

Mr. PETTUS. I should be obliged to the Senator from Nevada if he would explain the reason why these sureties ought to be relieved.

Mr. STEWART. I can do it in a moment. Zabriskie was a reputable citizen who was appointed melter and refiner of the United States mint at Carson City, Nev. His accounts were accepted, everything accounted for, and he was discharged from all liability. About ten days afterwards he died. About six months subsequent to that it was discovered that his assistant had been a defaulter, running back even to the time that Zabriskie was in office. The assistant was convicted and sent to the penitentiary. One of the sureties on the bond is insolvent, and the other is practically so. They are both really practically insolvent. One of them has some property, but it is very heavily mortgaged, and it will be impossible for the Government to obtain anything. Besides, the matter had run six months before there was an examination by the Government. There was no suspicion cast upon the character of Zabriskie, and there is no suspicion now that he was responsible for the defalcation. It was therefore thought by the committee to be a case where relief should be afforded. I think it is a very strong case, if we are to give relief in cases of this kind, and we do relieve many.

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

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE.

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. W. J. BROWNING, its Chief Clerk, announced that the House had disagreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 8586) amending the act of March 2, 1901, entitled "An act to carry into effect the stipulations of article 7 of the treaty between the United States and Spain concluded on the 10th day of December, 1898," agrees to the conference asked for by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and had appointed Mr. RAY, Mr. JENKINS, and Mr. LANHAM managers at the conference on the part of the House.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the amendments of the Senate to the following bills:

A bill (H. R. 1200) granting an increase of pension to Oliver P. Goodwin;

A bill (H. R. 1324) granting an increase of pension to Charles N. Lee;

A bill (H. R. 1484) granting an increase of pension to Robert M. Scott;

A bill (H. R. 2620) granting a pension to Jennie A. McKinley;

A bill (H. R. 3229) granting a pension to Katherine R. A. Ogden;

A bill (H. R. 3266) granting an increase of pension to James Smith;

A bill (H. R. 6453) granting an increase of pension to Ida R. Siegfried;

A bill (H. R. 7343) granting an increase of pension to Martha V. Keenan; and

A bill (H. R. 8652) granting an increase of pension to Virginia Terrill.

EXECUTIVE SESSION.

Mr. ALLISON. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business. After eight minutes spent in executive session the doors were reopened, and (at 4 o'clock and 5 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until to-morrow, Wednesday, February 19, 1902, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS.

Executive nominations received by the Senate February 18, 1902.

THIRD SECRETARY OF EMBASSY.

George Barclay Rives, of New Jersey, to be third secretary of the embassy of the United States at Berlin, to take effect March 18, 1902, vice Samuel Morrill, resigned.

COLLECTOR OF CUSTOMS.

Thomas V. McAllister, of Mississippi, to be collector of customs for the district of Vicksburg, in the State of Mississippi, to succeed Joseph H. Short, whose term of office will expire by limitation February 25, 1902.

REGISTER OF LAND OFFICE.

Frank D. Hobbs, of Utah, to be register of the land office at Salt Lake City, Utah, to take effect April 21, 1902, at expiration of his present term. (Reappointment.)

UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE.

James P. Platt, of Connecticut, to be United States district judge for the district of Connecticut, vice William K. Townsend, promoted to be circuit judge for the second judicial circuit.

APPOINTMENTS IN THE ARMY.

To be brigadier-general.

Col. Francis L. Guenther, Artillery Corps, February 13, 1902, vice Merriam, retired from active service.

Artillery Corps.

James M. Fulton, at large, to be second lieutenant, January 24, 1902.

NOTE.—Mr. Fulton was nominated to the Senate February 3, 1902, for appointment as second lieutenant in the Infantry Arm, with rank from February 2, 1901, and was confirmed February 7, 1902.

This message is submitted for the purpose of renominating Mr. Fulton for appointment in the Artillery Corps, with rank from January 24, 1902.

CONFIRMATIONS.

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate February 18, 1902.

POSTMASTERS.

William L. Trent, to be postmaster at Knoxville, in the county of Knox and State of Tennessee.

Charles S. French, to be postmaster at Lake Geneva, in the county of Walworth and State of Wisconsin.

Jorgen C. Jacobson, to be postmaster at Elroy, in the county of Juneau and State of Wisconsin.

James F. Wray, to be postmaster at Reidsville, in the county of Rockingham and State of North Carolina.

John W. C. Long, to be postmaster at Statesville, in the county of Iredell and State of North Carolina.

Edwin L. Ware, to be postmaster at Kings Mountain, in the county of Cleveland and State of North Carolina.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

Tuesday, February 18, 1902.

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

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

CONSULAR AND DIPLOMATIC APPROPRIATION BILL.

Mr. HITT, chairman of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, reported the bill (H. R. 11471) making appropriations for the diplomatic and consular service for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1903; which was ordered printed, and referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. RICHARDSON of Tennessee reserved all points of order on the bill.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES.

Sundry messages, in writing, from the President of the United States were communicated to the House of Representatives by Mr. PRUDEN, one of his secretaries, who also informed the House of Representatives that the President had approved and signed bills of the following titles:

On January 31, 1902:

H. R. 9342. An act to amend the code of law for the District of Columbia, approved March 3, 1901; and

H. R. 10368. An act to provide for the removal of snow and ice from cross walks and gutters in the city of Washington, D. C.

On February 4, 1902:

H. R. 8759. An act to require cases of typhoid fever occurring in the District of Columbia to be reported to the health department of said District.

On February 7, 1902:

H. R. 2008. An act to authorize the city of Duluth, Minn., to construct and maintain, or cause to be constructed and maintained, a car transfer over the Duluth Canal, and for that purpose to occupy certain lands of the United States.

On February 14, 1902:

H. R. 8761. An act to declare the international railway bridge over the St. Lawrence River, near Hogsburg, N. Y., a lawful structure;

H. R. 4988. An act for the relief of Mary E. McDonald;

H. R. 4372. An act to regulate the collection of taxes in the District of Columbia; and

H. R. 9315. An act making appropriation to supply urgent deficiencies in the appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1902, and for prior years, and for other purposes.

On February 15, 1902:

H. R. 10076. An act to receive arrearages of taxes due the District of Columbia to July 1, 1900, at 6 per cent per annum, in lieu of penalties and costs.

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. 2947. An act granting an increase of pension to Elizabeth A. Shaw—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.
 S. 577. An act granting an increase of pension to Joseph W. Burch—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.
 S. 3522. An act to increase the pension of certain Mexican war pensioners to \$12 per month—to the Committee on Pensions.
 S. 3388. An act granting an increase of pension to John L. Peterson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.
 S. 1942. An act granting an increase of pension to Kate H. Clements—to the Committee on Pensions.
 S. 3553. An act granting an increase of pension to Mary A. Van Wormer—to the Committee on Pensions.
 S. 2508. An act granting an increase of pension to Pauline Lowe Murphy—to the Committee on Pensions.
 S. 450. An act for the erection of a public building at Selma, Ala.—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.
 S. 3204. An act granting an increase of pension to Mary T. Bruce—to the Committee on Pensions.
 S. 1800. An act granting an increase of pension to Jennie C. Ruckle—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.
 S. 721. An act granting an increase of pension to Lavalette D. Dickey—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.
 S. 3064. An act granting an increase of pension to Emma Sophia Harper Cilley—to the Committee on Pensions.
 S. 3424. An act granting an increase of pension to Minnie E. King—to the Committee on Pensions.
 S. 2100. An act granting an increase of pension to John McGrath—to the Committee on Pensions.
 S. 3393. An act granting a pension to William P. Arble—to the Committee on Pensions.
 S. 3482. An act granting an increase of pension to Ida C. Emery—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.
 S. 2643. An act granting an increase of pension to Peter C. Cleek—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.
 S. 2815. An act granting an increase of pension to William S. Derby—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.
 S. 2422. An act granting an increase of pension to John W. Burnham—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.
 S. 1933. An act granting a pension to Ella Bailey—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.
 S. 2398. An act granting an increase of pension to George W. Myers—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.
 S. 8. An act granting a pension to Mrs. George Leonard Andrews—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.
 S. 3036. An act granting an increase of pension to Jason L. Leighton—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.
 S. 1041. An act granting a pension to Abbie M. Packard—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.
 S. 2867. An act granting an increase of pension to John A. Hazelton—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.
 S. 1135. An act granting an increase of pension to Thomas J. Stowers—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.
 S. 2930. An act granting an increase of pension to Franklin B. Delaney—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.
 S. 2013. An act granting an increase of pension to Sidney Leiland—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.
 S. 3559. An act granting an increase of pension to George E. Houghton—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.
 S. 2923. An act granting an increase of pension to Elizabeth Floyd Sicard—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.
 S. 3284. An act granting a pension to Gilbert P. Howe—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.
 S. 2767. An act granting an increase of pension to Albert D. Scovell—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.
 S. 2049. An act granting an increase of pension to Franklin Taylor—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.
 S. 2394. An act granting an increase of pension to Sybil F. Hall—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.
 S. 3269. An act granting an increase of pension to Jane E. Tompkins—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.
 S. 3328. An act granting an increase of pension to Heber C. Griffin—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.
 S. 1967. An act granting an increase of pension to Andrew J. Freeman—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.
 S. 3054. An act granting an increase of pension to Alice De K. Shattuck—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.
 S. 3322. An act granting an increase of pension to Joseph M. Clough—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.
 S. 3329. An act granting an increase of pension to Annie McElheney—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.
 S. 3257. An act granting an increase of pension to Elizabeth K. Prescott—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

S. 3258. An act granting a pension to Simon Partridge—to the Committee on Pensions.

S. 3072. An act granting a pension to Oliver Gisborne—to the Committee on Pensions.

S. 1641. An act granting an increase of pension to Frank J. Clark—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

S. 3097. An act granting an increase of pension to Joseph A. Nunez—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

S. 2929. An act granting an increase of pension to Jacob Barton—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

S. 3213. An act granting a pension to Anna J. Thomas—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

S. 2802. An act granting a pension to Martha R. Osbourn—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

S. 628. An act granting a pension to Annie E. Taggart—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

S. 502. An act granting a pension to Alexander Beachboard—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

S. 1139. An act granting a pension to Abby Clark McNett—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

S. 1331. An act granting a pension to Ann Eliza Trout—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

S. 1626. An act granting an increase of pension to Michael Samelsberger—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

S. 508. An act granting an increase of pension to Adelaide Worth Bagley—to the Committee on Pensions.

S. 3157. An act granting an increase of pension to Rhody Ann Bradshaw—to the Committee on Pensions.

S. 462. An act granting an increase of pension to Sallie Demonbrun—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

S. 2531. An act granting an increase of pension to William H. H. Scott—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

S. 1467. An act granting an increase of pension to Cynthia A. McKenny—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

S. 713. An act granting a pension to Frances E. Stebbins—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

S. 3026. An act granting an increase of pension to Marie U. Nordstrom—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

S. 1289. An act granting an increase of pension to Julius W. Clark—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

S. 2732. An act granting an increase of pension to Marie J. Smyth—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

S. 2692. An act granting an increase of pension to Lucy W. Smith—to the Committee on Pensions.

S. 3403. An act granting an increase of pension to George M. Emery—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

S. 3820. An act granting an increase of pension to Warren B. Nudd—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

S. 1453. An act authorizing the appointment and retirement of William B. Franklin with the rank of colonel, United States Army—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

S. 2877. An act to remove the charge of desertion standing against the record of Thomas Blackburn—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

S. 1256. An act to remove charge of desertion from the military record of Stephen A. Toops—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

S. 636. An act to remove the charge of desertion against David A. Lane—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

S. 690. An act to correct the military record of Talton T. Davis—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

S. 1681. An act granting an increase of pension to Maria Louisa Michie—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

S. 469. An act granting an increase of pension to Hiram H. Kingsbury—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

S. 1748. An act granting an increase of pension to Williamanna E. Lynde—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

CHARLES N. LEE.

The SPEAKER laid before the House the bill (H. R. 1324) granting an increase of pension to Charles N. Lee, with a Senate amendment.

The Senate amendment was read.

Mr. SULLOWAY. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House concur in the Senate amendment.

The motion was agreed to.

TREATY OF THE UNITED STATES WITH SPAIN.

The SPEAKER laid before the House the bill (H. R. 8586) amending the act of March 2, 1901, entitled "An act to carry into effect the stipulations of Article VII of the treaty between the United States and Spain, concluded on the 10th day of December, 1898," with Senate amendments.

The Senate amendments were being read by the Clerk, when

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, I move that the further reading of the amendments be dispensed with and that the House disagree to the Senate amendments and agree to the conference asked for by the Senate.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER appointed as conferees on the part of the House Mr. RAY of New York, Mr. JENKINS, and Mr. LANHAM.

OLIVER P. GOODWIN.

The SPEAKER laid before the House the bill (H. R. 1200) granting an increase of pension to Oliver P. Goodwin, with Senate amendments.

The Senate amendments were read.

Mr. LOUDENSLAGER. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House concur in the Senate amendments.

The motion was agreed to.

JAMES SMITH.

The SPEAKER also laid before the House the bill (H. R. 3266) granting an increase of pension to James Smith, with Senate amendments.

The Senate amendments were read.

Mr. LOUDENSLAGER. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House agree to the Senate amendments.

The motion was agreed to.

JENNIE A. M'KINLEY.

The SPEAKER also laid before the House the bill (H. R. 2620) granting a pension to Jennie A. McKinley, with Senate amendments.

The Senate amendments were read.

Mr. LOUDENSLAGER. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House agree to the Senate amendments.

The motion was agreed to.

ROBERT M. SCOTT.

The SPEAKER also laid before the House the bill (H. R. 1484) granting an increase of pension to Robert M. Scott, with a Senate amendment.

The Senate amendment was read.

Mr. LOUDENSLAGER. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House concur in the Senate amendment.

The motion was agreed to.

CATHERINE R. A. OGDEN.

The SPEAKER also laid before the House the bill (H. R. 3229) granting an increase of pension to Catherine R. A. Ogden, with Senate amendments; which were read.

Mr. LOUDENSLAGER. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House concur in the Senate amendments.

The motion was agreed to.

IDA R. SIEGFRIED.

The SPEAKER also laid before the House the bill (H. R. 6453) granting an increase of pension to Ida R. Siegfried, with a Senate amendment; which was read.

Mr. LOUDENSLAGER. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House concur in the Senate amendment.

The motion was agreed to.

VIRGINIA TERRILL.

The SPEAKER also laid before the House the bill (H. R. 8652) granting an increase of pension to Virginia Terrill, with a Senate amendment; which was read.

Mr. LOUDENSLAGER. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House concur in the Senate amendment.

The motion was agreed to.

MARTHA V. KEENAN.

The SPEAKER also laid before the House the bill (H. R. 7343) granting an increase of pension to Martha V. Keenan, with Senate amendments; which were read.

Mr. LOUDENSLAGER. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House concur in the Senate amendments.

The motion was agreed to.

INDIAN APPROPRIATION BILL.

Mr. SHERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House now resolve itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the purpose of considering the bill (H. R. 11353) making appropriations for the current and contingent expenses of the Indian Department and for fulfilling treaty stipulations with various Indian tribes for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1903, and for other purposes.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, with Mr. MONDELL in the chair, and proceeded to the consideration of the bill.

Mr. SHERMAN. Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask my colleague on the committee, the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. LITTLE], what his desire is in reference to general debate, so that we may, if possible, agree upon some fixed time for closing such debate.

Mr. LITTLE. Mr. Chairman, I have a number of requests from gentlemen who desire to indulge in general debate—in some

cases germane to the bill, and in others, of course, not. I suggest that we have two days of general debate.

Mr. SHERMAN. The gentleman thinks we could not get along with less time than that?

Mr. LITTLE. I hardly think so.

Mr. SHERMAN. Then I ask unanimous consent that to-day and to-morrow be devoted to general debate on this bill, and that immediately after the reading of the Journal on Thursday next this bill be taken up for consideration by sections under the five-minute rule.

Mr. LITTLE. That is entirely satisfactory.

The CHAIRMAN. Unanimous consent is asked that to-day and to-morrow be given to general debate on the pending bill, and that immediately after the reading of the Journal on next Thursday the bill be taken up for consideration under the five-minute rule. Is there objection? The Chair hears none.

Mr. SHERMAN. I understand that many gentlemen on both sides of the House desire to speak in the course of the general debate on subjects that do not relate to the Indian bill. As the few remarks that I desire to make will be confined to that subject exclusively, I do not care to make them now. I prefer to make them when the bill is about to be considered. I therefore desire now to reserve my time, to be used later.

Mr. Chairman, I do not know that I included in my request—if I did not, I will make the request now—that the time for general debate be controlled on the other side by the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. LITTLE] and on this side by myself.

The CHAIRMAN. If there be no objection, it will be so ordered. The Chair hears no objection.

Mr. SHERMAN. Does the gentleman from Arkansas desire to occupy some time now? I understood that he did.

Mr. LITTLE. Yes, sir.

Mr. SHERMAN. Then he can take the floor at once.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from New York [Mr. SHERMAN] desire to dispense with the reading of the bill at this time?

Mr. SHERMAN. I do. I ask unanimous consent to dispense with the second reading of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York? The Chair hears none.

Mr. LITTLE. I now yield thirty minutes to the gentleman from Texas, Mr. BURLESON.

Mr. BURLESON. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, the remarks I propose to submit on this bill are not exactly germane, but, incidentally, I may attempt to toy with the scalp lock of the opposition party with a tomahawk in real aboriginal style.

I regret exceedingly that the amendments offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. BABCOCK] failed of a sufficient vote in the Ways and Means Committee to tack them on to the bill that passed yesterday. Not that they would have stood any chance of being enacted into law, because if those amendments had been tacked on to that bill we would have had an entirely different rule brought before this body and submitted to it for consideration; but I was anxious to have them ingrafted upon that bill in order to accentuate the position or attitude of the Republican party toward what are commonly called trusts.

And in this connection, and on this subject of the relation of trusts to the dominant party, I desire to submit a few observations.

Mr. Chairman, this is a most wonderful country of ours, and startling changes are constantly taking place, and I now direct your attention to a recent one which was quickly but none the less completely and radically wrought. It is well known to all that after the election in 1900 the trusts and illegal combinations of aggregated capital quietly settled themselves down to what was accepted by them as a guaranty of four years more of uninterrupted loot and pillage of the people. Judging by the past, they had a perfect right to expect this. This condition obtained until some time in the late summer or early fall of 1901. And candor compels me to say that in the meantime the trusts were not being disappointed in their expectations, for they were being given practically unbridled license to do as they would.

About this time a strenuous man, for reasons satisfactory to himself, proceeded to Minneapolis, in the State of Minnesota, and there delivered himself of a speech. In the course of this speech he used these significant words, speaking of trusts. I read:

We shall find it necessary in the future to shackle cunning as in the past we have shackled force. * * * The vast individual and corporate fortunes, the vast combinations of capital which have marked the development of our industrial system, create new conditions and necessitate a change from the old attitude of state and nation toward property.

This was pointed language, spoken in an emphatic way. Did it alarm or startle the trusts? Oh, no. The strenuous one was only the occupant of an obscure office and was in no position to menace their interests or even temporarily interrupt their acts of spoliation practiced under laws enacted to favor them by the dominant political party which they had so often favored.

Mr. HAMILTON. I would like to ask the gentleman whether he knows of any trust organized under any Federal law?

Mr. BURLESON. If the gentleman is not aware of the existence of trusts in this country at this time—

Mr. HAMILTON. I did not question that.

Mr. BURLESON. I have no hope of being able to enlighten him, and abandon him as a hopeless task.

Mr. HAMILTON. I did not ask the gentleman that question. I asked him to answer me whether he knew of any trust organized under any Federal law?

Mr. BURLESON. I know of laws that the dominant party could enact to throttle great monopolies and trusts, if they had the will and desire to do it.

Mr. HAMILTON. Do you know of any trusts organized under any Federal law?

Mr. BURLESON. I will open a kindergarten for the instruction of the gentleman, if it becomes necessary; but I decline to be interrupted in this way and at this time.

Mr. HAMILTON. Open the kindergarten now.

Mr. BURLESON. I do not wish to be interrupted now. The gentleman knows I have only a limited time.

Mr. HAMILTON. Do you know of any trust organized under any Federal law?

Mr. BURLESON. I should be glad to enlighten the gentleman from Michigan and also the gentleman from Minnesota upon this question, but I do not want to do it in the limited time which I have to discuss this.

Mr. BLACKBURN. Take a day.

Mr. HAMILTON. Name just one trust organized under a Federal law—mention one.

Mr. BURLESON. Well, if the gentleman is so densely ignorant of the conditions in this country that he does not know of the existence of trusts, I have no hope of enlightening him.

Mr. HAMILTON. Is the gentleman sufficiently well informed to inform me?

Mr. BURLESON. I decline to be further interrupted.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas declines to yield.

Mr. HAMILTON. I want to know the name of a single trust organized under any Federal law.

Mr. BURLESON. I have declined to be interrupted by the gentleman.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. There are a dozen trusts organized under the tariff law that could not exist without it.

Mr. BURLESON. I can suggest to the gentleman laws that would remedy these evils.

Mr. HAMILTON. What laws?

Mr. BURLESON. A revision of the tariff, for one, along lines suggested by a member of your own party, Mr. BABCOCK, of Wisconsin.

But to resume, Mr. Chairman, the leaders of this political party knew the power and influence of trusts, the trusts knew they knew it, and feared not. But this emphatic and apparently honest statement made by the strenuous one fastened the attention of the country at large, and especially the victims of trust manipulations, and in their sore distress they cried out, "Oh, if the strenuous one could only be given an opportunity!" With his great ability, his keen insight into actual conditions, with his honest desire to correct these admitted evils, with the apparent courage to utilize his ability for the accomplishment of his desire, the very thought of it brought cheer to the honest farmers of this country, the one class who never ask special favors at the hands of their Government, but who are at present being victimized by the trusts to the extent of being compelled to pay from 40 to 300 per cent more for their agricultural implements than the same articles, manufactured by the same concerns, can be bought for in the foreign territory adjoining us on the north or southwest. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

The suggestion that this cunning could be shackled was a solace and comfort to the mercantile classes throughout the Middle West and Southwest, who were struggling under the exactions of a powerful and voracious railroad combine. The great mass of wage-earners who by reason of trust exactions are groaning under the burden of paying considerably more than double the price for their food supplies than they were paying three years ago heard the voice of the "strenuous one" and believed that they were permitted a gleam of hope that an era might dawn which could bring them relief. Ah, if the "strenuous one" could only be given an opportunity!

The ways of Providence are inscrutable, for, lo, through the happening of a deplorable tragedy at Buffalo, N. Y., on September 6-14 the opportunity unexpectedly came. For a time all our people were overwhelmed with sorrow, but from amidst the pall of grief which enshrouded our country at least one ray of light was to be seen. In the limitless quantities of bitter there was to be found a little sweet. The opportunity to shackle trusts had come.

The "strenuous one" will now proceed to place the gyves upon

cunning, as in the past shackles had been placed on force. Of course, as a means for carrying into effect this laudable purpose, he will utilize the services of the Department of Justice to strike down these giant monopolies and trusts which have been for so long preying on a helpless people. Of course he will first carefully overlook the entire field and select an able lawyer for Attorney-General of the United States; a lawyer whose training has been such that he will be in thorough sympathy with this praiseworthy design. This great lawyer shall be his strong right arm—the honest blacksmith, as it were—to fashion the shackles and gyves that the "strenuous one" had determined to place on cunning trust barons and shrewd monopolists, who through their greed and avarice were distressing the people.

Who is to be selected to fill this important post? Great caution must be exercised. No mistake must be made. There was some delay. The strenuous one, anxious to select the right man, concluded, maybe (out of an abundance of caution), to take counsel of his party leaders. It is true, just at this time he was surrounded by many newly acquired friends, and, it may be, he sought advice of his national chairman, or, perchance, the easy boss of New York was consulted. Whether so or not, we will never know, but when he acted all America was disappointed to learn that he had decided to retain a corporation lawyer, a trust attorney, to play the rôle of brawny blacksmith to weld the shackles for cunning trust magnates he had so long and so faithfully served. In effect, the wolf had been selected to care for and protect the sheep. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Time rolls on, and before Congress had convened some of the most colossal aggregations of capital are effected. Trusts now invaded many industrial lines. Finally, a railroad combination is attempted so palpably monopolistic in character that a Republican governor of one of the sovereign States of the Northwest felt that protest must be made; that some action must be taken in the interest of the people. It was not surprising that the brawny blacksmith remained inactive, but, strange as it may seem, for some reason—which is plain to me—the strenuous one had also become quiescent.

Some thought that he had discovered that existing laws did not furnish adequate authority to adjust the shackles he had so bravely and honestly spoken of using. Some thought he waited to communicate with Congress in the method prescribed by our organic law and tell us what he had ascertained and ask for additional authority; some thought other reasons existed in explanation of his conduct, but no one dreamed of the change which had been actually wrought.

Finally the day comes. Congress is in session. The strenuous one sends in his message. Now we are to know why he has been so pitifully quiescent. And lo! when the tale has been told we find that the strenuous one, who was to shackle the cunning trusts, when the opportunity came to carry into effect the declarations so courageously made, had been unable to discover any monopolists or trust barons, but only could see "captains of industry." Permit me to read from this message, in order that I may do him no injustice.

Speaking of trusts, he says:

The creation of these corporate fortunes has not been due to the tariff nor to any other governmental action, but to natural causes in the business world, operating in other countries as they operate in our own.

The process has aroused much antagonism, a great part of which is wholly without warrant. It is not true that as the rich have grown richer the poor have grown poorer. On the contrary, never before has the average man, the wage worker, the farmer, the small trader, been so well off as in this country and at the present time. There have been abuses connected with the accumulation of wealth, yet it remains true that a fortune accumulated in legitimate business can be accumulated by the person specially benefited only on condition of conferring immense incidental benefits upon others. Successful enterprise, of the type which benefits all mankind, can only exist if the conditions are such as to offer great prizes as the rewards of success.

The captains of industry who have driven the railway systems across this continent, who have built up our commerce, who have developed our manufactures, have, on the whole, done great good to our people. Without them the material development of which we are so justly proud could never have taken place. Moreover, we should recognize the immense importance to this material development of leaving as unhampered as is compatible with the public good the strong and forceful men upon whom the success of business operations inevitably rests.

How very tame and, if I wanted to indulge in strong language, I might say cringing as compared with the aggressive and courageous declarations made at Minneapolis only three short months before. I will read again his declaration at Minneapolis in order that you may appreciate the striking contrast:

We shall find it necessary in the future to shackle cunning as in the past we shackled force. * * * The vast individual and corporate fortunes, the vast combinations of capital which have marked the development of our industrial system create new conditions and necessitate a change from the old attitude of State and nation toward property.

But this was not enough, for by way of making known his complete surrender, or rather, to be charitable, I will say by way of evidencing an abandonment of all hostility on his part toward trusts he has recently named the son of "the captain" of the "captains of industry" to speak the humiliation of republican America at

the coronation of an Emperor and King whose government is now endeavoring to destroy every vestige of republicanism on the dark continent. But, gentlemen, as I have said before, the strenuous one is not blamable. He is envired by a political organization which is owned, body and soul, by the trusts. Nothing else could be expected. And why do I say this?

We all know that a child if taken when it is an infant can be taught that even a green snake is the source of all power, and the child can be made to believe that it actually controls its destiny, and I do not care afterwards how much you may educate that child it can never shake off entirely the effect of its early teachings and environments. It will always feel a superstitious dread of the green snake.

The trouble in this case is the strenuous one is a Republican, he is envired by the Republican party, which is directed and controlled by trusts. This party has looked to trusts and monopolies so long for support and assistance, turning its back upon the people, that now notwithstanding the strenuous one honestly desired "to shackle cunning," when the opportunity came these old influences were immediately thrown around him and he found himself overcome. He now knows the power of trusts; he now knows their influence; he has been taught it by those who surround him. He is a Republican; his environments control him. He still worships the green snake. As I have said, I have no harsh words for him, only pity, because of the resultant consequences of his most deplorable surroundings. As far as trusts are concerned, henceforth he is blind, he can not see; he is deaf, he can not hear.

Gentlemen of the dominant party, permit me to say to you that you are intoxicated with your present power; you have become recklessly indifferent to the wishes of the people. Listen to what I say. The people are at last awakening to true conditions. You have reached the point where you are anxious to trim, to evade, to dodge, and the people know it. During this Congress there will be no revision of the tariff, there will be no interference with the continued reign of the trusts. The trusts have so willed it. Now, mark the prophecy: These issues will bring about your undoing. Already a storm is gathering in the West. The gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. BABCOCK], who has been on the watch-tower for the Republican party for eight years, as chairman of the Republican Congressional Committee, has sounded a note of warning, which has been echoed in effect by the present governors of Iowa and Minnesota, both Republicans, but it will avail naught. You are joined to your idols; you are true Republicans; you know the power of trusts; they know your venality. This tells the whole story. [Loud applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. HILL. Mr. Chairman, if any excuse whatever was necessary to bring before this House a discussion of the financial bill, I think that it would be found in the last message which William McKinley sent to Congress. I will read from it:

It will be the duty, as I am sure it will be the disposition of the Congress, to provide whatever future legislation is needed to insure parity under all conditions between our two forms of metallic money, silver and gold.

That was the last utterance William McKinley ever made to the Congress or the American people on the money question. I propose, in view of that message, to take up now for consideration and explanation, as well as I may, House bill 7645, to maintain the legal-tender silver dollar at parity with gold and to increase the subsidiary coinage, which stands No. 1 on the Union Calendar.

In June, 1878, prior to resumption of specie payments, this country had 900,000 legal tender silver dollars and \$71,700,000 of subsidiary coin.

The ratio between gold and silver was then 17.94 to 1, and our stock of gold was \$213,199,977.

On November 1, 1893, the purchase clause of the Sherman Act was repealed amid gloom, disaster, and panic, brought on by a well-grounded fear of silver redemption of coin obligations. Our legal-tender silver had then increased to \$392,695,785. Our subsidiary coin to \$76,960,353 in amount, but fallen off in per capita from \$1.36 to 98 cents.

Our stock of gold at the end of the fiscal year was \$597,697,685, and the ratio between gold and silver was then 26.49 to 1.

From that day to this we have steadily and persistently continued to coin more dollars which the people do not want and will not circulate, and with the exception of twenty millions refused to coin subsidiary, which the people do want and will keep in circulation.

On January 1, 1902, the legal-tender silver dollars amounted to \$532,955,428, and subsidiary coin to \$91,975,381. The ratio between gold and silver this year has been about 35 to 1. Fortunate indeed is it that our stock of gold has risen to \$1,176,172,153, and saved us from the otherwise inevitable results of our own mistakes.

The present bill proposes to frankly recognize the errors of the past, to stop now in the path we have been pursuing, and which our own judgment and the experience of every gold-standard nation in the world tell us is the wrong one, and manfully taking up

the burden which we have put upon ourselves, retrace our steps to the sure and firm ground of financial safety and national honor.

It proposes to do this first by stopping now, and I trust forever, the compulsory coinage of full legal-tender silver dollars.

That any person could object to the exchangeability of silver and gold because of some fancied danger, and at the same time insist upon the continued coinage of the dollar, is to me most amazing. I congratulate our friends in the minority that after a six years' struggle with a simple problem in economics they have now abandoned their old theory that legal-tender silver could be maintained under free and unlimited coinage at a parity with gold, and in their report on page 3 have announced that such dollars "never can go to a discount so long as they are limited in number." What limit? By whom made? With what relation to the whole volume of currency? If they will struggle on for six years more they will get down to the elementary truth that the only way by which any forms of money can be maintained at parity is by redemption or exchangeability at the will of the holder.

The fact that we were forced to the gold redemption of greenbacks, notwithstanding that they had been limited for years to an amount far below that of the silver dollars, should give the advocates of this fallacy food for thought.

I presume the advance already made, however, accounts for the fact that no objection is urged in the minority report to this provision of the bill.

In his recent report the Director of the Mint says:

No good reason appears why the coinage of dollar pieces should not altogether cease and the entire stock of bullion be used for subsidiary coin.

This opinion is fortified by the remarkable fact that the United States is the only gold-standard independent nation in the world to-day that continues to coin a legal-tender silver dollar or silver piece of similar size and value.

There are many things in which this nation leads the world, but to be champion of an economic heresy is a distinction of which we have little reason to be proud.

Referring to the table in the majority report, showing the monetary systems and approximate stocks of money in the principal countries of the world, it will be seen that Great Britain, Austria, Japan, Russia, Norway, Sweden, Spain, Switzerland, Servia, Roumania, Portugal, Finland, Egypt, Denmark, Cuba, the South African Republic, Cape Colony, Canada, and Australia have now not a single dollar of legal-tender silver in circulation, and Germany is recoining hers into subsidiary coin as rapidly as possible, and under the law passed last year will have it all so changed within ten years.

Under these circumstances is it not at least worth while for the United States to stop and think?

The second proposition of the bill is that the bullion remaining in the Treasury shall be minted into subsidiary coin. Either this must be done or new bullion must be purchased, for the demand for that form of money is imperative and must be met.

The situation is plainly shown in a letter recently written by Hon. George E. Roberts, Director of the Mint. He says:

The facts of the situation, briefly stated, are that prior to the passage of the act of March 14, 1900, the total stock of subsidiary coin in the country was limited to \$80,000,000, and by that act the limit was raised to \$100,000,000. The demand for subsidiary coin during the past two years has been very heavy, and the total stock in the country is now nearly \$22,000,000, almost all of which is outside the Treasury in active circulation.

It seems quite probable that unless this Congress takes some action to again raise the limit, the entire amount authorized will be absorbed before another Congress can act, and the Treasury will be unable to meet the legitimate wants of trade. It is therefore of urgent importance that some measure be passed by the Fifty-seventh Congress, and, if practicable, during the present session, to relieve the situation. It scarcely need be said that nothing can be more annoying or embarrassing in business circles than to be unable to make change.

There is no gainsaying or arguing against the demand for subsidiary coin. The business men call for it because they want it, and when they call for it are exceedingly annoyed if unable to obtain it. No reason exists why their needs should not be completely supplied, and it is unwise and inconsiderate to neglect the situation and not allow the Treasury to provide for their constantly growing requirements.

The Secretary of the Treasury in his report has referred to the situation, and made the definite recommendation that the limit of the stock be raised from one hundred to one hundred and twenty million, and I know, from personal conference with him, that he has no objection to the limits being entirely removed and thinks that would be the preferable policy.

The objection to limiting the stock of subsidiary coin to \$120,000,000 is that it will surely be necessary within three or four years to take further action. It is only two years since the limit was raised from eighty to one hundred million and no good reason exists why the supply of so important a tool of trade shall be strictly limited. If when legislation is asked on short notice it should for any reason be obstructed or delayed, serious embarrassment might result. There is no way in which the discretion vested in the Secretary of the Treasury can be exercised to the

detriment of the public, and it would appear from every consideration better to provide for a series of years.

I can add nothing to this statement as to the necessity for some action. The only question is, What action? And my reply, and I think that of every man who gives the subject any consideration, is, Give the people all they want as long as it will remain in circulation. How much that will be can be best determined by comparisons with other nations.

In 1878 we had \$1.36 per capita, and on January 1, 1901, we had only \$1.12.

On January 1, 1901, Great Britain had in circulation \$2.82; Austria Hungary, \$1.57; Germany, \$2.26, and under a law passed last year is now recoinage her legal-tender silver up to an aggregate of \$3.50 per capita, the balance of the legal tender having been sold as bullion; France, \$1.54; Switzerland, \$3.24; Denmark, \$2.46; Sweden, \$1.34; Japan, only 70 cents, but she, like Germany, on adopting the gold standard, called in all of the old legal-tender yen, sold 41,000,000 yen as bullion, and is recoinage into subsidiary 27,500,000 yen as rapidly as possible, and Norway, \$1.14.

It was the opinion of Horace White, of New York, expressed to the Coinage Committee, that the United States could float more subsidiary coin than Germany. My question was—

Germany will have about \$3.50 per capita when their legal-tender silver is changed to subsidiary coin. Do you think it will be safe for us to figure on the same amount ultimately?

Answer. I think we can calculate on a larger percentage.

Question. Say 4?

Answer. Yes; I should think so.

Question. That would be \$300,000,000 of subsidiary coin?

Answer. Yes.

But as a perfectly safe proposition let us take the average of all these countries, except Japan, and this would give \$2.30 per capita, and this on the basis of our population January 1, 1902, would make \$172,561,400 which this country would float, if our legislation would permit it to do so, with greatly increased satisfaction to the people and with corresponding relief to the Treasury.

It was the opinion of the Assistant Treasurer, C. N. Jordan, given to me a few days ago, that with the retirement of the one-dollar bills at least 60 per cent of the \$70,000,000 now outstanding would be replaced by subsidiary coin. We have now of subsidiary \$91,975,381. We have of bullion \$40,283,086 worth, which would make of subsidiary coin \$61,546,100, or a total when coined of \$153,521,481, or nineteen millions less than the average of the other nations would call for; but as it would take at least five years to coin the bullion and as with the present growth of the country we should then have a population of 85,000,000, the per capita of subsidiary would be but \$1.80, or very much below the average of the nations named.

In a word, we must have more subsidiary coin. To get it, we must either buy bullion or use what we have. The bill repeals the compulsory provisions of the war-revenue act and gives the Secretary of the Treasury power to use his discretion with reference to this matter, and further provides that when the stock of bullion is exhausted, if public necessity demands more, he shall recoin silver dollars into subsidiary coin to meet that demand. I regret that this latter contingency is so remote, for every dollar so recoined will give us a profit of 7 per cent at the same time that it lessens the danger to which we are exposed from the enormous volume of legal-tender silver dollars.

Precisely this is what other nations are doing, Japan and Germany selling part and recoinage the balance, and the Latin Union, by the convention of 1898, entering upon the recoinage process to the extent of the following amounts:

	Francs.
France	130,000,000
Belgium	6,000,000
Italy	30,000,000
Switzerland	3,000,000

Holland has upon her statute books a law permitting the treasury to melt into bars and sell the coins minted prior to 1873, the declared purpose being to enable the Government to maintain the relative value of gold and silver in case of necessity.

I do not believe that this is necessary in our case, nor do I believe that the people of the United States would consent to the loss which would accrue, which, figuring only the difference between the nominal and actual value of the stock on hand on January 1, 1902, would be \$285,664,110.

By the increase of our population, in less than a hundred years every dollar of it can be converted into limited tender, and meanwhile if the greenbacks are retired and proper precautions are used it can be safely carried.

I look forward to the time when the money of the United States, like that of our commercial rivals, Great Britain and Germany, and our future agricultural rival, Russia, will be gold as the legal tender, silver as the subsidiary coin, and bank notes and checks and drafts as the instruments of trade. Then deficits may come and surpluses may go, but the money of the people will be unchanged and unchangeable, and "maintenance of parity," "16 to

1," and the "Government in the banking business" will be traditions only.

When that time comes the world will be at our feet, for in every other element of superiority we have the advantage now.

So far as the quantity of legal-tender money is concerned no anxiety need be felt.

The increase in the world's stock of gold for the past ten years is but prophetic of its universal use as the world's medium of exchange in the years to come, for in the marts of commerce, as in the factory, the best tool is the cheapest and always will be chosen where choice is possible. The increase in our stock of gold for the past decade has been as follows:

January 1—	
1893	\$507,697,685
1894	627,293,201
1895	696,229,825
1896	599,597,964
1897	606,270,542
1898	925,100,000
1899	945,800,000
1900	1,080,200,000
1901	1,110,800,000
1902	1,176,172,153

With such a stock of gold as this, why talk of an insufficient supply of legal tender, when the fact is that hardly 10 per cent of either gold or silver is in actual use, but only their paper representatives which possess no such quality, and one of the principal uses for the legal-tender paper which we do have is to draw from the Treasury nonlegal-tender bars of gold for international trade?

To all of the propositions thus far advanced I assume that the minority give their full assent, for in their dissenting views not one word is found concerning any of them, and if the proverb that "silence gives consent" was ever true, it must be in this case.

Assuming then, first, that the maximum limit of legal-tender silver has been fixed, and, second, that an automatic process has been provided by which the volume can be reduced and ultimately changed into a safe, desirable, and needed form of currency, the second clause of the bill looks squarely to its maintenance meanwhile, under all conditions, at parity with the standard of 25.8 grains of gold, by exchangeability therefor, at the will of the holder.

This is based on the plain proposition that a Government ought not to issue a single dollar which the citizen can be forced to accept, unless it will itself accept it in return in exchange for the dollar which it has itself prescribed as the standard.

Let us first see what the relation of the silver dollar is to our currency system now. Under section 3529, Revised Statutes, pennies and nickels are made exchangeable, each for the other, and both redeemable in lawful money in sums of \$20 or more. By the law of June 22, 1874, silver coins, in excess of \$100 in amount, shall be exchanged for gold coin at the mints and the New York assay office. By the law of June 9, 1879, the Treasurer and assistant treasurer are required to exchange subsidiary coin in sums of \$20 and multiples thereof for lawful money, or to exchange lawful money for subsidiary coin on demand of the holder.

By the act of August 7, 1882, the Treasury is directed to transport free of charge silver coins on request and on deposit of like amount of coin or currency in the Treasury.

By the act of May 26, 1882, gold bars are exchangeable for gold coin.

By the act of March 14, 1900, United States notes and Treasury notes are redeemable in gold.

Under section 3700, Revised Statutes, the Secretary of the Treasury can buy coin (gold or silver) at such rates and upon such terms as he may deem most advantageous to the public interest and pay in exchange therefor any bonds or notes of the United States authorized by law.

Of course gold and silver certificates are exchangeable for the respective metals.

So that pennies, nickles, subsidiary, paper, and even gold coin all have a redeemer, except the silver dollar; but this half and half of value and promise must stand alone, trusting in God and the Republican party, to maintain itself at parity with other legal-tender money. And yet we call this a gold-standard nation.

I do not think that there is a man on either side of this House who believed, after the campaign of 1896, that the overwhelming victory then secured for sound money was to end with a declaration only for the gold standard, and with it the permanent retention in our monetary system of 346,000,000 demand notes and 573,000,000 silver dollars, and yet, while the position of the greenback has been strengthened and that of the silver weakened by the act of March 14, 1900, both still remain a menace and a hindrance to a real currency reform.

The proposition now before the House is not a new one. On the 12th of January, 1897, a convention assembled in Indianapolis, and 26 States were represented. Its one purpose was a reform in

the currency. A commission was appointed to prepare a measure for presentation to Congress. It consisted of George F. Edmunds, of Vermont; Charles S. Fairchild, of New York; C. Stuart Patterson, of Pennsylvania; John W. Fries, of North Carolina; Thomas G. Bush, of Alabama; George E. Leighton, of Missouri; Stuyvesant Fish, of New York; William B. Dean, of Minnesota; Robert S. Taylor, of Indiana; J. Laurence Laughlin, of Illinois; Louis A. Garnett, of California. The entire year was spent in patient investigation.

Thousands of circular letters were sent out with a series of inquiries on every branch of the subject, and numerous meetings were held for consultation, and on January 3, 1898, their conclusions were given to the public, and at once a bill embodying them was introduced in Congress by Hon. JESSE OVERSTREET.

It provided for an unqualified adoption of the gold standard and for its maintenance, that no more silver dollars should be coined, the exchangeability of the silver dollar for gold, the retirement of the greenbacks, and for the sale of the bullion in the Treasury. Leslie M. Shaw, of Iowa, was president, and Henry C. Payne, of Milwaukee, a member of the executive committee of the convention which approved this report.

The bill failed to become a law, but these provisions received the approval of the majority of the Republican members of the Banking and Currency Committee, and in the second session of the Fifty-fifth Congress were embodied in another bill, except that the bullion was to be made into subsidiary coin instead of being sold.

This bill went to the Committee on Coinage, Weights, and Measures, and by the solid Republican membership was passed and put upon the Calendar of the House.

There it died a natural death, but prior to the adjournment of the Fifty-fifth Congress a Republican caucus of the House appointed a special committee to prepare a bill to be submitted to the Fifty-sixth Congress. That committee consisted of Hon. DAVID B. HENDERSON, Hon. SERENO E. PAYNE, Hon. JOHN DALZELL, Hon. JESSE OVERSTREET, Hon. W. S. Kerr, Hon. J. W. BABCOCK, Hon. PAGE MORRIS, Hon. W. C. LOVERING, Hon. E. F. LOUD, Hon. CHARLES CURTIS, Hon. R. B. Hawley. After two weeks' deliberation, they made a unanimous report to the caucus of the Fifty-sixth Congress, setting forth "that they did not seek to arrange a complete scheme of finance, but confined their recommendations to those subjects of most pressing demand, as evidenced by pledges of the Republican party," and expressed their "opinion that the most urgent subject was the question of a monetary standard and provision for its maintenance."

Among these provisions were the establishment of the gold reserve against the United States notes, fixing it at 25 per cent of the notes and 5 per cent of the silver dollars outstanding, which would make a total now of \$122,855,884; authorized the exchangeability of the silver dollar for gold, and indeed all forms of money; removed the limit for subsidiary coin, and allowed the use of the Treasury bullion for such coinage.

That bill, with those provisions in it, received the vote of every Republican member of the House and of many Democrats besides. It went to the Senate, and came back here with a modified gold-standard declaration at the beginning, and at the end a statement that—

The provisions of this act are not intended to preclude the accomplishment of international bimetalism whenever conditions shall make it expedient and practicable to secure the same by concurrent action of the leading commercial nations of the world and at a ratio which shall insure permanence of relative value between gold and silver.

And this statement was literally true, for into the very heart of the bill had been driven the continued and expedited coinage of the Treasury bullion. The authority to increase the subsidiary coin had been limited to \$20,000,000, and even the discretionary power given to the Treasury to maintain the parity of the silver dollar by exchanging it for gold was stricken out, and such powers as were given by that act were limited to greenback redemption only, so that the silver dollar stands absolutely alone and unsupported to-day, and the Secretary of the Treasury, though directed to maintain the parity of all forms of money, has no lawful power given him to do it. The only way by which anyone has even claimed that parity could legally be maintained is by use of the redeemed greenback, under the term "for any lawful purpose" (and by section 3700, Revised Statutes, the exchange of greenbacks for silver would be lawful); but the trouble is that the language of the same section explicitly provides that—

whenever and as often as any of said notes shall be redeemed from said fund it shall be the duty of the Secretary of the Treasury to use said notes so redeemed to restore and maintain such reserve fund in the manner following, to wit:

First, by exchanging the notes so redeemed for any gold coin in the general fund of the Treasury; second, by accepting deposits of gold coin at the Treasury or at any subtreasury in exchange for the United States notes so redeemed; third, by procuring gold coin by the use of said notes, in accordance with the provisions of section 3700 of the Revised Statutes of the United States. If the Secretary of the Treasury is unable to restore and maintain the gold coin in the reserve fund by the foregoing methods, and the amount

of such gold coin and bullion in said fund shall at any time fall below \$100,000,000, then it shall be his duty to restore the same to the maximum sum of \$150,000,000, and for the debt thus incurred to issue and sell—

bonds, etc., so that demands upon the reserve amounting to fifty millions more than the gold and notes in the current funds of the Treasury would render even this course impossible until a bond issue had been forced.

Furthermore, when this point is reached the Treasury has only come by an indirect and circuitous route to the result of restoring parity, when the direct and easy method of exchangeability would have prevented a panic in the beginning.

But it is said that this bill is more stringent in its provisions than the caucus measure which the House passed. Let us compare the two.

This bill directs the Secretary to maintain at all times the silver dollar at parity with gold by exchangeability of these two only at the Treasury (that means in Washington), and, in his discretion, the greenback reserve fund and all provisions of law for maintaining it are made available.

The language of the caucus bill was:

The Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and required to use said reserve fund in maintaining at all times the parity and equal value of every dollar issued or coined by the Government, and if at any time the Secretary of the Treasury deems it necessary in order to maintain parity and equal value of all the money of the United States he may, at his discretion, exchange gold coin for any other money issued or coined by the United States.

The present bill covers legal-tender coin only, the caucus bill covered nonlegal-tender paper and even subsidiary coin. Both required the maintenance of parity. One authorized the method and provided a reserve, the other directs the thing itself, a reserve being now in existence larger by \$28,000,000 than was then proposed. No better argument can be presented for the proposed plan than the language of the caucus report where they say:

If such an emergency shall arise, it is best that the duty of the Government shall be clear. This will not increase the responsibility beyond the burden which now rests upon the Government. It will discharge the duty directly which is now met indirectly. Indeed, it is confidently believed that less embarrassment will follow the direct method. The demand for such exchange will be reduced in proportion as the certainty of the exchange is made manifest.

To all of which I say "Amen."

The bill as amended came back to the House, and became the law of March 14, 1900. Since that this proposition has received the unanimous Republican vote of the Committee on Coinage, Weights, and Measures in both the Fifty-sixth and Fifty-seventh Congresses, and a bill introduced by Hon. JESSE OVERSTREET, covering exchangeability of the silver dollar at the demand of the holder, received the Republican vote of the Banking and Currency Committee of the Fifty-sixth Congress and has again been introduced in the Fifty-seventh Congress, so that the principles involved in this bill have a very respectable indorsement.

It is needless to discuss now the reasons why the bill which passed the House in the Fifty-sixth Congress did not become a law. The act of March 14, 1900, while falling far short of what had been expected after the campaign of education in 1896, was still a distinct step forward, and, with an explicit declaration for the single gold standard written in the statutes, gave promise of better things. The only question is, Shall those things which are absolutely necessary to its maintenance be done now, or will Congress wait till another sore experience like 1893 compels such action? For the dangerous features of our system which existed then are still present, and, aside from the power to issue certificates of indebtedness to provide for deficiencies of revenue and the increase of gold, the Government machinery for meeting those dangers is less efficient than before.

You who think the endless chain is stopped examine your morning statements of Treasury operations and you will find that from resumption in 1879 to March 14, 1900, the average annual redemption of greenbacks was \$23,759,409, and since that time in this floodtide of wonderful prosperity, with over three hundred millions of the gold in the Treasury owned by private parties through certificates, the greenback redemptions in gold have averaged \$29,924,952 per year, so that instead of stopping or even clogging the endless chain it has only been made to work more smoothly. There is no room in a gold-standard system for fiat money. It must either be paid and canceled or the responsibility of its current redemption squarely assumed by the issuing power. You say it is dangerous to assume the redemption of the silver dollars. I concede it, but it is still more dangerous not to, for the danger exists all the time, and it is far safer to prepare for it in times of prosperity than to have it find us unprepared and helpless when adversity comes, as come it surely will.

The fiat in the silver dollar and the fiat in the paper dollar must both be treated alike. To say that "it will compel a large increase of the gold reserve" is to admit that the danger exists and that we are unprepared for it. To argue that "it will create a new endless chain" ignores the fact that the silver dollar is receivable for customs duties, and that paying silver into one door

of the Treasury has a worse effect upon the gold reserve than drawing gold out from another by greenback redemption. To claim that "the Government has the power to call an absolute halt to a raid upon its gold reserve by impounding the greenbacks and Treasury notes," as the minority do claim, simply shows that they have not read the law, for it explicitly states that only fifty millions can be so held and then the mill begins to grind again. To assert that "it will facilitate the exportation of gold" sets aside the simplest law of trade, that gold exports are governed by rates of exchange and interest charges, over neither of which the Government has any control, and that international balances must in the end be paid.

According to Gresham's law, cheap money will expel good from circulation, and for that reason the money of the wage-earner should be just as good as that which pays the foreign creditor. The minority claim that "it will cause the retirement of the silver dollars." If it would do this, more than half of our troubles would be gone, but I confess I utterly fail to see how exchangeability can have any effect upon quantity; but if by any legerdemain this result was achieved, it would only bring us to the goal which 19 other gold-standard nations of the world have reached after long struggles and severe losses with full legal-tender silver.

The final argument against exchangeability is that it is unnecessary, for "parity will be maintained by use." My reply is that the use of any legal-tender fiat money can only be compelled in the settlement of existing debts, and each new contract must be made with confidence in its ultimate redemption. That confidence once shaken, where possibility of choice exists, as it does here, it surely will be exercised, and that means ultimate disparity.

Limitation of quantity does not affect the quality of money. A counterfeit dollar is no better or no worse because there may be few or many of them. Let me cite an illustration of the difference between parity by use and parity by redemption. India was a silver-standard country. By the act of June 26, 1893, the mints of India were closed to the free coinage of silver and the volume practically limited now to \$469,700,000, or a per capita of \$1.58 against our \$8.51. According to the law of limitation and use, the value should have remained unchanged, but instead of that great fluctuations occurred, "until the act 23 of 1899 passed by the governor-general in council gave legislative effect to the decision of the government to change the standard of the Indian monetary system from silver to gold." Now, as will be seen by the Mint report for 1901, page 382—

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

Mr. HILL. Yes; if I have the time.

Mr. SHAFROTH. Is the policy for which the gentleman contends required by law? Does not the Government retain the option of paying either gold or silver as it chooses?

Mr. HILL. Let us see about that. I say it does not make any difference whether the Government retains the power or not. It is doing this thing now and has done it ever since the gold standard was adopted.

Mr. SHAFROTH. Your bill requires the Government, does it not, to pay gold for silver?

Mr. HILL. Suppose that silver should go to a discount, would not the Government, if it had the power, be compelled to redeem it? It could not refrain from exercising this power. I say that the difference between the word "authorized" and the word "directed" does not make one particle of difference in the practical operation of this bill; and I am perfectly ready at any time when the bill comes up for consideration to accept an amendment changing the word "directed" into "authorized," feeling and knowing that it would make no practical difference in the operation of the bill.

"The Government for the present undertakes to receive from the public gold in exchange for rupees and rupees in exchange for gold at the rate of 15 rupees to the sovereign." Does anyone doubt that parity will continue with exchangeability and disappear at once when exchangeability stops? A year ago I cited the case of Porto Rico. Let me again call your attention to it. Up to 1895 they were using the Mexican dollar. For five years they had tried to maintain its nominal value by forbidding its importation and keeping it in use. But limitation and use alike were of no avail, and it went steadily down to 59 cents, and the necessities of life went up in price proportionately.

The Porto Rican government then concluded that they would have a currency of their own, which would not be affected by the value of silver in the outside world, but which, exactly adjusted to the needs of trade among their own people, would thus maintain its parity by use. So they gathered in the Mexican dollars at 95 cents each and coined from these the Porto Rican peso or dollar, with less silver in it, and issued them at a dollar apiece in lieu of the Mexicans, which had all been withdrawn. It was a full legal tender, redeemable in nothing, exchangeable for nothing, exactly adjusted to the wants of the trade, for when the island

would absorb no more the undistributed balance was sent back to Spain, and free coinage was not permitted, and so every element which could enter into the problem of maintenance of parity by use existed in a marked degree.

There was one thing, however, which they did not do. They did not build a fence around the island and stop the import and export of commodities, and everything which went out or came in just as truly marked the value of the money there as if it had been gold, for the commercial world was doing business with gold as the measure of values. Instead of equaling a dollar in gold in purchasing power among their own people, it started off in 1896 at 64½ cents, fell in 1897 to 59 cents, and when the American occupation came in 1898 went to 42 cents, its bullion value, and in just three years the curtain was rung down on the farce of maintenance of parity by use.

I honestly believe that but for the confidence of the American people that the Government will stand squarely behind the silver dollar and ultimately accept it in exchange for gold it would go to a discount now, as the greenback did before resumption, although the quantity was limited and no legal-tender silver dollars were in existence. I want that confidence made supreme by writing the promise in the statutes, for when once there no party will dare to disobey it.

Let me cite a few proofs that the American people also want it. Says Arthur Hadley, president of Yale University:

The bill in general seems to be a good one, and you are at liberty to quote me as having said so.

A. M. Day, professor in the school of political science in Columbia University:

I sincerely hope that the bill may become a law at once. It seems to me to embody both the least and the most that can now safely be done to secure the safety of our monetary system.

The thirty-first annual meeting of the National Board of Trade, at its session in this city a year ago, after a full discussion and conference with the Secretary of the Treasury and President by a distinguished committee, reported specifically by name and number in favor of the adoption by Congress of this identical bill. At their session again this year the board passed a resolution—

That we recommend that Congress enact such legislation as may be necessary to put this country on a permanent gold basis.

And supplemented this action by declaring for every provision embodied in this bill.

The Finance Committee of the New York Chamber of Commerce said:

We believe that the sooner any and all defects in the legislation of the previous session relating to the maintenance of the gold standard are removed the better it will be for the country at large and for business in general; and we also feel that action in this direction should be taken now at the present session of Congress, rather than be delayed and acted upon at the next session of Congress, when another election is approaching. The marvelous development of the mercantile interests of this country now in progress demands, in our judgment, the serious attention of Congress, in order that the groundwork may be laid and the superstructure begun of a broad and comprehensive working system, which will be adequate to the needs of the coming generations. And the first thing to be done, it seems to us, is to fix beyond all cavil and question the gold basis upon which this fabric of credit and finance shall rest.

The Philadelphia Inquirer says:

Mr. Hill has reported a bill that makes the gold standard absolute in this country, in practice as well as in theory. It ought to pass speedily.

The New York Times says:

The passage of the bill will finally settle the silver question and establish the gold standard on a perfectly sound and steady basis. It will at the same time make provision for the sorely felt and constantly increasing need of small change.

Of it the New Haven Register said last winter:

It is not possible for the party in power to withhold its prompt approval without opening itself to the just charge of a betrayal of sacred trust. In 1896 it made the enactment of a gold-standard law the leading issue of the campaign. It won its election upon that issue with the aid of thousands of men who are members of a different household of political faith. For four years it neglected its pledge, and last year it was again returned to power upon the money issue. Mr. Hill should exhaust his opportunities to drive the bill through in time for the Senate to concur before the death of Congress. It is everlastingly right and just.

The Hartford Post says:

President McKinley and Secretary Gage both recommend that the defect in the law should be remedied at the earliest opportunity. The necessity for doing so is obvious. Mr. Hill's bill covers the ground. It should be passed without unnecessary delay and without amendment.

Worcester Spy says:

Congress should complete the work it has begun.

Memphis Scimitar:

The last remaining danger of a cheap-money Administration degrading the currency would be done away with.

New York Evening Post says:

The measure will require no more gold reserve than we have now, but rather less, since its passage will quiet all lingering suspicions that the Government itself makes a difference between gold dollars and silver ones.

Bradstreet's, New York City, says:

Some such measure would seem to be desirable to remove the uncertainty which still lingers in the public mind in spite of the passage of the law of March 14, 1900.

The Buffalo Commercial, referring to the Overstreet and Hill bills, says:

If either becomes a law there will be no further menace to the gold standard in times of panic or financial distress.

Philadelphia Record says:

This, then, would complete the legislation in regard to the monetary standard.

Baltimore American says:

There being no reason, then, in the American's philosophy for maintaining a flirtation with the white metal when the country is firmly wedded to the yellow, Congress should put an end to the matter by passing the bill.

Pittsburg Times says:

With silver exchangeable for gold, there will be no further doubt of the stable basis of the coinage of the United States, and the fears that were excited by the Bryan campaign will arise no more to plague the nation.

Pittsburg Dispatch says:

The adoption of this measure should suffice to put an end to the mischievous agitation of the currency question as a political issue. In two national elections the people have declared most emphatically for the existing sound monetary system. There can be no doubt either of their understanding of the subject or of their determination upon it.

Cleveland Leader says:

The country simply can not afford to run the risks involved in the postponement of such action by Congress as would make it possible to disturb the existing standard of values by the manipulation of the great stock of silver now on hand.

The Omaha Bee said, referring to the last Congress:

There is no good reason why legislation to fortify the gold-standard act should not be enacted by the present Congress. It is approved by the financial and business interests, and there is nothing to be gained by leaving it to the next Congress. Delay is needless and might prove dangerous.

And the San Francisco Call, speaking of the movement of gold after this legislation passes, says:

It will continue to flow hitherward from all the world, making us a great reservoir of the world's capital, and, therefore, the world's creditor.

Mr. Chairman, this is the consummation which I seek.

In October, 1901, 93 per cent of all the customs duties in New York City were paid in gold certificates. In June, 1894, 84 per cent were paid in silver certificates, the Treasury came within twenty-four hours of compulsory silver redemption, the country was stripped of the change money needed for paying wages and small transactions, and the Treasury was helpless.

It was a concrete illustration of the Golden Rule translated from the domain of ethics to the practical experience of everyday life, "Whatsoever ye would that men should do to you, do ye even so to them."

The people of this country will have precisely the degree of confidence in our money which the Government has, and if the Treasury refuses to exchange gold for silver, the people will do likewise when the pinch comes and their individual interest prompts them to such a course.

Past experience is not only a warning to the foolish man, but should be a guide to the wise one.

I am not willing to see this nation idly rest in the dreamer's paradise of "letting well enough alone."

China has done that for three thousand years, and has been slowly dying all the time. "Letting well enough alone" never won a victory or blazed the way of progress, and it never will. Thus far in its history the Republican party has been the party of achievement, not of obstruction or stagnation. It looks to the future with joy and hope, rather than to the past with a smirking smile of self-content. So long as there are things to be done which make for righteousness; so long as misery, suffering, and want exist—until the law is all fulfilled and the millennial dawn shall come—there will be no place or time when the nation or the individual can "let well enough alone."

Our motto should be, "Forward," while the laggards and those who are "weary in well-doing" fall to the rear as the procession marches on.

The commercial conquest of the world awaits this nation, when it is impregnable at home, in its industrial and financial systems, for when this is secured it can have no rival elsewhere. [Loud applause.]

Mr. LITTLE. I now yield twenty minutes to the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. SHAFROTH].

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

Mr. GILLET of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, the other day, when the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. WHEELER] made his attack upon the Administration, I tried to get the floor, as did several other gentlemen, but the gentleman from New Hampshire, who had charge of the legislation then under consideration, very naturally and very properly objected to it, saying that if he once let us in all the day would be consumed.

It seemed to me that the gentleman from Kentucky, while his speech was most injudicious, was very judicious and shrewd in his selection of a time to make it, for he chose a day when he knew no one could answer him except by unanimous consent,

which was pretty certain not to be freely granted. Consequently he was fairly safe from response. I appreciate that the matter is stale now, and is petty. It needs no refutation, because the very intemperance of his remarks carried with them their own condemnation.

But, inasmuch as the gentleman based his indictment of the Administration on the fact that it was making a departure from Democratic simplicity, that they were tending toward aristocracy and worship of titles, that theory is so contradicted by facts that I wish to give another historical incident illustrating the gentleman's mistakes and showing that we are moderating the Democratic fondness for royalty instead of exaggerating it. I do not mean to intimate that I think that the action of our Administration needs any Democratic precedent. It is sound enough to stand on its own merits. I remember that a great lawyer—I think it was Erskine—was once arguing a case and the court asked him if he had any precedent for his opinion. He said: "I have not examined the cases, your honor. I will if you wish; but I should be sorry to deprive your honor of the distinction of being the first to establish so just and wise a precedent." I think that applies in the present case.

I think the conduct of our Administration is only courteous, hospitable, and sensible, and, without any precedent, will receive the approbation of the American people regardless of party. But, inasmuch as there has been an attempt to make party capital of it, let me give you a Democratic precedent. The reception of the Prince of Wales by President Buchanan was so thoroughly aired the other day by the gentleman from Ohio that it certainly demolished part of the gentleman's argument. The other action which he complained of as unprecedented and wrong was that a member of the President's family was going abroad to take a glimpse of a foreign court.

Now, I do not think that is a very proper subject of discussion here. I will do the gentleman from Kentucky the justice to say that he had the grace to admit that he did not like to bring it forward, and he touched upon it as delicately as possible, if he was to allude to it at all. I confess it seems to me preposterous to argue it. If a young lady can not accept the invitation of friends to go and see a great public ceremonial in another country which, however empty and dull it may seem to the gentleman from Kentucky, yet, with its pomp and picturesqueness, would naturally be attractive to the curiosity and ardor of youth, if she could not do that without criticism on this floor, then what I supposed was the dominant principle of American society, the inherent and inalienable right of the American girl to do exactly what she pleases, is seriously endangered. [Laughter.]

To a venerable and serious-minded statesman entirely engrossed in his solemn studies, thin-blooded, aged, and blasé, such pomp and ceremony may appear useless mummeries. But the gentleman must not forget that there is another point of view, less wise, perhaps, but perfectly harmless, and that 99 per cent of the girls of America would be glad to see such a ceremony and would disown anyone of their class who did not seize the opportunity. Then, of course, it follows that 99 per cent of the young men would indorse and approve that opinion, and would consider that nobody could criticise it except some cold and petrified fossil. I do not believe the gentleman from Kentucky belongs in that class at all [laughter], but I fear he will subject himself to the danger of being put there.

Now, it seems to me that prudence would have suggested to the gentleman, before charging this Administration with wandering from Democratic simplicity, to have looked at the facts of history. The truth is that all our Presidents, no matter what their politics have been, under the sobering influence of responsibility have always borne themselves toward foreign nations with dignity. They have never allowed the spirit of demagoguery to overcome the courtesy and amenity which marks the gentleman. In good Democratic times, however, there was not always the simplicity the gentleman imagines, and I wish to cite an instance that occurred many years ago under the Presidency of James Madison. You look back to him very properly with admiration and pride, and claim him as a Democratic President; and Dolly Madison is one of the favorite characters of our history.

Dolly Madison had a son, and when some embassy went abroad, I think at the time of the treaty of peace in 1815, this son went with the embassy. I am not sure whether he had a salary, but it would have been natural and democratic if he did. Some years afterwards Henry Clay, who was one of the ambassadors, met this son in the streets of Washington, when his fortunes had very much fallen off from the position he once occupied as the President's son, and Mr. Clay said to him: "Do you remember the day when we went to a court ball, and you, as the son of the President, were admitted into the innermost court circles and allowed to dance with the princesses, while we, being only ambassadors, were kept on the outside and could only look at you from a distance?"

That shows the conduct of the son of good old James Madison. Does the gentleman think that is good evidence of democratic simplicity?

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

Mr. GILLET of Massachusetts. Certainly.

Mr. FLEMING. Does the gentleman mean to say that this was President James Madison's son?

Mr. GILLET of Massachusetts. No; he was the son of the President's wife by a previous marriage, but he was accepted abroad as the President's son; and this son of a Democratic President was dancing with princesses while Henry Clay and Albert Gallatin and John Quincy Adams had to stand in the background and look on. There is democratic simplicity! I do not think we shall follow that Democratic precedent.

If James Madison had asked that his son be accorded this rank of royalty, I think he would have been properly subject to criticism. But I do not believe that Clay and Adams and Gallatin, as they looked on, felt resentment or anything more than a good-natured amusement that the son of our President was treated with such distinction, and I do not believe that in that day there was any member of Congress so lacking in the sense of the ridiculous or delicacy or propriety as to get up and criticize the Administration of James Madison because of this escapade of his young son; and I do not believe any Democrat or Republican except the gentleman from Kentucky ever has or ever will criticize any other President if he allows some young member of his family to take a look at a foreign court.

I know that the Democratic party is sadly and distressfully groping for new issues, but I do not believe such an issue as that ever occurred to the imagination of more than one gentleman.

Mr. FLEMING. Does the gentleman seriously assert or assume the position that Democrats on this side of the House, as a body or as a party, indorse such a position as that of the gentleman from Kentucky?

Mr. GILLET of Massachusetts. I do not know. I will ask the gentleman what his opinion is.

Mr. FLEMING. I am not authorized to speak for anybody but myself, but I will say that I do not indorse that gentleman's position, and from conversations I have had with other members on this floor, I think I am entitled to say that the Democratic Representatives here do not indorse the position of the gentleman from Kentucky as a whole; they may indorse a part of it, but not all of it.

Mr. GILLET of Massachusetts. I am very glad to hear the gentleman's statement that he does not indorse all that was said by the gentleman from Kentucky. It corresponds with my opinion of the gentleman from Georgia. I have only spoken of the remarks of the gentleman from Kentucky as a Democratic speech—an attack upon the Republican Administration; and the parts of that speech which I particularly reprobate were greeted with applause on the Democratic side. But if the Democratic party is trying to make an issue upon that question, I think it is the most preposterous and ridiculous attempt since the great bedchamber plot, when the administration of Sir Robert Peel abandoned power because they could not have the appointment of the ladies of the Queen's bedchamber. [Laughter.]

Now, there is another phase of the gentleman's speech that, while I am on the floor, I would like to say a word about. To my mind it is most unfortunate that a member of Congress should use such language, should allude to a Secretary of State as a man who was a "pitiable flunky and ought to be booted out of his office;" or should ridicule the German nation and claim that he did not care for their good will.

Whatever else our Secretary of State may be—however the gentleman may disapprove of his policy, which, in my opinion, has been eminently wise and farsighted and successful—nobody can deny that he has won a distinguished place in literature, and that in the many offices which he has filled he has always borne himself as a courteous, dignified, exemplary gentleman. And that such language should be used about him here makes me almost regret that the rules of parliamentary law are such that a point of order could not be made against the words.

I think it unfortunate that in this world while ability is necessary to achieve any good results, harmful results can easily be, and perhaps oftener are achieved, by the very lack of ability. It is always easy to achieve notoriety, simply by intemperate and extreme remarks; and the more unjustifiable and disgraceful they are, the more notoriety they bring. When such language is used in regard to a foreign nation, it is especially unfortunate, because the people of that nation when they read such remarks about themselves, as they certainly will, know nothing of the man who delivers them; they know nothing of the weight to which his words are entitled; they simply know that he is an official member of the House of Representatives; and it reflects upon all members of this House when a member says something which can alienate and provoke friendly nations.

I do not at all agree with the gentleman that it is of no value to

us what the German people think of us. I think it is of vast value to us. It is of value for trade; it is of value for peace; it is of value for that self-respect which makes every man wish the good opinion of his fellow-men. In a measure the rules of conduct among gentlemen apply to the intercourse of nations. Private life would be intolerable if each of us brutally proclaimed each ground for criticism of his neighbor's conduct.

I venture to say that if the friends of the gentleman from Kentucky should say plainly to him just what they thought of him all the time, their friendship would be very much strained [laughter on the Republican side], for I have no doubt that he, like all the rest of us, has foibles which it would not be pleasant to have constantly proclaimed. And, as in the ordinary intercourse of gentlemen, we repress our opinions and try to be courteous and friendly, so, I think, in the intercourse of nations we ought to follow the same rule.

Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Massachusetts will not be so unfair, I hope, as to charge the Democratic party with being responsible for the utterances of the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. GILLET of Massachusetts. Well, these repeated disavowals are very agreeable to me, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana. The gentleman should himself avow whether that is his purpose or intention—to charge the great Democratic party of the country, whose precedents he has cited, in line with the action of the whole country, as I understand it to be, to do honors to the prince—whether he charged to the Democratic party responsibility for the utterances or the sentiments of the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. GILLET of Massachusetts. I have made no charge, Mr. Chairman. I am simply answering some remarks which were made on the other side. How much those remarks were sympathized with and enjoyed and are now indorsed by the gentlemen on that side I do not know. I think if they do not indorse them it would be well that somebody should take the pains to say so. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. THAYER. Mr. Chairman, I should like to make a suggestion, if the gentleman will give way for a moment.

Mr. GILLET of Massachusetts. Oh, certainly.

Mr. THAYER. I think the gentleman from Massachusetts, being upon the side of this House where everyone dances when anyone pipes, is living under the delusion that the men upon this side of the House are in the same category themselves. The gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. WHEELER] spoke for himself, and, in my opinion, spoke for the very minor part of those upon this side of the House, especially in the latter portion of his speech, and it is unfair and unjust to taunt the Democracy of this nation as being in sympathy with the sentiments that the gentleman from Kentucky expressed the other day.

Mr. GILLET of Massachusetts. Well, one gentleman after another is obviously seeing which side it is better to stand on.

Mr. TALBERT. Will the gentleman allow me for one moment?

Mr. GILLET of Massachusetts. I will allow a question. You can make a speech afterwards.

Mr. TALBERT. I just want to say while gentlemen on this side are disclaiming any responsibility for what the gentleman from Kentucky said, I want to say that I want to take my part of the responsibility for what he said, and I indorse every word he said and I am sorry he did not go further. [Laughter on the Republican side.] And I believe the Democratic party is more to blame for its cowardice than anything else. Let the party say what it thinks and stand by it and not be such mortal cowards. [Laughter on the Republican side.]

Mr. GILLET of Massachusetts. I commend those remarks to my colleague from Massachusetts [Mr. THAYER].

Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana. Does the gentleman notice that the applause is on the Republican side and not on the Democratic side?

Mr. TALBERT. They applaud what they believe to be right. I believe the sentiments of Mr. WHEELER to be on the right line. I believe they are democratic, and hence I indorse them.

Mr. GILLET of Massachusetts. Now, Mr. Chairman, on the question of the influence of words spoken here, I happened last night to read this sentence from a distinguished scholar and publicist, Charles Francis Adams, which I should like to read here:

It is useless to say that as between nations irresponsible utterance through the press and from the platform are not entitled to consideration and should not be recalled. They none the less are a fact and they are not forgotten. On the contrary they rankle.

I think the members of this House ought to remember that fact and ought to endeavor not to use words which will rankle. There is too much tendency, not perhaps so marked in this House as "elsewhere," to cater to public sentiment at home quite regardless of the effect abroad. The good will of every nation in this world is useful to us. We have an illustration of the value of

good will in the case of Russia to-day. Russia, because of events which happened more than a generation ago, although she differs from this country more than any other nation. although she represents the extreme of despotism just as we represent the extreme of republicanism, Russia to-day has the warm good will of this country, and that good will I think she would find, if occasion came, was a valuable asset. The good will of every country is an asset of every other country, and it is very unwise in us to go out of our way to alienate and destroy it.

Of course, when the relations of other nations come before us for discussion, then we must fairly and openly debate them, but to bring up such a question when there is no occasion for it and to fling a taunt in the face of a foreign nation is to my mind most unkind and unwise.

The gentleman from Kentucky said that the reception of Prince Henry by the President would be a departure toward aristocracy. I agree with what the gentleman said in his disclaimer of love for titles and aristocracy. I entirely and heartily sympathize with him in that. I think the great mass of our people agree with him, and certainly no one more than our President.

The American principle is that worth makes the man, and not birth or royal favor. To my mind there are just two classes of people here who worship birth and title. The great majority say merit is what should be rewarded and what we should respect. But there are two classes which still look to birth and ancestry. One class is the self-styled aristocratic circle in our great cities, who have shown a strong tendency to pay huge prices for empty titles even when they had to be taken with the incumbrance of a useless and disreputable husband. The other class exists almost exclusively in the part of the country dominated hopelessly by the Democratic party, where they consider that no culture, no refinement, or ability, or noble service can atone for a taint of color in the blood.

These are the two classes in this country which recognize birth and not merit. I was glad to see that the gentleman from Kentucky bravely took himself out of the latter class. But aside from these two classes this whole country, as a rule, does not like title, does not care for birth, but honors plain, honest merit. But we can not shut our eyes to the sentiment of other countries.

In Germany they do not agree with us. They prefer an Emperor to a President. They prefer to allow their ruler to come down by descent rather than by choice. They recognize as a distinguished citizen the brother of the Emperor, not simply because he is an admiral, but because he belongs to the reigning house; and when he comes here representing, as we know he does, that feeling in Germany, no matter how little we may consider his title of nobility, we must recognize how Germany looks on him, and in welcoming him we welcome him not simply as a prince, but because Germany recognizes him as one of her great and distinguished men. We want to be a hospitable and generous people, and I am glad that the prince is coming here as the representative of Germany.

Within a few years there has been a little strain in our relations, and I look upon the coming here of the Emperor's brother as a sort of tender of good will, a wiping out of past differences, and I think it would be churlish and inhospitable if we did not give him a hearty and warm welcome.

Now, as to the other embassy, which we are sending over to England, I have much sympathy with the gentleman's feeling that it is a useless show. I do not think it is very democratic or republican, and I do not think that under ordinary circumstances we should send such an embassy. It seems to me, however, it is always a matter of question how much we shall conform to European usages, and that just now it is exceedingly timely and wise to send these two embassies to Spain and to England.

When this matter was considered by President McKinley we had just ended the war with Spain. They were about to crown their young King. Other nations of the world were sending their embassies to carry their congratulations to him. Would it not have seemed rather spiteful, rancorous, and churlish if we had not done the same? If, when nations of Europe were by special embassies expressing their congratulations, should this great, rich country, in order to save a few dollars, refuse to send one?

I think we ought to show our good will toward Spain by doing what the other great nations do. And my zeal is not diminished because a Democrat was selected as ambassador. It was an admirable selection. And if we send one to Spain we can not refuse to send one to England. The exception would be too pointed. As a question of economy, it seems to me when we are spending toward \$200,000,000 a year in maintaining the Army and the Navy to insure ourselves against the hostile feeling of other nations, it surely is not very extravagant to spend a few thousand dollars to express to them our good will, to conform with the customs of other great nations and cultivate their friendship by participating in ceremonies which they prize highly. [Loud applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. Chairman, in what I said the other day I did not pretend to speak as a leader of the Democratic party. I could never for a moment hope to have placed myself in such a position without first having the approval of the gentleman from Georgia and the gentleman from Indiana. I simply voiced my own sentiments and what I believed to be the sentiments of quite a number of the people of the United States. My judgment then has since been fortified by innumerable letters, many from the gentleman's [Mr. GILLET of Massachusetts] own State, commending in unstinted terms every word I uttered.

Far be it from me, Mr. Chairman, to ever declare, as the gentleman has seen proper to do, that the amenities either of life or of politics require that a citizen shall resort either to deception or untruth to make himself agreeable even to his colleagues, his neighbors, or to other nations. I prefer the truth, however unpalatable it may be, in all our transactions.

I can not refrain, Mr. Chairman, under the patience of the House, from alluding briefly to the colloquy between the gentleman from Massachusetts and the gentleman from Ohio and myself relative to the reception given by President Buchanan to the Prince of Wales. I find upon investigation that the gentleman from Massachusetts and the gentleman from Ohio are about as far from the real record as the average Republican is when you pin him down to the facts.

President Buchanan never received the Prince of Wales in his official capacity, but he received him as one gentleman should another, and paid the expenses out of his own pocket, like one gentleman should always do when he asks another to be his guest.

Now, what is the record on the subject?

In October, 1860, the Prince of Wales, with a number of friends, visited Washington and were guests at the Executive Mansion. The entertainment of the Prince and his suite at the White House entailed a great deal of expense, extra servants and other things. Congress was never asked to pay any part of it. The British party was taken to Mount Vernon on a revenue cutter, accompanied by President Buchanan, Miss Lane, and nearly all of the diplomatic corps, and the leading Army, naval, and civil-service officers. President Buchanan escorted his guests to Washington's tomb, and the great-grandson of George III planted a tree near the grave of the arch-rebel against that monarch's rule.

That Democratic President seized the first opportunity to make profert of the democratic spirit that burned in his breast, and carried this monarchical representative to the tomb of the arch rebel, George Washington, and had him plant a tree there. Not only that, but a member of his Cabinet invited this gentleman to go on a yachting party on a revenue cutter, and President Buchanan refused to allow the Government to pay for the trip, and paid for it out of his own revenue.

I never contended, nor will any fair-minded man place such a construction on any remarks made by me, that a distinguished gentleman coming from any country in the world and touching our shores should not be extended every courtesy. What I protest against is the spirit of truculency, the spirit of sycophancy, that is characteristic not only of this Administration but the preceding one, and especially of the State Department in its conduct of our foreign affairs. My passing reference to the coming visit of the German Prince was simply brought into my speech to accentuate the dangerous tendency of the present Administration and the Republican party toward what I believe to be un-American methods.

But, Mr. Chairman, the best test of the judgment of the American people is in their own expressions. Whatever my colleagues here may think, whatever my colleagues on that side of the Chamber may believe, when we carry all public questions to their last equation, they must be submitted to the intelligent arbitrament of the rank and file of the American people.

Now, this is only two days' mail that I hold in my hand [here Mr. WHEELER held up a large number of letters]. Nine-tenths of them are from Republican States, and a great number of them from men who call themselves lifelong Republicans. They are from the States of New York, Pennsylvania, Illinois, Michigan, Massachusetts, Connecticut, and if I had the time (for the edification of a few of my New England friends) I would like to read some of these letters, which declare in unstinted terms that all the patriotism now to be found in the Republic is in the South and West. [Derisive cries and laughter on the Republican side.] It is only the foolish man, joined to his idols, who becomes so blind that he can never see his own shortcomings. The derisive laughter on the other side of the Chamber shows conclusively that those gentlemen have wandered so far away from true American principles that when they are reminded of the fault they absolutely deride one who seeks to call them back to the patriotic spirit of our forefathers.

I do not wish to be discourteous; I do not wish to be understood as desiring the American people to occupy a position of ignorance or one unbecoming a high-minded body of citizens. But before the American people, I unhesitatingly declare that I have not one word to retract of the utterances delivered by me on Friday in this Chamber; and I repeat that I seriously, earnestly, candidly

believe that we are drifting toward a spirit hostile to the true interests of the Republic, and that unless we look backward and return to those things and that belief practiced by our forefathers, it bodes no good to the Republic.

I do not believe that in order to occupy a dignified and a great position before the nations of the world we must sacrifice our own institutions or our own conceptions of government; and what boots it to us what other nations think of us if we must have their good will at the expense of our own institutions? It is not against the entertainment of any foreigner per se that I protest; it is against the official reception given to him because of the accident of his birth. I am a son of a foreigner who left a European country to escape the oppression of a monarchy, and it is born and bred in me to love a republic. And I am not afraid to say that I love the institutions of my country, even though I lose the regard of men who do not share my feelings. [Applause.]

I have been taunted, Mr. Chairman, through the medium of the press, with the charge that I am an ignorant agriculturist. I wear that contemptuous epithet as a decoration of honor. Thank God I am a farmer's son, and I wish every man who undertakes to speak for the American people first drank his inspiration from the healthy life of the country. I am not ashamed of that, nor am I ashamed of being the son of a foreigner. But I am ashamed of the men who seek to apologize for the sycophancy and the truculency and the disgraceful bootlicking that characterize the official class in the Republic to-day.

I will read, Mr. Chairman, a few telegrams and letters received by me. For obvious reasons I will not publicly state the names of the gentlemen who sign these documents. I have not the right to do so; but if any member in this House desires to read them, I will cheerfully show them to him.

Mr. BOREING. Will my colleague allow an interruption?

Mr. WHEELER. Yes, sir.

Mr. BOREING. The gentleman refers to a considerable volume of correspondence that he has received. I would like to ask him how many of those letters and telegrams are from the State of Kentucky.

Mr. WHEELER. Not exceeding ten or fifteen.

Mr. BOREING. And they are not from Republicans, are they?

Mr. WHEELER. I do not recall that I have received a single letter or telegram from a Republican in Kentucky. [Derisive laughter on the Republican side.]

Mr. BOREING. May I ask the gentleman how many of them are from his own district?

Mr. WHEELER. Not a single one.

Mr. BOREING. I did not believe the gentleman had indorsement down there.

Mr. WHEELER. That may be. There has not been time yet for any communication from my district to reach me by mail. I will say that eight-tenths of these letters and telegrams are from Northern States. Here is one from Rochester, N. Y. The name of the signer indicates very clearly that he is a German. He says:

Most manly, typical American speech made in Congress this session. The State Department is a hotbed of un-American intrigue and English flunkysm. Ought to be smoked out before disgust becomes dangerous.

[Laughter.]

This is signed "A Life-Long Republican." How does that strike the gentleman? Here is a cablegram from London, which I received this morning:

True Americans everywhere entertain your sentiments.

He is a "life-long Republican," he says.

A MEMBER. Where is that from?

Mr. WHEELER. That is from London.

I suppose he is one of the gentlemen who is going over there to see the coronation.

Now, Mr. Chairman, here is a letter from the city of Philadelphia, signed by half a dozen gentlemen, who say they represent a million and a half of capital. You can inquire as to their standing and their position, both financially and socially.

Mr. FORDNEY. They have gone into a trust. [Applause and laughter on the Republican side.]

Mr. WHEELER. No; they have not yet gone into a trust. That would be according to your code, but they have not formed one yet. [Applause and laughter on the Democratic side.] The letter reads as follows:

PHILADELPHIA, February 14, 1902.

We, the undersigned, business men and citizens, after reading your true, brave words, "Hay should go and retire and Pauncetote should take the first ship home," agree with you heartily and admire you for your good, brave words. Hay should go with Pauncetote, as he is only the slave of English aristocracy.

That is signed by a lot of gentlemen in the city of Philadelphia.

Mr. FORDNEY. I suppose they are lifelong Republicans?

[Laughter.]

Mr. WHEELER. I don't suppose there is anyone else there.

Here is a letter from a lawyer in Toledo, Ohio. He seems to be

a member of a very good firm—I do not know who he is—and he writes as follows:

TOLEDO, OHIO, February 15, 1902.

I do not know your first name, your creed, nor your "previous condition of servitude," but I do know that it is a mighty refreshing thing in these degenerate days to hear something from an American point of view, and from the bottom of my heart I congratulate you. I have a firm conviction that your constituents and the American public will esteem you for it. It has become fashionable to say that men of my blood are prejudiced against kingcraft, because of the old-time grudge against government in England. I notice, however, that the Irish in this country (and they have come here largely in forty or fifty years) have caught up pretty fairly the spirit of our institutions. For myself, I was born under the shadow of Bunker Hill. My own prejudices extend to royalty (?) of all bloods, and I pray for the preservation of the simplicity of our fathers. It is meet that that simplicity should find eloquent expression from the South.

I can not, of course, go on and read all of these letters, or any portion of them. Here is one from Cleveland, and also from many other points, commenting on my speech:

CLEVELAND, OHIO, February 15, 1902.

Nothing has pleased me more this winter of the proceedings which have taken place in and about Congress than your speech yesterday before the House of Representatives. It seemed to be the enthronement of reason and of our time-honored principles. All Democratic hearts will throb in unison with your patriotic, whole-souled democratic sentiments. If it did no good in Congress, it will nevertheless again foster, kindle, and inflame our old and time-honored desire of isolation and cherished immunity from foreign embroglios and plutocratic machinations. I guess now our anglomaniacs will be good for a while. Give it to them once again if you get the opportunity. All my friends are highly pleased.

MARION, S. C., February 17, 1902.

I do not know you personally, but I tip my hat to anyone with such backbone and sound mind. Your able speech in the House of Representatives in regard to "a little Dutchman" ought to be read by every honest son of toil, and your State and district are certainly honored by having you as their Representative. We of the South stand off in admiration and say, "Lay on, Macduff, and damned be he who first cries, 'Hold, enough!'" Give it to them, and a few more such shots will make them abhor the idea of ever seeing a prince, king, or other crowned head. I have no ax to grind in writing you, but do it because I admire your stand.

ROCHESTER, N. Y., February 14, 1902.

The most manly, typical American speech made in Congress this session. The State Department is the hotbed of un-Americanism, intrigue, and English flunkysm, and ought to be smoked out before disgust becomes dangerous.

CHICAGO, ILL., February 15, 1902.

Thank God for your American speech. We join true Democrats in indorsing its sentiments.

NEW YORK, February 16, 1902.

As an American citizen I want to thank you, compliment you, and to congratulate you upon your speech in the House on Friday, February 14. The flunky Administration at present in power at Washington is a disgrace to the American people, and it appears to me from what I read of your speech that you appreciated that fact as well as anyone, and that you have the ability as well as the courage to voice your sentiments in regard to it—sentiments that I really believe are shared by a majority of the American people in spite of their seeming lethargy in the face of such a miserable state of affairs. Again I thank you.

WASHINGTON, D. C., February 15, 1902.

Permit me to express my approval of the general substance of your recent speech in the House of Representatives respecting our official departure from the national dignity of our Democratic character. I had the pleasure of reading only such portions as appeared in this morning's local papers. I did not see the RECORD. While my appreciation and approval may be of little concern to you, still, as an American citizen, born and reared in the State of Michigan, and in political relations a Republican, I am your constituent in the broader sense, and also as true an American as you, and you will not be unkind of the good will of a citizen of any State. Party or State lines have but little significance to me in international matters or relations. In fact, respecting national partisan politics, etc., I am not such a bigoted partisan as to observe neither good nor bad propositions in either party.

The commercial and intellectual development of our country and the world must also deplore our attitude toward social and economic propositions. Only this, we, as a nation, can not afford to be sycophantic nor transmute individual liberties into corporate, municipal, or State control. The largest share possible of the liberty of the individual should be retained—avoid even bureaucracy and paternalism. We surely have nothing to gain by a flunky recognition of forms of foreign governments whose every pretense the divine rights of kings is slavery and subjugation. We can treat them as will be advisable and manifest our respect for our own institutions. I thank you for calling the country's attention to the real superiority of a republic.

GRAND VIEW, MO., February 15, 1902.

I want to commend you on your speech, made in the House February 14, denouncing European flunkysm. In politics we differ, but on flunkysm we are a unit. Let the good work go on.

BALTIMORE, MD., February 15, 1902.

You are a brave, fearless, honest American, and I regret the fact that I am not a resident of your State and a voter in your district. If we had such Democrats in Maryland like you the dirty imperial Republican party would never win.

ATLANTIC CITY, N. J., February 15, 1902.

Please accept the very cordial appreciation of one citizen for your powerful and much-needed speech in the House yesterday. While I may not agree with you in every detail of your address, it was eminently needed, and even the possible excess of statement was good. I sincerely hope you will return the charge, and keep it up until you make an impression on the people. I do not speak as a partisan, being an independent in politics.

BELLEFONTAINE, OHIO, February 15, 1902.

By your noble speech yesterday you have raised yourself in the estimation of the people more than you know. We should not be mindful of a king or his coronation, and I believe your constituents will uphold you.

ST. LOUIS, MO., February 15, 1902.

Allow me to congratulate you on your speech regarding the "little Dutchman taking charge of a little ship." It is the first real true American sentiment that has been uttered in Congress for a long time. As you know, I do not belong to your party, but I admire the truth and bravery wherever found. Follow up your attack on the flunkies. You made them wince. Your speech has been the "talk of the town," and it is almost universally approved. I send you a clipping of the St. Louis Chronicle of the 14th instant, which shows you that the people of this country feel outraged about this prince business. We are going to have three meetings this week to protest against this prince.

ATHENIA, N. J., February 15, 1902.

I wish to thank you as a true American for the Americanism expressed in your speech as reported in the New York Times.

BROCKTON, MASS., February 15, 1902.

Please excuse the liberty I take, but after reading your speech of the 15th instant, in the House of Representatives, I could not help writing you to let you know how thoroughly I appreciate your words.

NEWVILLE, PA., February 15, 1902.

Thank God we have still a man in Congress who has nerve enough to tell the truth. My wish is to live in your district so as to support you when you are a candidate for office. The country has need of many more men like you. This is written by a one-armed Union soldier.

NORFOLK, VA., February 15, 1902.

Your expression in Congress yesterday touching upon the official reception of Prince Henry and other foreign questions will, without doubt, meet with the approval of all right-thinking American citizens, and they compose the tremendous majority of the people regardless of party. I am for one delighted with the stand you took yesterday. It was well and nobly done. You have my cheers and well-wishes for your grand speech.

ROCKFORD, ILL., February 15, 1902.

You had the courage yesterday, in your splendid philippic, to say exactly what the vast majority of citizens of genuine American fiber, those who have been named "the common people," really think of prevalent toadyism in the Administration; what they think, but can not so well express as you have done.

GRAND RAPIDS, MICH., February 14, 1902.

I read an extract of your remarks in regard to sending a delegation to the crowning of King Edward. I am pleased that there are some true Americans still in Washington. If we do not turn face about, we are on the road of losing a republican form of government, how much many may say it is really a scare.

ROSEVILLE, OHIO, February 15, 1902.

Under separate cover I am this day sending you marked copy of my paper about the "Little Dutchman" to manifest my entire approval of your speech in the House. It is refreshing, indeed, to note that the fires of Democracy still burn in some Democratic papers and some Democratic breasts. I further note the unkind manner in which certain so-called Democratic papers, such as the Cincinnati Enquirer, for instance, handled the matter in behalf of our bewhiskered friend, Mr. GROSVENOR, "the very biggest flunky in all flunkydome." Pour it into them. You can not make it too warm for them. The people are ready for that question.

KANSAS CITY, MO., February 14, 1902.

I wish to express my admiration for your recent speech in the House against royal flunkysim. I am glad to know that at least one man in that body is a true American.

NEW HAVEN, CONN., February 14, 1902.

What you said in the House to-day, as reported in the papers, with reference to England's attitude in 1898, and with reference to Sir John Hay, United States Secretary of State, delights many people in this city, and gives further evidence of the truth that for real, true, genuine American sentiment one must look in these days to the South or to the West. However, for the good words well and timely spoken, God bless you; and may the spirit of Washington, of Jackson, and of Jefferson inspire you with sentiments dear to all true Americans, the utterance of which makes us proud of the speaker and gives us hope for the future.

ST. PAUL, MINN., February 15, 1902.

Please permit me to thank you for your very timely strictures upon the un-American conduct of those at present in power in our Government. That the abject adoration of royalty and titles is confined almost entirely to the people living near the Atlantic seaboard is one of the causes of congratulation for those whose homes are in the thoroughly American part of our country, and who are not of the hyphenated Americans. Our ancestors came here to escape the evils of caste and class; yet these degenerate sons of grand men are endeavoring to ingratiate themselves with the useless figure-heads of effete monarchies. It is good to know that there are yet some who are able to speak, and who are willing to endure the odium of unpopularity for the sake of warning the American people again "against the insidious wiles of foreign influence," and to urge that the "jealousy of a free people ought to be constantly awake, since history and experience prove that foreign influence is one of the most baneful foes of republican government." I hope that your frankness will not militate against you in the future. I thank you for my share in what you have said.

KALAMAZOO, MICH., February 15, 1902.

As an American citizen, and one whose ancestry fought to get rid of the British yoke and establish a country with a government of the people, by the people, and for the people, and who in the war of 1812 again went to the front to protect from the same invading foe what they had so dearly bought through the Revolutionary war from Bunker Hill to Valley Forge and York-

town, and again succeeded in driving the noble-blooded oppressors from our land, I wish to congratulate you on your remarks in the House of Representatives yesterday, when you raised your voice against the toadyism and flunkysim that seems to be taking possession of some of the people's servants at Washington, from the occupant of the White House down. Rotten, degenerate royalty! What have we, as an American people, to do with it, whether it be England, Germany, or any other of the so-called princely powers?

It is a shame that the President, even though he is there by accident and through the assassin's bullet, should so far forget his duty to the American people as to take such notice of the coronation of an English king as to debauch the American sentiment and principles by sending a member of his family to be tutored in the ways of rotten royalty, and spend the people's money to entertain another accident of birth, the brother of another degenerate so-called emperor. It is enough to make the true American bow his head in shame and hide from the public gaze. We are drifting rapidly toward centralization of power, brought about by this spirit of flunkysim and toadyism that means ruin to our free system of government, and it is high time the alarm was sounded and the bells of liberty want to be kept ringing and the notes of warning sounding until the people wake up to the situation and place none but true Americans on guard, from the highest to the lowest place of public trust in the land. I congratulate you, and I hope you will not be frightened off by public or private taunts. I hope you will keep up the good fight. The Americans are waking up and listening, and will move in these matters as soon as they are aroused. I beg pardon for so long a letter, but the subject is a grave and great one.

CINCINNATI, OHIO, February 15, 1902.

Allow me to thank you for your speech in the House yesterday against European flunkysim. I am a Republican, but I indorse all you and Mr. TILLMAN and Mr. HOAR, in the Senate, have said. I have lately been in New York, Washington, Pittsburg, and through Ohio, and everywhere the common-sense people are disgusted with the attempts of the American Government to initiate monarchy. Go on, give it to 'em; the reaction will be expressed at the polls.

ST. LOUIS, February 16, 1902.

I crave your pardon for the liberty of addressing you, which I do for the purpose of offering my thanks for your opposition to our Government's proposed act of flunkysim in connection with the coming visit of a German prince, which seems to me to be a distinct affront to every German citizen of this country who has felt impelled by the militarism and cruel tyranny of a Government of which this prince is an important and cruel part to leave his German home, and likewise it seemed to me to be a distinct affront to every citizen of this Republic who has not become wholly drunk with the spirit of militarism and imperialism, and consequent aristocracy, now sought to be made so much a part of our governmental régime.

CHESTER, PA., February 15, 1902.

I read with much satisfaction your speech of yesterday, and hasten to say that you are doing your country a great service. You no doubt were actuated from honest motives, but I desire to say that your course is applauded by a vast majority of our people, and gives me so much pleasure that I can not but send you these lines. We congratulate you, sir, to stand in the midst of such "flunkies" and courageously denounce the conduct of Hay, Pauncote, etc. A company of us here to-day gave three cheers for you, and not all Democrats, either. The writer was raised a Republican, but am convinced that Bryan's teachings and your sentiments must be held up.

EL RENO, OKLA., February 15, 1902.

Will you kindly mail to my address above a copy of the RECORD containing your time-worthy assault, last Friday, on European flunkysim? It meets the approval of the people of the Southwest, and you have won the esteem of all true Americans for the vigor of the assault. With the hope that other Democrats may follow in the same line, I am, etc.

WARE, MASS., February 17, 1902.

Accept my hearty indorsement of the sentiments expressed in your recent speech in the House against flunkysim. I am in perfect accord with you against such rot. An old veteran of the rebellion wishes me to also extend you his approval.

DAYTON, OHIO, February 15, 1902.

Permit me to congratulate you on the remarks you made in the House of Representatives on the tendency of "snobbery." I read the report of your speech in the public press with much satisfaction and gratification, and believe that you struck a responsive chord in the hearts of thousands of your countrymen. Kissing kings' hands at coronations of the crown and paying homage to royalty at public expense is not American, and I am glad you publicly said so.

PROVIDENCE, R. I., February 16, 1902.

I am no politician, diplomat, or statesman, but plead guilty to possessing Republican proclivities; have never been a candidate for any public elective position, although a citizen and voter in this, my native State, for more than thirty years. Nevertheless, permit me simply, sincerely, and hastily to thank you for your manly courage in publicly expressing the sentiments accredited to you in the herewith inclosed newspaper clipping. Assuming that you may have had, or will have, the entire speech printed later, I beg that you may favor me with a copy of the same that I may read the full text of your remarks. I indulge the pleasing and, I trust, not delusive, hope that there are a large majority of both political parties in the States that hold the same views as yourself upon this subject.

DETROIT, MICH., February 16, 1902.

I thank you for your able denouncement of our American toadies and imperialists. I do not think it will lose one Democratic German vote. Possibly German imperialists, like our Yankees of the same stripe, may think it will. No lover of free institutions here or abroad will take offense at what you say; on the contrary, they will applaud you.

MUSKEGON, MICH., February 15, 1902.

I have just concluded a careful reading of your speech reflecting on the present attitude of our present Administration and the State Department, which is endeavoring to fashion the near future of everything official in America, and I can not refrain from giving some slight expression of my gratitude over the undeniable fact that there is still one American in a position that enables him to voice a sentiment deep-seated in the hearts of the common

people of this country to some purpose. Nothing has transpired to enhance my comfort during the past year as your speech has. My only excuse for thus trespassing upon your valuable time is an uncontrollable enthusiasm for any man who at this time undertakes to preserve all that is distinctively American and the loyal old-fashioned sentiment seemingly fast departing.

CINCINNATI, OHIO, February 15, 1902.

I wish that I were present and could be able to grasp your hand to congratulate you on your able and manly speech before the House. I was a soldier during the late unpleasantness, and I respect the memory of such men as Washington, Lincoln, Jefferson, and Jackson. God bless you! Continue on this same basis, and you will have the support of all true Americans.

NEW HAVEN, CONN., February 15, 1902.

For the true patriotic stand and the words you spoke in Congress yesterday, when you pointed out the duty of this country's administration, who are all gone Anglophobia. I desire to thank you. My friends here are many who join with me in sending you our heartfelt thanks for your noble American sentiments.

BLOOMINGTON, ILL., February 15, 1902.

God bless you for your speech yesterday against the universal toasting of Prince Henry and England. The United States was never in trouble that all Europe did not have to be watched like a hawk; we never had a real friend among them. Four other Republicans and myself were discussing your speech, and they were unanimous that you were right, and they all join me in sending you a hearty "thank you."

TOWANDA, PA., February 15, 1902.

I thank you most sincerely for the remarks you made in Congress yesterday. I should like to know the man personally who dared to speak as an American should. You voiced what should be the sentiment of the whole people of our country. Again I thank you. Should you be interested to know by whom you are addressed; I would suggest that you inquire of Hon. J. C. SIBLEY. He knows me better than the other Congressmen from this State.

JOPLIN, MO., February 15, 1902.

I have just read your speech of yesterday, and I want to thank you for being the only member of Congress that has had the courage to hit Secretary Hay square between the eyes. The potent influence of that man over the McKinley Administration has been to me a bewildering puzzle—inexplicable. That a person of his vanity and ostentation should become saturated with the delirium of social exaltation accorded titled royalties during long assignment to the court of St. James can be understood, but that he should exploit it from his official position as he has and "hold his job" is a marvel. How long would he have lasted under Jackson or Lincoln? Active participation in newspaper work for twenty-five years leaves me with a keen interest in politics. The imperialistic tendency developed in the last three years is to me appalling. This impels me to express my gratitude to you for your broadside at Hay, the truckling to royalty, and the most unnatural and disgraceful attitude of the present Administration toward the South African Republic.

SHERWOOD, OHIO, February 15, 1902.

The country applauds the genuine American ring in your recent speech in the House against the funkyness of the Republicans in catering to the royal snobs across the sea. What we need is more speeches on that line, and I am surprised that this foolishness has been allowed to go on so long without rebuke.

BOSTON, MASS., February 15, 1902.

I read with much pleasure your speech delivered before Congress on the 14th instant concerning the reception of Prince Henry, the coronation, etc. As the Boston papers contained only a few extracts, and as I would very much like to read the speech in full, will you kindly send me a copy of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD containing it?

CHICAGO, ILL., February 15, 1902.

As a lifelong Republican I wish to congratulate you on having the nerve to show to the people of this United States how we are drifting. Toadyism is an Eastern sentiment, not a Western. Any traveling man knows you have got to get west of Buffalo to get into the United States. I read in this morning's Tribune how much the Democrats will lose by your speech from the German vote. As I know an American German, they came to this country to get rid of what this country is drifting into, and as a mass will uphold you in your sentiments. Many true Republicans are tired of this Government toadyism to foreign nations. It is not American, and our children should not be brought up to believe a monarchy is more to be desired than a republic. I thank you for your speech; it can do no harm; it must do good.

Mr. SHATTUC. May I ask the gentleman a question?

Mr. WHEELER. No, sir; I do not care to be interrupted.

A MEMBER. I would like to see the names that are signed to all these things.

Mr. WHEELER. You can see the names; I will show you every one.

Mr. SHATTUC. I would like to ask the gentleman a question. Have you got one yet from Edward Atkinson? [Applause and laughter upon the Republican side.]

Mr. WHEELER. No, sir; not yet. And yet, Mr. Chairman, when those men who laughed so derisively upon the other side of the House are dead and gone to that oblivion to which they are so rapidly drifting, Edward Atkinson will be known to posterity and every true American, and will be honored and respected by them. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman's time has expired.

Mr. WHEELER. I ask for a few minutes more.

Mr. GILLET of Massachusetts. I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman be allowed to continue.

Mr. WHEELER. I desire just a few minutes more.

Mr. SHERMAN. The time is under the control of the other side.

Mr. LITTLE. I yield the gentleman five minutes more.

Mr. WHEELER. Here is another one from Hadensville, Mass.

Mr. GILLET of Massachusetts. I think that is from the district of the gentleman on the other side [Mr. THAYER].

Mr. THAYER. It is not. There is no such place in my district. [Laughter and applause.] There is no such place on the map.

Mr. SHACKLEFORD. I rise to a point of order; that the gentlemen on the other side are trying to take the five minutes' time away from the gentleman.

Mr. WHEELER. No; I am perfectly well satisfied. This letter is not from the district of either of the gentlemen from Massachusetts who have spoken, Mr. Speaker, and I am satisfied the House will be persuaded it is not when they have heard it read. I have simply read these letters to show that this sentiment is confined to no particular part of the country, and that you gentlemen who drink inspiration around the hotel corridors of Washington and from a few newspapers do not represent the real American sentiment.

Now, I understand that there are certain gentlemen on that side of the Chamber who desire to circulate the speech made by me on last Friday in their districts, and I desire to make a proposition to them. If there is any gentleman on that side of the Chamber who thinks he can make capital out of the speech delivered by me, I here and now pledge myself to send a copy of it, accompanied by a copy of the speech of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. GROSVENOR], to every Democrat and every Republican in his district, if he will furnish me their names, and I will do it at my own expense.

Mr. SHATTUC. May I ask you a question?

Mr. WHEELER. Not till I get through. Not only that; when the gentleman's campaign begins, if there be one who believes he can make capital out of it, if he will have the manhood and the bravery to take the end of it taken by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GILLET] and the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. GROSVENOR], will notify me when his campaign begins I will meet him on every hustings in the district and pledge myself to repeat my speech made on the floor of this House from every stump, and I now challenge him for a division of time.

Mr. SHATTUC. May I ask a question now?

Mr. WHEELER. Yes.

Mr. SHATTUC. Do not you think it is possible that the reason your people have not communicated with you about this speech before is that they are still debating the question of keeping "Uncle Tom's Cabin" out of Kentucky?

Mr. WHEELER. I think it is very likely, and I think they will send it over to the district of the gentleman from Ohio, who seems to have a fondness for that sort of thing, if my information is correct.

Now, Mr. Chairman, in conclusion I desire to say that I have thrashed over this straw; I have said all I wanted to say. I have no apology to make. I am brave enough and true enough to stand by my words whether I believe them to be discreet or not, and I sincerely affirm that I believe every word uttered by me was justified. I do not think any disrespect can be tortured out of what I said about this man coming to our country. None was intended by me. What I intended to do was to emphasize the fact that a man can not be born great, and that he is entitled to no recognition because of the fact that he happens to be somebody else's brother.

Mr. KLUTTZ. I should like to ask the gentleman if he meant any disrespect to the great German people?

Mr. WHEELER. Of course I meant no disrespect to the German people. There are millions of liberty-loving Germans who fled from the tyranny and oppression of the Emperor of Germany and came to the United States to find a home in a free country. They are a brave, patriotic people, and I would not insult them, and everybody knows that. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. KLUTTZ. That is what I wanted to give the gentleman an opportunity to say; that is all.

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. Chairman, it is only the diseased mind of partisan bigotry and spite that could so torture the remarks I made; and if my Republican friends think they can get any capital out of that they are welcome to it. I stand by what I said, and I do not think there is an intelligent German-American citizen to-day that will not echo the sentiments I have voiced. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. SHERMAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. LITTLE. I had agreed to recognize a friend on this side of the House to consume half an hour.

Mr. SHERMAN. The gentleman from Kentucky desires to follow his colleague.

Mr. LITTLE. Very well.

Mr. BOREING. Mr. Chairman, I was not present in the House

at the time my colleague [Mr. WHEELER] made the speech referred to in the discussion to-day. I have not read the speech, but if the newspaper reports of that speech are correct, the Democratic party having disavowed responsibility for it, on the part of the people of Kentucky I want to disavow for the State of Kentucky. I am glad to hear my colleague here personally assume the sole responsibility for his speech, for in so far as it reflects upon the Administration or upon our distinguished Secretary of State I am quite sure it will not be indorsed by the people of Kentucky, neither the Republicans nor the Democrats.

I do not believe my colleague in his speech reflected the sentiment of 5 per cent of his constituency at home. I am glad to hear him state that the letters and telegrams that he has received have not come from the people of Kentucky. He said it is too far away from his district to hear from them yet. Yes; he is too far away to make a speech like that to this House. [Laughter and applause on the Republican side.] He is like that prodigal son that went into a far country. A Representative can go a long way from his district sometimes in opinion and sentiment, and geographically not be very far off either.

Now, so far as the reflection upon the Germans is concerned, I am glad to hear him disavow any intention to reflect upon them, because a large per cent of the citizenship of Kentucky are Germans. They are in general an intelligent, honorable, and upright class of people everywhere. They are industrious and hard-working people, who attend strictly to their own business affairs. I desire to disavow any indorsement of any of those statements so far as the Eleventh district is concerned and so far as the citizens of Kentucky generally are concerned. Personally I entertain a high regard for my colleague, but I think our people will regard it as unfortunate that any representative of the State should stand upon the floor of this House and insult the intelligence of the country in any such manner. [Loud applause on the Republican side.]

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE.

The committee informally rose; and Mr. PAYNE having taken the chair as Speaker pro tempore, a message from the Senate, by Mr. PARKINSON, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed the following resolution; in which the concurrence of the House of Representatives was requested:

Senate concurrent resolution 25.

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That the Secretary of War be, and he is hereby, directed to cause an examination to be made of the coast of Washington in the vicinity of the mouth of the Hoh River, with a view to the establishment of a harbor, and to submit an estimate therefor.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed bills of the following titles, in which the concurrence of the House of Representatives was requested:

S. 176. An act to provide for the extension of the charters of national banks;

S. 1025. An act to promote the efficiency of the Revenue-Cutter Service;

S. 65. An act providing for the retirement of petty officers and enlisted men of the Navy;

S. 1099. An act authorizing the Secretary of the Navy to return to Harvard University certain colors, silver cup, and Nordenfeldt gun;

S. 1563. An act for the relief of William H. Crawford; and

S. 2921. An act to place Henry Biederbick, Julius R. Frederick, Francis Long, and Maurice Connell on the retired list of enlisted men of the Army.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed without amendment joint resolutions of the following titles:

H. J. Res. 88. Joint resolution authorizing the Commissioner of Internal Revenue to return bank checks, drafts, certificates of deposit, and orders for the payment of money, having imprinted stamps thereon, to the owners thereof, and for other purposes; and

H. J. Res. 131. Joint resolution authorizing the transfer to the Library of Congress of the Library of State reports, etc.

The message also announced that the Senate had insisted upon its amendment to the bill (H. R. 3104) to grant the right of way through the Oklahoma Territory and the Indian Territory to the Enid and Anadarko Railway Company, and for other purposes, disagreed to by the House of Representatives; had agreed to the conference asked by the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and had appointed Mr. QUARLES, Mr. HARRIS, and Mr. RAWLINS as the conferees on the part of the Senate.

INDIAN APPROPRIATION BILL.

The committee resumed its session.

Mr. LITTLE. I yield fifteen minutes to my colleague from Arkansas [Mr. REID].

Mr. REID. Mr. Chairman, in accordance with the custom practiced by the members of this House, I shall not confine myself to the pending bill, but shall take advantage of the time allotted to

me to discuss for a few moments the policy recently inaugurated by this Government toward the people of the Philippine Islands. It would of course be presumptuous in me to assume that I could add anything particularly new or original to the volumes of argument that from time to time for the last two years have been made upon this subject upon the floor of this House and in the Senate Chamber; but as time progresses and the situation becomes more fully developed the truth or falsity of those arguments becomes manifest, and it becomes more apparent that in the course we have adopted we are departing from American spirit and endangering American interest. In this, sir, I find some excuse for trespassing for a time upon the patience of this committee.

Mr. Chairman, we are paying a colossal price for something over in the Philippine Islands. We must be fighting for something of incalculable worth. Judging from the stupendous price in money and blood we are paying, nothing short of the very existence of our nation and the safety of our own liberties can be at stake upon the issue. What do we expect to get out of it? Are we on the defensive or aggressive? If we are on the defensive, why are we attacked by so relentless a foe, and what is it we have that he seeks to take from us? What have we done that he should punish us? If we are on the aggressive, what is it he has got that we would take from him? What great indignity has he offered us? What vital injury have we suffered at his hands that millions must be appropriated from the revenues of State from year to year to carry on the struggle, and hundreds of thousands of the young manhood of the country must be called into service to pour out their blood in this interminable conflict? These questions can not be answered with such indefinite responses as we hear when we are told that we are "upholding the honor of the flag," or that we are fighting to become a "world power."

The time is coming, sir, when the American people are not going to be content with high-sounding metaphor and sentimental phrase in answer to these vital questions. When the tocsin of war was first sounded and it was heralded over the length and breadth of the land that an issue had been drawn between the armies of this country and an alien race in a foreign land, the American people, true to their natural impulses, never stopped to parley or to reason. Shoulder to shoulder they stood by the Administration and for the honor of the American soldier, who has never yet been conquered by a foe. But the conflict of the hour has lengthened into the duration of years. The insurrection that at first could not be dignified by the name of war has begun to cost us hundreds of millions a year, and the best blood of our armies. The hostile outbreak of an insignificant faction, that we were promised should be suppressed in ninety days, is now admitted to have settled down to a system of warfare that requires the presence of 30,000 men, scattered over 500 stations in the islands.

It was said that the leader of the "rebellion," as it was termed, by some means had caught the spirit of liberty in his savage heart and was furnishing inspiration to the others, and that when his capture was effected resistance to American arms would collapse in the twinkling of an eye. But notwithstanding that we are told he experienced at once a sudden change of heart, and issued a proclamation urging the cessation of hostilities, and inviting his countrymen to find peace under the "glorious banner of the United States," there is as little hope of peace to-day as there was many months ago when his capture was effected. There have been enlisted in the service in the Philippine Islands scarcely less than 125,000 men. More than 1,000 have been killed or died from injuries received in battle. Nearly 3,000 have died from diseases of various kinds. About 4,000 have been discharged for disabilities. Not less than 500 have become insane, and the Surgeon-General startles us with the intelligence that homesickness was one of the principal causes.

The cost of the war can not be accurately stated in dollars and cents. Government officers dare not hazard an estimate upon it. Before the war our Army cost us about \$30,000,000 a year. During the three years we have occupied the Philippines it has cost us over \$536,000,000, and the Secretary of War's estimate for the year ending June 30, 1903, asks for over \$140,000,000 more, and his estimate ending for the fiscal year 1903 calls for \$158,403,000 more. This is the price, sir, we are paying for the luxury of establishing our authority over the Philippine Islands. What can we hope to accomplish by it? Control the trade of the Philippines? It has been more than once demonstrated upon the floor of this House that we will not get back what we have already spent for generations in the centuries yet to come; that the cost of governing those distant islands, and keeping them in subjugation to American authority, will always exceed by millions the revenues derived from their trade. An examination into the experience of other nations will show conclusively that spheres of influence and colonial possessions are in no wise essential to the upbuilding of

trade and the expansion of commerce. It was stated a few days ago upon the floor of the Senate that an army of 30,000 men kept for twelve months in the Philippine Islands would consume the profit of our trade with them for one hundred and fifty years.

Sir, we have utterly no use for colonies. A modern writer on colonial history has shown that more wars have been waged in controversy over colonies and possessions foreign to the parent state than over all other causes combined. He writes: "Hostilities once commenced will spread. A contest thus commenced often serves as an excuse for an attack on a parent state. A colony is, as some have very truly said, a tinder box, which only requires a stray spark to ignite the conflagration of war. The inhabitants of the mother country must, therefore, always be ready at command to render services in behalf of her wards, or, as frequently happens, to protect their own land against the foreign aggressor to whom some territorial dispute offers the desired pretext." I repeat, sir, we have no use for colonial possessions. Other nations, huddled upon the narrow islands of the sea, may, in the very necessity of the case, be driven to seek broader lands into which to shake from their overcrowded shores a discontented and complaining population. But, sir, this nation, with an expanse of territory embracing millions of square miles upon which the human foot has scarcely trod, teeming with resources that can not be developed in a score of generations, can find no just excuse for such a course.

No careful student of the political history of the country can deny that our Government is being launched upon a course and committed in a large measure to a policy that was never dreamed of by those who drafted the Constitution and the Declaration of Independence. But we are told that we have outgrown them; that our nation has become too great and too powerful to be hedged about and embarrassed by such narrow restrictions. The great documents that were adopted by the people of this country with shouts of glad acclaim and to the peals of liberty's bell scarce more than a hundred years ago, hailed as enduring and eternal, are now, even in this short span of our country's history, said to have served their purpose, and must give way to new and changing conditions. The simple but sublime old truths, so proudly proclaimed by the fathers of this country but a short time ago, and which no man dares to deny, and to which all political parties pointed as the basic principles of their creeds and the all-sufficient fountain of their faith, are now subjected to the closest scrutiny and harshest criticism, and he who can find an exception or evade express provisions by ingenious and tortured construction is proclaimed a great statesman and the man of the hour.

The Declaration announced as the first self-evident truth that all men were created equal. Can anyone truthfully deny that we are dealing with millions of men to-day, not as equals, but as subjects? That to secure the inalienable rights of life, liberty, and happiness governments were instituted among men, deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed. Can any man deny that we are governing 10,000,000 people without deriving from their consent the just power to do so? Commissions for their government are created by legislation in this Hall. Are they represented here? "A right inestimable to them and formidable to tyrants only." Are we not "creating a multitude of new offices and sending thither a swarm of officers to harass the people and eat out their substance?" All of these things and many more have been urged upon the floor of this House and in public discussion, but it has all fallen upon ears "deaf to the voice of justice."

Mr. Chairman, it does seem that if we can not learn from the plain history and hallowed traditions of our own country that we ought at least to hesitate when the universal verdict of all history is against us. There is not a nation, from the most ancient to modern times, that has ever reaped any lasting benefit to itself or conferred any true blessing upon any other by the arbitrary exercise over it, against its consent, of the powers of government. A nation may subject another, and by the appropriation of its resources and a great display of its military strength be called a world's power and flourish for a season; but, sir, the very principle and spirit that elevates her to that "bad eminence" becomes at last a source of all her troubles and the ultimate cause of her own disintegration and decay. Gentlemen are anxious for our nation to become what they are pleased to call a world's power.

And let me ask, what is meant by this high-sounding phrase? What is a world power among nations? If it is meant that we should assume the dictatorship of the world; that we should marshal great armies and majestic fleets, and send them on missions of conquest to foreign zones; if it is meant that we should levy tribute upon the weak in order to fill the coffers of the strong, that we must tax the humble to the extent of endurance, in order to maintain the great in the height of affluence; if it is meant that farmer, mechanic, and tradesman must be burdened in order to build up and maintain a horde of governors and proconsuls,

and commissioners; if it is meant that we must monopolize the commerce of the world at the point of the sword and the mouth of the cannon; that we must "bestride this narrow world like a Colossus while petty nations peep about beneath our huge legs to find themselves dishonorable graves," then, sir, I raise my provincial voice against my country's ever becoming such a world power as that.

But if it is meant that we should lead the van of civilization in the industrial arts and sciences; that by the energy and enterprise of American merchant and manufacturer our products shall find a market in every zone; if it is meant that our Government is secure from internal strife and commotion, because resting upon the foundation of contented homes of 80,000,000 people; if it is meant that we have builded here a republic in which equality before the law is the first principle; that we must set the example and lead the way into that perfect system of self-government wherein all the nations of earth may follow, and, ridding themselves of kingcraft and tyranny, enter into the blessings of a true republic, then I call the battle on and God speed the day.

I do not conceive that a nation's greatness consists in the strength of her standing armies and in the great fleets she sends to the seas, in the millions hoarded in her treasury vaults, and in great officials, surrounded by pomp and pageantry, sent to foreign shores to hold the reins and guide the destinies of inferior people. I am among those who still believe that our forefathers, who had lately suffered the evils of intolerable government, had the true idea of national greatness. True then, truer now. They regarded that nation greatest that guaranteed the greatest measure of individual liberty consistent with the good of the state. They believed in preserving the equality of the citizen, and boasted that every man was a sovereign. They believed that the security of the state rested in the happiness and contentment that broke in sunshine about the home of the citizen. That a people who loved their country and shared equally in the burdens and blessings of state could be relied upon in an hour of national peril to rally to her defense and destroy her foes. They had read the history of the nations, and they believed that standing armies were a menace to the liberties of a republic.

These simple principles were the foundations upon which the Republic was builded, and when they were made good by the war of independence they shook every throne on earth. They aroused a revolution in France, and they made a Republic of Brazil. Never in the history of the world did a nation spring with such sudden grandeur from lowliness to might, from weakness unto strength. In less than a century this lusty young Republic marched, the peer of any, among the galaxy of nations; and whenever and wherever the hour of her trial came she measured up to the fullest standard of national greatness. And, sir, to those who can find no measure of a nation's greatness but the rule of barter and trade, although the spirit of commercial greed had not overshadowed every other branch of honest industry and claimed for itself the first favors of government, as it seems to have done in those days, it did sustain a healthy relation to the general development of the country, and the product of American industry and American genius and skill were fast finding their way into every port of trade and mart of commerce on earth.

And let me say here that a nation's permanent commercial success is due to the industry and genius of her people and the resources wrapped in her soil more than in all protective statutes that can be enacted and armies and navies that can be mustered. It is a law of nature against which artificial conditions can not prevail. It is just as certain, sir, that in due season and without protective tariffs and subsidies for ships, and navies and armies, and "spheres of influence," this nation, backed by the enterprise and spirit of her people and the fields and forests and mines that rest on her bosom, should gain the commercial supremacy of this world as it is that the earth should bud and blossom and bear fruit in the warmth of the summer's sun. I have confidence in the American. I believe that he is the greatest and grandest among the tribes of men. He needs nor asks no unfair advantage in the battle of life. He wants no vassal nations to plunder. Guard his individual rights, preserve inviolate the Constitution of his country, stand by the creed of his fathers and he will lead the van of civilization and sway the scepter of commercial supremacy.

A few years ago, when the Democratic party began to cry out against the imperialistic tendencies so suddenly developed in the administration of this Government's affairs, the idea was laughed to scorn or met with indignant denial. And gentlemen are unwilling to admit that they have veered the course of this Government to an alarming extent in the direction of imperialism. But on all sides the advocates of the policy are beginning to defend their position by arguments in substance to the effect that the rugged constitutional structure of a republic is behind the times and must be remodeled to come up to the demands of the hour. It is vaguely hinted that the common people are not

capable of self-government after all. Magazines and periodicals are filled with articles describing the beauties of foreign possessions—the wonderful accomplishments of empires in colonizing the world and reaping rich harvests from the government of inferior people. Large appropriations of the people's money are asked for the subjugation of distant races and to send representatives of the American people to make obeisance at the crowning of kings. Things are advocated and done to-day that ten years ago would have meant the destruction of any political party that stood for them, and now he who lifts his voice against them is charged with lack of patriotism and proper conception of the dignity and greatness of his country. It is but a verification of the truth that—

Vice is a monster of so frightful mien,
As to be hated needs but to be seen;
Yet seen too oft, familiar with her face,
We first endure, then pity, then embrace.

Mr. Chairman, of all men I despise the demagogue most. I believe that our country more than once has been led wrong by want of courage upon the part of those whom the people trusted and looked to lead them right. I do not believe in the abuse of the rich to inflame the poor, or in decrying the great to court the applause of the low. But it has come to the point that no man can lift his voice against the high-handed policy recently inaugurated without being exposed to the charge of being a demagogue. I do not believe in a niggardly administration of the affairs of my country. I believe in maintaining the highest dignity among nations. But I do not forget that ours is a peculiar province. We entered the arena of nations not for conquest and plunder, but to make good the equality of all before the law and to see that a representative government does not perish from the earth.

But gentlemen say there is no cause for alarm. Sir, I do not contend that national destruction is an immediate and impending calamity. I know the exhaustless resources of this great country. I know that the people are long suffering and slow to provoke to wrath. Most of them who have the necessities and a few of the comforts of life rely upon the patriotism and wisdom of their rulers, and give little heed to the drift of public affairs. It may take years, perhaps a generation, for the present course of events to culminate in revolution, but "after us the deluge."

To him who has read history the signs are unmistakable. There are certain well-defined principles from which the course of a nation may be determined with as much certainty as the mariner can determine the course of his bark by the observation of the stars. The mathematician, given the variations of certain lines, can tell with exactness the point of intersection. So the statesman, if the outcome of present policies does not belie the unbroken record of the past, can see with clearness that the "meteor of conquest has already allured us too far."

Show me a nation in which the people forget the lessons of their ancestors and squander the heritage so dearly bought and so proudly possessed by them; show me a nation in which the military spirit predominates and overshadows the majesty of civil institutions, a nation in which gigantic combinations of wealth boldly demand and receive special privileges at the hands of the state, a nation that withholds her sympathy from those struggling to maintain a republic and prides herself upon following in the wake and practicing the methods of empires and kingdoms, a nation that hearkens not to the rights and liberties of others—and I will show you a nation in which the liberties of her own people are inclining to their fall. When it was said that standing armies were a menace to the liberties of a republic a truth was uttered based upon the universal verdict of history. There is something in the clarion voice of war that warps the soul of man. Tales of conquest and glory beyond the seas fall upon the human ears like the song of a siren.

The human heart leaps to the wild music and hoarse cadence of battle. The noble, the brave, and the true flock to the red throne of war. Young manhood rushes from field and forge to march to the stirring strains of life and drum. It is sweet and glorious to die for one's country; and be it said to the eternal honor and glory of American arms that from the general in command to the humblest soldier in the ranks none have ever paused to question or parley. With them it was not a question of right or wrong. It was "the duty of a soldier to answer and to die." My voice and vote shall never be withheld when it is needed to support or maintain them while they fight the battle of my country; but, sir, that voice and that vote shall never be lent to the cause of those who, under the guise of making provisions for the comfort and maintenance of the Army, are compelling those brave soldiers to cross the seas, thousands of miles from their homes, and wage a cruel war against a defenseless people in the interest of a cold and selfish commercialism and commit my country to a policy that has disgraced the annals of a hundred nations before her.

When I reflect, sir, upon the untold millions that are being poured out in this unhallowed and purposeless strife, and think

what magnificent things might be accomplished by the proper expenditures of the same means at home, I am profoundly astonished that any should insist upon it. The arid lands of the West could be redeemed, the canal could be dug, rivers and harbors could be opened, public buildings erected, and thousands now idle and helpless could be given profitable employment, and this all without any question of national honor or the sacrifice of a single life. I think, sir, of what could be done in my own country, with her vast primeval forests, her broad, deep rivers, and her fields of snow-white cotton, her beds of coal and mineral, her fertile valleys and towering mountains. With these rivers open to navigation and these resources brought in touch with some of the millions going to maintain the mercenary strife, a throne of commercial empire would spring up on the banks of the Mississippi and the Arkansas that would bring beneath its peaceful sway more weal and wealth than can be gathered from the sunburnt Orient in a thousand years. And better, sir, it would bring a community of interest and a better understanding between North and South and East and West. The dark shadows of sectionalism would fade away in the bright light of peace and prosperity.

Unjust aspersion and cruel criticism would give way to genuine assistance and kindly sympathy. Embarrassing and vexatious questions, which have harassed and annoyed this nation for half a century, would find their happy solution in the common interest of all. Let us give up this wild dream of conquest; let these people who have been under the hard hand of the oppressor for over three hundred years feel for once the thrill of freedom in their hearts; let them catch the vision of their own flag floating to the breeze. They welcomed the coming of our ships to their shores as the dawning of national independence. Shall we make it an eternal night of warfare and bondage? Let us do what we could have done the first day we went into their harbor—plant the standard of this Republic upon some vantage ground from which we can control our share of the vast commerce of which we hear so much, and let us also be the guardians of the liberties we have conferred upon these people, and by the gentle arts of peace and contact with civilization lead them into a higher order of life and national independence. Let Cuba and Porto Rico join the sisterhood of States at the earliest moment consistent with the wishes of their people and the interest of good government, and we shall have practiced in spirit what we preach in letter and kept, to our honor, the hallowed faith of our fathers. [Loud applause.]

Mr. SHERMAN. I yield thirty minutes to the gentleman from Utah [Mr. SUTHERLAND].

Mr. SUTHERLAND. Mr. Chairman, I do not desire to take advantage of the latitude allowed in this general debate to discuss questions which are entirely foreign to the bill under consideration, but I desire to make some observations upon a subject which is intimately connected with the matter which we are presumed to be considering. The President in his recent message makes use of this language:

In my judgment the time has arrived when we should definitely make up our minds to recognize the Indian as an individual and not as a member of a tribe. The general allotment act is a mighty pulverizing engine to break up the tribal mass. It acts directly upon the family and the individual. Under its provisions some 80,000 Indians have already become citizens of the United States. We should now break up the tribal funds, doing for them what allotment does for the tribal lands—that is, they should be divided into individual holdings. There will be a transition period, during which the funds will in many cases have to be held in trust. This is the case also with the lands. A stop should be put upon the indiscriminate permission to Indians to lease their allotments. The effort should be steadily to make the Indian work like any other man on his own ground.

Further along he says:

The ration system, which is merely the corral and the reservation system, is highly detrimental to the Indians. It promotes beggary, perpetuates pauperism, and stifles industry. It is an effectual barrier to progress. It must continue to a greater or less degree as long as tribes are herded on reservations and have everything in common. The Indian should be treated as an individual—like the white man.

If the Indian is to be recognized as an individual, and not as a member of a tribe, then the time has come when we must enter upon the work of breaking up the great Indian reservations, so that they may be settled by the home seekers of this country and the Indians be compelled to take allotments of land in severalty. There is nothing, in my judgment, which fosters and tends to perpetuate the tribal relations so much as the holding of these vast, unbroken areas of the public domain by these Indians in their tribal capacity.

But under the leasing system, which was inaugurated by the act of Congress of March 28, 1891, and as that act has been interpreted and stretched and construed by the Indian Department, the Indians have been so worked upon by their own cupidity and by the efforts of individuals who have procured or who are seeking to procure leases of Indian lands that it has become almost impossible to obtain their consent to the further opening of the reservations.

The Indian policy of this Government is one which has changed

from time to time. It has been a matter of evolution. We began by treating the Indians substantially as belonging to a sovereign body with whom we treated. That was the idea of William Penn when he treated with the Indians, and was the principle upon which the colonies proceeded and the principle upon which the Government of the United States proceeded until 1871.

In 1871, however, Congress repealed the treaty-making system, and at that time declared that no more treaties should be made with the Indians. Since that time we have been making agreements with them, and to-day, instead of treating with the Indians as belonging to sovereign nations, we deal with them as wards of the Government. Now, the question is whether or not we can consistently and legally open these reservations to settlement without procuring the consent of the Indians thereto.

Before I discuss that, however, I want to speak a moment or two with reference to the leasing question and its effect upon the Indians in the way of retarding efforts to procure their consent to the opening of their reservations. Gentlemen will know that in 1891 we passed an act which provides for the allotment of lands to the Indians in severalty. That act contains a proviso to the effect that when Indians are in the occupancy of lands which they have "bought and paid for" these lands may be leased by consent of the council representing the Indians, and under such regulations as the Secretary of the Interior may prescribe.

It seems to me that that act was originally a very plain one and that there could be no doubt as to exactly what was intended by Congress. Let me refer briefly to what led to the passage of it.

As early as 1884 or 1885 there was considerable agitation in this country upon the question of the leasing of Indian lands to the cattlemen by the Cherokees and the Creeks and other Indians inhabiting the Indian Territory.

Many of these Indians held their lands by patent, in fee simple, and they thought that it was not right that their lands should be tied up and they receive no benefit from them in the way of revenue. So that the chiefs and headmen, speaking for the Indians, undertook to lease them. The matter was called to the attention of the Government, and the question was referred to the then Attorney-General of the United States, Mr. Garland, who rendered an opinion that under the sweeping provisions of section 2116, Revised Statutes of the United States, those leases were absolutely void, wholly irrespective of the question of title.

But the Indians continued to lease their lands, and finally, in 1890, the situation became acute, and the President of the United States, Mr. Harrison, was appealed to. He submitted the same question to the Attorney-General, Mr. Miller, who came to the same conclusion that his predecessor had arrived at, namely, that the leases were absolutely void.

President Harrison then issued a proclamation declaring the leases void, and ordered the cattlemen to remove their cattle from the lands within sixty days, or at any rate on or prior to the 1st day of October succeeding, in 1890. At that time there was pending in Congress this bill providing for the allotment of lands to the Indians in severalty.

The original provision of the bill was that "Indian lands" that were not intended for individual allotment might be leased. The bill in that form passed the Senate; it came to the House, and it passed the House in that form. Some amendments were made, and the matter was sent to a conference committee of the House and Senate, and when the bill came from conference it contained the proviso that I have called attention to, striking out the language that "Indian lands" might be leased, and containing the provision that only such lands as had been "bought and paid for" by the Indians should be leased.

Now, the Indian Department has construed that language so that it substantially applies to every Indian reservation. They say these reservations have been created by carving out of the large body of Indian lands the small bodies which have been erected into reservations, and the Indians have given up the larger body of land for the smaller bodies of land, and have thereby acquired a superior right which, within the meaning of the act, has been "bought and paid for."

Nearly all the Indian reservations have been thus created. Originally the Indians are found maintaining a roving occupancy of vast tracts of land. A treaty is made with them by which they cede to the Government whatever rights they have or claim to have in these lands, reserving from the cession smaller tracts for their future use and occupation, in language more or less comprehensive, and these tracts thereupon become the so-called Indian reservations. Now, it is perfectly clear that no additional title is conferred upon the Indians by these reservations. The effect plainly is simply to exclude the lands so reserved from the effect of the cession and to reserve them for another purpose, leaving the title as it stood before the cession. Such is the clear meaning of the word "reserved" itself, and such is the view of

the courts that have passed upon the question, as I shall show in a moment.

That legislative grants are construed most strongly against the grantee is a rule well settled by the authorities, and that this rule applies to reservations claimed under Indian treaties is equally well settled. The Interior Department, with an apparent striving after an extension of its own power and jurisdiction, has ignored this plain rule, and instead of giving these treaties the restricted interpretation demanded by an adherence to this fundamental rule has given them an extended construction wholly unwarranted by any principle of law.

Now, it seems to me that when we come to consider this rule and the history that I have briefly referred to which led to the passage of the act, we must come to the conclusion that the Indian Department is mistaken in its construction of the law. The language is "land which has been bought and paid for."

The expression appears to have been deliberately and carefully chosen. It is not "lands bought by the Indians" or "lands paid for by the Indians" or even lands "owned by the Indians," which might have been interpreted to include the Indian title by occupancy, but it is "lands bought and paid for." It clearly implies a transaction by which there has been an actual sale by one, an actual purchase by another, and an actual payment by the latter.

Congress, it seems to me, undoubtedly had in mind that class of lands such as were in the Indian Territory, and perhaps elsewhere, that by a bargain and sale transaction, with the Government upon one side and the Indians upon the other, had actually been sold to the Indians and for which the Indians had paid. There were quantities of land to which they held title by actual payment of money. This is the case in many instances with reference to Indians in the Indian Territory.

Congress evidently considered that as to such lands, not merely reserved, but actually paid for and held by fee-simple title, it was unjust that the Indians should not be authorized to deal with them in such a way as to make them financially beneficial. But a general leasing system of all Indian lands—including mineral lands of unknown richness—bringing with it the scandals, the Congressional investigations, the opportunities for jobs and imposition upon the Indians by unscrupulous speculators and adventurers which would go with it, was never dreamed of. If it had been, the provision in question would not have received a vote in either House.

The effect of this interpretation by the Indian Office has been to make the Indian a landed proprietor. He is getting a revenue from these reservations, which were never intended to come within the operation of the law, with no effort upon his own part. He is worked upon by the individuals procuring the leases from the Indians in such a way that he now refuses to give his consent to open the reservations.

The question is whether or not the Indian is to be left in his tribal relations forever, or whether we shall adopt some other means of opening the reservations. I have introduced in the House at this session a bill which provides for the opening of the Uintah Reservation in Utah, and I take that as an example of many other reservations.

That bill, in substance, provides that the Secretary of the Interior, within six months after its passage, shall cause each of the Indians residing on the reservation to make a selection of 160 acres of land if he is the head of a family and 80 acres if he is not, which shall thereupon be allotted to him and thereafter held by him in severalty, and that following that the remainder of the reservation lands shall be thrown open to settlement under the homestead law, except that the land shall be paid for at the rate of \$1.25 an acre and the funds realized from the sale of these lands, together with the funds realized from the sale of mineral lands, shall be turned into the Treasury of the United States and draw interest at the rate of 4 per cent, and the interest and principal of the fund shall be invested under the direction of the Secretary of the Interior for the benefit of these Indians.

There is no provision for obtaining the consent of the Indians.

Now, it seems clear that some such method as that must be devised in order that the recommendations of the President in his message, to which I have called attention, may be carried out. It seems to me that ample justification might be found for adopting that method in the idea that I first adverted to, that we had come to look upon the Indian as the ward of the Government.

We may deal with his lands and his possessions and dispose of them precisely, it seems to me, as a court of equity may deal with and dispose of the lands of an infant or an incompetent person, being careful of course at all times that no injustice be done to the Indian. In a bill such as I have introduced, following a policy of that kind, no injustice would be done to these Indians, and unless some method of that kind be adopted this reservation must remain forever, or at least for many, many years, entirely closed to settlement by the whites.

The courts of the United States have repeatedly held that the

mere fact of the carving out from the body of the public lands of an Indian reservation, calling it such, providing that it shall be occupied as a permanent home by the Indians, does not in any manner change the title. The Indians have their right of occupancy, but nothing more. I want to call attention to one or two cases which hold this doctrine. I will refer first to the case of *Godfrey v. Beardsley* (2 McLean, 412). In that case it was decided that—

An Indian treaty which cedes lands within certain boundaries, reserving certain parts, does in no respect change as to such parts the original right; but that if a treaty declares there shall be granted certain tracts designated, to certain persons, and in the same article these are referred to as grants, they are held to operate as such.

And the court makes use of this language:

The Indian right is that of occupancy, and until this right shall be extinguished by purchase no possession adverse to it can be taken. It is admitted that the mere reservation of the Indian right to a certain part of the described boundaries leaves the right reserved, as it stood before the cession.

Again, in the case of *Goodfellow v. Muckey* (1 McCreary, 238), the circuit court of the United States came to the same conclusion. In the course of the opinion upon that subject, it is said:

As a rule legislative grants must be interpreted, if practicable, so as to effect the intention of the grantor, but if the words are ambiguous the true rule is to construe them most strongly against the grantee. (*Rice v. Railroad Company*, 1 Black., 363.) All grants of this description are strictly construed against the grantee. Nothing passes but what is conveyed in clear and explicit language. (*Railroad Company v. Litchfield*, 23 How., 66.) This rule of construction may very properly be applied to grants and reservations claimed under Indian treaties.

It has been the policy of the Government in treating with Indian tribes to reserve from the public domain tracts of land for the use and occupation of the Indian tribes and to limit them to such reservations. The right of the Indians to have and occupy these lands for themselves and their families has been granted in language more or less comprehensive, but always evincing the purpose on the part of the General Government to limit the Indian title to the use and occupation of the land.

In some instances their lands have been patented to them in fee simple so long as they should exist as a nation and remain on the land. Such were the provisions of the treaties with the Senecas and Shawnees made in 1861 (7 U. S. Stats., 349, 352). In most treaties the words "set apart and reserved" are used in appropriating portions of the public lands as a home for the Indian tribes. In a treaty with the Menomones, of Wisconsin, in 1871 (7 U. S. Stats., 342), the following language is used:

"The following-described tract of land, at present owned and occupied by the Menomonee Indians, shall be set apart and designated for their future homes."

The Supreme Court in that case held that the Indian title was in no manner changed by that very broad language. In the case of *Wheeler v. Meshingomesia* (30 Indiana, 402), a treaty had been entered into with the Indians, the second article of which provided:

From the cession aforesaid the Miami tribe reserve for the band of Matosinia the following tract of land, etc.

It was claimed upon the trial that the effect of this was to vest the fee in the band of Indians mentioned. But the court said:

This position can not be maintained. The ultimate title was in the United States, with the right of occupancy in the Miami tribe of Indians. By the treaty of 1838 the Indian tribes ceded to the United States their right in certain territory named, but from this cession there was reserved by the tribe, for the band of Matosinia, the land in question. Now, the land thus reserved stood precisely as it did before the cession so far as the ultimate title was concerned. It was left subject to a future cession to the United States.

So that the point I make is that in no manner has the title to these various Indian reservations been changed. The lands upon the Indian reservations are legally as much under the control of the United States Government and as much at the disposal of the United States Government as they were before the reservations themselves were created.

Of course, questions may arise as to whether or not it is just to the Indians themselves to undertake to break up their reservations and sell them, but that is entirely aside from the legal question that is involved. If we deal with the Indians justly, if we sell their lands at a fair price, such as is provided in this bill—\$1.25 an acre—and allot them lands on the reservation, so that they may have their farms and grazing lands, and cover the funds arising from the sale of lands into the United States Treasury, and give them the full benefit of that investment, it seems to me no complaint can be made on the part of the Indians themselves.

Now, there are certain reservations to which the United States has a broader title than the ones I have just been discussing, and within that class of reservations is included the reservation that is in question in the bill that I have adverted to, the Uintah Reservation, situated in the State of Utah. Prior to the Mexican cession that was Mexican territory. The Mexican Government recognized no title whatever in the Indians, except those Indians who were gathered together in pueblos, who had actually settled on definite tracts of land. The Mexican Government recognized no title whatever in the wandering tribes of Indians, the so-called "blanket" Indians, who roamed to and fro in this vast territory.

Now, the rule is well settled that where one country acquires territory from another, either by conquest or by purchase, it takes exactly the title which the latter country has. So that when the United States acquired this Mexican territory by the

treaty of Guadalupe-Hidalgo, they acquired exactly the title which Mexico had, and the Government of Mexico recognized no title in the Indians, and the Indians had no title to the lands.

It is true the Government has at various times made treaties with these former subjects of Mexico, but it has not been done in recognition of any title. It has been done by way of obtaining peace. It has been done to avoid disastrous conflicts, because the United States considered that it was very much easier to make a treaty with the Indians than it was to fight them.

Those treaties were made at a time when the Indians in that section of the country were numerically strong and the whites were not; and, as I say, the Government simply considered that it was less expensive and infinitely better for the people of the United States that they should treat with the Indians for their fancied right to the lands than that they should go to war with them.

But time and time again in that section of the country the United States has disposed of the lands over which the Indians theretofore roamed, and to which they had as much claim as they have to these reservations, without consulting the Indians at all. That was the case with reference to the public domain in the State of Utah prior to the creation of this Uintah Reservation. A number of the Indians had settled in four different so-called reservations—one called the Corn Creek Reservation, another the San-pete Reservation, another the Deep Creek Reservation, and a fourth the Spanish Fork Reservation.

Now, by the act of May 5, 1864, by which the Uinta Reservation is created, it is provided that those reservations shall be appraised and sold to the highest bidder, and the consent of the Indians is not asked or obtained. Later, along in 1878, that provision of the law of 1865 is repealed, and the reservations are restored to the public domain, to be disposed of under the direction of the Secretary of the Interior, as other public lands; and in that way the Government has disposed of these reservations.

It has disposed of the other public lands in the State of Utah, and I doubt not in other surrounding States, which were formerly a part of the Mexican territory, so that the Congress in dealing with these lands has recognized repeatedly that the Indians have no claim to them, such as was recognized to exist in the Indians settled in the Eastern States and in the Mississippi Valley.

In the case of the Uinta Reservation there is not even a treaty stipulation which creates the reservation. I am aware of the fact that the Indian Department and the supreme court of my own State have intimated that, in their opinions, this reservation was created in pursuance of the treaty made with the Utah Indians in 1849; but a moment's investigation will disclose the fallacy of that position. This treaty will be found in 9 Statutes United States, page 985. It is strictly a peace treaty. It provides for the surrender by the Indians of stolen property, the restoration of captives, and that their territorial—not reservation—boundaries shall be designated, and that when adjusted the Indians promise to confine themselves to such limits.

The Utahs consisted of numerous bands, having separate tribal organizations, under separate chiefs. They did not constitute a nation. They roamed, as the treaty indicates, over large tracts of country, having no fixed abiding places. This treaty was not made with all the Utah Indians, but with three isolated bands in New Mexico called the Mohuaches, Capotes, and Nomenuches. Not one of the tribes of Utes in Utah participated in the treaty. They knew nothing of it whatever, and the treaty has no more connection with the Uintah Reservation than the treaties made by William Penn. It has been time and again declared by the Commissioner of Indian Affairs and the Indian agents, in their correspondence prior to 1891, that no treaty existed with the Ute Indians of Utah, and such is the fact.

The Uinta Reservation was created by an Executive order of October 3, 1861, and by act of Congress approved May 5, 1864. This act provides that the Superintendent of Indian Affairs shall collect as many of the Indians of the Territory of Utah as he may find practicable in the Uinta Valley, which is set apart for their permanent occupation. It is not limited to the Utah Indians, which is of itself sufficient to show that it was not created in pursuance of any treaty stipulation with the Utahs, but all Indians were to be sent there—Navaho, Shoshone, Utahs, or others who were in Utah at that time. No title is conferred, no lands are described, no Indians or Indian tribes are named.

It is difficult to understand how anyone can be found who will seriously assert that an additional title has been created where there is no grant or language implying one, no lands described, and no grantee.

This reservation is subject to the absolute power of Congress. We may dispose of it as we have already disposed of other lands occupied by the Indians in Utah, with or without their consent, as we please. This bill goes beyond exact justice. It gives the Indians every dollar which may be realized from a sale of the

lands. In the interest of the development of the Indians themselves, it should be enacted into law.

Now, Mr. Chairman, it seems to me that the Indian tribal system, fostered and perpetuated by the Indian reservation system, is contrary to the genius of our civilization, which is built upon the idea of individual action and responsibility. A thousand Indians upon the Uintah reservation, controlling over 2,000,000 acres of land, stand in the way of homes and farms for 50,000 citizens of the Republic.

These Indians contribute no revenue to the Government which feeds and clothes and schools them. They pay no taxes to the State which protects them. The ordinary citizen toils every day in order that he may eat every day. These luxurious wards of ours "toil not, neither do they spin;" but they are the steadiest boarders that we have. In a nation of workers the reservation Indian is an aristocrat. He is the landed proprietor of a princely domain which he has perpetually dedicated to the solitude of the wilderness.

In my judgment, it is time we inaugurated a new policy. Open the reservations. In doing so, deal justly with the Indians—generously, if you please—but open the reservations to settlement, in order that labor may take the place of idleness, that civilization may replace barbarism, that the hunting ground may give way to the farm, and that the desert silence may be broken by the voice of industry. [Applause].

Mr. LITTLE. I yield fifteen minutes to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. PADGETT].

Mr. PADGETT. Mr. Chairman, there are no two questions of more vital importance to the people in their individual capacities and the body politic than the questions of taxation and commerce. The question of taxation has always been and ever will be one of deep and abiding interest to the masses of the people, for it is one that comes in close and immediate contact with them in their daily avocations. It is a question that rightfully should arouse and maintain among the people a deep solicitude, for its rightful exercise is and should be promotive of their welfare, and its perversion is easily accomplished and is fraught with much evil. Of like importance is the question of commerce, for it involves the rights of trade and traffic and the opportunities of the people to secure a livelihood and the gaining of wealth.

There are two theories or underlying principles of taxation. One theory, and the one which the Democratic party teaches and advocates, is that the power of taxation—the power which the Government possesses to take and appropriate the private property of the individual citizen—can be rightfully and properly exercised only for the purpose of raising public revenues adequate and sufficient in the exercise of legitimate Government duties and functions to meet the expenses of the Government honestly and economically administered, and when revenues sufficient for these purposes have been secured, the power of the Government to take and appropriate the private property of the individual citizen ceases and determines.

The Democratic party proclaims that the taxing power of the Government is limited to the necessities of the Government and that the exercise of the taxing power for any other or different purpose is a perversion of the power of taxation and, to the extent of such wrongful exercise, is an oppression of the people. The Democratic party is now and ever has been jealous in behalf of the masses of the individual citizenship of the country to restrict and limit the exercise of this power within its rightful and legitimate scope; has ever battled and still battles against every theory and exercise of the taxing power which seeks to use this strong arm of the Government for ends or purposes other or different than Government ends and purposes.

The other theory or underlying principle of taxation, and the one which the Republican party teaches and practices, is essentially different and distinct in its scope, intent, and purpose from the one taught by the Democracy. Judged by its declarations and by its legislation, the Republican party controverts the principle and theory of taxation as taught by the Democracy and boldly asserts that the taxing power of the Government is not limited to the necessities of a Government honestly and economically administered, but boldly asserts that the Government has the right and authority to exercise the taxing power—that is, to take and appropriate the private property of the individual citizen—for purposes other and different from raising public revenue. It proclaims that, independent of the question of public revenues, and without reference to the question of the necessities of the Government for revenue, the taxing power can and should be rightfully exercised for the purpose of promoting the private business affairs of individuals, or certain classes of individuals, whose business, in the exercise of its discretion, it wishes to foster, upbuild, and protect.

This is an issue between the two great political parties, and in its correct analysis it comes to the proposition as to whether legislation, and especially taxation, shall be exercised only for consid-

eration of the masses, or whether the Government shall constitute itself an agency or engine to care for, protect, foster, and upbuild the private business of particular classes. Upon this issue the Democracy is proud of its position and confidently appeals to the ultimate judgment of the American people. It realizes that temporarily the power and influence of protected capital, combining in a common purpose to pervert the taxing power and secure Government aid, may obscure the judgment and thwart the real purposes of the people, but time, experience, and observation will expose and lay bare the insincerity, the perversion, and the wrongs of such legislation, and the people, realizing their situation, will rise in their might and power to make manifest their belief in the truth, the righteousness, and the justice of the legislation and political theories which have for their aims and purposes the welfare and prosperity of the masses of the people.

The Democracy believes that the legitimate purpose of government is to maintain order and administer public affairs so as to afford to all of its citizens untrammelled and unhampered opportunities in the race of life for wealth and happiness. And it spurns with indignation that political dogma which teaches that the Government has the right and authority to levy tribute upon the labor, the toil, and the production of the masses of the people and appropriate it by legislation to increase the wealth and strengthen the position and power of any particular class or classes of its citizenship.

It believes and teaches that the individual citizen is the unit in society, and that the Government, preserving order and maintaining organized society, should leave to every citizen the full measure of opportunity which his intellect, ingenuity, and skill may secure for him in the honest pursuit of wealth; and that the Government exceeds its authority and perverts the functions of government when, by the exercise of legislation, it requires one citizen to pay tribute, either of his labor or his earnings, to increase the private wealth of some other citizen. And I reaffirm that upon this issue the ultimate judgment of the American people, based upon its intelligence and conscience, will approve the Democratic doctrine.

It is our opinion that the legislation of the Republican party for the past forty years, in the exercise of the taxing power of the Government, has been subversive of every one of these fundamental principles of justice and individual right. The taxing power of the Government has, by legislation, been so manipulated and constructed that the masses of the American people have been required to pay tribute to the classes, and the production of the country has been tolled, like the miller tolls the turn of his customer, and this toll has been turned into the coffers of these classes whom the Republican party has seen fit, for political purposes, to make the favored objects of its munificent bounty. As illustrations and proof of this contention, may I cite the many colossal fortunes of amazing and incomprehensible magnitude which have been accumulated in this country within the last forty years.

I realize and fully appreciate that this is a new country of magnificent domain, of rich mines, fertile fields, and verdant forests, and that the opportunities for the accumulation and upbuilding of private fortunes is exceptional. But these conditions are not a sufficient answer or explanation of the thousands of fortunes amounting to twenty-five, fifty, seventy-five, one hundred, and in some cases as much as two hundred millions of dollars. Does any man with capacity to reason and with a sober judgment to weigh and consider believe that these great fortunes separately and collectively represent and are the results and the accumulation of honest toil and legitimate industry? I will not stop to make the effort to give some comprehension of the magnitude of a million dollars.

I believe that I will be safe in saying that to the minds of all it simply means a great sum, which we can not adequately comprehend or measure in our minds; much less can we form any intelligent or adequate conception or comprehension of the real magnitude when we speak in figures of \$50,000,000 and \$100,000,000. When I assert that these colossal fortunes are not the result of honest toil or legitimate industry, I do not mean to state, nor would I be understood as meaning, that necessarily the owners of these fortunes have personally been guilty of dishonest methods or practices or have resorted to personal acts of wrongdoing. But I do mean to say that the conditions and circumstances which made possible the accumulation of such fortunes within such few years have not been rightful or legitimate conditions, and that these fortunes do not represent the accumulation of legitimate labor and personal industry, but they are the results of the perversions of legislation, whereby under Republican administration the taxing power of the Government has been so manipulated and exercised in such a way as to require contributions—exorbitant contributions—from the labor, toil, and production of the masses of the people, and through these channels of legislation have been emptied into the private treasuries of these specially

benefited or protected individuals and classes of Republican legislation.

There is no other sufficient or adequate explanation of these conditions, and they stand out boldly as object lessons of the practical workings and of the perversion of the taxing power of the Government under Republican administration. This explanation and solution of this state of affairs is not only the sole, sufficient, adequate, and satisfactory one, but it does not in any way disparage the individual intelligence, industry, and worth of the American citizen or discredit the matchless resources and opportunities for wealth of our magnificent country. Giving due consideration to the resources of our country and the energy, industry, and intelligence of our citizenship, our minds can not rest easily upon the conviction that fortunes of \$25,000,000, \$50,000,000, \$100,000,000, and \$300,000,000, represent the results of honest toil and legitimate industry, and are not the results of perverted legislation.

The Democratic party to-day is and always has been the true friend, admirer, and advocate of toil, intelligence, and industry; and for the accumulations of these manly virtues it cherishes a profound respect and friendship, and lends encouragement to every proper effort for their support, maintenance, and upbuilding. At the same time it protests, and will continue to protest, against all legislation which has for its purpose or its logical results the creation of conditions whereby the masses of the people are required to contribute of their labor and production to maintain and enrich particular classes and build up these unnatural and unhealthy aggregations of capital.

The Democratic party realizes that wealth in its last analysis is labor, and that the dollar of to-day represents and stands for the labor of yesterday, and wholly fails to see any distinction or essential difference in the exercise of a governmental power which can take from the citizen his dollar, which represents his labor of yesterday, and contribute it to upbuild the fortune of his neighbor and the exercise of a power of the Government, by compulsion, to require a citizen without reward to labor in the workshop of his neighbor.

We are aware that there has been a measure of success and accumulation on the part of the great mass of the people, but we assert with full confidence that the authoritative statistics will sustain the assertion that the measure of success of the masses of the people in the accumulation of wealth has been wholly inadequate and greatly less proportionate to the accumulation of the classes, and that the masses of the people have prospered, not by reason of the legislation which they have enjoyed, but in spite of it. Possessed of an intelligence, industry, and energy far above the average, living in a country comparatively new, with fertile fields, rich mines, virgin forests, the masses of the people, by their incessant toil and continued labor, have produced a mass of wealth of which the masses have enjoyed an inadequate proportion, and of which the classes, by means of Republican legislation, have received an unmerited share.

But these favorable conditions can not continue indefinitely in behalf of the masses of the people. Increase of population and exhaustion of natural resources and productiveness will increase and intensify competition and reduce profits and render success and accumulation more difficult. And the burdens of the legislation of which I complain will become more perceptible and bear more harshly upon the masses of the people, and will widen the chasm—that chasm which is, from a social and political standpoint, awful and fearful to contemplate—between wealth and poverty, and gradually eliminate the great middle class of society, which has ever been the stay and support of the social system. This condition will breed dissatisfaction and discontent with existing institutions and will not be promotive of patriotic impulses.

Let us make a brief retrospect of the history of tariff legislation and see if the criticisms which I have offered are not justified and well founded. In the first tariff law enacted by Congress, in 1790, the duties averaged about 8½ per cent ad valorem. Up to about the year 1812 the average rates on both free and dutiable goods were less than 20 per cent.

Gradual advances were made in the rate of duty until 1830, when the general average was about 45 per cent ad valorem. Then the rate began gradually to decrease, until in the year 1861 the general average was about 14 per cent ad valorem on free and dutiable goods.

The condition of the country following the war of 1812, and especially from a commercial standpoint, superinduced by the action of Great Britain, the industries of the country, especially the manufacturing industries, were in a depleted and dependent condition, and the argument was made, and with some show of force and reason, that the Government should remedy these conditions and help the struggling industries in their infancy. This was then a new and undeveloped country; there was but little wealth or money in the country; the manufacturing industries

were in their infancy, without capital, without money, and without any source of supply.

Under these conditions and for the purposes suggested by them the doctrine of a tariff with incidental protection was inaugurated; but to-day, at a distance of eighty-five years from that period, with a strong and powerful nation of 75,000,000 of people, with our country developed, our manufactures no longer struggling infants, but powerful giants, with every branch of industry and manufactures become skilled and experienced, no longer paupers financially, but strong and powerful, with a collective capital amounting in the aggregate to many billions of dollars, and with a money circulation in the United States, February 1, 1902, of \$2,544,446,893, we find a very different condition prevailing; and yet with these changed and favorable conditions we find a tariff tax of 50 per cent ad valorem upon dutiable goods, on a general average, but when specially examined and applied to individual articles we find many of the rates much higher.

No longer is the appeal made for protection to struggling industries in their infancy and poverty. No longer is the plea made that the Government should place its arm of support under these weak institutions and enable them to stand. These pleas have long since been discarded, and these favorites come forth and boast of their power and their strength and their magnitude. They assert not only their power and magnitude here at home, but point to their great achievements of sales in foreign lands, and by reason and virtue of their strength and power demand this Government protection, this bonus, not as a source of support, but as an element of profit. And we find the Republican party, true to its instincts and purposes of class legislation and its alliances with the rich and powerful organizations of the country, yielding to them their demands and contributing to the increase of their profits at an ad valorem rate of 50 per cent on dutiable goods.

The Democratic party asserts that this is not only wrong in principle, but if there ever was a time and condition of affairs in this country which warranted such legislation, that time has passed and those conditions no longer exist, and there is to-day no necessity for the further continuance of legislation which is an oppressive burden upon the masses of the American people and a menace and a threatening danger to American commerce.

We confidently assert that there is no necessity for the further continuance of this exorbitant tariff tax, and for the proof of the correctness of this assertion we point to the \$433,851,756 worth of manufactured articles exported from the United States in the year 1900. We assert that this export trade was profitable or it would not have been undertaken, and we call attention to the fact that these exports not only yielded profit to the American manufacturer, after paying cost of transportation and additional handling, but were sold in foreign countries, in the open markets of the world, entirely separate from any good influence of our tariff legislation, and in competition with the pauper labor of Europe, Asia, and Africa, that bugbear which the Republican party so much delights to hold up to frighten and intimidate the American people, and especially the American laboring man, into a support of its policy and legislation which yields tribute money to these rich and powerful classes.

Mr. Chairman, I submit to the candid and unprejudiced judgment of this House and of the country the statement that if this export business was profitable and desirable—and both of these propositions are universally admitted to be true—why is it not profitable for these manufacturers to sell their products to the American people at the same price at which they sell them to the foreigner? This proposition I respectfully invite some advocate of the opposition to answer candidly. Again, selling to the American people at the same price as to the foreigner, is not the profit greater by the amount of saving of freight and additional cost of handling?

But let us turn this proposition around, and look at it from the other side, and by so doing we will make more odious and more vicious that system of legislation which sanctions and tolerates such taxation.

It is well known that the price at which American manufactures are sold abroad is only 60 to 70 per cent of the price at which the same products are sold by the same concerns to the American people. If there be profit in the sale to the foreigner, does not the transaction dealing with the American people pass out of the domain of percentage of profit into the domain of common robbery? What reason, excuse, or justification can longer be offered for the continuance of a system of legislation which works such results upon the American people? The Democracy asserts that such a system of legislation is neither just, right, nor patriotic. It proclaims that the American people are worthy of better consideration and fairer treatment at the hands of the lawmakers, and we believe that the American citizenship will awake to a full realization of the iniquity of such legislation and will sweep it from the statute books and the public policy of the Government.

Forbearance with such conditions and such legislation has

ceased to be a virtue, and virtue will be a dignified but unmistakable disapproval by the American people of a further continuance of such conditions. But this is not yet a full view of the situation. This Republican legislation has not only become no longer revenue legislation, no longer is it legitimate and proper legislation for the protection of American industries, but it has become an actual prohibition and hindrance of national and international commerce.

Around this country it has erected a mighty wall, prohibiting the legitimate commerce of the nation. It forbids the foreigner in a large measure to bring his wares and merchandise to our shores and trade and traffic with our people. For the purposes of such trade privileges he must pay such enormous and onerous duties that he finds in other lands more profitable trade. The result is that the American people are, so to speak, hemmed in, denied all choice of trade, and forced to buy of the American manufacturer at 100 cents the goods and wares which he sells to the foreigner at 60 and 70 cents. Is that patriotism? And more than this, by so doing you drove away from the American market a customer for the corn and wheat and products of field and farm of the American citizen.

Mr. Chairman, there is still another phase of this question to which I desire to invite the serious consideration of this House. That is our commercial position, from a political standpoint, relating to the world's commerce. Under the tariff policy of the Republican party—a narrow, selfish, and restrictive policy, which has had no eye of consideration for the trade and traffic of foreign nations—we find ourselves confronted with serious trade conditions. Has there been no serious suggestion? Is there no valuable lesson to be learned, and from which to derive profit, from the threatening attitude and menacing declarations of other nations regarding the narrowness and injustice of Republican national commercial policy?

What do these conditions mean? Do they mean that we can continue this policy without penalty? Do they mean that we can continue to cherish the hope of selling our products to other nations and forbidding to them a fair and reasonable opportunity to traffic with our people? Does it mean that we can continue to live and move and have our commercial being within a narrow, restricted, and selfish policy and expect the other nations of the world to extend to us a wholesome, generous welcome to their markets? It seems to me unnecessary to make answer to these questions. Their very mention suggests answers of disapproval for such policies, and demands a change of conditions.

I fully realize, Mr. Chairman, that the leaders upon the majority side of this House who control its legislation and dictate and shape the policy of Republican legislation, like Ephraim are joined to their idols, and have declared that no change should be made by this Congress in the tariff policies and legislation. Pride of opinion and elation over past successes may obscure their judgment and fortify them in their determination, but the enlightened judgment and quickened conscience of the American people will not much longer tolerate these iniquities. I am aware that this legislation of the Republican party has given a stimulus, a powerful stimulus, to the development of American manufactures.

I believe I would be justified in saying it had yielded an unnatural stimulus, and, encouraged by the fictitious profits consequent upon such legislation, an enormous amount of capital has been invested in these enterprises, and the result is that we have an immense production of manufactured products demanding exportation and sale in other countries. We even witness the condition here at home that these enterprises, springing up everywhere, with immense capital, struggling in competition with each other for self-preservation, must combine into great consolidated or trust organizations in order to continue their existence, or else, profiting by the suggestion arising from the Republican policy of shutting out competition, organize themselves into trusts for the purpose of throttling and destroying competition. Take which ever horn of the dilemma you will, there is no relief or consolation to the American consumer.

Many of the wiser and more farseeing of the Republican leaders have realized the situation to which we are brought, especially in relation to our international commerce, and they realize the direful results commercially which forebode the continuance of this policy and are trying to extricate their party and the country from the consequences thereof. Pride of opinion for their party policy and an unwillingness to acknowledge the correctness and the wisdom of the Democratic policy, when viewed from a broad and wise international statesmanship and point of view, are trying to extricate themselves from the dilemma by resorting to what they are pleased to term "reciprocity."

Reciprocity is a Democratic principle and policy. It is the underlying principle of Democratic doctrine of fair, reasonable, and just legislation, patriotic in its purpose but international in its scope, which affords reasonable opportunities for all the world to trade with us and in return to give us the right and privilege

to trade with them. The Republican party are seeking to extricate themselves by appropriating Democratic doctrine and brand it with a new name. Reciprocity is a good thing as far as it goes. If good to have with one nation, why not with two? And if desirable to have congenial trade relations with two nations, why is it not desirable to have congenial trade relations with all the world? This is the Democratic doctrine and policy.

The adoption of reciprocity arrangements will to some extent relieve the congested commercial situation, the extent of the relief being measured by the extent of the reciprocal arrangements effected. It would be wiser and we think a better solution to so revise the tariff legislation as to eliminate the unjust and oppressive features of the existing tariff system; but as there is a fixed purpose on the part of the Republican leaders to refuse such relief, it will be well through the medium of reciprocity negotiations, authorized and adopted by the Congress, to incorporate into our tariff system and legislation as large a measure of Democratic doctrine and theory as possible.

In discussing this question it is well to bear in mind the following propositions, which I believe are clearly evident and will not be seriously controverted:

First. The Government necessities no longer require the continuance of these high and excessive tariff rates for revenue purposes. The Treasury of the Government is overflowing with money. The recent statement issued from the Treasury Department shows about \$350,000,000 in gold in the Treasury, and the last report of the honorable Secretary of the Treasury shows an excess of revenue over disbursements of about \$100,000,000 a year, notwithstanding the enormous expenditures and extravagances of the Administration in carrying on the war against the Filipinos and maintaining a costly and unnecessary civil establishment of officeholders in the Philippine Islands and in the home Government. Notwithstanding these enormous expenditures and extravagances, the question which presents itself and is demanding urgent consideration is how to reduce the revenue.

Second. It is evident to every unprejudiced mind that it is no longer necessary to continue this excessive tariff taxation for the purpose of protecting and maintaining against foreign competition. Whenever it is admitted that American industries can carry their products across the seas and sell them in foreign lands in successful competition with the home product, manufactured by the so-called pauper labor of such foreign countries, the admission goes with it that the American industries can sell their products profitably to the American people at the same price and that an artificial stimulus and support are no longer needed for their maintenance.

As before stated, the amount of manufactured products sold abroad in the year 1900 was more than \$433,850,000. The statisticians and writers upon commercial geography place the ratio of domestic and foreign commerce which goes into utilization or consumption at a proportion of from 12 to 1 to as high as 20 to 1. The best authorities and the consensus of opinion place the ratio at about 15 to 1, but for the purposes of this illustration let us adopt the low basis of 10 to 1, and upon this basis the amount of manufactured products consumed by the American people in the year 1900 would be of the enormous value of \$4,338,500,000.

It is further apparent that these are very conservative figures when we remember that the census of 1900 places the value of manufactured products in the United States in the year 1900 at more than \$13,000,000,000, excluding from said estimate the production of all establishments with a yearly output of less than \$500. Assuming that the price at which the goods are sold to the American people is only 30 cents in the dollar more than the foreign price, it will be seen that more than \$1,300,000,000 per annum, by this system of legislation, over and above legitimate profits is legislated from the masses of the people, and especially the laboring classes, into the coffers of these protected classes. Is it any wonder that under such legislation and such manipulation of the taxing power we have seen the number of millionaires increase by the thousand, and the magnitude of their estates multiply by the hundred?

Third. It is manifest and universally admitted that we need and must have the markets of the world in which to sell our surplus products if we are to avoid a commercial crisis and disaster. Can such markets be secured so long as the Republican tariff policy and legislation continues? Does any reasonable man believe it? What mean the mutterings and the threats of commercial combinations and antagonisms and retaliatory legislation we hear coming from Germany and Russia and the other powers of Europe? Are these things meaningless? Is there no significance to them? Nay, verily, we believe it is the part of wisdom that the Congress of the United States should place its commerce upon the foundation of broad, humane, statesmanlike international foundations.

I stated before that some of the wiser and more farseeing of the Republican leaders had realized the straits and rocks into

which the further continuance of the Republican policy would lead the commerce and business interests of this country. I call your attention to the following declaration of the late President McKinley, taken from his fourth annual message, 1900:

The policy of reciprocity so manifestly rests upon the principles of international equity, and has been so repeatedly approved by the people of the United States, that there ought to be no hesitation in either branch of the Congress in giving to it full effect.

Again I call your attention to his language and warning, taken from his Buffalo speech in 1901:

The period of exclusiveness is past. The expansion of our trade and commerce is the pressing problem. Commercial wars are unprofitable. A policy of good will and friendly trade relations will prevent reprisals. Reciprocity treaties are in harmony with the spirit of the times; measures of retaliation are not.

I invite your attention to the language and wisdom of President Roosevelt, taken from his Minneapolis address:

Through treaty or by direct legislation it may, at least in certain cases, become advantageous to supplement our present policy by a system of reciprocal benefit and obligation. We must remember, in dealing with other nations, that benefits must be given when benefits are sought.

Again I invite your attention to the recommendations of President Arthur in his annual message, 1884:

A series of reciprocal treaties with the countries of America which shall foster between us and them an unhampered movement of trade. The conditions of these treaties should be the free admission of such merchandise as this country does not produce, in return for the admission free, or under a favored scheme of duties, of our own products. * * *

It is by no means desirable, however, that the policy under discussion should be applied to these countries alone. The healthful enlargement of our trade with Europe, Asia, and Africa should be sought by reducing tariff burdens on such of their wares as neither we nor the other American states are fitted to produce, thus enabling ourselves to obtain in return a better market for our supplies of food, of raw material, and of the manufactures in which we excel.

It seems to me that many of the embarrassing elements in the great national conflict between protection and free trade may thus be turned to good account; that the revenue may be reduced so as no longer to overtax the people; that protective duties may be retained without becoming burdensome; that our shipping interests may be judiciously encouraged, * * * and above all such a unity of interests established among the States of the American system as will be of great and ever-increasing advantage to them all.

The broad principle of reciprocity, which has come under discussion in recent years, in which we make concessions in tariff duties on goods imported from another country in return for like concessions on the part of the other party to the treaty, was first enunciated by Thomas Jefferson. In 1791, while Mr. Jefferson was Secretary of State in Washington's Cabinet, the Congress, by a resolution, asked his advice as to means for promoting the commerce of the United States with other countries. In his report Mr. Jefferson said:

As to commerce, two methods occur: First, by friendly arrangements with the several nations with whom these restrictions exist; or, second, by the separate act of our own legislature for countervailing their efforts. There can be no doubt but that, of these two, friendly arrangement is the most eligible.

Some nations, not yet ripe for free commerce in all its extent, might still be willing to modify its restrictions and regulations for us in proportion to the advantages which an intercourse with us might offer. Particularly they may concur with us in reciprocating the duties to be levied on each side, or in compensating any excess of duty by equivalent advantages of another nature.

Having shown that the doctrine of reciprocity is a Democratic doctrine and rests and is grounded upon the great underlying Democratic principles and theories of legislation, and that it has received the approval of Republican leaders, I wish to invite your attention to the consideration of the proposition that whenever and wherever these principles have been practiced, and our commerce has rested upon wise legislation, granting fair and just tariff rates, that the trade and commerce of the United States has greatly increased in volume and value. There existed with Cuba a reciprocity treaty from 1891 to 1894. I invite your attention to the following statistics:

Reciprocity with Cuba, 1891-1894.

Year.	Total exports to Cuba of domestic use.	Wheat flour.		Corn.	
		Barrels.	Value.	Bushels.	Value.
1891.....	\$12,224,888	114,447	\$591,886	367,324	\$220,187
1892.....	17,953,570	366,175	1,826,348	627,177	369,131
1893.....	24,157,698	616,406	2,821,557	1,041,474	582,050
1894.....	20,125,321	662,248	2,473,806	1,136,657	571,326
1895.....	12,807,661	379,856	1,301,079	362,204	216,602
1896.....	7,530,880	176,724	647,057	199,193	93,201

Year.	Beef products.	Bacon.	Hams.	Salt pork.	Lard.	Potatoes.
1891.....	\$11,760	\$351,955	\$294,458	\$33,315	\$2,079,534	\$168,354
1892.....	71,939	453,624	529,328	43,911	2,974,545	228,079
1893.....	89,460	556,747	761,082	59,276	4,023,917	554,153
1894.....	75,529	532,035	668,959	52,333	3,625,545	496,875
1895.....	43,009	390,454	420,215	32,586	2,209,067	274,853
1896.....	32,982	386,475	348,065	10,286	1,551,185	217,315

I further invite attention to the following table of statistics of the exports from the United States to Cuba of manufactured products during the treaty period:

Exports from United States to Cuba.

	1891.	1892.	1893.	1894.	1895.
Agricultural implements.....	\$55,618	\$84,442	\$130,341	\$118,254	\$38,461
Breadstuffs.....	1,004,535	2,436,850	3,588,837	3,203,885	1,673,655
Carriages and vehicles.....	166,890	270,276	316,045	261,175	147,740
Cotton.....	101,800	114,112	143,178	120,183	67,441
Fibers.....	279,190	235,660	76,478	66,321	30,495
Iron and steel (bars, rods, sheets, plates, wire, and casting).....	260,490	257,280	809,807	835,300	256,197
Builders' hardware.....	174,620	294,490	335,964	246,142	160,633
Machinery, printing presses, locomotive and stationary engines, sewing machines, boilers, and not otherwise specified.....	1,915,906	3,023,181	3,776,527	2,319,324	1,666,833
Nails and spikes.....	40,070	48,716	127,582	129,370	40,830
Tools.....	107,291	130,368	243,544	192,578	97,369
All other manufactured iron and steel.....	573,851	600,203	1,255,139	885,151	455,169
Leather, raw and manufactured.....	172,813	277,386	181,476	144,467	99,618
Provisions, canned meats, smoked meats, butter, cheese, and lard.....	2,787,337	4,203,955	5,700,195	5,134,560	3,240,255
Lumber.....	740,467	932,406	1,269,271	1,097,381	509,307
Furniture, wooden ware, etc.....	329,783	446,507	445,462	390,791	206,934
Total.....	8,710,661	13,355,947	18,494,846	15,144,982	8,690,926

A reciprocity treaty was negotiated with Hawaii in 1875, and continued in force until 1898. I submit some statistics, beginning with the year 1874 and ending with 1900, which show that during this treaty period when our high tariff rates were removed our exports to the island increased nearly tenfold:

Results of Hawaiian treaty.

Fiscal year.	Imports into United States from Hawaiian Islands.	Exports from United States to Hawaiian Islands.
1874.....	\$1,016,952	\$614,628
1875.....	1,373,681	662,164
1876.....	1,227,191	779,257
1877.....	2,550,335	1,272,949
1878.....	2,678,830	1,736,099
1879.....	3,257,938	2,374,918
1880.....	4,606,444	2,086,170
1885.....	8,857,497	2,787,922
1890.....	12,313,908	4,711,417
1895.....	7,888,961	3,723,057
1896.....	11,757,704	3,985,707
1897.....	13,687,799	4,690,075
1898.....	17,187,380	5,907,155
1899.....	17,831,463	9,305,470
1900.....	20,707,903	13,509,148

There also existed treaties with Brazil and Germany during these same years.

The trade with Brazil during these years also shows a substantial increase, being:

Barrels.	Barrels.
1891..... 722,367	1893..... 837,639
1892..... 918,447	1894..... 920,869

While our shipments to Germany show a still larger percentage of increase, being:

Barrels.	Barrels.
1891..... 8,864	1893..... 209,719
1892..... 54,277	1894..... 286,229

Mr. Chairman, I wish to call attention to the fact, and to emphasize it, that while there has been an increase in the volume of our export trade, such increase has been made up largely of manufactured products, and there has been but very little increase in the volume and value of the agricultural products of the country since 1881. Fifty-eight per cent of the increase of our export trade was composed of manufactured products, while the increase in the exports of leading agricultural products from 1881 to 1900 was less than 6 per cent. I submit for consideration the following table of statistics for the years 1881, 1891, and 1900 of some of the leading agricultural products:

Articles.	1881.	1891.	1900.
Sheep.....	\$762,932	\$261,100	\$733,477
Hogs.....	572,138	1,146,630	394,813
Cattle.....	14,304,103	30,445,249	30,635,153
Bacon and hams.....	61,161,205	45,650,674	59,362,282
Dairy products.....	22,775,742	9,863,780	9,223,520
Breadstuffs.....	270,332,519	128,121,656	232,744,078

Mr. Chairman, let us make a brief review of the commerce of the world and compare the commerce of the United States with the commerce of the other leading nations of the world in the great markets of other nations.

The exports of manufactured goods from Great Britain to France in 1897 were \$43,000,000; exports of manufactured goods from Germany to France in 1897 were \$31,000,000; exports from the United States of manufactured goods to France in 1897 were \$4,000,000.

I submit a comparative statement of statistics furnished me by the Bureau of Statistics of the Treasury Department of the commerce of the world and the share of the United States therein:

TREASURY DEPARTMENT, BUREAU OF STATISTICS,
Washington, February 6, 1902.

The imports into the various grand divisions, and share supplied by the United States, was as follows:

Country.	Total imports.	Amount from United States.	Per cent from United States.
Asia.....	\$725,083,066	\$53,291,278	7.35
Oceania.....	308,078,981	38,957,177	9.79
Africa.....	197,226,959	13,879,155	7.04
Europe.....	8,005,200,513	1,845,790,901	16.82
North America.....	877,733,117	199,331,780	52.77
South America.....	359,679,426	39,208,741	10.90
Total.....	10,063,002,089	1,691,459,033	16.81

O. P. AUSTIN, Chief of Bureau.

Imports into the United Kingdom.

From United States.....	\$375,417,939
From Germany.....	151,745,533
From France.....	260,935,189
From other countries.....	1,457,446,570
Total.....	2,545,545,281

United States equals 26.2 per cent.

Imports into the United States.

From United Kingdom.....	\$143,388,501
From Germany.....	100,445,902
From France.....	75,458,739
From other countries.....	503,879,023
Total.....	823,172,165

Imports into Germany.

From United Kingdom.....	\$171,167,000
From United States.....	238,858,000
From France.....	72,011,000
From other countries.....	890,180,000
Total.....	1,372,216,000

United States equals 17.4 per cent.

Imports into France.

From United Kingdom.....	\$130,319,000
From United States.....	98,339,000
From Germany.....	82,407,000
From other countries.....	595,611,000
Total.....	906,676,000

United States equals 10.8 per cent.

Exports of domestic merchandise to China, Hongkong, Straits Settlements, British India, Japan, and Australasia.

From United Kingdom.....	\$417,938,553
From United States.....	74,094,131
From Germany.....	57,355,000
From France.....	11,666,000
Total.....	561,053,684

United States equals 13.2 per cent.

Mr. Chairman, we often allow the magnitude and extent of our country and our large population to give us erroneous and misleading ideas of the foreign commerce of the United States. We have become so accustomed to speak flatteringly of ourselves as the greatest of commercial nations that we fail properly to compare our foreign commerce with that of other nations. I submit for consideration some estimates based on a per capita comparison, and on such a basis it will be seen that the United States stood No. 10 in the list of nations.

Foreign commerce per capita based on statistics of 1898-99.

Netherlands.....	\$258.18
Switzerland.....	117.55
Belgium.....	100.07
Great Britain.....	98.78
Denmark.....	92.17
Canada.....	60.76
Sweden and Norway.....	43.57
France.....	43.21
Germany.....	42.02
United States.....	27.65
Austria-Hungary.....	20.15
Roumania.....	19.48
Spain.....	19.04

These figures forcibly impress upon us the serious fact that our foreign commerce is much below what it should be, and that by establishing wise, fair, and just trade relations with the other

nations of the world there are splendid commercial opportunities for the United States—large fields of trade and commerce barely touched by the American trader.

I refer to the foregoing statistics and quotations not for the purpose of expressing approval of the Republican idea and practice of reciprocity as exemplified under Republican administration, but to illustrate and emphasize two important truths:

First. That under the operation of lower tariff rates our foreign commerce rapidly grows and expands and a profitable market is secured for the surplus of American products.

Second. That the present high tariff rates are unnecessary and are so recognized by these eminent Republicans.

The logical result is an approval of the Democratic doctrine of taxation when viewed from an international commercial standpoint and having in view the permanent commercial policy of this Government. I might cite other statistics with other countries, but deem it unnecessary. The fact is demonstrated and the truth of the statement is made manifest, that under existing conditions the high-tariff duties of Republican legislation are hindering and crippling and in the future will demoralize the foreign commerce of the United States; and it further demonstrates that the avenue of escape from such embarrassing conditions is to remove the excessive and burdensome and unnecessary taxes now being levied and collected by the Republican party under existing tariff legislation.

Cuba is asking for an opportunity to trade with us. She desires to sell to us her sugar and tobacco and buy from us our breadstuffs and manufactured products. She asks for fair and reasonable trade rates and that the prohibitive tariff duties may be partially removed.

The inhabitants of our new colonies in the far-away Philippine Islands ask for similar rights and privileges. Against their petitions these protected and duty-fattened home concerns rise in wrath and indignation; the hue and cry goes forth in a demand for a claim for protection to American enterprises and institutions of manufacture. What a spectacle! What a confession! The great United States, with its magnificent domains, its splendid civilization, its established industries, its fabulous wealth and aggregated capital, frightened at the very prospect of competition with poor little downtrodden Cuba, and staggering at the thought of competition with the poor Filipinos, whom it is so popular to describe as half civilized and wholly incapable of self-government. When will the protected industries of the United States pass from a state of infancy and reliance upon Government bounty and step upon the plane of independent manhood, ready to do battle, unsupported by Government aid, in the great commercial conflicts with the mighty powers of the earth?

I spurn the suggestion and I despise the plea, as beneath the spirit of American manhood and the spirit of American enterprise, which would forever keep our industries in swaddling clothes and supported by unjust contributions, levied by unhalloved legislation upon the toil and production of the American people. [Loud applause.]

Mr. LITTLE. I now yield to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. POU].

Mr. POU. Mr. Chairman, the time allotted for the discussion of measures in this House is so exceedingly short that I count it a matter for congratulation that I have been able to secure a few moments during which to discuss a proposition which I believe to be of great importance to the American people.

The plan of the majority on this floor is rather peculiar. Important measures are allowed but a few hours of discussion. Unimportant measures are given ample time. This is certainly an evidence of great boldness upon the part of the majority. The more unimportant a measure is, my observation has been, the more time there is allowed for its discussion. But measures affecting the property or happiness of millions of people are rushed through with unseemly haste, and a minute or two is exceedingly precious.

Now, another evidence of the boldness of the majority was the rule which their committee brought in on yesterday not permitting any amendments to the bill which was then under discussion. If there had been any opportunity for amendment, humbly, as a new member, I should have been glad to submit this for their consideration:

Whenever any article manufactured in the United States is sold at a lower price abroad than in the United States the President, having ascertained such to be the case, is authorized and empowered to suspend the collection of the duty on similar articles imported into this country from abroad for such length of time as the President may deem expedient.

Mr. Chairman, the Republicans tell us that they have a bold party and that they dare do anything. They were not bold enough, however, to permit an amendment of this kind. They were not bold enough to give gentlemen an opportunity to vote upon an amendment of this sort. Yet it is stated in the public prints, and I have never seen it denied, that the great trusts of

this country, the great industrial combinations, are selling their products cheaper abroad than they are to the people of the United States.

For instance, they are selling farm implements, grain drills, harrows, and things of that kind cheaper to the people of South America than they are to our own people here in the United States. They are selling petroleum outfits cheaper to the people at Baku, on the shores of the Caspian Sea, than they are to the people of Beaumont, in the State of Texas. They are treating us worse than they treat foreigners.

More than that, Mr. Chairman, they are treating us worse than foreigners treat us. It seems to me that no gentleman can stand on this floor, in the light of this condition of affairs, and deny that proposition. I desire to emphasize, Mr. Chairman, that these great industrial combinations, fostered, protected, and built up by the Republican party, are treating us not only worse than they treat foreigners, but they are treating us worse than foreigners treat us. All that we ask is that we be put upon an equality with heathens and aliens. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Now, for the edification of our Republican friends, I should like to read from a declaration of their convention. You would never hear anything about this, Mr. Chairman, if some gentleman did not read it; but I find in the Republican platform of the year 1900 these words:

We recognize the necessity and propriety of honest cooperation of capital to meet new business conditions, and especially to extend our rapidly increasing trade—

Sounds like you might trust that, does it not?—

but we condemn all conspiracies and combinations intended to restrict business, to create monopolies, to limit production, or to control prices.

Nobody, Mr. Chairman, would ever have known this last was in the Republican platform, except by referring to the original document. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Now, this amendment, which I should like to see tested, it seems to me is above criticism, even from a Republican standpoint. Of course, as a good Democrat, I say it does not go far enough. It puts in the hands of your President the power to suspend the duty upon articles which come in competition with articles of American manufacture sold cheaper abroad than they are at home.

These monopolies have become so absolute and so tyrannical that they fix their price according to competition. Where the competition is small the price is high, and where the competition is great the price is lower. Our people at home are absolutely at their mercy. The law of supply and demand is abolished, and in order to aid these combinations to oppress the people more effectively the Republican party has surrounded this country with a tariff wall which shuts off competition from every other part of the universe.

There is nothing complex about the proposition to put these articles on the free list. It does not require the President to determine whether any particular corporation is a trust or not. It does not require him to ascertain whether two or more persons have conspired together to regulate prices. There is no difficulty about it. There is no legal obstacle in the way. There need be no fear of any shifting decision of one majority by the highest court in the land.

The proposition would apply to the individual as well as the corporation. It is simply the suspension of duty on every article which comes in competition with articles sold by American manufacturers cheaper abroad than at home. The President could easily determine this. You say you do not fear him. He is a protectionist; he is a bold man; he is a warrior; he leads a strenuous life. You need not fear to put yourself in his hands. You say, and I say, we believe he is honest.

Now, if these things be true, let us offer an amendment of this kind to some bill, and let us give to Theodore Roosevelt, Republican, soldier, warrior, the absolute power to suspend the duty on all articles which are sold cheaper abroad than they are at home. You condemned all conspiracies to restrict business or create monopolies in the platform of your party. We are ready to help you carry out your platform pledges. If you do not do this, then all we ask of you is that in the year 1904 you have the courage to nominate for President of the United States Theodore Roosevelt, upon a platform which honestly declares the true principles of your party.

Yes, in some respects your President is bold. He is bold enough to allow the Stars and Stripes to continue to float over polygamy and human slavery. During the civil war the great Lincoln issued his proclamation giving freedom to every slave in the United States. Now, you say your President did not enter into a contract with any one of the native rulers of the Philippine Islands whereby we are bound to protect slavery over there.

You can not deny that human beings are held in bondage by other human beings in one of the islands at least. Why has not your President the courage of great Mr. Lincoln? Why does not he issue his proclamation and declare free every slave in the

islands? You say the war is ended. Gentlemen on this floor who have recently visited this extraconstitutional territory of ours tell us they have seen and talked with slaves. Your President is czar of the islands. Let him issue his edict and remove this stain before history shall indelibly record it.

But, Mr. Chairman, we have been told that our party is dead; that the Democratic party is dead. We heard something of that kind of talk in 1872. Then they said that the Democratic party was dead. In 1876 they found out differently. They got the Presidency in 1876 in a way they have never been proud of. There is an odor about that affair which lingers to this day.

In 1880 they said that the Democratic party was dead. In 1884 they found that it was still alive. In 1888 they said the Democratic party was dead. In 1892 they found out the old party was still alive. Mr. Chairman, they say now that the old Democratic party is dead, but in 1904 they will again find out that the old party is still alive, thank God! [Loud applause on the Democratic side.]

Our Republic can boast of the greatest trusts on earth. It is too bad we must be constantly punished by them. You said if the Government would protect these great corporations so that they could become rich it would enable them to sell their goods cheaper and enable them to pay more for the labor necessary in the manufacture of their goods. My observation has been, Mr. Chairman, that these huge combinations of capital get just as much as they can for their goods and get their labor just as cheap as they can.

This is human nature, anyway. Men do not pay wages according to their ability to pay. Most men get all they can in this world. The laboring man is not fooled by this argument any longer. He knows that he must look out for himself, and he is wise when he does it. The trusts have outgrown our country. They tell us they want the world for their market. If so, it is only fair that they should have the world to compete with.

These things can not endure always. Unless the conscience of the Republic has become paralyzed; there must be, there will be, a change. We have the right on our side, and in the end the right will win. It is not right to shoot down men who are entitled to freedom just as much as we are. It is not right to allow laws to endure which permit individuals and corporations to charge us more for their products than they do foreigners. If anything in the world is wrong, these things are wrong. If there is ever a change, it must be, it will be, wrought by the Democratic party.

It may be of interest to you Republicans to know that in the year 1904 you will be confronted by a united Democratic party, and nobody knows better than you what that means. [Applause on the Democratic side.] Hoist your banner. If the truth shall be written upon it, your motto should be this: "Slavery or death to the Filipinos; protection for the trusts at home." Upon ours shall be: "Freedom for the Filipino; equal and exact justice to all men; equal opportunity to every citizen, State, and section;" and upon this issue, Mr. Chairman, with confidence we shall appeal to the sense of right of the American people. [Loud applause on the Democratic side.]

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. PARKINSON, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment bill of the following title:

H. R. 11470. An act making an appropriation for clearing the Potomac River of ice.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed with amendments the bill (H. R. 10308) to provide for a permanent Census Office; in which the concurrence of the House of Representatives was requested.

INDIAN APPROPRIATION BILL.

The committee resumed its session.

Mr. LITTLE. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. ROBINSON].

Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I agree with the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. PADGETT] that upon the shoulders of labor rests the burden of taxation.

Labor is likewise burdened by trust exactions imposed by the combinations mentioned by the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. POUL].

These trusts and monopolies have flooded the field of industries in the last few years. Why do you not consult the interest of labor when you mold the policies of government? So far from consulting it, you would impose taxes on labor that you may further oppress it, under the plea of "trade expansion," by bringing into competition with it the lowest-paid labor in the world.

Our present colonial policy, which so vitally and adversely affects labor, received its full measure of encouragement by a taxation of the masses to augment the surplus in the Treasury.

The toilers who bear the taxation are made to feel the heavy

hand not only in taxation, but in appropriations, to bring within our domain and hold Asiatic and tropical peoples who will dispute with them in all the walks and avenues of labor.

From earliest time there has been a conflict for supremacy between those of the race well favored with world's goods and those who struggled for subsistence. At first this conflict was waged by force of arms. Brute force and violence held full sway. The weak succumbed to the strong and became their serfs and slaves. Later in the progress of the world governments were established to equalize conditions, to guarantee rights, and to redress wrongs.

The struggles between the contending forces have gone on through governmental institutions, and in this country to-day the only real power of government that needs to be controlled by any interest to dominate all the others is taxation. It involves the raising and equipping of armies, the creation of navies; it involves expansion; it involves everything in government, for appropriations, which are the life of administration, must be preceded by taxation.

Taxation can create or destroy. In government it has done both. If taxes were so adjusted as to charge by tolls and tributes those special interests clamoring for colonies and expansion and exclusively receiving the benefits of it, in short, if the people were, by a system of taxation, relieved from this burden and it was placed on commercialism, where it belongs, this policy would cease and we would be spared the evils that follow in its train.

The power of taxation has been used to foster "infant industries" and is still used to "protect" them after they have reached full manhood. Everything in government that is known is made or unmade through the great power of taxation.

The producers of wealth—the laboring men—pay the greater part of the tributes levied by the Government in the form of taxes.

But what recognition is accorded to them in legislation? The Government in late years, under the policy adopted by the Administration, has come to tax the people each year on an average \$10 a head for the support of National Government. This amount falls heavily on the laboring man and his family, when to it must be added the State, county, and municipal taxes necessary to support local administration.

A large share of the national taxes is expended for the luxury of a colonial policy that tends to bring closer to us and into our dominion an Asiatic cheap and competing labor which lowers the level of our labor and makes it less able to bear its burden of tax. The annexation of every new island opens a flood gate to cheap labor. It will be a menace so long as boats ply between the ports. You can not keep it out when the bars are once laid down unless you can eradicate the cupidity of man.

It will be useless to try when you are adding more coasts to watch, more territory to patrol. With the ingenuity and cunning of man, and the sordidness of the navigation corporations, it will be physically impossible to keep cheap labor away, not to mention the impolicy and destructive consequences of attempting to prevent free migration from one part of our country to another. Where will the line be drawn? How long will a people under our flag be bound down by restrictions on their travels? Will they not ever be in revolt, or be abject slaves to the unjust system of American colonial rule?

California and the Pacific coast States that have been afflicted as with a plague by the incoming of Asiatics seek by act of Congress to keep out the Chinese inhabitants of Hawaii. This is manifestly in the interest of labor, but can it be lawfully done?

The Japanese and Filipinos are as great a menace to labor as the Chinese. Many of the former as artisans are along the streets of the populous cities, many are working as domestics, and many are on the farms and in the gardens of California and the Western States, and many more are scattered over the face of this broad country disputing with their low grade of living and low wages that labor which has heretofore been performed by Americans.

But it seems we must deal gently with the Japanese because they aided us in the trouble in China; because, forsooth, she is ready to aid in the division and exploitation of China.

So far from showing the proper interest in labor, you make not the least efforts to keep out the Japanese, a more dangerous menace to American labor than the Chinese. You exclude the latter, why not the Japanese? You have the power. The Japanese treaty of 1894 gives you expressly the power. I read on page 353 of the *Compilation of Treaties*, in force, of 1899, article 2, paragraph 3:

It is, however, understood that the stipulations contained in this and the preceding article do not in any way affect the laws, ordinances, and regulations with regard to trade, the immigration of laborers, police, and public security which are in force or which may hereafter be enacted in either of the two countries.

Sir, the reason for the retention of the Philippines is for the exploitation of China. This policy is urged on and encouraged not by the patriots, but by the men who labor and pay our taxes, but

by those who want to profit at the expense of weaker people. What is our attitude in China? It can all be gathered in brief from pages 43 to 45 of President Roosevelt's message.

The President says:

Owing to the rapid growth of our power and our interests on the Pacific, whatever happens in China must be of the keenest national concern to us. The general terms of the settlement of the questions growing out of the anti-foreign uprisings in China of 1900, having been formulated in a joint note addressed to China by the representatives of the injured powers in December last, were promptly accepted by the Chinese Government. After protracted conferences the plenipotentiaries of the several powers were able to sign a final protocol with the Chinese plenipotentiaries on the 7th of last September, setting forth the measures taken by China in compliance with the demands of the joint note, and expressing their satisfaction therewith.

"Promptly accepted" are proper terms of designation of the action of China, which seeks to rule 400,000,000 people with an inert soldiery.

Why should not China "promptly accept" what all the powers of Europe and what the United States, all with trained soldiers on her territory, demanded of her?

What further does the President say:

Provisions have been made for insuring the future safety of the foreign representatives in Peking by setting aside for their exclusive use a quarter of the city which the powers can make defensible and in which they can, if necessary, maintain permanent military guards; by dismantling the military works between the capital and the sea, and by allowing the temporary maintenance of foreign military posts along this line. An edict has been issued by the Emperor of China prohibiting for two years the importation of arms and ammunition into China.

Here is a surrender of sovereignty by a weaker country to the superior force of the joint powers. Here is the first step in the dismemberment of China by the other countries of the world. We join in the erection of military forts and establishments in a foreign country.

Under the provisions of the joint note of December, 1900, China has agreed to revise the treaties of commerce and navigation and to take such other steps for the purpose of facilitating foreign trade as the foreign powers may decide to be needed.

Here it is shown that China yields to the other countries, "the powers," the right and authority to dictate and decide what is needed in the revision of China's treaties of commerce and navigation, and is to take such other steps "for the facilitation of foreign trade" as the foreign powers may decide to be needed.

This is an abdication of power of government by China forced by "the powers."

Again this surrender of power is shown:

The Chinese Government has agreed to participate financially in the work of bettering the water approaches to Shanghai and to Tientsin, the centers of foreign trade in central and northern China, and an international conservancy board, in which the Chinese Government is largely represented, has been provided for the improvement of the Shanghai River and the control of its navigation.

Then follows a statement which shows how far the United States and Europe has encroached on China. It shows a monopolizing of a material part of the taxing power of government by the United States and "the powers." It reads:

In the same line of commercial advantages a revision of the present tariff on imports has been assented to for the purpose of substituting specific for ad valorem duties, and an expert has been sent abroad on the part of the United States to assist in this work. A list of articles to remain free of duty, including flour, cereals, and rice, gold and silver coin and bullion, has also been agreed upon in the settlement.

Thus we control the tariff laws of China. Is this proper? Is it wise for our country to enter into the affairs of another country? Would our country submit to any such rule, such exactions by other countries?

We lay a tariff tax on wheat and flour and rice in our Dingley bill, but in the tariff bill that we joined "the powers" in forcing on China we put them on the free list.

A singular and portentous anomaly. Republicans standing for protection in America and for free trade in China. In tariffs they stand for one thing in the United States, another thing for Cuba; for one thing at one time in Porto Rico, and for another at another time, and for still another policy in China, and for a mixed policy in the Philippines.

To this incongruity does the avidity for power and thirst for dominion lead us.

Surely in polity and in domestic rule each nation is the equal of any other.

Surely no rule of this Government can be found to justify us in levying a tribute on, or assuming a governmental function in, or exacting a right to pass a revenue law for China.

Continuing the President, as if in palliation of our conduct, says:

During these troubles our Government has unwaveringly advocated moderation, and has materially aided in bringing about an adjustment which tends to enhance the welfare of China.

On page 45 of his message the President says:

Leaving no effort untried to work out the great policy of full and fair intercourse between China and the nations on a footing of equal rights and advantages to all. We advocate the "open door" with all that it implies; not merely the procurement of enlarged commercial opportunities on the coasts, but access to the interior by the waterways with which China has been so extraordinarily favored. Only by bringing the people of China into

peaceful and friendly community of trade with all the peoples of the earth can the work now auspiciously begun be carried to fruition. In the attainment of this purpose we necessarily claim parity of treatment, under the conventions, throughout the Empire for our trade and our citizens with those of all other powers.

What has the Philippine "open door" done for us in the Philippines? It has given us a war that has cost hundreds of millions of treasure and thousands of lives, and in return for this, according to the last annual report of the Secretary of War, on pages 76 and 77, we get in trade (let me read): "Out of a total in one year of \$53,000,000 of imports and exports the United States got the paltry amount of \$5,000,000, both amounts in round numbers." Ten per cent of profit in this trade would represent \$500,000 as the recompense to the traders for the expenditures of war by the nation. Does it pay? Let us be honest with ourselves. Let us be fair to the people. Does it pay?

This is a new system of international comity—this nation to rule another for her benefit. This sounds again like "manifest destiny," but used in a different sense than that in which the President used it once in his work on Thomas H. Benton, of Missouri. In that work he styled those who favored aggression on weaker peoples as men of "easy international morality."

The President shows, in his message, our purposes and intentions to share in the arbitrary rule of China, and mellows this harsh and unwarranted treatment by the assertions that it is our right and for her good.

Thus we face the great and momentous problem, whether this nation should assume the dangers and evils and entanglements that will ensue from the dismemberment of China, to which this policy of the party in power unerringly and inevitably leads.

The President likewise shows that the "open door," which is England's colonial policy, will prevail in China under the rule of the powers, and we are thus committed irrevocably to the "open door" so long as we retain a foothold in the Philippines.

How fortunate it would have been had this nation been checked in its policy of imperialism by a lack of revenues that furnished the means for these new and dangerous enterprises. How much would we have saved in blood and treasure and in national honor.

Occasionally some one with a sinister design concealed rises up and says, "give us expansion with the golden rule." These principles do not go together. No such incongruous thoughts can inspire one prompted by true Americanism. The golden rule is too sweet, too harmonious, too Christian, to enter into a problem that involves the shedding of human blood.

Why invoke "manifest destiny" and the "golden rule" to justify oppression, bloodshed, and warfare? He that does this clothes in the livery of the best masters to serve the devil in. If appeals to religion can be made, if the "golden rule" and "manifest destiny" can cover the crime of imperialism, how much, I wonder, will these great cardinals be appealed to in years to come to cover up national sins?

It is claimed that we annexed the Hawaiian Islands by reason of their strategic value as a key to the Pacific and to prevent the peaceful invasion of them by the Japanese. It is asserted that Porto Rico came to us as a fruit of war, and that she is also of value as a key, as a strategic point in the Atlantic. Of these two keys one was admitted under the Constitution, the other outside its pale.

We hold a suzerainty in form over Cuba, because it is alleged she is near our shores, and the Monroe doctrine is again invoked.

The same class of statesmen would have us purchase the Danish West Indies from the King of Denmark, not for a strategic point, for we have already Porto Rico, but in furtherance of and maintenance of the Monroe doctrine. They appeal to the Monroe doctrine to justify colonial rule in the West, but abandon it in their attitude in the Far East. Why appeal to the Monroe doctrine to justify the holding of islands in the West and refute and repudiate it by holding islands in the East?

Those in whose interest this policy is urged, without compunction, if indeed the word conscience can be found in the lexicon of commercialism, with a versatility and elasticity they claim that manifest destiny guided us to the Philippines. If manifest destiny and not the commercial interests guided us to the Philippine Islands, what power is it that urges on to the rule of China? Was there ever an instance where the exercise of a power was more exacting and autocratic than that in which we joined the powers in the rule over China? Can we dissociate this exercise of sovereignty from the abject submission of China and the absolute rule of the powers? The United States, in conjunction with the other countries of Europe, becomes a tyrant for the rule of a weaker country.

Why this departure? Why should this country enter into the politics of Asia? Thus are islands annexed, entangling alliances assumed, and the insidious wiles of foreign influences courted against our traditions and against our most familiar notions of American prudence and policy, because the commercial powers of this country, which already fully control the legitimate markets

of the world, desire the Government to use its power and its money to open up new and untried and un-American fields for exploitation.

The American laboring man, who has the power to control his country's policy, can not see in this new-fledged system any guaranty for his interests or his future safety and protection. You have bound the Philippines down with chains. You have oppressed Porto Rico. You have joined the powers in the control of China. You have curbed the freedom of Cuba, and, after tying her hand and foot, you are getting ready to still extend your character as men of "easy international morality" by stifling your consciences against her appeals for humanity. You have raped her industries, and if you refuse her full reciprocity you lay her helplessly at your feet.

Hawaii so far has escaped. She was annexed in 1898, when we were imbued with the spirit of true Americanism. The Hawaiian Islands were admitted to full fellowship under the Constitution and the flag.

In passing the organic law for their government we ruthlessly and rightly tore down the slave flag that covered the serfdom there before, and snatched from the driver's hand the lash that beat the backs of men and women who labored under contract. I voted against the admission of Hawaii, believing that American labor would suffer by its inclusion.

To those who favor island annexation the unwelcome truth has been unfolded by our experiences in Hawaii. The census of 1900 shows that of the total population of 154,000 in an area one-fifth the extent of Indiana, 25,767 are Chinese as against 17,002 in 1890, and 61,111 Japanese in 1900 as against 12,360 in 1890.

The census shows a population of native and mixed Hawaiian blood of 37,918.

This is the heterogeneous admixture of the un-American races that were afflicted upon the laboring men of this country by the resolution of the gentleman from Nevada [Mr. NEWLANDS], and as he has recently introduced a resolution for the annexation of Cuba I hope that in the interest of American labor he will see the evil consequences to our workingmen and forbear bringing islands into our dominion. Let us aid Cuba to help herself. With this our mission is ended. Can our laboring men compete with the Chinese and the Japanese of Hawaii or with the native Hawaiians?

This is full American territory. They must be admitted with full privilege with the mainland or the Constitution be endangered by attempts to keep them out. Such is colonial rule in its protection to labor, and thus must you abandon the interest of the toilers or give but a limited constitutional guaranty and protection to the inhabitants of Hawaii.

There is no reason for duplicity or deception, for uncertainty or vagueness. Our Government is strong in military prowess. It should be just and merciful and magnanimous. It must deal fairly with the soldiers and their families, who are tortured and distressed in body and in mind by deadly war and pestilential disease. Our Government must be fair to them or retribution will come.

The President and his advisers know full well the meaning of language, and they can say that it is the purpose to give the Philippines their independence, as we did to Cuba, and at that instant the war in the Philippines will be ended.

The President has not said so. His advisers have not said so, and the war goes on. All civilized nations know the consequences of war. Americans know them full well. Our duty lies along the pathway blazed out by the Declaration of Independence, the Constitution, our traditions, and humanity.

The Bacon resolution, introduced in the Senate before the direful consequences in the Philippines had befallen us, would have spared and rescued us from its misfortunes.

It reads like this:

Resolved further, That the United States hereby disclaim any disposition or intention to exercise permanent sovereignty, jurisdiction, or control over said islands, and assert their determination, when a stable and independent government shall have been erected therein, entitled in the judgment of the Government of the United States to recognition as such, to transfer to said government, upon terms which shall be reasonable and just, all rights secured under the cession by Spain, and to thereupon leave the government and control of the islands to their people.

This resolution was opposed by the body of Republican Senators and was supported by the Democrats. The vote resulted in a tie and was decided in the negative by the deciding vote of the Republican Vice-President. It may have been thought at that time that there would be no serious insurrection, no serious rebellion, no strenuous war for human liberty, and no great drain in money. All these matters have been made clear to us now, to our misfortune.

Our duty is made plain to us in the language of the Democratic platform, which but voices true Americanism. It says: "We favor an immediate declaration of the nation's purpose to give to the Filipinos, first, a stable form of government; second, independence, and, third, protection from outside interference, such as

has been given for nearly a century to the Republics of Central and South America."

There is not a Filipino of the millions on the islands, from the most cultured to the slave-owning, polygamous inhabitants of the Sulus, who cares for us or for our institutions, except as their attachment is held by the mighty arbitrament of the sword or by the more mild and seductive influences of money, filched by taxation from the islanders to hoist into office mercenary Filipinos, whose attachment to our Government is measured by the tenure of their offices and the amount of the perquisites they afford.

Every Filipino who has a sense of patriotism as it is understood by Americans is to us an enemy, a traitor, or a spy. This is shown by the testimony of our officers, military and civil. Our warfare shows it, and it is disclosed in the history of the islands.

Filipinos may be in the service of the United States, they may pretend to be our friends, but they will wait forever to strike the invader; and when the opportunity comes and the blow is struck, it will show us the folly of lulling ourselves into a security while treachery was so plainly written in their dissembled conduct.

From all the reports that come to us it does not take much penetration to see through the slight veneer that covers the real character.

If this position is not correct, then no one heretofore has correctly written the history of these islands and the 8,000,000 people. If this position is not sound, then no one heretofore has understood human nature the world over.

The spirit of rebellion, as we call it, the spirit of patriotism, as they call it, is on the islands to stay, and the only question that concerns our people is whether we should be taxed to hire soldiers, to buy war ships and war supplies to suppress it. All told, colonial rule costs us annually over a hundred million. It can not be eradicated entirely. It will smolder on in embers, while Wheaton's 50,000 soldiers patrol the coasts and are quartered among them. Under daring chiefs and leaders they will rise from year to year in insurrection and rebellion. Sickness and death stalks in the wake of our army there, and plague and pestilential disease overtakes them.

To carry on this colonial Philippine policy we are taxed, not only for war, but we are taxed in the lives and limbs and health of our soldiers, taxed in tears and anguish of mothers and sisters, whose sons and brothers have been sent to those far-away islands on a dreadful mission. To mitigate in some measure the horrors of that climate it is recommended that the soldiers be relieved in a year or two of service.

The necessity for this regulation shows the danger in the climate. But who can tell how many will fall in that time victims to it by diseases peculiar to the climate? Surely more than in battle. How many will be wrecked for lives, and how liberal will the Government be to them in pensions? Let these considerations enter into the questions of taxation.

The managers of the Republican party were wont to tell us on this floor for several years that it was but a shadow of an insurrection in the Philippines; that our prophecies that it would be long, stubborn, and dangerous were ridiculous, and that the facts upon which this judgment was based existed nowhere but in the mind of some weak or designing and unpatriotic person. But the spark that kindled the flame grew to be a dreadful conflagration that takes more than one-half our Army to smother. They can only allay it. They can not conquer it altogether. How different the conditions here and there.

Seventy-five million people here and an Army less than one-half of the whole; an insurrectionary and dissatisfied people there numbering 8,000,000, and more than one-half of our Army needed to coerce and suppress them. And such a method of warfare! A system that punishes the promulgation of the Declaration of Independence and Constitution of the United States! These considerations are not sentimental. They are real; they are substantial.

If sentimentality were to be appealed to, we could cite that the war in Cuba was waged in the cause of liberty and humanity. Now we offer them a sort of liberty, a diluted liberty, diluted by the Platt amendment.

But we give them a form of liberty, and when they set up a stable form of government it will be easy enough for the Cubans, under the sentiment that prevails in America, if I mistake not, to shake off any hold that this country may claim to have or any restraints it may have imposed, which were notoriously secured under duress from the people of Cuba.

Why not give the same guaranties to the Philippines? There is a similarity between the case of Cuba and the Philippines, if not in its good and humanitarian purposes and objects, at least in its harsh misfortunes, the result of war.

Weyler's order to the Cuban reconcentrados meant torture, death, and starvation.

Our generals in the Philippines are giving out the same reconcentrado order, in efforts to suppress the insurrection.

England finds the same effective means in her war against the Boers who fight for the South African Republic.

England against the Boers follows the example of Spain in Cuba; and has it come to this, Mr. Chairman, that we must follow the example of both to suppress the Filipinos?

To-day little Boer boys, snatched from their homes in the absence of their parents and imprisoned, now are crying for their fathers and their mothers; and little Boer girls, in reconcentrado camps, to-day are crying, bitterly crying, for their mothers and their fathers. Must we follow their example? They were kidnapped, many of them, and carried from their homes, and are now held in prison in the name of human warfare. They are kept from care and protection of parent. This is warfare as England understands it, as Spain understood it, and it is the system that is being adopted in the Philippines by our officers.

Can such acts be brutalities only when practiced by Spain and England?

Our history is moving in cycles. Our soldiers who went to Cuba in that war for liberty and humanity found reconcentrado camps with untold sufferings under the Spanish. Our soldiers now, who go to the Philippines, find the same camps of suffering and distress under American officers.

The laboring man is taxed to support a system of colonial rule that strikes at his vital interest.

Let him beware. When he understands the situation, he will rebel against it. If he fails to heed the admonition enforced by a departure from more than a hundred years of constitutional government for his protection, if he fails to do his duty, for he still has the sovereign power, and a horde of Asiatics and kindred peoples are brought in closer relations with us, then not only will labor suffer in his day, but the cloud will hang over his children in the coming generation. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. SHERMAN. I move that the committee rise.

The motion was agreed to.

The committee accordingly rose; and the House having resumed its session, Mr. MONDELL reported that the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union having had under consideration the Indian appropriation bill, had come to no resolution thereon.

LEAVE TO PRINT.

Mr. SHERMAN. I ask unanimous consent that all gentlemen who have spoken on the Indian appropriation bill, or who shall speak on it during the general debate, may have leave to extend their remarks in the RECORD.

There being no objection, leave was granted accordingly.

INTERNATIONAL RECOGNITION OF BOILER-INSPECTION CERTIFICATES.

Mr. GROSVENOR. Mr. Speaker, I hold in my hand the bill (H. R. 7936) to amend section 4400 of the Revised Statutes of the United States, and the bill (H. R. 7951) to amend section 4400 of the Revised Statutes of the United States, relating to a reciprocal recognition of boiler-inspection certificates between the several maritime nations having marine-inspection laws. I ask that the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries may be discharged from the further consideration of these two bills and that they may lie on the table. I make this request because a corresponding bill—Senate bill 546—has already been passed by the House.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, House bills 7936 and 7951 will be laid on the table.

There was no objection.

EXECUTION OF DEEDS IN THE PHILIPPINE ISLANDS, ETC.

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message of the President of the United States; which was read, referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia, and ordered to be printed:

To the House of Representatives:

In compliance with a resolution of the House of Representatives of the 17th instant (the Senate concurring), I return House bill No. 5814, entitled "An act to provide for the execution in the Philippine Islands and in Porto Rico of deeds of lands situate in the District of Columbia or the Territories of the United States."

THEODORE ROOSEVELT.

WHITE HOUSE, February 18, 1902.

RETIREMENT OF NAVAL CONSTRUCTOR RICHMOND P. HOBSON.

The SPEAKER also laid before the House the following message of the President of the United States; which was read, referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs, and ordered to be printed:

To the Senate and House of Representatives:

In June, 1900, Naval Constructor Richmond P. Hobson, then on duty at the naval station, Cavite, P. I., was found to be suffering from "compound hypermetropic astigmatism, retinal hyperemia, and trachoma," and an operation was performed for the latter. On the 28th of June, 1900, he was admitted to the naval hospital, Yokohama, Japan, the hospital ticket stating: "Retinitis. There is good evidence it was in line of duty. While on duty at Hongkong during the past year he suffered from weakness of eyes, particularly after exposure to glare of sun or while subject to the irregularities of

light on board the ships under repairs." On September 7, 1900, he was discharged from the naval hospital at Yokohama and ordered to the United States, and was subsequently granted six months' leave of absence on account of continued "irritation of retina."

In January, 1902, Naval Constructor Hobson appeared before a retiring board, the medical members of which, after an examination of his case, made the following certificate:

"At present there is apparently only a slight retinal irritation, but by the exercise of reasonable care it should not give great trouble."

"An ophthalmoscopic examination not made and deemed not essential."

"We believe, therefore, that Mr. Hobson is fit for active duty."

Upon this state of facts the retiring board decided "that Naval Constructor Richmond P. Hobson, United States Navy, is fit for active duty."

Without suggesting that any injustice has been done by this finding, and while in effect pronouncing it correct, Mr. Hobson states, in a letter addressed to the Secretary of the Navy, February 5, 1902, that "the duty required in the Construction Corps, in connection with plans and blue prints, and in connection with inspection and supervision in the glare at shipyards and navy-yards, requires just the kind of use of the eyes that is painful and injurious and would tend to thwart their recovery;" that the condition of his eyes has improved since his return to the United States, while on special duty not in the usual line of work of the Construction Corps, but that "under these favorable conditions the irritation and sensitiveness continue and show that" he "should not undertake work that taxes the eyes * * * in the future." He accordingly asks special legislation authorizing his retirement as for disabilities incurred in the line of duty. This request is approved by the Chief Constructor and by the Secretary of the Navy.

In consideration of the foregoing, but especially of the gallant service rendered by Mr. Hobson in the sinking of the *Merrimac* in the harbor of Santiago during the recent war with Spain, I recommend the enactment of a suitable measure for his relief.

THEODORE ROOSEVELT.

WHITE HOUSE, February 17, 1902.

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the President of the United States be, and he is hereby, authorized to transfer to the retired list of the Navy, as for disabilities incurred in the line of duty, Naval Constructor Richmond P. Hobson, United States Navy, at the rate of pay provided by section 1683 of the Revised Statutes in the case of officers retired on account of incapacity resulting from long and faithful service.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED.

Mr. WACHTER, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that they had examined and found truly enrolled bills of the following titles; when the Speaker signed the same.

H. R. 4208. An act granting an increase of pension to Susan M. Pardee;

H. R. 2321. An act granting an increase of pension to Joseph R. Martin;

H. R. 2607. An act granting an increase of pension to Uriah S. Karmany;

H. R. 5147. An act granting an increase of pension to Theodore Lane;

H. R. 2502. An act granting an increase of pension to Ambrose Burton;

H. R. 2528. An act granting a pension to Helen M. Evans;

H. R. 5169. An act granting an increase of pension to Hiram S. Kingsley;

H. R. 6926. An act granting a pension to Mabel H. Lazear;

H. R. 1285. An act granting an increase of pension to Cyrus Odell;

H. R. 6465. An act granting an increase of pension to Samuel Briscoe;

H. R. 5149. An act granting an increase of pension to Charles E. Bachelder;

H. R. 815. An act granting an increase of pension to Henry S. Comer;

H. R. 5002. An act granting an increase of pension to Thomas H. McConnaughey;

H. R. 2983. An act to amend an act entitled "An act granting an increase of pension to Francis M. Thompson," approved March 3, 1901;

H. R. 3230. An act granting a pension to Catherine Pflueger;

H. R. 6720. An act granting an increase of pension to George Patterson;

H. R. 2265. An act granting an increase of pension to Martin V. Hathaway;

H. R. 1374. An act granting an increase of pension to James Willard;

H. R. 5860. An act granting an increase of pension to Edward B. Scott;

H. R. 3511. An act granting an increase of pension to Mary C. Newcomb;

H. R. 2416. An act granting an increase of pension to John B. Wilcox;

H. R. 7408. An act granting an increase of pension to Levi Cross;

H. R. 2193. An act granting an increase of pension to David A. Ireland;

H. R. 1017. An act granting a pension to Mary Tripp;

H. R. 6459. An act granting an increase of pension to Mary F. Hooper;

H. R. 9312. An act granting an increase of pension to Kate Virginia Dewey Cushing;

H. R. 2455. An act granting an increase of pension to George W. McClure;

H. R. 3413. An act granting an increase of pension to Jedediah S. Vallet;

H. R. 5108. An act granting an increase of pension to Elisha B. Taylor, alias Elisha T. Bisbee;

H. R. 3184. An act granting an increase of pension to David Petee;

H. R. 3300. An act granting an increase of pension to George B. Boyd;

H. R. 2484. An act granting an increase of pension to Jeremiah Evans;

H. R. 287. An act granting an increase of pension to Leighton J. Folsom;

H. R. 4037. An act granting a pension to Julia Maher;

H. R. 3024. An act granting an increase of pension to Thomas V. Stran;

H. R. 2529. An act granting an increase of pension to Gustav Schwartz;

H. R. 2628. An act granting an increase of pension to Andrew Mulholland;

H. R. 286. An act granting an increase of pension to Lawrentus Lane;

H. R. 2412. An act granting a pension to Helen L. Pepper;

H. R. 2429. An act granting an increase of pension to John C. Morrison;

H. R. 3240. An act granting an increase of pension to Joseph Church;

H. R. 5162. An act granting an increase of pension to Andrew H. Gifford;

H. R. 6684. An act granting an increase of pension to Marshall Bachelder;

H. R. 4182. An act granting an increase of pension to David Cupps;

H. R. 4268. An act granting an increase of pension to James D. Woodward;

H. R. 5753. An act granting an increase of pension to Emil Frank;

H. R. 1728. An act granting an increase of pension to George W. Thompson;

H. R. 2617. An act granting an increase of pension to John Rapple; and

H. R. 10780. An act to transfer the county of Carroll from the northwestern division of the northern district of Georgia back to the northern district of Georgia of the United States district and circuit courts, and for other purposes.

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

S. 1267. An act granting an increase of pension to Susan F. Connit;

S. 2128. An act granting a pension to Jane Taylor;

S. 2161. An act granting an increase of pension to A. Custis Steever Carpenter;

S. 1337. An act granting an increase of pension to Mary R. Miller;

S. 1329. An act granting an increase of pension to George W. Black;

S. 1465. An act granting an increase of pension to George Fowler;

S. 1610. An act granting an increase of pension to Napoleon B. Perkins;

S. 1623. An act granting a pension to Theophilus Goodwin;

S. 890. An act granting an increase of pension to Catharine Moore;

S. 891. An act granting a pension to Lucinda W. Cavender;

S. 920. An act granting an increase of pension to Francis M. Reilly;

S. 919. An act granting an increase of pension to Daniel C. Knowels;

S. 1094. An act granting an increase of pension to Henry Gifford Dunbar;

S. 1143. An act granting an increase of pension to Charles L. Sweat;

S. 1148. An act granting an increase of pension to Dennis Han-nifin;

S. 1167. An act granting an increase of pension to John Ferguson;

S. 887. An act granting an increase of pension to Sarah McCord;

S. 888. An act granting an increase of pension to Mary Taylor;

S. 889. An act granting an increase of pension to Charles F. Burger;

S. 692. An act granting an increase of pension to Daniel T. Rose;

S. 526. An act granting an increase of pension to John McGrath;

S. 563. An act granting an increase of pension to Henry Fisher;

S. 232. An act granting a pension to Mary E. W. Morgan;

- S. 199. An act granting an increase of pension to Nathaniel Eaton;
 S. 197. An act granting an increase of pension to John Chandler;
 S. 200. An act granting an increase of pension to Eunice P. Detweiler;
 S. 193. An act granting a pension to Richard H. Musgrove;
 S. 1783. An act granting an increase of pension to Henry B. Schroeder;
 S. 194. An act granting a pension to Joseph W. Mulford;
 S. 1805. An act granting a pension to Laura B. Wear;
 S. 1977. An act granting an increase of pension to Harrison T. De Long;
 S. 1020. An act for the relief of John Emerson;
 S. 2107. An act granting a pension to Matilda Armstrong;
 S. 2334. An act granting an increase of pension to Oscar Reed;
 S. 2359. An act granting an increase of pension to Samuel Hymer;
 S. 2389. An act granting a pension to John E. Farrell;
 S. 2390. An act granting a pension to Nellie M. Emery;
 S. 2485. An act granting an increase of pension to Tempy French;
 S. 2484. An act granting an increase of pension to Loren S. Richardson;
 S. 2392. An act granting an increase of pension to Elmer L. Stevens;
 S. 1621. An act granting an increase of pension to David Pollock;
 S. 2010. An act granting an increase of pension to Marcia M. Merritt; and
 S. 2131. An act granting a pension to Carolina N. Allen.

SENATE BILLS AND RESOLUTION REFERRED.

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

- S. 65. An act providing for the retirement of petty officers and enlisted men of the Navy—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.
 S. 1099. An act authorizing the Secretary of the Navy to return to Harvard University certain colors, silver cup, and Nordenfeldt gun—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.
 S. 1563. An act for the relief of William H. Crawford—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.
 S. 2921. An act to place Henry Biederbick, Julius R. Frederick, Francis Long, and Maurice Connell on the retired list of enlisted men of the Army—to the Committee on Military Affairs.
 S. 1025. An act to promote the efficiency of the Revenue-Cutter Service—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

S. 176. An act to provide for the extension of the charters of national banks—to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Senate concurrent resolution 25—

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That the Secretary of War be, and he is hereby, directed to cause an examination to be made of the coast of Washington, in the vicinity of the mouth of the Hoh River, with a view to the establishment of a harbor, and to submit an estimate therefor.

to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE.

Mr. McCLEARY, by unanimous consent, obtained leave of absence for one week, on account of sickness.

WITHDRAWAL OF PAPERS.

By unanimous consent, leave for withdrawal of papers was granted in the following cases, no adverse report having been made:

- To Mr. TAYLOR of Alabama, papers in the case of James W. Carmody (Fifty-sixth Congress).
 To Mr. OVERSTREET, papers in the case of Samuel B. Alexander (Fifty-fourth Congress).

LEAVE TO PRINT.

Mr. SHERMAN. I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. SAMUEL W. SMITH] may have permission to print remarks in the RECORD on the Indian appropriation bill. I was unable to give him time.

There was no objection, and leave was accordingly granted.

PERMANENT CENSUS OFFICE.

The SPEAKER laid before the House, with amendments of the Senate, the bill (H. R. 10308) to provide for a permanent Census Office.

Mr. RUSSELL. I ask unanimous consent that the House disagree to the several amendments of the Senate and request a conference.

There being no objection, it was ordered accordingly; and the Speaker announced as conferees on the part of the House Mr. HOPKINS, Mr. RUSSELL, and Mr. GRIFFITH.

And then, on motion of Mr. PAYNE (at 5 o'clock and 7 minutes p. m.), the House adjourned.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS.

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 Interior, transmitting a draft of a bill relative to the signing of letters patent for inventions—to the Committee on Patents, and ordered to be printed.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII, bills and resolutions were severally reported from committees, delivered to the Clerk, and referred to the several Calendars therein named, as follows:

Mr. HITT, from the Committee on Foreign Affairs, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 11471) making appropriations for the diplomatic and consular service for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1903, reported the same, accompanied by a report (No. 558); which said bill and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. ADAMS, from the Committee on Foreign Affairs, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 8129) to amend sections 4076 and 4078 and 4075 of the Revised Statutes, reported the same with amendments, accompanied by a report (No. 559); 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.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII, private bills and resolutions were severally reported from committees, delivered to the Clerk, and referred to the Committee of the Whole House, as follows:

Mr. STORM, from the Committee on Claims, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 6703) for the relief of George A. Rogers, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 560); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. CAPRON, from the Committee on Military Affairs, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 336) to grant an honorable discharge from the military service to Charles H. Hawley, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 561); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. PARKER, from the Committee on Military Affairs, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 608) for the relief of George K. Bowen, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 565); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 3762) for the relief of Emanuel Klauser, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 566); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 24) for the relief of James W. Howell, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 567); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

ADVERSE REPORTS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII, adverse reports were delivered to the Clerk and laid on the table, as follows:

Mr. SLAYDEN, from the Committee on Military Affairs, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 32) to correct the military record of Albert S. Austin, reported the same adversely, accompanied by a report (No. 562); which said bill and report were laid on the table.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 619) to authorize the President to revoke the order dismissing William T. Godwin, late first lieutenant, Tenth Infantry, United States Army, and to place him on the retired list, reported the same adversely, accompanied by a report (No. 563); which said bill and report were laid on the table.

Mr. PARKER, from the Committee on Military Affairs, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 139) for the relief of Edward Byrne, reported the same adversely, accompanied by a report (No. 565); which said bill and report were laid on the table.

CHANGES OF REFERENCE.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXII, committees were discharged from the consideration of the following bills; which were referred as follows:

A bill (H. R. 7509) granting an increase of pension to Annie M.

Walker—Committee on Invalid Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

A bill (H. R. 11199) granting a pension to Lewis Walton—Committee on Invalid Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

A bill (H. R. 11464) granting a pension to Marion L. Wilson—Committee on Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

PUBLIC BILLS, MEMORIALS, AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, bills, resolutions, and memorials of the following titles were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. HITT, from the Committee on Foreign Affairs: A bill (H. R. 11471) making appropriations for the diplomatic and consular service for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1903—to the Union Calendar.

By Mr. CONRY: A bill (H. R. 11472) to establish light-houses at the mouth of Boston Harbor to mark the entrance to the new Broad Sound Channel—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. BROWN: A bill (H. R. 11473) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to fulfill certain treaty stipulations with the Chippewa Indians of Lake Superior and the Mississippi, and making appropriation for the same—to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. JENKINS: A bill (H. R. 11474) for the acknowledgment of deeds and other instruments in the Philippine Islands and Porto Rico affecting land situate in the District of Columbia or any Territory of the United States—to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. IRWIN: A bill (H. R. 11475) for the purchase of the portrait of Gen. George H. Thomas—to the Committee on the Library.

By Mr. SPARKMAN: A bill (H. R. 11476) authorizing, empowering, and directing the Commissioner of Fish and Fisheries to establish in the State of Florida, on the Gulf of Mexico, a station for the investigation of problems connected with the marine-fishery interests of the region—to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. SAMUEL W. SMITH: A bill (H. R. 11477) for improving Fort street between Twelfth and Fourteenth streets north-east, and for other purposes—to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. RICHARDSON of Tennessee: A bill (H. R. 11478) to provide for refunding internal-revenue taxes paid upon legacies and bequests for uses of a religious, literary, charitable, or educational character, or for the encouragement of art, under the war-revenue act of 1898—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WILCOX (by request): A bill (H. R. 11479) to apportion the term of office of seven senators elected at the first general election of the Territory of Hawaii—to the Committee on the Territories.

By Mr. TONGUE (by request): A bill (H. R. 11480) appropriating the receipts from the sale and disposal of public lands in certain States and Territories to ascertain the extent to which said lands may be reclaimed, and to authorize the taxation of public lands under certain conditions—to the Committee on Irrigation of Arid Lands.

By Mr. CURRIER: A bill (H. R. 11481) to authorize the purchase of certain pictures of Arctic expeditions, by Mr. Albert Operti—to the Committee on the Library.

By Mr. LACEY: A bill (H. R. 11535) for the protection of game in the district of Alaska, and for other purposes—to the Committee on the Territories.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11536) to transfer certain forest reserves to the control of the Department of Agriculture, to authorize game and fish protection in forest reserves, and for other purposes—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. NORTON: A bill (H. R. 11537) to reimburse detailed or assigned officers—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. BELL: Joint resolution of Colorado legislature, favoring a department of mining—to the Committee on Mines and Mining.

By Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi: Memorial memorializing the Representatives and Senators of Mississippi in Congress to prepare and urge the passage of a bill refunding to the cotton-growing States the cotton tax collected from said States immediately after the war—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. RYAN: Memorial memorializing the Representatives and Senators of Mississippi in Congress to prepare and urge the passage of a bill refunding to the cotton-growing States the cotton tax collected from said States immediately after the war—to the Committee on War Claims.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills of the following titles were presented and referred as follows:

By Mr. BELL: A bill (H. R. 11482) for the relief of O. E. Noland, of Mancos, Colo.—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. BLAKENEY: A bill (H. R. 11483) granting an increase of pension to William D. Kimble—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BROWNLOW: A bill (H. R. 11484) for the relief of Edwin S. Harris—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. COWHERD (by request): A bill (H. R. 11485) granting a pension to Julia McCarthy—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. DOUGHERTY: A bill (H. R. 11486) to correct the military record of Aaron Norris—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11487) granting a pension to James F. Montgomery—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11488) granting an increase of pension to John J. Hunter—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. EMERSON: A bill (H. R. 11489) granting an increase of pension to William D. West—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. FORDNEY: A bill (H. R. 11490) granting an increase of pension to Elizabeth Parrish—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. FOWLER: A bill (H. R. 11491) granting an increase of pension to Israel D. Lum—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11492) granting an increase of pension to John J. Willis—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. GORDON: A bill (H. R. 11493) granting a pension to Mary A. Lipps—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HANBURY: A bill (H. R. 11494) granting a pension to Henrietta A. Buell—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HAUGEN: A bill (H. R. 11495) granting an increase of pension to Mary A. Bailey—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. HEMENWAY: A bill (H. R. 11496) granting a pension to Henry S. Foster—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HOWARD: A bill (H. R. 11497) for the relief of Martha Strickland, widow of William Strickland—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. IRWIN: A bill (H. R. 11498) granting an increase of pension to Candace Browder—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11499) granting an increase of pension to Silvia Miller—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11500) for the relief of Schuyler B. Mayhall—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11501) for the relief of John Hedrick—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11502) for the relief of Mary D. Griffiths—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. KEHOE: A bill (H. R. 11503) granting an increase of pension to Israel T. Osborn—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11504) for the relief of James H. Reeder—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. MERCER: A bill (H. R. 11505) granting a pension to David Dunkle—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MIERS of Indiana: A bill (H. R. 11506) granting a pension to Samuel Stetzer—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. NAPHEN: A bill (H. R. 11507) for the relief of the heirs of Valentine Kirchner—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. NORTON: A bill (H. R. 11508) granting an increase of pension to Joseph A. Van Pelt—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. ROBB: A bill (H. R. 11509) granting an increase of pension to Henry J. Smith—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11510) to remove the charge of desertion from the military record of James Coad—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11511) for the relief of George Kinnard—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. SELBY: A bill (H. R. 11512) granting an increase of pension to J. H. Daniels—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SHAFROTH: A bill (H. R. 11513) granting a pension to Oscar O. Vaughan—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11514) granting an increase of pension to Charles Ambrook—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11515) for the relief of Samuel Gates—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. SHALLENBERGER: A bill (H. R. 11516) granting an honorable discharge to William J. Coad—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. SMITH of Iowa: A bill (H. R. 11517) for the relief of John Lammert—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11518) granting an increase of pension to Craig Mardis—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11519) granting an increase of pension to Henry Russell—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. STEWART of New York: A bill (H. R. 11520) granting an increase of pension to Carrie Conant, widow of Capt. Charles H. Conant—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11521) to correct the military record of Wesley Mickel—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11522) for the relief of Eliza Ellen Ehle—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. TATE (by request): A bill (H. R. 11523) for the relief of the First Georgia State Troops—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also (by request), a bill (H. R. 11524) for the relief of Samuel Howard—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11525) for the relief of William Pastell—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11526) to correct the military record of Capt. Thomas E. Holland's company of Georgia Mounted Volunteers—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. TOMPKINS of Ohio: A bill (H. R. 11527) to correct military record of Charles H. Jessup—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. WHEELER: A bill (H. R. 11528) for the relief of Vina Ferguson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WILLIAMS of Illinois: A bill (H. R. 11529) for the relief of the heirs of R. H. Montgomery, of Holmes County, Miss.—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. BALL of Delaware: A bill (H. R. 11530) granting an increase of pension to William J. Williams—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11531) to correct the military record of William J. McNatt—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11532) to remove the charge of desertion from the military service of John Gilsenen—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. BROUSSARD: A bill (H. R. 11533) for the relief of Remy Bagary, of Iberia Parish, La.—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. PERKINS: A bill (H. R. 11534) for the relief of Hugh McGuckin—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

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 the SPEAKER: Petitions of E. C. Little Post, No. 54; Sam Rice Post, No. 6, Department of Iowa; William McKee Post, No. 110; Blythedale Post, No. 551; Marion Post, No. 119; Andy Martin Post, No. 259, Department of Missouri; E. C. D. West Post, No. 168; James A. Garfield Post, No. 46, Department of Maine; G. W. Larrimore Post, No. 445; Joseph Cross Post, No. 691; T. J. Stanley Post, No. 295, Department of Ohio; Lincoln Post, Charles-town, N. H.; Live Eagle Post, Fullerton, Nebr.; L. S. Payne Post, North Tonawanda, N. Y.; J. W. Thornburg Post, Odon, Ind.; Eli Berlin Post, East Hickory, Pa.; A. H. Dutton Post, Wallingford, Conn.; Caldwell Post, Lake City, Mich.; John A. Logan Post, Ashaway, R. I., Grand Army of the Republic, for investigation of the administration of the Bureau of Pensions—to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. ACHESON: Petition of Ripper Lodge, No. 263, of Washington, Pa., favoring the building of vessels in the United States navy-yards—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Also, resolution of Ripper Lodge, of Washington, Pa., for exclusion of Chinese—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, petition of the First Reformed Presbyterian Church of Beaver Falls, Pa., in opposition to the reenactment of Chinese-exclusion law—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. ADAMSON: Petition of Garment Makers' Union No. 63, of Columbus, Ga., in favor of the reenactment of Chinese-exclusion act—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. ALEXANDER: Resolution of Tile Layers' Union No. 5, and Marine Engineers' Beneficial Association No. 1, Buffalo, N. Y., in favor of laws restricting immigration—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. BABCOCK: Resolution of Will Hickok Post, No. 134, Grand Army of the Republic, Bloomington, Wis., favoring the construction of Government vessels in navy-yards—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. BARTHOLDT: Resolutions of Broom Makers' Union No. 45, and Badge and Lodge Paraphernalia Makers' Union No. 9136, Iron Molders' Union No. 7413, National Building Trades Council, and Carpenters and Joiners' Union No. 51, of St. Louis,

Mo., favoring the reenactment of the Chinese-exclusion act—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, resolution of the National Trades Council of America, favoring irrigation by the General Government—to the Committee on Irrigation of Arid Lands.

Also, resolution of citizens of St. Louis, Mo., regarding House bill 7189 and Senate bill 2162, relating to the United States Marine-Hospital Service—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, resolutions of Beer Drivers and Stablemen's Union No. 43, of St. Louis, Mo., concerning the relief of reconcentrados in South Africa—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, petition of Musicians' Mutual Benefit Association of St. Louis, Mo., urging that the navy-yards be utilized for the construction of war vessels—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Also, petition of citizens of St. Louis, Mo., in favor of a Federal election law—to the Committee on Election of President, Vice-President, and Representatives in Congress.

By Mr. BOUTELL: Petition of A. C. Miller and others, of Chicago, Ill., in relation to the report of the Department of Labor, under an act of March 3, 1887—to the Committee on Labor.

By Mr. BOWERSOCK: Resolution of Western Retail Implement and Vehicle Dealers' Association, held in Kansas City, Mo., against House bill 6578, known as the parcels-post bill—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

Also, resolution of George H. Thomas Post, No. 18, of Ottawa, Kans., favoring the construction of Government vessels in navy-yards—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Also, resolutions of Coopers' Union No. 18, of Kansas City, Kans., concerning the Chinese-exclusion act—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. BROWNLOW: Petition of the heir of Jacob Shelton, deceased, late of Tennessee, for reference of war claim to the Court of Claims—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. BRUNDIDGE: Petition of James H. Merritt, of De-witt, Ark., praying reference of war claim to the Court of Claims—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. BURKE of South Dakota: Resolution of the Typographical Union No. 218, of Sioux Falls, S. Dak., favoring the Chinese-exclusion act and the restriction of immigration—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, resolution of Silas A. Strickland Post, No. 127, of Hot Springs, S. Dak., favoring the construction of war ships at the navy-yards—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. BURLESON: Resolution of Trades Council of Austin, Tex., favoring the Chinese-exclusion act—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. CORLISS: Resolution of Tobacco Workers' Union of Detroit, Mich., favoring the construction of war vessels in Government navy-yards—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. COWHERD: Papers to accompany House bill 11424, granting a pension to Mrs. A. Crismas, wife of Hiram Dickinson—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. CUSHMAN: Petition of the Alaska Chamber of Commerce, of Juneau, Alaska, relative to desired legislation for the district of Alaska—to the Committee on the Territories.

By Mr. EMERSON: Resolutions of Cigar Makers' Union No. 279, of Plattsburg, N. Y., in favor of the reenactment of Chinese-exclusion act—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, papers in support of House bill 3516, granting an increase of pension to O. F. Cheney—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, paper to accompany House bill 4799, granting a pension to Mrs. S. A. Fay—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, papers to accompany House bill 7238 for the relief of William Brown—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, papers to accompany House bill 11489, granting an increase of pension to William D. West—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. ESCH: Resolution of the Lake Seamen's Union, against Chinese labor—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, resolution of the Lake Seamen's Union, in opposition to House bill 7189, changing the name of the United States Marine-Hospital Service—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. FITZGERALD: Petition of Central Tea Growers and Traders' Association, of Japan, for the repeal of the tax on tea—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of New York Retail Grocers' Union, protesting against the removal of the duty on teas—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, resolution of the Oklahoma City Commercial Club, urging the admission of Oklahoma and Indian Territory as a single State of the Union—to the Committee on the Territories.

By Mr. FOERDERER: Resolution of National Building Trades

Council, favoring the reenactment of the Chinese-exclusion act—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, resolution of the National Building Trades Council, in relation to the sale of public lands and the irrigation of arid lands—to the Committee on Irrigation of Arid Lands.

Also, resolutions of the United Retail Grocers' Association of Brooklyn, and New York Retail Grocers' Union, of New York City, in relation to the duty on tea—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, resolution of the executive board of the American Lace Curtain Operatives' Union of Philadelphia, Pa., favoring the exclusion of Chinese—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, resolutions of the Grocers and Importers' Exchange of Philadelphia, urging the creation of a department of commerce and industries—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, resolutions of the Grocers and Importers' Exchange of Philadelphia, favoring Cuban reciprocity—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FOSS: Resolutions of the National Tea Duty Repeal Association, in relation to the duty on teas—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of officers of societies, protesting against the enactment of any law to exclude honest, able-bodied foreigners from immigrating to this country—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. FOWLER: Petition of the Presbytery of New Brunswick, N. J., against the repeal of the anticanteen law—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, petition of Chicago and Northwestern Railway Telegraphers, Division No. 76, and Cigar Makers' Union No. 427, of Rahway, N. J., for the restriction of illiterate immigrants—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, petition of Board of Chosen Freeholders of Hudson County, N. J., concerning the Chinese-exclusion act—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, resolutions of Typographical Union No. 23, of Rahway, N. J., and American Wire Weavers' Protective Association, of Belleville, N. J., favoring the construction of war ships at the navy-yards—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. GAINES of Tennessee: Petition of Rock City Division, No. 135, Order of Railway Conductors, Nashville, Tenn., praying for the further restriction of immigration—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. GILLET of New York: Petition of Gregory Post, No. 649, Grand Army of the Republic, Department of New York, for investigation of the administration of the Bureau of Pensions—to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. GRAHAM: Petition of the United Presbyterian Church of Sewickley, Pa., in opposition to the exclusion of Chinese—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, resolution of Merchants' Association of New York, in favor of the establishment of reciprocal relations with Cuba—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, resolution of the Oklahoma City Commercial Club, Territory of Oklahoma, in favor of single statehood for Oklahoma and Indian Territories—to the Committee on the Territories.

Also, petition of S. Saito, for the repeal of the duty on tea—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GREENE of Massachusetts: Resolution of National Building Trades Council, Worcester, Mass., and Boot and Shoe Workers' Union No. 238, of New Bedford, Mass., in favor of the reenactment of Chinese-exclusion act—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, resolutions of the National Building Trades Council, held at Worcester, Mass., in relation to the leasing of public lands, irrigation, and homesteads—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, resolution of the National Association of Machinists, Boston, Mass., favoring the construction of war ships at the navy-yards—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. GRIFFITH: Resolution of Indianapolis Division, No. 11, Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers, of Indianapolis, Ind., in support of Senate bill 1118, limiting the meaning of the word "conspiracy," etc.—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HAUGEN: Resolution of Hughes Post, No. 168, Grand Army of the Republic, Decorah, Iowa, for the construction of war vessels in Government navy-yards—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Also, resolution of Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers, Division No. 117, of Mason City, Iowa, favoring restriction of undesirable immigration—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. HAY: Petition of George W. Bromley, of Frederick County, Va., for reference of war claim to the Court of Claims—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, petition of the heir of John B. Almond, deceased, of Page County, Va., for reference of war claim to the Court of Claims—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, petition of Branon Thatcher, of Frederick County, Va., for reference of war claim to the Court of Claims—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. HEMENWAY: Resolution of Post No. 139, Grand Army of the Republic, of Fulsomville, Ind., favoring the construction of war vessels in Government navy-yards—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Also, resolution of the Tanners' Union No. 96, of Evansville, Ind., concerning the reenactment of the Chinese-exclusion act—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, resolution of Iron Molders' Union No. 51, of Evansville, Ind., for an educational test in the restriction of immigration—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. HENRY of Connecticut: Resolution of Carpenters' Union No. 757, of South Manchester, Conn., American Federation of Labor, concerning the construction of Government vessels in navy-yards—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Also, resolution of Unity Lodge, No. 436, of New Britain, Conn., favoring the passage of the Chinese-exclusion act—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. HILL: Resolutions of Cigar Makers' Unions Nos. 139, of Long Hill, Conn., and 130, of Danbury, Conn., favoring the continuation of the exclusion law against Chinese laborers—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, resolutions of Carpenters' Unions Nos. 216, of Torrington, and 115, of Bridgeport; Typographical Union No. 143 and Iron Molders' Union No. 110, of Danbury; Sheet Metal Workers' Lodge No. 127, of South Norwalk, Conn., for restriction of immigration, etc.—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. HOWELL: Petition of Cigar Makers' Union No. 146, of New Brunswick, N. J., for the restriction of illiterate immigrants—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, resolutions of Hiawatha Council, Junior Order United American Mechanics, of East Millstone, N. J., relating to the suppression of anarchy—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of Cigar Makers' Union No. 146, of New Brunswick, N. J., favoring the reenactment of the Chinese-exclusion act—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. JACKSON of Kansas: Resolution of Union No. 157, of Pittsburg, Kans., for the reenactment of the Chinese-exclusion law—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. LITTAUER: Papers to accompany House bill correcting the military record of Seneca S. Van Ness—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. LITTLE: Petition of J. M. Cooper, heir at law of Marie Cooper, deceased, late of Saline County, Ark., for reference of war claim to the Court of Claims—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, petition of Susan Allen, heir at law of Isaac T. Epler, deceased, late of Sebastian County, Ark., for reference of war claim to the Court of Claims—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, petition of John B. Clark, heir at law of Asa Clark, deceased, late of Fort Smith, Ark., for reference of war claim to the Court of Claims—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. LITTLEFIELD: Petition of Lewiston (Me.) post-office clerks, urging the passage of House bill 5286, for the reclassification of salaries—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

Also, resolution of Union No. 273, of Rockland, Me., for the reenactment of the Chinese exclusion law—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. LOUDENSLAGER: Resolution of Glass Bottle Blowers' Association, of Woodbury, N. J., and American Flint Glass Workers' Union of Millville, N. J., favoring the enactment of a law excluding the Chinese without limitation from this country—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. MAHONEY: Petitions of H. C. Valentine and numerous other citizens of Chicago, Ill., and of the Fifth Congressional district of Illinois, in behalf of such intervention on the part of the United States for the cessation of hostilities in the Transvaal as may reestablish peace upon honorable terms—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. McCULLOCH: Petition of Mary Johnson, of Cross County, Ark., for reference of war claim to the Court of Claims—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, petition of C. G. Dorris, heir at law of Othello E. Dorris, deceased, late of St. Francis County, Ark., praying reference of war claim to Court of Claims—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, petition of W. R. Hicks, heir at law of J. C. Hill, deceased, late of St. Francis County, Ark., praying reference of war claim to Court of Claims—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. McANDREWS: Sundry petitions of citizens of the

Fourth Congressional district of Illinois, in behalf of such intervention on the part of the United States for the cessation of hostilities in the Transvaal as may reestablish peace upon honorable terms—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, petition of Journeymen Plasterers of Chicago, Ill., favoring restriction of undesirable immigration—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, petition of the West Side Woman's Christian Temperance Union, of Chicago, Ill., and the Metropolitan Church of Christ, of Chicago, for the abolition of the saloon in the island possessions of the United States—to the Committee on Alcoholic Liquor Traffic.

By Mr. McRAE: Petition of John Q. Taylor, of Arkansas, praying reference of war claim to Court of Claims—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, petition of W. P. Barton, heir at law of J. W. Barton, deceased, of Clark County, Ark., praying reference of war claim to Court of Claims—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. MERCER: Resolution of Sedgwick Post, No. 1, Grand Army of the Republic, Omaha, Nebr., favoring the construction of war vessels in Government navy-yards—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Also, resolutions of Sheep Butchers' Union, Beef Butchers' Union, and Stationery Firemen, of South Omaha; Theatrical Stage Employees' Union of Omaha, Nebr., for the reenactment of the Chinese-exclusion act—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. MIERS of Indiana: Resolutions of Grand Army of the Republic post at Freedom, Ind., favoring the building of war vessels in the navy-yards—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. NORTON: Resolution of Jaqueth Post, No. 196, Grand Army of the Republic, Sycamore, Ohio, favoring the construction of war vessels in Government navy-yards—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Also, resolution of National Brotherhood of Operative Potters, Tiffin, Ohio, and Iron Molders' Union of Bucyrus, Ohio, favoring exclusion of the Chinese from the United States and our insular possessions—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, resolution of Iron Molders' Union No. 353, Bucyrus, Ohio, favoring an educational test in the restriction of immigration—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, petition in support of House bill 5192, granting an increase of pension to John English—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, papers to accompany House bill 7856, granting an increase of pension to Wilson H. Davis—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, petition of Joseph A. Van Pelt, to accompany House bill 10963, granting him a pension—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. PATTERSON of Pennsylvania: Petition of Retail Clerks' Union No. 469, Shenandoah, Pa., American Federation of Labor, favoring the construction of war ships at the navy-yards—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Also, resolution of United Brewery Workmen's Union, of Pottsville, Pa., for the reenactment of the Chinese-exclusion law—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. PATTERSON of Tennessee: Resolution of Memphis Cotton Exchange, Memphis, Tenn., favoring improvement of rivers and harbors—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana: Petition of B. J. Crosswait Post, No. 150, Grand Army of the Republic, Department of Indiana, for investigation of the administration of the Bureau of Pensions—to the Committee on Rules.

Also, resolution of Steam Engineers' Union No. 19, Fort Wayne, Ind., favoring the Chinese-exclusion act—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, petition of James Butler, of Gage, Ind., for reciprocal trade relations with Cuba—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. REID: Petition of Mrs. M. J. Spake, of Pulaski County, Ark., for reference of war claim to the Court of Claims—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, petition of Mrs. R. M. Scruggs, heir at law of Mary Le-fevre, deceased, late of Pulaski County, Ark., for reference of war claim to the Court of Claims—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. RICHARDSON of Alabama: Papers to accompany House bill 5609, for the relief of Sallie C. Smith—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, papers in support of House bill 7844, providing for the erection of a public building in the city of Florence, Ala.—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. ROBB: Papers to accompany House bill for the relief of George Kinnard—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, papers to accompany House bill 4128, granting a pension to Rhoda Burnham—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. RUPPERT: Resolution of the Amalgamated Wood Workers' Union No. 92, of Clinton, Iowa, for the reenactment of

the Chinese-exclusion law and favoring an educational test in the restriction of immigration—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, resolutions of the New York Retail Grocers' Union, in relation to the removal of the duty on teas—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SCHIRM: Resolution of Amalgamated Woodworkers' Union No. 6, of Baltimore, Md., favoring the Chinese-exclusion act—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. SCOTT: Resolution of Western Retail Implement and Vehicle Dealers' Association, held in Kansas City, Mo., against House bill 6578, known as the parcels-post bill—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. SHALLENBERGER: Petition of Clearman & Hines and 6 other merchants of Heartwell, Nebr., against House bill 6578, known as the parcels-post bill—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. SHERMAN: Papers to accompany House bill 11837, for the relief of the legal representatives of James and Milton Caldwell—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, resolution of Mailers' Union No. 19, of Utica, N. Y., in favor of the reenactment of Chinese-exclusion act—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, resolution of Amalgamated Leather Workers' Union No. 10, of Littlefalls, N. Y., praying for the further restriction of immigration—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, protest of the Quapaw tribe of Indians, of Indian Territory, against the annexation of Indian Territory—to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. SNOOK: Resolution of Cigar Makers' Union No. 166, of Defiance, Ohio, praying for the further restriction of immigration—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, resolution of the National Building Trades Council of America, concerning the Chinese-exclusion act—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, resolutions of National Building Trades Council of St. Louis, Mo., favoring irrigation of arid lands—to the Committee on Irrigation of Arid Lands.

Also, resolutions adopted by the Addison Clark Post, Grand Army of the Republic, of Ohio, favoring the construction of naval vessels at the Government navy-yards—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. SPERRY: Resolution of Excelsior Lodge, No. 259, of Derby, Conn., favoring the Chinese-exclusion act—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. STARK: Papers in support of House bill 10023, granting an increase of pension to William Mills, Beatrice, Nebr.—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. STEWART of New York: Papers to accompany House bill No. 11521, relating to the correction of the military record of Wesley Mickel—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. SULLOWAY: Petitions of the Woman's Christian Temperance Unions of Sanbornville, Manchester, Nottingham, Water Village, Tilton, and Northwood, all of New Hampshire, favoring the adoption of an antipolygamy amendment to the Constitution—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WOODS: Resolution of Stockton Federated Trades, for the reenactment of the Chinese-exclusion law—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, resolution of the Chamber of Commerce of San Francisco, Cal., favoring a light and fog-signal station at Point Buchon, California, and also at a point on Karquines Strait, California—to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

Also, resolution of the Chamber of Commerce of San Francisco, urging favorable consideration of the bill which provides for a reorganization of the consular service—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. YOUNG: Petition of S. Saito, Washington, D. C., for the repeal of the duty on teas—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, resolutions of New York Retail Grocers' Union, against repeal of duty on tea—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, resolutions of the National Building Trades Council of St. Louis, Mo., and of Local Union No. 114, of Ottumwa, Iowa, favoring the exclusion of the Chinese—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, resolutions of National Building Trades Council of America, favoring the irrigation of the arid lands of the United States—to the Committee on Irrigation of Arid Lands.

Also, petition of the Grocers and Importers' Exchange of Philadelphia, favoring a reciprocity treaty with Cuba—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, resolutions of the Grocers and Importers' Exchange of Philadelphia, Pa., urging the creation of a department of commerce and industries—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, resolutions of G. W. Childs Division 353, Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers, Philadelphia, Pa., in favor of laws restricting immigration—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, papers to accompany House bill for the removal of the charge of desertion from the military record of George W. Smith—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

SENATE.

WEDNESDAY, February 19, 1902.

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

The Secretary proceeded to read the Journal of yesterday's proceedings, when, on request of Mr. KEAN, and by unanimous consent, the further reading was dispensed with.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the Journal will stand approved.

PRINTING OF GEOLOGICAL SURVEY REPORTS.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a letter from the Director of the Geological Survey calling attention to the advisability of a change in existing law regarding the printing of his annual report, etc., which, with the accompanying papers, was referred to the Committee on the Geological Survey, and ordered to be printed.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS.

Mr. KEAN presented the memorial of Mrs. Joel Borton, of New Jersey, remonstrating against the regulation and control of vice by the board of health of Manila; which was referred to the Committee on the Philippines.

He also presented a petition of Hiawatha Council, No. 110, Junior Order United American Mechanics, of East Millstone, N. J., praying for the enactment of legislation to suppress anarchy; which was ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented a petition of Cigar Makers' Local Union No. 427, American Federation of Labor, of Rahway, N. J., praying for the enactment of legislation authorizing the construction of war vessels in the navy-yards of the country; which was referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

He also presented petitions of Monitor Council, No. 83, of Hackensack, of Speedwell Council, No. 227, of Morristown, Junior Order United American Mechanics, and of Federal Labor Union No. 7211, American Federation of Labor, of Dover, all in the State of New Jersey, praying for the reenactment of the Chinese-exclusion law; which were referred to the Committee on Immigration.

Mr. FAIRBANKS presented a petition of the Quarterly Meeting of Friends, of Westfield, Ind., praying for the enactment of legislation to prohibit the sale of firearms and intoxicating liquors in the island possessions of the United States; which was ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented petitions of Division No. 11, Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers, of Indianapolis, and of Division No. 221, Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers, of Huntington, in the State of Indiana, praying for the passage of the so-called Hoar anti-injunction bill to limit the meaning of the word "conspiracy" and the use of "restraining orders and injunctions" in certain cases; which were ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented the petition of Katherine H. Day and sundry other members of the Home Missionary Society of the Presbyterian Church, of Indianapolis, Ind., praying for the adoption of an amendment to the Constitution to prohibit polygamy; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also presented petitions of Steam Engineers' Local Union No. 19, of Fort Wayne; of Cigar Makers' Local Union No. 221, of South Bend; of Local Branch No. 61, Glass Bottle Blowers' Union, of Gas City, and of W. C. Beaty and sundry other citizens of Linton, all in the State of Indiana, praying for the reenactment of the Chinese-exclusion law; which were referred to the Committee on Immigration.

He also presented a petition of the Goshen Milling Company, of Goshen, Ind., praying for the adoption of certain amendments to the interstate-commerce law; which was referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

He also presented the petitions of Charley Thornton and sundry other citizens of Bristol; of Z. T. Strong and sundry other citizens of Muncie; of I. O. Grimes, of Martinsburg, and of L. D. Pierle, of Martinsburg, all in the State of Indiana, praying for the passage of the so-called Grout bill to regulate the manufacture and sale of oleomargarine; which were referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

He also presented petitions of Local Union No. 652, United Brotherhood of Carpenters and Joiners, of Elwood, and of the Trades and Labor Council of Fort Wayne, in the State of In-

diana, praying for the repeal of the so-called desert-land law and also for the commutation clause of the homestead act; which were referred to the Committee on Public Lands.

He also presented petitions of Hackelman Post, No. 64, of Brookville; of Harrison Cathcart Post, No. 117, of Bristol, Department of Indiana, Grand Army of the Republic; of Elwood Typographical Union, No. 331, of Elwood; of Friendship Lodge, No. 70, of Fort Wayne, and of Journeymen Horseshoers' Local Union No. 81, of the American Federation of Labor, all in the State of Indiana, praying for the enactment of legislation authorizing the construction of war vessels in the navy-yards of the country; which were referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Mr. McMILLAN presented a petition of sundry business men of Detroit, Mich., praying for the establishment of reciprocal trade relations with the Dominion of Canada; which was referred to the Committee on Relations with Canada.

Mr. WETMORE presented a petition of Farragut Post, No. 8, Grand Army of the Republic, Department of Rhode Island, of Providence, R. I., praying for the enactment of legislation authorizing the construction of war vessels in the navy-yards of the country; which was referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Mr. PERKINS presented petitions of United Metal Workers' Union No. 47, Granite Cutters' National Union, of Raymond; of the Federated Trades Union, American Federation of Labor, of Stockton; of the Marine Cooks and Stewards' Association of the Pacific Coast, of San Francisco, and of the Chamber of Commerce and Merchants' Exchange of San Francisco, all in the State of California, praying for the reenactment of the Chinese-exclusion law; which were referred to the Committee on Immigration.

He also presented a petition of the Chamber of Commerce of San Francisco, Cal., praying for the adoption of certain changes in the consular service; which was ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented a petition of the Chamber of Commerce and Merchants' Exchange of San Francisco, Cal., praying for the enactment of legislation granting unrestricted entrance into the United States to all members of the mercantile class of Chinese, such as salesmen, clerks, buyers, bookkeepers, accountants, managers, storekeepers, bankers, and cashiers; which was referred to the Committee on Immigration.

Mr. NELSON presented a petition of the Chamber of Commerce of St. Paul, Minn., praying that an appropriation be made for the construction of reservoirs in the arid regions of the country; which was referred to the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation of Arid Lands.

Mr. HAWLEY presented a petition of sundry citizens of Watertown, Conn., praying that generous treatment be accorded the inhabitants of Cuba and the Philippines; which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented a petition of sundry citizens of Watertown, Conn., praying for the ratification of reciprocity treaties with foreign countries; which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. DIETRICH presented petitions of sundry citizens of Dorsey, Omaha, Blackbird, Meek, Knoxville, Bellevue, Fairburg, and of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Fairburg, all in the State of Nebraska, praying for the adoption of an amendment to the Constitution to prohibit polygamy; which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also presented a petition of the Omaha Association of Credit Men, of Omaha, Nebr., praying for the adoption of certain amendments to the present bankruptcy law; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also presented a petition of Cigar Makers' Local Union No. 276, of Plattsmouth, Nebr., praying for the reenactment of the Chinese-exclusion law; which was referred to the Committee on Immigration.

He also presented petitions of Local Union No. 82, Brotherhood of Stationary Firemen, of Omaha; of Carpenters and Joiners' Local Union No. 427, of Omaha; of Local Union No. 180, International Association of Machinists, of North Platte; of Omaha Typographical Union, No. 190, of Omaha; of Carpenters and Joiners' Local Union No. 113, of Lincoln, and of Cigar Makers' Local Union No. 276, of Plattsmouth, all of the American Federation of Labor, in the State of Nebraska, praying for the enactment of legislation authorizing the construction of war vessels in the navy-yards of the country; which were referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

He also presented petitions of Buford Post, No. 23, of Central City; of Rising City Post, No. 20, of Rising City; of Local Post, No. 155, of Kenesaw; of Neligh Post, No. 68, of Neligh, and of Lyon Post, No. 11, of Grand Island, all of the Department of Nebraska, Grand Army of the Republic, in the State of Nebraska, praying that preference be given to veterans in the employment