have the Calendar cleared. That is the way to do business. Now I will yield to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. VANDIVER] for a question.

Mr. VANDIVER. My purpose was not so much to ask a question as to make this statement: That I think the gentleman from New York has done quite as much talking to-night as anybody else, and has consumed quite as much time. I am sure that for my part I have done very little, and what little I have done was for the purpose of expediting business rather than retarding it.

The gentleman started out by saying that he had been here every Friday night when we had had a meeting. Now, without intending to reflect upon anybody or irritate anybody, I should like to know why it is that with five or six thousand pension bills before the Committee on Invalid Pensions we have had no other meeting during these past weeks. I believe this is only the second or the third meeting during this session of Congress.

Mr. RAY of New York. Now, Mr. Chairman, let me answer the gentleman. The House of Representatives has had nearly one hundred of its bills constantly before the Senate not acted upon. We have now something like eighty pension bills before the Senate awaiting its action.

Mr. VANDIVER. Well, let the Senate be responsible for the delay.

Mr. RAY of New York (continuing). And before the Senate disposes of them we will have eighty more ready for them. We will have, at all events, from eighty to one hundred bills unacted upon by the Senate all the time.

Mr. VANDIVER. I would like to ask if the gentleman from New York would consider it a reasonable answer to an objection as to any other bill that might be pending that we should not pass it or give it attention now because we have reason to suspect that the Senate would not consider it? Is that a reason to stop legislation here? I want some better reason why there has not been an opportunity to get rid of all of these bills.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will submit the question of the gentleman from Texas, that each member present be allowed to call up one bill.

Mr. RAY of New York. I have already objected to that, Mr. Chairman, and renew the objection.

The CHAIRMAN. But the question is now on the motion of the gentleman from Texas, which is not subject to objection.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. BRUCKER. I raise the point of order that it is not in order to entertain the motion.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair thinks it is in order.

Mr. BURKE. It is too late now, as the motion has once been submitted to the House, and the Chair announced that it had been carried.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will again submit the motion, as there was some confusion before.

The question was taken on the motion of Mr. BURKE; and it was agreed to.

Mr. COOPER of Texas. Then I suppose the order proposed would be the alphabetical order of the members present?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will state first that the bill (H. R. 2412) to amend the military record of James Roche was being considered by the committee, and the first question will be on the amendments proposed by the committee to that bill.

The amendments were agreed to.

The bill as amended was laid aside to be reported to the House with the recommendation that it do pass.

ORDER OF BUSINESS.

Mr. COOPER of Texas. I now call up the bill H. R. 8179—

Mr. McRAE. Mr. Chairman, I suggest that we have some order, or the call of the roll, in this business.

Mr. RAY of New York. I make the point of order that the committee can not change the order of the bills on the Calendar or the calling of the bills, except by unanimous consent. The rule of the House requires that when we go into Committee of the Whole the bills shall be taken up in their order on the Calendar.

Mr. McRAE. The gentleman is mistaken. We have repeatedly laid aside bills and taken up others.

Mr. RAY of New York. Only by unanimous consent. The rule requires the bills to be taken up in their order.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair overrules the point of order. The rule provides:

In the Committee of the Whole House business on their Calendars may be taken up in the regular order, or in such order as the Committee may determine.

Mr. COOPER of Texas. Then I am in order in my request.

Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I move that the bills be called in their order on the Calendar, and where the member is present that the bill be considered.

The motion was agreed to.

EMILY M'LAINE.

The first bill on the Calendar was the bill (H. R. 11420) to pension Emily McLaine.

Mr. McRAE. Mr. Chairman, I call for the reading of the bill.

The bill was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he hereby is, authorized and directed to place upon the pension roll the name of Emily McLaine, widow of M. T. McLaine, late a private in Capt. Samuel Moore's Company, D. First Arkansas Volunteers, Mounted Gun Men, 1838 (called out for the protection of the Sabine frontier), and pay her a pension of \$12 per month.

The committee recommended the adoption of the following amendments:

Change the spelling of the claimant's and soldier's surname to "McLain." In line 9 strike out "twelve" and insert "eight."

Amend the title so as to read: "A bill granting a pension to Emily McLain."

The amendments were agreed to.

The bill as amended was laid aside to be reported to the House with a favorable recommendation.

LEVI M. TRUIT.

The next business on the Calendar was the bill (H. R. 8179) for the relief of Levi M. Truitt.

Mr. COOPER of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I ask the consideration of that bill.

The bill was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior is hereby authorized and directed to place upon the pension roll the name of Levi M. Truitt, a soldier in the Mexican war, and is authorized and directed to pay to the said Levi M. Truitt the sum of \$12 per month as pension.

The committee recommended the adoption of the following amendments:

Change the spelling of the claimant's surname to "Truitt."

Strike out all after the word "war" in line 5 and substitute therefor the words "and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month."

Amend the title so as to read: "A bill granting a pension to Levi M. Truitt."

The amendments were agreed to.

The bill as amended was laid aside to be reported to the House with the recommendation that it do pass.

JUDITH DOHERTY.

The next business was the bill (H. R. 11899) granting a pension to Judith Doherty.

The bill was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to place upon the pension roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws, the name of Judith Doherty, widow of William F. Doherty, late a corporal in Captain Russell's company, First Regiment Volunteer Mounted Gunmen, West Tennessee, Indian war of 1813, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$3 per month.

The bill was ordered to be laid aside to be reported to the House with a favorable recommendation.

ALBERT PUTNAM.

Mr. LACEY. Mr. Chairman, the next bill on the Calendar is that to pension Albert Putnam. My colleague [Mr. HULL] had charge of that bill. He has been ill a good deal of the time lately and unable to be here at the day sessions of the House. He asked that in case such an order was made as has been made this evening he might be excused from the effect of it. Of course members all know the situation.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Iowa [Mr. LACEY] asks unanimous consent that the succeeding bill may be taken up, notwithstanding the absence of the gentleman who introduced it in consequence of his sickness. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The bill (H. R. 9702) granting a pension to Albert Putnam, Company E, Twenty-first United States Infantry, was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior is hereby authorized and directed to place upon the pension roll of the United States at \$12 per month, under the limitations and regulations of the Pension Bureau, Albert Putnam, late a member of Company E, Twenty-first United States Infantry.

The Committee on Pensions recommended the following amendments:

Strike out of the title all after the word "Putnam."

Strike out all after the enacting clause and substitute therefor the following:

"That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to place upon the pension roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws, the name of Albert Putnam, late of Company E, Twenty-first United States Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month."

The amendments recommended by the committee were agreed to.

The bill as amended was ordered to be laid aside to be reported to the House with a favorable recommendation.

FLORA STANTON KALK.

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Chairman, the bill (S. 4775) granting a pension to Flora Stanton Kalk has been passed over. I represent that bill. I introduced a similar bill in the House, but the House committee adopted the Senate bill. Am I not entitled under the order made this evening to call up the bill?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair holds that under the order made by the House the gentleman, being present, can call up the bill.

The bill was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to place upon the pension roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws, the name of Flora Stanton Kalk, and infant children, widow of First Lieut. Frank Green Kalk, late of the Fifth United States Infantry.

The Committee on Pensions recommended the following amendments:

In line 6 strike out "and infant children," and after the word "Infantry," in line 8, add the words "and pay her a pension at the rate of \$17 per month."

The amendments recommended by the committee were agreed to.

The bill as amended was ordered to be laid aside to be reported to the House with a favorable recommendation.

ROBERT FLOWER.

The next business was the bill (H. R. 7632) to remove the charge of desertion from the military record of Robert Flower.

The bill was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of War be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to remove from the rolls and records of the War Department the charge of desertion now standing against the name of Robert Flower, late a private in Company E of the Seventy-ninth Regiment of New York Volunteers, and to issue to said Robert Flower a certificate of honorable discharge from said organization.

The Committee on Military Affairs recommended the following amendment:

Insert at the end of the bill the following:

"Provided, That no pay, bounty, or other emoluments shall become due or payable by virtue of the passage of this act."

The amendment recommended by the committee was agreed to.

The bill as amended was ordered to be laid aside to be reported to the House with a favorable recommendation.

GEORGE BROWN.

Mr. CURTIS of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, the bill H. R. 10385 has been passed over. I introduced that bill and have been present here this evening. I was called out into the lobby for a few moments and the bill was passed over during that time. I ask unanimous consent to return to that bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair thinks the gentleman is entitled to have his bill called up.

The bill (H. R. 10385) for the relief of George Brown was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to place upon the pension roll the name of George Brown, late of Company G, Tenth United States Cavalry, and Company M, Ninth United States Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The Committee on Pensions recommended that the title of the bill be amended so as to read: "A bill granting a pension to George Brown."

The amendment recommended by the committee was agreed to.

The bill as amended was ordered to be laid aside to be reported to the House with a favorable recommendation.

WILLIAM MOORE.

Mr. JETT. I ask to take up the bill (H. R. 11615) removing the charge of desertion from the record of William Moore, Company I, Twenty-third Regiment Kentucky Volunteers, No. 1061 on the Calendar. It appears to have been passed over. The gentleman who introduced the bill is not present, but wished me to look after it.

Mr. GREENE of Nebraska. You can not take it up under the order which has been adopted.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair thinks that would not come within the order of the House.

HARRIETTE F. HOVEY.

Mr. WARNER. Mr. Chairman, I call up the bill S. 2616, No. 1157 on the Calendar.

The bill (S. 2616) granting a pension to Harriette F. Hovey was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to place on the pension roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws, the name of Harriette F. Hovey, widow of Charles E. Hovey, late colonel of the Thirty-third Regiment Illinois Volunteers and brevet major-general of volunteers, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

The bill was ordered to be laid aside to be reported to the House with a favorable recommendation.

JOHN M. PALMER.

Mr. RAY of New York. Mr. Chairman, I call attention to the bill S. 5342, Calendar No. 1156. The House bill was introduced by the gentleman who now occupies the chair [Mr. CONNOLLY], and I think it is right that that should be considered.

The bill (S. 5342) granting a pension to John M. Palmer was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to place on the pension roll the name of John M. Palmer, late major-general, United States Volunteers, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$100 per month.

The Committee on Invalid Pensions recommended the following amendments:

In line 4, after the word "roll," insert the words "subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws."

In line 6 strike out the words "one hundred" and insert the word "fifty."

Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana. Let us have the report on that bill, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman desire the report read?

Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana. Yes; I desire the report read on that.

The report (by Mr. RAY of New York) was read, as follows:

The Committee on Invalid Pensions, to whom was referred the bill (S. 5342) granting a pension to John M. Palmer, late a major-general in the volunteer service of the United States during the war of the rebellion, have examined the same and all the evidence relating thereto and most respectfully report:

The Senate act proposes to pension at \$100 per month John M. Palmer, of Springfield, Ill.

The act as amended and reported to the House proposes to pension him at \$50 per month.

The beneficiary of this bill, John M. Palmer, was elected colonel of the Fourteenth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry on the 9th day of May, 1861; was made brigadier-general of volunteers, and later was made major-general of volunteers. He resigned in September, 1863, having held many important commands, including that of the Fourteenth Army Corps in the Atlanta campaign and the military department of Kentucky, and having participated in many important battles. His military service was valuable and most honorable. Prior to the war he held civil offices, including that of probate judge, and after the war held many civil offices, including that of United States Senator from the State of Illinois.

Nearly always an officeholder and always strictly honest, he finds himself now, in his eighty-second year, retired to private life without means or income, broken in health, blind in one eye and rapidly losing the sight of the other. It is not claimed, however, that his present physical or financial condition in any way results from his army service.

Under the general law applicable to all soldiers of the Republic in like condition (the disability not being of service origin), he is entitled to a pension of \$12 per month and no more.

Were his present disabilities of service origin, he would be entitled to a pension of \$30 per month; and should his disabilities (were they of service origin) so increase as to require the frequent and periodical attendance of a third person, that pension could be increased to \$50 per month.

We are not to pension General Palmer because he has been a distinguished man in civil life, but because he was a most capable, brave, and efficient officer during the civil war. When a United States Senator General Palmer was for many years chairman of the Committee on Pensions in that body, and while he was always just and liberal in his treatment of the old soldiers, his comrades in arms, he was consistent and believed that equality is equity, and was always opposed to large and sentimental pensions, based on social standing and political pull, for a few favored ones, while the great mass of the brave and needy only draw \$12 per month when totally disabled from earning a living by reason of disease not contracted in the service.

Fifty dollars per month is all that General Palmer himself will approve, for he wants no different treatment accorded him than the Government accords others of equal rank in the service and equal need now. That sum will afford him a reasonable support and lift him above want. The thousands of his old comrades in arms, equally brave and equally in necessitous circumstances, must be remembered and a reasonable provision made for them by special legislation when exceptional cases of great merit are presented.

The Senate act is therefore reported back with the recommendation that it pass when amended.

Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana. I desired the reading of this re-

port in order to emphasize to the House the situation here presented. Here is an applicant for a pension who, under the law, is not entitled to it. It is urged in his favor that he is old, decrepit, and unable to make a living. The same grounds might be urged in favor of every soldier of the late war who receives no pension to-day.

General Palmer was in public life a man of eminence; and while the old soldiers who have four or five thousand bills before the Invalid Pensions Committee of this House are waiting they could urge the same reasons for the consideration of their bills as are presented here. They did not have the advantage of large salaries in public office to support those dependent upon them in affluence and to enable them to save something for a rainy day.

So we find a situation here based largely on sentimentality, because it can not be claimed under any construction of the law that General Palmer is entitled to a pension. Why is he entitled to a pension any more than thousands of soldiers who are knocking now at the door of the Committee on Invalid Pensions and knocking at the door of the Committee on Pensions? Can it be said by reason of his age that he is entitled to it?

I have here also a bill—it was presented in the Senate anterior to the one before the House—for a worthy soldier, Gen. Albert P. Godding, who is insane, deaf, debilitated, and incapacitated both in mind and body by reason of heavy cannonading in battles through which he passed; and his bill was passed in the Senate long before this bill. It passed that body long, long ago. He is left to die insane, a charge practically upon the public, and will be buried by the public maybe without any consideration of his claim by the Invalid Pension Committee.

Now, if there is any case under the sun where the line should be drawn, where care should be used in voting the public money, it is a case such as is presented here. Private soldiers who may have been of less age than General Palmer have fought their battles; many were wounded; and they do not seek nor receive the consideration that is sought by the applicant. Not only that, but here we have the spectacle presented of having a wedge entering in our Government policy. One precedent will create another. They soon accumulate and constitute law. What yesterday was fact, to-day is custom. So that if you pension one who is not entitled to a pension, how can you avoid the irresistible conclusion that you must pension all?

Mr. RAY of New York. The gentleman would not desire, I know, to lead himself, the House, or the country into error.

Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana. I did not catch the gentleman's statement.

Mr. RAY of New York. You would not desire to lead the House, the country, or yourself into error.

Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana. If there is any fact you have, I would be glad for you to state it.

Mr. RAY of New York. You have stated once or twice, inadvertently, I know, that General Palmer under no circumstances would be entitled to a pension.

Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana. Under the law.

Mr. RAY of New York. Why, certainly. Under the law he is entitled to a pension of \$12 a month.

Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana. I understood from the reading of the report he was not entitled to a pension of \$12 only.

Mr. RAY of New York. What is given above \$12 is an increase on account of rank and pecuniary necessity.

Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana. And now it is sought to pension him at the rate of \$50 a month?

Mr. RAY of New York. That is right. By way of an increase, on account of rank and his blindness.

Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana. What would he be entitled to?

Mr. RAY of New York. Twelve dollars per month. Now, if the gentleman will permit me, you have referred to Mr. Godding. He is insane; he is in an institution for the insane. We have here a Government Hospital for the Insane. He is in St. Elizabeth's and is taken care of by the United States, and having the very best care that can be given to any human being. He has no one on earth dependent upon him and no family, and the public is taking care of him.

Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana. I appeal to the gentleman, who was a soldier himself, whether a man who went through the civil war, as did hundreds of thousands of soldiers, ought to-day to be a public charge, or when he is laid away ought he to be buried at the expense of the public?

Mr. RAY of New York. Will you permit me right there?

Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana. Certainly; an interruption does not embarrass me.

Mr. RAY of New York. The gentleman and I will not quarrel over this. Now, then, the gentleman that you refer to, Mr. Godding, is insane. He can not be taken care of in a private family; he must be kept in a place designed for the care of the insane, and that is where he is now. If he had a pension of a thousand dollars a month he could not have any better attention; if he had a pension of a thousand dollars a day he could not be taken out of

that asylum; he would have to remain where he is. The United States Government is taking care of him now.

Remember that General Palmer is blind and poor.

Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana. Now, I have never criticised—

Mr. LACEY. I would also like to make an additional suggestion. St. Elizabeth's is a national place, and Mr. Godding is being taken care of by the National Government.

Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana. In response to the suggestion that we need to hurry along, I have only this to say, that we have been denied evenings for pension consideration, and gentlemen should use their efforts to secure them hereafter.

Mr. SIMPSON. Now, I would like to suggest to the gentleman that if he talks too long and takes up too much time in answering gentlemen we will not reach this case that I have, to pension a very worthy dependent widow.

Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana. There will not be any unnecessary waste of time—

Mr. SIMPSON. So that we can get to this widow.

Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana. I suggest that the remedy might be sought at a future Friday night meeting.

Mr. SIMPSON. No; this has got to go through to-night or it will not go through at all.

Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana. I have not complained of the Committee on Invalid Pensions having presented to the House bills unworthy, nor have I complained because they have presented too many bills. Outside of this special bill, which I do not believe has merit, I believe the Invalid Pensions Committee has done good work in the small number of bills they have presented, and they never have presented enough. I want to call the attention of the House to the simple fact that we have not had a chance to consider, as the House of Representatives ought, the Godding bill, which is not here present; and I do not believe the statement by the gentleman from New York [Mr. RAY] excuses a failure to present that bill. I also call to the attention of the House another case presented to me by a Grand Army post of Indiana:

To the Congress of the United States of America:

We, the members of Judson Kilpatrick Post, No. 45, Department of Indiana, Grand Army of the Republic, through the officers of said post, send greeting and would show:

That a member of this post, Comrade Charles Allen, who was a private in Company B, Fourth Regiment Michigan Volunteers, was granted a pension over twenty years ago, at the rate of \$4 per month, to date from the 1st day of July, 1864, and continued to receive such pension until the 15th day of July, 1892, at which date he was granted \$8 per month under the act of June 27, 1890, to date from the 17th day of November, 1890, and was paid at the rate of \$8 per month to the 4th day of May, 1896.

That on the 27th day of May, 1896, a new certificate, under the act of June 27, 1890, was issued, "in lieu of certificate dated July 15, 1892, to recover erroneous payments under general law," on the margin of which certificate was the following entry:

"Deduct all payments under act of June 27, 1890, and recover at the rate of \$4 per month from July 1, 1864, to date of last payment under general law."

Which is construed by the pension agent at Indianapolis to mean that all pension paid him from July 1, 1864, to the 17th day of November, 1890, to wit, \$1,336.40, is to be recovered back, and that he is to receive no further pay until his present rate at \$8 per month shall have amounted to the said \$1,336.40, which, as said pension agent has figured it, will be the August payment in 1909, at which time there will be due him \$5.87. (?)

Comrade Allen is now past 60 years old, is poor, has no income of any kind, except what he earns by days' work, has a family to support, and will in all probability be dead before the year 1909.

He served three years in said Fourth Regiment Michigan Volunteers, participating in all the campaigns and battles during that time that the regiment was in, and now in his old age, when he actually needs the help, to have the small pension of \$8 per month stopped on him, and worse, that he be compelled to pay back all he had received at \$4 per month, is, in the opinion of his comrades, not only unjust, but cruelly wrong.

And we appeal to the Congress of the great Government he gave the best years of his life to preserve, to right this great wrong by at once placing his name on the pension roll for at least \$8 per month, from the 4th day of May, 1896.

We notice a move is about to be made to place the name of Gen. John M. Palmer on the pension roll at \$100 per month. We don't object to this, but simply ask that at the same time, the name of poor old comrade Charles Allen be also placed on the roll—not at \$100 per month, but at \$8, as above prayed for. We ask this in justice, and we ask it because it is right. And for this we will ever pray.

By command of the post:

LEWIS KIRKWOOD,
Post Commander.

Official:

W. H. LEMMON, Post Adjutant.
FREMONT, IND., January 21, 1899.

Mr. TALBERT. I would like to ask the chairman of the committee what is the condition of General Palmer?

Mr. RAY of New York. General Palmer, if my recollection serves me, is 82 years old, or 84, and he is nearly blind.

Mr. TALBERT. Has he no taxable property?

Mr. RAY of New York. He has not—not a cent in the world.

Mr. TALBERT. No plantation?

Mr. RAY of New York. Not a cent; no property whatever, unless we have been outrageously lied to.

Mr. TALBERT. Have you nothing more than the simple statements?

Mr. RAY of New York. Oh, yes; we have affidavits and letters and statements from those who know him.

Mr. TALBERT. And he has no taxable property in the world?

Mr. RAY of New York. That is what they say; and he is absolutely blind in one eye and nearly blind in the other.

Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to annex to my remarks a statement by the Grand Army post, not against this bill, but in connection with my remarks.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the request of the gentleman from Indiana will be granted.

There was no objection.

Mr. BRUCKER. Mr. Chairman, I call attention to the fact that this bill to pension General Palmer, who was the candidate of the so-called Sound-Money Democracy for President in 1896, was introduced within the last thirty days, and has already reached this stage of its passage.

Mr. TALBERT. Mr. Chairman, I move to amend the amount fixed in the bill by making it \$30 instead of \$50.

The question was taken; and the amendment offered by Mr. TALBERT was rejected.

The amendments recommended by the committee were agreed to.

Mr. TALBERT. Mr. Chairman, I move that the \$50 be paid in silver. [Laughter.]

The bill was laid aside to be reported to the House with a favorable recommendation.

WILLIAM MOORE.

The next business was the bill (H. R. 11615) removing the charge of desertion from William Moore, Company I, Twenty-third Regiment Kentucky Volunteers.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of War be, and he is hereby, directed to remove the charge of desertion from the military record of William Moore, late a member of Company I, Twenty-third Kentucky Infantry Volunteers, and grant to him an honorable discharge.

SEC. 2. That no pay or allowance shall become due by reason of the passage of this act.

The bill was laid aside to be reported to the House with a favorable recommendation.

ANDREW J. SNOWDEN.

The next business was the bill (H. R. 2293) granting a pension to Andrew J. Snowden, of Nebraska.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to place upon the pension roll the name of Andrew J. Snowden, late of Company B, Fifteenth United States Infantry, and allow him a pension at the rate of \$35 per month from and after the passage of this act, the same to be in lieu of pension certificate No. 90316, for meritorious services during the war of the rebellion and on account of suffering from gunshot wounds.

The committee amendments were as follows:

In line 4 strike out "upon" and insert in lieu thereof "on."

In line 4, after "roll," insert "subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws."

In line 6 strike out "allow" and insert "pay."

In lines 6 and 7 strike out "thirty-five" and insert in lieu thereof "twenty-five."

Strike out all after "month," in line 7, and insert "in lieu of the pension he is now receiving."

Amend the title so as to read: "A bill granting an increase of pension to Andrew J. Snowden."

The amendments recommended by the committee were agreed to.

The bill as amended was laid aside to be reported to the House with a favorable recommendation.

CATHARINE C. GOODRICH.

The next business was the bill (H. R. 10355) to pension Catharine C. Goodrich according to the military rank of her husband.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That from the date of the death of her husband, Catharine C. Goodrich, widow of Charles H. Goodrich, late of the First Regiment of Ohio Volunteer Cavalry, and whose military record has been corrected so as to give him the rank of a first lieutenant of Company M in said regiment, to take effect from the 29th day of June, 1865, is hereby pensioned at the rate of \$18 per month, less the amount of pension she has already received as his widow.

The committee amendments were as follows:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert the following:

"That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to place on the pension roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws, the name of Catharine C. Goodrich, widow of Charles H. Goodrich, late first lieutenant Company M, First Regiment Ohio Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$17 per month in lieu of that she now receives."

Amend the title so as to read: "A bill granting an increase of pension to Catharine C. Goodrich."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was laid aside to be reported to the House with a favorable recommendation.

CATHERINE EAKIN.

The next business was the bill (H. R. 9059) to pension Catherine Eakin.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to place on the pension roll the name of Catherine Eakin, widow of Alexander McI. Eakin, of Company D, One hundred and seventy-ninth New York Infantry, and pay her a pension of \$12 per month.

The committee amendments were as follows:

In line 4, after "roll," insert "subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws."

In line 7, after "pension," insert "at the rate."

Amend the title so that it will read: "A bill granting a pension to Catherine Eakin."

The amendments recommended by the committee were agreed to.

The bill as amended was laid aside to be reported to the House with a favorable recommendation.

AMANDA WILLMARTH.

The next business was the bill (H. R. 10858) granting an increase of pension to Amanda Willmarth.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to place on the pension roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws, the name of Amanda Willmarth, widow of James D. Willmarth, late of Companies B and C, Seventy-sixth Regiment New York Volunteers, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$50 per month in lieu of the pension she is now receiving.

The committee amendment was as follows:

In line 8 strike out "fifty" and insert "eighteen."

The amendment recommended by the committee was agreed to.

The bill as amended was laid aside to be reported to the House with a favorable recommendation.

JAMES PORTER.

The next business was the bill (H. R. 10803) granting an increase of pension to James Porter.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to place the name of James Porter, late of Company K, Thirty-second Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, on the pension roll of the United States, at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of the pension he is now receiving, under the limitations and regulations of the Pension Bureau.

The amendments recommended by the committee were as follows:

In line 4, after "place," insert "on the pension roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws."

In line 6 strike out "on the pension roll of the United States" and insert "and pay him a pension."

In line 7 strike out "thirty" and insert "twenty."

Strike out all after "receiving," in line 8.

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill as amended was laid aside to be reported to the House with a favorable recommendation.

THOMAS J. HAUGHEY.

The next business was the bill (S. 821) to increase the pension of Thomas J. Haughey.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, directed to place upon the pension roll the name of Thomas J. Haughey, a soldier in both the Mexican war and the war of the rebellion, and pay him a pension of \$30 per month in lieu of any pension which he now receives.

The bill was laid aside to be reported to the House with a favorable recommendation.

JAMES J. MARCHER.

The next business was the bill (H. R. 8749) for the relief of James J. Marcher.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to place upon the pension roll the name of James J. Marcher, late of Company E, First California Cavalry Volunteers, and to grant to him a pension of \$72 per month, subject to the conditions and limitations of the pension laws.

With the following committee amendments:

In line 4, after "roll," insert "subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws."

Line 6, strike out "to grant to" and insert "pay."

Lines 6 and 7, strike out "seventy-two" and insert "twenty."

Strike out all after "month," line 7.

Amend the title so it will read: "A bill granting a pension to James J. Marcher."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill as amended was laid aside to be reported to the House with a favorable recommendation.

AMANDA F. JUMPER.

The next business was the bill (S. 4982) granting an increase of pension to Amanda F. Jumper.

The bill was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to place on the pension roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws, the name of Amanda F. Jumper, widow of the late Alden H. Jumper, major, Twenty-sixth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$25 per month in lieu of the pension she is now receiving.

The amendment reported by the committee was read, and agreed to, as follows:

In line 8 strike out "twenty-five" and insert "twenty."

The bill as amended was laid aside to be reported favorably.

NANCY SHALEY.

The next business was the bill (H. R. 10241) granting a pension to Nancy Shaley.

The bill was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to place the name of Nancy Shaley, widow of Thomas Shaley, late of Company H, Eleventh Regiment of Kentucky Cavalry Volunteers, on the pension roll, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$8 per month.

The amendment reported by the committee was read, and agreed to, as follows:

In line 7, after "roll," insert "subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws."

The bill as amended was laid aside to be reported favorably.

KITTY ANN PATTERSON.

The next business was the bill (H. R. 3155) granting a pension to Kitty Ann Loggins.

The bill was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to place on the pension roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws, the name of Kitty Ann Loggins, widow of Isaiah Loggins, late private of Company D, Twenty-eighth Regiment United States Colored Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The amendments reported by the committee were read, and agreed to, as follows:

In line 6 strike out "Loggins" and insert "Patterson."

After "Loggins," in line 7, insert "or Patterson."

In line 8, after the word "Infantry," insert the words "and pay her a pension."

In line 8 strike out the word "twelve" and insert the word "eight."

Amend title by striking out "Loggins" and inserting "Patterson."

The bill as amended was laid aside to be reported favorably.

ARBA CAPRON.

The next business was the bill (H. R. 7040) granting an increase of pension to Arba Capron, of North Topeka, Kans.

The bill was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to increase and pay a pension of \$50 per month, in lieu of the pension now received, to Arba Capron, of North Topeka, Kans., late of Company I, Fiftieth New York Volunteer Engineers; said increased pension to be subject to the provisions and limitation of the pension laws.

The amendments reported by the committee were read, and agreed to, as follows:

In lines 4 and 5 strike out "to increase and pay a pension of \$50 per month, in lieu of the pension now received, to" and insert in lieu thereof "to place on the pension roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws, the name of."

In line 6 strike out "of North Topeka, Kans."

Strike out all after "Engineers," in line 7, and insert "and pay him a pension at the rate of \$24 per month, in lieu of that he now receives."

Amend the title so it will read: "A bill granting an increase of pension to Arba Capron."

The bill as amended was laid aside to be reported favorably.

STEPHEN M. DAVIS.

The next business was the bill (S. 1827) granting an increase of pension to Stephen M. Davis.

The bill was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to place on the pension roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws, the name of Stephen M. Davis, late private in Company A, Second Regiment North Carolina Mounted Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month, in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The bill was laid aside to be reported favorably.

LAVINIA M. PAYNE.

The next business was the bill (H. R. 3574) to increase the pension of Mrs. L. M. Payne.

The bill was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to place the name of Lavinia M. Payne, who was a nurse in the Medical Department of the United States Volunteers, upon the pension roll at the rate of \$30 per month, in lieu of that at which she was pensioned by certificate No. 870579, subject to the laws and regulations governing the granting and issuing of pensions to army nurses and the general provisions of the United States pension laws in other respects.

The amendments reported by the committee were read, and agreed to, as follows:

Line 6, after "roll," insert "and pay her a pension."

Line 6 strike out "thirty" and insert "twenty-four."

Strike out all after "she," line 7, and insert "now receives."

Amend the title so it will read: "A bill granting an increase of pension to Lavinia M. Payne."

The bill as amended was laid aside to be reported favorably.

BELLE SHUMARD.

The next business was the bill (H. R. 5200) to grant a pension to Mrs. Belle Shumard, widow of Dr. George G. Shumard, late surgeon, United States Volunteers.

The bill was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, directed to place the name of Mrs. Belle Shumard, widow of Dr. George G. Shumard, late surgeon, United States Volunteers, and medical director of the district of Kentucky, on the pension rolls, and pay her the sum of \$50 per month.

The amendments reported by the committee were read, and agreed to, as follows:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert the following: "That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to place on the pension roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws, the name of Belle Shumard, widow of George G. Shumard, late surgeon, United States Volunteers, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$35 per month."

Amend the title so it will read: "A bill granting a pension to Belle Shumard."

The bill as amended was laid aside to be reported favorably.

ISOM GIBSON.

Mr. DINSMORE. Mr. Chairman, I ask consent to consider the bill (S. 4854) granting a pension to Isom Gibson.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the bill will be read.

The bill was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to place on the pension roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws, the name of Isom Gibson, of Company B, commanded by Captain Bateman, Arkansas Volunteers, Sabine disturbances, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 a month.

Mr. DINSMORE. I move that the bill be reported favorably to the House.

The motion was agreed to; and the bill was laid aside to be reported favorably.

JERE SMITH.

The next business was the bill (H. R. 6681) to increase the pension of Jere Smith.

The bill was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior is hereby authorized and directed to place the name of Jere Smith, a sergeant of Company F, Thirtieth Regiment of Tennessee Cavalry, on the pension roll at the rate of \$35 per month, in lieu of the pension he is now receiving.

The amendments reported by the committee were read, and agreed to, as follows:

In line 4, after "place," insert "on the pension roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws."

In lines 5 and 6 strike out "on the pension roll at the rate of \$35 per month" and insert "and pay him a pension at the rate of \$18 per month."

Amend the title so as to read: "A bill granting an increase of pension to Jere Smith."

The bill as amended was laid aside to be reported favorably.

MILLIE A. BERRY.

The next business on the Private Calendar was the bill (S. 4231) granting an increase of pension to Millie A. Berry.

The bill was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to place on the pension roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws, the name of Millie A. Berry, widow of R. C. Berry, late first lieutenant of Company F, Seventy-seventh Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$17 per month in lieu of the pension she is now receiving.

The bill was laid aside to be reported to the House with the recommendation that it do pass.

PATRICK O'SHEA.

Mr. RAY of New York. Mr. Chairman, I desire to say to the members of the House that General CATCHINGS is sick. He has a very worthy soldier in his district whose bill is on this Calendar. The case is No. 1200 on the Calendar. I ask unanimous consent that it be considered now.

Mr. MIERS of Indiana. All right.

There was no objection.

The bill was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to place on the pension roll the name of Patrick O'Shea, late of Company K, Twenty-seventh Missouri Volunteer Mounted Infantry, and to pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month, subject otherwise to the provisions and limitations of the act of June 27, 1890.

The committee recommended the adoption of the following amendments:

In line 4, after "roll," insert "subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws."

Strike out all after "month," in line 8.

The amendments were agreed to.

The bill as amended was laid aside to be reported to the House with a favorable recommendation.

MRS. SUSAN STEDMAN.

The next business on the Private Calendar was the bill (H. R. 8598) granting an increase of pension to Mrs. Susan Stedman.

The bill was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to increase the pension of Mrs. Susan Stedman, widow of Kinsley Stedman, late a private in Company H, Eighty-third Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteers, from \$8, the amount now received by said widow, to \$15 per month.

The bill was laid aside to be reported to the House with a favorable recommendation.

ANNIE CUSACK.

The next business on the Calendar was the bill (H. R. 10605) to increase the pension of Annie Cusack.

The bill was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to place the name of Annie Cusack, widow of Patrick Cusack, late captain, Ninth Cavalry, United States Army, on the pension roll, and pay her a pension of \$20 per month in lieu of that which she is now receiving.

The committee recommended the adoption of the following amendment:

Insert after the word "roll," in line 6, the words "subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws;" and after the word "pension," in line 7, insert the words "at the rate."

The amendments were considered, and agreed to.

The bill as amended was laid aside to be reported to the House with a favorable recommendation.

ORDER OF BUSINESS.

Mr. RAY of New York. I move that the committee now rise and make report of the bills to the House.

The motion was agreed to.

The committee accordingly rose; and Mr. LACEY having resumed the chair as Speaker pro tempore, Mr. CONNOLLY reported that the Committee of the Whole House, having had under consideration sundry bills on the Private Calendar under the rule, had directed him to report them to the House with various recommendations.

BILLS PASSED.

Bills of the House of the following titles, reported from the Committee of the Whole with amendments, were considered, the amendments severally agreed to, and the bills as amended ordered to be engrossed and read a third time; and they were accordingly read the third time, and passed:

H. R. 8506. A bill to remove the charge of desertion from the military record of John P. Henderson and to grant him an honorable discharge;

H. R. 5758. A bill to remove the charge of desertion from the record of James Geissinger;

H. R. 3804. A bill for the relief of James McKenzie;

H. R. 2412. A bill to amend the military record of James Roche;

H. R. 11420. A bill to pension Emily McLain;

H. R. 8179. A bill for the relief of Levi M. Truitt;

H. R. 7302. A bill granting a pension to Albert Putnam, Company E, Twenty-first United States Infantry;

H. R. 7632. A bill to remove charge of desertion from the military record of Robert Flower;

H. R. 2293. A bill granting a pension to Andrew J. Snowden, of Nebraska;

H. R. 10355. A bill to pension Catharine C. Goodrich according to the military rank of her husband;

H. R. 9059. A bill to pension Catherine Eakin;

H. R. 10803. A bill granting an increase of pension to James Porter;

H. R. 8749. A bill for the relief of James J. Marcher;

H. R. 10241. A bill granting a pension to Nancy Shaley;

H. R. 3155. A bill granting a pension to Kitty Ann Patterson;

H. R. 7046. A bill granting an increase of pension to Arba Capron, of North Topeka, Kans.;

H. R. 2574. A bill to increase the pension of Mrs. L. M. Payne;

H. R. 5209. A bill to grant a pension to Mrs. Belle Shumard, widow of Dr. George G. Shumard, late surgeon, United States Volunteers;

H. R. 6681. A bill to increase the pension of Jere Smith;

H. R. 5328. A bill granting a pension to Patrick O'Shea;

H. R. 10605. A bill to increase the pension of Annie Cusack; and

H. R. 10858. A bill granting an increase of pension to Amanda Willmarth.

Bills of the House of the following titles, reported from the Committee of the Whole without amendment, were considered, ordered to be engrossed and read a third time; and being read the third time, were passed:

H. R. 11899. A bill granting a pension to Judith Doherty;

H. R. 10385. A bill for the relief of George Brown;

H. R. 11615. A bill removing the charge of desertion from the record of William Moore, Company I, Twenty-third Regiment Kentucky Volunteers; and

H. R. 8568. A bill granting an increase of pension to Mrs. Susan Stedman.

Bills of the Senate of the following titles, reported from the Committee of the Whole House with amendments, were considered, the amendments severally agreed to, and the bills as amended were ordered to a third reading; and being read the third time, were passed:

S. 4775. An act granting a pension to Flora Stanton Kalk;

S. 5342. An act granting a pension to John M. Palmer;

S. 4982. An act granting an increase of pension to Amanda F. Jumper; and

S. 4854. An act granting a pension to Isom Gibson.

Bills of the Senate of the following titles, reported to the Committee of the Whole without amendment, were considered, and

ordered to a third reading; and being read the third time, were passed:

- S. 2616. An act granting a pension to Harritte F. Hovey;
 S. 821. An act to increase the pension of Thomas J. Hanjhey;
 S. 1827. An act granting an increase of pension to Stephen M. Davis; and
 S. 4231. An act granting an increase of pension to Millie A. Berry.

CHAUNCEY A. BRADLEY.

Mr. RAY of New York. Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that a short time is yet remaining before the close of the evening session, I would like to ask unanimous consent to take up for consideration the Senate bill Calendar No. 1171 for present consideration. I refer to the bill S. 4630.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from New York asks unanimous consent to call up the bill Calendar No. 1171, S. 4630. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. RAY of New York. I ask unanimous consent that it be considered in the House as in Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman asks unanimous consent that the bill be considered in the House as in Committee of the Whole. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The bill (S. 4630) granting an increase of pension to Chauncey A. Bradley was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to place on the pension roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws, the name of Chauncey A. Bradley, late private in Company A, One hundred and fourteenth Regiment New York Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension of \$30 per month in lieu of the pension he is now receiving.

The Committee on Invalid Pensions recommended the following amendment; which was read, and agreed to:

In line 8, after the word "pension," insert "at the rate."

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

THOMAS MULLEN.

Mr. McRAE. Mr. Speaker, I have a bill here in a very meritorious case, and I ask unanimous consent for its present consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Arkansas asks unanimous consent for the present consideration of a bill which will be reported by the Clerk.

The bill (H. R. 1417) for the relief of Thomas Mullen was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of War be, and is hereby, authorized and directed to remove the charge of desertion now standing upon the records of the War Department against the name of Thomas Mullen, of Wallaceburg, Ark., late member of Company G, First New York Mounted Rifles Volunteers, and grant him an honorable discharge as of the 29th day of November, 1865.

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

There was no objection.

The following amendment, recommended by the Committee on Military Affairs, was read, and agreed to:

Insert at the end of the bill the following:
 "Provided, That no pay, bounty, or other emoluments shall become due or payable by virtue of the passage of this act."

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

Mr. RAY of New York. As to each of the bills passed to-night I move to reconsider the vote by which the bill passed, and I move to lay that motion on the table.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from New York asks unanimous consent that a motion to reconsider the vote by which each of the bills was passed this evening be laid on the table. If there be no objection, it will be so ordered.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The hour of 10.30 o'clock having arrived, the House, under the rule, stands adjourned until tomorrow at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, the following executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a copy of a communication from the Treasurer of the United States relating to pay for overtime work among certain employees of his Department—to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers relating to legislation on the subject of the pay of civilian employees to engineer officers on the staff of department commanders—to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting the petition of certain citizens residing along the Chattahoochee River for continuation of issue of rations by the Government—to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII, bills and resolutions of the following titles were severally reported from committees, delivered to the Clerk, and referred to the several Calendars therein named, as follows:

Mr. LACEY, from the Committee on the Public Lands, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 11737) granting the right of way to the Pensacola and Northwestern Railroad Company over and through the United States naval and military reservations near Pensacola, in the State of Florida, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 2085); which said bill and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 11971) to authorize the Commissioner of the General Land Office to cause public lands to be surveyed in certain cases, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 2086); which said bill and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. CUMMINGS, from the Committee on the Library, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 1160) to authorize the erection of a statue of the late President Abraham Lincoln at Gettysburg, Pa., reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 2087); which said bill and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. KLEBERG, from the Committee on the Public Lands, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 11110) to extend the time for the completion of the incline railway on West Mountain, Hot Springs Reservation, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 2088); which said bill and report were referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. HAWLEY, from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, to which was referred House bill 11796, reported in lieu thereof a bill (H. R. 12075) authorizing the Arkansas Harbor Terminal Railway Company to construct a bridge across the Corpus Christi Channel, accompanied by a report (No. 2089); which said bill and report were referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. CURTIS of Iowa, from the Committee on the District of Columbia, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 5391) to provide for an appropriate national celebration of the establishment of the seat of government in the District of Columbia, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 2090); which said bill and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII, private bills and resolutions of the following titles were severally reported from committees, delivered to the Clerk, and referred to the Committee of the Whole House, as follows:

Mr. BELKNAP, from the Committee on Military Affairs, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 11053) to correct the military record of Lieut. Edward B. Howard, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 2091); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. McDONALD, from the Committee on Military Affairs, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 11294) to correct the relative rank of Richard R. Steedman, captain, Eleventh Infantry, United States Army, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 2092); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

CHANGE OF REFERENCE.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXII, the Committee on Invalid Pensions was discharged from the consideration of the bill (H. R. 12036) to pension Mrs. Walter E. Spicer, widow of Walter E. Spicer, late of the postal service of the United States at Guantanamo, Cuba; and the same was referred to the Committee on Pensions.

PUBLIC BILLS, RESOLUTIONS, AND MEMORIALS INTRODUCED.

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, bills, resolutions, and memorials of the following titles were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. CURTIS of Kansas: A bill (H. R. 12069) authorizing the Kansas, Oklahoma and Texas Railway Company to construct and operate a railway through the Indian Territory and Oklahoma Territory, and for other purposes—to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. HOWARD of Georgia: A bill (H. R. 12070) for the erection of a post-office building at Athens, Ga.—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. WEYMOUTH: A bill (H. R. 12071) to equalize the pay of letter carriers—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. BANKHEAD: A bill (H. R. 12072) to authorize the construction of a wagon bridge across the Warrior River in Tuscaloosa County, State of Alabama—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. HICKS: A bill (H. R. 12073) for a public building at the city of Johnstown, Pa.—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. FENTON: A bill (H. R. 12074) to provide for the purchase of a site and the erection of a public building thereon at Ironton, in the State of Ohio—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. HAWLEY, from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce: A bill (H. R. 12075) to amend an act entitled "An act authorizing the Aransas Harbor Terminal Railway Company to construct a bridge across the Corpus Christi Channel, known as the Morris and Cummings Ship Channel, in Aransas County, Tex."—to the House Calendar.

By Mr. CATCHINGS: A bill (H. R. 12076) to purchase Wilson Park, District of Columbia—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. BINGHAM (by request): A bill (H. R. 12083) for the purchase of a lot in Brookland, D. C., for use as a school yard—to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. BABCOCK: A joint resolution (H. Res. 363) making an appropriation of \$5,000 for clearing the Potomac River of ice—to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. BRODERICK: A resolution (House Res. No. 397) in relation to the consideration of a bill of the Senate (S. 3729), with House committee amendments, on Tuesday, February 14, 1899—to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. JOHNSON of North Dakota: A memorial from the State of North Dakota senate and assembly, favoring the election of United States Senators by direct vote—to the Committee on Election of President, Vice-President, and Representatives in Congress.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS INTRODUCED.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BURLEIGH: A bill (H. R. 12077) granting an increase of pension to Charles N. Smiley—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. FOWLER of North Carolina: A bill (H. R. 12078) granting an increase of pension to Catharine Stone—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. GRAFF: A bill (H. R. 12079) granting a pension to Noah Myers—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MAHON: A bill (H. R. 12080) for the allowance of certain claims reported by the accounting officers of the United States Treasury Department—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. STALLINGS (for Mr. WHEELER of Alabama): A bill (H. R. 12081) for the relief of Frank Goodwin—to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. VINCENT: A bill (H. R. 12083) for the relief of Robert H. Semple—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, the following petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

By Mr. ALEXANDER: Protest of the Baptist Ministers' Conference of Buffalo, N. Y., against the seating of Brigham H. Roberts as a Representative from Utah—to the Committee on Elections No. 1.

Also, petition of soldiers and citizens of Buffalo, N. Y., asking for the passage of the Ellis bill to forbid the sale of intoxicating beverages in all Government buildings—to the Committee on Alcoholic Liquor Traffic.

By Mr. BINGHAM: Petition of citizens of Armbrust, Big Spring, Grover, Lick Run Mills, Sibleyville, and Spring Church, Pa., favoring the establishment of postal savings banks—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. BROSIUS: Petitions of the Christian Endeavor Society of Salisbury and various churches and societies in Lancaster County, Pa., favoring the Ellis bill—to the Committee on Alcoholic Liquor Traffic.

By Mr. BUTLER (by request): Petitions of H. N. Price and 200 citizens of Grant, Joseph H. Paschall and 200 citizens of Ward, R. A. Covert and 201 citizens of Rices Landing, Pa., in favor of

the establishment of postal savings banks—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

Also, petition of the Monthly Meeting of Friends of New Garden, and the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Avondale, Pa., to forbid interstate gambling by telegraph or telephone—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petitions of certain citizens of Oxford, Presbyterian, Baptist, and Methodist churches and Society of Friends of Oxford, Epworth League of Spring City, Meeting of Friends of New Garden, and Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Avondale, Pa., churches and societies of Montoursville, Pa., and 10 churches of Westchester, Pa., and various Woman's Christian Temperance unions of Delaware County, Pa., in favor of the Ellis bill—to the Committee on Alcoholic Liquor Traffic.

By Mr. CAPRON: Petitions of Joseph F. Baggs and 46 citizens of Woodville, R. I., urging the establishment of postal savings banks—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. CUMMINGS: Papers to accompany House bill No. 1260, for the relief of Carl P. Larson—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. DALZELL: Petition of the Chamber of Commerce of New York, in favor of the reorganization of the consular service—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. ERMENROUT: Petitions of F. W. Maurer and 201 citizens of Pine Grove, Pa., Charles B. Bertolet and 210 citizens of Athol, Pa., and Martin P. Curley and 210 citizens of Flynn, Pa., in favor of the establishment of postal savings banks—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. GRAHAM: Petitions of Mount Washington Methodist Episcopal Church and Mount Washington Methodist Protestant Church, First Pentecostal Church, Mount Washington Baptist Church, Twelfth United Presbyterian Church, Anchor Lodge, No. 39, Independent Order of Good Templars; Pioneer Tent, No. 1, Rechabites, all in the city of Pittsburg, Pa., to prohibit the sale of liquor in canteens, in immigrant stations, and in Government buildings—to the Committee on Alcoholic Liquor Traffic.

Also, circular of the Indian Rights League, asking that a definite plan be provided for measurements of lumber among the Chippewa Indians—to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. GROUT: Petition of Asa D. Gilmore, of Weston, Vt., and 46 other fourth-class postmasters, urging the passage of House bills Nos. 4930 and 4931, for increase of compensation—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

Also, resolutions adopted by the Vermont Society of Colonial Dames, Caroline M. Smalley, president, favoring the passage of laws to further restrict the practice of polygamy—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HITT: Petition of citizens of Anamosa, Jones County, Iowa, for woman suffrage in the Hawaiian Islands—to the Committee on the Territories.

By Mr. JOHNSON of North Dakota: Petition of J. M. Wylie, C. W. Callenge, and 14 other citizens of North Dakota, in opposition to the sale of liquor in canteens, prize fighting, and polygamy—to the Committee on Alcoholic Liquor Traffic.

By Mr. KERR: Petition of the Methodist Episcopal Church of Collins, Ohio, to prohibit the sale of liquor in Government buildings, etc.—to the Committee on Alcoholic Liquor Traffic.

By Mr. LACEY: Remonstrance of Rev. J. W. McPlace and other citizens of Bloomfield, Iowa, against the seating of Brigham H. Roberts as a Representative from Utah—to the Committee on Elections No. 1.

By Mr. LITTAUER: Petitions of George Vanderpool and other citizens of Mayfield, N. Y., in favor of the establishment of postal savings banks—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. MAHON (by request): Petition of C. H. Cordukes and 52 citizens of Aiken, David C. Lambert and 191 citizens of Daley, P. M. Kilmer and 201 citizens of Kilmer, H. K. Aurondt and 209 citizens of Waterstreet, Pa., in favor of the establishment of postal savings banks—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. OVERSTREET: Petition of H. L. Whitehead and 31 citizens of Indianapolis, Ind., favoring the passage of the Ellis bill—to the Committee on Alcoholic Liquor Traffic.

Also, resolution of the Anti-Saloon League of Indiana, thanking the House for its action in forbidding the "Army canteen"—to the Committee on Alcoholic Liquor Traffic.

By Mr. RUSSELL: Resolutions of the New Haven, Conn., Medical Association, relative to the reorganization of the Medical Corps of the United States Army—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, resolutions of Gideon Wells Naval Veteran Association of Connecticut, favoring House bill No. 10403, known as the naval personnel bill—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. SHOWALTER: Petition of the Presbyterian Church of Rochester, Pa., in favor of the Ellis bill—to the Committee on Alcoholic Liquor Traffic.

By Mr. STONE: Petitions of Peter Arp and 18 citizens of Warren County, B. F. Hall and 39 citizens of Northampton County, George W. Bollinger and 26 citizens of Rockspring, H. J. Brown and 19 citizens of Flemington, C. L. Shantz and 40 citizens of Berks County, John O. Jones and 18 citizens of Wyoming County, A. E. Foster and 37 citizens of McKean County, J. W. Keisel and 41 citizens of Pike County, J. W. Kepler and 19 citizens of Clinton County, S. L. Snyder and 9 citizens of Millerstown, J. A. Mossman and 37 citizens of Mercer County, Mrs. W. L. Graham, J. W. McIlwain and other citizens of Lycoming County, Mrs. H. Hulings and 14 citizens of Cheswick, W. J. Griffin and 14 citizens of Sullivan County; J. H. Witmer and others, of Dauphin County, R. B. Kirchner and others, of Westmoreland County, all in the State of Pennsylvania, favoring postal savings banks—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. TERRY: Resolution of the Commercial League of Fort Smith, Ark., favoring the speedy connection of the Port Arthur Canal with the Gulf of Mexico—to the Committee on Railways and Canals.

By Mr. WEYMOUTH: Papers to accompany House bill granting an increase of pension to William B. Paul—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. YOUNG: Petition of the Credit Men's Association of Philadelphia, Pa., urging the passage of the Caffery national quarantine bill—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

SENATE.

SATURDAY, February 11, 1899.

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

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

HEALTH OF SOLDIERS IN THE PHILIPPINE ISLANDS.

The VICE-PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of War, transmitting, in response to a resolution of the 20th ultimo, a letter from the Surgeon-General of the Army, submitting a report and tabulated statements concerning deaths and sickness of soldiers in the Philippine Islands; which, with the accompanying papers, was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs, and ordered to be printed.

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 bills:

A bill (S. 831) to increase the pension of Thomas J. Haughey;
A bill (S. 1827) granting an increase of pension to Stephen M. Davis;
A bill (S. 2616) granting a pension to Harriette F. Hovey;
A bill (S. 4281) granting an increase of pension to Millie A. Berry; and

A bill (S. 5186) to amend an act entitled "An act to amend the statutes in relation to immediate transportation of dutiable goods, and for other purposes," approved June 10, A. D. 1880, by extending the privileges of the first section thereof to the subport of Miami, Fla.

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

A bill (S. 4775) granting a pension to Flora Stanton Kalk; and
A bill (S. 5342) granting a pension to John M. Palmer.

The message further announced that the House had passed the following bills, each with an amendment; in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

A bill (S. 1776) to increase the pension of Mrs. Letitia Tyler Semple;
A bill (S. 4630) granting an increase of pension to Chauncey A. Bradley;

A bill (S. 4854) granting a pension to Isom Gibson; and
A bill (S. 4982) granting an increase of pension to Amanda F. Jumper.

The message also announced that the House insists upon its amendment to the bill (S. 1964) for the erection of a public building for the use of the custom-house and post-office at Newport News, in the district of Newport News, Va., disagreed to by the Senate; agrees to the conference asked for by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and had appointed Mr. MERCER, Mr. HICKS, and Mr. BANKHEAD managers at the conference on the part of the House.

The message further announced that the House insists upon its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (S. 4936) for the allowance of certain claims for stores and supplies reported by the Court of Claims under the provisions of the act ap-

proved March 3, 1883, and commonly known as the Bowman Act, and for other purposes; agrees to a further conference asked for by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and had appointed Mr. MAHON, Mr. OTJEN, and Mr. RICHARDSON managers at the conference on the part of the House.

The message also requested the Senate to furnish the House with a duplicate copy of the engrossed bill of the Senate (S. 3256) in reference to the civil service and appointments thereunder, the same having been lost or misplaced.

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

A bill (H. R. 1417) for the relief of Thomas Mullen;
A bill (H. R. 2293) granting an increase of pension to Andrew J. Snowden;

A bill (H. R. 2412) to amend the military record of James Roche;
A bill (H. R. 2574) granting an increase of pension to Lavinia M. Payne;

A bill (H. R. 3155) granting a pension to Kitty Ann Patterson;
A bill (H. R. 3804) for the relief of James McKenzie;

A bill (H. R. 5209) granting a pension to Belle Shumard;
A bill (H. R. 5328) granting a pension to Patrick O'Shea;

A bill (H. R. 5758) to remove the charge of desertion from the record of James Geissinger;

A bill (H. R. 6631) granting an increase of pension to Jere Smith;

A bill (H. R. 7046) granting an increase of pension to Arba Capron;

A bill (H. R. 7632) to remove the charge of desertion from the military record of Robert Flower;

A bill (H. R. 7902) granting a pension to Albert Putnam;
A bill (H. R. 8179) granting a pension to Levi M. Truit;

A bill (H. R. 8503) to remove the charge of desertion from the military record of John P. Henderson, and to grant him an honorable discharge;

A bill (H. R. 8568) granting an increase of pension to Mrs. Susan Stedman;

A bill (H. R. 8749) granting a pension to James J. Marcher;
A bill (H. R. 9059) granting a pension to Catherine Eakin;

A bill (H. R. 10241) granting a pension to Nancy Shaley;
A bill (H. R. 10355) granting an increase of pension to Catharine C. Goodrich;

A bill (H. R. 10385) granting a pension to George Brown;
A bill (H. R. 10605) to increase the pension of Annie Cusack;

A bill (H. R. 10803) granting an increase of pension to James Porter;

A bill (H. R. 10858) granting an increase of pension to Amanda Willmarth;

A bill (H. R. 11420) granting a pension to Emily McLain;
A bill (H. R. 11615) removing the charge of desertion from the record of William Moore, Company I, Twenty-third Regiment

Kentucky Volunteers; and

A bill (H. R. 11899) granting a pension to Judith Doherty.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED.

The message also announced that the Speaker of the House had signed the following enrolled bills; and they were thereupon signed by the Vice-President:

A bill (S. 2673) for the relief of William A. Cowles;
A bill (S. 3684) for the relief of Joseph Tousaint, alias Touzin;

A bill (S. 5088) to amend section 27 of the Revised Statutes, relative to the apportionment and election of Representatives; and

A bill (H. R. 5019) for a light vessel off Tail of Horse Shoe, Chesapeake Bay.

CREDENTIALS.

Mr. VEST. Mr. President, I present the credentials of my colleague [Mr. COCKRELL] for his fifth term in the Senate.

The credentials of FRANCIS MARION COCKRELL, chosen by the legislature of Missouri a Senator from that State for the term beginning March 4, 1899, were read and ordered to be filed.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS.

Mr. TELLER presented the memorials of M. Newman and 53 other citizens, of F. S. Brown and 18 other citizens, of W. J. McNamara and 18 other citizens, E. J. Fort and 18 other citizens, M. Storms and 18 other citizens, Douglas Patullo and 18 other citizens, the Marx Merchants Company and 18 citizens, L. T. Boutwell and 18 other citizens, George J. Ribber and 18 other citizens, Henry Small and 19 other citizens, H. Stein and 19 other citizens, H. S. Deane and 19 other citizens, J. M. Lomery and 19 other citizens, H. G. Smith and 19 other citizens, J. F. Meyer and 19 other citizens, H. Jackson and 19 other citizens, H.-F. Stringfeller and 19 other citizens, Charles Horan and 19 other citizens, Louis Zimmerman and 19 other citizens, A. T. Levy and 19 other citizens, P. A. Wagner and 19 other citizens, Hamilton & Kendrick and 19 other citizens, R. Le Bert and 19 other citizens, C. L. Thompson and 19 other citizens, W. W. C. Hyde and 19 other citizens, E. E. Sommers and 19 other citizens, W. W. Andrews and 19 other citizens,