

to officers in the Life-Saving Service—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. ALLEN of Kentucky: Petitions of Federal Labor Unions No. 9816 and No. 9384, of Caseyville; Labor Union No. 9812, and Mine Workers' Union No. 993, of Nortons Gap, Ky., for the further restriction of immigration—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. APLIN: Petition of St. Joseph's Polish Society, of Bay City, Mich., favoring the passage of House bill 16, for the erection of a statue to the late Brigadier-General Count Pulaski at Washington, D. C.—to the Committee on the Library.

By Mr. BELL: Resolution of the League of American Sportsmen, favoring the passage of House bill 10306, for the preservation of wild animals and game birds—to the Committee on the Territories.

Also, resolutions of the National Encampment at Springfield, Ill., Spanish War Veterans, for allowance of travel pay from Manila to San Francisco, Cal.—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. BURLESON: Petitions of officers of Company A, Signal Corps, of the Texas Volunteer Guards, favoring House bill 11654, increasing the efficiency of the militia—to the Committee on the Militia.

By Mr. BUTLER of Pennsylvania (by request): Resolutions of Colonel George F. Smith Post, No. 130, of Westchester, and Phoenixville Post, No. 45, Department of Pennsylvania, Grand Army of the Republic, favoring House bill No. 3067, relating to pensions—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CASSINGHAM: Resolutions of Lithographers' International Beneficial Association of the United States and Canada, favoring an educational qualification for immigrants—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. DEEMER: Resolutions of General Mansfield Post, No. 48; Colonel S. D. Barrows Post, No. 835; George Cook Post, No. 315, and George W. Moyer Post, No. 379, Grand Army of the Republic, Department of Pennsylvania, favoring the passage of House bill 3067—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. GRAHAM: Petition of Martha Proven and other citizens of Bellevue, Pa., favoring an amendment to the Constitution making polygamy a crime—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, report of the committee on foreign commerce and the revenue laws of the Chamber of Commerce of the State of New York, urging the reduction of the tariff on the imports into the United States from the island of Cuba—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GRIFFITH: Evidence to accompany House bill 13094, granting an increase of pension to John Parker—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, testimony to accompany House bill 10740, to amend the military record of Henry Davis—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. HAMILTON: Resolutions of Harlow Briggs Post, No. 80, Grand Army of the Republic, Department of Michigan, protesting against granting pensions to ex-Presidents or their widows—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HANBURY: Resolutions of the Eighteenth Assembly District Republican Club, of Brooklyn, N. Y., indorsing House bill 6279, to increase the pay of letter carriers—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

Also, resolutions of Carpenters' Union No. 639, of Brooklyn, N. Y., for the further restriction of immigration—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. HEMENWAY: Resolution of Labor Union No. 8398, of Boonville, Ind., favoring an educational qualification for immigrants—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. HITT: Resolution of the League of American Sportsmen, favoring the passage of House bill 10306, for the preservation of wild animals and game birds—to the Committee on the Territories.

By Mr. JACKSON of Kansas: Resolutions of Federal Labor Union No. 8460, of Stippville, and Union No. 8454, of Independence, Kans., for the further restriction of immigration—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. JOY: Coupon petitions of 1,075 readers of the St. Louis Evening Star, asking Congressmen to vote for House bill 6279, to increase the pay of letter carriers—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. LAWRENCE: Resolutions of Central Labor Union of Adams, Mass., and Boot and Shoe Workers' Union of Dalton, Mass., favoring an educational test for restriction of immigration—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. McCLELLAN: Petition of Loyal Lodge, No. 406, Association of Machinists, favoring an educational qualification for immigrants—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, resolutions of the Chamber of Commerce of the State of New York, favoring a reduction of not less than 50 per cent of

the duty on Cuban sugar and tobacco—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. NEVIN: Resolutions of Lithographers Protective Beneficial Association, Coshocton, Ohio, for the exclusion of illiterate immigrants—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. OTJEN: Petition of citizens of Alexandria, Va., protesting against the "Jim Crow" car law—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, resolution of Stuart Reed Lodge, No. 300, Association of Machinists, Milwaukee, Wis., favoring an educational qualification for immigrants—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. PATTERSON of Pennsylvania: Resolutions of Mine Workers' Union No. 169, of McAdoo; Labor Unions No. 9182, of Ashland, and No. 8874, of Shenandoah, Pa., favoring an educational restriction on immigration—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana: Petition of Oswald Bruckner and 126 other citizens of Fort Wayne, Ind., on tariff and reciprocity—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. RUSSELL: Resolution of commissioned officers of the Second Regiment Connecticut National Guard, favoring House bill 9972, increasing the efficiency of the militia—to the Committee on Militia.

Also, petition of H. J. Kilroy and other citizens of Norwich, Conn., in favor of House bills 178 and 179, for the repeal of the tax on distilled spirits—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, resolutions of New London Lodge, Association of Machinists, New London, Conn., for the exclusion of illiterate immigrants—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, petition of the Business Men's Association of Waterbury, Conn., favoring an appropriation for a public building at Waterbury—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. SCOTT: Resolutions of the Industrial Council of Pittsburg, Kans., for the further restriction of immigration—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. SHACKLEFORD: Petition of John Brooks, for reference of war claim to the Court of Claims—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. THAYER: Resolutions of Boot and Shoe Workers' Union No. 52, of North Grafton, Mass., favoring restriction of immigration—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. WARNOCK: Petition of Subordinate Association No. 19, of Lithographers' International Protective and Beneficial Association, favoring an educational qualification for immigrants—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, petition of T. D. Weld and others, of the Eighth Congressional district of Ohio, for an amendment to the Constitution preventing polygamous marriages—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ZENOR: Proof to accompany House bill 3005, for the relief of John Hammond—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

## SENATE.

TUESDAY, April 15, 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. GALLINGER, and by unanimous consent, the further reading was dispensed with.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the Journal will stand approved.

### HOUSE BILLS REFERRED.

The following bills, received yesterday from the House of Representatives, were severally read twice by their respective titles, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs:

A bill (H. R. 3592) for the relief of Henry Lane;

A bill (H. R. 9455) to remove the charge of desertion standing against the name of Lorenzo Marchant;

A bill (H. R. 9723) granting an honorable discharge to Levi Wells; and

A bill (H. R. 11621) to correct the military record of H. J. Rowell.

The House pension bills received yesterday were severally read twice by their titles, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

The bill (H. R. 8326) to set apart certain lands in the Territory of Arizona as a public park, to be known as the Petrified Forest National Park, was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Public Lands.

### SCHOONER GEORGE AND JANE.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a communication from the assistant clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting the conclusions of fact and of law filed under the act of

January 20, 1885, in the French spoliation claims, set out in the findings by the court relating to the vessel, schooner *George and Jane*, Clark Elliott, master; which, with the accompanying paper, was referred to the Committee on Claims, and ordered to be printed.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE.

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. C. R. McKENNEY, its enrolling clerk, announced that the House had passed, with amendments, the joint resolution (S. R. 56) providing for a modification in the adopted project for the improvement of Everett Harbor, Washington; in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

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

A bill (H. R. 8752) authorizing the board of supervisors of Santa Cruz County, Ariz., to issue bonds for the erection of a courthouse and jail for said county;

A bill (H. R. 12452) granting to the Mobile, Jackson, and Kansas City Railroad Company the right to use for railroad purposes the tract of land at Choctaw Point, Mobile County, Ala., and now held for light-house purposes;

A bill (H. R. 13025) to make the provisions of an Act of Congress approved February 28, 1891 (26 Stats., 796), applicable to the State of Utah; and

A bill (H. R. 13627) making appropriations to supply additional urgent deficiencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1902, and for other purposes.

The message further announced that the House had passed a resolution transmitting to the Senate the bill (H. R. 11418) granting an increase of pension to Hannah T. Knowles, with the accompanying message of the President, with the request that the Senate reconsider its action in passing the bill, in order that the bill may be amended.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED.

The message also announced that the Speaker of the House had signed the following enrolled bills and joint resolution; and they were thereupon signed by the President pro tempore:

A bill (S. 1178) providing for an additional circuit judge in the second judicial circuit;

A bill (H. R. 7875) to construct a light-house keeper's dwelling at Calumet Harbor; and

A joint resolution (H. J. Res. 155) granting permission for the erection of a monument in Charlotte, N. C., and for the ornamentation of the public grounds in that city.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS.

Mr. LODGE. I present a letter, in the nature of a petition, from H. L. Wheatley, representing business interests in Chicago and New York, praying that the provisions of the Senate bill to give a temporary civil government to the Philippine Islands, being S. 2295, in regard to corporations owning or controlling more than 50,000 acres of land, be changed to permit them to hold 20,000 acres. I move that the petition be printed as a document.

The motion was agreed to.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is any reference to be made?

Mr. LODGE. It may lie on the table, as it relates to the bill now pending.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The petition will lie on the table.

Mr. FAIRBANKS presented a petition of Winfield Scott Hancock Post, No. 337, Department of Indiana, Grand Army of the Republic, of Veedersburg, Ind., praying for the enactment of legislation granting per diem pensions; which was referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also presented a petition of North Vernon Division No. 9, Order of Railroad Telegraphers, of North Vernon, Ind., 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 and remonstrating against the passage of any substitute therefor; which was ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented petitions of Federal Labor Union No. 8398, of Boonville; of Fire Insurance Agents' Local Union No. 8530, of Elwood; of Federal Labor Union No. 8971, of Sullivan, and of Foundry Helpers' Local Union No. 9433, of Indianapolis, all in the State of Indiana, praying for the enactment of legislation providing an educational test for immigrants to this country; which were referred to the Committee on Immigration.

Mr. NELSON presented a petition of Local Division No. 356, Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers, of Breckenridge, Minn., 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 was ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. PERKINS. I present sundry telegraphic dispatches signed by Hon. E. E. Schmitz, mayor of San Francisco, and the board of supervisors, the labor council, and many representative citizens of that city, relative to the passage of the pending Chinese-exclusion bill, and remonstrating against the passage of any other bill relating to the same subject. I move that the dispatches lie on the table.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. RAWLINS presented a petition of the Cattle Growers' Association of the State of Utah, praying for the cession by Congress to the State of Utah of that portion of the Territory of Arizona lying north and west of the Colorado River and adjoining southwestern Utah; which was referred to the Committee on Territories.

He also presented a petition of the Cattle Growers' Association of Utah, and a petition of the Wool Growers' Association of Utah, praying for the adoption of certain amendments to the interstate-commerce law; which were referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

He also presented a petition of the Cattle Growers' Association of Utah and a petition of the Wool Growers' Association of Utah, praying for the passage of the so-called Grosvenor pure-fiber bill, relating to the labeling of manufactured goods; which were referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented a petition of the Wool Growers' Association of Utah and a petition of the Cattle Growers' Association of Utah, praying for the adoption of an amendment to the census law providing for the taking of an annual classified census of live stock; which were referred to the Committee on the Census.

Mr. CLAY presented a petition of the Chamber of Commerce of Atlanta, Ga., praying for the adoption of certain amendments to the bankruptcy law; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. QUAY presented petitions of Lodge No. 348, International Association of Machinists, of Philadelphia; of Lock Workers' Local Union No. 9354, of Lancaster, and of the Federal Labor Union of McSherrystown, all in the State of Pennsylvania, praying for the enactment of legislation providing an educational test for immigrants to this country; which were referred to the Committee on Immigration.

He also presented petitions of 38 citizens of Pittsburg, of 40 citizens of Bellevue, and of 20 citizens of Philadelphia, all in the State of Pennsylvania, 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 petitions of J. K. Taylor Post, No. 182, Department of Pennsylvania, Grand Army of the Republic, of Bethlehem; and of Captain Foster Alward Circle, No. 130, Ladies of the Grand Army of the Republic, of New Kensington, in the State of Pennsylvania, praying for the enactment of legislation granting pensions to certain officers and men in the Army and Navy of the United States when 50 years of age and over, etc.; which were referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. PENROSE presented a petition of the Allied Printing Trades Council, American Federation of Labor, of Philadelphia, Pa., 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 a petition of Jones-Darling Camp, No. 186, National Association of Spanish-American War Veterans, of Elkhart, Ind., praying for the adoption of an amendment to the so-called flag bill, authorizing camps of Spanish War Veterans to use the flag in the same manner as that authorized for the Grand Army of the Republic; which was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

He also presented a petition of officers and veterans of the Pennsylvania State Soldiers and Sailors' Home, praying for the enactment of legislation to promote the efficiency of the clerical service of the United States Navy, etc.; which was referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

He also presented petitions of G. W. Ryan Post, No. 364, of Middleburg; of John T. Greble Post, No. 10, of Philadelphia; of Post No. 465, of Duncansville; of Graham Post, No. 106, of Pottstown; of Captain Walter S. Newhall Post, No. 7, of Philadelphia; of Lieutenant Arnold Labach Post, No. 297, of Newport; of Captain A. J. Mason Post, No. 322, of Espyville; of Gustin Post, No. 154, of Troy, all of the Department of Pennsylvania, Grand Army of the Republic, in the State of Pennsylvania, praying for the enactment of legislation granting pensions to certain officers and men in the Army and Navy of the United States when 50 years of age and over, etc.; which were referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. SCOTT presented a petition of Federal Labor Union No. 8532, of Martinsburg, W. Va., praying for the enactment of legislation providing an educational test for immigrants to this country; which was referred to the Committee on Immigration.

He also presented a petition of sundry citizens of West Virginia, praying for the adoption of certain amendments to the internal-revenue laws relative to the tax on distilled spirits; which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. COCKRELL presented a petition of Colonel Hassendeubel Post, No. 13, Department of Missouri, Grand Army of the Republic, of St. Louis, Mo., 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 a memorial of Typographical Union No. 206, of Sedalia, Mo., remonstrating against the enactment of legislation permitting the importation of books printed in a foreign language; which was referred to the Committee on Patents.

He also presented a memorial of Cigar Makers' Local Union No. 23, of Springfield, Mo., remonstrating against the enactment of legislation to reduce the import duty on cigars from Cuba and the Philippines; which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. COCKRELL. In support of Senate bill 2974, granting an increase of pension to Samuel J. Boyer, I present the affidavit of Dr. W. E. Dawson of April 12, 1902, showing total blindness. I move that the affidavit be referred to the Committee on Pensions, to be considered in connection with the bill.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. FRYE presented a petition of the League of American Sportsmen, praying for the enactment of legislation providing for the protection of game in the Western States; which was referred to the Committee on Forest Reservations and the Protection of Game.

#### DIVORCE LAW OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA.

Mr. WELLINGTON. I present a document relating to the divorce law of the District of Columbia. It is practically the same as Senate Document No. 174, Fifty-sixth Congress, first session, with additions. I move that it be printed as a document and referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

The motion was agreed to.

#### REPORTS OF COMMITTEES.

Mr. MALLORY, from the Committee on Patents, to whom was referred the bill (S. 4647) to amend section 4929 of the Revised Statutes, relating to design patents, reported it with an amendment, and submitted a report thereon.

Mr. HANNA, from the Committee on Naval Affairs, to whom was referred the bill (S. 4577) for the relief of William McCarty Little, reported it with an amendment, and submitted a report thereon.

Mr. DEBOE, from the Committee on Pensions, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. 6760) granting a pension to Susan House, reported it without amendment, and submitted a report thereon.

Mr. GALLINGER, from the Committee on the District of Columbia, to whom was referred the bill (S. 2699) to provide for the temporary detention of persons dangerously insane in the District of Columbia, reported it with an amendment, and submitted a report thereon.

He also, from the Committee on Pensions, to whom were referred the following bills, reported them severally without amendment, and submitted reports thereon:

A bill (S. 5153) granting an increase of pension to Eri W. Pinkham;

A bill (H. R. 11550) granting an increase of pension to William G. Gray; and

A bill (H. R. 2207) granting an increase of pension to Louis Hahn.

Mr. PENROSE, from the Committee on Post-Offices and Post-Roads, to whom were referred the following bills, reported them severally without amendment:

A bill (S. 2229) for the relief of J. M. Bloom;

A bill (S. 3779) for the relief of Thomas J. McGinnis; and

A bill (S. 2709) for the relief of John F. Finney.

#### PRINTING OF GENERAL INFORMATION SERIES.

Mr. PLATT of New York. I am directed by the Committee on Printing to report a joint resolution, and I ask for its present consideration.

The joint resolution (S. R. 79) providing for the printing of 3,000 copies of each volume of the General Information Series, the annual publication of the Office of Naval Intelligence, Navy Department, in addition to the number now authorized by law, was read the first time by its title, and the second time at length, as follows:

*Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,* That hereafter there shall be printed, in addition to the number now authorized by law, of each volume of General Information Series, the annual publication of the Office of Naval Intelligence, Navy Department, 3,000 copies, of which 1,000 copies shall be for the use of the Senate and 2,000 copies for the use of the House of Representatives.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the joint resolution?

There being no objection, the joint resolution was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

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

#### MANUAL OF SURVEYING.

Mr. HANSBROUGH. I am directed by the Committee on Public Lands, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. 12536) to further amend section 2399 of the Revised Statutes of the United States, to report it favorably without amendment, and I ask unanimous consent, it being a short bill, that it be considered at this time.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be read in full to the Senate for its information.

The Secretary read the bill, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.,* That section 2399 of the Revised Statutes of the United States, as amended by act of Congress of October 1, 1890 (Stat. L., vol. 26, p. 659), and act of Congress of August 15, 1894 (Stat. L., vol. 28, p. 285), be further amended so as to read as follows, namely:

"Sec. 2399. The printed Manual of Surveying Instructions for the survey of the public lands of the United States and private land claims, prepared at the General Land Office, and bearing date January 1, 1902, the instructions of the Commissioner of the General Land Office, and the special instructions of the surveyor-general, when not in conflict with said printed manual or the instructions of said Commissioner, shall be taken and deemed to be a part of every contract for surveying the public lands of the United States and private land claims."

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. RAWLINS. I do not quite understand the purpose of the bill.

Mr. HANSBROUGH. The bill simply reenacts the existing law legalizing the Manual of Surveying Instructions. It merely changes the date in the law, as has been the custom heretofore. The urgency of the case is owing to the fact that the printed instructions are now in the hands of the printer, and the passage of the bill at this time will obviate delay.

There being no objection, the bill was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment.

Mr. QUAY. As it seems that nothing is indicated in the title of the bill, I should be very glad to have the Senator from North Dakota explain its purpose.

Mr. HANSBROUGH. I thought I had explained the purpose of the bill. In order to make it more clear, I think it would be well to have the report of the House committee read.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The report will be read.

The Secretary read as follows:

Mr. LACEY, from the Committee on the Public Lands, submitted the following report (to accompany H. R. 12536):

Your committee recommend the passage of the bill without amendment. The bill was introduced at the request of the Department of the Interior, as contained in the following House document:

[House Document No. 456, Fifty-seventh Congress, first session.]

#### DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR,

Washington, March 11, 1902.

SIR: I inclose a copy of a letter from the Commissioner of the General Land Office, dated the 8th instant, in which he has asked that the Congress be requested to legalize the Manual of Surveying Instructions, dated January 1, 1902, approved by the Department December 30, 1901, and now in the hands of the printer, by an act in the usual form and as embodied in his letter.

I have the honor to recommend that the legalizing measure, as requested by the Commissioner, be enacted into law, and invite attention to the suggestion of early action.

Very respectfully,

THOS. RYAN, *Acting Secretary.*

#### DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR,

GENERAL LAND OFFICE,

Washington, D. C., March 8, 1902.

SIR: I have the honor to request that Congress may be requested to legalize the Manual of Surveying Instructions, dated January 1, 1902, recently approved by the Department, and now in the hands of the Printer, by the following act, which is in the same language as the act legalizing the Manual of 1894 (see U. S. Stats., vol. 28, p. 285).

I have the honor to ask that the immediate attention of Congress may be at once called to this proposed legislation in order that the date of Congressional enactment may be inserted in the manual when issued.

Very respectfully,

BINGER HERMANN, *Commissioner.*

THE SECRETARY OF THE INTERIOR.

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

#### IRRIGATION STATISTICS.

Mr. HANSBROUGH, from the Committee on Public Lands, to whom was referred the concurrent resolution submitted by Mr. MITCHELL on the 12th instant, authorizing the Director of the Census to complete certain statistics relating to the present condition of irrigation, asked to be discharged from its present consideration and that it be referred to the Committee on the Census; which was agreed to.

#### BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS INTRODUCED.

Mr. CULLOM (for Mr. MASON) introduced a bill (S. 5259) granting a pension to Isadore T. W. Gillmore; which was read twice

by its title, and, with the accompanying paper, referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. QUAY introduced a bill (S. 5260) to provide for the purchase of a site and the erection of a public building thereon at Easton, Pa.; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Mr. MITCHELL introduced a bill (S. 5261) reserving from the public lands in the State of Oregon, as a public park for the benefit of the people of the United States, and for the protection and preservation of the game, fish, timber, and all other natural objects therein, a tract of land herein described, and so forth; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Public Lands.

Mr. PENROSE introduced the following bills; which were severally read twice by their titles, and referred to the Committee on Pensions:

A bill (S. 5262) granting an increase of pension to John H. Martens;

A bill (S. 5263) granting a pension to Fannie Frost; and

A bill (S. 5264) granting a pension to Jane E. Morris (with accompanying papers).

Mr. PENROSE introduced a bill (S. 5265) to grant an honorable discharge from the military service to Frank McCloskey; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying paper, referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. FRYE introduced a bill (S. 5266) granting an increase of pension to Robert E. Wardwell; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying paper, referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also introduced a bill (S. 5267) granting an increase of pension to Peter Farley; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying paper, referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. HOAR introduced a bill (S. 5268) granting an increase of pension to Florence Courtney Cochnower; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. CULLOM introduced a bill (S. 5269) to provide a commission to secure plans and designs for a monument or memorial to the memory of Abraham Lincoln, late President of the United States; which was read twice by its title.

Mr. CULLOM. I desire to state that I introduced a bill very much like this some time ago, but after consultation it was changed somewhat, and I have now introduced the bill as improved. I move that it be referred to the Committee on the Library.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. COCKRELL introduced a bill (S. 5270) granting an increase of pension to Abner Taylor; which was read twice by its title.

Mr. COCKRELL. To accompany the bill I present the petition of Abner Taylor for an increase of pension, together with the affidavits of John J. C. Owens, John Keohler, Dr. A. R. Elder, and Dr. M. P. Overholser. I move that the bill and accompanying papers be referred to the Committee on Pensions.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. COCKRELL introduced a bill (S. 5271) granting an increase of pension to Jacob Stiger; which was read twice by its title.

Mr. COCKRELL. To accompany the bill I present the petition of Jacob Stiger, late private, Company I, Forty-ninth Ohio Veteran Volunteer Infantry, for increase of pension, together with the affidavits of Dr. T. M. Anderson, J. C. B. Davis, G. W. Morgan, and John Bailey, and also the Pension Office letter of March 15, 1902. I move that the bill and accompanying papers be referred to the Committee on Pensions.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. McMILLAN introduced a joint resolution (S. R. 80) postponing the payment of taxes on real estate in the District of Columbia for the fiscal year 1903, from November, 1902, to May, 1903, and for other purposes; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

He also introduced a joint resolution (S. R. 81) to enlarge the use of electric conduits in the District of Columbia; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

#### AMENDMENT TO SUNDRY CIVIL APPROPRIATION BILL.

Mr. QUAY submitted an amendment proposing to appropriate \$50,000 for the construction, under the direction of the Secretary of the Treasury, of a steam revenue cutter for service at the port of Philadelphia, intended to be proposed by him to the sundry civil appropriation bill; which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

HENRY F. TOWER.

On motion of Mr. TELLER, it was

*Ordered*, That the Committee on Pensions be discharged from the further consideration of the bill (S. 939) granting a pension to Henry F. Tower, and that leave be granted the said Henry F. Tower to withdraw the papers in the case from the files of the Senate.

#### INJUNCTIONS IN CONSPIRACY CASES.

On motion of Mr. HOAR, it was

*Ordered*, That Senate Document No. 190, Fifty-seventh Congress, first session, be printed for the use of the Senate.

ANDREW J. FELT.

Mr. GALLINGER submitted the following report:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (S. 2671) granting a pension to Andrew J. Felt having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

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

J. H. GALLINGER.

WM. J. DEBOE,

GEO. TURNER,

*Managers on the part of the Senate.*

W. A. CALDERHEAD,

J. A. NORTON,

HENRY R. GIBSON.

*Managers on the part of the House.*

The report was agreed to.

ROBERT J. SPOTTSWOOD.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the action of the House of Representatives disagreeing to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 7018) for the relief of Robert J. Spottswood and the heirs of William C. McClellan, deceased, and requesting a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon.

Mr. PENROSE. I move that the Senate insist on its amendment and accede to the request of the House for a conference.

The motion was agreed to.

By unanimous consent, the President pro tempore was authorized to appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate, and Mr. PENROSE, Mr. LODGE, and Mr. CLAY were appointed.

JANE K. HILL.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the amendment of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 201) granting an increase of pension to Jane K. Hill, which was, in line 8, before the word "dollars," to strike out "thirty" and insert "twenty-five."

Mr. GALLINGER. I move that the Senate agree to the amendment made by the House of Representatives.

The motion was agreed to.

#### HOUSE BILLS REFERRED.

The bill (H. R. 8752) authorizing the board of supervisors of Santa Cruz County, Ariz., to issue bonds for the erection of a court-house and jail for said county was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Territories.

The bill (H. R. 12452) granting to the Mobile, Jackson and Kansas City Railroad Company the right to use for railroad purposes the tract of land at Choctaw Point, Mobile County, Ala., and now held for light-house purposes was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Commerce.

The bill (H. R. 13025) to make the provisions of an act of Congress approved February 28, 1892 (26 Stat., 796), applicable to the State of Utah was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Public Lands.

HANNAH T. KNOWLES.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following resolution from the House of Representatives; which was read:

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, April 14, 1902.

*Resolved*, That the bill (H. R. 11418) entitled "A bill granting an increase of pension to Hannah T. Knowles," with the accompanying message of the President, be transmitted to the Senate by the Clerk, with the request that the Senate reconsider its action in passing the bill, in order that the bill may be amended as follows:

Change the title so as to read: "A bill granting a pension to Hannah T. Knowles."

Change the initial letter in name of the deceased sailor from "T" to "M," so as to read: "William M. Knowles."

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President, a few days ago a Senate bill was recalled from the President precisely similar to this one. Understanding that after a bill had been signed by the presiding officers of the two Houses of Congress it could not be reconsidered and amended, I introduced a new bill, which was passed through the Senate and sent to the other House. I want now to ask the Chair whether, in his opinion, it is competent for this body to reconsider and amend a bill that has received the signatures of the presiding officers of the two Houses?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair the only remedy in such a case is the introduction of a new bill.

Mr. GALLINGER. Very well. Then I move that the resolution of the House of Representatives lie on the table.

The motion was agreed to.

#### IMPROVEMENT OF EVERETT HARBOR, WASHINGTON.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the amendments of the House of Representatives to the joint resolution (S. R. 56) providing for a modification in the adopted

project for the improvement of Everett Harbor, Washington, which were, in line 6, to strike out "postpone" and insert "abandon;" in line 7, to strike out all after the word "and," where it occurs the second time, down to and including "deepen," in line 8, and insert "any balance heretofore appropriated or authorized for the present approved project may be used for the widening or deepening of;" and in line 9, after the word "and," to insert "the Secretary of War may."

Mr. FOSTER of Washington. I move that the Senate concur in the amendments to the joint resolution proposed by the House or Representatives.

The motion was agreed to.

#### REPORT OF BUREAU OF AMERICAN REPUBLICS.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, which was read, and, with the accompanying papers, was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, and ordered to be printed:

To the Senate and House of Representatives:

I transmit herewith a communication from the Acting Secretary of State submitting the annual report of the Director of the Bureau of American Republics, with accompanying papers.

THEODORE ROOSEVELT.

WHITE HOUSE, April 15, 1902.

#### CHINESE EXCLUSION.

Mr. PENROSE. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Senate bill 2960, known as the Chinese-exclusion bill.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 2960) to prohibit the coming into and to regulate the residence within the United States, its Territories, and all possessions and all territory under its jurisdiction, and the District of Columbia, of Chinese persons and persons of Chinese descent.

Mr. FAIRBANKS. Mr. President, I wish to give notice that after the routine morning business on to-morrow I shall submit some remarks upon the pending bill.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President, I have a large number of telegrams received by the President pro tempore of the Senate in reference to certain features of the bill now under consideration, which I have been requested to read.

SAN FRANCISCO, CAL., April 14, 1902.

The PRESIDENT OF THE SENATE, Washington, D. C.:

Through a telegraphic dispatch from Washington James R. Dunn, chief inspector of the Chinese bureau at San Francisco, is accredited with having made before the honorable Senate Committee of Immigration the following statement: "Passengers denied admission are apt to be held anywhere from three weeks to six months, as in almost every such case an appeal is taken to the Secretary of the Treasury, and the delays are caused by the action of the attorneys engaged in this business, who have no scruples as to the methods applied in fighting their cases, in holding up the Chinamen for all that can be obtained from them, and pursuing tactics which would not be permitted in any court and which place this class of attorneys quite outside of the pale of legal practitioners. I do not hesitate to say that many of the attorneys with whom we have to deal are absolutely unscrupulous and engage in the promotion of fraudulent cases to such an extent that they can not find employment in the respectable practice of the law."

The undersigned attorneys and counselors at law of San Francisco, practicing in the State and Federal courts, who at times have business before the Chinese bureau, and to whom the above-quoted language by inference may be held to refer, beg leave to reply thereto. The statement that the undersigned act in other than an upright manner in the presentation of their cases or that they pursue unscrupulous methods or tactics which would not be permitted in any court of justice is absolutely and unqualifiedly false and malicious. The undersigned most earnestly and respectfully request that Mr. Dunn be called upon to give the names of those attorneys with whom he has to deal and who he states are absolutely unscrupulous and engaged in the promotion of fraudulent cases. As to the professional and individual character and standing of the undersigned, they most respectfully refer to the honorable Senators from California and to the various Representatives from the Congressional districts of this State. The undersigned feel that in justice to themselves a full investigation of the charges made in the above statement should be made.

Very respectfully submitted.

GEO. A. MCGOWAN.

H. S. FOOTE,

Late United States Attorney,

Northern District California.

WM. M. MADDEN.

JOSEPH C. MEYERSTEIN.

DENSON & COHLESINGER.

NATHAN C. COUGHLAN.

STIDGER & STIDGER.

JOHN E. BENNETT.

FRANK V. BELL.

GASTON STRAUSS.

JAMES L. GALLAGHER.

OLIVER DIBBLE.

H. C. SCHAERTFER.

J. E. FOULDS.

EARLL W. WEBB.

TACOMA, WASH., April 14, 1902.

Senator W. P. FRYE, Washington, D. C.:

We protest against adoption Clark amendment to Chinese-exclusion bill.

PACIFIC COLD STORAGE CO.  
NATIONAL BANK OF COMMERCE.  
LONDON AND SAN FRANCISCO BANK, LTD.  
GREAT WESTERN STOVE CO.  
PUGET SOUND SAVINGS BANK.  
PACIFIC NATIONAL BANK.  
HARDY SHIPBUILDING CO.  
FIDELITY TRUST CO.  
LUMBERMEN'S NATIONAL BANK.  
DODWELL & CO.

SEATTLE, WASH., April 14, 1902.

Hon. W. P. FRYE, United States Senate, Washington, D. C.:

I beg you to use all possible influence to defeat Clark amendment to exclusion act. Its adoption means disaster to American shipping interests on Pacific coast.

M. F. BACKUS,

President Washington National Bank.

SEATTLE, WASH., April 14, 1902.

Hon. WILLIAM P. FRYE, United States Senate, Washington, D. C.:

I respectfully urge you to prevent, if possible, the passage of Clark amendment to Chinese-exclusion act. Its passage would be serious blow to Pacific Ocean shipping, and its failure to pass would do no injury.

HERMAN CHAPEN,

President Boston National Bank of Seattle.

SEATTLE, WASH., April 14, 1902.

Hon. W. P. FRYE, United States Senate, Washington, D. C.:

In the interest of American shipping on the Pacific we earnestly urge the adoption of the Platt amendment to Chinese-exclusion bill, proposing reenactment of Geary exclusion act. This bill as it stands without this amendment might as well be entitled "An act to drive out American ships from the trans-Pacific continental trade," for unless amended our trans-Pacific traffic to the Orient will pass from American to foreign bottoms.

J. FURTH.

SEATTLE, WASH., April 14, 1902.

Hon. W. P. FRYE, United States Senate, Washington, D. C.:

Believing Clark amendment to Chinese-exclusion bill disastrous to our shipping interests, I urge everything be done to prevent such errors.

E. V. ANDREWS, President.

PELZER MILLS, S. C., April 15, 1902.

Senator FRYE, United States Senate, Washington, D. C.:

The Pelzer Manufacturing Company and the Belton Mills, of South Carolina, exporters of cotton goods to China, repeat our protest against the Mitchell Chinese-exclusion act and favor the Platt amendment.

ELLISON A. SMYTHE, President.

NEW YORK, April 14, 1902.

Hon. WILLIAM P. FRYE, President Senate, Washington, D. C.:

It is our sincere hope that the contemplated legislation looking to drastic Chinese exclusion will be defeated in the Senate and the Platt amendment adopted.

DEERING, MILLIKEN & CO.

SAN FRANCISCO, CAL., April 14, 1902.

Hon. W. P. FRYE, President Senate, Washington, D. C.:

Strongly urge the adoption of Platt amendment, April 11, reenacting Geary Act.

ABNER DOBLE CO.,

M. A. DOBLE, President.

SAN FRANCISCO, CAL., April 15, 1902.

Hon. W. P. FRYE, President Senate, Washington, D. C.:

Geary Act by Platt amendment April 11 will give all the protection desired.

PACIFIC METAL WORKS,  
J. A. MORROW, President.

SAN FRANCISCO, CAL., April 15, 1902.

Hon. W. P. FRYE, President of the Senate, Washington, D. C.:

Highly recommend passage of Geary Act by Platt amendment of April 11.

LEMOINE SCOLLEY.

SAN FRANCISCO, CAL., April 14, 1902.

Hon. W. P. FRYE, President Senate, Washington, D. C.:

Platt amendment April 11 reenacting Geary Act we consider fully protects American interests and American labor. Urge its passage.

BYXBEE & CLARK.

SAN FRANCISCO, CAL., April 14, 1902.

Hon. W. P. FRYE, President Senate, Washington, D. C.:

Strongly urge passage Platt amendment April 11 reenacting present Geary Act.

A. A. WIGMORE,  
Vice-President John Wigmore & Sons Co.

SAN FRANCISCO, CAL., April 14, 1902.

Hon. W. P. FRYE, President Senate, Washington, D. C.:

Failure to pass Platt amendment April 11, reenacting Geary Act, will prove detrimental commercial interests of the entire nation.

E. L. ALLEN,  
Agent Newport Wharf and Lumber Company.

SAN FRANCISCO, CAL., April 14, 1902.

Hon. W. P. FRYE, President Senate, Washington, D. C.:

Imperative Platt amendment, April 11, be passed reenacting present Geary Act in order secure best results this coast, as also country at large.

H. LEVI & Co.,  
By J. LEVI, JR., Treasurer.

SAN FRANCISCO, CAL., April 14, 1902.

Hon. W. P. FRYE, President Senate, Washington, D. C.:

Consider pending bill injurious, and interest of the country will be fully protected by Platt amendment reenacting Geary Act.

W. S. RAY MANUFACTURING CO.

- SAN FRANCISCO, CAL., April 14, 1902.  
 Hon. W. P. FRYE, *President Senate, Washington, D. C.*:  
 Consider business interests Pacific slope demand acceptance Platt amendment, April 11, reenactment present Geary law.  
 NEVILLE & CO.,  
 By C. M. OSBORN, *President*.
- SAN FRANCISCO, CAL., April 14, 1902.  
 Hon. W. P. FRYE, *President Senate, Washington, D. C.*:  
 Best interests Pacific coast served by Platt amendment, April 11, reenacting present Geary law.  
 HAAS BROS.
- SAN FRANCISCO, CAL., April 14, 1902.  
 Hon. W. P. FRYE, *President Senate, Washington, D. C.*:  
 Many interests will suffer by passage pending measure. Would urge substitution Platt amendment reenacting Geary Act.  
 C. J. HENDRY CO.,  
 By G. W. HENDRY, *President*.
- SAN FRANCISCO, CAL., April 14, 1902.  
 Hon. W. P. FRYE, *President Senate, Washington, D. C.*:  
 Please urge passage Platt amendment reenacting Geary Act. This will fully protect labor interests.  
 BOESCH LAMP COMPANY,  
 EDWIN SAVERY, *Vice-President*.
- SAN FRANCISCO, CAL., April 14, 1902.  
 Hon. W. P. FRYE, *President Senate, Washington, D. C.*:  
 Consider mercantile interests California best served by passage Platt amendment, April 11, reenacting Geary Act.  
 MEESE & GOTTFRIED CO.,  
 By F. GOTTFRIED, *Secretary*.
- SAN FRANCISCO, CAL., April 14, 1902.  
 Hon. W. P. FRYE, *President Senate, Washington, D. C.*:  
 Demand passage Platt amendment April 11, reenacting present Geary Act, otherwise detrimental best interests this section.  
 G. M. JOSSELY & Co., Inc.,  
 By A. W. FORBES, *Manager*.
- SEATTLE, WASH., April 14, 1902.  
 Hon. WILLIAM P. FRYE, *President Senate, Washington, D. C.*:  
 Re proposed exclusion act, unamended House bill too severe. Believe reenactment Geary Act sufficient to prevent unrestricted immigration.  
 MERCHANTS' ASSOCIATION.
- SAN FRANCISCO, CAL., April 14, 1902.  
 Hon. W. P. FRYE, *Senate, Washington, D. C.*:  
 Please urge passage Platt amendment April 11, reenacting Geary Act. Not only the commerce but the industries of this coast would be injured by pending bill.  
 GORHAM RUBBER CO.,  
 By E. H. PARRISH, *Vice-President*.
- SAN FRANCISCO, CAL., April 14, 1902.  
 Hon. W. P. FRYE, *President Senate, Washington, D. C.*:  
 Present Geary Act protects American labor. Favor Platt amendment April 11.  
 HOOPER & JENNINGS,  
 By H. M. JOHNS, *Secretary*.
- SAN FRANCISCO, CAL., April 14, 1902.  
 Hon. W. P. FRYE, *Senate, Washington, D. C.*:  
 Pending bill too severe. Passage Platt amendment, April 11, reenacting present Geary Act, far preferable.  
 L. P. DEGEN BELTING CO.,  
 By L. P. DEGEN, *President*.
- SAN FRANCISCO, CAL., April 14, 1902.  
 Hon. W. P. FRYE, *Washington, D. C.*:  
 Passage pending Chinese-exclusion act would be a national misfortune. Would urge Platt amendment reenacting Geary Act.  
 CRUCIBLE STEEL CO. OF AMERICA,  
 By K. L. HYDES, *Manager*.
- SAN FRANCISCO, CAL., April 14, 1902.  
 Hon. W. P. FRYE, *Washington, D. C.*:  
 Platt amendment reenacting Geary Act entirely satisfactory. Pending bill too severe.  
 ALLEN & HIGGINS LUMBER CO.,  
 By K. E. HIGGINS, *Secretary*.
- SAN FRANCISCO, CAL., April 14, 1902.  
 Hon. W. P. FRYE, *Washington, D. C.*:  
 Consider the interests this coast would be injured by passage pending act. Platt amendment reenacting Geary Act satisfactory.  
 JUDSON MANUFACTURING CO.,  
 By J. D. OSBORNE, *Secretary*.
- SAN FRANCISCO, CAL., April 14, 1902.  
 Hon. W. P. FRYE, *Senate, Washington, D. C.*:  
 Platt amendment reenacting Geary Act would be highly satisfactory. Pending bill altogether too severe.  
 CALIFORNIA ARTISTIC METAL AND WIRE CO.,  
 By ST. JOHN E. MCCORMACK, *Secretary*.
- SAN FRANCISCO, CAL., April 14, 1902.  
 Hon. W. P. FRYE, *Washington, D. C.*:  
 Believe reenactment Geary Act will fully protect American interests, and Platt amendment April 11 should be passed.  
 FRED B. HAIGHT.
- SAN FRANCISCO, CAL., April 14, 1902.  
 Hon. W. P. FRYE, *Senate, Washington, D. C.*:  
 Platt amendment April 11 fully protects us. Present Geary Act should be reenacted.  
 VULCAN IRON WORKS,  
 By GEO. M. PINCKARD, *President*.
- SAN FRANCISCO, CAL., April 14, 1902.  
 Hon. W. P. FRYE, *Senate, Washington, D. C.*:  
 Consider Geary Act protects American labor. Urge passage Platt amendment April 11.  
 PACIFIC TOOL AND SUPPLY CO.,  
 By CHAS. STALLMAN, *Proprietor and Manager*.
- SAN FRANCISCO, CAL., April 14, 1902.  
 Hon. W. P. FRYE, *Senate, Washington, D. C.*:  
 Confident reenactment Geary bill would be advantageous to labor and mercantile interest alike.  
 DODGE, SWEENEY & CO.
- SAN FRANCISCO, CAL., April 14, 1902.  
 Hon. W. P. FRYE, *Senate, Washington, D. C.*:  
 The Geary Act has well safeguarded American labor, and its reenactment as provided for in Platt amendment of April 11 is urged.  
 THE 76 LAND AND WATER CO.
- SAN FRANCISCO, CAL., April 14, 1902.  
 Hon. W. P. FRYE, *Senate, Washington, D. C.*:  
 Hope pending bill will not pass. Too drastic for American commercial interests. Would urge passage Platt amendment April 11.  
 LEVENSON & CO.,  
 By E. LEVENSON, *President*.
- SAN FRANCISCO, CAL., April 14, 1902.  
 Hon. W. P. FRYE, *Senate, Washington, D. C.*:  
 Consider pending bill objectionable to commercial interests. Platt amendment April 11 reenacting present Geary Act is what we want.  
 LOUIS T. SNOW & CO.
- SAN FRANCISCO, CAL., April 14, 1902.  
 Hon. W. P. FRYE, *Senate, Washington, D. C.*:  
 Exclusion bill of House will be great detriment to commerce; favor strongly Platt amendment of April 11 reenacting Geary law.  
 GETZ BROTHERS, Incorporated,  
 By LOUIS GETZ, *President*.
- SAN FRANCISCO, CAL., April 14, 1902.  
 Hon. W. P. FRYE, *Senate, Washington, D. C.*:  
 Platt amendment April 11, should be passed reenacting present Geary Act to best serve interests this section.  
 THE CHARLES NELSON CO.,  
 By JAMES TYSON, *Manager*.
- SAN FRANCISCO, CAL., April 14, 1902.  
 Hon. W. P. FRYE, *Washington, D. C.*:  
 The coolies will be kept out by the reenacting of the Geary law. The Platt amendment of April 11 should be carried.  
 J. K. ARMSBY,  
 A. G. FREEMAN,  
*Vice-President*.
- SAN FRANCISCO, CAL., April 14, 1902.  
 Hon. W. P. FRYE, *Senate, Washington, D. C.*:  
 We strongly advise adoption of Platt amendment of April 11, reenacting Geary Act.  
 HOLT BROTHERS CO.,  
*Of Stockton and San Francisco*.
- SAN FRANCISCO, CAL., April 14, 1902.  
 Hon. W. P. FRYE, *Senate, Washington, D. C.*:  
 Urgently recommend adoption Platt amendment April 11. Fully answers all requirements and will not hamper commerce.  
 DIECKMAN & CO.
- SAN FRANCISCO, CAL., April 14, 1902.  
 Hon. W. P. FRYE, *Senate, Washington, D. C.*:  
 Interests of the State would undoubtedly suffer by passage of impending measure. Highly favor Platt amendment reenacting Geary Act.  
 CHAS. NELSON.
- SAN FRANCISCO, CAL., April 14, 1902.  
 Hon. W. P. FRYE, *Senate, Washington, D. C.*:  
 Recommend passage of Platt amendment of April 11. House bill too drastic.  
 SCHWARTZ BROTHERS.
- SAN FRANCISCO, CAL., April 14, 1902.  
 Hon. W. P. FRYE, *Senate, Washington, D. C.*:  
 If Platt amendment, April 11, passed, reenacting present Geary Act, it will serve best interests Pacific coast.  
 S. E. SLADE LUMPER CO.,  
 By S. E. SLADE.

SAN FRANCISCO, CAL., April 14, 1902.

Hon. W. P. FRYE, *Senate, Washington, D. C.:*

Platt amendment of April 11 should be adopted. The House bill will be highly injurious to commerce of country.

MARK SHELDON COMPANY,  
MARK SHELDON, *President.*

SAN FRANCISCO, CAL., April 14, 1902.

PRESIDENT OF THE SENATE, *Washington, D. C.:*

We urge the substitution of the Platt amendment of April 11 for the House bill.

JOHN A. ROEBLING'S SONS COMPANY.  
S. V. MOONEY, *Manager.*

SAN FRANCISCO, CAL., April 14, 1902.

PRESIDENT OF THE SENATE, *Washington, D. C.:*

House bill too drastic. Favor Platt amendment April 11, reenacting Geary Act.

ERLANGER &amp; GALINGER.

SAN FRANCISCO, CAL., April 14, 1902.

PRESIDENT UNITED STATES SENATE, *Washington, D. C.:*

Platt amendment of April 11, reenacting Geary Act, keeps out coolies and fully protects American labor. House bill too stringent.

JONAS ERLANGER DAVIS Co.  
E. DAVIS, *Secretary.*

SAN FRANCISCO, CAL., April 14, 1902.

PRESIDENT OF SENATE, *Washington, D. C.:*

Instead of pending bill urge Platt amendment, April 11, reenacting Geary Act.

WOLF &amp; SONS.

SAN FRANCISCO, CAL., April 14, 1902.

Hon. W. P. FRYE, *Washington, D. C.:*

Platt amendment of April 11 keeps out cool labor and protects American labor without stifling commercial interests. Favor it.

LIVINGSTON &amp; CO.

SAN FRANCISCO, CAL., April 14, 1902.

Hon. W. P. FRYE, *Washington, D. C.:*

Urgently recommend passage of Platt amendment of April 11. Fully keeps out coolies, and will not injure commercial interests.

CASTLE BROS.

SAN FRANCISCO, CAL., April 14, 1902.

Hon. W. P. FRYE, *Washington, D. C.:*

We urgently ask adoption of Platt amendment of April 11, reenacting Geary law. Present proposed legislation is too drastic, and will seriously injure growing trade with the Orient.

HOOKER &amp; CO.

SAN FRANCISCO, April 15, 1902.

Hon. W. P. FRYE, *Senate, Washington, D. C.:*

We urgently favor adoption Platt amendment April 11, extending Geary law. House bill injurious to commerce.

FIELD MERCANTILE Co.,  
By F. F. LYDEN,  
*Treasurer and Manager,*  
*Director.*

SAN FRANCISCO, CAL., April 15, 1902.

Hon. W. P. FRYE, *Washington, D. C.:*

Platt amendment April 11, reenacting Geary Act, less drastic than Senate bill 2900. In our judgment protects mercantile and labor interests. We urge its adoption.

THE CALIFORNIA FRUIT AND WINE LAND CO.

SAN FRANCISCO, CAL., April 14, 1902.

Hon. W. P. FRYE, *Senate, Washington, D. C.:*

We urge adoption of the Platt amendment of April 11, reenacting Geary law.

GULF BAG Co.  
W. N. DEKKER, *Manager.*

SAN FRANCISCO, CAL., April 15, 1902.

Hon. W. P. FRYE, *Washington, D. C.:*

Commercial interests this coast demand passage Platt amendment April 11, reenacting present Geary Act.

F. H. AMES Co.,  
By F. H. AMES, *President.*

SAN FRANCISCO, CAL., April 14, 1902.

PRESIDENT OF THE SENATE, *Washington, D. C.:*

The Chinese have decreased in number under Geary Act. Consider it sufficient protection. House bill will be highly injurious. Urgently recommend adoption of Platt amendment of April 11.

WILSON &amp; BRO.

SAN FRANCISCO, CAL., April 14, 1902.

PRESIDENT OF THE SENATE, *Washington, D. C.:*

The adoption of the Platt amendment of April 11 will keep out all coolies and will not injure commercial relations with Orient. Favor its passage.

THE GUIDGE PUBLISHING Co.  
WM. F. EMPEY.

SAN FRANCISCO, CAL., April 14, 1902.

PRESIDENT OF THE SENATE, *Washington, D. C.:*

Commerce will be greatly injured by passage of House bill. Recommend passage of Platt amendment of 11th instant, extending Geary Act.

SHERWOOD &amp; SHERWOOD,

BENICIA, CAL., April 14, 1902

Hon. W. P. FRYE, *President of Senate, Washington, D. C.:*

We strongly urge adoption of Platt amendment of April 11, reenacting Geary Act.

BENICIA AGRICULTURAL WORKS.

LOS ANGELES, CAL., April 14, 1902.

Hon. W. P. FRYE, *United States Senate, Washington, D. C.:*

SIR: On behalf of the interests of the Pacific coast we respectfully urge the reenactment of the Geary Act with the Platt amendment.

J. S. Slauson, R. J. Waters, Harry Chandler, H. C. Austin, G. W. Burton, W. F. Botsford, E. P. Johnson, A. H. Naftzger, E. Q. Storry, J. A. Reid, James H. Adams, N. B. Blackstone, M. A. Newmark & Co., Herman W. Helman, A. B. Cass, Chas. Silent, A. A. Petsch, J. B. Lankershim, H. Jevno, E. Q. C. Klokke, J. M. Elliott, C. D. Willard, J. C. Drake, Jno. D. Hooker, F. W. King, Union Hardware and Metal Co., Haas, Barch & Co., W. H. Perry.

NEW YORK, April 14, 1902.

Senator W. P. FRYE, *United States Senate, Washington, D. C.:*

We most earnestly protest in the interest of our oriental trade against the passage of any such legislation as the Mitchell bill and in favor of the substitution of the Platt bill.

THE JOHN THOMSON PRESS CO.,  
THE NEPTUNE METER CO.,  
253 Broadway, New York City.

NEW YORK, N. Y., April 14, 1902.

Hon. WILLIAM P. FRYE, *United States Senator, Washington, D. C.:*

As stated before Immigration Committee, we regard any such legislation as proposed in Mitchell bill as threatening friendly commercial relations with China and imperiling development of a rapidly expanding trade.

CHINA AND JAPAN TRADING CO., LIMITED.

SAN FRANCISCO, CAL., April 14, 1902.

Hon. W. P. FRYE, *President of Senate, Washington, D. C.:*

Senator PLATT, in his amendment of April 11, extending the Geary Act, has judged our desires fully.

W. P. FULLER &amp; CO.

SAN FRANCISCO, CAL., April 14, 1902.

Hon. W. P. FRYE, *President of the Senate, Washington, D. C.:*

The sentiment of business interests here is, "Give us the Geary Act by Platt amendment April 11."

ROTH, BLUM &amp; CO.

SAN FRANCISCO, CAL., April 14, 1902.

Hon. W. P. FRYE, *President of Senate, Washington, D. C.:*

Geary Act and Platt amendment 11th instant means protection to our labor and trade to our exporters.

S. FOSTER &amp; CO.

SAN FRANCISCO, CAL., April 14, 1902.

Hon. W. P. FRYE, *President of the Senate, Washington, D. C.:*

The people demand protection to American labor, and that will be amply secured by the extension of the Geary Act by Platt amendment April 11.

H. S. CROCKER COMPANY,  
W. A. SWINERTON, *Secretary.*

SAN FRANCISCO, CAL., April 14, 1902.

Hon. W. P. FRYE, *President of Senate, Washington, D. C.:*

Times for all us will be better if we can have the Geary Act with Platt amendment of 11th instant.

SPERRY FLOUR Co.,  
JAMES HOGG, *Manager.*

SAN FRANCISCO, CAL., April 14, 1902.

Hon. W. P. FRYE, *President of Senate, Washington, D. C.:*

You are bound to satisfy all interests if Geary Act continued by amendment April 11 Senator PLATT.

LANGLEY & MICHAELS Co.,  
By C. T. MICHAELS, *Treasurer.*

SAN FRANCISCO, CAL., April 14, 1902.

Hon. W. P. FRYE, *President of the Senate, Washington, D. C.:*

Urgently advocate adoption Geary Act by Platt amendment 11th instant.

C. A. MALMS CO.

SAN FRANCISCO, CAL., April 14, 1902.

Hon. W. P. FRYE, *President of Senate, Washington, D. C.:*

China's demand for American products is increasing. Make our relationship with her closer by passing Geary Act with Platt amendment of April 11.

S. L. JONES CO.

SAN FRANCISCO, CAL., April 14, 1902.

Hon. W. P. FRYE, *President of the Senate, Washington, D. C.:*

All interests safeguarded by reenactment Geary Act by Platt amendment April 11.

J. C. JOHNSON &amp; CO.

SAN FRANCISCO, CAL., April 14, 1902.

Hon. W. P. FRYE, *President of the Senate, Washington, D. C.:*

The passage of Geary Act as amended by PLATT April 11 will not hurt a single interest, will fully protect labor, and is all we want.

THE HARRY UNNA COMPANY OF SAN FRANCISCO,  
Per HARRY UNNA, *President.*

SAN FRANCISCO, CAL., April 14, 1902.  
 Hon. W. P. FRYE, *President of the Senate, Washington, D. C.*:  
 Protection to the workman, business for the merchant, if you reenact Geary Act as amended by PLATT April 11.  
 STOCKTON MILLING CO.,  
 SIGMUND SCHWABACHER, *President.*

SAN FRANCISCO, CAL., April 14, 1902.  
 Hon. W. P. FRYE, *President of the Senate, Washington, D. C.*:  
 Ample protection secured by Geary Act, Platt amendment April 11.  
 ALBERT SUTTON.

MARTINEZ, CAL., April 14, 1902.  
 Hon. W. P. FRYE, *President United States Senate, Washington, D. C.*:  
 House bill unnecessarily drastic; urge adoption of Platt amendment of April 11.  
 R. L. ULSH.

SAN FRANCISCO, CAL., April 14, 1902.  
 Hon. W. P. FRYE, *President United States Senate, Washington, D. C.*:  
 Senate bill 2960 more drastic than necessary; same will materially injure growing trade with China. We suggest and urge passage of amendment offered by Mr. PLATT, reenacting Geary Act, thus giving full protection to American labor and not restricting growing trade relations with the Orient.  
 Respectfully,  
 BAKER & HAMILTON.

SAN FRANCISCO, CAL., April 14, 1902.  
 Hon. W. P. FRYE, *President of Senate, Washington, D. C.*:  
 Platt amendment of April 11 renewing Geary Act suits us well.  
 GEO. H. TAYLOR COMPANY,  
 E. P. DANFORTH, *President.*

SAN FRANCISCO, CAL., April 14, 1902.  
 Hon. W. P. FRYE, *President of Senate, Washington, D. C.*:  
 American labor will be best protected and our industries best profited by reenactment of Geary Act by Platt amendment 11th instant.  
 LEEGE & HASKINS.

SAN FRANCISCO, CAL., April 14, 1902.  
 Hon. W. P. FRYE, *President of Senate, Washington, D. C.*:  
 All commercial interests and welfare of American labor insured by extension of Geary Act by Platt amendment 11th instant.  
 WHEATON, POND & HARROLD, INCORPORATED,  
 GEO. S. WHEATON, *Secretary.*

SAN FRANCISCO, CAL., April 14, 1902.  
 Hon. W. P. FRYE, *President of Senate, Washington, D. C.*:  
 The sentiment of the commercial community favors reenactment of Geary Act by Platt amendment April 11.  
 NORTON, TELLER & RODEN.

SAN FRANCISCO, CAL., April 14, 1902.  
 Hon. W. P. FRYE, *President of Senate, Washington, D. C.*:  
 Public sentiment seems in favor reenactment Geary Act as per Platt amendment 11th instant.  
 JOHN TAYLOR & CO.

SAN ANSELMO, CAL., April 14, 1902.  
 Hon. W. P. FRYE, *President of Senate, Washington, D. C.*:  
 Respectfully petition all United States Senators vote for Platt amendment April 11, as other measures entirely too drastic and detrimental best interests Pacific coast, and particularly State of California.  
 EDWIN E. STODDARD.

SAN FRANCISCO, CAL., April 14, 1902.  
 Hon. W. P. FRYE, *President of Senate, Washington, D. C.*:  
 Platt amendment April 11 renewing Geary Act just what we want.  
 ELECTRIC RAILWAY AND MANUFACTURING SUPPLY CO.,  
 SAML. N. TAYLOR, *Treasurer.*

SAN FRANCISCO, CAL., April 14, 1902.  
 Hon. W. P. FRYE, *President Senate, Washington, D. C.*:  
 Our prosperity will be guaranteed if we get the Geary Act as amended by PLATT on 11th instant.  
 J. SCHWEITZER & CO.

SAN FRANCISCO, CAL., April 14, 1902.  
 Hon. W. P. FRYE, *President Senate, Washington, D. C.*:  
 Our present amicable relations with China would be continued by renewal of Geary Act as per Platt amendment April 11.  
 BLAKE, MOFFITT & TOWNE,  
 By A. G. TOWNE, *Secretary.*

SAN FRANCISCO, CAL., April 15, 1902.  
 Hon. W. P. FRYE, *President of the Senate, Washington, D. C.*:  
 Geary Act with Platt amendment 11th instant affords every protection to American labor and means volume of export trade.  
 GEO. W. CASWELL CO.,  
 GEO. W. CASWELL, *President.*

SAN FRANCISCO, CAL., April 15, 1902.  
 Hon. W. P. FRYE, *President of the Senate, Washington, D. C.*:  
 The Geary Act, as amended by PLATT April 11, is a just one to labor and capital alike. Let us have it.  
 M. EARMAN & CO.

SAN FRANCISCO, CAL., April 14, 1902.  
 Hon. W. P. FRYE, *President Senate, Washington, D. C.*:  
 Great benefit to all would result from enactment of Geary Act as amended by PLATT April 11.

BOWERS RUBBER CO.  
 W. F. BOWERS, *President.*

SAN FRANCISCO, CAL., April 14, 1902.  
 Hon. W. P. FRYE, *President of Senate, Washington, D. C.*:  
 Pass Geary Act amended by PLATT April 11; good for all interests.  
 GEO. W. TENDELL.

SAN FRANCISCO, CAL., April 14, 1902.  
 Hon. W. P. FRYE, *President of the Senate, Washington, D. C.*:  
 Reenactment of Geary Act by Platt amendment 11th instant protects our wage earners and encourages large field for our exports.  
 BOYLE, LACOSTE & CO.

SAN FRANCISCO, CAL., April 15, 1902.  
 Hon. W. P. FRYE, *United States Senate, Washington:*  
 The adoption of Geary Act by Platt amendment April 11 will please.  
 CHAS. C. MOORE & CO.

SAN FRANCISCO, CAL., April 15, 1902.  
 Hon. W. P. FRYE, *President Senate, Washington, D. C.*:  
 By all means extend Geary Act by Platt amendment April 11.  
 W. T. GARRATT & Co.,  
 Per A. L. TAYLOR,  
*Vice President and Treasurer.*

SAN FRANCISCO, CAL., April 15, 1902.  
 Hon. W. P. FRYE, *President Senate, Washington, D. C.*:  
 Earnestly desire the extension of Geary Act by Platt amendment of April 11.  
 H. N. COOK BELTING,  
 By WILTON H. COOK, *Manager.*

SAN FRANCISCO, CAL., April 15, 1902.  
 Hon. W. P. FRYE, *President Senate, Washington, D. C.*:  
 No interest will be injured by continuation of Geary Act, as suggested by PLATT April 11.  
 C. W. MARWEDEL & CO.

SAN FRANCISCO, CAL., April 15, 1902.  
 Hon. W. P. FRYE, *President Senate, Washington, D. C.*:  
 Heartily indorse Platt amendment April 11, Geary Act.  
 GEO. E. DOW PUMPING ENGINE CO.  
 GEO. E. DOW, *President.*

SAN FRANCISCO, CAL., April 15, 1902.  
 Hon. W. P. FRYE, *President Senate, Washington, D. C.*:  
 Favor enactment Geary Act by Platt amendment April 11.  
 JOHN FINN METAL WORKS,  
 By JOHN FINN, *President.*

SAN FRANCISCO, CAL., April 15, 1902.  
 Hon. W. P. FRYE, *President Senate, Washington:*  
 Unite all interests by passing Geary Act with Platt amendment of April 11.  
 NEW HALL'S SONS & CO.

SAN FRANCISCO, CAL., April 15, 1902.  
 Hon. W. P. FRYE, *President of the Senate, Washington, D. C.*:  
 You can not better please all good American citizens of the Pacific coast than by passing the Geary Act by Platt amendment April 11.  
 JOHN ROSENFELD'S SONS.

ALAMEDA, CAL., April 15, 1902.  
 Hon. W. P. FRYE, *President United States Senate, Washington, D. C.*:  
 For the protection of our commerce with China, respectfully urge the passage of the Platt amendment of April 11, reenactment Geary law. Consider other pending legislation absolutely inimical to United States interests at large, and particularly to interests of the Pacific coast.  
 CHARLES M. CURTIS.

SAN FRANCISCO, CAL., April 15, 1902.  
 Hon. W. P. FRYE, *President of Senate, Washington, D. C.*:  
 Reenactment of Geary Act, as proposed by Platt amendment 11th, means amicable and satisfactory settlement of question.  
 OSGOOD & HOWELL.

VISALIA, CAL., April 15, 1902.  
 WILLIAM P. FRYE, *President Senate, Washington, D. C.*:  
 Respectfully urge adoption Platt amendment April 11; House measure unnecessarily severe.  
 C. B. SIMMONS.

PORT COSTA, CAL., April 15, 1902.  
 Hon. W. P. FRYE, *President of Senate, Washington, D. C.*:  
 Platt amendment April 11 by all means most satisfactory.  
 J. C. QUINN.

SAN FRANCISCO, CAL., April 15, 1902.  
 Hon. W. P. FRYE, *President of Senate, Washington, D. C.*:  
 Times are very prosperous here. Give us the Geary Act, by Platt's amendment of April 11, and keep them so.  
 CONTRA COSTA LAUNDRY CO.,  
 By GEO. H. HALLETT, *President.*



SAN FRANCISCO, CAL., April 15, 1902.

Hon. W. P. FRYE, *President of Senate, Washington, D. C.:*

With existing laws have not had too great an influx of Chinese labor, and with the extension of the Geary Act by Platt amendment of April 11 we shall have greater protection in the future. Let us have it.

THE HICKS JUDD Co.,  
N. A. JUDD, *President.*

SAN FRANCISCO, CAL., April 15, 1902.

Hon. W. P. FRYE, *President of Senate, Washington, D. C.:*

Give us China's good will and her commercial patronage by extending Geary Act by Platt amendment of April 11.

FRANK B. PETERSON &amp; CO.

SAN FRANCISCO, CAL., April 15, 1902.

Hon. W. P. FRYE, *President of Senate, Washington, D. C.:*

Beg to offer hearty approval Platt amendment, 11th instant, to reenact Geary Act.

E. E. DRAKE,  
*Agent Union Metallic Cartridge Co.*

SAN FRANCISCO, CAL., April 15, 1902.

Hon. W. P. FRYE, *President of the Senate, Washington, D. C.:*

We want the Geary Act and Platt's amendment of April 11: no more.

DOUGLAS S. WATSON.

SAN FRANCISCO, CAL., April 14, 1902.

Hon. W. P. FRYE, *President of the Senate, Washington, D. C.:*

The American laborer will be protected by continuation of the Geary Act by the Platt amendment of April 11.

THE HASLETT WAREHOUSE CO.,  
By S. M. HASLETT, *Secretary.*

SAN MATEO, CAL., April 15, 1902.

Hon. W. P. FRYE, *President Senate, Washington, D. C.:*

We favor adoption of Platt amendment.

J. H. GAZELL,  
C. L. DRESBACH,  
CARL W. FISHER,  
GEO. B. DRESBACH,  
J. H. MOSS,  
WM. L. NORRIS,  
H. R. MOSS.

LOS ANGELES, CAL., April 14, 1902.

Hon. W. P. FRYE, *President Senate, Washington, D. C.:*

Collective telegram sent by J. S. Slauson this morning signed by leading citizens of Los Angeles.

F. Q. STORY,  
*President Chamber of Commerce.*  
NILES PEASE,  
*President Merchants and Manufacturers' Association.*

NEW YORK, April 14, 1902.

Hon. WILLIAM P. FRYE, *President Senate, Washington, D. C.:*

American Asiatic Association renews most emphatically the protest against Mitchell bill as contrary to treaty stipulations, flagrantly unjust to China, and calculated to provoke retaliation highly damaging to our trade association; favors Platt amendment.

SILAS D. WEBB, *President.*

SAUSALITO, CAL., April 15, 1902.

Hon. W. P. FRYE, *President Senate, Washington, D. C.:*

All interests would be best served by passage of the Platt amendment of April 11 reenacting Geary Act.

L. M. HICKMAN.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. President, it is said the earth produces poison and it also furnishes the antidote. My friend from New Hampshire has read many telegrams from representative citizens of California. It is, therefore, only fair that I should read a few of those I have received. First I will read one addressed to the Senate, in my care. It reads as follows:

SAN FRANCISCO, CAL., April 14, 1902.

To the Senate of the United States,

Care of Senator PERKINS,  
*Senate Chamber, Washington, D. C.:*

Senate bill 2900, as requested by committee, meets requirements of Pacific coast. Platt measure or all other similar bills hostile legislation. Protests San Francisco capitalists and Chamber of Commerce do not represent business interests in general.

E. E. SCHMITZ,  
*Mayor San Francisco.*

SAML. BRAUNHART,  
HORACE WILSON,  
ROBT. J. LOUGHERY,  
FRED K. EGGERS,  
W. J. WYMAN,  
JOHN A. LIANCH,  
GEO. B. McCLELLAN,

JOHN CONNER,  
PETER J. CURTIS,  
FRED N. BENT,  
A. COMLE, JR.,  
JAMES P. BOOTH,  
S. U. BRANDENSTE,  
HENRY PAYO,

*Members Board of Supervisors.*

As appears from its face, the gentlemen who signed this telegram are all members of the board of supervisors of San Francisco, a city which has, as Senators know, a population of 350,000, and the supervisors are the legislative body of that city.

The next telegram I shall read is as follows:

SAN FRANCISCO, CAL., April 14, 1902.

To the Senate of the United States,

Care of Hon. GEORGE C. PERKINS,  
*Washington, D. C.:*

Platt or any similar bill hostile legislation. Pacific coast requires Senate bill 2900, as reported by committee. Coterie San Francisco capitalists petitioning Senate not representative of mercantile community in general.

W. D. GOFF, *President,*  
ED ROSENBERG, *Secretary,*  
*San Francisco Labor Council.*

Another telegram I have here reads as follows:

SAN FRANCISCO, CAL., April 14, 1902.

To the Senate of the United States,

Care of Senator PERKINS,  
*Senate Chamber, Washington, D. C.:*

Senate bill 2900 meets all demands of Pacific coast. Platt bill and other proposed measures considered hostile. Protests of capitalists and chamber of commerce not believed to represent general business interests.

FRANK H. KERRIGAN,  
FRANK J. MURSAKY,  
J. V. COFFEY,  
THEOS. F. GRAHAM,  
*Judges of Superior Court.*

The next telegram I read, Mr. President, is as follows:

SAN FRANCISCO, CAL., April 14, 1902.

To the Senate of the United States,

Care of Hon. GEORGE C. PERKINS,  
*United States Senate, Washington, D. C.:*

Chinese should be excluded, and our people demand the passage by the Senate of the bill reported by committee.

JOSIAH HOWELL,  
*Police Commissioner, San Francisco,*

The next telegram is as follows:

SAN FRANCISCO, CAL., April 14, 1902.

To the Senate of the United States,

Care of Hon. GEORGE C. PERKINS,  
*United States Senate, Washington, D. C.:*

I earnestly commend and support all of the provisions of the Mitchell-Kahn bill, and consider that it should be immediately passed.

JOHN HUNT.

This gentleman is a judge of the superior court. I have another telegram, reading as follows:

SAN FRANCISCO, CAL., April 14, 1902.

To the Senate of the United States,

Care of Hon. GEORGE C. PERKINS,  
*United States Senate, Washington, D. C.:*

With few exceptions among capitalists, this State emphatically demands passage of bill now pending before Senate for exclusion of Chinese. Any substitute would certainly be hostile to interests of Pacific coast.

A. BOUVIER,  
*Ex-Chairman Republican County Committee.*

Mr. PROCTOR. Will the Senator from Pennsylvania in charge of the pending bill yield to me to move an executive session?

Mr. PENROSE. I yield for that purpose, Mr. President.

Mr. PATTERSON. I should like to have two telegrams read to supplement those just read by the Senator from California [Mr. PERKINS].

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Vermont withdraw his motion for that purpose?

Mr. PROCTOR. I withdraw the motion temporarily.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The telegrams submitted by the Senator from Colorado [Mr. PATTERSON] will be read.

The Secretary read as follows:

SAN FRANCISCO, CAL., April 14, 1902.

Senator PATTERSON,

*United States Senate, Washington, D. C.:*

The chamber of commerce statement in regard to the Chinese-exclusion bill is grossly misleading. It does not express the sentiment of the people of California. California will be ruined if the Chinese are admitted. In regard to Chinese firemen, all prominent engineers and the Marine Engineers' Association assert that white firemen are better and more reliable than Chinese in any climate.

H. B. LISTER,

*Secretary,*

And J. J. SEAREY.

*Business Manager of the Marine Engineers' Association.*

JOHN BELL,

*Secretary Pacific Coast Marine Firemen's Union.*

L. J. BARRY,

*Independent Longshore Union.*

JOHN KEAN,

*Secretary Sailors' Union of the Pacific.*

SAN FRANCISCO, CAL., April 14, 1902.

Senator PATTERSON, *United States Senate, Washington, D. C.:*

We, the American Association of Masters and Pilots of Steam Vessels, California Harbor, No. 15, state that white sailors and white firemen are superior to Chinese in all climates. We also condemn as misleading the statements of the chamber of commerce. We know of no greater calamity that could happen to the people of California than the admission of Chinese.

F. R. WALL, *Acting Captain.*

Mr. MITCHELL. I also desire to present some telegraphic dispatches on the same subject.

Mr. PENROSE. I hope the Senator will defer his request so that we may hold a brief executive session.

Mr. PROCTOR. The executive session will take only a moment, and it is quite important that the matter should be attended to immediately.

Mr. MITCHELL. Very well; I will withhold the telegrams for the present.

EXECUTIVE SESSION.

Mr. PROCTOR. I renew my motion that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business. After five minutes spent in executive session the doors were reopened.

ADDITIONAL URGENT DEFICIENCY APPROPRIATIONS.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the bill (H. R. 13627) making appropriations to supply additional urgent deficiencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1902, and for other purposes; which was read twice by its title.

Mr. HALE. I ask unanimous consent for the consideration of that bill at this time. After the bill shall have been taken up I shall offer an amendment to it.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

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

Mr. HALE. I offer the amendment which I send to the desk to come in at the end of the bill.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment submitted by the Senator from Maine will be stated.

The SECRETARY. At the end of the bill it is proposed to add the following:

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA.

Board of Children's Guardians: For care of feeble-minded children; board and care of all children committed to the guardianship of said board by the courts of the District, and for the temporary care of children pending investigation or while being transferred from place to place, \$9,000.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended, and the amendment was concurred in.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time, and passed.

CHINESE EXCLUSION.

The Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 2960) to prohibit the coming into and to regulate the residence within the United States, its Territories, and all possessions and all territory under its jurisdiction, and the District of Columbia, of Chinese persons and persons of Chinese descent.

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. President, I now desire to present some telegraphic dispatches in reference to the Chinese-exclusion bill. The first I shall present is signed by 16 members of the San Francisco board of supervisors, and is as follows:

SAN FRANCISCO, CAL., April 14, 1902.

Senator MITCHELL, Senate Chamber, Washington, D. C.:

Senate bill 2960 as requested by committee meets requirements of Pacific coast. Platt measure or all other similar bills hostile legislation. Protests San Francisco capitalists and chamber of commerce do not represent business interests in general.

- |                    |                   |
|--------------------|-------------------|
| SAML. BRAUNHART,   | PETER J. CURTIS,  |
| HORACE WILSON,     | FRED N. BENT,     |
| ROBT. J. LOUGHERY, | A. COMLE, JR.,    |
| FRED K. EGGERS,    | JAMES P. BOOTH,   |
| W. J. WYMAN,       | S. U. BRANDENSTE, |
| JOHN A. LIANCH,    | HENRY PAYOL,      |
| GEO. B. MCCLELLAN, | JOHN CONNER,      |
- Members Board of Supervisors.

E. E. SCHMILZ,  
Mayor San Francisco.

I also present a number of other telegrams relating to the same subject, which I ask to have read.

The telegrams were read, as follows:

SAN FRANCISCO, CAL., April 14, 1902.

Senator MITCHELL, Washington, D. C.:

We urge passage of Senate bill 2960 as only effective Chinese-exclusion measure. We protest against substitutes or amendments and especially against passage of Platt bills. A small band of San Francisco capitalists are misrepresenting position of general mercantile community and of the people.

M. CASEY,  
President Brotherhood of Teamsters,  
JOHN McLAUGHLIN,  
Secretary.

SAN FRANCISCO, CAL., April 14, 1902.

Hon. JOHN H. MITCHELL, United States Senate, Washington, D. C.:

People of the Pacific coast urge passage of Senate bill 2960 as reported by committee. Any representation that our people are not unit in demanding enactment of this bill is erroneous.

A. M. McDONALD,  
Member California Assembly, Tuolumne County.

SAN FRANCISCO, CAL., April 14, 1902.

Hon. JOHN H. MITCHELL, United States Senate, Washington, D. C.:

Interests of united labor and mercantile class demand enactment of Senate bill 2960. This coast and entire country will be injured by passage of any substitute. San Francisco capitalists who have petitioned otherwise represent only their own personal interests and do not speak for business community at large.

- H. M. Burnet, secretary San Francisco Machinists' Union, 68; Rudolph Speck, secretary Brewery Workmen's Union 227; George Hook, secretary Brewery Workmen's Union 27; Guy Lathrop, secretary California State Federation of Labor; D. McLennon, secretary San Francisco Iron Trades Council; C. J. Collins, president Pattern Makers' Union; Miss Hannah Mahoney, general secretary Laundry Workers' Union (2,600 members); E. I. Wisler, business agent Machinists' Union 28.

SAN FRANCISCO, CAL., April 14, 1902.

Hon. JOHN H. MITCHELL, United States Senate, Washington, D. C.:

Workmen and merchants of Pacific coast demand enactment of Senate bill 2960. Platt substitute or any other amendment is hostile to best interests of this coast.

San Francisco capitalists who ask for anything else do not represent mercantile or labor interests of our community.

- J. S. PARRY,  
Fire Commissioner, San Francisco, and Secretary Union Labor Party.  
A. H. EWELL,  
Chairman Union Labor Party.  
CAPTAIN KRIMPHOFF,  
Member Executive Committee Union Labor Party.  
V. BELLO,  
Longshoremen's Union.  
P. DUFFY,  
Tanners' Union.  
M. FITZPATRICK,  
Rammers and Pavers' Union.  
J. MULALLY,  
Executive Committee Boilermakers' Union.  
FRANK CARNEY,  
Machinists' Union.

Mr. HANSBROUGH. In connection with the telegrams which have been read on the Chinese question, I have received a telegram from San Francisco, which I think ought to go into the RECORD, and I ask that it be read at the desk. It is very brief.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Secretary will read as requested.

The Secretary read as follows:

SAN FRANCISCO, CAL., April 11, 1902.

Senator HANSBROUGH, United States Senate, Washington, D. C.:

Exclusion act, as proposed, will seriously injure all commerce and practically destroy our trade relations China. Reenactment Geary Act would cover necessary requirements and still allow us maintain and increase trade with China.

W. L. B. MILLS.

Mr. HEITFELD. Mr. President, I am opposed to the immigration of Chinese laborers to this country, and represent a people who would be deeply injured if it were permitted. The friends of exclusion desire a law that will exclude. A loosely drawn enactment will be ineffectual. I think the measure as presented meets the requirements. I see nothing in it that is not essential and doubt if it can be amended to advantage.

It is charged by the opponents of this measure that it is too harsh in its provisions, and some of the opposition even assert that it is inhumane. A careful comparison of the bill with the existing laws and the present Treasury regulations will disclose that the pending bill is no more severe than the laws now in force and that there is no material difference between them.

The severity of this bill is the only argument advanced against it by its opponents. Experience has taught us that the most stringent laws and regulations are necessary to effectually keep the Chinese laborers from coming here, and the Pacific coast Senators and Representatives are satisfied that nothing short of the proposed measure will successfully bring about the desired results.

The present laws and the Treasury regulations relating to them have successfully stood the test, and we now desire to embody the whole of them into one law, a law that is specific in all its details and not subject to as many possible constructions as we have officials to carry out its provisions.

The chief difficulty with the present laws is that they are too general in their scope. Hence, the Treasury found it necessary to make certain regulations and to define the meaning of certain terms in order to secure uniformity. For example:

Section 5 of the pending bill construes the term "official." The present law fails to do this.

Section 6 defines the term "teacher." At present the inspectors are governed by a definition laid down by the Treasury Department.

In section 7 the term "student" is likewise defined. The term "merchant" is defined in this bill the same as in the act of November 3, 1893.

So, throughout the entire bill every provision is plain and specific. Every provision of this bill with the exception of such

parts as pertain to our island possessions is either contained in the present laws or in the rules and regulations of the Treasury Department dealing with these laws.

There is some objection to that part of the bill which provides that Chinese laborers shall not come from any of the insular territory of the United States to the mainland territory. This also is but a copy of a law now on our statute books.

The joint resolution of July 7, 1898 (U. S. Stat., 1897-98, p. 751), provides as follows:

There shall be no further immigration of Chinese into the Hawaiian Islands except upon such conditions as are now or may hereafter be allowed by the laws of the United States, and no Chinese by reason of anything herein contained shall be allowed to enter the United States from the Hawaiian Islands.

Mr. President, a careful study of the hearings before the Committee on Immigration ought to satisfy any unprejudiced person that the men who appeared before the committee in opposition to this bill are not so much concerned about this measure in particular as they are about the policy of exclusion in general. Some of them were guarded in their statements, while others openly advocated the repeal of all restrictive legislation.

The Hon. John W. Foster, who appeared before the committee in opposition to this measure, was asked by Senator TURNER, "Do I understand you to say now that you are in favor of excluding the laborers?" He replied:

I think it is a wise thing to have a reasonable exclusion. I think we ought to admit them where they are needed, and I qualified my position by endeavoring to show to you that our commissioners gave assurances that just such a state of affairs as existed in the Hawaiian Islands is a case where you ought to allow the admission of Chinese. There are places where they ought not to come, and there are places where they ought to be permitted to come.

Mr. Maxwell Evarts, who appeared before the committee on behalf of the Pacific Steamship Company, stated that he was in favor of the "Proctor" bill. His chief concern appeared to be that part of section 39 which provides that it shall be unlawful for any vessel holding an American register to employ in its crew Chinese not entitled to admission in the United States. But while discussing this particular feature of the bill he did not forget the main object. He did not openly advocate the unrestricted admission of Chinese laborers, but argued in favor of less stringent regulations as regards the question of transit. Since, according to the testimony of Treasury officials, this is the most difficult provision to guard and carry out, it is very evident that Mr. Evarts would like this part of the bill so modified as to be an inducement for the Chinaman to try this particular method of getting into our country. Mr. Evarts took pains to call the attention of the committee to that particular part of the annual report of General MacArthur in which the general spoke of the many good qualities of the people of China. But when he came to the conclusion drawn by the general he differed from him.

Mr. Evarts's language was as follows:

Now, the conclusions which General MacArthur draws from this clean bill which he gives to the Chinaman are not the conclusions which this committee would naturally draw. He says that because of their industry and their high moral qualities they will drive the Filipino and the American citizen out of business. I do not believe that the American citizen will ever take a back seat as to the Chinaman. They will use him just as they used him in the placer mines of California and in building the transcontinental railroads. Prior to the Geary law, prior to the exclusion of the Chinaman, at the time when those railroads were built and at the time when those mines were being worked, there were a quarter of a million Chinamen in California. When their work was done, when the roads were built and the placer mines exhausted, all those Chinamen went home. At the time when the first exclusion act was passed, early in the eighties, there were only seventy-five thousand or so in California.

Now, this question as to the Philippines is really of vast importance. You hear from General MacArthur what kind of men the Chinamen are. I say he has drawn a wrong conclusion from the fact. I say that the American in developing the Philippines will need and use the Chinamen, and when their work is through they will go home to China, just as they went home to China after California had been developed.

The question as to the Philippines is even more important than the question as to the United States, because it is a new country which we seek to develop. The question is what is the best means of developing the Philippines. So I say that Senator PROCTOR's bill should be enacted, because it leaves the situation as it is and does not introduce new elements the result of which no one can foretell.

Mr. President, this gentleman stated that at the time the placer mines were being worked California had a quarter of a million Chinamen and that all but 75,000 of them had left for home at the time the first exclusion laws were passed. If Mr. Evarts is correct, then it is evident that the census reports for 1860 and 1870 are incorrect. The census reports of 1860 give the total number of Chinese in this country as 34,933 and the census of 1870 gives a Chinese population of 63,199.

Mr. President, there are Chinamen in my State who have been in this country for more than thirty years. According to Mr. Evarts's theory, they ought to have gone home several times, but, strange to say, they show no inclination of wanting to get away. Some of those Chinamen worked in placers when they came here. The placers have long been exhausted, but the Chinamen remain.

Mr. Evarts tells us further that even the people of California want the Chinese labor. He says that owing to the lack of Chinamen the children must stay home from school to do the work that ought to be done by Chinamen. On the other hand, when this question was submitted to the people of California 154,638 voted to exclude the Chinese from our country, while but 883 voted against exclusion. It is evident that either Mr. Evarts is mistaken or the people of California have voted contrary to their own sentiments. This vote was taken some years ago, but from my knowledge of the people of the Pacific slope I should say that if the vote were taken now even the 800 negative votes could not be found.

Mr. Stephen W. Nickerson, who said he represented the opinion of a public meeting held in Boston, was very emphatic before the committee in his opposition to this bill; he was more candid than some of his associates. He did not prefer the "Proctor" or any other bill. He was simply against all legislation that excludes the Chinese, and asked that they be accorded the same privileges as the people of other countries. Mr. Nickerson saw no danger from an unrestricted influx of Chinese. He said the "demand for this class of legislation comes from people who are more frightened than hurt." He saw no cause for alarm and appeared anxious to embrace all Chinese who care to come, providing we can get in return a good share of China's trade.

Mr. President, I do not undervalue the advantage of the oriental trade, but I would rather have us do without a dollar of the China trade forever than open our doors to her coolie population. The Pacific coast, and California in particular, have too long suffered from this blight. If no Chinaman had ever set foot on our soil, we would be tenfold better off. Wherever the Chinese laborers go in any considerable number, there the white workman does not care to remain. Wherever Chinese are employed as domestic servants in any considerable number, there no white woman cares to engage in the same class of work.

The only possible way of ever solving this vexed question is by effectually barring the doors to every Chinaman who labors for a living. It gives me a great deal of satisfaction to learn from the last census reports that although our Chinese population is not decreasing as rapidly as I would like, it is at least gradually relieving many sections of our coast of its obnoxious presence.

New England and the Eastern States are drawing a considerable number from us, and, without wishing any evil fortune to workmen of the East, I would not object if that section had them all.

Mr. President, I will not take up the time of the Senate to speak of the virtues and vices of the Chinese. All the characteristics of these people have been fully discussed by Senators preceding me in this debate. The people of the Pacific coast need no enlightenment on this phase of the question. Nothing that can be said for the Chinese appeals to us, and I fear that nothing that can be said against him will have any effect upon the sentimentalist, who, for some reason or other, wants no restrictive legislation to hinder him in coming to our soil.

The question before us is a vital one. It must be dealt with in a practical manner. Sentiment must not be allowed to warp our judgment. Neither ought we to allow ourselves to be influenced by greed for foreign trade. China herself is not sentimental in this respect. She buys where she can get the best terms. No exclusion laws that may be passed by the lawmaking power of this country will keep her from buying from us if we can sell cheaper than other countries.

Since the passage of the first exclusion law our trade with China has gradually grown from about \$9,000,000 in 1881 to over \$30,000,000 in 1899. The falling off of our trade in 1900 was owing to the Boxer movement, and this country did not suffer a greater decrease than any other country on the globe.

I will insert a table showing China's trade with the principal countries of the world for the years 1899 and 1900. This table is issued by the Bureau of Foreign Commerce, Department of State:

IMPORTS.

Country.	1899.		1900.	
	<i>Hk. taels.*</i>	\$	<i>Hk. taels.*</i>	\$
Great Britain.....	40,161,115	\$28,936,083	45,467,409	\$32,768,362
Hongkong.....	118,096,208	85,088,318	93,846,617	67,635,257
India.....	31,911,214	22,992,090	16,813,029	12,117,150
Straits Settlements.....	3,646,195	2,627,083	2,625,258	1,892,023
United States.....	22,288,745	16,059,041	16,724,493	12,053,342
Philippine Islands.....	21,641	15,582	12,815	9,236
Europe, except Russia.....	10,172,388	7,329,213	10,273,405	7,404,043
Russia.....	3,233,239	2,229,549	4,236,507	3,053,251
Manchuria, Russian.....	289,195	208,343	136,956	98,704
Japan and Formosa.....	35,896,745	25,863,065	25,752,694	18,559,967
Macao.....	3,498,516	2,455,835	2,236,289	1,611,693
Turkey in Asia, Persia, Egypt, etc.....	841,850	606,533	1,237,413	891,804

EXPORTS.				
Country.	1899.		1900.	
	<i>Hk. taels.*</i>		<i>Hk. taels.*</i>	
Great Britain.....	13,982,547	\$10,080,015	9,356,428	\$8,743,178
Hongkong.....	71,845,558	51,764,725	63,961,634	45,097,150
India.....	1,731,498	1,247,544	2,865,945	2,065,054
Singapore and Straits Settlements.....	2,231,792	1,608,006	2,435,355	1,755,160
United States.....	21,685,715	15,624,558	14,751,631	10,631,500
Philippine Islands.....	61,629	44,404	113,831	82,088
Europe, except Russia.....	36,763,506	26,488,106	24,976,619	18,000,649
Russia.....	15,331,186	11,046,120	7,222,733	5,205,424
Manchuria, Russian.....	3,225,806	2,324,063	5,151,382	3,712,601
Japan and Formosa.....	17,251,144	12,429,449	16,938,053	12,207,254
Macao.....	5,824,487	4,196,543	4,710,359	3,894,756
Turkey in Asia, Persia, Egypt, etc.....	2,496,982	1,799,076	2,004,610	1,877,142

\*The haikwan tael in 1899 was valued by the United States Mint at 72.05 cents; in 1900, at 72.07 cents.

An example of China's lack of sentimentality in a matter of trade is clearly demonstrated in her present trade relations with Japan, a country that but a few years past gave her a sound drubbing and wrested from her a province. China imported from Japan in 1892, two years before the war between those countries, about 5 per cent of her total imports. In 1899 China imported from Japan more than \$25,000,000 worth of goods, or more than 12 per cent of her total imports for that year.

Since organized labor and the workmen in general have, by petitions and resolutions, plainly demonstrated that they are unalterably opposed to anything but the most rigid laws on this subject no one can question their position on this issue. Now, what interests are there which oppose this measure, and why all this opposition to a policy which has been in force for twenty years?

The answer can be found in the hearings before the Committee on Immigration. A representative of the China Development Company appeared in opposition to this measure. A representative of certain manufacturing interests in this country also appeared before the committee. Next we find a representative of the American Asiatic Company. Then came the president of the China and Japan Trading Company of New York. The Pacific Steamship Company had a representative on the ground. A gentleman presented credentials from the Boston Chamber of Commerce and the Boston Merchants' Association. Later it appeared this man was counsel for the Canadian Pacific Railroad Company, which company also operates one of the most important steamship lines between this continent and Asia. This concern is said to be most actively engaged in smuggling Chinamen across our northern border.

Now, in looking over this aggregation of "representative" gentlemen we must conclude that it is the corporate interests of this country which are so much concerned about the Chinaman and which beg us, for heaven's sake, to deal kindly with the yellow man.

Why all this solicitude? Why are the corporations so concerned about this race? It is for the sake of trade, for the sake of a few millions more of money. Little do they care what effect Chinese immigration may have on our own people.

The Mr. Stephen W. Nickerson, who said he represented "the opinion of a public meeting held in our city of Boston," delivered himself of the following utterance before the committee:

I wish to say this much plainly, that it is felt by a great many of my people that legislation has been passed against the Chinese—a people who have had no political voice, and who were powerless, and who had few friends—because it offered an easy opportunity for certain politicians "to square" themselves with their fellow-countrymen for betraying interests very important in legislation. That is plain speaking. It is not because I wish to say unpleasant things, but it is because I wish this committee to know what I ask. The people in my State perhaps have always been a little theoretical for right, but we have also been practical for trade. I know what the oriental trade did for my grandfather. I know that in my family there are still the evidences of the trade with Shanghai and the profits that came from trade and have descended to us. I know of great fortunes made in New England as the result of the Asiatic trade, when our section became wise enough to cease dealing with their fellow-men in rum in the West Indies and elsewhere and adopted a commercial policy of trade with the Orient.

Mr. President, it is clearly the purpose of certain corporate interests to ultimately get Chinese coolly labor into this country. At present they have not the courage to boldly advocate such a policy. They are playing for more time, and if it is granted them they will, at some not far distant day, make known their real purpose. Our new island possessions give these interests a splendid opportunity to do by indirection what can not otherwise be accomplished.

Major-General MacArthur, in his report to the Adjutant-General of the Army of the United States, dated July 4, 1901, in treating the subject of the Chinese people and Chinese immigra-

tion into the Philippine Islands, sounds a note of warning. I will quote from his report:

Although at present absolutely incapable of organizing on a large scale for political purposes at home, they have solved many of the minor problems relating to economic cooperation, especially of cooperative protection and production.

Such a people, largely endowed as they are with inexhaustible fortitude and determination, if admitted to the archipelago in any considerable numbers during the formative period which is now in progress of evolution, would soon have direct or indirect control of pretty nearly every productive interest, to the absolute exclusion alike of Filipinos and Americans.

This view is stated with considerable emphasis, as unmistakable indications are apparent of organized and systematized efforts to break down all barriers, with a view to unrestricted Chinese immigration, for the purpose of quick and effective exploitation of the islands—a policy which would not only be ruinous to the Filipino people, but would in the end surely defeat the expansion of American trade to its natural dimensions, in what is obviously one of its most important channels. In this connection it may not be improper to state that one of the greatest difficulties attending military efforts to tranquilize the people of the archipelago arises from their dread of sudden and excessive exploitation, which they fear would defraud them of their natural patrimony and at the same time relegate them to a status of social and political inferiority.

Mr. President, General MacArthur did not sound a false alarm. Ever since this question has been under consideration we have been receiving circulars, pamphlets, and marked copies of newspapers, all asking for some modification of our exclusion policy. But by far the most urgent demands come from our island possessions. Only a few weeks ago many Senators received copies of a memorial from the Chamber of Commerce of the city of Manila, asking for free and unrestricted immigration of Chinese coolly labor into the Philippine Islands. It is said that the members of this body of business men are American citizens. I give the circular herewith:

The American Chamber of Commerce of Manila. An appeal to Congress for the enactment of laws allowing coolly labor to enter the Philippine Islands under such restrictions and laws as the Philippine Commission may from time to time enact.

To the Congress of the United States of America:

The American Chamber of Commerce of Manila, P. I., respectfully represents to your honorable body:

That by authority and under instruction of resolution adopted at a full meeting of this chamber held on the 3d day of January, 1902, this chamber does petition and earnestly request the enactment of laws by Congress allowing coolly labor to enter the Philippine Islands under such restrictions and laws as the Philippine Commission may from time to time enact.

The present restrictive law does not benefit the Filipinos, nor is it of benefit to anyone. This labor will not enter into competition with American labor, and its entry into the Philippine Islands is imperatively needed.

Tobacco, hemp, and sugar plantations are only partially cultivated by reason of insufficiency of manual laborers. There are at present people in the city of Manila who came here for the purpose of investing in plantations and to cultivate them upon lines far in advance of the primitive ideas now in vogue. Investors are compelled to either leave these islands or await such time as laborers can be secured. This being the situation at present, without this legislation the Philippine Islands can not be properly developed.

Building in the city of Manila has been retarded for months, and only since the quarantine has been raised and those Chinese entitled to land have returned to these islands has building actively revived.

For the development of these islands the urgent necessity for the immediate enactment of such laws can not be placed too strongly before Congress. For which relief this chamber, composed of American citizens representing the commercial interests of the Philippines, does most respectfully pray.

F. E. GREEN, *President.*

ROGER AP. C. JONES, *Secretary.*

The Manila Critic of March 1, 1902, has the following editorial comment on the proposed legislation:

The Chinese-exclusion bill which the Pacific coast Representatives have agreed to support is a direct menace to the very best interests of the Philippine Islands, and if it should pass would render well-nigh impossible the exploitation of these islands by the Americans, and would cause an irretrievable loss of much capital now in the archipelago. The bill denies the right of entry to the Chinese not only into the mainland ports of the United States, but also into any of the insular possessions, including the Philippines. The cumulative evidence of many years proves that the native labor here is not to be depended upon. If the business of the archipelago be developed, as it can be, and ought to be, the services of the Chinese are absolutely necessary. It is to be hoped that the memorial of the American Chamber of Commerce and the recommendation of the Commission will raise up some friends for the Philippines in Congress. It is late to contemplate the idea, probably, but an authorized delegation of business men in Washington would be very valuable just now.

In the same paper also appears the following article, headed "Coolly labor necessary:"

With the several requests already made on the Philippines for a labor supply for other countries, the question as to what this country will do for a stable and assured labor in the future is brought very distinctly to mind. Regarding the new territory of the United States, Hawaii, it must be borne in mind that the country now asking for labor is practically without a labor supply of its own, and is dependent on other lands for men to till its fields and carry on the necessary work of its different business and plantations.

The conditions are quite similar in many ways to the state of affairs here, notwithstanding the fact that in these islands there is an ample supply of men perfectly able, physically, to work, but apparently without the disposition to exert themselves any more or for a longer time than is necessary to accumulate a few pesos for food, festa, or cock fight. In the one instance the money investor and producer is unable to secure a home labor for the reason that it is very limited and not nearly sufficient for the needs, and in the other case, while the supply is ample, the quality does not seem, from general appearance and experience, to be trustworthy enough to be depended on in time of real necessity. In all agricultural pursuits there are certain seasons of the year in which the entire success of the twelve months' work and expense is dependent on the time in which harvesting must be accomplished, else the complete loss of the crop will follow. Especially at this time

is it required that the employer should be assured of such labor as can be depended on for the work in hand, and in order to do this he is necessarily compelled to keep a greater number of men under pay through part of the year, in which he derives little benefit from their names on his pay roll.

Now, with ignorant labor under the control of a gang or labor boss and subject to his will and dictation, the boss will possess absolute control of the plantation owner's interest and be able to dictate the price of his men at the time when it is absolutely required that the employer shall have men or suffer the loss of his entire investment for the year. If large capital is expected to seek this country as a field for investment in tropical agricultural pursuits, it must be borne in mind that the success of a plantation is dependent on labor for its welfare, and until this matter is settled beyond a reasonable doubt, capital will not be overanxious to locate in a place where it is not assured of a reasonable amount of protection by law.

Ignorant labor can not be controlled by honeyed phrases or fair treatment at all times. The cooly class is not gifted with any unusual amount of judgment in matters beyond the present, and if left to its own way in work which would be better done at once in place of the future, no place dependent on it would ever see a successful year. The only way of settling the question for the general welfare of the country in general would seem to be the enactment of a just and fair contract law, under which the laborer would be given every protection of the laws of the country, yet at the same time would be bound in such a way that he could be compelled to work in times of necessity, provided of course that his health and general condition were not affected.

This country is naturally an agricultural country, and its wealth in that line is equal, at least, to any other country in the world. Its development depends entirely on the question of labor, and it is not a question to be passed over without the most serious of thought and consideration.

Will the people of the Philippines take kindly to this wholesale policy of exploitation? Will they be satisfied to surrender their native land to the greed of the corporate interests which care not what may become of the poor native so long as they are allowed to reap the harvest? Is it not probable that, goaded to desperation, the Filipinos may repeat the horrors of two centuries ago? In volume 1 of the report of the United States Philippine Commission, dated January 31, 1900, the Commission, in commenting on the hostility of the Filipinos to the Chinese, gives us a bit of history. Its language is as follows:

In the middle of the seventeenth century there were some 30,000 Chinese in the neighborhood of Manila. At that time they revolted against the Spanish Government and for some days besieged Manila. After various futile attempts they were convinced that they could not conquer in the Philippines and finally withdrew, raising the siege, and then they were pursued to a point behind Cainta and slaughtered in great numbers without pity. As a result of this revolt against the sovereignty of Spain in the archipelago greater restrictions were imposed on their immigration. In spite of these restrictions the Chinese colony gained in strength what it had lost in extent, because these restrictions gave the Chinese the undeniable right to manage their own commercial affairs and enabled them to always corrupt the administrative element in the Philippines.

In 1755 all non-Christian Chinese were ordered to be expelled, but before the day arrived for their expulsion, June 30, 1755, many had become Christians and many others were studying the mysteries of the faith. Two thousand and seventy were banished from Manila. In the time of Don Simon de Anda (1762-1764) it is calculated that some 8,000 died in the central provinces of Luzon, who were exterminated in those towns by the order of the governor-general, only those who lived in Manila and its suburbs remaining alive. As a consequence of this anti-Chinese campaign many of them who survived these assassinations emigrated to their own country, and the number of Chinese established in these islands diminished little by little.

The exploitation of the Philippine Islands with the aid of Chinese labor, directed by American energy and ingenuity, would undoubtedly produce marvelous results. Governor Taft and others tell us that at present there are but 5,000,000 acres of land held in private ownership under cultivation. Sixty-five million acres are yet public lands and lying idle. General Hughes estimates that 75 per cent of the public lands are fit for cultivation. Sugar and tobacco are the principal products. Cotton is also grown. It is highly probable that if these islands are retained by the United States at no far distant date they will become a dangerous rival of our Southern States. The cotton raiser of the Southern States will not be able to compete with the planter of the Philippine Islands if the latter is allowed to employ the Chinese cooly. And the cotton manufacturer of the South will see the oriental trade, for the sake of which he is now willing to allow the cooly to come into this country, monopolized by the manufacturers of cotton in those islands.

The sugar planter of Louisiana and the sugar-beet grower of the West are to-day alarmed about the possibilities of Cuba since peace has come and renewed energy prevails on that island. If Cuba, with her 40,000 square miles, is a menace to the sugar interests of this country, how much greater will be the danger of a rival which is nearly three times as large in area and which can avail itself of a class of labor which is unexcelled and which can be had for prices so low that it leaves no possible chance for our planter to successfully compete. The tobacco industry of the Philippine Islands is to-day a formidable one. With the tobacco plantations supervised by expert tobacco growers from this country and cultivated by the Chinese cooly, the possibilities of the islands in that direction may be expected to give the planter of this country considerable concern. The Philippine Islands, left to the natives, will maintain their own people in comfort, but will supply little for the world's trade; but with the island lands in the possession of large corporate interests, cultivated by Chinese coolies under the control of labor bosses, the result would become disastrous to our Southern States and

our Western beet-growing States, as well as to that class of our citizens which works at the manufacture of cotton goods and tobacco.

The provision of this bill denying the Chinese in the Philippine Islands admission to the United States is a most important one in the light of the conditions now existing in those islands. It is very doubtful if we can enact any law that will successfully keep the Chinese laborer out of the islands. Years of experience in this country has taught us how difficult it is to deal with these people, and it stands to reason that the islands, with their immense seacoast and their close proximity to the home of the Chinaman, will be invaded by great numbers of Chinese despite any barrier we may place in their way. Hence it is all important that we legislate in anticipation of the rush from the islands into this country. If this gap is left open the islands will afford the open door through which the yellow horde can reach the United States.

Mr. President, I repeat that this is not a question of sentiment, but a question of policy. We should legislate in the interest of our own people and not in the interest of the Chinese.

The people of the Pacific coast are almost a unit in favor of this bill, and the workmen of our entire country are in sympathy with them. Every man who works, either as a common laborer or as a mechanic, is vitally interested. He knows that he can not possibly compete with those people, a people who can live and thrive on a wage that would not supply the American workman and his family with bread and water, much less furnish them with such food and raiment as is necessary to keep them in good health and ordinary comfort.

What benefit will the Chinaman be to this country? He has the ability to produce, but since he does not consume anything worth mentioning, he is bound to bring about a great surplus and a general reduction will follow. Displace our American laborer with the Chinese cooly and who is to consume the enormous output of everything we produce? The Chinaman will not consume it, and the white man, being out of work and having nothing with which to purchase it, can not consume it.

It is well known that substantially all the Chinese ever in America have come from a single one of the many vast and densely populated provinces of China. Yet there are in that single province of Kwangtung about twice as many people as there are in the United States of America west of the Mississippi River. We know from past experience how that one subdivision of the Chinese Empire has poured its poor laboring people into this country. What would result if our doors were opened even partially to the countless legions of all China, the home of one-third of the human race? We have the door closed; let us keep it closed.

Mr. PRITCHARD. Mr. President, I desire briefly to state the reasons why I can not support the measure which has been reported by the Committee on Immigration, and in doing so I shall consider this question from a local standpoint, as it affects the Southern section of our country.

#### THE "OLD" AND THE "NEW" SOUTH.

Thirty years ago the South was crippled and poverty stricken. Possessing natural resources of wealth unsurpassed, she was without strength, opportunity, or implements, or capital to develop them. What with her utterly demoralized labor system, incident to the abolishment of slavery, her railroads—such as she had—and other methods of communication and transportation destroyed or broken, the survivors of this unhappy internecine struggle, confronted by the new conditions stated and other discouragements, well might have stood appalled over the future prospect.

But, facing this future with Spartan bravery, from the wreck and ruin in which she was then engulfed the South has now "worked out her own salvation" and has at last emerged triumphant, and to-day on the threshold of a new century she stands serene, sanguine, and progressive, if not aggressive, in her eagerness to grapple with the new and mighty problems of the new "world power" which our reunited States have become through the fortunes of war.

To-day the South stands on the verge of unprecedented industrial expansion. Equipped, as pointed out, by nature with abundant raw material, she has likewise been and is being fast supplied with the last and most improved machinery, with ample capital and credit to turn those limitless resources to the best account.

The two leading elements of productive wealth in the United States, agriculture and manufacture, bear the ratio of 28 per cent for agriculture to 52 per cent for manufacture, from which the South has been taught the lesson that her prosperity will be greatly enhanced by a general system of manufacturing her raw material on its native heath. There was a time when agricultural wealth surpassed all other wealth, but it is the magic of manufacturing which has produced within comparatively few years the extraordinary change in the wealth of the East as compared with the agricultural sections of the West and South and

which is now fast bringing the South up on a plane of competition with the New England manufactories.

In 1850 the capital invested in manufacturing in the United States was only \$750,000,000. At the outbreak of the civil war this capital had grown to be \$1,000,000,000; in 1870 there were \$2,750,000,000. This shows that from 1850 to 1860 a growth of 33 per cent had occurred, but from 1860 to 1870, a war period, there was an increase of 75 per cent in capital engaged in manufacturing industries. From 1870 to 1880 there was the large increase of \$1,000,000,000, while during the next ten years the capital increased to the enormous sum of \$6,250,000,000, or over 100 per cent increase. Since 1890 the increase has been stupendous, and the gigantic industrial capital of America so employed has well-nigh passed a point where ordinary business experience can well grasp or comprehend it.

#### COTTON AND ITS DEVELOPMENT.

Immediately following the civil war, when the work of reinstating their shattered fortunes was being instituted, the output of cotton grown in the eight cotton-growing States of the South—namely, Alabama, Arkansas, the Carolinas, Georgia, Louisiana, Mississippi and Texas—aggregated only 2,097,254 bales of 444 pounds each, selling for 31½ cents per pound, with an aggregate value in New York, basis middling, of \$193,822,944.44. In 1870 there was grown more than twice as much, or 4,352,317 bales, weighing an average of 442 pounds each, and valued at 16.95 cents per pound, basis middling, or \$74.91 per bale, equivalent to a total valuation in New York of, say, \$326,032,066.47.

Within the next decade, or in 1880, the crop had been augmented to 6,605,750 bales of 460 pounds each, and estimated at 11.34 cents per pound, or \$52.16 per bale, its aggregate value was \$344,555,920. This was equivalent to an increase of output within thirteen years of over 300 per cent in number of bales and 333 per cent in actual number of pounds. But on the other hand, showing such a great falling-off in price as to yield but a fraction greater than one-third per pound, with a net cash result varying in the last ten years only \$18,000,000, or more accurately, \$18,523,854. In 1890 the Southern crop still showed a marked increase in weight of output, but a corresponding decline in price, viz, 8,052,597 bales of 473 pounds each, worth 9.03 cents per pound, or a total aggregating in value \$369,118,787.02.

After 1890 the price of middling cotton never exceeded 10 cents per pound, but continued to decline to as low as 5 cents in the interior markets. In 1892 middling cotton, basis New York, ruled at 8.24; in 1893, at 7.67; in 1894, at 6.50; in 1895 it reacted back to 8.16, declining in 1896 to 7.72, and in 1897 to 7.4 cents per pound. Since that date the price "slumped" as low as 4 to 5 cents in the interior. In 1898, notwithstanding the crop aggregated the large amount of 11,199,994 bales of 500 pounds each, it netted the farmer only 4½ cents per pound, or \$22 per bale, the total money valuation being \$246,399,868, which was \$100,002,200 less than the net valuation of the crop of 1890, \$75,696,302 less than in 1880, and \$79,632,198 less than the valuation of the crop of 1870.

And this despite the fact that the number of bales had increased more than 550 per cent since 1886, and nearly 100 per cent since 1880, and 30 per cent since 1890; whereas for the thirty-two years the increase in actual weight was over 600 per cent. In other words, while the money crop of the South had thus increased in point of output or quantity produced during the thirty-two years to the extent of 600 per cent, on the other hand it had marked a decrease in cash valuation the very huge sum of \$100,000,000 per annum.

Meantime, be it noted that the population of the South from 1870 to 1890 had been augmented by 100 per cent, and the last decade shows a corresponding or proportionate increase, and at the same time, with perhaps a few exceptions, each nation of the globe has registered a marked increase in its population, though perhaps not so great as the United States.

#### CAUSES AND CONDITIONS FOR LOW PRICES OF COTTON.

Divers and sundry theories have been advanced to explain this unwelcome fact suggested by the gradual and almost uniform decline in price while the world's population was at the same time, if not jumping by leaps and bounds, as in our own country, at least was growing steadily, and the world's consumption of cotton goods was being likewise concurrently augmented. One of these attributed it to a defective national money system, while still another found advocates in a supposed baleful influence wielded by the cotton exchanges and so-called "bucket shops," which fostered gambling in "cotton futures."

In my opinion, neither of these influences can account for the phenomena mentioned, but that it springs from

INADEQUATE COMPETITION IN THE SPINNERS' PURCHASES, AND THE IMPERATIVE NEED OF A GREAT AND GROWING EXPORT MARKET, ETC.

In 1875 there were in operation throughout the world 67,940,000 spindles. Of these the English owned and operated 60 per cent,

or 39,000,000, although in area England covers not as much ground as one of our States. In 1876 England's spindles were increased to 41,881,789. Now England's takings of American cotton has averaged 65 to 68 per cent of the whole crop grown.

In 1880 there were in all the world 72,270,000 spindles, of which England still kept in operation the majority, and in 1885 she had 43,000,000 out of 81,145,000 spindles, or more than all the rest of the world combined. So, in 1890, she had 43,750,000 out of a total in the world of 86,145,000 spindles, and in 1895 she had 45,400,000 out of a total of 50,094,000 spindles for the world at large. As nearly as can be arrived at the last figures at hand reports the total number of spindles in operation in 1900-1901 throughout the world at about 98,000,000. Of these England then had 45,000,000, or just about one-half of the world's spindles being confined under the control of comparatively a few great cotton-manufacturing firms or corporations, and as many as 93 per cent of the latter concerns being actually located within 50 miles in and around Manchester, which is only 30 miles removed from that greatest cotton mart—Liverpool.

In other words, out of an estimate or census of 5,310 cotton factories or purchasers throughout the world, fully one-half of these (2,655) were almost in sight of each other and "touching elbows" on the Liverpool Exchange—in person or through brokers—daily. Small wonder, then, that after comparing notes and seeing that America had increased her output of cotton 600 per cent in thirty-two years, while the increase in spinning capacity had been only 50 per cent within the same period—not forgetting the handful of great concerns who dominated the markets, if not in name, certainly in fact—there was thus brought about a "community of interest" which crystallized into the more modern "trust," which thus easily reduced the price of cotton to \$22 per bale.

In 1875 England had 41,000,000 spindles and \$450,000,000 capital, or \$11 per spindle of invested capital. Estimating the spindles now at, say, about 80,000,000 throughout the foreign countries, and at the rate of \$11 per spindle, would represent \$900,000,000. Now, English capital is plentiful at rates as low as 3 and 3½ per cent, and her spinners have been netting from 8 to 12 per cent dividends and German spinners from 8 to 18 per cent. If these foreign spinners average, say, 10 per cent dividends where the customary rate of interest is as low as 4 per cent, then the South should receive a sum equal to at least 6 per cent on this capital, which would yield for its cotton \$54,000,000 more than it realized, say, in 1898, or a net increased profit of \$5 per bale.

Suppose, for sake of argument, that all of the spindles now operated in England, within an area of less than one of our States, were transposed into this country and planted in the cotton fields throughout the eight or ten cotton-growing States, the inevitable result of the active local competition from these buyers of the raw material would have enhanced the price to 7 cents per pound, or \$35 per bale, which would have realized for the South's use about \$168,000,000 annually in excess of its cash supply.

But admitting, on the other hand, that Southern cotton manufactories thus multiplied would not stimulate, as claimed, active competition in the purchase of cotton, it must still be conceded that 1,000,000 of the 12,000,000 Southern people could have found employment as operatives, and that the value of the manufactured product would reach \$1,750,000 annually instead of the \$246,000,000 for raw cotton for the single year named.

To recapitulate: The world's spinning capacity since 1875 has increased, say, about 50 per cent, while the production of cotton has increased in same period by 600 per cent annually, or an increase in actual output of 600 per cent against only 50 per cent increased spinning and weaving capacity. Since 1890, while the output of raw cotton grown has marked an increase of 30 per cent, the spinning capacity has increased only 15 per cent.

Clearly it follows that much of our misfortunes in the matter of the low plane of prices prevailing in more recent years can not be ascribed to "overproduction," but, rather, we contend, to "underspinning," and in some measure also to overcrowding the manufacturing capacity of our foreign customers with a plethora of our raw material, thereby diminishing, if not losing absolutely, the benefit of the zest and stimulus that comes from competitive bidding for our raw cash crop.

England, with her 50 per cent of the spindles of the world, and New England, with her 13 per cent of same, could not be coerced, if local conditions in each of these quarters justified it, to increase their plants to larger proportions, and by thus increasing their demands likewise necessitate competition with themselves in enhancing the price they should pay to the South for their raw material.

#### GROWTH AND PROSPERITY OF COTTON MANUFACTURING IN THE NEW ENGLAND STATES.

This can best be illustrated by taking the single State of Massachusetts—by far the wealthiest State per capita and per area, and which has the largest manufacturing output per area and per capita in the Union. In 1880 the wealth of Massachusetts was but

little changed from previous census, but the manufacturing output had increased to \$631,135,284. In the census returns of 1890 the wealth of Massachusetts was placed at \$2,803,645,447—an increase of 100 per cent in ten years. Her manufacturing output had increased to \$888,160,403, giving her \$963 per capita of assessed wealth as against only \$407 average throughout the United States.

Thus, devoid of any agricultural resources or native raw material, a State only one seventy-fifth part the size of the cotton-growing States was able to show in 1890 assessed wealth equal to that of Alabama, Arkansas, Georgia, Louisiana, Mississippi, North and South Carolina, and Texas combined—States growing 80 per cent of the production of cotton of the world, whereas Massachusetts only manufactures one-tenth of the American cotton. Therefore, considering that Massachusetts thus takes the raw material of her Southern neighbors, and by carrying it through her various processes of manufacturing, etc., has multiplied its value up to a volume of \$890,000,000 annually, does not this furnish the South an eloquent example to follow, and which she has been assiduously following of late years to her lasting prosperity, as evidenced by the following facts, many of which are vouched for by that undisputed authority, the Manufacturer's Record?

Before passing from this subject of "cotton" and taking up its kindred or correlative branch—"cotton manufacturing"—I will submit some interesting and recent statistics in the former connection by way of demonstrating not only the colossal proportions of the cotton crop of the South at large, but, incidentally, of the conspicuous part my own State itself contributes to swell these grand totals.

In a "supplement" to the Manufacturers' Record, of Baltimore, issued as a special cotton and cotton manufacturing edition, touching upon the "Future of cotton production," Hon. Charles W. Dabney, of Tennessee (referring to the preceding year's cotton crop), had this to say:

#### THE FUTURE OF COTTON PRODUCTION.

The chief facts with regard to the past history of cotton in the South are familiar to all. Few people appreciate, however, the vast importance of this crop and its value to the United States and the world. The American crop this year will probably reach 9,000,000 bales, worth nearly \$900,000,000, of which amount nearly 70 per cent will be exported and bring some \$210,000,000. The cotton produced in America in the last hundred years has been worth at the average price of each year in gold about \$15,000,000,000. The \$2,000,000,000 pounds exported from this country during the last hundred years was worth about \$11,000,000,000. These figures are almost beyond comprehension.

Soil and climatic conditions restrict the cultivation of cotton to a group of States in the southern portion of America, constituting less than one-fourth of the total area of the United States. Yet these States grow over 60 per cent of all the cotton consumed in the world. The total value of the annual crop is exceeded among the cultivated crops of the United States only by Indian corn, which is grown in every State in the Union, and about one year in four by wheat, which is grown in almost every State. Its production not only engages almost exclusively 7,000,000 of our people, but its handling for domestic and foreign markets and manufacture employ the capital or labor of several millions more. It is within the truth to say that 6,000,000 or 7,000,000 of people in these United States make their living out of cotton. Our interest in it is therefore a very great one, and it concerns us deeply to learn what we can about its future.

The future of cotton will be determined by the inexorable laws of supply and demand. We are not able to predict very much about the demand for cotton, further than that it is sure to grow with civilization and the progress of the arts. According to Mr. Edward Atkinson, less than half of the people of the world are supplied with cotton goods made by modern machinery. It will require an annual crop of about 45,000,000 bales to raise the world's standard of consumption of the best civilized nation. It is fair to assume that all of the fibers of the world have been pretty well tested as to their capabilities and uses. We must conclude, therefore, that cotton, which is now the preferred fiber, and is growing steadily in the favor of civilized man, will continue to be used by him in increasing amounts. If science teaches us anything, it is that the uses of cotton will multiply rather than diminish. We are constantly finding new uses for it, such as those in gun-cotton and celluloid. Doubtless many others will be found as science progresses and the wants of man increase. From the increases in the demand for cotton in the last twenty years, it is safe to predict that the world will in 1920 want at least 30,000,000 bales to supply its wants; provided, of course, that the price does not exceed the present ruling prices, say 7 or 8 cents a pound.

[Extract from editorial review of cotton manufacturing in the South, its growth and future development, by Hon. R. H. Edmonds, editor.]

#### THE TEXTILE FIELD.

Cotton growing used to be regarded as the dominating power in Southern economy. It was largely responsible for a fallacy that the South could do better as a producer of raw material for manufacturers than as an artisan and mechanic, handling in many processes its own cotton, lumber, and leather at home. This theory retarded industrial life, though it did not entirely suppress it, especially in those States where slaveholding was becoming a burden. In other States, however, the eminently sound policy of placing cotton mills in close touch with the cotton fields, if not actually within them, was successfully essayed at an early day.

Under more favoring circumstances it has been extended through the Piedmont region, teeming with reserves for the industrial army, readily and intelligently adapting itself to the betterment of changed occupations, and around its gratifying results, notably at Charlotte, N. C., have gathered mill-supply establishments, machine shops, and minor industries, materially affecting public opinion, inspiring to similar efforts in other directions, and more than compensating for increasing disadvantages encountered by the older cotton regions attempting to compete on traditional lines with the newer. Its value has become enhanced as the source of power has evolved from direct water, through steam obtained at a minimum cost, to electricity derived from streams having their heads high up in the mountains of eternal spring, as abundant fuel has at places been mined almost within shovel throw of the mill boilers, and as local capital, patiently and persistently pocketing its 10 per cent dividends, has been willingly and gladly supplemented by that from the North and East, in enlargements of well-proven

undertakings, in independent buildings, or in such a phase as the investment by a Massachusetts textile firm of over two millions of money in the construction of a duplicate factory at Huntsville.

In the drift of the center of cotton production toward Texas has followed the mill builder, until flourishing concerns have set an example and given an impulse to others in the Mississippi Valley and have started practical projects in Texas itself.

Meanwhile, the success of plain goods being assured, and new mills even closer to the cotton fields entering upon that particular plane, the manufacturers of the older communities are gravitating to a higher class of goods, either by reequipping existing buildings or by erecting others and filling them with up-to-date machinery.

This pregnant variation, to be expected with the reduplication of the number of spindles within twenty years from 667,000 to 5,000,000, and with the Southern consumption of cotton increasing within ten years from 547,000 bales to 1,399,399 bales, has been accompanied by a tendency to diversification of crops among the cotton growers. The ability thus acquired to raise food and feed supplies at home, rendering the farmer comparatively independent of the fluctuating price of the staple, the adoption of planting methods looking more to the character or quality of the crop than to its quantity, and to the consequent stricter attention to the improvement of farm labor will reduce the cost of cotton production, even while its quality shall be maintained, as a larger quantity is produced to supply a world's needs, and will attract more mill capital than ever to profit in the South.

The same intensive ideas will persist in the handling of cotton's great by-product, cotton seed. Already the crushing of the seed for its oil and meal, sought in domestic and foreign markets, requires \$40,000,000 capital, with millions of pounds of material still employed only primarily, and as more money seeks an outlet in this direction, as wider differentiation in the use of the oil occurs, the wealth of the South will grow.

Methods of spinning the fiber and of crushing the seed in vogue in the South point to the ultimate principle in textiles, the derivation by the producer of all the benefits possible from the product. When are established plants in which shall be conducted all the handling of cotton, from the boll to the sheetings, duck, twine, undergarments of knit goods and colored prints, to the oil prepared for table dressings, lubricants, and divers uses in the arts, to the meal ready to be fed to cattle after all industrial ingredients have been removed, to the hulls a basis for a fertilizer or a fuel, and even to the stalks and other waste, perhaps, converted into paper or other commodity; when bonded warehouses shall give the farmers a convenient means for using their crop as collateral and at the same time shall act as a regulator of the market; when bales sent to other parts of the country or to foreign lands shall be compressed in such a way that they shall be exempt from pillage, protected from damage, and relieved from many of the burdens of insurance, freight, and middlemen, which to-day entail an annual loss upon farmers of certainly \$20,000,000 for an average crop, the impression that cotton has lost any of its regal attributes will be dissipated. It is by no means an absolute monarch, and never can be. But as long as cotton is the cheap material for clothes, and as long as civilization, not yet universal, teaches more and more men and women to use clothes, it will be a mighty monarch, though in triple or quadruple alliance with others.

#### OTHER STATISTICS SHOWING THE WONDERFUL DEVELOPMENT OF THE COTTON-MANUFACTURING INDUSTRY IN THE SOUTH AND THE CONDITIONS WHICH HAVE CONTRIBUTED THERETO.

Mr. Edmonds, in tracing this encouraging development, and in ascribing his reasons for indulging in rosy predictions for the future of the South, sums up as follows:

To-day it has \$1,000,000,000 invested in manufacturing, with an annual output valued at \$1,500,000,000, and paying \$350,000,000 in wages. Its cotton mills, with 5,000,000 spindles, representing an investment of \$125,000,000, already consume yearly 1,400,000 bales of cotton. It is producing about 2,500,000 tons of pig iron a year, 40,000,000 tons of coal, from 10,000,000 to 11,000,000 bales of cotton, probably 10,000,000,000 feet of lumber, and 750,000,000 bushels of grain, and its railroads, steadily improving and increasing in length, have already a 50,000-mileage. The South has accomplished much. It has much more to do before its full growth shall have been attained. That it will be equal to its mighty task is proved by its present lustiness.

Its virility is no new trait of the South. It is not an artificial acquirement. It has existed as long as the South, but has at times been hampered by shortsightedness within or by unfriendly pressure from without. It has more than once been misdirected or wasted in rash experiment. In experience it has gained in judgment, though, until the point has been reached where it may be exerted to the best and truest ends, to the enrichment of its home and the well-balanced development of the whole country.

It is grounded and rooted in the South's stores of minerals, timber, cotton, and general agricultural supplies capable of wonderful expansion for the enlargement of domestic trade and the extension of foreign commerce.

It is manifested in cotton mills sending their products to the other side of the globe and equipping themselves with latest machinery for the manufacture of higher and higher grades of goods.

And Mr. J. B. Killebrew, of Tennessee, indulging in the same sanguine sentiments, follows in the same vein:

3. The low price of cotton is not without its compensations. Nay, the low price of cotton is stimulating its manufacture to a degree that was almost inconceivable twenty years ago. The cotton mills in the South in 1894 used 720,000 bales. To-day the cotton mills require 1,400,000, which is more than half the amount taken by Northern mills. And this great industry is hardly begun. Its rapid increase has astonished the cotton-manufacturing world, and in many countries is producing consternation. In 1880 the South had 180 cotton mills, 667,854 spindles, and 14,300 looms. Recent reliable statistics show that it has at present 550 cotton mills, 4,952,062 spindles, and 104,446 looms.

While the number of mills has only increased within nineteen years 206 per cent, the number of spindles within the same period has increased 641 per cent and the number of looms 630 per cent. The mills now building have far greater capacity and better equipment than those that were in operation in 1880. At that time the average number of spindles to the mill was 3,771; in 1899 the average number is 9,000. But this is not the most encouraging feature. In the six years ending September, 1899, the number of mills and spindles have doubled, as well as the consumption of cotton in the South, thus showing an accelerated movement.

THE CRYING NEED OF THE COTTON MILLS OF THE UNITED STATES BOTH IN NEW ENGLAND AND IN THE SOUTH NOW IS THE WANT OF FOREIGN OR EXPORT MARKETS, SUCH AS OFFERED BY THE ASIATIC TRADE AND THAT OF THE SOUTH AMERICAN REPUBLICS, ETC.

The foregoing statistics and other data arrayed under their respective heads show what the South has already accomplished and what it is to-day accomplishing, and mark out the lines upon which the South promises to progress safely, conservatively, yet

surely, as its limitless resources become, under the spur and impetus of abundant and enlivening capital and confidence born of success, contributors to the commerce which the United States are sending to all quarters of the globe.

As one of the South's staunch advocates, whose mission has been addressed particularly in the direction of exploiting her wonderful resources, well has said: "The South's story is a fascinating one. Two large volumes have been written. Their sequel is only beginning. It is full of the promise of greater interest and profit than either of the preceding ones."

The effect of cotton upon the commercial and social relations of mankind is, however, too far-reaching for estimation in dollars and cents. By reason of its many excellences and its cheapness cotton has become the favorite fiber for the clothing of all races and conditions of men in all parts of the world.

Of the four great staples that provide men with clothing—cotton, wool, flax, and silk—cotton is rapidly superseding its rivals among all peoples. The demand for it is steadily growing with civilization. The author of Sartor Resartus, Mr. Carlyle, defined man as distinguished from the brute in that he "wears clothes," and so it seems that dating from the time of Adam and Eve, the first substantial mark of civilization in man or woman as they advance in civilization finds expression in the matter of dress. And so cheap and so attractive have become the plain white and fancy colored cottons made in this country that the veriest savage has begun to clothe his nakedness with at least a cotton shirt.

There are 1,500,000,000 people in the world, of whom possibly 7,000,000 are financially interested some way in the growing, handling, and manufacturing of cotton, and possibly 8,000,000 in its sale, and thus we have remaining 99 per cent of the human family who are possible customers in the consumption of cotton in the manufactured state.

Of this huge population mentioned, China alone constitutes well-nigh one-third—a boundless field whose teeming hordes of humanity must be clothed. Owing to the honest goods they have been receiving so far from this country—our cotton being so cheap that it is as much a matter of cheapness and policy as of principle for our manufacturers to avoid the foreign ingredients commonly in use by foreign manufacturers, such as clays, starch, sizing, coloring, and other deleterious matter to make up for the raw cotton—the American cotton goods are given the preference everywhere abroad, "everything being equal." This is particularly true of the tropical countries, where the natives use the wash fabrics freely.

It is a fact that by reason of the proximity of the cotton to the mills of the South, and a multiplicity of other advantages we need not enumerate, to the Southern mills has been surrendered almost wholly the manufacture of the coarse and cheaper cotton goods which are exported to the Asiatic markets. Those of the great cotton-mill plants in the New England States which had developed a large export demand for their special brands, such as the "Indian Head" and other well-known brands, recognizing these superior advantages, solved the situation by simply erecting in the South, in a number of instances, branch factories, in which the manufacture of their brands for export continued, while their machinery in the New England mill was turned on to new and finer numbers, more especially competing with England.

Consequently the two sections—the New England and Southern mills—instead of being necessarily rivals for business, have a common interest in developing this Asiatic trade, in that whatever tends to relieve the congestion at home thereby leaves both sections free to follow this policy, namely, the South supplying the cheap, coarse cottons to the Asiatic trade and other tropical climes such as Africa, South America, etc., while the New England mills supply the home trade in fancy cottons and "lock horns," as stated, with England in placing her surplus abroad.

The spinning and weaving capacity of the United States having already far outstripped home consumption, inevitably it follows that foreign markets must be forged and forced to open and remain open to our expansive and expanding cotton manufactures. Per contra, check this outlet by such legislation as now threatens under this Chinese-exclusion bill, and the usual Asiatic markets being closed to the Southern mills, then in self-defense they must turn their machinery on to that class of goods made in the New England States and come in immediate competition with them for the control of the limited home market.

The sequence will be that it will inevitably resolve itself to a case of the survival of the fittest, and with her conceded numerous advantages, who doubts will be the sufferer in the end? New England, of course. Therefore it would seem plain that while the Southern mills have a direct and all-important concern over this threatened legislation, of the two sections, New England mills have a far greater reason to desire that this harsh measure do not pass.

The vital importance of this question to both sections can be

better demonstrated by a home experience or example to be found in the evidence of Col. James L. Orr, of South Carolina, president of the flourishing Piedmont Mills, of Piedmont (near Greenville), S. C. The experience recited by Colonel Orr is but the echo of the history of very many other prosperous Southern mills. It will be remarked that he especially stresses the fact that fully 75 per cent of his 39,000,000 yards of cloth is exported to China, Africa, and South America.

#### TEXTILES IN THE PIEDMONT REGION.

[By Col. James L. Orr, of South Carolina.]

In an interview with a representative of the Manufacturers' Record Col. James L. Orr, president of the Piedmont Mills, of Piedmont, S. C., regarding the textile industry in the Piedmont region of the South, said:

"The real beginning of cotton manufacturing in the Piedmont section of the Carolinas dates back to 1820, when William Bates, a native of Massachusetts, and who learned his trade in the old Arkwright Mills, near Providence, came to upper South Carolina at the instance of the Lesters, and finally built Lesters' factory upon the site of what is now Pelham. The machinery for this mill was bought in Philadelphia second hand, shipped to Charleston by water, and hauled from there by wagons over 300 miles.

"The real beginning of cotton manufacturing as we have it now commenced with the Piedmont Mills, projected and successfully carried out by the late Col. H. P. Hammett, a son-in-law of Mr. William Bates. This mill was begun in 1873, and began the manufacture of goods in the spring of 1876. In a very few years (1882) this venture was followed by the Pelzer Mills and the Clifton Mills. These pioneer mills soon demonstrated to a very skeptical world that cotton goods could be manufactured in the South as cheap, if not cheaper, than in any other section of the United States. The Piedmont Mills have grown from a small plant of 5,000 spindles to nearly 61,000 spindles; from a capital of \$200,000 to \$300,000, which is far below the value of the property.

"The market value of the stock is 185, but very little changes hands, being held for investment exclusively. Piedmont uses 32,500 bales of cotton annually, producing 39,000,000 yards of cloth, of which 75 per cent is exported to China, Africa, and South America.

"Following the signal success of these pioneer mills others were soon erected, 1,500,000 spindles, representing an outlay of nearly \$40,000,000. Ten per cent dividends, and many mills make more, represents annually a net profit of \$4,000,000. All this has been done in thirty years.

"The profits in cotton manufacturing during this period has been satisfactory, varying, of course, as the conditions have been more or less satisfactory. These mills have been through as hard times as have ever been known in the history of manufacturing in the United States. They have demonstrated their ability to live through unfavorable conditions and make money. As investments they are as well tried as any business investments in the world. They have been built by a combination of Northern and Southern capital, the former being, however, limited to those immediately having business relations with the mills. Gradually it has forced its way into all the investment world that as dividend payers there are none better, and their stocks are being sought for, and command, in many cases, fancy prices. As the facts become more generally known this will grow. Far-sighted New Englanders are to-day in the market for stock in standard Southern mills. One of these days the general public will see the desirability of these stocks as investments.

"As yet, however, we have only entered a small realm of cotton goods. Year by year, however, the number of mills are increasing that make finer numbers, some mills even now making finer goods than print cloths. The process is an evolution; but as to the future, it is well to let that take care of itself. We are dealing with facts of to-day, and those outlined are well within the truth.

"A new field for the products of cotton mills has been opened in the Far East. Southern cotton mills have entered this field, and some brands are as well known and appreciated in China and Africa as they are at home. With this new demand the danger, if there ever was any, of overproduction is remotely removed. Broadly stated, every bat of cotton that is not burned or lost at sea is manufactured. The crop is all manufactured at some point or other. If the natural advantages we possess are as good or better than other places, then we must continue to get new spindles, as well as the keeping of our old ones going."

FACTS AND STATISTICS SHOWING OUR DEPENDENCY UPON THE TRADE OF THE CHINESE EMPIRE IN PARTICULAR, AND THE CONSEQUENT REASONS WHY AT LEAST EXISTING RELATIONS UNDER THE GEARY LAW SHOULD REMAIN UNDISTURBED, IF NOT LEGISLATION HAD AMELIORATING THE HARSH CONDITIONS ATTACHING TO THE PRESENT LAW.

To show the utter dependency of the mills of this country upon this outlet in the Asiatic markets the single instance of one mill in the South might be referred to which was compelled to pile up as many as 30,000 bales of cotton goods—sheetings and drills for export—for which they had no outlet or market by reason of the paralysis to trade incident to the Boxer uprising in China—this being the chief if not sole market to which this mill had been sending its output.

And this was but one example out of numerous others.

During the year 1890, just preceding the Boxer troubles, and before the exports to China from this country were shut off, within the single month of July there were exported to China 15,519,945 yards of domestic cottons, valued at \$871,000, but within less than ninety days after the trouble began this export demand dwindled down to only 390,000 yards, valued at only \$25,375, and still kept down to this nominal figure until July, 1901, when the reaction having come, and the markets of China having been thrown open, the exports for the single month of July of that year aggregated 33,988,783 yards, valued at \$1,709,605. It gravitated around these figures from that time on until it crawled up in January, 1902, to the very encouraging figures of 37,672,467 yards, valued at \$1,773,585. It is estimated that for the current fiscal year our exports of manufactured cottons will probably exceed in value \$30,000,000.

It is the sheerest folly to assert that the Chinese Government will submit to any harsher measures than are embodied in the present Geary law, especially when the pending bill so ruthlessly



disregards and openly violates existing treaty rights. That she will as a self-respecting nation adopt some means of retaliation goes without saying.

Mr. President, I am in favor of the ship-subsidy bill as well as the bill authorizing the construction of an interoceanic canal, and I am satisfied that both of these measures will be enacted into law during the present session of Congress. The people of the South are in favor of both of these propositions, upon the ground that their adoption will facilitate the extension of our trade into foreign countries, and such being the case, many of us who live south of Mason and Dixon's line fear that the pending measure will curtail the amount of our foreign trade in the future.

I am opposed to the importation of Chinese labor, and will vote for any proposition which will prevent Chinese or cooly labor from coming in competition with the laborers of this country, provided its provisions will not interfere with our commerce in China. Such being the case, I shall vote to extend the provisions of the Geary Act, believing, as I do, that the extension of this measure will be adequate and at the same time by its adoption we will incur no risk of interrupting our present relations with the people of the Chinese Empire. I can not support the bill which has been reported by the committee, for its adoption would prove disastrous to the interests of the cotton manufacturers of the South, and would result in curtailing the amount of goods manufactured and lessen the demand for labor, which would necessarily result in a reduction of wages of operatives employed in the cotton mills in the Southern States.

Mr. MALLORY. I submit an amendment to the substitute proposed by the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. PLATT]. I ask that it be printed and lie on the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CLAY in the chair). The amendment will lie on the table and be printed.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President, if any other Senator desires to be heard on the bill I will be glad to yield. If not, I will occupy a few minutes in presenting one particular phase of the question.

The indications are that the so-called seaman clause in the bill is to be stricken out. At any rate, I feel confident that such will be the result of the vote. It does not seem to have had very earnest support from any quarter, not even by the committee that reported the bill. I notice on page 134 of the so-called testimony the chairman of the committee made this observation:

I confess it does not seem reasonable to me to prohibit the employment of Chinese seamen on vessels plying to Chinese ports.

It will be remembered that the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE] on yesterday offered an amendment striking that section from the bill, the Senator from Massachusetts being a member of the committee which reported it.

There has been a good deal of controversy as to the conduct of Chinese sailors, especially in time of danger. Going back to the discussion of the ship-subsidy bill, I find that the Senator from Colorado [Mr. PATTERSON] made some criticisms upon the Chinese in this regard. I wish to read very briefly from the speech of the Senator from Colorado, made on the 17th day of March last. He said:

It is true, Mr. President, that Chinese sailors are desirable for some purposes. They are obedient, they are sober; but while they possess traits such as these, it has been the experience from the time that Chinese sailors first manned vessels between the Pacific coast and China that in times of emergency they have always proved miserable failures. We know from those who testified before the Senate committee that in cases of wreck or collision, where it required bravery and presence of mind in the crews, the Chinese have always proved a failure, and ships have been lost and hundreds of lives sacrificed in the waters of San Francisco simply because in times of peril the Chinese crew were stricken by panic, and for that reason there has been a failure to save lives which otherwise would have been saved.

Mr. President, I personally know nothing about Chinese crews, nor whether they are brave or cowardly in time of danger and distress. What I do know is that the statements before the committee, upon which the arguments of the Senator from Washington [Mr. TURNER] and the Senator from Colorado [Mr. PATTERSON] have been based, appear to have no foundation in point of fact. Reference was made before the committee to the case of the collision between the *Oceanic* and the *City of Chester* in 1888, and to the sinking of the *Rio de Janeiro* in 1901. The *Oceanic* and the *Rio* both carried Chinese crews, and Mr. FURUSETH made the following statement in regard to them in support of his argument that Chinamen were cowards in time of danger:

As such, we could point to the notorious unreliability of the Chinese and other Asiatics in times of emergency on shipboard.

This characteristic has been demonstrated on numerous occasions—in fact, in every case of wreck or other serious accident. By way of illustration we would cite the case of the collision between the steamers *City of Chester* and *Oceanic* in the Golden Gate some years ago. The former vessel, manned by American seamen, sank with great loss of life. The *Oceanic* (chartered by the Pacific Mail Steamship Company), though little damaged, rendered practically no assistance to the sinking vessel, for the reason that her Chinese crew became terror stricken and were unable to launch the boats. The American seamen and firemen of the *City of Chester* had actually to make their way to the Chinese-manned vessel and launch the latter's boats, and by

so doing managed to save many lives that would otherwise have been lost through the inefficiency and cowardice of the Chinese. The *City of Chester* belonged to what we called the good old "Perkins boats"—that is, the Pacific Coast Steamship Company's line coastwise boats.

Coming down to the recent loss of the Pacific Mail Steamship Company's steamer *City of Rio de Janeiro* in the harbor of San Francisco, it will be remembered that that vessel remained above water for fifteen or twenty minutes after striking, thus affording ample time to get the boats overboard and secure the lives of the passengers. In this case, too, a panic occurred among the Chinese crew, with the result that 127 lives were lost, including the greater number of passengers, many of whom were women and children. Only one boat was launched, and that was captured by the Chinese, in utter disregard of the lives intrusted to their care.

Before I answer this charge of cowardice made against the Chinese race, let me call to the attention of the Senate the character of some of the statements in other matters made by Mr. FURUSETH, who makes the accusation. Like Mr. DUNN, who appeared before the committee as representing the Treasury Department, Mr. FURUSETH has a fondness for making sweeping charges based upon alleged information received from persons whose names he declines to reveal. He said on pages 253 and 254 of the testimony as follows:

The CHAIRMAN. You referred to the difficulty about seamen during the Spanish war. I had not heard of any difficulty before. Will you explain what you mean?

Mr. FURUSETH. I have what I consider unquestionably true information from men who were in the Navy at the time and from naval officers that only six of our fighting vessels attached to the Atlantic fleet were fairly well manned.

Senator CLAY. How is that? I did not catch your statement.

Mr. FURUSETH. Only six of our fighting vessels attached to the Atlantic fleet were fairly well manned.

Senator FAIRBANKS. Can you give the name of your informant or informants?

Mr. FURUSETH. I would not care about doing that. I will put you in the way of getting it; though I can tell just what I have a right to tell.

The CHAIRMAN. That is rather a sweeping statement, which I have never before heard intimated either in newspapers or in rumor.

Senator FAIRBANKS. For that reason I think it would be well for Mr. FURUSETH to be a little more specific.

Mr. FURUSETH. There are a great many men who were in the American Navy at the time of the war who are now in the merchant marine. There are a great many in San Francisco, a great many in New York who served around Cuba and on the Eastern coast. A great many of the men who were in the *Oregon* when she made her trip around and who were transferred from her on board other vessels are to be found in our seaports at the present time.

But I have referred to naval officers, and I want to say that two years ago there came to the Sailors' Union office in San Francisco a naval officer who said that he was instructed by the Navy to obtain the average age, nationality, how many had taken out intention papers, how many were citizens of the men then sailing on the Pacific coast and from the Pacific coast. I said to him, "I believe you have come to the right person, because I have got the records of those things, but I would like to know what you want it for before I give it." He says, "I have been instructed to obtain that information." I said, "Why?" "Because we found that the landsmen employed during the Spanish war were not efficient—would not do."

Senator FAIRBANKS. What was the name of that officer?

Mr. FURUSETH. If he was authorized to get the information, which he got, and was acting under instructions of the Navy Department, as he said he was, then by obtaining the information, Senator, you can obtain the name.

Senator FAIRBANKS. Do you know his name?

Mr. FURUSETH. I do not remember his name at the present time; so I can not tell it.

Senator FAIRBANKS. Very well.

Mr. FURUSETH. But even if I remembered it, I do not know that I had a right to tell it, because he said, "Do not give it to the public."

Senator CLAY. Do I understand you to say that only six of our vessels were properly manned during the Spanish war?

Mr. FURUSETH. That is what I said, referring to the Atlantic fleet.

Senator CLAY. That is a peculiar statement.

Mr. FURUSETH. It is rather a peculiar statement. It is a strong statement, Senator. If you were to investigate carefully the running of our Navy and the manning of our Navy during that time, and get the real facts of the case, I think it would agree just with what I said.

Senator CLAY. We would not have had to fight any battles, then, if the vessels had been properly manned?

Senator FAIRBANKS. Do you make that statement upon investigation of your own?

Mr. FURUSETH. I make it partly upon investigation of my own and partly upon inquiries that have been made at the Navy Department.

Senator FAIRBANKS. By this man whose name you have forgotten?

Mr. FURUSETH. Yes.

Senator FAIRBANKS. That is all.

Mr. FURUSETH. Now, I think I can find—

Senator CLAY. It is a right serious matter, I declare, and if it is true, we ought to know something about it.

Mr. FURUSETH. It is very easily verified by getting information from the Navigation Bureau of the Navy Department.

Senator FAIRBANKS. Did you examine the reports upon which you based your information; and if so, what reports?

Mr. FURUSETH. No, I did not examine the reports; the written reports.

I read this from the statement of Mr. FURUSETH for the purpose of showing to the Senate what manner of man he is; and I now come back to his assertion that in the disaster which befell the *Oceanic* in 1888 her Chinese crew were terror stricken and unable to launch her boats.

Mr. President, I hold in my hand an original letter from the captain of the *Oceanic* at the time of the collision, which I will now read:

PACIFIC IMPROVEMENT COMPANY,  
OFFICE OF SECRETARY, CROCKER BUILDING,  
San Francisco, Cal., February 14, 1902.

DEAR MR. SCHWERIN: Your 2a of the 5th instant just received on my return from a trip to Portland.

In reply I beg to say that the statement of Mr. FURUSETH, as quoted in the paper mentioned, is absolutely false in every particular.

The Chinese portion of the crew of the steamship *Oceanic* at the time of the collision occurring between her and the *City of Chester* behaved splendidly and with excellent discipline. When the collision occurred, the order was given to clear away the boats, and in three to four minutes three boats from the starboard side and one from the port side were alongside of the *Chester*, manned by the Chinese and an officer or petty officer in charge, and saved a number of the *City of Chester's* people.

There was not the least effort made to clear away the boats of the *Chester*. On the contrary, the major part of the crew scrambled up over the bow of the *Oceanic* and were the first to leave her. One boat got away from the *Chester*, and that was got out by the captain and, I should judge, some of the passengers.

In fourteen years' experience of Chinese as sailors and firemen I consider their conduct an example for that of any nation, being sober and industrious, and I never saw them try to evade their duties under trying situations.

I am yours, truly,

J. METCALFE,  
Surveyor to Lloyd's Register,  
Late Master of the *S. S. Oceanic*, twelve years.

R. P. SCHWERIN, Esq.,  
Vice-President and General Manager  
Pacific Mail S. S. Company, San Francisco.

Mr. President, I will now read a statement appearing in the San Francisco Call of August 23, 1888, which contains an extract from the testimony taken at the time in an investigation of the collision made by Federal officials in San Francisco. The Call says:

"How did the Chinese crew behave?" asked the vice-consul of Captain Metcalfe. "Splendidly; we had not the slightest trouble in getting the boats off. We have boat drills every day in port and every week at sea. We can put off 10 boats, fully manned, in fifteen or eighteen minutes. But in an emergency this can be done much quicker. We always carry four boats, ready for immediate action. We rescued people from the *Chester* over our bow with a rope and by hand." "Did the Chinese render any assistance in rescuing the *Chester's* people?" was asked. "Yes; very readily; but there were a large number of Chinese passengers who had nothing to do with the ship. Our crew consisted of 130 men, 35 of them white. The fact is that four minutes after we struck the *Chester* our boats were in the water. The Chinese acted splendidly. Their movements were exceedingly rapid. As the *Chester* sank one of her yards struck the boat in which Second Officer Bridgett was carried down in the vortex, and the four Chinamen only escaped by reason of their presence of mind in seizing hold of a piece of wreckage. All came to the surface and clung to the keel of the boat until they were rescued. Officer Bridgett was severely hurt, and was within an ace of being drowned. Another Chinaman (Ah Lun) jumped overboard to rescue a little 4-months-old baby. He was dragged down with the wreck, but caught hold of the child and climbed with it on the keel of the boat. His legs and feet were fearfully lacerated.

Mr. President, I will now present the decision of the board of investigation, taken from the San Francisco Call, as follows:

*Decision.*—That the master, John Metcalfe, and Louis Meyer, the pilot, appear to have navigated the steamship *Oceanic* in a safe and proper manner, and when casualty was apparently inevitable to have done everything in their power to avert the calamity. The chief officers, G. T. Tilton, G. E. Bridgett, second officer, and the other officers of the crew were each and all at their respective stations, proper discipline appearing to have been maintained, and all orders properly attended to. The boats, which were immediately manned, were the means of saving many lives. The court has no ground for blaming any of the above officers or crew of the steamship *Oceanic*, but desire to record their praise that each and all performed their duty.

Yet, Mr. President, that is the crew which Mr. Furuseth slanders in the so-called testimony that he gave before the committee, declaring them to have been cowards, and saying that through their cowardice hundreds of human lives were sacrificed in that collision.

As to the charge that the crew of the *Rio de Janeiro* were cowards, I read a statement which appeared in the San Francisco Call under date of March 2, 1901:

On the evidence of the surviving officers the greatest credit must be given to the Chinese crew of the *Rio Janeiro*. Every witness yesterday testified under oath that the Chinese had acted with great coolness and bravery, many of the men displaying remarkable ability under the sudden circumstances of the shipwreck.

Third Officer Charles Holland, of the *Rio Janeiro*, testified under oath before Commissioner Morse that "the Chinese make a good crew; that they obey orders; that there was no confusion among them; that they did all they could to launch the boats and save life; that they understood and spoke English sufficient to respond to all the orders given them." Mr. Holland, with five Chinese sailors, lowered the first boat from the *Rio Janeiro*, and, instead of the Chinese capturing this boat, it was crushed and upset by a falling spar from the sinking ship.

Frank Cramp, the carpenter of the *Rio Janeiro*, testified that he considered the Chinese a good crew, as far as seamanship goes; that they obey orders promptly. He says, under oath: "I have been in one typhoon with the *Rio*, and the Chinese sailors were at their post of duty, ready for call, and always obeyed every order that was given to them thoroughly. Every one on the *Rio* understood English."

Cramp's Chinese boat crew were at their station on the morning of the wreck.

Now, Mr. President, what I have said relates to the matter of the Chinese-crew clause, but I called it to the attention of the Senate not because of its relation to that clause, but because it shows the character of some of the men who have appeared before the committee, and upon whose statements this Pacific slope bill has been reported. This whole bill seems to be based upon just such statements as those of Furuseth, to which I have alluded. It was drawn by one of the men who made these statements, Mr. Livernash—at least he claims its authorship—and, in my opinion, the bill should never have been reported to the Senate.

After hearing the true facts as to the *Oceanic* and the *Rio de Janeiro*, it is difficult to see how any weight can be attached to

the arguments advanced by certain Senators on the point which I have briefly discussed.

As I said in the beginning, I feel very confident that that section of the bill will be eliminated. It certainly ought to be stricken from the bill. It would do immense damage to the transportation interests of this country, and I do not see that it possibly could do any good to anyone.

Mr. President, I ask permission to insert in the RECORD a brief statement as to the reasons why the Chinese-crew clause should be stricken from the bill under consideration.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it will be inserted in the RECORD.

The matter referred to is as follows:

REASONS WHY THE CHINESE-CREW CLAUSE IN SECTION 39 OF SENATE BILL NO. 2960, KNOWN AS THE CHINESE-EXCLUSION BILL, SHOULD BE STRICKEN OUT.

It has been stated that if it was made illegal for the Pacific Mail Steamship Company to employ Chinese crews upon its ships plying between San Francisco and ports of the Orient there would be an opportunity for American seamen to replace the Chinese now employed in the different departments of their vessels. The second paragraph of section 39 of Senate bill No. 2960 reads as follows:

"And it shall be unlawful for any vessel holding an American register to have or to employ in its crew any Chinese person not entitled to admission to the United States or into the portion of the territory of the United States to which such vessel plies; and any violation of this provision shall be punishable by a fine not exceeding \$2,000."

If this section should become law it would be directed against the Pacific Mail Steamship Company and would amount to class legislation. There are to-day 60 ships plying between Hongkong and ports on the Pacific coast from Vancouver to San Francisco. Ninety per cent of these ships fly the British or Japanese flag and employ a Chinese crew, in whole or in part, and many of them receive large subsidies. Three of these ships sail under the American flag and are owned by the Pacific Mail Steamship Company, and, practically, are the only ships engaged in this commerce which are affected by this proposed legislation. If this clause should become law the Pacific Mail would either have to give up business or else be obliged to place its ships under a foreign flag, leaving no ship in the trans-Pacific trade under the American flag.

The Pacific Mail Steamship Company employs three vessels in the trans-Pacific trade, as follows:

*China*—total officers and crew, 162; 35 Americans and Europeans, 1 Japanese interpreter, and 126 Chinese.

*City of Peking*—total officers and crew, 133; 35 Americans and Europeans, and 98 Chinese.

*Peru*—total officers and crew, 122; 35 Americans and Europeans, and 87 Chinese.

The above gives a total of 105 Americans and Europeans, 311 Chinese, and 1 Japanese.

These three ships represent the entire tonnage of the Pacific Mail in trans-Pacific trade under the American flag, and the above figures show that more than one-quarter of the total complement of the crews is composed of Americans and Europeans.

The following lines are also engaged in trans-Pacific trade in competition with the 3 steamers of the Pacific Mail Steamship Company, all of which have Chinese crews in whole or in part, as follows:

1. Canadian Pacific Steamship Company, British line, operating 5 steamers between Vancouver, British Columbia, and Hongkong, China. These vessels are manned entirely by Chinese, with the exception of the English officers and the imperial naval reserve deck force, and the company is allowed a subsidy by both the British and Dominion governments.

2. The "Nippon Yusen Kaisha," a Japanese line, operating 8 steamers between Seattle and Hongkong, and receiving a subsidy from the Japanese Government. It has Japanese and English officers, a partial complement of Japanese and Chinese.

3. Northern Pacific Steamship Company, operating from 6 to 8 steamers between Tacoma and Hongkong. Ships are British; chief officers are Englishmen and the balance of the complement Chinese; no subsidy.

4. The China Mutual, operating between Seattle and Hongkong, has a fleet of 12 vessels, all British. The chief officers are Englishmen, and the balance of the complement Chinese; no subsidy.

5. The Glen Line, operating between Seattle and Hongkong, has a fleet of about 10 vessels, all British. The chief officers are Englishmen and the balance of the complement Chinese; no subsidy.

6. The Portland and Oriental Line, operating between Portland and Hongkong, has 4 vessels, all British. The chief officers are Englishmen; balance of complement Chinese; no subsidy.

7. California and Oriental Line, operating between San Francisco, San Diego, and Hongkong, has 6 vessels, all British. The chief officers are Englishmen; balance of complement Chinese; no subsidy.

8. The Occidental and Oriental Steamship Company, operating 3 steamers between San Francisco and Hongkong, under the British flag. Officers Englishmen; crew all Chinese.

9. Toyo Kisen Kaisha Steamship Company has three steamers operating between San Francisco and Hongkong under the Japanese flag. The officers are Englishmen, deck force Japanese and Chinese, and the balance of the crew all Chinese. This line receives from the Japanese Government a subsidy of \$35,000 United States gold coin for each round voyage of each steamer. The line makes eighteen round voyages a year, making the total subsidy \$630,000 United States gold coin.

In addition to the above, there is a large number of tramp steamers carrying lumber and other commodities from San Francisco and Puget Sound ports to north China ports and Siberia, probably amounting to 40 departures from American ports in a year. Practically all these vessels carry a Chinese crew.

It is therefore apparent from the above that if the vessels of the Pacific Mail Steamship Company, which form but a minimum percentage of the total tonnage employed in trans-Pacific trade, are compelled to substitute foreign seamen other than Chinese or seamen who have "intention papers" for the present crews, it will affect to a very small degree the employment of the so-called American sailor on the Pacific coast. Further, the business between China and the United States is only obtained by the keenest competition in regard to rates; and if the Pacific Mail Steamship Company is especially singled out from among all its competitors and compelled to pay a different rate of wage, it will be unable to continue to work under the American flag if it expects to remain in this traffic against the competition of ships under a foreign flag.

For example, it has been heretofore stated that the crew of the *China* numbered 162 souls; the monthly pay roll of the Americans and Europeans amounts

to \$2,220 and of the Chinese to \$1,012.02, or a total of \$3,232.02. If a white crew is substituted for the Chinese, that portion of the pay roll will be increased from \$1,012.02 to \$4,520, United States gold coin, or the total monthly pay roll will be \$6,740, thereby increasing the yearly pay roll by \$42,095.96. In addition to the increase of the pay roll, there will be a very material increase in the cost of feeding the white crew as against the Chinese crew, which will amount to about \$500 per month for each steamer, or \$18,000 per year for the three steamers, while the total increase for the present three steamers would amount to about \$144,000 per annum.

Two steamships are being built for the Pacific Mail Steamship Company at the shipyards at Newport News, Va., for use in the trans-Pacific trade. One has just made her trial trip; the other is nearing completion. They are the finest and largest ships ever built in the United States. If the Chinese-crew clause should remain in the Chinese-exclusion bill, to take these new ships to the Pacific coast would be of doubtful expediency. The cost of operation would be increased by this bill \$75,000 a year for each ship above what it would be under the present conditions. The ships would therefore necessarily be placed under a foreign flag.

There have been several attempts to aid and assist, by both Federal and State legislation, American bottoms in foreign trade. In this act class legislation has developed, which, instead of assisting such bottoms in foreign trade, brings about a condition of increased expenditure which will practically prohibit continuing American ships under the American flag, without giving any commensurate benefit to the present so-called American seamen, a class which does not exist to-day in the foreign trade.

Again, it is important to bear in mind that the steaming distance from San Francisco to Hongkong is about 7,200 miles. It takes a race peculiarly constituted as regards their physical qualifications to stand extreme heat in the fire rooms of these ships while passing through the Tropics and the China seas. This bill also contemplates that the steamship company will be able to man its vessels with other than Chinese crews, but offers no alternative to the company provided that white men decline to ship in the fire rooms, or, having shipped, prove absolutely incompetent physically to perform the necessary continuous service.

It might be of interest to note that Hongkong has shipyards and dry docks not surpassed in any part of the world, and that the labor employed is entirely Chinese and is paid corresponding Chinese wages. All the vessels of the lines cited above which compete with the Pacific Mail Steamship Company have their repairs made in Hongkong, while it has always been the practice of the Pacific Mail Steamship Company to repair its ships at the Union Iron Works in San Francisco, and the records show that this company has spent about \$1,200,000 per annum in San Francisco for the different necessities of its vessels, including those operating between San Francisco and Panama, about one-third of the total expenses being incurred for the trans-Pacific steamers. This work would naturally be done in Hongkong if the ships were placed under the English flag.

As this bill is framed and intended to prevent the illegal entry of Chinese into the United States, it would appear that the Pacific Mail Steamship Company has been especially selected to suffer the results of class legislation, in so far that it is to be prevented from carrying a Chinese crew under the present register of its vessels, while vessels of other nationalities, without hindrance, can enter any port of the United States with Chinese crews; hence it can not be claimed that this legislation was necessary to prevent Chinese illegally entering the United States, as it is shown that the small number of Chinamen employed on the Pacific Mail Steamship Company's vessels is of little consequence compared with the total number of Chinese entering American ports on foreign vessels, which are the Pacific Mail's competitors; and further, there has never been a complaint that any of the crew of any of the steamers of the Pacific Mail Steamship Company have ever attempted to desert and illegally enter the United States.

The Pacific Mail Steamship Company had intended to enter the trade between the ports of the Philippine Islands and China with vessels under the American flag, but it will now be compelled to abandon this venture, for it is absolutely impossible for any vessels to obtain any other class of crews in these waters than Chinese. The bill therefore prohibits the further expansion of American shipping in these waters.

This bill makes it absolutely unlawful for any vessel holding an American register to have any Chinese person employed in its crew (whether such vessel may be operating between American and foreign ports or solely between foreign ports), and there is no qualification by which a vessel under the American flag can enter into trade between foreign ports where the conditions are such that only Chinese labor is available or where the Chinese are the only people capable of withstanding the climatic conditions. This bill deprives American vessels of this right, even though other governments permit subsidized lines to employ Chinese in their crews where the climatic conditions are such that other races are not physically adapted to perform certain services.

The Toyo Kisen Kaisha, a Japanese subsidized line, was compelled to carry, under its subsidy, crews composed entirely of Japanese, but was permitted in the beginning of the subsidy to carry for a certain period foreign officers, in addition to the Japanese officers provided by law. It was found that European passengers would not travel on these steamers provided they carried solely Japanese officers, nor could shippers by this line obtain satisfactory insurance rates. The law was therefore modified so that European officers should be carried solely. It was further found that the Japanese force in the fire and engine room was unable to stand the intense heat under high-speed conditions, and there were cases where these men abandoned the fire room and the ship was absolutely unable to proceed on its way except at reduced speed, after the men with great difficulty had been persuaded to return to their work. This resulted in a still further modification of the subsidy law, and these vessels were permitted and do now carry solely Chinese in their engine-room force.

The North German Lloyd have a subsidized line from Germany to Yokohama via India and China ports. They found that the German firemen and coal passers were unable to work in the fire room, owing to the intense heat. Article 31 of the contract of the North German Lloyd Line with the German Government was modified as follows:

"Asiatics shall not be employed in the crew on the Australian main line, and on the Chinese and Japanese main lines they may be employed only in the engine and fire rooms in so far as the employment of Europeans is impracticable for sanitary reasons.

"Exceptions to the foregoing conditions are permitted only with the consent of the Imperial Chancellor."

The fire rooms of the Pacific Mail ships have registered as high as 140° for many consecutive days. The experience of the Japanese line and the North German Lloyd Line will undoubtedly be the experience of the American steamers in the Asiatic trade; yet there is no provision to meet such a contingency. On the contrary, the wording of the bill is absolute. Further, the bill does not permit any American vessels to even employ a Chinese as interpreter or a Chinese cook, though its vessels are specifically in a trade carrying Chinese passengers, where the services of a Chinese interpreter can not be dispensed with. There is, according to law, a regular Chinese passenger traffic between the United States and China, and American vessels will be at a great disadvantage in this traffic, as the Chinese passengers will un-

doubtedly prefer to travel on vessels which have a Chinese crew, and under this law these can only be carried on foreign vessels.

From the wording of the clause eliminating Chinese from the crew of American vessels, it would appear to be aimed particularly against merchant vessels of the United States in the foreign trade, and that the employment of Chinese on Government vessels—that is, United States men-of-war—is not denied; nor does it appear that it is repugnant to the General Government, for it is a matter of fact that Chinese have for years been employed as stewards, cooks, and waiters on American men-of-war on foreign stations, and this act does not prohibit the continuance of such practice.

E. P. SCHWERIN,  
Vice-President and General Manager of the  
Pacific Mail Steamship Company.

Mr. MALLORY. Mr. President, I did not intend to say anything upon this bill or upon any of the amendments to it, but after listening to the remarks of the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. GALLINGER], who has just taken his seat, it occurs to me that possibly it is not inappropriate for me to say something from the view point which I have in looking at this particular subject, that is, the prohibition upon the employment of Chinese upon American ships anywhere.

The Senator from New Hampshire has stated that he is quite satisfied that this prohibition will be stricken from the bill. What his source of information is I do not know, because the Senator himself is, I believe, the only one, so far as I know, who has taken the trouble to make anything approximating toward an argument against that feature of the measure.

There have been read here a number of telegrams from gentlemen high in the social sphere and also, I believe, in commercial circles, protesting against the prohibition of the employment of Chinese as sailors, and I think there have been some counter telegrams, but so far as any argument is concerned or any reason that is assigned for removing from the bill the provision which the committee saw proper to insert in it, I have not heard a word, and I do not think anything has been said on the floor of the Senate on that subject outside of the remarks which we have just listened to from the Senator from New Hampshire.

It seems to me, Mr. President, that it is rather a remarkable thing that there should be such a universal assent to the abrogation of the principle embodied in that prohibition without anything having been said on the subject in the Senate against the views of the committee or of Senators who have had impressions and views upon that subject.

I think, Mr. President, if we analyze the question and give it a few moments thought that it will be rather a difficult thing for anyone to reach the conclusion summarily that this proposed action is proper to be now taken.

We have recently committed this body to a measure which proposes to devote \$9,000,000 per annum, if necessary, to the building up of the merchant marine of the United States; and one of the essentials of the merchant marine is the manning of them, the encouragement of men who will go into that business for the purpose of manning a ship, and I think everyone will admit that you can not take a farm hand or a man from the woods or from the mines, make a sailor of him, and render him in a few days capable of steering a ship by a compass or doing any of the ordinary elementary things which are required of men who follow the sea. It was urged in the advocacy of that bill, by those Senators who distinguished themselves peculiarly as its exponents and advocates, that that measure was in the interest of the American seaman, that one of the essential features of that measure was that we were to encourage the employment of American seamen, so that in times of stress, when it was necessary to man the naval vessels of the country, we should have a reserve corps to draw upon—a thing which does not exist to-day.

In addition to that, Mr. President, there was incorporated into that ship-subsidy bill a provision whereby men engaged in the deep-sea fisheries along the New England coast, not only the individual fishermen themselves, but the men who owned the vessels, were to receive a bonus, a subsidy, emoluments, not because of any particular merit in themselves, but in order to encourage American seamen.

Mr. President, the policy of the dominant party of this country has been—at least it has professed that that is its policy—to throw its protecting shield around the laboring man of the country in order that he may enjoy the benefits of enhanced prices by receiving enhanced wages. If there is anything which our Republican friends try to dwell most upon in their campaigns in this country in the political field it is when they appear before the laboring people of the land and call attention to the glorious results of the efforts of the Republican party to insure and secure beyond any question the highest possible wages as remuneration for the labor of the American wage-earner; and yet in this bill, which professes to be a measure to some extent looking to the protection of the American wage-earner, the only provision which undertakes to prevent the competition of the world against American wage-earners is to be stricken out, and to be stricken out without any reason being assigned therefor. I confess, Mr. President, that it is somewhat surprising to me.

I do not care to discuss the measure in the abstract. Many of its features are not such as I, if I were drawing a measure relating to the exclusion of the Chinese, would adopt; but of all the features that are contained in it I do not think there is any which this body can more consistently adhere to and incorporate as a part of this measure than the very one which the Senator from New Hampshire takes it for granted is going to be, by a kind of unanimous consent, stricken out of it to-morrow.

I have taken occasion, Mr. President, to offer an amendment, which is now pending, to the amendment proposed to this bill by the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. PLATT], in which I add to the provisions of the amendment proposed by the Senator from Connecticut the proposition contained in the bill prohibiting the employment of Chinese sailors on ships holding an American register. My reason for that is, as I have stated, that if we are going to protect American labor against Chinese competition, there is no one in all the vast field of effort in this country among the American wage-earners who is more in need of such protection and who has had less of such protection than the American sailor. We are here expending our breath from session to session protesting how anxious we are to build up the American merchant marine and lift the American sailor above the low plane to which he has sunk.

It seems to me, Mr. President, that if we wish to be consistent, if the Republican party wishes to put itself on record as being in line with what it professed only a few months ago, that it will carefully avoid striking out that provision regarding the Chinese sailor.

Mr. FAIRBANKS. Mr. President, I move that sections 6 and 7 of the bill be stricken out.

Mr. TELLER. What are they?

Mr. FAIRBANKS. They are the sections relating to teachers and students.

Mr. TELLER. The Senator will not call for a vote on them now, I suppose?

Mr. BEVERIDGE. May I inquire what is the proposed amendment?

Mr. FAIRBANKS. It is to strike out sections 6 and 7. Section 6 defines the term "teacher," and section 7 defines the term "student." I hope that motion will be acceptable to the chairman of the committee.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Objection was made yesterday that, under the unanimous-consent agreement, votes on contested amendments could not be taken until to-morrow.

Mr. TELLER. If the amendment proposed by the Senator from Indiana is a committee amendment, and all the members of the committee are in favor of it, I shall not enter any objection to its being acted upon now.

Mr. PENROSE. I feel authorized to accept those two amendments for the committee. I think they are not only favored by the committee, but by the Chinese-exclusion commissioners and the friends of the bill. In fact, they were suggested by members of the Chinese-exclusion committee. If the amendment be adopted, the result will be that the Treasury regulations will be amply sufficient, and that these two amendments will remove many objections which have been made to the bill.

Mr. TELLER. If it is the desire of the committee to get this bill in such a shape that every Senator will vote for it, whether he is in favor of Chinese exclusion or not, I think when we get through with the bill it will be of very little value.

Mr. FAIRBANKS. I would say to the Senator from Colorado that these two sections have been matters of difference with the committee, and that the committee deemed, upon full consideration, that the ends of the friends of the bill would be subserved by amending it as I have proposed and leaving the subject to be dealt with by the Secretary of the Treasury.

Mr. TELLER. I think that a good deal of the fault which has been found with this bill would be found with any bill that was of value.

Mr. PENROSE. I agree with the Senator on that.

Mr. TELLER. I have had a good deal of experience here. I commenced my service in this body in 1879, and I have heard the same thing at every session when we have had a Chinese-exclusion bill pending before us. We never got a bill that was satisfactory to certain Senators and to certain sections of the country, and we never shall.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment proposed by the Senator from Indiana will be stated.

The SECRETARY. It is proposed to strike out, on pages 3 and 4, sections 6 and 7, as follows:

SEC. 6. That the term "teacher," used in this act, shall be construed to mean only one who, for not less than two years next preceding his application for entry into the United States, has been continuously engaged in giving instruction in the higher branches of education, and who proves to the satisfaction of the appropriate Treasury officer that he is qualified to teach such higher branches and has completed arrangements to teach in a recognized institution of learning in the United States and intends to pursue no other occupation than teaching while in the United States.

SEC. 7. That the term "student," used in this act, shall be construed to mean only one who intends to pursue some of the higher branches of study, or to be fitted for some particular profession or occupation for which facilities for study are not afforded in the foreign country or the territory of the United States whence he comes, and for whose support while studying sufficient provision has been made, and who intends to depart from the territory of the United States immediately on the completion of his studies.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on the amendment proposed by the Senator from Indiana [Mr. FAIRBANKS] to strike out the sections which have been read.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. PENROSE. Mr. President, we have had many telegrams and communications read to the Senate to-day in opposition to the pending measure. I have upon my desk and I shall present and ask to have inserted in the RECORD as an appendix to my speech a large number of petitions which I have presented during this session of the Senate from labor unions of the State of Pennsylvania. I also have a large number presented by my colleague [Mr. QUAY] in this body, which I shall likewise ask to have printed.

Mr. President, the bill which is now under discussion is as urgently demanded by the laboring people of the State of Pennsylvania as it is by the people of the Pacific coast. All our great industrial centers, all our miners' unions and other labor organizations throughout the anthracite and bituminous regions of Pennsylvania urgently demand and insist upon the enactment of effective legislation to exclude Chinese laborers from our territory.

When the American Federation of Labor was formed, in 1881, at the city of Pittsburg, Pa., a preamble and resolution was unanimously adopted asking at the hands of Congress the passage of a law that should not restrict but should exclude Chinese laborers from coming into the United States. The language of the preamble and resolution is as follows:

Whereas the experiences of the last thirty years in California and on the Pacific coast have proved conclusively that the presence of Chinese and their competition with free white labor is one of the greatest evils with which any country can be afflicted: Therefore, be it

Resolved, That we use our best efforts to get rid of this monstrous evil which threatens, unless checked, to extend to other parts of the Union, by the dissemination of information respecting its true character and by urging upon our representatives in the United States Congress the absolute necessity of passing laws entirely prohibiting the immigration of Chinese into the United States.

At the last convention of the American Federation of Labor, held at Scranton, Pa., last December, the executive officer of that organization called attention to this fact in a report from which I desire to read a brief extract. He said:

In my last report your attention was called to the fact that the Chinese-exclusion act will expire May 5, 1902. This fact is repeated now, and the warning given that energetic and immediate action is an imperative necessity. There is no question to be considered by the present Congress fraught with half so much import to the American people as is the question whether or not the Chinese shall be excluded from our country and its domain. Fully realizing the immense importance attached to the work done by the American Federation of Labor and the danger of underestimating the strength of the antagonistic element, I have arranged for a most active and energetic campaign.

Being aware that the pro-Chinese element in the country depends in a large measure upon the general ignorance of many of us east of the Rocky Mountains as to the merits or demerits involved, literature has been prepared upon the subject for general distribution. We have issued a pamphlet containing in substance the result of official investigations, made by special committees of the California legislature, a special committee of the board of supervisors of San Francisco, and the several commissioners of the bureau of labor statistics of California, together with extracts from memorials adopted by State and anti-Chinese conventions; also containing the views of some famous statesmen and economists, furnishing exhaustive and startling data which will enable those interested to obtain the information necessary to combat ignorant or unreasoning opposition.

Then the report goes on to say:

There can not be any honest division of opinion on Chinese exclusion. However much we may oppose, and with justice, unrestricted immigration from elsewhere, this Chinese question is not at all to be compared with or included in a general immigration law. Important as are the interests of labor involved, they form by no means the sole or controlling influence governing us in our efforts to continue the policy of exclusion.

Apart from the fact that we are workmen, we are also American citizens, fully imbued with the grand principles underlying our form of government and our present system of civilization. The introduction or continuance of an element so entirely at variance with our economic, political, social, and moral conceptions, and so utterly incapable of adaptation to the Caucasian ideas of civilization, is not only dangerous to us as a class, but is destructive of the various institutions we are so earnestly striving to uphold, maintain, or attain. Whatever may be the opinion of others, to us this matter does not permit a compromise.

Chinese exclusion is an issue upon which all organized labor is a unit.

The hearthstone of American citizen is in danger.

Every incoming coolie means the displacement of an American and the lowering of the American standard of living.

It represents so much money sent out of the country.

So much more vice and immorality injected into our social life in its place. We can not afford to trifle with a race of people so utterly unassimilative, so ruinous to our general prosperity, and so blighting to our every prospect.

Comparison with immigration of other peoples is only possible by contrast. While we object to an indiscriminate influx of other foreign laborers, we maintain that discrimination in the case of Chinese immigrants is impossible.

We insist upon an exclusion act which will effectively exclude. Provision must be made for proper enforcement of the law when enacted, and the jurisdiction and execution of the law so conferred as to remove it from the legal juggling to which former laws have been subject.

The general importance of this legislation justifies me in again urging the necessity of ceaseless and untiring activity in whatever direction it may

be essential, and, furthermore, that every honest and legitimate effort be used to impress others with the same zeal for the furtherance of this law, so that all may contribute toward the successful consummation of an act so absolutely necessary for the best interests of the nation.

Mr. President, the report of the special committee appointed by that convention, only two members of which hailed from the Pacific coast, was unanimous in favor of this legislation. That report declared, among other things, the principal dangers of Chinese immigration.

First. The mobility of the Chinese as a race and their tendency to move in vast numbers toward countries offering them opportunities (by excessive toil and the cheapest possible method of living) to save enough with which to return to their native land.

Second. An invasion of a people representing uncounted millions, wedded to inferior social standards would itself become a calamity.

Third. It would hamper our progress as a nation, by the introduction of a large element which, on account of their highly developed race consciousness, can not be assimilated.

Fourth. Their presence in considerable numbers would engender a hostility which would make them a disturbing factor in society.

Fifth. Their admission would provide an unfailing supply of degraded servile laborers that would affect our efforts to improve industrial conditions.

Sixth. It is not only a question of wages, but one which concerns the moral and social well-being of the people.

Seventh. From common observation they foster vices peculiar to their race and most degrading to humanity.

Eighth. To admit them would be a dangerous reversal of a public policy which has proven to be sound.

Ninth. The demand for their exclusion is unanimous upon the part of all citizens, save those having special financial interests to serve.

Mr. President, I desire to file the petitions which have been offered by me during the present session of Congress as well as those of my colleague urging the passage of this particular bill.

No law will be effective to accomplish the exclusion of the Chinese except some bill substantially like that reported by the Committee on Immigration or as that passed by the House of Representatives. Any other bill is but a subterfuge of those who either have no particular interest in the exclusion of the Chinese or, on the other hand, perhaps are in favor of their general admission.

The details of the question have been gone over so carefully by others that it is not necessary for me to go into the reasons for the enactment of this legislation at this time. The fact remains that this bill is simply a reenactment of the Geary law and of the Treasury regulations which have been promulgated under that law and have been in practice for a number of years. When I say the Geary law, Mr. President, I mean one only of several existing measures relating to Chinese exclusion.

The United States Treasury officials in carrying out the exclusion policy of the United States are, in fact, acting under nine different laws, in whole or in part, and the Treasury decisions and regulations and a great mass of decisions of the Supreme Court of the United States, circuit and district courts, of the United States Commissioners, besides the opinions of the Attorney-General and of the Solicitor-General of the Treasury, and the decisions of the Secretary of the Treasury, and various collectors of customs. The bill is, therefore, a codification of existing laws, decisions, and regulations. It is not an exaggeration to say that there is hardly a vital departure to be found in this bill in any of its many sections. The bill is in the interest of uniformity in enactment and in practice.

Not only will no substitute for this bill be effective, but it will not even embrace all the subjects which confront us as the result of our recent expansion in the direction of the Pacific. It will not affect the condition of our insular possessions, and if those possessions are left open for the admission of Chinese from the coasts of Asia, or if we permit Chinese persons to come from them to the mainland territory of the United States, we have opened a gateway which will render ineffective any reenactment of the Geary law.

It is admitted and must be understood that this legislation is extraordinary in its character. The reason is that we are confronted with the menace that has threatened the white peoples of Europe for thousands of years. First it was military and warlike competition with the Mongolians; now it is industrial competition with them. It is legislation directed against a particular people. The provisions of the law are stringent and unusual. The principle of exclusion herein embodied is the product of national development, and has become a vital principle of American policy, essential for the protection of American citizenship and for the preservation of American civilization.

The policy of the United States Government in reference to the admission of Chinese persons has gone through three phases of progression, from free immigration in 1868 to prohibition in 1894, to wit: Free immigration from 1868 to 1880, restriction from 1880 to 1888, exclusion from 1888 to 1892, and prohibition from 1892 to the present time. From free immigration in 1868, therefore, we have reached a point when the principle of Chinese exclusion confronts us as a labor problem, as a social problem, and in a still more vital degree as a political problem, involving the integrity of American civilization.

Our first treaty with China was negotiated by Caleb Cushing in 1844 and marked a great advance in trade and in a recognition of the rights of American citizens in the Chinese Empire. Instead of trying to keep out the Chinese, American diplomacy was then engaged in enabling American citizens to secure admission into China and to break up that exclusion and isolation in which the great oriental Empire had been involved for ages. In fact, there had been, with the exception of a few ports, an absolute exclusion of Americans and all foreigners from the Chinese Empire; and the rapid development of commerce in the Orient soon made necessary a revision of the treaties of all the Western nations.

We were then laboring under no apprehension of an invasion of cooly labor from China. The object of our diplomacy was to secure admission for our own merchants and traders, as it was that of England and the nations of Europe.

France and Great Britain in 1857 invited the United States to join in an armed intervention to compel China to grant the additional commercial privileges which they desired. Without resorting to force, however, we were at length able to bring about the treaty of 1858, by which we secured additional commercial concessions.

In a few years, however, a new situation of affairs in the Pacific was developed. In order to unify the nation and bring the Pacific States into easy communication with the rest of the Union the construction of a railroad across the continent and over the mountains became a necessity. Labor was scarce on the Pacific coast. The construction of a railroad was delayed, and resort was had to China for workmen. They came in large numbers, and by their aid that great transcontinental work was being carried to successful completion. But the Chinese were brought in under a contract system which was practically slavery—naturally repugnant to the American people.

In 1868 a large embassy from China arrived in the United States, the first ever sent abroad, having at its head an American—Anson Burlingame, who had resigned the post of minister to accept the position. With this embassy Secretary Seward negotiated what was termed "additional articles to the treaty of 1858." The Burlingame treaty secured greater privileges to the American citizens in China, recognized the autonomy of the Empire, disavowed any intention to interfere in its internal affairs, and prohibited the cooly contract system. The treaty was hailed as a triumph of American diplomacy, because it marked another advance in the admission of our own people into China.

The Chinese question had not then assumed menacing proportions, and our chief concern was to secure greater privileges to American citizens in China. Our people beheld the immigration of thousands of Chinese every month to the Pacific coast without any great apprehension, and were disposed to entertain a good opinion of their assiduity, patience, and fidelity; while it was felt that a great advance had been made toward opening the Empire to our civilization and religion, giving promise to the future of greater and greater practical results in the diffusion of our arts and industries, our manufactures and material importance, and the sentiments of government and religion.

But the development was so rapid upon the Pacific coast it was not long before our Government was again compelled to ask for a modification of our treaty relations with China. The sentiment was emphatic from the Pacific States that some check should be placed upon Chinese immigration in the interest of American labor. The immigration treaty of 1880 was finally agreed to, restricting the coming of Chinese persons; but even this treaty did not prove satisfactory as a sufficient protection against the rapidly increasing danger to American labor from Chinese immigration, and the Scott Act was passed by Congress in 1888, while efforts were being made to negotiate further treaty stipulations with China.

Then we have the treaty of 1880 substituted by the treaty of 1894, under which we are at present living. Our early treaties were controlled by conditions utterly different from those existing at the present day. Then it was the effort of the people and the merchants of the United States, as well as of the nations of Europe, to break into the exclusion which the Chinese Empire had maintained with rigid consistency in all the recorded time of its existence. It was to open to our merchants and to our traders those rich oriental markets which have always dazzled the minds of men. It was only as our own Pacific coast developed that this menace of Chinese cooly labor grew darker and darker upon us.

Then China finally agreed and consented to restrict cooly labor and to provide for certain exempted classes of her own people. To say that when this treaty expires we must go back to the treaty of 1868, negotiated under conditions so absolutely different from those which prevail in the United States at the present day, to say that we must go back to the treaty of 1868 after China, by two successive treaties, has given her consent to the restriction of Chinese cooly labor into this country, is to extend a veneration

and a regard for ancient treaties of this country with other nations for which I have very little sympathy.

Mr. President, even if it were so in a question of this character, involving as it does, in my opinion, the protection of American labor, the protection of the American home, and the preservation of our American civilization, I should say let Congress exercise its right, which has been declared by the Supreme Court of the United States, and let it by proper enactment of exclusion measures abrogate all treaties, ancient and modern, on this question.

It will be seen that the policy of the United States with reference to the exclusion of Chinese laborers has been one of slow growth. In the beginning Chinese exclusion was not a matter of much concern. The principal object of our diplomatists was to break through the exclusion of the Chinese Empire and to secure access for our citizens and the development of our trade. With the growth of the Pacific coast conditions became changed, and the demand became more and more insistent that Chinese immigration should be restricted and regulated, and finally that it should be prohibited. The principle of exclusion became a national necessity.

Our expansion since the Spanish-American war has compelled us to extend the principle of exclusion upon a proportionately extended scale. The existing laws and regulations have been extended to the Philippines, and, in fact, to all of our insular territory. In the Hawaiian Islands, Chinese immigration is prohibited by the joint resolution of annexation and by the act of Congress providing for the government of the Territory of Hawaii. The existing laws and regulations providing for exclusion of Chinese from the United States have been established and enforced in the Philippine Islands by military proclamation, and the present bill therefore makes permanent conditions already existing.

Mr. President, the Committee on Immigration carefully considered the question of the exclusion of the Chinese from the Philippines. There were presented to the committee many petitions and some testimony urging the admission of unskilled or at least skilled labor into the Philippine Islands. It was the opinion of the members of the Committee on Immigration that it was better to postpone the commercial and industrial development of the Philippine Islands for a time and to preserve those islands for the Filipino people themselves and not to threaten them with that of which we understood they had the greatest apprehension, that the islands should be immediately thrown open to the exploiter and speculator.

The question of exclusion is as important in the Philippines as it is in the United States. Manila must not be permitted to exist as a gateway through which Chinese immigrants can find entrance into the United States, and it is our obligation and our duty to preserve the Philippine Islands for the Filipino people, extending to them as rapidly as possible the principles of American civilization and the largest practical measure of free government. A feeling of hostility toward the Chinese on the part of the Filipinos seems to have always existed in the islands and to be as strong as any similar sentiment in the United States.

In the middle of the seventeenth century there were about 30,000 Chinese in the neighborhood of Manila. At that time they regarded the Spanish Government and for some years before that they regarded the Spanish Government as their protector.

They finally withdrew, raising the siege, but they were pursued to a point beyond Canarta and slaughtered in great numbers. As a result of this revolt against the sovereignty of Spain in the archipelago greater restrictions were placed on their immigration, but in spite of these restrictions the Chinese colony, notwithstanding their great loss, always displayed a peculiar ability to corrupt the administrative element in the Philippines.

In 1755 all non-Christian Chinese were ordered to be expelled, but before the day arrived for their expulsion (June 30, 1755) an extraordinary number had become Christianized, while many others began to study the mysteries of the faith. Several thousand were banished from Manila, and in the time of Don Siman Deon, 1762 to 1764, it was calculated that some 8,000 died in the central province of Luzon, being exterminated by the order of the governor-general. The Chinese question has always been a serious one for the governors-general. In 1859, when Señor Norzaray gave up his command in the Philippines, he declared that one of the most difficult questions remaining to be solved was that of the commerce carried on by the Chinese in the provinces.

The clamor against the Asiatics he declared to be general in the country, because competition with them was impossible. Spaniards, Mestizos, and Indians all gave them a free field in retail business when they entered the islands. Their few needs, their patience under every insult and vexation and sacrifice, their great industry, their low standard of living, and their close cooperation among themselves all gave them extraordinary advantages. The governor-general inquires, "Are the complaints of thousands of individuals of other races sufficient warrant for the prevention of their invading activity in all their industries?" And his answer is in the affirmative.

Since the administration of Norzaray down to the beginning of the war between the United States and Spain, the influence of the Chinese in the Philippines has been increasing in commerce and industry. The Chinese were able by giving valuable presents to overcome any opinion unfavorable to them, both in the government of the islands and at Madrid. By means of this policy, they triumphed over the anti-Chinese report, which was sent to the Government of Spain in June, 1896, signed by many merchants and manufacturers of the Philippines, both natives of the islands and of the peninsular.

It may be true that the exclusion of the Chinese from the Philippines will delay the exploitation and development of these islands. It may be true that Chinese labor is needed in some parts of the Philippines, and that Chinese skilled laborers are needed everywhere there; but it is our duty and it should be our policy to protect the native Filipinos and to insure them in the enjoyment of the Philippine Islands and their great resources. One of their greatest apprehensions concerning American domination is the fear that the islands will be exposed to reckless, selfish, and unscrupulous exploitation.

The sooner the Philippine people realize that our first duty is to secure their freedom and happiness, the sooner will peace and order be restored to the islanders. It is hoped and confidently believed that with a suitable government established, and with the arts of a higher civilization introduced, new wants will be created among the Filipino people, and that they will in a short time be aroused to the habits of industry, which will gradually produce an ample supply of labor, skilled and unskilled. In any event, it is better that we should act conservatively in this matter; it is better that the commercial and industrial development of the islands be delayed for the ultimate advantage of the Philippine people and of the American people than that they should be given over to the speculator, the capitalist, and the exploiter regardless of the permanent welfare of the islands.

Our trade with China is becoming an important factor in our commercial development. The commerce of the Pacific seems to point in the direction of the great commercial expansion of the future. In the opinion of many interested in this growing trade, legislation, apparently hostile to the citizens of the Chinese Empire, is not calculated to encourage and foster this commerce, but rather to depress and discourage it by incurring a sentiment of hostility among all classes in China. Even if such were the case, this legislation would still be justified as vitally necessary to protect American labor and to preserve the integrity of American civilization and American institutions, but it is difficult to see how any just complaint can be made against such legislation enacted by the American Congress.

It is difficult to see how existing treaties, international obligations, or even international comity, are violated in any way by the proposed legislation. Circumstances have changed completely since our first treaty with China, when the principal object of our diplomats was to break the exclusion of the Chinese Empire and open it for our citizens and our trade. From the outset the position of the foreigner in China has been one of violation and exclusion. His rights have been limited under treaties to certain specific objects within the narrow limits of the treaty ports and extended only at the will of the Chinese Government to residence and travel in the interior.

Other nations by treaty with China have impliedly recognized the inherent right of the Empire to regulate the domicile and business of aliens within its borders by obtaining from China the limited privileges expressed by the former treaties and the expanded privileges growing out of them. Innumerable incidents might be mentioned where citizens of the United States, peacefully dwelling or traveling in China, have been the victims of mob violence and of hostile aggression on the part of local authorities. The fact that foreign nations have any rights at all in China at the present time is only the result of years of diplomatic endeavor.

We alone are the judges as to whether an emergency has now arisen requiring more stringent legislation on our part to continue the exclusion of Chinese laborers. The assumption is a false one which claims that the status of the Chinese subjects with relation to the body politic of the United States is similar to that of aliens of other nationalities. Neither in the light of international reciprocity nor of municipal sovereignty can these assumptions hold good. The restrictions upon foreigners in China are especially narrow as to vocation, residence, and travel. In fact, Chinese legislation is based on the great primitive fact that natural barriers exist which seem to forbid the assimilation of the foreign element with the active Chinese race.

This condition of immiscibility is likewise as forcibly present in the case of Chinese in the United States as it is generally absent in regard to aliens of the same race and blood as our own. It is the inherent prerogative of sovereignty to take cognizance of such incompatibilities, to provide special conditions for the

tolerance of the immiscible element in the national community. Chinese exclusion can be justified on these grounds, and this sovereign right is freely exercised by the United States in the adoption of restrictive or discriminating legislation in regard to any class of alien immigration whenever the exigencies of the public needs demand and to whatever extent they may require.

So far from injury having been inflicted upon our growing trade with China by exclusion legislation, our commercial relations have, on the contrary, tended to develop to a remarkable degree. In our diplomatic relations our attitude has been generous and disinterested and free from all suggestion of territorial aggrandizement beyond any other nation. We stand preeminently for the integrity of the Chinese Empire, and our magnanimous attitude is duly appreciated. In 1897, when all of the most drastic of the present Treasury regulations were in operation, our trade with China nearly quadrupled the trade of 1882, which marked the beginning of our exclusion policy, and more than doubled the trade of the year in which the Geary Act was passed.

It is believed by many in a position to judge that if we make allowance for the large part of our China trade which passes for British and Japanese trade, it is probable that the United States is second to Great Britain in goods sold to the Chinese. American kerosene oil, cotton cloth, American drills, American sheetings, and American agricultural products find an increasing market in China. The controlling factor of these commercial relations is self-interest. Sentiment enters very much less in the Chinese trade than in the trade of any other nation. The Chinese lack to a marked degree the national spirit. They will buy our goods because they are the best and because they are the cheapest.

We are indeed looking upon the expanding horizon of a new century, and we have awakened to the splendid possibilities of our future since the fortunes of war have given us possessions in the Far East across the Pacific Ocean. The most available direction for our free commercial expansion is in the direction of China. Our trade with South America does not give promise for great development in the future.

A large part of Africa, India, Australia, and Canada are necessarily more or less within the sphere of British influence, but if the commerce of the Pacific is to supplant, in the not distant future, that of the Atlantic in importance, and to transform the commercial, industrial, and political conditions of the world, the American people in geographical situation are destined to be the principal beneficiaries in the rapid development of intercourse with the Orient. Across the Pacific from the States of California, Oregon, and Washington is a coast line of 4,000 miles, from Vladivostok and Yokohama on the north to Bangkok and Singapore on the south.

If we include Australasia, we can extend this coast line so that it will be 8,000 miles, with some 500,000,000 people immediately identified therewith, with whom is exchanged a foreign trade exceeding \$2,000,000,000. This great trade already existing is yet in the infancy of its development. The wonderful possibilities of growth are illustrated in the case of Japan, the foreign commerce of which thirty years ago was about \$30,000,000, or nearly \$1 per head. To-day, I believe, it averages between \$6 and \$7 per head.

Korea and Siam offer enormous possibilities for commercial development in the future. Right in the center of this populous and busy coast line is Manila. No one can question the commercial importance of Manila and the Philippines. If the foreign trade of these islands amounted to \$30,000,000 under restrictive Spanish rule, there is no reason why, under American direction, when peace and order are finally and firmly established, this total should not reach one hundred and fifty millions per annum within the next decade.

Such increase would be no more remarkable than that which Hawaii has shown, nor more than Burma showed after ten years of British authority. Java, with an area less than Luzon, and with no greater variety of resources, has developed under the control of Holland an important foreign trade, valued at nearly \$200,000,000 per annum. Similarly across the South China Sea from the Philippines, French Indo-China, including Tokin, Anam, and Cambodia, has shown a wonderful capacity for commercial growth under French control—possessing a trade nearly fourfold greater than it was when the French first took possession.

It is not necessary to refer to the enormous possibilities of Australia, New Zealand, and the neighboring islands. With all these countries the future channels of foreign commerce are in the direction of the United States. As steamship facilities are improved, cables are laid, and the transisthmian canal completed there will come a growth of trade that will surpass the wildest expectations. China, with a population of 400,000,000 persons, seems to be on the verge of a marvelous development. China's foreign trade in the year before the Boxer outbreak amounted approximately to \$333,000,000. This was less than \$1 per head.

Compare this with Japan's advance from less than \$1 per head to \$7 per head in thirty years. If China, which is far more re-

sourceful than Japan, is open to the foreign world and provided with a progressive administration, it is logical to estimate that its foreign commerce ought to amount to at least \$6 per head in the next two or three decades. The demand for manufactured and raw cotton will increase to such an extent as to have a marked effect upon the cotton mills and plantations of the South.

When we consider that in China's area of 4,000,000 square miles there are not more than 400 miles of completed railway, we can picture in some measure the demand that will be made upon our iron and steel industries to supply the construction of the future great development of her railway system. The Pacific coast of the United States is destined soon to rival our Atlantic shores in population and in commercial and industrial development.

In view of our possession of the Philippines, our occupancy of Hawaii, our intention to preserve the open door in China, and our policy in maintaining cordial relations with Japan, Australia, and other countries on the Pacific, we have good ground to predict that when the interoceanic canal is constructed, the Pacific cable is laid, and vigorous methods employed to advance our interests, our commercial expansion in the East will grow with rapidity to splendid proportions. Legislation by the American Congress prohibiting the immigration of any class of unassimilable and immiscible foreigners can not affect the march of this great development.

Legislation of the character of this Chinese-exclusion bill is necessarily exceptional and extraordinary. It can hardly be said that the ordinary rules of consistency and propriety apply. We are face to face with a fact originating in prehistoric times—the immiscibility of the white European races and the Mongolian races.

The Senator from Massachusetts the other day referred to it as a contest between the great Aryan peoples and the Mongolian. I believe he was right, and he referred to a point which I have had in mind in the consideration of this question.

The researches of modern science disclose an enormous antiquity for the human race, and coming down to comparatively recent times we have the geological records of more than one great ice age, when a large part of the northern hemisphere was buried under a stupendous sheet of ice, sending out glaciers, and between these Glacial periods with arctic climates we have intervals of tropical conditions. We suppose that a race of men, described as "the men of the river drift," took up their abode in Europe and struggled with the extremes of climate. This race of men is probably now as extinct as the cave bear or the mammoth.

Late in what is known as the Pleistocene period he disappeared from Europe, and was replaced by a new race coming from the northeast, along with the musk ox and reindeer, and called the cave men. Both cave men and river-drift men were in the stage of culture known as the Paleolithic or old Stone age—that is, they used only stone implements. The river-drift men belonged to the southern fauna, which existed in Europe before the approach of the Glacial cold.

As the climate of Europe became arctic and temperate by turns the river-drift men appear to have retreated southward to Italy and Africa or advanced northward into Britain along with the leopards, hyenas, and elephants, with which they were contemporary. After several such migrations they returned no more, and instead of them we find plentiful traces of the cave men, a race apparently more limited in its range, and clearly belonging to a subarctic fauna, being contemporary with the reindeer and bison, the arctic fox, the mammoth, and the woolly rhinoceros. We may suppose that the cave men were identical with the Eskimos at present living about the Arctic Circle.

With the passing away of Pleistocene times further changes occurred in the geography of Europe and in its population. The British Isles became detached from each other and from the Continent. The North Sea and the Irish Channel had assumed very nearly their present sizes and shapes, and in general the geographical and physical structure of Europe assumed very much the position it has retained until the present time. The dog, the horse, the ox, the pig, the sheep, and the goat appear among the animals inhabiting Europe and with them a new race of men, the first, as far as we know, in Europe to become tamers and owners of these domestic animals.

These men represented a higher step in civilization, as they built rude huts and had stone instruments of fine edge and improved design. The age to which they belonged is known to archaeologists as the Neolithic age. The lake villages of Switzerland have come down to us from that time. It is certain that the domestic animals did not originate in Europe, but were domesticated in central Asia, which was the home of their wild ancestors, and, moreover, they were not introduced into Europe generally one by one, but suddenly and en masse. It is clear, therefore, that they must have been brought in from Asia by the Neolithic men.

The same is true of the four kinds of wheat, two of barley, the millet, apples, pears, plums, and flax which grew in the orchards

of Neolithic Switzerland. This elementary and Neolithic civilization was spread all over Europe, and, unlike the cave men and river-drift men who had preceded it, it has remained there in a certain sense to this day, and constitutes a very important part of our ancestry. This race which once possessed the whole of Europe in the Neolithic age, and until the Aryan invasions, is known as the Iberian, and is still represented in a few corners of Europe, as in the instance of the Basques of northern Spain.

At last, in what may be termed very recent times, probably not more than twenty centuries before the Christian era, Europe was invaded by a new race of men coming from central Asia. These were the Aryan people, described as a tall race, massive in stature, with round and broad skulls, powerful jaws and prominent eyebrows, face rather square and angular than oval, fair ruddy complexions, blue eyes, and red or flaxen hair. They came in successive swarms, generally described as the Kelts, followed by the Teutons, and later times by the Slavs. They were further advanced in civilization than the Iberians, and they everywhere overcame them. The swarthy Iberians and the fair-skinned Aryans have given rise to the present mixed population of Europe.

It is neither pertinent nor profitable at this time to speculate as to the place of origin of the great Aryan race. It is sufficient to say that we find them advancing from the north and spreading over the country between the Euphrates and the mouth of the Ganges. They first seem to have attained something like historical importance in the highlands of central Asia between the source of the Oka and the Jaxartes. They seem to have migrated from the Oka in the direction of Hindostan.

The dominant race in Persia and in ancient India was one and the same approaching India from the northwest. But, Mr. President, the remarkable fact is that the migration of the Aryan race seemed subsequently to have been diverted westward, and they have continued ever since to take a westward course. The eastern domain has altered but little for many centuries, but westward it has extended until it has occupied all of Europe, has crossed the Atlantic Ocean and extended to the Pacific coast, has at length crossed the Pacific Ocean, and is now confronting the immiscible people of Asia.

Europe possesses a wonderfully mixed population, Iberian and Aryan, divided into several great nationalities. These various Aryan people, Celts, Gauls, Romans, Greeks, Teutons, and Slavs, consolidated into their various European nationalities, have crossed the Atlantic, and in a new admixture of peoples have come to constitute under new geographical, climatic, and political conditions a new and homogeneous race, the people of the United States.

The migration of the imperial Aryan race, which seems in all times to have been the custodian of all progress and civilization, has ever been westward. In other words, the course of empire has been westward. The reasons would seem at first to be involved in mystery, but little investigation will make it evident that this course has probably been due to the pressure of external masses of barbarism, ever on the alert to break through the barrier that has walled it off from growing civilization, ever threatening to undo the costly work which has been accomplished. Whether the enemy at times appear in the shape of invasions of barbaric hordes in the fifth century, and of Mongols in the thirteenth century, and at other times as exemplified by Arabs and Turks, the principle involved has always been the same.

In every case the stake has been the continuance of higher civilization, although the amount has greatly varied. When the Greeks confronted social organization of inferior type at Marathon and at Salamis, the danger was considerable. In prehistoric times it may well have happened more than once that some crumb of progressive civilization has been snatched away in a torrent of conquering barbarism. Until the rise of the Roman power the general military business of the civilized community had been to drive out the barbarian.

The Tartaric hordes which molested the Aryans in far Asia and to whose attack, as well as the unmanageable increase of their own numbers, we must probably ascribe their gradual and long-continued migration into Europe, were far less civilized than the Aryan people. Only after many centuries those less civilized Aryans, known as Germans and Slavs, were driven into collision with their more civilized brethren of the Roman Empire. Their invasion was in an all-important respect different from the invasions of Huns and Tartars; the followers of Alaric, Hengist, and Chlodwig came to colonize, whereas the followers of Attila came but to riot and destroy.

When we survey the field of our political, administrative, and commercial development, when we consider the great height which we have already attained, and contemplate the limitless and splendid future which seems to be opening before us, the American people can not fail to be imbued with the deep sense of responsibilities accompanying our great triumphs in every field of activity. The people of Europe are astonished at the rapid extension of American activity and influence.

That is the keynote to the vital principle which has enabled us so rapidly to develop this American continent and to preserve American institutions under tremendous civil and military conflict. We stand to-day as the most successful and the greatest nation that has ever existed in the history of the world.

Mr. President, it behooves us for our own interests and that of our posterity to see that these institutions are not imperiled. They depend upon the individual energy and intelligence of each citizen of the United States. In my opinion, they would be imperiled if we are to have all our great cities and in many of our agricultural centers inhabited by a people never assimilative, not desiring to be assimilative, whose ways are so different from our ways, separated by so many thousand years of separation that it does not seem likely that they ever will be assimilative.

Mr. President, I would rather go a little slow in our development than have these institutions for one moment threatened by an element in our population which can not, as I have said, at any time be assimilated with American civilization. The mysteries surrounding the Orient have always excited the curiosity of men. It inspired them in the early days to build up the commerce of Naples, Genoa, and Venice and the great commercial cities of the Mediterranean.

Subsequently, after the Mongolian and the Turk and the other non-Aryan people blocked the approaches to China and the East, the decadence of those Mediterranean cities began, and then men's thoughts faced the ocean and they endeavored to find a passage to the East across the ocean or around the Cape of Good Hope in Africa.

Finally the Portuguese discovered the Indian Ocean around the African continent. Portugal, by reason of her oriental trade, was built up and became for a brief period the great commercial center of Europe. Then when the Portuguese Empire was absorbed with Spain and her brief period of commercial prosperity ceased, the nation of Holland, the Dutch cities, became prominent, and for a time the most important commercial cities of Europe through their trade with the East. It built up England later on, and in our own time it seems to afford the greatest prospect for our own expansion.

I believe that we are destined to secure that expansion and to get our full share of the trade of the East. I believe it is as certain to come to us as is the gradual growth of population upon our own mainland territory.

But I am willing, Mr. President, to imperil it rather than to imperil for the present generation, in my opinion, and for posterity the integrity of American civilization and American institutions by letting down in any degree the bars which keep out Chinese laborers on the ground that they are a race which can not be assimilated and which can not mix with our people.

In my opinion, any member of this body who believes that a measure briefly enacting existing law is sufficient to cover this case either deceives himself or is grossly deceived. If he believes that it will satisfy the undoubted public clamor and demand which exists for this legislation he is gravely mistaken and is rushing to his undoing. It will not satisfy the demand, but in my opinion if any inadequate, half-way legislation is passed at the present session of Congress, the demand will rise so rapidly, increasing so urgently, so irresistibly, from the Pacific coast and from all the industrial States of this Union for effective Chinese exclusion, that the opponents of the pending measure will bitterly regret that they have laid any obstacle in its path.

#### APPENDIX.

*Petitions and memorials praying for the reenactment of the Chinese-exclusion law presented by Mr. Quay.*

December 4.—Petitions of Pioneer Fire Company, No. 1, of Hazelton; the Carpenters' Association of Philadelphia; of Local Union No. 1376, United Mine Workers of America, of Hazelton; of Washington Camp, No. 16, Patriotic Order Sons of America, of Harrisburg; of the Council of the Allied Building Trades, of Philadelphia; of the Central Labor Union of Hazelton; of Local Union No. 1499, United Mine Workers of America, of Fredland; of Local Union No. 1659, United Mine Workers of America, of St. Nicholas; of Local Union No. 865, United Mine Workers of America, of Arnot; of West Philadelphia Council, No. 561, Junior Order of United American Mechanics; of Local Union No. 1736, United Mine Workers of America, of Rossiter; of Local Union No. 349, United Mine Workers of America, of Wilkesbarre; of Local Union No. 1138, United Mine Workers of America, of Edwardsdale; of Local Union No. 166, United Mine Workers of America, of McAdoo; of Local Union No. 1513, United Mine Workers of America, of Nuremburg; of Branch No. 10, Glass Bottle Blowers' Association, of Royersford; of Local Union No. 1383, United Mine Workers of America, of Mahanoy City; of Local Union No. 801, United Mine Workers of America, of Munson Station; of 207 members of Abraham Lincoln Council, No. 513, Junior Order United American Mechanics, of Montoursville; of 108 members of General William Lilly Council, No. 326, Junior Order United American Mechanics, of Philadelphia; of 76 members of Eden Council, No. 988, Junior Order United American Mechanics, of Eden; of 110 members of Media Council, No. 749, Junior Order United American Mechanics, of Media; of 53 members of Roseville Council, No. 680, Junior Order United American Mechanics, of West Hanover; of 147 members of James E. Hyatt Council, No. 923, Junior Order United American Mechanics, of Philadelphia; of 110 members of Oriole Council, No. 877, Junior Order United American Mechanics, of Chantlersburg; of Local Union No. 884, United Mine Workers of America, of Shamokin; of citizens and members of the Ninth District United Mine



Workers of America, of Lykens; of Shawnee Council, No. 84, Junior Order United American Mechanics, of Hazleton; of Local Union No. 570, United Mine Workers of America, of Portage; of Local Union No. 378, United Mine Workers of America, of Glen Richey; of Local Union No. 1549, United Mine Workers of America, of Tresckow; of Local Union No. 205, United Mine Workers of America, of Shamokin; of the Amalgamated Journeyman House Painters and Decorators' Beneficial Association, of Philadelphia; of Trades Unionist Publishing Company, of Hazleton; of 36 members of Hampton Council, No. 685, Junior Order United American Mechanics, of Hampton; of 91 members of Westchester Council, No. 633, Junior Order United American Mechanics, of Westchester; of 151 members of Colonel David F. Houston Council, No. 739, Junior Order United American Mechanics, of Westchester; of 123 members of Black Creek Council, No. 51, Junior Order United American Mechanics, of Weatherly; of 188 members of Guarantee Council, No. 95, Junior Order United American Mechanics, of Wissa; of 112 members of Shenandoah Valley Council, No. 530, Junior Order United American Mechanics, of Shenandoah; of 608 members of Allen Council, No. 753, Junior Order United American Mechanics, of Allentown; of 67 members of Enhaut Council, No. 231, Junior Order United American Mechanics, of Enhaut; of 210 members of Camp Curtin Council, No. 629, Junior Order United American Mechanics, of Harrisburg; of 180 members of George Bancroft Council, No. 571, Junior Order United American Mechanics, of Tacony; of 142 members of Melrose Council, No. 928, Junior Order United American Mechanics, of Harrisburg; of 293 members of Hazleton Council, No. 258, Junior Order United American Mechanics, of Hazleton; of 238 members of Edwin A. Shubert Council, No. 728, Junior Order United American Mechanics, of West Philadelphia; of 203 members of St. Clair Council, No. 493, Junior Order United American Mechanics, of St. Clair; of 146 members of Juniata Council, No. 372, Junior Order United American Mechanics, of Altoona; of 493 members of James G. Blaine Council, No. 766, Junior Order United American Mechanics, of Philadelphia; of 212 members of Harmony Council, No. 53, Junior Order United American Mechanics, of Philadelphia; of 484 members of Chester Council, No. 36, Junior Order United American Mechanics, of Chester; of 165 members of Woodlawn Council, No. 179, Junior Order United American Mechanics, of Philadelphia; of Washington Camp, No. 60, Patriotic Order Sons of America, of Altoona; of 78 members of Wapwallopen Council, No. 891, Junior Order United American Mechanics, of Wapwallopen; of Bridesburg Council, No. 135, Junior Order United American Mechanics, of Bridesburg; of 80 members of Dunns Council, No. 918, Junior Order United American Mechanics, of Dunns; of 442 members of Keystone Council, No. 11, Junior Order United American Mechanics, of Philadelphia.

December 5.—Petitions of Protection Council, No. 935, of McKeesburg; of Litzitz Springs Council, No. 197, of Litzitz; of Grace Council, No. 631, of Philadelphia; of Clear Ridge Council, No. 940, of Clear Ridge; of Beaver Falls Council, No. 48, of Beaver Falls; of Industrial Council, No. 437, of Orwigsburg; of Uhlertown Council, No. 522, of Uhlertown; of Mount Carmel Council, No. 874, of Mount Carmel, and of Bowmans Council, No. 440, of Bowmans-town, of the Junior Order United American Mechanics, and of Local Union No. 180, United Mine Workers of America, of Shamokin, all in the State of Pennsylvania.

January 16.—Petitions of Councils Nos. 124, 28, 89, 68, 43, 17, 139, 154, 45, 81, 61, 6, 150, 162, 68, 134, 61, 69, 148, 57, 46, 42, 77, 55, 2, 141, 10, 94, 63, 116, 172, 127, 19, 95, 53, 147, 5, 146, 138, 20, 100, 118, 50, 52, 71, 40, 44, 102, 35, and 108, all of the Daughters of Liberty; of Councils Nos. 621, 71, 904, 887, 230, 967, 407, 1001, 235, 839, 188, 319, 800, 787, 112, 1030, 199, 421, 90, 671, 63, 304, 64, 946, 448, 17, 691, 925, 371, 127, 305, 555, 932, 244, 713, 13, 885, 253, 333, 169, 523, 59, 122, 812, 1024, 1194, 140, 54, 18, 906, 70, 744, 161, 896, 579, 954, 44, 1503, 259, 65, 909, 95, 115, 443, 998, 29, 24, 128, 606, 1500, 455, 15, 453, 370, 211, 548, 790, 330, 439, 89, 339, 338, 337, 271, 9176, 1024, 549, 898, 984, 944, 967, 54, 234, 280, 1004, 149, 620, 233, 894, 553, 159, 75, 232, 517, 605, 12, 134, 526, 803, 52, 531, 23, 99, 384, 107, 853, 141, 1012, 233, 366, 315, 242, 172, 22, 393, 277, 194, 945, 55, 163, 42, 200, 780, 273, 1939, 330, 272, 541, 474, 332, 5, 49, 41, 900, 643, 27, 948, 777, 360, 732, 249, 352, 493, 957, 934, 302, 77, 373, 909, 573, 848, 302, 219, 666, 210, 505, 528, 703, 144, 640, 1005, 125, 201, 307, 335, 108, 858, 160, 685, 755, 682, 679, 164, 838, 504, 396, 101, 292, 754, 844, 945, 615, 1007, 607, 80, 182, 84, 927, 121, 46, 1011, 659, 355, 722, 763, 114, 775, 123, 985, 276, 308, 516, 977, 875, 378, 162, 840, 228, 110, 488, 31, 716, 37, 635, 886, 196, 997, 922, 738, 518, 513, 661, 617, 460, 401, 574, 354, 144, 979, 117, 961, 282, 521, 943, 597, 879, 180, 234, 129, 717, 720, 520, 708, 1, 580, 83, 204, 21, 746, 351, 167, 111, 139, 508, 65, 171, 500, 444, 442, 962, 816, and 757, all of the Junior Order of United American Mechanics; of Local Unions Nos. 486, 122, 124, 198, 847, 228, 233, 394, 150, 723, and 86, all of the American Federation of Labor; of sundry citizens of Arch Spring, Harrisburg, Allegheny, Myoma, Verona, Jefferson, Center, Buffalo, New Brighton, Philadelphia, Schellsburg, Christiana, Pittsburg, Reynoldsville, Spring Hill, Ingram, Crafton, Maxwell, Washington, Myersdale, Carbon County, Pittsburg, Chester, Apollo, Berwyn, Montrose, Newberry, and Eno, all in the State of Pennsylvania.

January 15.—Petition of Council No. 23, Junior Order of United American Mechanics, of Turtlecreek, Pa.

January 16.—Petition of Conemaugh Council, No. 137, Junior Order of United American Mechanics, of Conemaugh, Pa.

January 20.—Petition of 403 members of Allegheny Council, No. 23, Daughters of Liberty, of Allegheny, Pa., and a petition of the Past Councilors and Active Workers' Association of Lycoming County, Junior Order of American Mechanics, of Montgomery, Pa.

January 22.—Petition of Massassauga Council, No. 608, Junior Order of United American Mechanics, of Erie, Pa., and of District Assembly No. 3, Knights of Labor, of Pittsburg, Pa.

January 27.—Petition of J. P. Winower Council, No. 618, Junior Order United American Mechanics, of Pittsburg, Pa.

January 28.—Petitions of 220 members of Walburba Council, No. 859, Junior Order United American Mechanics, of Pitcairn, and of sundry members of the congregation of the Methodist Episcopal Church of Pittsburg, in the State of Pennsylvania.

February 3.—A petition of the United Labor League of Western Pennsylvania, of Pittsburg, Pa.

February 6.—Petitions of the Central Labor Union of Wilkesbarre and of Tub Molders' Union No. 7452, of New Brighton, in the State of Pennsylvania.

March 25.—Petitions of sundry citizens of Bradford; of Local Union No. 173, United Mine Workers of America, of Beaver Rock; of Local Union No. 1824, of Leechburg; of Railway Telegraphers' Local Union No. 67, of Wilkesbarre; of sundry citizens of Bethlehem; of sundry citizens of Brownfield; of Typographical Union No. 437, of Franklin, and of Retail Clerks' Local Union No. 196, of Wilkesbarre, all in the State of Pennsylvania.

March 26.—Petitions of Bricklayers' Local Union No. 31, of Braddock; Cigar Makers' Union No. 446, of Norristown; Oil City Union, No. 156, of Oil City; Brewery Workmen's Union No. 22, of Charleroi; Retail Clerks' Union No. 209, of Meadville; 20 citizens of Galeton; 53 citizens of Irwin; Electrical Workers' Union No. 91, of Easton; 17 citizens of Tyrone; Central Labor Union of Hanover and McSherrystown; Bricklayers and Plasterers' Union No. 37, of Easton; Local Union No. 84, of Erie; Local Union No. 3, of Belle Vernon; Local Union No. 615, of Fayette; 18 citizens of Columbia; Bricklayers' Union No. 40, of Johnstown; Carbondale Typographical Union, No. 239, of Carbondale; Local Union No. 1264, of McGovern; Local Union No. 1359, of Bowertown; 40 citizens of Verona; 23 citizens of Archbald; Local Union No. 558, of McDonald; 22 citizens of Williamsport; Bricklayers and Masons' Union No. 43, of

Franklin; Hod Carriers' Protective Union No. 7351, of Reading; Harrisburg Typographical Union, No. 14, of Harrisburg; Pittsburg Lodge, No. 18, of Pittsburg; of sundry citizens of South Side, Pittsburg; Newspaper Writers' Union No. 11, of Philadelphia; Journeymen Barbers' Union No. 198, of Meadville; Bricklayers, Masons, and Plasterers' Union No. 47, of Pottsville; Bricklayers and Masons' Union No. 16, of York; Cigar Makers' Union No. 257, of Lancaster; Stone Masons' Union No. 34, of Philadelphia; United Brotherhood of Carpenters and Joiners of America, Local Union No. 709, of Shenandoah; sundry citizens of Artz; Federal Labor Union No. 7204, of Carbondale; Coopers' International Union No. 101, of Allegheny; United Mine Workers' Local Union No. 79, of Webster; Philadelphia Plate Printers' Union, No. 1, of Philadelphia; sundry citizens of Hellertown; Local Union No. 1787, of Fayette; Miners and Mine Workers' Local Union No. 248, of Fayette; Retail Clerks' Union No. 61, of Easton; Iron and Steel Workers' Union No. 8610, of Lebanon; Local Union No. 761, of Webster; Cigar Makers' International Union No. 104, of Pottsville; sundry citizens of Kutztown; Local Union No. 376, of Roscoe; sundry citizens of Johnstown; Bakers and Confectioners' Union No. 132, of Lancaster; Iron and Steel Workers' Union No. 9249, of Pottstown; Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen's Union No. 172, of Reading; Erie Typographical Union, No. 77, of Erie; Local Union No. 1572, of Lansford; sundry citizens of Pittsburg; Typographical Union No. 2, of Philadelphia; Bricklayers and Plasterers' Protective Union No. 8, of Bethlehem; sundry citizens of Dunbar; sundry citizens of Conemaugh; Bricklayers and Masons' Union No. 56, of Greenville; sundry citizens of McKeesport; sundry citizens of Elixir; Pattern Makers' Association of Erie; sundry citizens of Fogelsville; Coal Miners' Union No. 1828, of Canonsburg; Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen's Union No. 43, of Sunbury; Bartenders' Local Union No. 225, of Meadville; the Central Labor Union of Kane; sundry citizens of O'Hara Township; United Mine Workers' Union No. 132, of Pricedale; sundry citizens of Springrove borough; sundry citizens of Philadelphia; sundry citizens of Shiremanstown; Stone Masons' Union No. 58, of Reading; Stove Mounters' Union No. 6, of Philadelphia; Local Union No. 11, of Washington; Local Union No. 1736, of Saltsburg; United Mine Workers' Union No. 1234, of Tarentum; the Central Labor Union of Charleroi; Stove Mounters' Union No. 42, of Reading; International Bricklayers' Union No. 54, of Norristown; Society of St. Joseph, No. 293, of Lansford; Bricklayers' Union No. 12, of Chester; Cigar Makers' Union No. 194, of Bradford; United Mine Workers' Union No. 1622, of Greenock; Bricklayers' Union No. 4, of Allegheny; Brotherhood of Blacksmiths' Union No. 104, of Philadelphia; sundry citizens of Tidal; Granite Cutters' National Union, of Philadelphia; sundry citizens of Pittston; sundry citizens of New Stanton; United Mine Workers' Union No. 548, of Buena Vista; Meadville Central Labor Union, of Meadville; Glass Bottle Blowers' Branch Union No. 95, of Tarentum; Barbers' Local Union No. 297, of Lansford; Journeymen Barbers' International Union No. 277, of Easton; Cigar Makers' Local Union No. 406, of Easton; Journeymen Plumbers' Union No. 207, of Bradford; Powder Makers' Union No. 8742, of Olivers Mills; Carpenters' Local Union No. 492, of Reading; sundry citizens of Jeannette; United Mine Workers' Local Union No. 700, of Hauto; Local Union No. 1115, of Pricedale; sundry citizens of Steelton; Local Union No. 187, of Pittsburg; Local Union No. 556, of Meadville; sundry citizens of Johnstown; Cigar Makers' Local Union No. 232, of Sellersville; Shirt Waist and Laundry Workers' Union No. 74, of Reading; Ellwood City Lodge, No. 5, of Ellwood City; Federal Labor Union No. 8139, of McSherrystown; Local Union No. 500, of Butler; Journeymen Bakers' Union No. 150, of Reading; Central Labor Council, of Franklin; Typographical Union No. 7, of Pittsburg; the Central Labor Union of Hazleton; Coopers' International Union No. 162, of Brownsville; United Mine Workers' Union No. 844, of Carbondale; Tinners and Slaters' Union No. 7382, of Newcastle; United Mine Workers' Local Union No. 1887, of Seek; Federal Union No. 9257, of Renovo; Tin Plate Workers' Union No. 30, of Washington; Typographical Union No. 258, of Easton; Iron Molders' Union No. 370, of Reading; Federal Labor Union No. 9220, of Newcastle; Local Union No. 1515, of Roscoe; Amalgamated Sheet Metal Workers' Union No. 146, of Easton; Iron Workers' Union No. 9261, of Lancaster; Local Union No. 1263, of Monongahela; Boiler Makers' Union No. 147, of Susquehanna; American Tin Workers' Union No. 19, of New Kensington; Local Division No. 85, Amalgamated Association of Street Railway Employees of America, of Pittsburg; Electrical Workers' Union No. 56, of Erie; sundry citizens of Wescoesville; Cigar Makers' Local Union No. 295, of Scranton; Machinists' International Union No. 159, of Philadelphia; Local Union No. 51, of Monongahela; Cigar Makers' Union No. 236, of Reading; Central Labor Union of Lancaster; delegates to the Federal Trades Council of Reading; the Central Trades Assembly of Washington; Typographical Union No. 86, of Reading; Slate and Tile Roofers' Union No. 8926, of Reading; Local Union No. 32, of Canonsburg; Powder Workers' Union No. 8974, of Wapwallopen; the Central Labor Union of Carbondale; International Jewelers' Union No. 5, of Philadelphia; Good Hope Lodge, No. 19, of McKeesport; Glass Cutters' Union No. 78, of Monaca; Local Union No. 6, of New Kensington; Printing Pressmen's Union No. 31, of Pittsburg; the American Lace Curtain Operators' Union of Philadelphia, all in the State of Pennsylvania.

April 4.—Petitions of sundry citizens of Pittsburg; of Typographical Union No. 321, of Conellsville; of Railroad Telegraphers' Division No. 3, of Harrisburg, and of Falls City Council, No. 885, Order United American Mechanics, of Falls City, all in the State of Pennsylvania.

Petitions and memorials praying for the reenactment of the Chinese-exclusion law presented by Mr. Penrose.

December 4.—Petitions of Clearfield Council, No. 394, Junior Order of United American Mechanics; of 76 members of Eden Council, No. 988; of 53 members of Roseville Council, No. 680; of 110 members of Media Council, No. 449; of 131 members of West Philadelphia Council, No. 561; of Local Union No. 166, United Mine Workers of America, of McAdoo; of Local Union No. 1738, United Mine Workers of America, of Rossiter; of Local Union No. 865, United Mine Workers of America, of Arnot; the Amalgamated Journeyman House Painters and Decorators' Association of Philadelphia; of Local Union No. 1499, United Mine Workers of America, of Freeland; of Pride of Mountain City Council, No. 472, of Altoona; of Amalgamated Sheet Metal Workers' International Association No. 140, of Hazleton; of Local Union No. 1627, United Mine Workers of America, of Freeland; of Washington Camp, No. 16, Patriotic Order Sons of America, of Harrisburg; of Local Union No. 117, United Mine Workers of America, of Springfield; of Local Union No. 1549, United Mine Workers of America, of Tresckow; of Local Union No. 205, United Mine Workers of America, all in the State of Pennsylvania.

December 5.—Petitions of Pioneer City Council, of Carbondale; Litzitz Springs Council, No. 197, of Litzitz; Chester Council, No. 36, of Chester; Black Creek Council, No. 51, of Weatherly; James G. Blaine Council, No. 768, of Philadelphia; Local Union No. 884, of Shamokin; Guarantee Council, No. 95, of Wissahickon; George Bancroft Council, No. 571, of Tacony; Edwin A. Shubert Council, No. 728, of West Philadelphia; Melrose Council, No. 928, of Harrisburg; Shenandoah Valley Council, No. 530, of Shenandoah; Keystone Council, No. 11, of Philadelphia; Allen Council, No. 753, of Allentown; Enhaut Council, No. 231, of Enhaut; Dunns Council, No. 918, of Dunns; Camp Curtin Council, No. 629, of Harrisburg; St. Clair Council, No. 493, of St. Clair; Colonel David F. Houston Council, No. 739, of Chester; Harmony Council, No. 53, of Philadelphia; Juniata Council, No. 372, of Altoona; Ira Council, No. 713, of

Red Lion; Oriole Council, No. 877, of Chambersburg; James E. Hyatt Council, No. 923, of Philadelphia; Peace Council, No. 395, of Philadelphia; Pennsburg Council, No. 961, of Pennsburg; Siker Council, No. 802, of Manchester; Battlefield Council, No. 717, of Gettysburg; Abraham Lincoln Council, No. 513, of Montoursville; William Lilly Council, No. 326, of Philadelphia; Industrial Council, No. 437, of Orwigsburg; Protection Council, No. 935, of McKeansburg; Clearidge Council, No. 940, of Clearridge; Natrona Council, No. 214, of Natrona; Hampton Council, No. 965, of Hampton; West Chester Council, No. 633, of West Chester; Uhlertown Council, No. 522, of Uhlertown; Mount Carmel Council, No. 874, of Mount Carmel; Beaver Falls Council, No. 48, of Beaver Falls; Greble Council, No. 13, of Philadelphia; Linesville Council, No. 555, of Linesville; Bowman's Council, No. 440, of Bowmanstown; Grace Council, No. 631, of Philadelphia; Hazle Council, No. 258, of Hazleton; Wapwallopen Council, No. 891, of Wapwallopen, all of the Junior Order United American Mechanics, in the State of Pennsylvania.

December 9.—Petitions of 158 members of North American Council, No. 332, of Philadelphia; 40 members of O. W. Howell Council, No. 210, of Stauffer; 32 members of Port Kennedy Council, No. 844, of Port Kennedy; 110 members of McAllister Council, No. 1011, of Hanover; 230 members of Twin City Council, No. 121, of Allegheny; 127 members of Quaker City Council, No. 84, of Philadelphia; 44 members of Pride of Pickering Council, No. 927, of Pickering; 40 members of Octorara Council, No. 977, of Parkesburg; 413 members of Wayne Council, No. 48, of Phoenixville; 243 members of York Council, No. 505, of York; 108 members of Acme Council, No. 219, of Pittsburg; 87 members of Muncy Council, No. 516, of Muncy; 108 members of Martha Washington Council, No. 528, of Philadelphia; 202 members of Hero Council, No. 668, of McKeesport; 172 members of Pequea Council, No. 875, of Gap; 50 members of Latrobe Council, No. 80, of Latrobe; 118 members of Landsville Council, No. 1007, of Landis Store; 35 members of Belsano Council, No. 182, of Belsano; 243 members of Kearsarge Council, No. 822, of Philadelphia; 177 members of John Morton Council, No. 738, of Chester; 61 members of North Star Council, No. 493, of Wilmerding; 46 members of Col. John Clark Council, No. 615, of Holmesburg; 64 members of Neptune Council, No. 777, of Philadelphia; 120 members of Audenreid Council, No. 775, of Audenreid; 110 members of Lansdale Council, of Lansdale; 52 members of Greensboro Council, No. 355, of Greensboro; 67 members of Nuremberg Council, No. 763, of Nuremberg; 69 members of Blandburg Council, No. 957, of Figart; 150 members of Council No. 985, of Leesport; of sundry citizens of Springville; the officers and members of Paoli Council, No. 590, of Paoli; 119 members of Victor Council, No. 870, of Greencastle; 98 members of West Hazleton Council, No. 943, of West Hazleton; 97 members of Mertztown Council, No. 444, of Mertztown; 172 members of Active Council, No. 617, of Philadelphia; 214 members of Monument Council, No. 847, of Girardville; 271 members of Royersford Council, No. 521, of Royersford; 175 members of Pittsburg Council, No. 117, of Pittsburg; 113 members of Ivyland Council, No. 661, of Ivyland; 79 members of Harrogate Council, No. 979, of Philadelphia; 145 members of Shenango Council, No. 180, of Newcastle; 320 members of William J. Byars Council, No. 282, of Wilkesbarre; 81 members of Sarversville Council, No. 401, of Sarversville; 182 members of Iron City Council, No. 171, of Pittsburg; 96 members of Lescalle Council, No. 442, of Pittsburg; 44 members of Rising Star Council, No. 708, of Rouzerville; 51 members of Elizabethville Council, No. 992, of Elizabethville; 192 members of Carlisle Council, No. 574, of Carlisle; 74 members of Henry Seybert Council, No. 520, of Abington; 165 members of Woodland Council, No. 179, of Philadelphia; 104 members of Roberts Council, No. 460, of Minersville; 120 members of Electric Council, No. 354, of East Mauch Chunk; 99 members of American Council, of Bloomsburg; of sundry members of Southwark Council, No. 144, of Philadelphia; 110 members of Federal Council, No. 129; 121 members of Port Richmond Council, No. 234, of Philadelphia; 86 members of Banksville Council, No. 720, of Banksville; 256 members of Clearfield Council, No. 394, of Philadelphia; 147 members of American Star Council, No. 49; 523 members of Kensington Council, No. 5, of Philadelphia; 238 members of Robert Morris Council, No. 41; 143 members of West Fairview Council, No. 716; 167 members of True American Council, No. 196, of Homestead; 31 members of Monongahela Council, No. 122, of Braddock; 62 members of Lebanon Valley Council, No. 885, of Avon; 143 members of Reserve Council, No. 253, of Philadelphia; 125 members of Jefferson Council, No. 31, of Philadelphia, and of 30 members of Morton McMichael Council, No. 886, of Philadelphia, all of the State of Pennsylvania.

December 10.—Petitions of 676 members of Allegheny Council, No. 112, of Allegheny; 70 members of McDonald Council, No. 199, of McDonald; 96 members of Aurora Council, No. 304, of East Prospect; 213 members of Science Council, No. 127, of Philadelphia; 100 members of William Penn Council, No. 64, of Pittsburg; 210 members of Samuel J. Randall Council, No. 448, of Reading; 110 members of American City Council, No. 1000, of Philadelphia; 225 members of Lieutenant Cushing Council, No. 839, of Philadelphia; 280 members of Aolian Council, No. 17, of Philadelphia; 177 members of Mount Holly Council, No. 671, of Mount Holly Springs; 75 members of Troy Hill Council, No. 319, of Allegheny; 92 members of Robert Fulton Council, No. 890, of West Philadelphia; 212 members of Wenona Council, No. 63, of Germantown; 116 members of Girard Council, No. 509, of Philadelphia; 128 members of Reliance Council, No. 787, of Philadelphia; 57 members of Captain Philip Schuyler Council, No. 188, of Philadelphia; 113 members of Southampton Council, No. 946, of Holland; 140 members of Neversink Council, No. 371, of Reading; 210 members of Coatesville Council, No. 421, of Coatesville; 100 members of Reliable Council, No. 90, of Allegheny; 257 members of Mount Prigot Council, No. 123, of Mauch Chunk; 185 members of Brandywine Council, of Westchester; 43 members of Major G. Lowery Council, No. 732, of Rimersburg; 90 members of Penbrook Council, No. 398, of Penbrook; 50 members of Monroe Council, No. 390, of Swiftwater; 230 members of Garfield Council, No. 114, of Rochester; 48 members of Goshen Council, No. 607, of Rocky Hill; 65 members of Annette Council, No. 732, of Philipsburg; 418 members of Freeland Council, No. 343, of Freeland; 300 members of Resolute Council, No. 27, of Reading; 23 members of Golden Heart Council, No. 648, of West Whiteland; 70 members of Milroy Council, No. 635, of Milroy; 122 members of Spring City Council, No. 900, of Spring City; 150 members of John Grey Council, No. 249, of Pittsburg; 415 members of U. S. Grant Council, No. 352, of Pottstown; 55 members of Fort Washington Council, No. 488, of Lemoyne; 33 members of Emsworth Council, No. 474, of Emsworth; 147 members of General John C. Frémont Council, No. 518, of Philadelphia; 247 members of Duquesne Council, No. 110, of Pittsburg; 90 members of Ardmore Council, No. 169, of Ardmore; Mount Pleasant Council, No. 37, of Birdsboro; 68 members of Picture Rocks Council, No. 523, of Picture Rocks; 396 members of Mount Vernon Council, No. 333, of Harrisburg; 159 members of Lafayette Council, No. 59, of Hazleton; 89 members of Cressona Council, No. 812, of Cressona; 65 members of Summeytown Council, No. 997, of Summeytown, and 185 members of Versailles Council, No. 691, of McKeesport, all in the State of Pennsylvania.

December 17.—Petitions of West Liberty Council, No. 273, of Allegheny County; of Pleasant Valley Council, No. 331, of Allegheny; of Tamaqua Council, No. 547, of Tamaqua; of Council No. 272, of Ford City; of Globe Council, No. 45, of Mount Carmel; of Industry Council, No. 163, of Reading; of Clifton Heights Council, No. 730, of Clifton Heights; of Pema Council, No. 200, of Strafford; of James Allen Council, No. 835, of Allentown; of Star Council, No. 55, of New Brighton; of Livingston Council, No. 923, of York; of Eldred

Council, No. 345, of Kunkletown; of Pride of the West Council, No. 157, of Allegheny; of Local Unions Nos. 1024 and 1194, of Mayfield; of Tube City Council, No. 378, of McKeesport; of Dartrum Council, No. 989, of Sharon Hill; of Courtland Saunders Council, No. 866, of Philadelphia; of Council No. 161, of Wilkesbarre; of Council No. 954, of Annville; of Colonel Theodore Hyatt Council, No. 573, of Chester; of Central Labor Union, of Kane; of Commonwealth Council, No. 597, of Mechanicsburg; of Carpenters' Council, No. 848, of Ashland; of Mechanic Local Union, No. 723, of Lansford; of Local Union No. 185, of Hazleton; of Triumph Council, No. 502, of Sardis; of Cranberry Local Union, No. 1434, of West Hazleton; of Local Union No. 1550, of Williams-town; of Carpenters' Union No. 541, of Washington; of Cigar Makers' Union No. 236, of Reading; of Councils Nos. 44, 375, 456, 1, 967, 904, 230, 146, 243, 70, 837, 259, 495, 109, 77, 15, 362, 621, 71, 703, 909, 969, 744, 96, 65, 96, 20, 276, 57, 52, 75, 1023, 31, 72, 513, 86, 1599, 18, 842, 54, 1003, 153, 115, 407, 71, 160, 317, 167, 257, 110, 1168, 1534, 135, 349, 1687, 1062, 1513, 181, and 1413, all of the Junior Order of United American Mechanics, in the State of Pennsylvania.

December 18.—Petitions of 99 members of Cohocksink Council, No. 166, of Philadelphia; of Pacific Council, No. 44, of Malvern; of 80 members of Resolute Council, No. 77, of Mechanicsburg; 53 members of Pride of Mount Carmel Council, No. 42, of Mount Carmel; 174 members of Banner Council, No. 46, of Chambersburg; 190 members of Columbia Council, No. 43, of Wilkesbarre; 80 members of Akron Council, No. 906, of Akron; 95 members of Royaltor Council, No. 140, of Royaltor; of Friedensburg Council, No. 1001, of Friedensburg; 72 members of Doylestown Council, No. 40, of Doylestown; of Pride of the West Council, No. 27, of Allegheny; 137 members of Mount Vernon Council, No. 150, of Harrisburg; of Pride of East Mauch Chunk Council, No. 162, of East Mauch Chunk; 61 members of Riverside Council, No. 97, of New Cumberland; 54 members of Bloomsburg Council, No. 81, of Bloomsburg; 101 members of Oberlin Council, No. 754, of Oberlin; 151 members of Harrisburg Council, No. 328, of Harrisburg; 57 members of White Haven Council, No. 840, of White Haven; 234 members of Steelton Council, No. 162, of Steelton; 157 members of Eagle Council, No. 3, of Philadelphia; 77 members of Etna Council, No. 439, of Etna; 71 members of Vine Cliff Council, No. 83, of Allegheny; 200 members of Moses Taylor Council, No. 151, of Scranton; of Local Union No. 1640, of Minersville; 276 members of William Windom Council, No. 580, of Philadelphia; 290 members of Mantau Council, No. 83, of Philadelphia; 37 members of General Cameron Council, No. 851, of Mount Joy; 124 members of Orient Council, No. 72, of Johnstown; 183 members of New Tripoli Grand Council, No. 204, of New Tripoli; 260 members of Jordan Council, No. 745, of Allentown; 250 members of Fidelity Council, No. 21, of Bristol; 117 members of Mountville Council, No. 65, of Mountville; Local Union No. 1571, of Tamaqua; 94 members of West Side Council, No. 288, of West Nanticoke; 150 members of Capital City Council, No. 327, of Harrisburg; 12 members of Cambria Council, No. 192, of Wilmore; 114 members of General John F. Reynolds Council, No. 143, of Germantown; 249 members of Colonel Robert P. Decker Council, No. 978, of Philadelphia; 34 members of Wise Council, No. 18, of —; 42 members of Colonel T. M. Bayne Council, No. 163, of Bellevue; 182 members of Excelsior Council, No. 4, of Williamsport; 112 members of Susquehanna Council, No. 158, of Steelton; 117 members of Martha W. Crow Council, No. 65, of Philadelphia; 128 members of Reserve Council, No. 91, of Philadelphia; 60 members of Betsey Ross Council, No. 119, of Gettysburg; 290 members of Silver Star Council, No. 130, of Harrisburg; 218 members of Bethlehem Council, No. 508, of Bethlehem; 151 members of Perseverance Council, No. 72, of Harrisburg; 80 members of Westchester Council, No. 45, of Westchester; 57 members of Moss Rose Council, No. 292, of Seven Valleys; 200 members of Susquehanna Council, No. 89, of Wrightsville; 672 members of Champion Council, No. 8, of Philadelphia; 157 members of Golden Star Council, No. 6, of Middletown, and of Loyal Orange Lodge, No. 237, of Altoona, all of the Daughters of Liberty, Junior Order of United American Mechanics, and United Mine Workers of America, in the State of Pennsylvania.

January 7.—Petitions of councils Nos. 140, 172, 127, 149, 620, 583, 125, 151, 100, 61, 201, 526, 118, 154, 43, 68, 66, 500, 139, 35, 89, 102, 28, 128, 7, and 148, all of the Daughters of Liberty, and of councils Nos. 108, 550, 421, 148, 853, 160, 141, 546, 271, 357, 1804, 1533, 338, 24, 9178, 780, 504, 15, 29, 863, 104, 988, 443, 235, 28, 111, 945, 164, 101, 154, 640, 211, 838, 307, 125, 901, 496, 806, 335, 549, 172, 896, 331, 339, 22, 207, 1005, 384, 124, and 393, all of the Junior Order of United American Mechanics, in the State of Pennsylvania.

January 9.—Petitions of Council No. 685, of Ferndale; of Council No. 755, of Columbia; of Council No. 194, of Freedom; of Hand in Hand Council, No. 50, of Quakertown; of Bellevue Council, No. 682, of Philadelphia; of James G. Blaine Council, No. 2, of Philadelphia; of Shamokin Council, No. 138, of Shamokin; of the Typographical Union of Carbonade; of Heilmann Council, No. 277, of Philadelphia; of Webster Council, No. 23, of Schuylkill Haven; of Rock Council, No. 54, of Glen Rock; of Clover Council, No. 99, of Archbald; of Council No. 306, of Worthington; of Major Wm. H. Jennings Council, No. 367, of Shenandoah; of Fairview Council, No. 52, of Philadelphia; of Council No. 984, of Easton; of Vinco Council, No. 944, of Mineral Point; of Camac Council, No. 315, of Philadelphia; of Volunteer Council, No. 679, of Philadelphia; of Lewisberry Council, No. 1012, of Lewisberry; of Quaker City Council, No. 17, of Philadelphia; of Local Union No. 1691, of Olyphant; of West End Council, No. 230, of Easton; of Colonial Council, No. 605, of York; of Neptune Council, No. 141, of Philadelphia; of Progressive Council, No. 63, of Shippensburg; of Grace Council, No. 147, of Philadelphia; of Federal Council, No. 19, of Philadelphia; of Edwin A. Schubert Council, No. 5, of Philadelphia; of Loyal Council, No. 94, of Philadelphia; of General Harrison Council, No. 95, of Greencastle; of Williams Valley Council, No. 317, of Tower City; of Council No. 10, of Philadelphia; of Cincinnati Council, No. 116, of Philadelphia; of Just in Time Council, No. 346, of West Bethlehem; of Saratoga Council, No. 262, of Pittsburg; of General McClellan Council, No. 150, of Verona; of Dawson Council, No. 75, of Dawson; of Poetter Council, No. 894, of Caledon; of Mahoning Council, No. 233, of Punxsutawney; of Wm. Thaw Council, No. 396, of Allegheny City; of Clearfield Council, No. 146, of Philadelphia; of Royal Council, No. 342, of Adamsburg; of Colonel A. L. Hawkins Council, No. 334, of California; of Charles A. Gerasch Council, No. 1004, of Kutztown; of Carpenters and Joiners' Local Union No. 57, of Shamokin, and of the Glass Bottle Blowers' Association of Pittsburg, all of the Junior Order of United American Mechanics, in the State of Pennsylvania.

January 14.—Petitions of Seemsville Council, No. 757, Junior Order United American Mechanics, of Seemsville; of West Park Council, No. 108, Daughters of Liberty, of Philadelphia; of Rachel Hill Council, No. 816, Junior Order United American Mechanics, of Johnstown, and of Charity Council, No. 64, Daughters of Liberty, of Nesquehoning, all in the State of Pennsylvania.

January 20.—Petition of Turtlecreek Council, No. 28, Junior Order United American Mechanics, of Turtlecreek, Pa., and of Conemaugh Council, No. 137, Junior Order United American Mechanics, of Conemaugh, Pa.

January 23.—Petitions of District Assembly No. 3, Knights of Labor, of Pittsburg; of Allegheny Council, No. 23, Daughters of Liberty, of Allegheny, and of the Past Councilors' and Active Workers' Association of Lycoming County, Junior Order United American Mechanics, of Montgomery, all in the State of Pennsylvania.

January 31.—Petition of Lodge No. 140, International Association of Machinists, of Williamsport, Pa., and a petition of Massassauga Council, No. 608, Junior Order of United American Mechanics, of Erie, Pa.

February 4.—Petitions of Waturba Council, No. 859, of Pitcairn; of J. P. Winower Council, No. 618, of Pittsburg, all of the Junior Order of United American Mechanics; of the United Labor League, American Federation of Labor, of Sharpburg, of Washington Camp, No. 252, Patriotic Order Sons of America, of Lansford, all in the State of Pennsylvania; of the Chamber of Commerce, of Boston, Mass., and of the Merchants' Association of New York City.

February 6.—Petitions of Local Union No. 18, United Mine Workers of America, of Phillipsburg, and of Local Union No. 228, United Brotherhood of Carpenters and Joiners of America, of Pottsville, in the State of Pennsylvania.

February 11.—Petitions of Leather Glaziers' Union No. 5, of Philadelphia; of Federal Union No. 7174, of Jermyn; of Tub Molders Helpers' Union No. 7452, of New Brighton; of Kindling Wood Workers' Union No. 7100, of Austin; of the American Lace Curtain Operative Union, of Philadelphia; of Cigar-makers' Local Union No. 466, of Easton, and of Local Union No. 6, Tin Plate Workers' International Protective Association, of New Kensington, all of the American Federation of Labor, in the State of Pennsylvania.

February 12.—Petitions of Press Feeders and Helpers' Union No. 31, of Pittsburg; of Iron Workers' Local Union No. 9334, of Columbia; of Division No. 8, Brotherhood of Railway Trackmen, of Spruce Creek; of United Cloak Pressers' Local Union No. 3, of Philadelphia; of American Glass Workers' Local Union No. 38, of Beaver Falls, and of Local Union No. 348, International Association of Machinists, all in the State of Pennsylvania.

February 13.—Petitions of Jewelry Workers' Local Union No. 5, of Philadelphia; of the Central Labor Union, of Carbondale; of Federal Labor Union No. 9101, of Johnsonburg, and of Good Hope Lodge, No. 19, of McKeesport, all of the American Federation of Labor, in the State of Pennsylvania.

February 28.—Petitions of 45 citizens of Tionesta; of 22 citizens of Steelton; of 48 citizens of Jeannette; of 32 citizens of Johnstown; of Local Union No. 1719, United Mine Workers of America, of Lansford; of Local Union No. 556, of Meadville; of Local Union No. 210, International Association of Machinists, of Wilkesbarre; of Cranberry Local Union, No. 1434, of Hazleton; of Lebanon Circle, No. 25, of Lebanon; of Elwood City Lodge, No. 5, of Elwood; of Boiler Makers' Local Union No. 17, of Chester; of Glass Bottle Blowers' Local Union No. 85, of Tarentum; of Local Union No. 1065, National Mine Workers of America, of Carbon; of the Central Labor Union of Meadville; of Barbers' Local Union No. 297, of Lansford; of Machinists' Local Union No. 217, of Philadelphia; of Local Union No. 548, United Mine Workers of America, of Buena Vista; of Federal Labor Union No. 7150, of Bradford; of Journeymen Plumbers' Local Union No. 207, of Bradford; of Local Union No. 115, of Pricedale; of Powder Makers' Local Union No. 8742, of Olivers Mills; of Local Union No. 700, United Mine Workers of America, of Horton; of Journeymen Barbers' International Union No. 277, of Easton; of Carpenters' Local Union No. 432, of Reading; of Glass Bottle Blowers' Local Union No. 76, of Sharpburg; of Cigar Makers' Local Union No. 489, of Souderton; of Chair Makers' National Lodge No. 1, of Braddock; of Team Drivers' Local Union No. 22, of Ashland; of Iron Molders' Local Union No. 370, of Reading; of Typographical Union No. 258, of Easton; of Tile Layers' Local Union No. 4, of Pittsburg; of Local Union No. 1315, of Roscoe; of Cigar Makers' International Union No. 257, of Lancaster; of Tin Plate Workers' Local Union No. 30, of Washington; of the Federated Trades Council of Reading; of the Central Trades Assembly of Washington; of Local Union No. 1687, United Mine Workers of America, of Leek; of Shirt Waist and Laundry Workers' Local Union No. 74, of Reading; of Local Union No. 844, United Mine Workers of America, of Carbondale; of Keystone Associated Shirt and Waist Cutters' Local Union No. 40, of Philadelphia; of Federal Union No. 9251, of Renovo; of Boiler Makers and Boiler Workers' Local Union No. 46, of Reading; of Glass Bottle Blowers' Local Union No. 83, of Butler; of John F. Ward Union, No. 9, of Iron and Steel Workers, of Newcastle; of United Brotherhood of Carpenters and Joiners' Local Union No. 500, of Butler; of the Central Labor Council of Franklin; of Journeymen Bakers' Local Union No. 150, of Reading; of Typographical Union No. 7, of Pittsburg; of the Central Labor Union of Hazleton; of Federal Labor Union No. 8139, of McSherrystown; of Cigar Makers' Local Union No. 232, of Sellersville; of Slate and Tile Roofers' Local Union No. 8236, of Reading; of Powder Workers' Local Union No. 8974, of Wapwallopen; of the Central Labor Union of Lancaster; of Typographical Union No. 86, of Reading; and of the Philadelphia Board of Trade, of Philadelphia, all in the State of Pennsylvania.

March 4.—Petitions of the Bricklayers and Masons' Local Union No. 16, of York; of the Cigar Makers' Local Union No. 108, of Lock Haven; of the Journeymen Barbers' Local Union No. 241, of Scranton; of the Cork Makers' International Union No. 53, of Philadelphia; of Coopers' Local Union No. 9, of Philadelphia; of Local Union No. 169, of McAdoo; of Local Union No. 376, of Roscoe; of Plate Printers' Local Union No. 1, of Philadelphia; of Local Union No. 248, of Fayette; of Local Union No. 1787, of Fayette; of Leather Workers' Local Union No. 32, of Fremont; of the Iron and Steel Workers' Local Union No. 9249, of Pottstown; of Newspaper Writers' Local Union No. 11, of Philadelphia; of Coal Miners' Local Union No. 1826, of Canonsburg; of Local Union No. 1572, of Lansford; of Amalgamated Sheet Metal Workers' Local Union No. 148, of Easton; of Local Union No. 761, of Webster; of Cigar Makers' International Union No. 104, of Pottsville; of Bakers and Confectioners' Local Union No. 132, of Lancaster; of Typographical Union No. 77, of Erie; of Paving Cutters' Local Union No. 7, of Gray Station; of American Tin Workers' Local Union No. 10, of New Kensington; of Local Union No. 1202, of Monongahela; of Boiler Makers' Local Union No. 147, of Reading; of Retail Clerks' Local Union No. 61, of Easton; of Iron and Steel Workers' Local Union No. 8610, of Lebanon; of Local Union No. 51, of Monongahela; of Cigar Makers' Local Union No. 295, of Scranton; of Bricklayers, Masons, and Plasterers' Local Union No. 47, of Pottsville; of International Association of Machinists, Local Union No. 159, of Philadelphia; of Journeymen Barbers' Local Union No. 198, of Meadville; of Local Union No. 91, of Oil City, all of the American Federation of Labor; of 21 citizens of Hellertown, 50 citizens of Johnstown, 43 citizens of Kutztown, and 27 citizens of Bradys Bend, all in the State of Pennsylvania; of Typographical Union No. 36 of Oakland; of Ship and Machine Blacksmiths' Local Union No. 168, of San Francisco; of Local Union No. 143, of Vallejo; of the Iron Ship Builders' Union of Vallejo; of the Federated Trades Council of San Jose; of Cigar Makers' Local Union No. 225, of Los Angeles, and of Local Union No. 64, of San Francisco, all of the American Federation of Labor, in the State of California; of the Journeymen Barbers' Union No. 215, American Federation of Labor, of Omaha, Nebr.; of the Lake Seamen's Union, International Seamen's Union, of Marine City, Mich.; of the Lake Seamen's Union, International Seamen's Union, of Cleveland, Ohio; of the Lake Seamen's Union, International Seamen's Union, of Milwaukee, Wis.; of the Tonawanda Branch of the Lake Seamen's Union, International Seamen's Union, of New York City; of the Pacific Coast Marine Firemen's Union, International Seamen's Union, of San Francisco, Cal.; of the Seamen's Union, International Seamen's Union, of Toledo, Ohio, and of the Lake Seamen's Union, International Seamen's Union, of Ashtabula, Ohio.

March 6.—Petitions of Local Union No. 159, Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen, of Derry; of Typographical Union No. 241, of Hanover; of Local Union No. 158, Mauchchunk Division, Order of Railroad Conductors, of Mauchchunk; of Bartenders' Local Union No. 225, of Meadville; of Carpenters and Joiners' Local Union of Hazleton; of 27 citizens of New Stanton; of 25 citi-

zens of Springgrove; of Bricklayers' Local Union No. 12, of Chester, of Stove Mounters' Local Union No. 6, of Philadelphia; of International Bricklayers' Local Union No. 54, of Norristown; of Stone Masons' Local Union No. 38, of Reading; of the Central Labor Union of Charleroi; of Cigar Makers' Local Union No. 194, of Bradford; of Bricklayers' Local Union No. 4, of Allegheny; of 32 citizens of Philadelphia; of Local Union No. 132, United Mine Workers of America, of Providence; of the Central Labor Union of Kane; of Stone Masons' Local Union No. 34, of Philadelphia; of Local Union No. 11, of Washington; of 21 citizens of Artz; of 50 citizens of Shivemans; of Stove Mounters' Local Union No. 42, of Reading; of St. Joseph's Society, Local Union No. 293, of Lansford; of Stone Masons' Local Union No. 10, of Newcastle; of Local Union No. 1726, of Saltsburg; of Journeymen Bricklayers' Protective Union No. 1, of Philadelphia; of 15 citizens of Fogelsville, and of 100 citizens of O'Hara, all in the State of Pennsylvania; of the Labor Council of San Francisco; of Cloak Makers' Local Union No. 8, of San Francisco; of the Granite Cutters' Local Union of San Francisco; of San Jose Typographical Union, No. 231, of San Jose, in the State of California, and of Ship and Machine Blacksmiths' Local Union No. 168, of Washington, D. C.

March 7.—Petitions of 42 citizens of Philadelphia; 50 citizens of Pittsburg, and 52 citizens of Tidal; of the Pattern Makers' Association of Erie; of Typographical Union No. 181, of Meadville; of the Granite Cutters' National Union, of Philadelphia; of the Bricklayers' Local Union No. 2, of Pittsburg; of Brotherhood of Blacksmiths' Local Union No. 104, of Philadelphia; of Local Union No. 337, of Sayre, all of the American Federation of Labor, in the State of Pennsylvania, and of 101 citizens of Wilberton, Ind. T.

March 11.—Petitions of 109 citizens of Irwin; of Core Makers' Local Union No. 83, of Meadville; of Jersey Shore Division 168, Order of Railway Conductors, of Jersey Shore; of Cigar Makers' Local Union No. 446, of Norristown; of Typographical Union No. 232, of Uniontown; of Brewery Workmen's Local Union No. 1, Branch 1, of Charleroi; of Bricklayers' Local Union No. 31, of Braddock; of Switchmen's Local Union No. 38, of Erie; of Oil City Local Union, No. 157, of Oil City; of Youghiogheny Lodge, No. 218, Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen, of Connellsville; of Bricklayers and Masons' Local Union No. 53, of Greenville; of Bricklayers and Plasterers' Local Union No. 8, of Bethlehem; of Typographical Union No. 2, of Philadelphia; of A. L. Dunbar Lodge, 142, of Meadville, and of 35 citizens of Dunbar, all in the State of Pennsylvania.

March 14.—Petitions of 50 citizens of Punxsutawney; of 51 citizens of Derry Station; of 28 citizens of Tyrone; of 25 citizens of Columbia; of Honest Workers Lodge, No. 25, Amalgamated Association of Iron, Steel, and Tin Workers, of Reading; of Liberty Bell Lodge, No. 587, Brotherhood of Railway Trainmen, of Philadelphia; of the Central Labor Union of Hanover and McSherrystown; of Cigar Makers' Local Union No. 436, of Olyphant; of Bricklayers' Local Union No. 40, of Johnstown; of Bricklayers and Plasterers' Local Union No. 37, of Easton; of Local Union No. 3, United Mine Workers of America, of Belle Vernon; of John F. Ward Lodge, No. 9, Amalgamated Association of Iron, Steel, and Tin Workers, of New Castle; of Patriotic Order Sons of America Camps of Berks County, and of Local Union No. 615, United Mine Workers of America, of Fayette; all in the State of Pennsylvania.

March 20.—Petitions of Retail Clerks' Local Union No. 185, of Girardville; of Allegheny City Division, No. 314, of Allegheny; of Bricklayers and Masons' Local Union No. 43, of Franklin; of Local Union No. 132, of Reading; of Team Drivers' Local Union No. 219, of Dubois; of Tailors' Local Union No. 115, of Souderton; of Coremakers' Local Union No. 83, of Meadville; of Plasterers' Local Union No. 8, of Philadelphia; of Local Lodge No. 323, Brotherhood of Railroad Telegraphers, of Freedom; of Bricklayers and Masons' Local Union No. 23, of Erie; of sundry citizens of Williamsport; of Bartenders' Local Union No. 187, of Bradford; of 49 citizens of Verona; of Miners' Local Union No. 1254, of McGovern; of Mine Workers' Local Union No. 1359, of Bowerton; of Lackawanna Division No. 12, Order of Railway Conductors, of Dunmore; of Steel and Copper Plate Printers' Local Union No. 2, of Washington; of Cigar Makers' Local Union No. 108, of Lock Haven; of the Amalgamated Society of Engineers, of Pittsburg; of Retail Clerks' Local Union No. 102, of Williamsport; of Typographical Union No. 230, of Carbondale; of Bricklayers' Local Union No. 18, of Scranton, all in the State of Pennsylvania; of sundry citizens of Hartshorne, Ind. T.; of Teamsters' Local Union No. 85, of San Francisco, Cal.; of Local Division No. 389, Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers, of Fremont, Nebr.; of Cigar Makers' Local Union No. 132, of Brooklyn, N. Y., and of the Immigration Restriction League, of Washington, D. C.

March 21.—Petitions of Journeymen Tailors' Local Union No. 56, of Philadelphia; of Typographical Union No. 14, of Harrisburg; of Local Division No. 95, Order of Railway Telegraphers, of Wellsboro; of sundry citizens of South Bethlehem, West Bethlehem, and Bethlehem; of Railway Conductors' Local Division No. 144, of Derry; of Hodcarriers' Local Union No. 751, of Reading; of Just in Time Lodge, No. 346, Brotherhood of Railroad Telegraphers, of Bethlehem; of Stone Masons' Local Union No. 35, of Philadelphia; of Southwest Union, No. 63, Brotherhood of Railroad Telegraphers, of Scottsdale; of Bricklayers' Local Union No. 18, of Scranton; of 43 citizens of New Alexandria; of 59 citizens of Pittsburg; of Tobacco Workers' Local Union No. 59, of Wilkesbarre; of 68 citizens of Brownville, all in the State of Pennsylvania, and of Bricklayers and Masons' Local Union No. 2, of Lincoln, Nebr.

March 24.—Petitions of Local Union No. 3, of Waynesburg; of Painters, Decorators, and Paper Hangers' Local Union No. 370, of Pittsburg; of Local Union No. 24 of Newcastle, all of the American Federation of Labor; of Lodge No. 228, Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen, of Bradford; of Council No. 853, Junior Order of United American Mechanics, of Chester County; of 44 citizens of South Bethlehem, and of Local Division No. 357, Order of Railway Conductors, of Connellsville, all in the State of Pennsylvania.

March 25.—A petition of the Ship-Keepers' Protective Union No. 8970, American Federation of Labor, of Vallejo, Cal.

Mr. PENROSE also presented petitions of the Brooklyn Branch, of Brooklyn, N. Y.; of the Providence Branch, of Providence, R. I.; of the Portland Branch, of Portland, Me., and of the Baltimore Branch, of Baltimore, Md., all of the Atlantic Coast Seamen's Union; of the Seattle Branch, Pacific Coast Marine Firemen's Union, of Seattle, Wash.; of the Seattle Branch of Sailors' Union of the Pacific, of Seattle, Wash.; of San Pedro Sailors' Union of the Pacific, of San Pedro, Cal., and of the San Pedro Brande Sailors' Union of the Pacific, of San Pedro, Cal., praying for the enactment of legislation providing for the protection of American seamen from Chinese competition.

April 2.—Petitions of Painters, Decorators, and Paperhangers' Local Union No. 208, of Washington; of Retail Clerks' Local Union No. 204, of Ashland; of Boiler Makers' Local Union No. 41, of Elwood; of Typographical Union No. 321, of Connellsville; of Local Division No. 3, Order of Railroad Telegraphers, of Harrisburg; of Mine Workers' Local Union No. 1824, of Leechburg; of Railway Conductors' Local Union No. 187, of Sunbury; of 130 citizens of Donora, and of Silk Mill Workers' Local Union No. 246, of Plymouth, all in the State of Pennsylvania, and of Steam Fitters' Local Union No. 82, of Omaha, Nebr.

April 3.—Petitions of 64 citizens of Pittsburg; of Fall City Council, No. 385, Order of United American Mechanics, of Fall City; of Mount Moriah Lodge, No. 319, of Philadelphia, all in the State of Pennsylvania.

Mr. FAIRBANKS. Mr. President, I move that when the Senate adjourns to-day it be to meet at 11 o'clock to-morrow.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. FAIRBANKS. The amendments made to the bill a short time ago render a couple of brief amendments necessary in section 4.

I move that after the word "teachers" the word "and" be inserted, and after the word "students" a semicolon be inserted in place of the comma; that before the word "merchants" the words "and to" be inserted, and after the word "merchants" the comma be stricken out, so that the section as amended will read:

That from and after the passage of this act the privilege of Chinese persons other than laborers, to enter or remain in the United States shall be restricted to officials, teachers, and students; and to merchants and travelers for curiosity or pleasure, as hereinafter defined.

Mr. TURNER. Mr. President, I understood yesterday when an amendment to another section of the bill was offered that all amendments which went to the substantial framework and structure of the bill were to be left until the voting commenced tomorrow at 1 o'clock. I was in the Chamber when the amendments to which the Senator from Indiana refers were passed, but my attention was diverted, and I was not aware of what was taking place. Otherwise I should have objected to taking the vote upon those amendments at that time. I hope the Senator will permit that vote to be reconsidered at this time and allow the bill to stand as it originally was until the vote is taken tomorrow. All of the discussion is not over. These are important and substantive provisions of the bill, and they are provisions that a great many members of the Senate think ought to be retained in the bill.

Mr. FAIRBANKS. The amendments were proposed and accepted by the chairman of the committee on behalf of the committee.

Mr. TURNER. But I do not understand that the committee has ever had its attention called to them. I am a member of the committee, and I do not know of any committee action ever having been taken. I do not understand that it is conformable to the rules of the Senate that the chairman of a committee should speak for the committee unless the committee has taken some action in the premises. I know that there are a great many Senators who consider sections 5 and 6 to be very valuable provisions in the bill and would regret very seriously to see them stricken out. I would think, in view of that, that no vote ought to have been taken until the time for the voting to-morrow.

Mr. FAIRBANKS. Could not the Senator accomplish the same purpose by offering to amend the bill so as to make it stand as it did before these amendments, embodying what was reported by the committee and what has been stricken out?

Mr. TURNER. That puts those who are in favor of those provisions in a different position from what they would be if the provisions were left in the bill. The matter went, as I understood, pro forma, and it seems that it is not asking too much to request the Senator who moved that amendment to permit it to remain unacted on until the voting commences to-morrow. I hope he will take that course, because if a majority of the Senate is in favor of those amendments they will be made on to-morrow, but the bill ought not to have been changed by an amendment of this character made at this time.

Mr. PATTERSON. Mr. President—

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Washington yield to the Senator from Colorado?

Mr. TURNER. Certainly.

Mr. PATTERSON. Mr. President, I was not in the Chamber when the amendment was made. However, a short time before I went out of the Chamber the Senator from Indiana [Mr. FAIRBANKS] spoke to me about the amendment, and I said to him I had no objection to it. That is all I know about the matter.

I wish to say to the Senator from Washington that the effect of the amendment, as I understand it, is that it includes in the prescribed classes teachers and students, leaving to the Secretary of the Treasury, and requiring the Secretary of the Treasury, to make proper rules and regulations to carry into effect their exclusion—in other words, leaving the law as it is, and making the law in the pending bill precisely as it is now. The bill incorporates the definition of students and teachers. The law as it was simply mentions students and teachers, and the Secretary of the Treasury made regulations defining what they were. Those regulations have been carried into this bill, and if the amendment remains, the law, so far as this new bill is concerned, will continue to be precisely as it is now.

Mr. TURNER. Do I understand the Senator to say that the amendment is satisfactory to those having the bill in charge?

Mr. PATTERSON. That is my understanding about it.

Mr. TURNER. Then I withdraw my request, Mr. President.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Indiana [Mr. FAIRBANKS] has offered an amendment, which will be stated.

The SECRETARY. In section 4, on page 3, line 4, after the word "teachers," it is proposed to strike out the comma and insert the

word "and;" after the word "students" to strike out the comma and insert in lieu thereof a semicolon; before the word "merchants," in the same line, to insert the words "and to;" and after the word "merchants" to strike out the comma; and in line 5, after the word "pleasure," to strike out the comma; so that if amended the section would read:

That from and after the passage of this act the privilege of Chinese persons other than laborers to enter or remain in the United States shall be restricted to officials, teachers, and students; and to merchants and travelers for curiosity or pleasure as hereinafter defined.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on the amendment proposed by the Senator from Indiana.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. TURNER obtained the floor.

Mr. HANSBROUGH. Mr. President—

Mr. TURNER. Does the Senator from North Dakota rise for the purpose of discussing the bill?

Mr. HANSBROUGH. I wish to offer an amendment to the pending bill.

Mr. TURNER. I desire to submit a few observations to the Senate, but I shall yield to the Senator from North Dakota for the purpose indicated by him.

Mr. HANSBROUGH. I do not believe that the amendment which I intend to offer will give rise to any controversy. It is to perfect the bill. I offer the amendment which I send to the desk, and ask that it may be read.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment offered by the Senator from North Dakota will be stated.

The SECRETARY. In section 11, on page 10, line 4, after the words "New Orleans," it is proposed to insert the words "Portal, Neche, Pembina, Saint Vincent, Warroad, El Paso."

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment will lie upon the table.

Mr. HANSBROUGH. I ask the Chair if the amendment is not in order at the present time?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the unanimous-consent agreement, the Chair thinks that these amendments should be postponed until 1 o'clock to-morrow.

Mr. HANSBROUGH. Very well. The amendment has been offered and printed several days since. Being of a nature not requiring any debate, I supposed it would be in order now.

Mr. TELLER. I mean to object to any further amendments being adopted until to-morrow at 1 o'clock, according to our agreement.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Any amendment, the Chair thinks, comes within the purview of the unanimous-consent agreement.

Mr. PLATT of Connecticut. Then those which have already been adopted—

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. That was by unanimous consent.

Mr. PLATT of Connecticut. And accepted here ought to be reconsidered, and stand with the rest of the amendments. Those amendments were entirely agreeable to me; but there may have been a good many Senators absent from the Senate who ought not to be bound by those amendments.

Mr. TELLER. That is the reason we ought not now to vote on them at all.

Mr. FAIRBANKS. They were in the nature of committee amendments, and unanimous consent was given.

Mr. PLATT of Connecticut. I have no objection to the amendments being adopted. They are entirely satisfactory to me. Mr. President, I wish to make an inquiry as to section 53.

Mr. TELLER. I did not mean to say that I should object to the amendment which has already been adopted, but I shall object to adopting any more. We had better stop now on these and wait until to-morrow.

Mr. PLATT of Connecticut. I am not proposing an amendment. I am making an inquiry about what is meant in a certain section. Section 53 provides:

That the term "Chinese" and the term "Chinese person," used in this act, are meant to include all male and female persons who are Chinese either by birth or descent, as well those of mixed blood as those of the full blood.

Now, I should like to inquire whether it is the understanding of those in charge of this bill that the bill would prevent the coming into the United States of all persons from the Philippine Islands who had the slightest trace of Chinese blood in their veins? I make that inquiry because I think the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE] said in his address that he would not be in favor of extending the prohibition to the mixed bloods in the Philippine Archipelago. It is well known there that a great many of the Filipinos have more or less of Chinese blood in their veins; and this provision would debar every such person, even if he was only one thirty-sixth Chinese, coming from the Philippine Archipelago to the United States, as I understand it. I wish to know if that is the understanding of the committee?

Mr. TURNER. Mr. President, I wish to notice briefly the contention made by the Senator from Ohio [Mr. FORAKER] yesterday in the very able and forceful speech which he made to the effect that the true construction of the several treaties with China, particularly the treaties of 1880 and 1894, was that nobody was to be excluded from this country except Chinese laborers, and that the restrictive words of the treaties of 1880 and 1894, defining other classes, to wit, that part of it which permitted those to enter who were defined as officials, teachers, students, merchants, and travelers for curiosity or pleasure, were merely by way of illustration and were intended to indicate that all the Chinese other than laborers, similar in character to those mentioned, were entitled to come in under the provisions of those treaties.

The Senator from Ohio made quite an elaborate examination of our treaties with China for the purpose of establishing this proposition, and went back as far as the treaty of 1844, our first treaty; followed that up with an examination of the treaty of 1858, then of the treaty of 1868, then of the treaty of 1880, and finally of the treaty of 1894.

This was the principal contention in his speech, to which he directed most of his argument, and on it he based the proposition that it was contrary to public policy and good morals for us to extend the restrictions beyond the classes named, because it would be a violation of our plighted faith with a friendly nation.

I do not consider any of these treaties essential to a determination of the question raised by the Senator from Ohio, except the treaties of 1880 and 1894, because it is by those treaties alone that we have made provision for Chinese exclusion. Nor do I consider any treaty necessary to be examined to determine the question, except that of 1894, because each of the treaties following, from the first down to the last, that of 1894, were intended to be a little more and more restrictive than the former treaties.

It is sufficient to determine this question, applying the ordinary principles of construction, to look at the language of the treaty of 1894. If there be any obscurity in that treaty, of course it is proper to look back to the prior treaties to see what the intention was in the use of the particular language employed in the later treaty; but there is nothing obscure in it; there is nothing in the treaty of 1894 which requires an examination of prior treaties.

The language of that treaty, on which the friends of this bill rely as excluding all except those specifically mentioned, is found in the third article of the treaty of 1894:

The provisions of this convention shall not affect the right at present enjoyed of Chinese subjects, being officials, teachers, students, merchants, or travelers for curiosity or pleasure, but not laborers, of coming to the United States and residing therein.

The Senator from Ohio insisted that the designation of those who may come in under the article which I have just read is merely by way of description; but it seems to me utterly impossible for any logical mind to take this article and put any such construction as that upon it. There is not anything in the language to indicate that either the United States or China meant anything of that kind:

The provisions of this convention shall not affect the right at present enjoyed of Chinese subjects, being officials, teachers, students, merchants, or travelers for curiosity or pleasure—

From being admitted into the United States. If it was the purpose to put this merely by way of illustration, it seems to me very clear that different language would have been employed, that appropriate phraseology would have been used. Instead of an iron-bound designation, as we find in this article of the treaty, which uses without qualification the terms, "officials, teachers, students, merchants, or travelers for curiosity or pleasure," the wording would have been, "Chinese subjects of the classes such as officials, teachers, students, merchants, or travelers," etc., or something of that kind. That is so plain that it would suggest itself readily to any mind; and the minds of those who were engaged on both sides in formulating this treaty, I imagine, were as astute as any in the diplomatic service of any country of the world.

The construction which might be placed on this language would have so readily occurred to them that they would have employed apt and appropriate words to indicate a contrary construction if they had so intended, words showing plainly that they used the terms employed by way of illustration, instead of using them for the purpose of indicating, as claimed by the friends of this bill, the particular classes that might be permitted to come in under the provisions of the treaty.

This, it appears to me, is made absolutely certain and conclusive when the second clause of the third article is read. That clause reads:

To entitle such Chinese subjects as are above described to admission into the United States, they may produce a certificate from their Government or the Government where they last resided, viséed by the diplomatic or consular representative of the United States in the country or port whence they depart.

If the contention of the Senator from Ohio is correct, clearly the language of this last clause would have been "To entitle such Chinese of the classes above described," or "To entitle such Chinese other than laborers to come into the United States." But no. The language is "To entitle such Chinese subjects as are above described," showing that the parties had no other classes of Chinese in their minds than those who had been specifically described in the preceding provision of Article III.

If that be correct, Mr. President, then the force and effect of the greater part of the magnificent speech delivered by the Senator from Ohio yesterday is destroyed, because that speech largely proceeded upon the theory that this bill was an unfair, an unjust, and an unconscionable effort to extend the restrictions upon Chinese immigration much beyond anything contemplated by the treaty.

When we consider, moreover, that this treaty has been given this identical construction for the last ten years, not only by the lawmaking department of the Government, but by the executive department as well, and that it has been acquiesced in by China, with the exception of one letter written by the Chinese minister only two or three months ago, and evidently in contemplation of this legislation, which it was known would come before Congress—when we consider all of these factors, in addition to the logical conclusion which must necessarily be derived from the language employed, it seems to me that there is absolutely no justice whatever in attempting to enforce upon the Senate a proposition that in the enumeration of the classes who may come here, as provided in the present bill, there is any attempt to stretch the provisions of the law one iota beyond the provisions of the treaties of 1880 and 1894.

The Senator from Ohio went further and undertook to say that the Supreme Court of the United States had given a construction to our treaty obligations with China in consonance with his position. The Senator is certainly mistaken about that. The Supreme Court of the United States has never, in any of the litigation that has come before it involving the Chinese, or any question growing out of the Chinese treaties, or any question growing out of the exclusion laws, had occasion to determine this particular and identical question.

It is true that in the case to which the Senator referred, reported in 140 U. S., the justice delivering the opinion therein undertook to give something of a history of the spirit and purpose of the exclusion laws; but it was pure obiter, and had nothing at all to do with the determination of the question then before the court. The statement was about a matter which the justice writing the opinion had a right to suppose would never be called in question, either in court or in the halls of legislation, and concerning which he need not be as accurate as he would be with reference to those matters which were immediately before the court.

The only question before the court in the case to which the Senator from Ohio referred was the question of the right of a Chinese person claiming to be a merchant to enter the United States under the provisions of the then existing law; and the Supreme Court of the United States held that he was not entitled to be admitted for two reasons: first, because he did not have the certificate contemplated by the law viséed by the consular officers of the United States in China; and second, because the testimony showed that he was a laborer and not a merchant and was endeavoring to enter the United States in a fraudulent character.

The words employed by the learned justice in the conclusion of the opinion, which were the words read by the Senator from Ohio, were not intended as a determination of either of these questions and were not necessary to their determination, but were merely a loose statement of the justice as to what he understood the object of the legislation to have been. This was what the justice said and what was quoted by the Senator from Ohio:

The result of the legislation respecting the Chinese would seem to be this: That no laborers of that race shall hereafter be permitted to enter the United States, or even to return after having departed from the country, though they may have previously resided therein and have left with a view of returning; and that all other persons of that race, except those connected with the diplomatic service, must produce a certificate from the authorities of the Chinese Government, or of such other foreign governments as they may at the time be subjects of, showing that they are not laborers and have the permission of that government to enter the United States, which certificate is to be viséed by a representative of the Government of the United States.

He does not even say in the language which I have read here, and which was read by the Senator from Ohio, who the particular classes are that may come in; but simply—

that all other persons of that race, except those connected with the diplomatic service, must produce a certificate.

Evidently the court did not have this contention in its mind at all, as every lawyer must see who reads the case, or intend to make any determination or adjudication on the subject.

So that we are remitted to the logical construction of the treaty of 1894 for a determination of this question, and it is impossible

to read the two clauses of the third article of the treaty of 1894 and say that both parties did not have in mind that the only other Chinese persons besides laborers who should be permitted to enter the United States without the consent of the United States were officials, teachers, students, merchants, and travelers for curiosity or pleasure.

Mr. President, this bill did not have any politics in it when it came to this Chamber from the committee. It was conceived in a spirit of the highest patriotism. It is the first and only public measure originating in Congress since I have been a member of this body with the assent of any considerable part of the dominant majority which has had for its object the protection of the rights and the interests of the common people of the land, which is based upon a recognition of their partnership in our Government and of their right to the provident care and protection of the Government.

The considerations which induced the members of the committee to accept this bill without regard to their party affiliations I had hoped would be equally effective in inducing both sides of this Chamber to accept and pass it. But from the time it was reported here by the Committee on Immigration down to the present hour sentiment has been crystallizing against it on the other side of this Chamber, until at this moment, outside of the three or four Republican members upon the Committee on Immigration who gave it their assent in that committee, and outside of most of the Republican Senators from the Pacific coast, I do not believe it has a single friend upon the other side of the Chamber.

The truth of the matter is that politics has crept in in spite of everything that anybody could do to keep it out. The ingrained tendencies of Republican policy have had their operation to bring about a strong and forceful sentiment upon the other side of the Chamber against the enactment of this just measure.

The powerful corporations have been heard from upon the subject while the bill has been pending here. The business interests have become alarmed, or have affected to become so; the leaders and representatives of organized labor have had the imprudence to show themselves in the corridors and committee rooms of the Capitol, and that has been an additional cause of offense in the eyes of some people.

When we consider that the Republican party worships at the shrine of wealth, when we consider that it regards the sole or at least the chief duty of government to be the conservation of wealth rather than the promotion of an honest, intelligent, and patriotic citizenship, the wonder to my mind is not that sentiment should have crystallized against this measure on the other side of the Chamber, but that there should be found anybody upon that side strong enough, with patriotism and statesmanship enough in his composition to cast aside the influences of his environment and give his support to the bill. I honor those who have been able to do so and believe that they will find in the approving views of their countrymen full justification for the course which they are pursuing.

In what I say upon this subject I do not intend, either by insinuation or innuendo, to accuse any Senator of pursuing any other course than that which his conscience demands. I am simply stating as a philosophic reason for the action of Republican Senators the fact that the Republican party finds its chief end and aim and object in life in the conservation of wealth, instead of in the protection of the common people of the land.

I am stating that as a reason why at this time, after all this debate, after the merits of this measure have been so fully shown to the Senate and to the country, the sentiment against the bill should have crystallized as it has done upon the other side of this Chamber.

I believe that the Republican party to-day is in favor of the dollar instead of the man, and this measure, conceived and framed in the interest of the manhood of the American people, goes down by the vote of the other side of the Chamber when the dollar mark of disapprobation has been put upon it.

The question now and here has come down, in my judgment, to a determination whether the committee bill, framed in the interest of the people of the land, shall receive the assent of the Senate or whether the substitute offered by the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. PLATT] shall receive the vote of the Senate.

Our friends upon the other side may not be conscious of the fact; I have no doubt they feel justified in the course which they are about to pursue by an approving conscience, but I believe that those who vote in favor of the Platt substitute will do so because way down in their hearts, perhaps unconsciously to themselves, they are opposed to restricting the immigration of Chinese to our country, and they are opposed to it because the manufacturing corporations, the transcontinental railroads, and the steamship companies want unrestricted Chinese immigration into this country.

I desire to tell the Senate what they are going to do when they

adopt, in lieu of the committee bill, the substitute offered by the Senator from Connecticut. They are going to leave in the utmost confusion the restriction laws now in force. They are going to make difficult their application because of that confusion. Those laws are scattered through a half dozen different enactments. They are difficult for the legislator to find, and when he finds them they are in so many different shapes, there are so many conflicting provisions, there are so many provisions that coincide, that it is exceedingly difficult for even a trained legal mind to determine what the law is upon any specific point.

And, moreover, they are going to prevent the officers who have the duty of administering our Chinese-exclusion laws, the lawyers and the judges who are called upon in judicial matters to enforce those laws, from having ready access to the Treasury regulations on the subject, made as the necessities of the case and as experience have shown they ought to be made. They will thereby prevent an efficient administration of such laws as we have, and they are going to do that, in my judgment, because way down in their hearts they are opposed to Chinese exclusion.

Even as a mere matter of codification, as a matter of revision, for the purpose of presenting in one compact and intelligent system our laws upon the subject of Chinese exclusion, the committee bill ought to be accepted here in preference to the substitute offered by the Senator from Connecticut. It should be passed preferably if there were no other object than that. But there is another object for this extended codification of these laws, which everybody knows here, which nobody has undertaken to controvert at all, and concerning the policy of which there ought to be no question in the mind of any Senator.

Do you want a lame, a halting, an inefficient administration of the laws relating to the exclusion of Chinese from our shores? Do you want as many holes to be punched into those laws as possible? Do you want to leave as many loopholes as possible to enable the Chinese to come here? If you do, then you want to vote for the Platt substitute for the pending bill, because that is what it will do.

A great part of the present laws upon Chinese exclusion are found in the act of 1888. A great part of the effective laws upon the subject of Chinese exclusion are the regulations made by the Treasury Department supplementing the legislation, which experience has shown are absolutely essential to any efficient carrying on of our policy against the admission of Chinese to our country. It is a fact that both the Scott law and the Treasury regulations are being attacked in five cases in the Supreme Court of the United States, with the great probability that that court will be compelled to declare that the Scott Act has no force and effect as a law because it was passed in contemplation of the ratification by the Chinese Government of the treaty of 1888, which that Government declined to do.

So if you adopt the substitute offered by the Senator from Connecticut, instead of passing the committee bill, you are going to give us a lame, a halting, an inefficient system of laws, under which it will be impossible to have any efficient exclusion of Chinese from the country pursuant to the policy entered upon twenty years ago.

More than that, Senators, the substitute drawn by the distinguished Senator from Connecticut provides by its own terms that it shall run with the present Chinese treaty and expire when that treaty expires, and it is a distinct statement to the statesmen of the Chinese Empire, as it is a distinct statement to the laboring men of this land, that the Republican party in this country does not propose to have Chinese exclusion hereafter except with the consent of the Chinese Government.

Mr. PLATT of Connecticut. Will the Senator from Washington permit me to interrupt him?

Mr. TURNER. Certainly.

Mr. PLATT of Connecticut. I do not see how the Senator from Washington can claim that when the amendment provides:

That in case said treaty be terminated as provided in Article VI thereof, this act and the acts hereby extended and continued shall remain in force until there shall be concluded between the United States and China a new treaty respecting the coming of Chinese persons into the United States, and until appropriate laws shall be passed to carry into effect the provisions thereof.

If no treaty should be negotiated, then they would be continued indefinitely.

Mr. TURNER. I am very glad to be informed by the Senator from Connecticut that he has added that clause to his proposed substitute. I was not aware of it before. But still I think the substitute must be taken as an indication of the purpose stated, because it would be satisfied by the making between this country and China of a treaty of any character on the subject of Chinese exclusion.

Mr. PLATT of Connecticut. I presume the Senator himself can not ask more than that these laws shall be in force if China refuses to make a treaty, and if it does, certainly we ought not to go beyond the provisions of the treaty in its enforcement.

Mr. TURNER. Undoubtedly. My proposition is that any treaty which we may negotiate with China, no matter how inefficient its terms might be, would meet the purposes of the amendment which the Senator has now added to his proposed substitute.

I think, in view of the evident disposition on the part of the dominant political party in this country to break down or at least to render as inefficient as possible our laws and regulations upon the subject of the exclusion of the Chinese, we may expect at no very distant day after China has denounced the present treaty, that another treaty will be made upon the subject of Chinese exclusion which will fairly meet the present views and purposes of the Chinese Government, but which will not meet the views and purposes of the common people of this land, who demand that their labor, their morals, and their civilization shall not be perverted by the inroad of the hordes of Chinamen who will come here whenever our present policy of restriction is broken down or materially weakened. But at any rate the substitute prepared by the Senator from Connecticut will be an invitation to the Government of China to abrogate the treaty in 1904.

The minister from China has written strong letters, showing that the purpose of the Chinese Government is to break down our present exclusion laws if possible; showing his dissatisfaction with the present system of Chinese exclusion, and certainly that Government will take advantage of the clause in the treaty of 1894 authorizing it to denounce the treaty at the end of ten years if it has tendered it such an invitation as that which is couched in the proposed substitute of the Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. President, I do not see why there should be all of this exceedingly great tenderness upon the subject of our treaty relations with China, all this exhortation upon the good faith with which we should observe our treaty obligations with that Government. I am not in favor of violating any of them, but I have been amazed at the almost hysterical utterances which I have heard here from day to day since this matter has been under consideration, to the effect that it would be a breach of national honor, it would be a stain upon the fair escutcheon of our country if we should pass any laws which in any respect trench upon any of the provisions of any of these treaties.

It has only been about eighteen months or two years since the Government of China had our minister and the members of his legation penned up in the legation building in the city of Peking endeavoring to murder them. To-day, under the terms of these treaties with China, there is not a single American who dares to go anywhere in the interior of China, and there is not one in China to-day anywhere within its interior. They are all confined to the treaty ports. They do not dare to go anywhere else, because the Chinese Government could not protect their lives anywhere else from the ferocity of the Chinese people.

It does seem remarkable, with this condition of affairs prevailing in China, that Senators should declaim here in a hysterical manner and demand in the name of sacred honor that we observe rigorously and scrupulously every provision of the Chinese treaties.

Mr. President, if we wanted an excuse to overrule and override any treaty we have with China, that country has furnished it over and over again a hundred times in the breaches of the treaty of which she has been guilty within the last two years and a half.

I did not rise for the purpose of making a speech particularly, but simply to notice the ground upon which the distinguished Senator from Ohio [Mr. FORAKER] founded the greater part of the very eloquent speech which he made to the Senate yesterday. In concluding I wish to present to the Senate some telegrams from labor organizations in my State which I have received since yesterday upon the subject of the pending bill. I ask that they be read to the Senate by the Secretary.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Secretary will read as requested.

The Secretary read as follows:

SEATTLE, WASH., April 14, 1902.

Hon. GEORGE TURNER, Portland, Washington, D. C.:

The Longshoremen's Protective Association urges the adoption of Chinese-exclusion bill reported by committee, seamen's section included.

J. WEAVER, President.  
J. McCURDY, Secretary.

SEATTLE, WASH., April 14, 1902.

Hon. GEORGE TURNER, United States Senate, Washington, D. C.:

The Western Central Labor Union urges the adoption of Chinese-exclusion bill reported from committee, seamen's section included.

A. POHLE, President.  
F. A. RUST, Secretary.

SEATTLE, WASH., April 14, 1902.

Hon. GEORGE TURNER, United States Senate, Washington, D. C.:

The Seattle Branch of the Sailors' Union urges adoption of Chinese-exclusion bill reported from committee, seamen's section included.

P. B. GILL, Agent.

SEATTLE, WASH., April 14, 1902.

Hon. GEORGE TURNER, United States Senate, Washington, D. C.:

The Marine Cooks and Stewards' Association of Seattle urges the adoption of Chinese-exclusion bill reported from committee, seamen's section included.

R. POWERS, Agent.

SEATTLE, WASH., April 14, 1902.

Hon. GEORGE TURNER, United States Senate, Washington, D. C.:

The Seattle Branch of the Marine Firemen's Union urges the adoption of Chinese-exclusion bill reported from committee, seamen's section included.

J. CARNEY, Agent.

TACOMA, WASH., April 13, 1902.

Senator GEORGE TURNER, Portland, Washington, D. C.:

We urge your vote for adoption sailors' section Chinese exclusion.

TACOMA TRADES COUNCIL,  
J. MENZIES, Secretary.

TACOMA, WASH., April 14, 1902.

Senator G. TURNER, Washington, D. C.:

We urge your vote for adoption sailors' section Chinese exclusion.

TACOMA SAILORS' UNION.

SEATTLE, WASH., April 14, 1902.

Hon. GEORGE TURNER, United States Senate, Washington, D. C.:

Chamber of commerce received dispatch from Washington asking if retention of seamen's clause of Chinese-exclusion bill will be detrimental to oriental shipping. Committee on national affairs given full power to act; hence Mr. Burke's telegram.

P. B. GILL.

SEATTLE, WASH., April 14, 1902.

Hon. GEORGE TURNER, United States Senate, Washington, D. C.:

Thomas Burke, chairman committee national affairs, chamber of commerce, is attorney for Great Northern Railway Company. Prohibition of Chinese seamen on American vessels will not force them to sail under foreign flags. The owners are too anxious to receive subsidy. Will wire later about chamber of commerce.

P. B. GILL.

TACOMA, WASH., April 14, 1902.

Senator GEORGE TURNER or Senator A. G. FOSTER, Washington, D. C.:

We urge you work and vote for adoption of sailors' section Chinese exclusion.

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE OF  
WASHINGTON STATE FEDERATION OF LABOR,  
WILLIAM BLACKMAN, President.

ABERDEEN, WASH., April 15, 1902.

Hon. GEORGE TURNER, United States Senate, Washington, D. C.:

Organized labor of Aberdeen in mass meeting assembled urgently request you to vote and work for seaman's clause in exclusion act.

C. R. HUTTON, Chairman.  
C. J. CAMPBELL, Secretary.

Mr. SPOONER. Mr. President, I am not satisfied with the bill reported by the committee, amended very materially as it has been, nor am I satisfied with the substitute offered by the distinguished Senator from Connecticut [Mr. PLATT] as it is now framed, and I wish very briefly to state my position upon each proposition.

I do not stop to reply properly to the very bitter speech which has just been delivered by the Senator from Washington [Mr. TURNER]. I have personal friendship for him and great admiration for his ability, and I am, I confess, quite amazed that he should find it in harmony with his inclination or his belief to impute to every member of this body on this side of the Chamber who does not happen to agree with him unworthy motives or a surrender to influences which ought not to affect any Senator on either side of the Chamber.

Mr. TURNER. Mr. President—

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Wisconsin yield to the Senator from Washington?

Mr. SPOONER. Certainly.

Mr. TURNER. Mr. President, I must disclaim having imputed to any Senator on the other side any unworthy motive. I especially endeavored to guard against that by saying that I attributed the sentiment which had been crystallizing upon the other side of the Chamber to the peculiar tenets and policies of the Republican party which had become ingrained in the consciousness of the members of that party.

Mr. SPOONER. I can not account for the bitter feeling of the Senator toward the Republican party. Senators on the other side of the Chamber who have been lifelong Democrats disagree with us—

Mr. TURNER. Will the Senator permit me to explain that also?

Mr. SPOONER. I think it might take some time.

Mr. TURNER. No, sir; just a moment. I was cozened by the Republican party for thirty years, and when I found it out I became very bitter toward that party.

Mr. SPOONER. The Senator thinks apparently that the moment he left the party all the virtue, all the patriotism, all of its traditional regard for the interests of labor and for humanity departed with him. The Senator is mistaken.

There should not be—and I was not aware until the Senator

from Washington made his speech that there was—any politics in this proposed legislation, and I resent, for one, the suggestion that because I do not agree with the Senator from Washington as to this bill I am any less in favor than he is of excluding Chinese laborers from the United States; and I deny that there is a Senator on this side of the Chamber, so far as I know, who is not as thoroughly committed, not simply mentally, but in his heart, to the protection of American labor against this impossible competition as the Senator or any of his associates.

I do not need to defend the Republican party in its devotion to the interests of labor, Mr. President. Its record does that, and one ground of Democratic attack upon it always has been that it was its policy to do that. The Republican party has been in favor of protecting the labor of the United States not only against alien contract labor but against the products of that labor made in other lands and brought here into unjust and unfair competition with similar products of our own labor. It is too late for any man to suggest, with the expectation that he can command the confidence of the people in the statement, that the Republican party is hostile to the interests of labor. Strike from the statute books, Mr. President, what the Republican party in its history has done for labor in the United States, and what would there be left?

I do not know what sentiment, if any, has crystallized upon the pending bill on this side of the Chamber. I never ask any Senator how he intends to vote. I never canvass the Senate. I do not know how Senators will vote except as they have declared themselves in their utterances upon this measure.

Mr. President, the Senator from Washington regards, from my standpoint, somewhat loosely treaty obligations. It is not a question of power. I agree entirely with the Senator from Colorado [Mr. TELLER]—I agree entirely with the Senator from Washington—that Congress has the power to pass laws abrogating every treaty which exists between us and foreign governments. It has the power to cut us off, if it chooses to exercise it, from international comity and relation. A treaty in our system of government is unique.

By the Constitution the power to make laws is vested in the Senate and House of Representatives, but the Constitution gives to a treaty, after it shall have been entered into by the President and ratified by the Senate, the force of law throughout the land equally with laws passed by Congress. That is the one instance where a supreme law of the land, binding everybody but Congress, binding courts, obligatory upon the people, passes to the statute books without the intervention oftentimes of the House of Representatives or the Senate, acting as a legislative body. It is made by the Executive and the Senate.

That is not all, Mr. President. There is something of uniqueness in it beyond that—that it can not be made by the President and the Senate without the intervention of a foreign power. So it becomes a law, but it is also a compact or a contract. Being a law, the Supreme Court has repeatedly decided that it is subject to repeal by the lawmaking power of the country.

But there is something about it all beyond that which does not go to the courts, for whether the Congress acts wisely or justly in abrogating a treaty is not for the courts to review. That is a question solely for the Congress to determine.

And these treaties with foreign powers, Mr. President, rest in honor. They are not like compacts or contracts between individuals which can be enforced in courts of justice. In the last analysis they are enforceable only at the cannon's mouth, because, as the court has repeatedly said, while we have the power to abrogate them, we do it at our peril; we do it subject to reprisal upon the part of the injured party to it.

A man who does not keep his contracts stands not well in any community, and the man stands best, Mr. President, who keeps his contract—or, in other words, his word—where the obligation is such that it can not be enforced in any tribunal. Among honorable men an honorable obligation is as strong, if not stronger, than one enforceable in the tribunals of the land.

There are cases where a country is justified in abrogating a treaty. I am frank to say here, although I resisted with other Senators for two years any attempt to abrogate the Clayton-Bulwer treaty, which shackled the United States and prevented us from constructing in the interest of commerce and in the interest of our safety a canal connecting the oceans. I was influenced partly by the fact that negotiations were pending to abrogate it; but if they had failed I should have deemed it entirely compatible with the honor of this country to have voted to abrogate it, because compacts between nations sometimes—containing no clause authorizing a denouncement—which affect the safety, as time goes on, of a people, they are not bound to observe, and a government can not trade away for all time the safety or the well-being of its people. This is a doctrine underlying treaties. Happily there was in the case of the Clayton-Bulwer treaty no such exigency, as I did not believe there would be.

So Congress passed an act to abrogate the Chinese treaty, and

it was a justifiable abrogation. The Supreme Court so declared in the "Chinese-exclusion case" (Chae Pang Ping, 130 U. S.). I think the act was not signed. It was justifiable because we had entered into a treaty with China for unrestricted intercourse, and it brought to our shores an army of Chinese laborers, and, because of their racial instincts, because of their characteristics, because of their peculiarities, because of the absolute impossibility of their ever assimilating with us, because of the impossible competition which it put upon our labor, that Government not being willing to abrogate it or modify it, it being perpetual in form, in the interest of labor, in the interest of society, in the interest of our whole people, Congress passed a bill to abrogate it.

So to-day, Mr. President, there is no man, so far as I know, except those who consult a purely selfish interest (and if they have any representative here I do not know who he is), who is in favor of throwing open the gates to the immigration of Chinese labor. We are afraid of them; that is the truth about it. They can not become citizens of the United States. They create Chinese societies in our midst which are as isolated as if they were in China. They are acute, patient, thrifty, imitative, able, and with a standard of living which would enable them, if they could come here at will, to drive American labor to the poorhouse, if America would permit it, which American labor would not.

So, Mr. President, it is not only in the interest of American labor that they are to be excluded, but it is in the interest, from the standpoint of humanity, of Chinese labor that they should be excluded. I do not yield—and I think I speak in that respect for every Senator on this side of the Chamber—to the Senator from Washington [Mr. TURNER] in the slightest degree in strength of purpose and desire to exclude Chinese labor from the United States.

Now, Mr. President, a great Government like this, as powerful and as rich as this Government is, able to deal with the greatest to enforce its just demands, can ill afford, except where there is supreme necessity for it, to violate its plighted faith with other governments. It can ill afford to do it, Mr. President, beyond all things, with the weaker governments of the earth and as to those from whose fleets and guns it has nothing to fear.

I believe in observing treaty obligations. If they are not satisfactory, I would seek to modify them. If they can not be modified and the public interest certainly demands it, I would exercise the power which we possess to relieve the Government from it, but I would do it always only as a last resort.

I venture to say, Mr. President, that if the Geary Act, as it is called, did not expire for three years this bill would not be here. Legislation is necessary, that is conceded, because with the coming of May, if there be none now enacted we are left, as I understand it, without exclusion legislation, and that would be intolerable. We are not to go back to the treaty of 1880. I think Senators never will find the time when our people are willing to let down the bars to Chinese labor, no matter if some railway companies desire it, no matter if some Pacific steamship companies desire it, no matter who desires it for a selfish and ulterior purpose, never.

The Senator criticised the substitute proposed by the distinguished Senator from Connecticut [Mr. PLATT]. I said, and I will refer to that for a moment as I go along, although I meant to deal with it later, that it is not satisfactory to me. It is not satisfactory to me for two reasons. In the first place, it is not satisfactory to me because it does not provide distinctly that Chinese from the Philippine Archipelago shall not come into the United States. Possibly they would be excluded by existing law. I have some doubt about it.

Congress, upon the record, had doubt about it as to Hawaii, and notwithstanding there was in force this Chinese-exclusion legislation when we acquired the territory of Hawaii, to which acquisition I was opposed, the Congress, in the act of annexation, as I recollect it, prohibited the coming from Hawaii to the mainland of Chinese, and again, as the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE] said the other day, when the government bill for Hawaii was passed in Congress was that prohibition repealed. I do not know exactly what would have been the effect, as a matter of law, of the annexation without that legislation, but this to me is certain, that having enacted it as to Hawaii, if we omit it as to the Philippines, the Philippines not having been the property of the United States when the treaty was entered into, it might raise a question which I think all possibility of should be eliminated.

That is not all. I do not like the substitute proposed by the Senator from Connecticut for another reason. It continues in force all existing laws for the exclusion of Chinese. That is the language of it. I am told that there is now pending before the Supreme Court of the United States a case, perhaps more than one, in which it is contended that the Scott law never took effect. I was a member of this body when that law passed, and I think I voted for it. If the Supreme Court of the United States should so decide, then that would not be one of the laws falling within the use of that word in the substitute offered by the Senator from



Connecticut. So I suggested to him privately, and I suggest to him now publicly, that I think for safety his substitute should be amended by inserting at the proper place the words "including the act entitled 'An act to prohibit the coming of Chinese laborers to the United States,' approved September 13, 1888."

Mr. PATTERSON. May I ask the Senator from Wisconsin a question?

Mr. SPOONER. Yes, sir.

Mr. PATTERSON. If the Scott law shall turn out to be a void law, can it be vitalized by mere general terms?

Mr. SPOONER. I did not say a void law.

Mr. PATTERSON. Well, suppose it is declared to have never been operative?

Mr. SPOONER. Well, Mr. President, it might be declared never to have been operative, and it would not follow from that at all that Congress had not the power to make it operative, would it?

Mr. PATTERSON. The thought in my mind is that if the Scott law shall be declared void for constitutional or other reasons it was void from its inception, and I do not believe there is a possibility to give vitality to such a law by mere general legislation of the kind that is proposed.

Mr. SPOONER. I agree entirely with the Senator, that if the Scott law should be decided to have been void because as contravening the Constitution it would be void because unconstitutional.

Mr. PATTERSON. Or for any other reason.

Mr. SPOONER. Oh, not at all. I am going to divide the question. If the Supreme Court of the United States shall decide that the Scott law is void as being in contravention of the Constitution, and hold the act to be an entirety, exempt from the doctrine of dependent and independent provisions, Congress could not give it vitality, because—I do not need to argue to my friend from Colorado, who is an excellent lawyer—that Congress can not pass an unconstitutional act and give it vitality.

Mr. PATTERSON. That is not the logic of my question at all.

Mr. SPOONER. It is the logic of my answer. Now, the Senator says, "or for other reasons." He has gotten away now from the first reason he gave, which was a constitutional reason. He says "for other reasons;" and perhaps in order to be able to answer the question intelligently I ought to know the other reasons; but I undertake to say—

Mr. PATTERSON. I can suggest a reason.

Mr. SPOONER. What reason?

Mr. PATTERSON. For the reason that the law was based upon a treaty that never went into effect. That might be one.

Mr. SPOONER. The law having been based upon a treaty which never went into effect, the only reason the law never would have been a law was because it never went into effect, would it not be? It would be because the condition precedent upon the happening of which depended its going into effect never happened. Would that prevent the Congress of the United States from reenacting it, to take effect at once, without any precedent condition?

Mr. PATTERSON. Mr. President, I think that Congress would have the right in terms—I do not mean simply by the naming of the law, referring to its title and the date of its passage, but by proceeding as we enact any law—to reenact that law. Of course, it would have the right to do it. But when a law was void because it was based or intended to be based upon something years ago that did not exist, and that never came into existence after the passage of a number of Congresses, I do not believe it can be made a vital law simply by general terms.

Mr. SPOONER. The Senator from Colorado has forgotten the doctrine of legislative recognition. He has forgotten the long, long line of decisions by which the courts have held repealed laws to be revived by being treated as if in force, and those decisions are overwhelming in numbers. For the Senator to say that because the act never took effect, not on account of unconstitutionality, but because the treaty upon the ratification of which depended its going into effect never was ratified, Congress has not the power to reenact it except formally, surprises me.

Does the Senator mean to say that if the amendment of the Senator from Connecticut, continuing in force all laws relating to Chinese exclusion, had incorporated in it these words, "including the act entitled 'An act to prohibit the coming of Chinese laborers to the United States,' approved September 13, 1888," that from the approval of the substitute bill by the President that would not become a part of the law of the land?

Mr. PATTERSON. That is practically my contention. It would at least place the law in a very dangerous situation. It would give to the enemies of Chinese exclusion a most excellent ground, with a substantial hope of ultimately succeeding, by going into court for the purpose of having the law again declared invalid. That is my view of it.

Mr. SPOONER. If there is a lawyer in the United States

who would charge much to a client for taking that proposition into court I do not think he ought to be paid for it. But if the Senator from Colorado has any doubt about that, and I have none, he can remove his own doubts by moving to amend this amendment, if he desires, by saying "which is hereby reenacted." How would that do?

Mr. PATTERSON. My notion is that you would have to set out each section of the law in totidem verbis.

Mr. SPOONER. Then that amounts to this: That if Congress should pass an act saying that from and after the 1st day of July next the McKinley law, naming it by chapter, should be in force as the law of the United States, it would be a brutum fulmen and without effect as a piece of legislation. What is the answer to that question?

Mr. PATTERSON. What law do you refer to?

Mr. SPOONER. The McKinley Act, or any other act.

Mr. PATTERSON. You mean the tariff act?

Mr. SPOONER. Yes.

Mr. PATTERSON. I think it would be a very grave question whether in the case of a law that is absolutely dead, of which the country has been relieved, which if there was a revision of the laws would be wiped from the statute books altogether and would not appear, simply by naming that law by title it could be revived in all of its terms. I do not believe that it could be done.

Let me suggest this further proposition to the Senator from Wisconsin. Suppose a law is declared to be unconstitutional that has passed with all the regularity and solemnity required for the passage of a law, and shortly thereafter the constitutional trouble has been relieved. Would the Senator from Wisconsin claim that by referring to that act by title and declaring that it shall be reenacted it would be given vitality upon the statute books?

Mr. SPOONER. Yes. At common law the repeal of a repealing act revived the original act. There is no particular solemnity necessary to constitute a law.

Mr. PATTERSON. But there is reasonable particularity.

Mr. SPOONER. No, there is no reasonable particularity in the sense in which the Senator now uses that phrase. All that is necessary is an enacting clause, authority existing under the Constitution, and language which makes plain the purpose of Congress.

Mr. PATTERSON. May I ask the Senator a question?

Mr. HOAR. May I ask the Senator to allow me to remind him, what I dare say he would think of himself, that we have frequently adopted a body of laws for Territories by saying, for instance, that the law of Oregon should be in force in Alaska?

Mr. SPOONER. Certainly.

Mr. PATTERSON. Mr. President, replying to the Senator from Massachusetts, that does not meet the objection. You are applying a live law to another subject or another section of the territory of the United States.

Mr. SPOONER. What is the difference between applying a live law to a section of the territory of the United States and applying a live Congress to a dead law?

Mr. PATTERSON. There is the difference between reviving or attempting to revive a carcass by electricity and securing signs and evidences of life in a body that for the time is simply comatose. That is the difference.

Mr. SPOONER. Mr. President, if the Senator can not see any distinction between the revivifying effect of electricity on a carcass and the power of Congress on a repealed law in order to revive it, I can not make it clear.

Mr. PATTERSON. They are both dead.

Mr. SPOONER. Yes.

Mr. PATTERSON. What is the difference between a carcass and a dead law?

Mr. SPOONER. One is dead with no power on earth to bring it to life and the other is dead with the power on earth that made it in the first place to bring it to life. That is the difference.

Mr. PATTERSON. Let me ask the Senator to answer another question.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Wisconsin yield to the Senator from Colorado?

Mr. SPOONER. Of course.

Mr. PATTERSON. Suppose you want to enact a law adopted by the English Parliament. Can you make that the law of this land?

Mr. SPOONER. Why not?

Mr. PATTERSON. Could it be particularized by simply enacting that a law, with the following title, adopted by the Parliament of England at a certain time, shall from this day forward be the law of the United States?

Mr. SPOONER. Why not?

Mr. PATTERSON. Simply because you can not do it. You might try it, but you would fail.

Mr. SPOONER. That is the only knockdown I have had.

Mr. PATTERSON. That is the best I can give you.

Mr. SPOONER. Simply because you can not do it. You can reenact a law by a reference to it, can you not?

Mr. PATTERSON. In my judgment, you can not reenact a dead law. You can not put life into that which is dead, that which has passed out of existence, simply by calling it by name.

Mr. SPOONER. It takes a new law and becomes a new law.

Mr. PATTERSON. That is where we differ.

Mr. SPOONER. No; that is where I think the Senator does not understand.

Mr. PATTERSON. I may be obtuse.

Mr. SPOONER. I did not mean that.

Mr. PATTERSON. Yes.

Mr. SPOONER. We do not reenact a live law; we reenact a dead law, and make it live again. That is all.

Mr. PATTERSON. Of course you can enact anything, but you can not reenact a dead law by reference to its title.

Mr. SPOONER. You can not perhaps make it retrospectively alive; it was dead, but when it is revived by an act of Congress it lives again.

Mr. PATTERSON. I despair of convincing the Senator from Wisconsin, and so I shall cease.

Mr. SPOONER. If the Senator did not despair of convincing me of his proposition, I should despair of myself. We have the power of reenacting by reference—and I think very few will dispute it—any law which has hitherto been repealed by Congress, provided that the reference to it is so specific that the purpose of Congress to revive it and reenact it is plain.

But I have spent—I had expected to be through before this time—all my time in practically an elementary discussion of the law with the Senator from Colorado.

Now, Mr. President, what has been the trouble with the existing law? Any? They say that frauds have been attempted to be perpetrated upon it. Frauds will be attempted to be perpetrated upon any law on this subject which you pass; frauds are attempted to be perpetrated upon the tariff law; and wherever avarice is the moving motive among men, and they are only restrained by legislative enactment, frauds will be sought to be perpetrated upon the law. You may say there has been some bribery and corruption among officials. Can you pass any law to prevent that? No matter whether you continue the existing law or pass this bill, which liberty-loving and patriotic men must support under penalty of impeachment of their motives, is it to be said that there will be no attempt to evade it and perpetrate frauds upon it?

What has been the effect of the existing law? Has it thrown the doors open to Chinese laborers? I talked the other day upon this subject with a gentleman who has had much to do with the matter; an able, clear-headed, frank man. He might not be willing that I should name him here, but he talked to me frankly and clearly. He did not hesitate to say that the existing law has been effective, but said the trouble was they were afraid it would be overturned so far as it related to the Scott Act by the decision of the Supreme Court of the United States. I want to guard against that as completely as any Senator can, and my suggestion of that possibility and of an amendment to guard against it was not made for the first time to-day by any means.

The census figures have been brought to the attention of the Senate. In 1890 the number of Chinese in the United States was 107,480; in 1900, 89,863; in California, in 1890, 72,472; in 1900, 45,753—nearly 40 per cent decrease the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. GALLINGER] said in his argument here as to California, and nearly 17 per cent, or quite that, of decrease during the decade in the United States. What did it? Did the Chinese abandon their desire to come here, or was it the enforcement of the law in this country which has brought about this result?

It was suggested by the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE] that the census which has just been taken is erroneous in its results as to the number of Chinese in the United States. It is pretty early to impeach the census. If it is false in this respect, in what other particulars is it untrustworthy? It has been generally considered throughout the country to have been managed with great skill and with integrity. The work of the Director of the Census has been extolled by Senators on both sides of this Chamber, and I regret that the exigencies of debate have seemed to compel anyone, almost within a month after the publication of its bulletins, to impeach its accuracy. It leads men to doubt it, it casts suspicion upon it, which, so far as I know, finds no justification whatever in the facts.

Senators say that this bill is only a codification, and that they are proposing to enact by it only Treasury regulations. Is that true? And they ask what is the harm in enacting Treasury regulations? Do not Senators see the great distinction between Treasury regulations for the enforcement of a treaty and statutory regulations for its enforcement? Administrative officers construe the treaty, which is a law, and they construe our statutes in carrying them out; but even if inconsistent with

treaty obligations, Mr. President, they do not violate the treaty on the part of this Government; they do not abrogate the treaty, to speak more accurately, because that is a question of construction. It is not for the Congress to construe laws. That is a function of the courts.

Anyone whose right under a treaty is invaded by Treasury regulations incompatible with the national obligation has his day in court; and if the Treasury regulation made by the Commissioner of Immigration is not in harmony with a treaty—if it deprives some one of a right in fact conferred upon him by the treaty—the courts will say that, and the honor of the country will be saved by one of its Executive Departments, and that the one to which is committed by the Constitution that function. But if the Congress, whose duty is not to construe laws but whose duty it is to make laws, enacts into a statute regulations incompatible with a treaty, *pro tanto* it abrogates the treaty. That is the difference, and it is a wide difference.

Mr. TELLER. Mr. President—

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Wisconsin yield to the Senator from Colorado?

Mr. SPOONER. Certainly.

Mr. TELLER. I do not like to interrupt the Senator, but he is complaining that we are abrogating some of the provisions of the treaty with China by this bill. I wish the Senator would point them out. I myself have not been able to find them.

Mr. SPOONER. I will point them out. But to some Senators that does not make any difference.

Mr. TELLER. Mr. President, I say it would not make any difference to me if I thought a treaty ought to be abrogated, but I do not see where in this bill we are abrogating the treaty. It would not make any difference to the Senator if it ought to be done. The Senator said he was in favor of abrogating a treaty that ought to be abrogated.

Mr. SPOONER. Yes, as a last resort, I said. Two years from now we shall have the right to denounce this treaty of 1894, and China will have the right to denounce it. This country, of course, will never rest content with any less liberal treaty than the treaty of 1894. I do not assume to doubt, especially in view of the attitude of this Government during the last two years toward China, that, when the day comes, that Government will be found willing to yield to our wishes in this respect. I do not feel even as to China—I would not do it as to the weakest and poorest government under the sky; I would rather do it as to the strongest—that we should violate by statute the honorable obligation of this Government, rather than continue in force the efficient laws now upon the statute book, when within two years the question will be open. The Senator asked me whether it violates the treaty.

Mr. TELLER. In what particular does the bill violate the treaty?

Mr. SPOONER. In several particulars. The Senate has stricken out, I believe, on motion of members of the committee, some of the provisions in the bill which violated the treaty. The student clause, I believe, has been stricken out. Why? If it ought to have been there when it came from the committee, if it ought to have been there yesterday, why did it go out to-day?

Mr. FAIRBANKS. Mr. President, is the Senator objecting that it has gone out?

Mr. SPOONER. No, sir; I am not objecting to its going out.

Mr. FAIRBANKS. We are dealing here with practical things and not with theories.

Mr. SPOONER. Yes, we are; and so am I.

Mr. FAIRBANKS. If the Senator objects to its being stricken out, he can put it back by amendment.

Mr. SPOONER. Not at all. But what excites my curiosity is, if it went out because it was in violation of the treaty, why was it put in, and why has it been contended for here all these days, and why put that violation of the treaty out and leave other violations of the treaty in?

Mr. MITCHELL. Nobody, so far as I know, who had any connection with this bill has said that this provision did violate the treaty.

Mr. SPOONER. Why, then, did it go out?

Mr. MITCHELL. Why does any provision go out in considering a bill in any legislative body, where it has been discussed pro and con, and when the members of the committee themselves are not quite agreed after consultation? Is it in any wise unusual to strike a clause out of a bill that has been reported? Is that a sufficient cause to excite the Senator from Wisconsin to the tremendous pitch into which he seems to have gotten?

Mr. SPOONER. I am not excited at all.

Mr. MITCHELL. I am perfectly amazed at the Senator from Wisconsin.

Mr. SPOONER. I am glad I have succeeded in impressing myself upon the Senator from Oregon. [Laughter.]

Mr. MITCHELL. I am absolutely amazed to see that the Senator is making such a rumpus, because after an investigation and

discussion here of ten days, the committee has consented that a certain provision of the bill shall go out.

Mr. SPOONER. If it was essential to protect the laborers of the United States against Chinese laborers and was not in violation of the treaty, why did the provision go out? It ought to have stayed in.

Mr. MITCHELL. There is a difference of opinion in regard to that matter. The members of the committee differ in opinion, so they tell us, and the members of the Senate differ in opinion. For one, I believe the provision ought to have remained in the bill. I believe it is necessary to the protection of American labor that it should have remained. I do not believe that it abrogated any provision of the treaty. I think it was in strict accordance with the fair and honest construction that has been placed upon the treaty by the Department of Justice and by the Department of the Treasury.

Mr. SPOONER. Well, did it go out because there was a difference of opinion among the members of the committee as to whether or not it violated the treaty?

Mr. MITCHELL. I think the Senator can satisfy himself upon that point.

Mr. SPOONER. Well, I am amazed at the Senator from Oregon—[laughter]—amazed that he should leave his committee in such an attitude.

Mr. MITCHELL. In the first place, Mr. President, I am not a member of the committee.

Mr. SPOONER. The Senator ought to be.

Mr. MITCHELL. I am not a member of the committee, and do not want to be; but I was so amazed, if I must repeat the word, at the peculiar attitude of the distinguished Senator from Wisconsin that I could not help so expressing myself.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. President, I am informed by members of the committee—

Mr. SPOONER. Is the Senator a member of the committee?

Mr. PERKINS. I am not; but I am informed by members of the committee that they hoped by striking out this provision they would secure the advocacy, the support, and the vote of the distinguished Senator from Wisconsin. [Laughter.]

Mr. MITCHELL. I never expected that.

Mr. PATTERSON. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. KEAN in the chair). Does the Senator from Wisconsin yield to the Senator from Colorado?

Mr. SPOONER. Yes, sir.

Mr. PATTERSON. The reason the members of the committee consented to striking out the clauses which defines a student and a teacher is as follows: We were conscious that there was no violation of the treaty nor any addition to the rules and regulations as they exist with those express provisions in the bill, but we also believed that the efficacy of the bill was in no wise destroyed, because we believed that the Secretary of the Treasury, making regulations to carry into effect the provision of the treaty which under certain circumstances permits the admission of teachers and students, will leave the law precisely where it is now as applicable to those two classes.

Mr. SPOONER. Well, then, why could he not by making regulations leave the merchant where he is now, as well as the rest of them?

Mr. PATTERSON. Because the description of a merchant is contained in the treaty itself and in the act of Congress itself. That is the very reason.

Mr. MITCHELL. Also "laborer." That is a statutory definition.

Mr. PLATT of Connecticut. Oh, no.

Mr. SPOONER. Yes; it is.

Mr. MITCHELL. "Laborer" and "merchant" are both defined in the act of 1893.

Mr. SPOONER. I am about to speak of that now.

Mr. MITCHELL. And this bill, I may say in that connection, follows the precise language, the precise phrase, although there is a proviso at the end that somewhat qualifies it.

Mr. SPOONER. Yes; I know that.

Now, Mr. President, as to the contention of the Senator from Ohio [Mr. FORAKER] in construing Article III, upon which the Senator from Washington [Mr. TURNER] has commented, I have reached the same conclusion as that announced by the Senator from Washington.

I am not prepared to say, reading the treaty of 1880 and the treaty of 1894, that the latter treaty left all classes of Chinamen except laborers entitled to come into the United States. If they had omitted Article III altogether and had limited this treaty of 1894 to the prohibition of the immigration of Chinese laborers, there would have been force in the contention of the Senator from Ohio. They did not do that. The fact that they revised that subject-matter forces us to find the law as to the excepted classes in this revised article upon that subject.

The provisions of this convention shall not affect the right at present enjoyed of Chinese subjects, being officials, teachers, students, merchants, or travelers for curiosity or pleasure, but not laborers, of coming to the United States and residing therein.

I had underlined the next clause to which the Senator from Washington referred, which, to my mind, is absolutely conclusive that his construction of this treaty of 1894 is the correct one and that the Attorney-General was correct in the decision of 1898, to which the Senator from Ohio referred. It says:

To entitle such Chinese subjects as are above described—

Students, merchants, travelers for curiosity or pleasure, teachers, officials—limited to them.

To entitle such Chinese subjects as are above described to admission into the United States, they may produce a certificate from their Government or the Government where they last resided, viséed by the diplomatic or consular representative of the United States in the country or port whence they depart.

That is the condition precedent, defined in the treaty itself, to the excepted classes obtaining entrance to this country, and if the construction put upon this treaty by the Senator from Ohio [Mr. FORAKER] is correct it leaves all other Chinese classes, except those here mentioned and laborers, to come here freely without any means of identification or any evidence of the class to which they belong being indicated by the treaty; which never could have been and obviously never was intended.

Mr. MITCHELL. I indorse that statement.

Mr. SPOONER. So it is clear to me that while the laborer is prohibited from coming, the teacher, the student, the merchant, or the traveler for curiosity or pleasure may come upon affording the evidence provided for by the treaty.

Mr. MITCHELL. If the Senator will allow me just at that point—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Wisconsin yield to the Senator from Oregon?

Mr. SPOONER. Yes.

Mr. MITCHELL. I agree entirely with what the Senator has just said—

Mr. SPOONER. The Senator agrees with me?

Mr. MITCHELL. Yes; I do.

Mr. SPOONER. I am amazed at the Senator. [Laughter.]

Mr. MITCHELL. I am a little amazed myself that I am able to agree with the Senator, but still I do.

I desire to ask the Senator a question right at this point in regard to the third article of the treaty of 1894, about which he has been speaking, which provides that the exempted classes shall be permitted to come to this country by producing a certificate from their Government or the Government where they last resided, viséed by the diplomatic or consular representative of the United States in the country or port whence they departed. The question I desire to put to the Senator is this: In his judgment, can Congress, without transgressing the provisions of this treaty or running counter to them, provide any other means or conditions that shall attach to these exempted persons in coming here than the one prescribed in the treaty?

Mr. SPOONER. Reasonable regulations to protect the country against fraud in the administration of this treaty.

Mr. MITCHELL. The Senator is familiar with the sixth section of the act of 1884?

Mr. SPOONER. Yes.

Mr. MITCHELL. It refers to the return of these exempted classes and it provides a great many things that they shall do other than those prescribed in the third article of the treaty of 1894. There are quite a number of things. A photograph must be presented, and a great many things are provided for in that section. I will not stop to read it. The Senator is doubtless familiar with it. Does the Senator think that provision is in conflict with the treaty?

Mr. SPOONER. That is a serious question. Reasonable regulations against the perpetration of fraud by these excepted classes—

Mr. MITCHELL. The amendment of the distinguished Senator from Connecticut, as the Senator knows, proposes to extend that as one of the laws which he extends by his amendment.

Mr. SPOONER. That is a law which has been in force many years.

Mr. MITCHELL. Yes, sir; it has been in force many years.

Mr. SPOONER. And the Chinese Government has not seen fit to denounce the treaty as destroyed by its violation under that law.

Mr. MITCHELL. That is what I desire to get at. What I wish to say further is that the pending bill is no more drastic in its provisions than the sixth section of the act of 1884.

Mr. SPOONER. I rather think it is.

Mr. MITCHELL. I do not think the Senator can point it out. Mr. SPOONER. I rather think it is. Take Article II, which deals with the right of Chinese who have been lawfully in this

country and have gone out of it to return, what do they say about that?

Mr. MITCHELL. I am speaking of the exempted classes.

Mr. SPOONER. I will get to that. This is the language of the treaty:

The preceding article shall not apply to the return to the United States of any registered Chinese laborer who has a lawful wife, child, or parent in the United States.

That is pretty plain.

A lawful wife.

Under this treaty we agree that a Chinaman, having a lawful wife in the United States, who returns to China may return to the United States within a year, complying with certain regulations which are indicated here. Where do you get the authority to provide that he must have been married to that wife a year? His coming to the United States is made by the treaty dependent upon a question of fact—had he in fact a lawful wife in the United States whom he had left here?

I suppose if he had been married to her only three months he might possibly desire to come back to her, if he loved her, and the treaty gives him the right to do it. If we find the fact to be that he has here a lawful wife, you provide in this bill, as I recollect it, that he must have been married to her a year before he left the country.

Mr. MITCHELL. What provision of the treaty does the Senator refer to?

Mr. SPOONER. I refer to Article II. If we have the right to provide that he shall only come back if he have a lawful wife to whom he shall have been married a year, we have the right to provide that he shall only come back if he have here a lawful wife to whom he has been married ten years.

Mr. MITCHELL. Not at all. The Senator admits that we should have some reasonable regulations to determine those things.

Mr. SPOONER. To prescribe reasonable regulations to get at the fact.

Mr. MITCHELL. Just so.

Mr. SPOONER. You could provide any regulation you please to elicit the fact whether he was lawfully married in the United States and left a wife here, but where do you get the authority under this treaty, it being admitted that he left a wife in the United States, to provide that he shall not come back unless he has been married to her a year before he departed?

Mr. MITCHELL. It is one of the regulations and seems reasonable.

Mr. TELLER. I call the attention of the Senator from Wisconsin to the fact that this provision is in the statute of 1888, and was in existence when the last treaty was made.

Mr. SPOONER. That act, it is claimed, did not go into effect. But there is force in what the Senator says. But technically the treaty repealed it.

Mr. TELLER. The Department always claimed that a portion of it did take effect—from sections 4 to 14, inclusive, except section 12. The Department always insisted that those sections took effect.

Mr. SPOONER. Here is another:

Or property therein of the value of \$1,000.

I think it is all right to provide, of course, that that shall be over and above incumbrances. That is a proper provision.

Or debts of like amount due him and pending settlement.

Mr. MITCHELL. That is in the treaty?

Mr. SPOONER. Yes.

Debts of like amount due him and pending settlement.

What does "pending settlement" mean? Pending payment? Unpaid, does it not? Where is there any authority for providing in the bill that he shall not be permitted to come in even if debts are owing to him amounting to a thousand dollars or \$20,000 or \$50,000 if they are represented by a promissory note or notes?

Mr. HOAR. Or a Government bond?

Mr. SPOONER. Or a railroad bond or a Government bond? Must it be unliquidated indebtedness?

Mr. MITCHELL. It is the wording of the treaty. It follows substantially the wording of the treaty.

Mr. SPOONER. No.

Mr. MITCHELL. So far as property is concerned.

Mr. SPOONER. It does not.

Mr. MITCHELL. Where is the difference?

Mr. SPOONER. I will show you the difference.

Mr. MITCHELL. Before the Senator does that—I was looking for the Scott Act a moment ago. The Senator objects to a provision in the pending bill that a man must have a wife to whom he has been married at least a year prior to the application. That very provision is in the Scott law, which the Senator from Wis-

consin proposes to extend. The sixth section of the Scott law provides:

The marriage to such wife must have taken place at least a year prior to the application of the laborer for a permit to return to the United States, and must have been followed by the continuous cohabitation of the parties as man and wife.

The Senator from Wisconsin proposes to incorporate that in the amendment of the Senator from Connecticut and make it the law of the land.

Mr. SPOONER. There is this to be said about it, as suggested by the Senator from Colorado. That was the law when the treaty of 1894 was entered into. What the court would hold about that I do not undertake to say. But you have provided here in the tenth section of the pending bill that—

If the right to return be claimed on the ground of property or debts, it must appear: (a) In the case of property, that the ownership is of property other than money and is in good faith; that the requisite minimum value is over all incumbrances, liens, and offsets.

I see no objection to that.

In the case of debts, that the debtor is solvent—

That is not in the treaty—

that the amount due is not less than the required sum, clear of offsets and discounts; that the debts do not consist of promissory notes or similar acknowledgments of ascertained or settled liability; and that the indebtedness was not created with a view to evasion of this act.

That it must be a bona fide indebtedness. Now, under that clause, if a man, as I understand it, had \$20,000 of railroad bonds and the company had defaulted and gone into the hands of a receiver, and he wanted to come back here to save all he had in the world, he could not come, because the indebtedness was liquidated and evidenced by promissory notes.

Mr. PLATT of Connecticut. And the debtor was insolvent.

Mr. SPOONER. And the debtor was insolvent. He could not come back to collect his *pro rata* share, to prove his bonds, to protect his interests. Is that in harmony with the treaty? The treaty says:

Nevertheless every such Chinese laborer shall, before leaving the United States, deposit, as a condition of his return, with the collector of customs of the district from which he departs, a full description in writing of his family, or property, or debts, as aforesaid, and shall be furnished by said collector with such certificate of his right to return under this treaty as the laws of the United States may now or hereafter prescribe and not inconsistent with the provisions of this treaty.

We agreed as a nation to that.

So much of my time has been taken by the Senator from Colorado and others that I must omit a number of things to which I desired to call attention.

Take this provision as to merchants. The treaty of 1894 is a unique treaty in this respect, that it refers to statutes of exclusion that had been enacted by Congress before it was entered into.

The Government of the United States having, by an act of Congress approved May 5, 1892, as amended by an act approved November 3, 1893—

Incorporating by reference those two acts in Article V—

required all Chinese laborers lawfully within the limits of the United States before the passage of the first-named act to be registered as in said acts provided, with a view of affording them better protection, the Chinese Government will not object to the enforcement of such acts.

That is not all, either. They adopt, if the Senator from Oregon will hear me for a moment, as I view it, in the treaty of 1894 the definition of "merchants" contained in the act of 1893 as fully as if it had been written in the body of the treaty, and if it had been written in the body of the treaty, I take it no Senator would claim that it could be lawfully added to by inconsistent provisions or burdensome requirements.

And reciprocally the Government of the United States recognizes the right of the Government of China to enact and enforce similar laws or regulations for the registration, free of charge, of all laborers, skilled or unskilled (not merchants as defined by said acts of Congress), citizens of the United States in China, whether residing within or without the treaty ports.

It is not possible to contend that that definition of merchants as made by the act of 1893 is adopted there as to American merchants who go to China and is not adopted by the United States as to Chinese merchants who come here. The great word "reciprocally" is used in the clause. It is mutual. It applies to our merchants going to China, and it applies equally to their merchants coming here.

Mr. TURNER. Will the Senator from Wisconsin permit me a question?

Mr. SPOONER. Certainly.

Mr. TURNER. Is there any part of China to-day outside of the treaty ports to which an American merchant would dare go?

Mr. SPOONER. That has nothing to do with the construction which honest-minded men who wish to keep the obligations of the Government should put upon this language. There has been trouble in China. That is unquestioned. The whole world knows it. China was punished much by force of arms for it. China was punished much by the governments aggrieved by the exaction of

an indemnity for that, and also by obeisance and apology demanded by Germany. I do not know that the Chinese Government was responsible for that trouble. No Senator, I think, is able to say that. China suffered for it. Are we, because of that trouble, to violate this treaty?

Mr. TURNER. Mr. President—

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Wisconsin yield to the Senator from Washington?

Mr. SPOONER. Certainly.

Mr. TURNER. Does the Senator have any doubt that the Chinese Government was responsible?

Mr. SPOONER. I have had great doubt about it.

Mr. TURNER. You have?

Mr. SPOONER. Yes, sir. There were prominent men under the Chinese Government who were responsible for it. Possibly the Chinese Emperor was responsible for it. Possibly the Dowager Empress was responsible for it. I am not able to say. But we have demanded indemnity for it. Other Governments have demanded indemnity for it and have put upon the Chinese Government punishment at the cannon's mouth. Are we in this way to add to that? Are we to violate the treaty because of the outbreak in China?

The outbreak in China, to me, gives an added reason why we should in this instance, if not in all others, move along the line of honor, giving to treaty obligations scrupulous observance, because out of the trouble in China came the splendid attitude of the United States Government toward China that ought to win the friendship of China, which, from a commercial standpoint, I believe our people in the long years to come much desire and will much profit by.

The attitude of this Government—and I am glad we were in a position which gave weight to it—was against the seizure and partition of China. Never, in my judgment, under any administration was there finer diplomacy than that which characterized that Administration in relation to the whole Chinese difficulty. When the time of settlement came we exacted no punitive damages from China. We put upon China no humiliation. We stood out apart from some other nations as we stood apart on questions of partition from some, and exacted from China only actual damages.

We have a right to feel that China owes us her friendship. Is there any man here who is anxious to have nonintercourse for all time to come between China and the United States? Are we not looking to the Orient for an immense, incalculable addition to our foreign trade? Is there any reason why that should be considered only a dream? Is there any reason why we should not in the future have our share of it? Is there no reason in the interest of labor why we should be just to China in the observance of treaty stipulations? Is there any pressing necessity within the next two years for our departing from the line of good faith and violating in fact and in spirit obligations of this treaty?

I have not been able to see it. If there were need for it, if we were threatened with an influx of Chinese labor, I would vote to pass this bill and to make it more drastic even than it is. I am willing, as matters stand—I feel it as a Senator to be a duty—to continue, not simply for two years, but until another treaty is made, followed by necessary legislation, the laws now in force, including the Scott Act—laws which hitherto have been so effective as to reduce the number of Chinese residents in the United States.

Take the matter of merchants. What does "merchant" mean? I have authorities as to what it means, but I can not take time to refer to them. It is used there, I think, in its generic sense. It is defined in this treaty, where they adopt the definition in the act of 1893.

This bill provides, in addition to the definition in the treaty, as follows:

The term "merchant," as employed herein and in the acts of which this is amendatory, shall have the following meaning and none other: A merchant is a person engaged in buying and selling merchandise, at a fixed place of business, which business is conducted in his name, and who during the time he claims to be engaged as a merchant does not engage in the performance of any manual labor, except such as is necessary in the conduct of his business as such merchant.

And where an application is made by a Chinese person for entry into the United States as one formerly or at the time engaged in China as a merchant, or in some other foreign country as a merchant, or where such application calls for entry into one portion of the United States from another portion thereof, then, as a prerequisite to entry, the applicant must have been engaged as a merchant for at least one year next preceding his application; and it must appear to the satisfaction of the appropriate Treasury officer at the port of entry that he comes to exercise in good faith his calling as a merchant, and that calling exclusively, and that he has the means under his immediate control for forthwith becoming, and has completed the arrangements for forthwith becoming, the owner, in whole or in part, of a good-faith mercantile business in the United States, or any portion of the territory thereof.

May he not under the treaty come to buy our goods or to sell his own? May he not come, being a merchant, upon his business, as a merchant, in our interest and in his, without opening an establishment here? He is not a traveler, teacher, student, etc. He does not come as a commercial traveler to sell some one else's goods, but to sell his own or to buy ours. The treaty was intended,

in this provision, to promote commercial intercourse between the two countries.

Being a merchant in China within the definition of the treaty, he can not under this bill come here to become a merchant unless before he comes and before he knows any place or person he shall have completed arrangements for forthwith becoming the owner in whole or in part of a "good-faith" mercantile business in this country. Is this in the "merchant" definition of the treaty? Clearly not. It is a plain violation of the treaty in every way.

Suppose a merchant engaged in business in China at a fixed place of business conducted in his name wants to come to the United States to make business arrangements, to study our productions, to examine into our machinery, to buy our goods, to select some agent or factor to sell his wares, is he not under the treaty entitled to come, and entitled to come by producing the certificate of his Government visé by our representative abroad?

To say that he shall not, to put the restrictions upon him which are put in this bill, is practically in my judgment to exclude him, and a plain, palpable violation of the treaty. Merchants have a right to come, in my opinion, being properly vouched for by their Government and our own representatives, as men who are within the definition adopted by the treaty of 1894, and if we may put the restrictions about them which are put into this bill without violating the treaty, we can add others without limit.

I intended to analyze this provision, but I have not the time to do it. The interruptions have taken time which I intended to devote to the consideration of some other sections here in their relation to the treaty. There are several violations of it, in my judgment. I can not take further time, and all I wish to say in conclusion is that I hope the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. PLATT] will accept the amendment which I have read in the hearing of the Senate, modifying it if there is any doubt about its reviving the Scott Act, which I am certain there is not, so as to revive it beyond all question.

I hope, also, he will amend his substitute so as to clearly exclude the Chinese from coming from the Philippine Archipelago into the United States. Whether they ought to be permitted to come any longer into the archipelago I do not know. There seems to be a difference of opinion about that among our officials over there, and I have thought, as we are in a few days—probably on Thursday—to take up the Philippine government bill, that on a fuller discussion and better opportunity to get at the truth and consider from all standpoints this particular phase of the subject, we might take up the matter when that bill is before the Senate. I regret to have been so diverted as to preclude a more thorough discussion of this bill. There is no need to violate the faith of the Government, and I will not vote, without necessity, to do it.

Mr. HOAR. I simply want to say to the Senator from Wisconsin that I hope, in making his proposed amendment to the amendment of the Senator from Connecticut where he revives the Scott Act, he will say "so far as not in violation of the treaty," or some such phrase. The Scott Act, as I understand it, preceding the treaty, we had a right, without violating any treaty, to make a provision that the laborers should have been married a year; but following the treaty, as the Senator has so conclusively argued, we have no right to do that. Therefore, if he simply revives the Scott Act in his suggested amendment to the amendment of the Senator from Connecticut, he is encountering the same difficulty.

Mr. SPOONER. It is abrogating the treaty in that respect.

Mr. HOAR. But if, when he revives the act of 1888, he simply says "so far as not inconsistent with the treaty," that will make it more clear.

Mr. PLATT of Connecticut. Mr. President, I do not wish to say that the Senate is getting technical. I thought when I proposed this amendment and when I said "that all laws now in force prohibiting the coming of Chinese," etc., should be "extended and continued in full force and effect," etc., I included what is known as the Scott law. I supposed that that law was now in force, the whole of it, it not having been decided that it was not in force by the Supreme Court of the United States, and it having been decided by the attorney for the Treasury Department or the Attorney-General that the sections from section 5 to section 14, inclusive, except section 12, took effect whether the treaty was ratified or not. I supposed, therefore, when I drew the amendment, that there was not any question about its applying to the Scott Act and continuing that in force.

But I am willing to accept the suggestion of the Senator from Wisconsin and to insert, after the word "therein," in the fourth line of the first print of my amendment, the language suggested by him, as follows:

Including the act entitled "An act to prohibit the coming of Chinese laborers to the United States," approved September 13, 1888.

I am willing to add the suggestion of the Senator from Massachusetts, "so far as the same is not inconsistent with the treaty obligations now existing." How will it read now?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Connecticut modifies his substitute as follows:  
The Secretary read as follows:

Including the act entitled "An act to prohibit the coming of Chinese laborers to the United States," approved September 13, 1888, so far as the same is not inconsistent with the treaty obligations now existing.

Mr. PLATT of Connecticut. I have a right to modify it, I believe.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Undoubtedly.

Mr. PLATT of Connecticut. In view of the suggestion of the Senator from Wisconsin, I am willing to adopt language which was furnished me by the junior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE].

Mr. LODGE. If the Senator will allow me, I have worked up what I think is a little better form. I will suggest it to the Senator before he moves it. It is to add at the end of section 2:

And said laws shall apply to all territory under the jurisdiction of the United States and to all immigration of Chinese laborers from the island to the mainland territory of the United States or from one portion of the island territory of the United States to another portion of said island territory: *Provided, however,* That this shall not apply to the transit of Chinese laborers from one island to another island of the same group or to any island within the jurisdiction of any State or of the district of Alaska.

Mr. HOAR. Does that leave still in force the provision defining what is an island—that it is not something within the jurisdiction of any State?

Mr. TURNER. Mr. President, I ask who has the floor?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Connecticut has the floor.

Mr. PLATT of Connecticut. If it will make it more acceptable to the Senator from Massachusetts, I will adopt his language.

Mr. LODGE. Perhaps I had better have it printed.

Mr. PLATT of Connecticut. We will have it printed. I propose to add at the end of section 1 what I send to the Chair.

Mr. HOAR. The question which I put—without being recognized, and, I am afraid, out of order—to my colleague is one which I ask recognition to put to the Senator from Connecticut, if he will consent.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Connecticut yield?

Mr. PLATT of Connecticut. Yes, sir.

Mr. HOAR. As I understand it, the phraseology of the committee's bill referring to coming into the United States from islands to the mainland would apply to the coming from Long Island to New York, or from Mare Island to San Francisco, or to Nantucket or Marthas Vineyard in Massachusetts, but for a definition in the committee's bill which is that the term "island" shall only be understood to apply to islands not forming a part of any State. But if you put it into this proposition of the Senator from Connecticut, which has not that provision in it, then you have regulated the going and coming across from the island of Nantucket, or Long Island, or any other island off our coast to the mainland. So it ought to be accompanied with the adoption into the Senator's amendment of the provision of the main bill defining island. Am I mistaken in that respect?

Mr. LODGE. I think that can be added to the proviso so as to cover it.

Mr. HOAR. I have not studied it carefully, but I suppose that is correct.

Mr. McCOMAS. Will the Senator allow me?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Connecticut yield?

Mr. PLATT of Connecticut. Yes, sir.

Mr. McCOMAS. Will the Senator from Massachusetts, in the time of the Senator from Connecticut, tell me why a simple provision excluding Chinese coming from any islands of the Pacific Ocean subject to the jurisdiction of the United States would not cover the whole business?

Mr. HOAR. How about Porto Rico?

Mr. LODGE. It is necessary to prevent their going to Porto Rico.

Mr. McCOMAS. And with the words "Porto Rico" added.

Mr. LODGE. I think mine is phrased correctly. The language is drawn with some care.

Mr. McCOMAS. I suggest that it read "the island of Porto Rico and the islands of the Pacific Ocean subject to the jurisdiction of the United States."

Mr. HOAR. It struck me that committee's phrase, though, of course, I do not support their bill at all, is a very good one; that it is an island not within the jurisdiction of any State. That is in the bill, and is, I thought, a very comprehensive and a very felicitous phrase.

Mr. MITCHELL. Will the Senator from Connecticut yield to me a moment?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Connecticut yield?

Mr. PLATT of Connecticut. Yes, sir.

Mr. MITCHELL. I desire to give notice that when the time

comes, if it be in order then, before we shall vote on the amendment of the Senator from Connecticut, I shall move to amend the amendment, if it is not accepted by the Senator, in the following manner: I shall move to strike out all after the words "force and effect," in line 5, page 1, section 1, and to insert in lieu thereof the following:

until the 8th day of December, 1904.

So that should that amendment be adopted or accepted it will simply extend existing laws absolutely until the 8th day of December, 1904, at which time the treaty of 1894 will expire, unless denounced either by China or the United States six months before the 7th day of December, 1904.

Mr. PLATT of Connecticut. Now let the Secretary read the amendment suggested by the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE].

Mr. TURNER. Mr. President—

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Will the Senator from Connecticut yield to the Senator from Washington?

Mr. PLATT of Connecticut. I wish to get my amendment perfected. It will take only a moment now.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Connecticut modifies his amendment as follows.

The SECRETARY. It is proposed to add at the end of section 1, the following:

And said laws shall apply to all territory under the jurisdiction of the United States, and to all immigration of Chinese laborers from the island to the mainland territory of the United States, or from one portion of the island territory of the United States to another portion of said island territory: *Provided, however,* That this shall not apply to the transit of Chinese laborers from one island to another island of the same group or to any island within the jurisdiction of any State or of the district of Alaska.

Mr. TURNER. Mr. President, I wish to question the character of the courtesy which has been exhibited by my friends on the other side. The Senator from Wisconsin having made a number of personal allusions in the speech just concluded, which must have been apparent to everybody, I should like to have the opportunity of answering. The moment he concluded the Senator from Connecticut took the floor, and we were treated to a family colloquy between Senators on the other side, brushing me aside at this late hour of the evening like I was a fly upon a wheel. I beg to assure my friends on the other side that I am very far from that. I may not amount to very much, but I know enough to insist upon my rights, and know when I am being treated with discourtesy.

Mr. HOAR. I am one of the persons who spoke, and, if the Senator will pardon me, I do not believe that any discourtesy to him could be intended, but it may be some consolation to him to reflect that probably he is the first man since the creation of the world that was ever brushed aside by a family colloquy.

Mr. TURNER. Whether I am the first or not, it is quite evident that there was an attempt to do so on this occasion.

Mr. PLATT of Connecticut. If the Senator will permit me—

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Washington yield to the Senator from Connecticut?

Mr. TURNER. Yes, sir.

Mr. PLATT of Connecticut. I certainly ought not to be put in the position of being discourteous to the Senator from Washington. I certainly intended no discourtesy. I rose and was recognized by the Chair, and supposed I was within my rights to perfect the amendment which I had offered. I did not suppose it would take more than a minute, and it did take several minutes. I assure the Senator that I did not intend to be discourteous. I have taken no time in this debate.

Mr. TURNER. When I undertake to perfect an amendment, I sit down at my desk or in my committee room and I write out the amendment in the way I want it to read, and at some appropriate time—and certainly there will be plenty of time before the bill is to be voted on for the Senator to perfect his amendment—I offer it, instead of taking up the time of the Senate uselessly and at a late hour and depriving some other Senator who desires to go on with the discussion of the bill of having the opportunity to do so.

I do not, however, desire to detain the Senate longer here tonight if Senators are impatient and desire to go home, although I am ready to proceed with such observations as I want to make at this time if Senators are ready to remain.

Mr. FAIRBANKS. Will the Senator allow me to interrupt him?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Washington yield to the Senator from Indiana?

Mr. TURNER. I do.

Mr. FAIRBANKS. As the Senator knows, the hour for voting is not far away. This morning I gave notice that after the routine business to-morrow I should do myself the honor of addressing some few remarks to the Senate upon this subject. The Senator from Colorado [Mr. PATTERSON] and the junior Senator from Ohio [Mr. HANNA] indicated a desire to be heard in the time to-morrow morning. I would suggest to my honorable friend that,

if he could do so, he conclude his observations to-night, because we will be very much restricted to-morrow.

Mr. TURNER. I am very willing to do so.

Mr. HOAR. Will the Senator allow me to make a suggestion which may be agreeable to him? It seems that if the Senate is to vote on this bill at 1 o'clock and have the five minutes' debate after that, it might be well to change the hour of meeting to-morrow from 11 o'clock to 10 o'clock. That would give an added hour for general debate.

Mr. TURNER. I desire to take about half an hour in reply to the Senator from Wisconsin. If we might have unanimous consent to postpone the hour of voting until 2 o'clock instead of 1 o'clock to-morrow, I think it would enable me to make such observations as I want to make, and other Senators could do the same thing.

Mr. HOAR. I do not believe we can change a unanimous-consent agreement when there are very few persons present. To test the question, I move that when the Senate adjourns to-day it adjourn to meet at 10 o'clock.

Mr. TURNER. Very well; that is satisfactory to me.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Massachusetts moves that when the Senate adjourns to-day, it adjourn to meet at 10 o'clock to-morrow.

Mr. GALLINGER. Has not a motion been adopted that when the Senate adjourns it shall adjourn to meet at 11 o'clock to-morrow?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. It has.

Mr. GALLINGER. It seems to me that ought to be reconsidered.

Mr. HOAR. It does not require that.

Mr. GALLINGER. It seems to me it would be an extraordinary proceeding if we do not.

Mr. HOAR. I move to rescind the order by which the Senate agreed to meet at 11 o'clock.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Massachusetts moves to reconsider the vote by which an agreement was made that when the Senate adjourns to-day it adjourn to meet at 11 o'clock. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is reconsidered. The Senator from Massachusetts moves that when the Senate adjourns to-day it adjourn to meet at 10 o'clock to-morrow.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. TURNER. I hope now that I may be permitted to have the floor on the assembling of the Senate to-morrow.

Mr. PETTUS. I ask the Senator to yield to me to make a motion?

Mr. TURNER. I yield.

Mr. PETTUS. I move that the Senate adjourn.

Mr. PLATT of Connecticut. Will the Senator withhold that motion for a single moment?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Alabama withhold his motion?

Mr. PETTUS. I did not understand what the purpose was.

Mr. PLATT of Connecticut. I wish to propose an amendment to the bill to be printed.

Mr. PENROSE. I hope the Senator will suspend his motion for a single minute. I wish to make a request in reference to the pending bill.

Mr. PETTUS. I will yield for anything that will not tend to delay. I think we have been here long enough.

Mr. TURNER. Mr. President—

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Will the Senator from Alabama withdraw his motion for the present?

Mr. TURNER. I simply wanted to ask if I would be entitled to the floor on the reassembling of the Senate to-morrow.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair should consider himself rather obliged to recognize the Senator immediately after the routine business to-morrow.

Mr. TURNER. Very well.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Connecticut [Mr. PLATT] has offered an amendment to the pending bill. What disposition does he desire to be made of it?

Mr. PLATT of Connecticut. I ask that the amendment may be printed and lie upon the table.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment will be ordered to be printed and lie upon the table.

Mr. PENROSE. I ask that the usual number of copies of the pending bill be printed for the use of the Senate, so that Senators will have it before them in its final shape to-morrow morning.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. How many copies does the Senator desire to have printed?

Mr. PENROSE. The usual number for the use of the Senate. I do not know how many that is.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The usual number is 1,600.

Mr. PENROSE. Well, I will say 200 copies.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. In the absence of objection, the order to print 200 copies of the bill as amended will be made.

## EXECUTIVE SESSION.

Mr. PENROSE. There is rather an important nomination to be acted upon, to which I do not think there will be any objection, but it is somewhat urgent, and I therefore move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business. It will not take a minute.

Mr. PETTUS. I move that the Senate adjourn.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on the motion of the Senator from Alabama [Mr. PETTUS], that the Senate do now adjourn. [Putting the question.] The "noes" seem to have it.

Mr. PENROSE. Mr. President—

Mr. PETTUS. I ask for the yeas and nays, Mr. President.

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

Mr. PETTUS. I call for the yeas and nays.

Mr. PENROSE. I raise the point of order, Mr. President, that the decision of the Chair has been announced.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Alabama on this question demands the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were not ordered.

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

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on the motion of the Senator from Pennsylvania.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. GALLINGER. I move that the Senate do now adjourn, if the Chair has decided that the motion for an executive session has been rejected.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on the motion of the Senator from New Hampshire, that the Senate do now adjourn.

Mr. PENROSE. What decision did the Chair make on my motion for an executive session?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The decision was that the motion had carried.

Mr. PENROSE. Then I ask that the order be executed, and that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The fact that a motion for an executive session was agreed to does not prevent the motion to adjourn being made. Will the Senator from Pennsylvania state what he desires?

Mr. GALLINGER. I withdraw my motion for an adjournment. I did not understand—

Mr. PENROSE. I do not like to discuss executive matters in open session, but there is a nomination desired very urgently by the head of a department.

Mr. GALLINGER. Will the Senator from Pennsylvania permit me to make a statement?

Mr. PENROSE. Certainly.

Mr. GALLINGER. I did not understand that the Chair had announced that the motion to go into executive business had carried. I thought the Chair announced that the motion had not carried.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. No; the Chair announced that the motion had carried.

Mr. GALLINGER. Very well.

The Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business. After two minutes spent in executive session the doors were reopened, and (at 6 o'clock and 18 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until to-morrow, Wednesday, April 16, 1902, at 10 o'clock a. m.

## HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

TUESDAY, April 15, 1902.

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

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

## WAR CLAIMS.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the House nonconcur in the Senate amendments to the bill H. R. 8587, the war claims bill, and ask for a conference thereon.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Pennsylvania asks unanimous consent that the House nonconcur in the amendments of the Senate to the bill H. R. 8587, the war claims bill, and ask for a conference. Is there objection?

Mr. MADDOX. Mr. Speaker, I object.

The SPEAKER. Objection is made.

## CLERK FOR ELECTIONS COMMITTEE NO. 3.

Mr. JOY. Mr. Speaker, I am directed by the Committee on Accounts to call up House resolution 171, which I will send to the desk and ask to have read, together with the report.

The Clerk read as follows:

The Committee on Accounts, to whom was referred House resolution No. 171, for the appointment of a clerk to the Committee on Elections No. 3 at a compensation of \$2 per day, and providing that such appointment shall not deprive the chairman of said committee of personal clerk hire allowance, have had the same under consideration, and report herewith a resolution in lieu thereof and recommend its adoption.

The second paragraph of the original resolution, providing that the appointment of a clerk to said committee shall not deprive its chairman of personal clerk-hire allowance, contemplates a change of existing law, which can not be done by resolution of the House. Your committee therefore, believing that the Committee on Elections No. 3 is as much entitled to a clerk as the other two Committees on Elections, report herewith a resolution for the appointment of a clerk to said committee for the sessions of the present Congress at the usual compensation of \$5 per day, and recommend its adoption, to wit:

*Resolved*, That the chairman of the Committee on Elections No. 3 is hereby authorized to appoint a clerk to said committee, to be paid out of the contingent fund of the House at the rate of \$5 per day during the sessions of the fifty-seventh Congress.

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the gentleman from Missouri if he will yield for a moment?

Mr. JOY. Certainly.

Mr. BARTLETT. I want to say to the House and to the gentlemen on this side of the House that that resolution simply provides a clerk for the Committee on Elections No. 3, which is the only Committee on Elections that has not been provided with a clerk. The House considered the resolution in the opening of the session providing for clerks, I think, without understanding the situation of the work before the Committee on Elections No. 3, and, I thought at the time, more in a spirit of fun than anything else, struck out the resolution reported to the Committee on Accounts the provision providing for a clerk for that Committee No. 3. Now, these gentlemen have had their work to do, and I understand the chairman has been compelled to provide for clerk hire out of his own pocket for the work of the committee, and under the rules he has not been provided with a clerk for himself. Therefore this is but a just and proper resolution in my judgment, and as such met the approval of the entire Committee on Accounts.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the substitute resolution reported by the Committee on Accounts.

The substitute resolution was agreed to.

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

#### CUBAN RECIPROCITY.

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H. R. 12765) to provide for reciprocal trade relations with Cuba. Pending that I would like to see if some arrangement can not be made by which we can close debate, say, on Thursday next, and on Friday consider the bill under the five-minute rule, a vote to be taken in the committee on reporting it to the House, say, at 4 o'clock, and in the meantime, if there is any desire on the part of the House to meet to-morrow and next day at 11 o'clock and also to meet to-morrow evening and the next evening, holding a session from 8 to half past 10 for debate only, to make such arrangement. This, of course, would involve a change of debate fixed for the War Claims Committee from Friday, and I would suggest that it be changed from Friday to Tuesday, if that be agreeable to the chairman of that committee.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New York moves that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 12765, and pending that motion seeks to make an arrangement to close debate on Thursday next and to meet to-morrow and the next day at 11 o'clock in the morning instead of at 12, and to-morrow evening and the next evening.

Mr. RICHARDSON of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I demand the regular order.

The SPEAKER. The regular order is demanded. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from New York that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 12765.

The motion was agreed to.

The House accordingly resolved itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, Mr. SHERMAN in the chair.

The CHAIRMAN. The House is in Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 12765, the title of which the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

A bill (H. R. 12765) to provide for reciprocal trade relations with Cuba.

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

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. DAYTON] is recognized for fifteen minutes.

Mr. DAYTON. Mr. Chairman, as a protectionist and a Republican I have no apology to make for my opposition to this bill after having listened to the remarks of the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SWANSON]. [Applause on the Republican side.] I have not in my political career trained in the school that would teach to this country the idea that we are to reduce revenue simply to break down its institutions and industries. I do not for one moment allow myself to be subjected to the charge that 20 per cent or 10 per cent or 5 per cent or 1 per cent of Democratic free trade has been infused into my political composition. [Laughter on the Republican side.]

When I remember the effect of that Democratic free trade, the effect that every man in this country can recall if he will stop a moment, that prostrated the industries of the country and brought us all to our knees in distress and almost in despair, I for one am opposed to having any repetition of it; and believing, as I honestly do, that this bill is in the nature of a tinkering with the Dingley law, that the representative of the Democracy from Virginia has just now so vigorously denounced, I am opposed to it. When I look over this great land of ours and see it the most prosperous under heaven, when I see its mills all running, its mines in operation, everybody making money and everybody happy as a result of five years of practical experience under that Dingley tariff law, the gentleman from Virginia can stand here and denounce it until he is baldheaded, and I will, if permitted, stand here to uphold it and vote for it. [Applause on the Republican side.]

It is not given to us to understand the inner thoughts of our fellow-men, but I would be glad to know what some of the leaders of this House thought when they heard the prophecy of the gentleman that this bill—their work—was the beginning of the sweeping away of the Dingley tariff law and the beginning of a new era of free trade!

Mr. WM. ALDEN SMITH. And free silver.

Mr. DAYTON. I am aware that some of my friends here, for whom I have the highest regard, have expressed themselves upon this subject, and have told us that conditions have changed, and changes are therefore in order in our tariff laws. I am not like the warrior who, when purchasing his horse, wanted one that could turn quick and run fast. I do not want to turn the corner of free trade and run away from the Dingley bill and its schedules. Let me call attention very briefly to some reasons for the position I take.

In the first place I insist that when the Dingley law was passed five years ago it was for the purpose of establishing prosperity in this country. I look every Republican in the face and ask you if there is any greater satisfaction in your hearts than the one which springs from the fact that you can go before your constituents and defy any one of them to point to a single promise, or a single pledge, or a single prophecy of prosperity that has not been redeemed by reason of our passing that law. [Applause on the Republican side.] And I want to ask you if there has ever been a stronger confidence established between man and his fellow-men than has been established between us, as the representatives of the Republican party and the great constituencies of this country, because they recognize and know the fact that prosperity has come in so full measure as the result of that law and of our pledges and of our policies.

And we told the people, Mr. Chairman, that that Dingley law was to bring stability as well as prosperity. It was to bring stability in prosperity. Under the complex business conditions of this country there is no element so essential as that there shall be stability in our tariff and revenue laws. The distinguished chairman of the Ways and Means Committee recognized that when he stood upon the floor of this House and said that the Dingley law was to last a quarter of a century. It has lasted five years, and I regret to say that the first tinkering with it has come from his own hands. Not only that, but so recently as last June, when another distinguished Republican, who has been eulogized by the Democratic party, started out in another direction, there was an outcry in all parts of this country from these distinguished leaders on our side against any such tinkering.

The chairman of the Ways and Means Committee himself in an interview denounced the Babcock bill. The distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DALZELL] came out in an interview in which he stated that the Babcock measure, that affected the steel schedules in which his State was interested, would not be corrective of the trusts; and that very distinguished gentleman from Ohio [Mr. GROSVENOR], who has reflected upon some of the members here because they were young and inexperienced, also had something to say upon the same subject. I do not claim to have been a member of this House so long that "the memory of man runneth not to the contrary," but I was a member of this House five years ago when the Dingley law was passed. I may at least be called of indifferent age, old enough to be allowed to speak for myself.



Therefore, my friends, I want to say to the gentleman from Ohio that I have not changed my opinions in the last six or seven or eight months. Some insist that conditions have changed since the Spanish war, and that these utterances of theirs were uttered five years ago. I want you to hear what the distinguished gentleman from Ohio [Mr. GROSVENOR] said not five years ago but last June: in the balmy month of June, when we were all taking our vacation, and when we had a chance, under our own vine and shade tree, to consider of these things. In a communication, dated on the very 1st day of June, 1901, this distinguished gentleman, who came before us a day or so ago to tell us that these schedules are not to be stable, said this to the people of the country:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES OF THE UNITED STATES,  
June 1, 1901.

EDITOR OF THE AMERICAN ECONOMIST, New York.

DEAR SIR: The great danger to the future welfare of the American people lies in the shortness of their memory.

In view of the position taken by the gentleman here, I might say, "Lord, be with *him* yet, lest *he* forget, lest *he* forget."

Mr. HAMILTON. He says the Lord is with him now.

Mr. DAYTON. Wait a minute. Let me quote further from the gentleman.

Two things have made this country prosperous and rich, and are moving forward with enormous strides toward making us the richest country on earth. Those two things are, first, the Dingley tariff law, and, second, the confidence which up to a recent period the American people had that we were to have steadfast adherence to the status quo, that it was to be maintained, and that disturbers of the peace—

God save the mark! Where does he come in now? [Laughter.]

that disturbers of the peace and prosperity of the country were to be relegated to the rear.

[Applause on the Republican side.]

The demand for tariff reform—

Watch, now, how carefully he defines all possible conditions of things—

The demand for tariff reform, tariff revision, tariff anything whatever other than what we now have, comes from two classes of people. First, the free trader in all his forms, semblances, and phases, and, second, the man who, stampeded about trusts and combinations, has been carried off his feet by the cry of the tariff reformer, that we ought to repeal the tariff on certain products in order to break up the trusts.

Now, listen how he illustrates the case to you, my brother Republicans:

It is a small matter to get up on an elevation where there is a reservoir of water and bore a gimlet hole through the structure and let a stream of water the size of a straw project itself out upon the city below, but when it is entirely apparent that there is that sort of a gimlet hole which will become an auger hole, and finally a breach in the wall, and that the flood will come down on the town, then the old Bible illustration becomes forcible: "It is the beginning of strife."

[Laughter and applause.]

And to think that he should be boring a gimlet hole in the protective wall that surrounds our industries!

Mr. Chairman, let us consider this matter just a moment. Is it not enough to make any thoughtful Republican stop and consider, when he hears a Democrat like the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SWANSON] already undertake to dictate and tell us what we shall do to get ourselves out of the dilemma that our own leaders have placed us in? I am not yet prepared to say that the great protective policy is intended to be put into the guardianship of such men as the gentleman from Virginia.

But let us look at this matter from another standpoint. If you will take this measure by the four corners and shake it, it seems to me you will find it is based on no sound principle of economy, nor any sound principle of morality, either. It is neither "flesh, nor fowl, nor good red herring." [Laughter.] They say that it is proposed in the interest of Cuba, and they say that under our peculiar relations to Cuba we must establish a government—a "stable" government, according to the language in the report—in Cuba. Is that true? Grant it for the moment, that we are to establish a stable government in Cuba. But does that mean that we are to establish a certain class of Cuba's citizens in a stable private business?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. WEEKS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman may be permitted to extend his remarks until they are concluded.

The CHAIRMAN. How much time does the gentleman desire, if he desires any?

Mr. DAYTON. I desire to say, Mr. Chairman, that I understood originally that I had thirty minutes, but the Chair announced that I had but fifteen. I would be very glad if my time might be extended. I shall not take the time of the committee longer than fifteen or twenty minutes.

Mr. CUSHMAN. The request was made that the gentleman be permitted to close his remarks.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Washington has properly stated what the request was that the gentleman made; but the Chair did not recognize anybody to make that request. The Chair has allotted the time so far as he could so that everybody might be accommodated. It is within the province of the Chair to extend the time of the gentleman for fifteen or twenty minutes. The Chair thinks that he can do so, and still take care of other gentlemen who desire to speak, and therefore it is not necessary to submit the request of the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. DAYTON. I think I will be able to conclude my remarks in twenty minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is recognized for fifteen minutes.

Mr. DAYTON. I say that this proposition is not based upon a logical proposition to establish a stable government in Cuba. There are very many things that enter into that proposition that do not enter into this.

According to the statement of this report itself, since we have had charge of the affairs of Cuba its business has increased threefold. But they say that business has been expensive; that there has been an overproduction in sugar—one of the kinds of business in Cuba—and that therefore the price has gone down to such an extent that some of the Cuban planters will (not now) go to the verge of bankruptcy if we do not pass this bill. I want to ask you, gentlemen, legislating in the interests of our own country, when we ever took the revenues from our Treasury and gave it to anyone (one of our own people) to whom the possible contingency of misfortune and disaster was to come in business? They say that this business interest in Cuba is an incident to the establishment of a stable government. So it may be; but there are a thousand and one other things that are a part and parcel and incident to the establishment of a stable government in Cuba. Among other things there must be patriotism there. There must be disinterested patriotism and a lack of selfishness and the presence of virtue in Cuban people themselves or else that government never will be stable.

And all the laws of this country can not establish that government unless the inherent elements of self-government are in the people of Cuba themselves. And if those elements are in the Cuban people, they ought to be, and would be, the last people on earth to come cringing to another nation asking its money, asking its laws, asking its help to give them the power to govern themselves. It strikes me that if I were a patriotic Cuban, hoping and trusting to establish a stable government in my land and my country, the last thing on earth I would do would be to go to a foreign nation and place myself under obligations to it in order to establish some of my fellow-citizens in a private business by such a measure as this; and I would repudiate unquestionably the interference of that foreign country in the character of the laws my country should establish for its self-government.

How do we know what may be best for Cuba as to its naturalization, as to its immigration, as to its labor laws? Why not do the thing itself that would be reasonable and allow Cuba to become a part of us if we have to supply her citizens with the money to carry on their business? What kind of a stable business do you propose to establish under such conditions as that?

Then they tell us it is for the purpose of "establishing reciprocal trade relations with Cuba." Does any man think here for one moment that a few months, or a little over a year's time, under a bill like this will establish reciprocal trade relations with Cuba? How many of the people of Cuba will be able to get their bearings before this bill has passed away? How many will be able to establish trade relations with this country of a satisfactory character before the time comes when it has expired?

The more I study this bill, and I say it unhesitatingly, the more I believe its sole practical effect will be to disturb the sugar industry in our own country in the interest of the sugar trust that is seeking to get it by the throat. It can not have any effect in establishing a stable government. It can not have any effect in establishing reciprocal trade relations. It does not last long enough to do it, and the excuse for it is not justified by any practical business experience or sound business judgment.

Why, they tell us that the sugar trust is the sole purchaser of the sugar of the Cuban planter. Does any man suppose, if that is true, that under the extraordinary conditions in that country, where the sugar planters are embarrassed, that the sugar trust will allow the planters to go to the wall and suffer? If they do they cut off their supplies of raw sugar for refining, do they not? Business sense will tell us that the trust will see to it that the temporary financial difficulty is bridged over, and that it is bridged over without any loss or destruction of the source of supply. There are many men in different classes of business in our own country who have met temporary embarrassment by reason of extraordinary exigencies which have arisen.

I know that is true in regard to the coal men of our country. The fact that they must operate for a year or two in the hands of a receiver is not an uncommon thing. So these sugar planters will be able to make temporary loans necessary to bridge them over the difficulty. It is a mere bugaboo. This agitation was started by the trust that first sought to destroy the beet-sugar industry by putting down the price of sugar, and when the beet-sugar men met that by buying trust sugar and selling it at a price that they could realize a profit from, then it started the hue and cry in regard to the suffering in Cuba, and when the matter came before the Ways and Means Committee, as the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. MORRIS] pointed out, it was the men interested in the sugar trust that appeared before that committee and made the argument. There they had to admit that Cuba was not in a suffering condition, but they insisted that some of her people were about to suffer.

But, Mr. Chairman, I want to say to the members of this House that opposition to this measure should not be based, in my judgment, solely on the ground of our obligations to the beet-sugar industry or to any special industry in this country. The broad general proposition that I want to lay down is that when you are doing well let well enough alone. It is this tariff agitation that I cry out against. It started with the proposition coming from the distinguished gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. BABCOCK], and the leaders of the House opposed that. Now, I cry out against their coming here with a proposition that means tinkering with the tariff in another direction.

I can talk plainly because I have no private interests to subserve. There is not a single stick of sugar cane, not a single sugar beet, nor a pound of sugar grown or refined in my State. Our soil and climate are not adapted to the growing of the sugar beet. We have not anything to do nor can have nothing to do with these industries. On the other hand, I have always been a sincere friend of Cuba.

Just prior to the Spanish war, when under the leadership of this House it was sought to quell and repress agitation for relief to Cuba, I had the fortune to be one of the first to stand on this floor and urge our country's intervention in order to stop the butchery and cruelty that was going on in that island, and give to her her freedom.

But what have we done? We have given her \$3,000,000; we have loaned her our Army and Navy at an expense of \$200,000,000; we have given her freedom; we have established her cities in healthful condition. We have done all this. And now we are asked to do what we never in our Government's history did for any class of our own citizens. We are asked to take the revenues of the United States and give them to a class of private citizens in Cuba in order to establish them in business. I rebel against such a proposition. It seems to me that it is contrary to good morality.

What right have we—yes, even Democrats, whom the gentleman from Virginia so enthusiastically praised and to whom individually I have no objection, but whose policies somehow or other I feel safest in keeping as far away from as possible—I ask Democrats under what law of morality they can justify themselves in taking and giving away \$8,000,000 of the revenues of this country without reducing the price of the article to the consumer a single cent? It is conceded that this is the purpose by all. Under what right and by what law and by what principle of morality will you take these revenues and give them to some citizens in a foreign country? How will you justify this proposition? In my judgment, gentlemen, there is no justification for it.

The gentleman from Virginia played the play of Hamlet, but left Hamlet out. On this measure he favors a 20 per cent reduction. For what purpose? For the mere purpose of reducing the revenue in the interest of the sugar trust. I say to you gentlemen who are clamoring for improvements in the South—for the improvement of your rivers and your harbors and for the building up of your naval stations—what argument can there be for cutting down the revenue of the United States if it does not bring any good to the people of this country? Do you not believe that the \$8,000,000, which you propose as a free gift for the benefit of some of the private citizens of Cuba, can be expended in your Southland and my Southland in building up the country and repairing the ravages which still exist as the result of the civil war—expended in the improvement of our rivers and our harbors? Why do we want to cut down these revenues, the effect of which must be that these improvements can not be made?

Mr. DINSMORE. I understood the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. DAYTON] to insist that the reduction of the tariff on sugar provided for in this bill will not reduce the price of sugar?

Mr. DAYTON. I stated that on what I believe to be good authority, the authority of the report of the committee.

Mr. DINSMORE. If that be true, then, how can any injury result to the beet-sugar producers from this bill if it is not going to reduce the price of sugar?

Mr. DAYTON. Why, sir, that argument has been met over and

over again by the special friends of the beet-sugar industry in this way: The proposed reduction may not put a stop to the present industry, but it will retard its development and growth. It will prevent the building up of large manufacturing establishments for the prosecution of this industry.

Mr. DINSMORE. How so, if the price of sugar does not go down?

Mr. DAYTON. The mere fact that the great policy established in respect to this industry (for, as will be shown by an examination of the discussions on the Dingley tariff bill, the sugar schedule was established for the purpose of providing that the \$100,000,000 spent annually by the American people for sugar should inure to the benefit of the beet-sugar industry) has been repudiated at the instance, as I believe, of the American Sugar Refining Company must have the effect to cause those contemplating investment in this direction to think that eventually much greater reductions will be made.

Mr. WEEKS. Is it not also to be considered that the discrimination against this one industry, selected out from all the other industries of the country, would have a tendency to alarm and impede this branch of production?

Mr. DAYTON. Certainly.

Mr. DINSMORE. The gentleman from West Virginia has conceded that the reduction of duty will not lower the price of sugar. That being so, I ask him whether it will or will not inure to the advantage of the consumer?

Mr. DAYTON. Certainly it will not. That branch of this question has been thoroughly gone over by those who specially represent this industry. As my time is limited, I do not care to enter into minute details in regard to the price of sugar or the effect of this measure upon it. But I do know this, as the gentleman suggested a moment ago: That for this Congress to select that industry in its youth as the single schedule that is to be affected by this legislation will have a retarding effect, a paralyzing effect, on the beet-sugar industry; and I want to call the attention of the gentlemen from the South to another condition that enters into this and which no man can deny.

The hearings before the Ways and Means Committee showed clearly that the cane-sugar industry in the State of Louisiana has not been prosperous this year; that they have had to meet the same condition of an overproduction of sugar, and that if we pass this measure at the instance of Cuba we do it discriminating against our sugar planters down there, and the distinguished chairman of the Ways and Means Committee himself admitted that there was danger of paralyzing the sugar industry in Louisiana. My friends on this side, I want to call your attention incidentally to the fact that there are 375,000 colored people in the State of Louisiana who get their bread and butter day by day and year by year from this industry, and I can not reconcile it as good morality for us to discriminate against these colored people, our own citizens, for the benefit of the foreign raisers of cane sugar. [Applause.]

Mr. SAMUEL W. SMITH. Mr. Chairman, impressed as I am with the belief that I ought not to give my support to the pending measure, I feel that I owe it to myself, to the House, and to my constituents to give some of the reasons which actuate me at this time.

When I came here at the beginning of the Fifty-fifth Congress, all branches of industry were in a deplorable condition. Capital was idle, agriculture was depressed, and the laboring men of the country were without employment. During the exciting contest of 1896 I had said to my constituents that if they honored me with a seat in Congress I would do all in my power to bring about a change for the better, and I at once set myself to work, as best I could, to accomplish that purpose.

Some one has said in the course of this debate that those of us who oppose this legislation are not in accord with the Administration. It is true that the President, Secretary of War, and Governor Wood have made certain recommendations. But have we not the right to differ with one or all of them and to make our objections known? This is a Government composed of three great departments—the legislative, judicial, and executive—and notwithstanding the Supreme Court of the United States is the court of last resort, I hold that it is the right of every citizen not only to differ from but in a respectful manner to criticize the court's decisions. Surely the legislative is an independent branch of the Government.

I do not believe we ever had a President who more thoroughly respected one who honestly differed with him or who had more decidedly the courage of his convictions than President Roosevelt. I may be wrong in the views which I entertain about this proposed legislation, but God knows I am honest in the position which I take. I have great admiration for the President, and congratulate him upon the splendid Administration that he is giving to the country; and his recent trip to Charleston demonstrates that he is not simply the President of the Republican

party or of a divided country, but that he is the President of all the people of this great Republic. [Applause.]

I congratulate him on the statesmanship displayed in that hour of great national grief, when he said to the people that the policy of William McKinley should be his policy, and, further, that he should call to his counsel those who had been the counselors and advisors of our lamented President. No one event in recent years has given such universal satisfaction; and, sir, when a vacancy occurred in his Cabinet, I congratulated him that he came to this forum and selected one of our number. Our best wishes will go with our colleague in his new field of labor, and may the time be near at hand when he shall occupy as prominent a place in the counsels of the Cabinet as he has in this august body. [Applause.]

We differ also with some of the Republican members of the Ways and Means Committee, but nevertheless we respect their great ability and believe them to be honest and conscientious in the discharge of their every duty; and we express the hope that their constituencies, recognizing their commanding ability and their years of service and experience, which have given them a foremost place in the greatest of legislative bodies, will continue to send them here as long as they will consent to come.

There ought to be no partisan politics in this measure; indeed, from my standpoint, there is none. This is clearly shown by the fact that Mr. RICHARDSON of Tennessee, the minority leader; Mr. McCLELLAN, of New York, and Mr. SWANSON, of Virginia, all leading and able Democrats, have joined with a portion of the Republican members of the Ways and Means Committee in reporting this bill to the House.

I repeat that it is not properly a political measure, because it is one which will either injure or benefit one of the new and leading industries of the country; and as a further reason why there should be no politics in it I desire to call your attention to the fact that the Government has already expended a large sum of money in helping to promote this new industry, as is shown by a letter of recent date from Hon. James Wilson, Secretary of Agriculture, which I will present herewith:

APRIL 2, 1902.

DEAR SIR: With reference to the expenditure of money in this Department for the investigation and encouragement of the sugar-beet industry, I may say that this work was begun in 1881 and since that time has been conducted in a number of bureaus and divisions of the Department. The largest expenditures have been made in the Bureau of Chemistry, extending from 1881 to 1892. Beginning with the fiscal year 1898, an annual appropriation has been made for the investigation of domestic sugar production, and, beginning at the same time, an annual distribution of sugar-beet seed has been made. Where this special appropriation has been used to pay salaries of chemists working under the direction of the Bureau of Chemistry, as occurred in the years 1899-1901, inclusive, or where, as in the year 1900, part of the sugar-beet seed for general distribution was purchased from this appropriation, it has been subtracted and put under the heading "Bureau of Chemistry" and "Distribution of sugar-beet seed," respectively, to avoid duplication. Following is an itemized statement of the expenditures that have been made:

Bureau of Chemistry, 1881-1892 .....	\$25,518.54
Sugar investigations:	
1898 .....	4,941.82
1899 .....	5,545.95
1900 .....	3,476.93
1901 .....	3,488.87
1902 .....	*5,000.00
Distribution of sugar-beet seed, including cost of seed and labor:	
1898 .....	3,301.06
1899 .....	3,531.85
1900 .....	3,705.20
1901 .....	2,457.75
1902 .....	1,706.00
Investigation of sugar-beet disease, 1902 .....	3,000.00
Total .....	65,683.47

Trusting that the foregoing information will be satisfactory, I am,  
Very truly, yours,

JAMES WILSON, Secretary.

Hon. SAMUEL W. SMITH,  
House of Representatives.

The efforts of the General Government in this direction are only in keeping with what several States have already done in their individual capacity, through the instrumentality of their agricultural colleges, and I point with pride to the fact that no State in the Union has taken a greater interest in promoting this industry than has the State of Michigan, through its Agricultural College, and to Prof. R. C. Kedzie, of that college, as well as to others. No little credit is due for their years of patient effort in seeking to make the raising of sugar beets in this country a success.

Mr. Chairman, my first objection to this measure is that the proposed legislation is repudiated in advance by Mr. Palma, the President-elect of the Cuban Republic, as is shown by the following statement by him, published in the New York Tribune of January 25, 1902:

The prosperity of Cuba depends to a great extent upon the attitude of the United States to the now forming republic. The full moral obligation of

\* This figure is the appropriation for the fiscal year 1901-2, and probably is considerably in excess of what actually will be expended for beet-sugar investigations.

this great nation to Cuba will be discharged when the United States has opened the only market that is possible to Cuban products. We must have this market. Unless we receive a reasonable reduction on sugar and tobacco prosperity will be an impossibility. If this is denied it will be the ruin of the country. It is impossible to improve the bad condition of our principal staple, sugar, by reducing the American duty one-third. In that way the problem will not be solved at all. The clamor for further reduction will continue.

Also the Washington Times of March 25, 1902, quotes General Palma as saying:

We have said from the beginning that a reduction of 50 per cent, or possibly 40 per cent, was necessary for Cuba's relief, and I have said before, and I am compelled to say now, that 20 per cent reduction will not be of any benefit.

And recently before the New York Chamber of Commerce he gave expression to the same views. If such are his opinions, can we not confidently expect, when the new republic is organized on May 25 next, and the Cuban congress adopts this legislation—if it ever reaches them—that he will promptly veto it, upon the grounds that it affords the Cuban—at least the poor Cuban resident planter—no relief? Would it not be much better to defer this legislation until after the organization of the new republic, so that we may know not only the views of the president-elect, but also of the Cuban congress? We ought not to seek to force upon the Cubans legislation which is unprofitable and unacceptable to them, and especially when it is being urged by the sugar trust, which, in a large degree, is to be the recipient of the benefits of this legislation.

Next, I am opposed to this legislation because we were told, in the first instance, that there was great suffering in the island of Cuba, and that the proposed reduction of 20 per cent was needed by the poor Cuban planter, and it is further urged that he will be largely benefited if this measure becomes a law. I deny the truth of both these statements.

In order to determine what the conditions were in Cuba, hearings were had before the Ways and Means Committee, beginning January 25, 1902, and continuing until the 29th of that month. Eighteen witnesses testified in favor of tariff reductions in the case of Cuba, and their testimony disclosed clearly what the conditions are in Cuba.

I quote briefly from the testimony as to these conditions, as to wages, and as to in whose hands are the property and business of the island:

HUNGER AND DISTRESS DO NOT EXIST.

BLISS. I have not spoken of distress except to deny that any existed so far as I knew. It is a long time since I have seen anyone begging on the streets or anyone who wanted work who was not at work at good wages. (P. 359.)

BLISS. I should say there was no distress whatever from all I have seen. (P. 379.)

HAWLEY. Q. And anybody who comes there will be a competitor in the field of labor, and as all these people are now employed, how can they be distressed and starved? (P. 362.)

A. Who has said they are?

MENDOZA. Q. Then this condition of hunger or starvation which you have just outlined or detailed here does not exist to-day, does it?

A. Not yet; it will exist. (P. 67.)

ABAD. Q. Then there is no suffering among the laboring classes, is there? A. No; that is not the case, because living in Cuba is very high; it is very expensive. (P. 144.)

LABORERS' WAGES \$23 TO \$30 PER MONTH.

ATKINS. The wages are high. Wages there run quite as high as the average agricultural labor in the United States. (P. 15.)

ATKINS. The price of labor in Cuba is in excess of the price of labor in the Southern States. (P. 29.)

BLISS. The men themselves get varying wages, but many of them, in many portions of the island, get as much as \$30 a month, American gold; others much less than that. When I say much less I mean \$4 or \$5 or \$6 less. (P. 388.)

ATKINS. In my section I pay about \$23 for a month of twenty-six working days. Mr. Kelly has to pay \$1 a day. (P. 18.)

HAWLEY. Q. Is labor employed there? (P. 358.)

A. It is.

Q. Can labor find full employment?

A. It has employment at the present time.

Q. At good wages?

A. At good wages; yes. (P. 358.)

KELLY. Roustabout or unskilled labor in Cuba is 90 cents to \$1.10 per day, United States gold. (P. 51.)

KELLY. In our end of the island we are paying an average of \$30 a month. (P. 57.)

MENDOZA. There is plenty of work for the workmen in Cuba to-day. (P. 66.)

PLACÉ. We are paying \$22 to \$24 a month. (P. 76.)

PROPERTY AND BUSINESS OF THE ISLANDS IN THE HANDS OF SPANIARDS.

ATKINS. A large proportion of the property of the island is owned by Spaniards. (P. 11.)

PLACÉ. The business of the island is in the hands of the Spaniards. All business is in their hands. The majority of the Spaniards have not renounced their allegiance [to Spain]; they remain Spanish. (P. 95.)

PLACÉ. We are taking the money we get from you and going to Europe to spend it. You buy seven-eighths of our products, and we buy from you one-third of what we consume. (P. 45.)

MONEY AT 8 TO 13 PER CENT, STILL THE SUGAR INDUSTRY OF CUBA IS PROFITABLE.

MACHADO. We pay from 8 to 12 and sometimes 18 per cent per annum, sir. (P. 513.)

ATKINS. It was profitable last year; I do not deny it, sir. (P. 18.)

This ought to show that there is no great and widespread suffering or distress in the island, such as has been represented.

Now, as to the suggestions that the poor resident Cuban planter

is in need and is to be benefited by the proposed reduction, I think it is conceded that there are about 15,000 poor Cuban planters, many of whom are hopelessly in debt; that for some years, by some process of law in Cuba, they have been protected by Generals Blanco, Weyler, and Wood, and that if they were in this country they would take advantage of the bankruptcy law. Can we afford to legislate for these foreign people, who are being carried along by the payment of from 8 to 18 per cent, to the injury of a new and infant industry in our own country?

Let us see who will get the greater portion of this proposed 20 per cent reduction, and how much of it. The duty on raw sugar is 1.685 cents per pound. One-fifth, or 20 per cent, of this is 0.337. On 1 ton of 2,240 pounds the reduction would be \$7.55. The reduction on this year's Cuban product would be \$7.55 multiplied by 800,000 tons, which would be \$6,040,000. Let us for the purpose of this argument call it \$6,000,000.

Mr. H. Gilson Gardner, the Washington correspondent of the Chicago Journal, in writing of Cuban conditions, says: "Only 7 per cent of the sugar plantations in the island are owned by native Cubans." Mr. Gardner is doubtless correct, but let us be generous and say 15 per cent. If so, the poor native Cubans would get 15 per cent of \$6,000,000, which is \$900,000, and if you divide this among the 15,000 poor Cubans, they will receive the enormous sum of \$60 each, which will not do much to relieve them from the great burden of debt under which it is claimed they are laboring.

But it is equally interesting to know what is to become of the balance of the \$6,000,000, which is \$5,100,000. I assert, without fear of successful contradiction, that it will be divided among such men as Edwin F. Atkins, who is a resident of Boston, Mass., an American sugar refiner interested in a syndicate owning a 14,000-acre Cuban sugar plantation, and one of the organizers and original directors of the American Sugar Refining Company (sugar trust); also, Mr. Havemeyer (president of the sugar trust); Mr. Howell, in the syndicate owning a 75,000-acre Cuban sugar plantation (this is equal to more than three townships of land in the State of Michigan); also, James H. Post, of New York, president of the National Sugar Refining Company, controlled by the sugar trust, who is much interested in Cuban sugar and a partner of B. H. Howell, Son & Co., sugar merchants; also, Hugh Kelly, of New York, interested in the Santa Teresa Sugar Company, owning a 9,000-acre Cuban sugar plantation, and in one other plantation company; also, Miquel Mendoza, of Habana, owner of a 27,000-acre Cuban sugar plantation; and so we might go on adding to the list. What a shame and pity it is that Congress has not been more active and diligent in caring for these poor Cuban suffering planters, nearly all of whom live in the United States and enjoy the blessings of everything that wealth can command! [Applause.]

It will be interesting to still further inquire what amount some of these individuals whom I have named would receive by the proposed tariff reduction. I quote from page 8 of the hearings heretofore referred to, as follows:

The CHAIRMAN. Can you tell us what proportion of the present crop is owned by citizens of the United States or by corporations of the United States?

Mr. ATKINS. I am not prepared to give you those figures.

The CHAIRMAN. Can you give us an estimate?

Mr. ATKINS. No; I can not even estimate it for this reason, that there are so many naturalized Cubans, American citizens, in the island that you can not tell, even by talking with them, whether they are Americans or Cubans; it is impossible.

The CHAIRMAN. Well, leaving out that class—

Mr. ATKINS. Well, I can name them on my fingers. Mr. Kelly, who is here, represents an estate, of which he is a part owner, on the south side of Cuba, which turns out from 10,000 to 12,000 tons of sugar per year.

Mr. ROBERTSON. What grade of sugar is that?

Mr. ATKINS. That is standard 69 centrifugal sugar. The Trinidad Sugar Company, of which I am president, at Trinidad, Cuba, has an estate the capacity of which is about 10,000 tons per annum. My own property at Cienfuegos has a capacity of about 12,000 tons of sugar. We turned out last year 11,000 tons. The Homiguero estate is held by a New York corporation, located at Cienfuegos, Cuba, and has a capacity of 12,000 tons. The Constancia estate, recently purchased by parties in Louisiana, represented by Mr. Spellman, connected with the Illinois Central Railroad, I should say should have a capacity of about 20,000 tons of sugar. The United Fruit Company, of Boston, at a place called Banes have a factory—a new factory started last year—with a capacity of about 20,000 tons. There is the property called the Chaparra Sugar Company at Puerto Padre, on the north coast of Cuba, which is about ready to start up, owned by New York gentlemen, in which ex-Representative Hawley, of Texas, is interested and which has a capacity of about 20,000 tons. This estate has never been operated. There is an estate near Santiago called the San Francisco, in which Mr. Craig, of Philadelphia, is interested, which will start, I believe, this year with a capacity of 15,000 tons of sugar. Now, as far as my memory serves me, I think that is all the bona fide American interests there.

The Trinidad Sugar Company, of which Mr. Atkins is president, would receive \$7.55 by 10,000 tons, or \$75,500. Mr. Atkins would receive \$7.55 by 12,000 tons, which would be \$90,600. The Homiguero estate would receive the same amount. The Constancia estate would receive \$7.55 by 20,000 tons, or \$151,000; the United Fruit Company, of Boston, the same amount; and so on until the whole \$5,100,000 would be divided up among wealthy people who

have invested their money in Cuba, and who have been very largely interested with the sugar trust in creating the clamor for the reduction of the duty on sugar, under the plea that it was to be for the poor and destitute of the island of Cuba. We thus see very plainly, Mr. Chairman, where the bulk of this \$6,000,000 of good, solid American money would go. It would go straight into the pockets of these few rich American sugar capitalists. And where would it come from, Mr. Chairman? Straight out of the pockets of my Michigan constituents and the rest of our American beet-sugar producers. Is this right? Is this just? Is this even expedient and politic? Not while I have a voice or a vote in this Chamber will I fail to denounce and combat any such scheme for allowing the sugar trust to injure and defraud my honest, deserving, and hard-working constituents. I can hardly see how this legislation commends itself to anybody, and I am sure that when it is thoroughly understood, as it will be by the people later on, they, too, will repudiate it and say to those of us who have opposed it, "Well done, good and faithful servants." [Applause.]

Much has been said about our moral and legal obligation to Cuba, and if there is anyone here on either side of the Chamber who longer maintains that we are under either a moral or legal obligation to Cuba, I would be glad to have him say so. I hear no response. [Applause.]

Much has been said also about this proposed reduction benefiting the consumer. Already in this debate it has more than once been admitted on both sides of the Chamber that the consumer will receive no benefit by the reduction. Before Congress convened and for some time since a portion of the newspaper press was busy, as I believe, in the interest of the sugar trust (which was proper, for doubtless the trust paid for it) in circulating the statements of the sugar trust to the effect that the consumer would be benefited, and elaborate statements were made and sent out to that effect. In my judgment, when the American Sugar Refining Company (commonly known as the sugar trust) is found doing anything for the consumer, then you can confidently state that the devil has commenced to quote the Scriptures correctly. [Applause.]

Much has also been said to the effect that we ought to give up or yield a portion of our markets to Cuba. The hills and valleys of Cuba are sprinkled with the blood of our brave soldiers, \$300,000,000 of our National Treasury has been expended that Cuba might be free, and she has been relieved by our help from more than \$300,000,000 of debt. Suppose Cuba, unaided by the United States, had secured her own liberty from Spain, then where and how would she have secured a market for her products? Would we have been under any special obligation to her under those circumstances? And are we under any greater obligations to her to-day, after having given freely to her of our blood and treasure, and after releasing her from helpless bondage and bankruptcy?

We also are informed that we owe Cuba a market for her products because of the Platt amendments. It is said that these amendments forbid her to enter into commercial relations with the other nations of the earth. I deny it, and believe that a careful reading of the amendments will bear out my denial.

#### THE PLATT AMENDMENTS NO BAR TO CUBAN COMMERCE.

##### I.

That the government of Cuba shall never enter into any treaty or other compact with any foreign power or powers which will impair or tend to impair the independence of Cuba, nor in any manner authorize or permit any foreign power or powers to obtain by colonization or for military or naval purposes, or otherwise, lodgment in or control over any portion of said island.

##### II.

That said government shall not assume or contract any public debt, to pay the interest upon which and to make reasonable sinking-fund provision for the ultimate discharge of which the ordinary revenues of the island, after defraying the current expenses of government, shall be inadequate.

##### III.

That the government of Cuba consents that the United States may exercise the right to intervene for the preservation of Cuban independence, the maintenance of a government adequate for the protection of life, property, and individual liberty, and for discharging the obligations with respect to Cuba imposed by the treaty of Paris on the United States, now to be assumed and undertaken by the government of Cuba.

##### IV.

That all acts of the United States in Cuba during its military occupancy thereof are ratified and validated, and all lawful rights acquired thereunder shall be maintained and protected.

##### V.

That the government of Cuba will execute, and as far as necessary extend, the plans already devised, or other plans to be mutually agreed upon, for the sanitation of the cities of the island, to the end that a recurrence of epidemic and infectious diseases may be prevented, thereby assuring protection to the people and commerce of Cuba, as well as to the commerce of Southern ports of the United States and the people residing therein.

##### VI.

That the Isle of Pines shall be omitted from the proposed constitutional boundaries of Cuba, the title thereto being left to future adjustment by treaty.

VII.

That to enable the United States to maintain the independence of Cuba and to protect the people thereof, as well as for its own defense, the government of Cuba will sell or lease to the United States lands necessary for coaling or naval stations at certain specified points, to be agreed upon with the President of the United States.

VIII.

That by way of further assurance the government of Cuba will embody the foregoing provisions in a permanent treaty with the United States.

These stipulations have been well analyzed in the following terse language:

- Nos. 1, 2, and 3 are simply applications of the Monroe doctrine.
- Nos. 4 and 5 are simply exigencies of the occasion of occupation.
- No. 6 refers to acquisition of territory which is meaningless in that it refers the whole matter to a future treaty.
- No. 7 is an implied contract with Cuba to grant us, for a consideration, coaling and naval stations either by lease or grant of the fee to the same, dependent also on future treaties.

I cite the Chicago Tribune (and could cite many other influential journals) to prove my contention that the Platt amendments are no bar to Cuba's entering into commercial relations with other nations:

There is a mistaken idea that the Platt amendment forbids the republic of Cuba making treaties with foreign countries without the consent of the United States. The Platt amendment does not deprive Cuba of any treaty-making right, with the single exception that the republic of Cuba is forbidden to enter into any treaty which would impair its independence or which would authorize any foreign power to control any part of the island for military, naval, or other purposes. There is nothing to prevent the republic of Cuba making any kind of tariff treaty it sees fit providing for reciprocity with any country.—*Chicago Tribune*, March 3, 1902.

Let it be clearly understood that those of us who do not favor his legislation are in no wise opposed to entering into reciprocal relations with Cuba on a fair basis, and that we have also always expressed our willingness to vote to relieve any distress which may actually exist in the island of Cuba. Not less than two or three propositions have been submitted to the Ways and Means Committee, all of which have been rejected by that committee upon the ground that the majority of the committee deemed them unconstitutional. They do not seem so to me and to many others. I will proceed to outline two of these plans of relief. Why can we not, under the seventh clause of the Platt amendment, either lease or buy coaling stations of Cuba in consideration of reciprocal trade relations? This is the first plan, and it has been summarized as follows:

- First. It is claimed that a remittance of money from our Treasury to the Cuban treasury based on a percentage of our tariff is unconstitutional.
- Second. Taking it for granted that we are going to acquire said naval or coaling stations either by lease or purchase, it must be assumed that either feature represents a purchasable value.
- Third. Base our settlement of Cuban concessions by payment to the Cuban treasury from our Treasury on the bona fide purchase of the lease or fee of said coaling and naval stations.
- Fourth. We certainly have a right to buy anything we need, and this proposition meets the so-called "Cuban exigency," leaving the Cuban government to provide for the interests distressed.
- Fifth. It makes the Cuban respectable and not a beggar and assures our people that their money is being spent for legitimate purposes.
- Sixth. This appropriation of money for coaling and naval stations can be distributed on a sliding series of years consistent with the judgment of those responsible for its enactment.
- Seventh. The settlement of the question in the manner outlined will aid Cuba in establishing her commercial relations at the inception of her government.
- Eighth. It will advise home producers of their exact status.
- Ninth. It estops any meddling or tariff tinkering.
- Tenth. It places the money in the hands of the Cubans and not the American sugar refiners.
- Eleventh. It satisfies public sentiment.
- Twelfth. It gives us a quid pro quo for our money.
- Thirteenth. It benefits the Cuban people generally or specifically, as they may determine.
- Fourteenth. It is honest; it is equitable; it is fair.

I also submit a plan credited by the Chicago Record-Herald to Senator Spooner, one of the great constitutional lawyers of the Senate:

Senator Spooner, of Wisconsin, has devised a plan by which it is believed the warring elements may be reconciled and Cuba be given what she asks without any political or industrial harm in this country.

The beet-sugar and tobacco people of this country do not object to Cuban products coming into the United States, provided the price be not cut so as to injure home industries. Hence they are willing to have a rebate allowed or a bounty to the foreign producers. But the idea of direct American bounty to foreigners is too ridiculous to receive serious consideration. The Cuban planters are not satisfied to have a rebate unless they can get it, for in such cases they will be no better off than before. It is here that the Senator from Wisconsin comes along with the following ingenious plan:

- "1. The United States to charge full Dingley rates on all sugar and tobacco coming in from Cuba.
- "2. But in consideration of the agreement of the Cuban republic to reduce the Cuban tariffs on American goods going into Cuba the United States is to refund to the Cuban government, say, 40 per cent of the duties collected on Cuban sugar and tobacco.
- "3. So far as the reciprocity agreement between the two countries is concerned it is to go no further than this. But the Cuban congress can turn round and pay to its own planters an export bounty on sugar and tobacco equal to the drawback received from the United States.
- "By this plan there would be a fair reciprocity between the two countries, the United States would return to Cuba, say, 40 per cent of the revenue derived from sugar and tobacco imported from that island. For this concession the United States would secure a valuable return in tariff concessions by Cuba. The Cuban government would take the money which it receives from

the United States and turn it back to the exporters as a bounty, the bounty exactly equaling the drawbacks and finding its way to the proper parties.

"In other words, Cuba would get the relief asked for and no producing interest in the United States would be hurt."

A number of Senators to whom this plan has been submitted believe Senator Spooner has found a solution of the vexing problem. President Roosevelt is satisfied with it, the Cubans would be pleased with it, and there is no reason why the beet and tobacco people should object to it. Cuban sugar has to enter into competition with the bounty-paid sugars of Europe, and there is only one good reason why the government of Cuba should not also pay a bounty. This reason is that Cuba has not the money to pay it with. Here the United States proposes, for a valuable consideration—to wit, an enlarged Cuban market—to pay into the Cuban treasury the money needed for that purpose.

The domestic sugar industry would not thereby be endangered, at least for a time, the United States Treasury would get the bulk of the duty, and the rebate would go to the Cuban planters instead of going into the pockets of the sugar trust, as it would in case of a reduction of the duty. Moreover, it would be a gift from the American people as a whole, instead of being given entirely at the expense of one industry.

If there are no constitutional objections, there remains the one serious question if other foreign nations will not insist on the countervailing duties on their sugar being taken off if no such duty is put on Cuban sugar, which, under this plan, would receive a bounty.—*Chicago Record-Herald*.

I am further opposed to the pending measure because it is in violation of the principles of the Republican party as expressed in our national platform and in the utterances of leading Republicans in the House and Senate during the passage of the Dingley law, and since. It is the pride of every Republican that the party has always stood for protection to American industries and American labor, and further that it has faithfully kept every pledge and every promise made to the American people. Protection has accomplished four things in all industries naturalized and established in America—

1. Supplied the demand.
2. Cheapened the cost to the consumer.
3. Given remunerative employment to labor.
4. Quickened the spirit of invention.

That it will accomplish as much for the beet-sugar industry, if allowed to do so, no one can reasonably doubt. [Applause.]

In the platform of 1896 we said:

We condemn the present Administration for not keeping faith with the sugar producers of this country. The Republican party favors such protection as will lead to the production on American soil of all the sugar which the American people use, and for which they pay other countries more than \$100,000,000 annually.

During that exciting contest, we frequently quoted from the platform, which says:

The country demands a right settlement, and then it wants rest.

Did we mean what we said to the sugar growers, and did we later on settle the question and settle it right? If so, why seek to disturb it now in the interest of a foreign nation and of capitalists who have invested their money there rather than in the United States? We shall long remember the solicitude manifested by all parties in that campaign, and among the means used to win the desired victory was a document issued by the Republican national committee to the capitalists and farmers showing the benefits to be received from the new and infant beet-sugar industry. I respectfully herewith submit the same:

AMERICAN BEET-SUGAR INDUSTRY.

The following statement shows the benefits which will accrue to farmers, artisans, and the various trades of the United States from the fostering of the beet-sugar industry by means of a proper protective tariff, insuring home production of the 85 per cent of sugar consumed in this country, which is now imported into the United States and for which over \$100,000,000 are paid to foreign farmers and manufacturers.

It has been compiled and calculated from the official statistics of the United States Government for 1894-95, and from the actual experience of the beet raisers in California, Nebraska, and Utah; also from official returns of some of the beet-sugar factories now in operation in the United States.

More particularly, it exhibits:

- First. The amount of sugar consumed, produced, and imported into the United States in 1894 and the amount of money paid on this account to foreign countries by our people and thus withdrawn from our circulation.
- Second. The sources of supply and the countries benefited.
- Third. The number of factories required and the number of people who would be supported in producing the sugar now imported.
- Fourth. The value, cost of production, and profits to our farmers from the growing of the amount of sugar beets required to produce the sugar now imported.
- Fifth. The cost of construction of the number of factories necessary to produce the sugar now imported and the amount of money which would be distributed among our machine shops, mechanics, and laborers for the erection of the plants.
- Sixth. The amount of money which would be annually expended among our people in the beet fields and for labor and material in the factories, if the sugar now imported were produced at home.
- Seventh. Recapitulation of benefits to farmers and the various trades were the sugar now imported produced in our own country.

I. CONSUMPTION OF SUGAR IN THE UNITED STATES IN 1894.

	Tons.	Value.
Sugar consumed.....	2,024,694	\$128,871,960
Sugar produced at home.....	305,800	20,283,014
Sugar imported.....	1,718,894	108,588,946

II. SOURCE OF SUPPLY OF SUGAR IMPORTED IN 1895.

	Tons.
Europe.....	1,005,761
Cuba.....	164,310
Sandwich Islands.....	150,845
East Indies.....	135,894
British Indies.....	120,557
Brazil.....	87,646
Demerara.....	45,757
Other West Indies.....	45,947
Porto Rico.....	51,402
Other countries.....	15,137

Total..... 1,804,866

III. FACTORIES REQUIRED AND NUMBER OF PEOPLE SUPPORTED.

To produce the amount of sugar now imported would require 920 factories, with a capacity of 350 tons of beets each for every working day of twenty-four hours. Each factory would work up the product of 2,000 acres of sugar beets, and the 920 factories would utilize the product of 1,840,000 acres. At an average of 10 tons of sugar beets per acre, this would equal 18,400,000 tons of beets, which would be the amount of beets necessary to produce the sugar now imported. The total number of men employed in the factories and in the beet fields would represent a population of about 2,500,000 people.

IV. BEET GROWING AS AN AGRICULTURAL INDUSTRY.

The total average amount annually paid to our farmers for sugar beets required by 920 factories, in order to produce 1,718,894 tons of sugar now imported, would be:

For 18,400,000 tons of beets, at \$4.20 per ton, \$77,280,000, 40 per cent of which (or about \$30,000,000) would on an average represent the farmers' share of the total sum earned.

V. COST OF FACTORY CONSTRUCTION, ETC.

The average cost of construction of each factory having a capacity of 350 tons is \$400,000, or for 920 factories \$368,000,000, which would be distributed among our machine shops and the building trades. Since 90 per cent of nearly all our fabrics represents labor, it would follow that \$331,200,000 would go directly into the hands of our mechanics and laborers.

The annual expenditure for materials and labor in extracting the sugar from the 18,400,000 tons of beets (the amount necessary to manufacture the sugar now imported) and the amount of money placed in circulation through the channels of this most important industry would be as shown in the following detailed statement:

Detailed estimate of cost of extracting the sugar from 18,400,000 tons of sugar beets.

Labor and materials.	For 1 factory.	For 920 factories.
Labor as per pay roll.....	\$19,130	\$17,599,600
Beets, 20,000 tons, at \$4.20.....	84,000	77,280,000
Coal, 2,800 tons, at \$3.33.....	9,333	8,586,360
Lime rock, 1,200 tons, at \$2.....	2,400	2,208,000
Coke, 144 tons, at \$13.....	1,872	1,722,240
Filter cloth, 4,000 yards, at 17 cents.....	680	625,600
Filter bags, 800, at 25 cents.....	200	184,000
Sugar bags, 44,000, at 14 cents.....	6,160	5,667,200
Sulphur, 4 1/2 tons, at \$22.....	99	91,980
Hydrochloric acid, 60 carboys, at \$3.....	180	165,600
Soda, 200 pounds, at 35 cents.....	70	64,400
Cylinder oil, 50 gallons, at 60 cents.....	30	27,600
Machine oil, 200 gallons, at 30 cents.....	60	55,200
Tallow, 300 pounds, at 7 cents.....	21	19,320
Coal oil, 10 cases, at \$1.80.....	18	16,560
Waste, 200 pounds, at 10 cents.....	20	18,400
Beet knives, 150, at \$1.....	150	138,000
Carbon for 100 electric lights, at \$1.....	100	920,000
Chemicals for laboratory.....	250	230,000
Incidental and petty expenses.....	500	460,000
Taxes, at 1 1/4 per cent.....	1,875	1,725,000
Insurance, 1 per cent.....	1,000	920,000
Repairs and maintenance.....	5,000	4,600,000
Total annual expenditure.....	266,296	122,496,160

VI. LIST OF TRADES BENEFITED, WITH AMOUNTS.

The amount of money which would be paid per annum to our farmers and to each of the various trades and industries if the 1,718,894 tons of sugar now imported were produced in our own country would be as follows:

To farmers, for beets.....	\$77,280,000
To laborers in factories, as per pay roll.....	17,599,600
To miners, for coal.....	8,586,360
To quarrymen, for lime rock.....	2,208,000
To coke manufacturers, for coke.....	1,722,240
To textile manufacturers, for filter cloth, filter bags, and sugar bags.....	918,160
To machine shops and repairers, for annual repairs.....	4,600,000

VII. RECAPITULATION AND CONCLUSION.

Previous to 1888 there was practically no beet-sugar production in the United States.

The annual production of sugar in the United States from 1888 until 1896 was as follows:

Year.	Cane.		Beet.	
	Tons.	Tons.	Tons.	Tons.
1889.....	143,745	2,000		
1890.....	252,255	2,800		
1891.....	180,250	5,400		
1892.....	228,604	12,000		
1893.....	297,737	16,000		
1894.....	355,384	20,443		
1895.....	260,000	30,000		

Sugar beets can be successfully grown over the greater portion of the United States, and States unable to grow beets produce sugar cane or sorghum. Farmers receive from \$4 to \$5 a ton for their beets, delivered, according to location of factory.

One of the greatest advantages of this crop to the farmer is the knowledge which he has, when he puts his seed in the ground in the spring, of the exact amount which he will receive at harvest in the fall as the result of his year's work, since contracts are made with the farmer in the spring stipulating the price to be paid for beets at harvest, unlike oats, corn, wheat, and other crops, which are subject to speculation and to manipulation by the boards of trade of New York, Chicago, and London. If the crop of cereals is good, the price is apt to be low; whereas with beets the farmer gets all the advantage of a good crop. Why not help the farmer when the opportunity is offered?

Another point to be considered, which farmers within a very considerable radius of a sugar factory appreciate, is the increase in value of their lands. In fact, land values around and about sugar factories have increased 25, 50, and even 100 per cent wherever beet-sugar factories have been located. Because of the thorough tillage of land required for a crop of beets, other crops, when rotated, yield a double product. When the pulp is used for feeding cattle, as it is used abroad, the increase in number and weight of stock becomes apparent.

There is no known industry which calls for the employment of such a variety of labor and of material as the manufacture of sugar. There is no industry in which agriculture, manufacture, and transportation or inland commerce are brought so closely together, none which so completely shuts out the middleman who is abroad in the land, preying upon the people. The farmer has a sure market close at hand. He delivers his beets or cane and receives his money in cash, without deductions for commission, storage, or other charges which reduce his profits, and he knows just what he is to receive per ton and when he is to receive it, so that he can calculate very closely what his profit will be. It has been fully demonstrated that we have the soil and the climate to produce our own sugar. If we do it, we shall keep over \$100,000,000 at home annually which we are now sending abroad.

Germany has just increased its bounty to sugar exporters, and France has increased its protective duties for sugar producers. In this connection it might be well to quote from a recent report sent to the Department of State, in which the consul at Magdeburg, Germany, under date of May 30, 1896, says:

"In conclusion, I desire to speak a word for our own beet-sugar industry. If we consider the enormous wealth which has accrued to Germany and all other countries that have introduced and fostered this industry, it is indeed to be desired that the United States should be put on such a footing as to be able to produce its own sugar. With our vast territory and varied climate and soil we should find a sufficient area adapted to grow all the sugar we consume, if we can sufficiently protect the industry against European competition, unduly aided by direct or indirect bounties."

If the United States is to compete with these and other countries in the production of sugar, American manufacturers and producers must receive the same encouragement from their Government that Europeans receive from theirs. It goes without saying that if the \$100,000,000 which we now send abroad for sugar could be kept at home, this country would be much better off and our farmers would be enormously the gainers. The home production of sugar would diminish exportation of gold, because the importation of sugar would be so reduced that the balance of trade would be largely in favor of the United States; much money would therefore flow toward this hemisphere which now flows away from it.

This \$100,000,000 would be spent for American labor, and that would mean the employment of thousands of idle men. The farmers would have more money and could spend more; they could pay off their mortgages and return to the times when they were prosperous and happy.

The candidate for the Presidency nominated by the Chicago convention is bitterly opposed to helping the sugar industry. He worked and voted when in Congress against the sugar bounty; he worked and voted against a tariff for protection. In his speech in Congress in January, 1894, when the sugar tariff was under consideration, Bryan said: "If Congress can not properly give a bounty directly to the sugar industry, neither can it properly impose a tax upon sugar for the avowed purpose of protecting the sugar industry. It is as easy to justify a bounty as a protective tariff, and it is impossible to justify either." Should he be elected, no bill in aid of the sugar industry would receive his sanction.

If, on the contrary, the Republicans succeed in electing McKinley, there will be speedy legislation in favor of sugar, and not only will the price of beets be higher, but new factories will go up all over the United States, in proof of which we quote the plank inserted in the Republican platform at St. Louis last June: "We condemn the present Administration for not keeping faith with the sugar producers of the United States. The Republican party favors such protection as will lead to the production on American soil of all the sugar which the American people use, and for which we are sending abroad annually more than \$100,000,000 to foreign countries."

Since 1891 not a single new sugar factory has been built. With the probable return of the Republican party to power the erection of new factories is projected; and hope and animation pervade this industry, where gloom and despair have existed for the last four years.

I desire also to call your attention to the closing words of the splendid 1896 platform of the Republican party:

Such are the principles and policies of the Republican party. By these principles we will abide, and these policies we will put into execution. We ask for them the considerate judgment of the American people. Confident alike in the history of our great party and in the justice of our cause, we present our platform and our candidates, in the full assurance that the election will bring victory to the Republican party and prosperity to the people of the United States.

It has brought unparalleled prosperity, and for one, while I recognize that in the near future the tariff will have to be revised, I am opposed to doing it now, fearing the disturbance that may come to the business interests of the country; and when it is done, I want it done by the Republican party, which, so far, is the only party that has ever shown its fitness and ability to do so. [Applause.]

Who besides the sugar trust is asking for a reduction of the duty on sugar? I have been asked to seek to have the duty on hides and glass reduced. I have the honor of representing a district in which more carriages and buggies are manufactured than in any other in the Union, and considerable glass is used in the manufacture of show cases, etc.; but when requested to seek to reduce the duty on hides and glass, I have declined for the present, and have given as my reasons those which I have just assigned. There are now two beet-sugar factories in the district which honors me with a place here, and the money has been

subscribed for the building of at least two more, and I confidently believe that if it were not for this unwarranted agitation, they, and possibly one or two more, would have been built during the present year.

The gentleman from New York [Mr. PAYNE] has said that the proposed reduction would not injure the sugar-beet industry. In 1898 there was only 1 beet-sugar factory in Michigan. The growth has been so rapid that we now have 13. During the last year 5 of these factories did not make any money, and 1 of the factories has been or is being removed to Canada; and Mr. F. R. Hathaway, secretary of the Michigan Sugar Manufacturers' Association, is authority for the statement made in the presence of several other gentlemen competent to bear witness that the Michigan factories only made, last year an average net profit of 7 per cent. Certainly, no one will regard this as an extravagant profit, and in addition we respectfully call the gentleman's attention to the fact that if it were not for this agitation there would have been built during the present year in the United States more than 80 factories with a capitalization of \$50,000,000.

President McKinley convened Congress in extraordinary session March 15, 1897, and, thanks to the Republican members of the Ways and Means Committee of the House, we were offered without delay the Dingley tariff bill as prepared by them after weeks and months of patient study and care. During the ensuing discussion the leading members of that committee put themselves on record in speeches in regard to the subject of protecting beet sugar, in a most emphatic and positive manner, and repeatedly. Their utterances are not less eloquent and appropriate if applied to the present situation, and some of them appear rather inconsistent in connection with the attitude of certain leaders of that committee toward the pending measure. I quote as follows from the speeches in 1897 by Mr. Dingley, then chairman of the Ways and Means Committee; Mr. PAYNE, the present chairman; Mr. STEELE, and Mr. GROSVENOR, prominent committee members:

[Congressional Record, July 19, 1897, page 2708.]

DINGLEY.

It should be borne in mind that the general increase of duty on sugar made in the proposed tariff has been made not only to increase the revenue, but also to further encourage the production of beet sugar in this country and furnish a new crop for our farmers, who are being sorely pressed as to our large wheat surplus by Russia and South American competition. I believe that the time has come when the production of our own sugar from the beet ought to be and can be successfully entered upon, and thus the seventy-five millions—soon to be one hundred millions—sent abroad for the purchase of our sugar ultimately distributed here to our own farmers. Already, indeed, it has been demonstrated that we can successfully produce beet sugar here, and the proposed duty placed on that article will gradually bring this about, while for the time being affording increased revenue.

Certainly nothing can be done so successfully to clip the wings of the sugar trust as to develop our beet-sugar industry. Sugar-beet factories turn out their product in a refined form, and thus become the efficient competitors of other refiners. The successful establishment of the sugar-beet industry in even half of the 26 States which can and will successfully grow sugar beets under the proposed tariff would speedily end any sugar trust, and would at the same time confer immense benefits on our farmers and all of our people.

[Congressional Record, March 25, 1897, pages 302, 303.]

PAYNE.

Well, we did not get revenue enough yet, so we examined the sugar question. The people of this country seem to have a sweet tooth, as the saying is. We consume more sugar per capita than any other nation that the sun shines upon. Why, we consume 2,100,000 tons of sugar a year, and the entire sugar production of the world is only about 7,000,000 tons. We thought that was a good item upon which to raise revenue. \* \* \*

We knew that the people of Louisiana had been working hard for years to build up the industry, working with more zeal than wisdom, because if they had had as much wisdom as they had zeal they would have sent men to represent them in the Congress of the United States who believed in a protective law that would protect all the interests of this country, and not simply sugar. [Loud applause on the Republican side.]

We hope that the Representatives of Louisiana are wiser to-day, and will support this bill. We did not want to destroy that Louisiana industry in 1890, and, furthermore, the hope was held out that we might raise beets for making sugar in 20 States of the Union.

If we could do that, there was no reason why we should not produce as much beet sugar in this country as they produce in Germany or in France. So we gave the sugar growers a bounty, saying, as I said then in my speech, that if it should result in developing the industry we would still protect it, even if it became necessary to go back to a tariff on sugar.

Well, it did develop the industry. The production increased from 2,000 tons of beet sugar in 1889 to 37,000 tons in 1896, notwithstanding the Wilson-Gorman bill and the repeal of the bounty. The product increased in Louisiana from 200,000 tons in 1890 to 317,000 tons in 1896, notwithstanding the Wilson-Gorman Act. There is a bright outlook for sugar in this country, as there is for many an item in this bill. \* \* \*

Mr. Chairman, I said I would tell the House how we proposed to reduce revenue when it becomes necessary to do so, but I can only hint at it now, as my remaining time is so limited. We propose to take off five or six millions a year of duty on the linen that we import by producing it in this country and not having to pay any duty upon it, because it will not be imported. [Applause on the Republican side.] We propose to raise beet sugar and cane sugar enough in this country to supply all our 73,000,000 people who must have the best in the world, and in that way we will take off \$50,000,000 in the course of a few years.

We will take off four and a half million dollars which we are now paying for foreign tin plates brought into this country. So I might go all through the bill. I have not time to speak of the other items, but we will reduce the revenue as it becomes necessary by building up the industries of the United States. [Prolonged applause on the Republican side.] When we have done that,

Mr. Chairman, we shall cease to send \$75,000,000 a year abroad to pay for foreign sugar.

[Congressional Record, July 19, 1897, page 2748.]

PAYNE.

What did we do? We raised the duty on refined sugar from 1.87½ to 1.95, and then raised the raw sugars all along the line in the same proportion as we raised the refined. Did we do anything wrong in that? I ask you men, who are surrounded at home by farming constituencies that are reaching out for some new industry to take the place of others on their farms, did we do anything wrong in holding out this encouragement to the sugar-beet industry?

Men stand up here and seem to think that the way to demolish a trust is to start a windmill and interject invectives into this debate. [Laughter and applause.] And every name that they can get out of their vocabulary, whether in the dictionary or not, is applied to the trust. But you will never destroy a trust in that way. Gentlemen talk about destroying the trust by taking away the differential between the raw and the refined sugar; they say, "Let them all come in on a common plane." Well, of course, when you do that you break down the line of protection to that sugar-beet industry. You not only break down the refiners, you not only send their employees to tramp the streets looking after other jobs, but you break down the most promising farming industry that has been held out to the farmers of this country in the last century. The remedy is worse than the disease when you try to eradicate the trouble in any such manner as that. \* \* \*

What shall be done with the sugar trust? Well, I will tell you what, in my opinion, is the best way of dealing with it. Establish a beet-sugar factory in every Congressional district in the United States. [Applause on the Republican side.] Give competition and lots of it everywhere. Put the farmers over against the trust by passing this bill, and reduce the price of sugar so that German raw sugar can not be brought in to be refined here. Gentlemen on the other side, come over and help us, while we help the farmers out. [Laughter and applause.] You grangers over there, come and help us. You Populists, that go up and down the streets day after day proclaiming your devotion to the interests of the farmers, help us out now when we are trying to help the farmers in this industry that we can establish so successfully. In this way you will do something toward demolishing the trust. You will accomplish more in this way than by mere invective—by running windmills and all that. [Laughter and applause.]

Why should we not produce all of our sugar in this country? Why, it costs us, Mr. Speaker, about one hundred millions. We were looking around for proper subjects for taxation. We knew that sugar would produce an enormous revenue; and, besides all that, we knew that an adequate protective tariff would build up the industry in this country, and as it was gradually built up the revenue from that source would be reduced; and by and by the revenue will come in more largely from other sources, and when this industry is fully established and revenue from sugar ceases, the reduction will keep pace with the increase. The thing will regulate itself; we will not disturb our tariff in the next quarter of a century.

[Congressional Record, Appendix, March 25, 1897, p. 123.]

STEELE.

I am a protectionist because I believe firmly in protection, and if I had my own way in framing a bill I might overdo the matter. I believe in manufacturing in this country everything that the country needs and that it is possible for us to manufacture. I believe in our growing everything that it is possible for us to grow in this country and keeping at home the money we send out to buy the products of other countries.

With regard to sugar, I predict that if the tariff fixed by this bill is unchanged for a period of ten years we will at the end of that time be producing not only enough for our home consumption, but as much as we care to export, and at very little additional cost to the consumer. Germany gives an export bounty on sugar, yet the home consumer pays from 6 to 8 cents per pound for it, the bounty enabling the German producer to sell it in this country at a lower price, while the French consumer pays from 8 to 10 cents a pound for the same reason. The farmers in the 20 States where the sugar beet can be successfully raised will reap a double benefit from the development of the sugar industry; first, because the sugar beet is a more profitable crop than wheat or corn, and second, because the land devoted to raising beets will no longer be producing wheat and corn, and the lessened production will increase the price of these products.

[Congressional Record, March 24, 1897, p. 210.]

GROSVENOR.

We have put wool upon the dutiable list for two purposes: First, to raise revenue and, second, to give that industry another chance to live in the United States. Not only that, but we propose that agriculture and the agriculturists of my district and of all the districts shall be both directly and indirectly benefited by this wool schedule. First, we desire that the agriculturist shall have an opportunity to sell his wool at a fair price when the effects of free wool shall have been gotten rid of and, secondly, we propose that the agricultural lands unfitted in fact for the culture of anything but sheep shall be devoted to the sheep industry, and that that land shall cease to be competitive in the production of cereals and vegetables. We propose that instead of sending \$125,000,000 a year to the foreign countries of the world, most of which goes to pay labor in the production of sugar, we will make it possible for every pound of sugar that we want to be produced in the United States of America. [Applause.]

We are going to force upon Louisiana that which she dare not ask for herself. Suppliant at the hands of Congress, with people representing not the claims and the clamors of her own people, we will force upon her the benefice she dares not hope or ask for herself. We will give to the sugar producer of Louisiana an opportunity to enlarge his products and turn over some of the splendid lands of that beautiful State to the production of sugar instead of corn, cotton, and other products of the soil; and so, Mr. Chairman, throughout Nebraska, through Kansas, and all of the States of the Union we propose to offer the same beneficent opportunities. The Republican party comes and offers to the agriculturist of this country this magnificent boom. We will protect the industries of the country in all directions from further demoralization; and we ask you to turn aside hundreds of thousands of acres of the splendid lands of all these States from the production of corn, oats, wheat, potatoes, and cotton, to be put into an already overstocked market, to the production of sugar, and give to the farmers upon the farming lands of the country a better market, with less competition than they now have.

During this debate Republicans and Democrats alike were profuse in professions of their willingness and eagerness to enact legislation that would benefit the farmers and laboring men of the country. The bill having passed the House, it was at once taken up in the Senate, and I call your attention to some utterances on the beet-sugar question by the distinguished Senators from Iowa [ALLISON], Nebraska [THURSTON], and Massachusetts [HOAR].

[Congressional Record, June 11, 1897, p. 1674.]

ALLISON.

Mr. ALLISON. That is the situation as respects the sugar schedule. Now, I wish to say a word about the policy of it. It is that we shall do what Europe has done; that we shall establish the industry of producing sugar in our own country, instead of paying \$100,000,000 per annum, as we have been paying for the last twenty years, to other countries who are engaged in agriculture. But for that part of this policy I would follow Senators who would place a duty of only 40 to 45 per cent ad valorem even upon sugar as one of the methods of raising revenue to carry on the Government.

We import into the United States now nearly 3,500,000,000 pounds of sugar from other countries, and in increasing quantities constantly from Europe from sugar beets, which sugar beets are grown upon land in Germany, Austria, Holland, and Belgium that is worth three or four times the land in our own country which would produce, and by actual test can produce, sugar from beets equally well with the countries I have named. It is for this purpose that I favor these provisions for a high duty upon sugar.

The Senator from California [Mr. White] did me the honor a while since to quote what I said two years ago. It was the policy in 1890 to encourage the growth of the sugar industry in our own country by paying a bounty. That policy of course failed. It failed, perhaps, first, by the rapid increase of the production of sugar in our country, requiring a large draft upon the Treasury. It failed, secondly, by the policy of the Democratic party four years ago, when they decided that they would do nothing to encourage the beet industry of our country and but little to encourage the continuation of the production of sugar from cane.

So, Mr. President, the schedule stands or falls, and this policy stands or falls, as we succeed in establishing the beet-sugar industry in our country, which can be established, as shown by chemical tests, in nearly half the States of the Union.

Mr. HOAR. It is a great agricultural industry.

Mr. ALLISON. It is an agricultural industry, as my friend from Massachusetts suggests, and a great agricultural industry. It is said that it is the beet-sugar production in Germany that has given to that country its marked prosperity for the last few years. Can anyone tell me why it is that we should export the corn, the meat, the pork, and the grain of Iowa to Europe, grown upon fields in the interior of our own country and bearing the burden of transportation to the countries of Europe which now produce sugar, and then draw from them the refined sugar which we consume in Iowa? That is the question we are deciding here.

Of course, the other question is also under consideration, and I do not minimize the importance of it, and that is that while we are doing this we shall so balance the scales as between all interests as to give neither to the refiner nor to the producer an undue advantage.

That is all there is in this schedule. It may be that we have had the schedule adjusted and arranged not precisely as it ought to be, but it is confessedly within a fraction of all the schedules that have been devised in the past upon the subject, except that of 1894, and this one is much lower than any prior schedule.

I was asked by the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. Jones] to state why this three-eighths should not be counted as a part of the differential duty to refiners. This three-eighths of a cent is only 11 cents on a hundred pounds to the refiners, 27 cents of which is upon raw sugar. It is a fact, and a certain fact, as it seems to me, that if we do not give the three-eighths and the 27 the effect of it will be that our industry, which we call the beet-sugar industry, and the cane-sugar industry, if you please, will be still, as it has been, at the mercy of the beet-sugar raisers of Europe. If we shall not charge this countervailing duty, then we are in no position to compete with German sugars or with the sugars of the Continent. Therefore this countervailing duty is put on now, as it was put on in 1894 in the Wilson bill, so-called. They put on a countervailing duty equivalent to the bounty at that time. The result was to get rid of the countervailing duty.

Germany, France, and Austria all increased their bounties, so that the countervailing duty which the Senators on the other side of the Chamber put on four years ago proved unavailing to protect our sugar industry; and I think our own sugar industry would not be protected unless we place this countervailing duty of three-eighths of a cent per pound upon the sugars produced in Europe or in bounty-paying countries. Now, that is all there is of it. If Senators can show me that the countervailing duty is an injustice, I will deal with them in a spirit of justice as respects it. It is not involved now in the particular question before us; but I can see no way of protecting our industry in this country, whether it be beet or cane sugar, except by imitating what was proposed by the Senators on the other side in 1894 and imposing a countervailing duty equal to the bounty.

[Congressional Record, July 3, 1897, page 2244.]

Mr. JONES of Arkansas. Will the Senator give the Senate some idea as to why cane sugar and sugar made from sorghum should be discriminated against in this way? If I remember aright, the Committee on Appropriations, of which the Senator is chairman, has made appropriations of considerable amounts of money to develop the cultivation of sugar from sorghum, and great promise was made by the Agricultural Department of results to come from that industry. The development of cane sugar in this country has, I understand, been considered a sort of pet project with gentlemen on the other side. We would be glad to have some idea about what the theory of the committee was in proposing to discriminate in favor of beet sugar and leaving out sugar produced from other sources besides beets.

Mr. ALLISON. It is for the purpose, and that only, of introducing the cultivation of the sugar beet and the production of sugar from sugar beets, with the idea, whether it is a vain one or not, that in this country we can produce sugar from beets as well as can be done and is done in all the countries of Europe, and that in every State in the Union we can cultivate the sugar beet and produce sugar from it.

Mr. WHITE. I am inclined to accede to that proposition.

Mr. ALLISON. That is true as affects this scale. In endeavoring to distribute it, if I may use that word, the Senate conferees in dealing with the subject desired that there should be as much protection, if I may use that word without offense, given to beet sugar as could reasonably be done. Therefore we have protected in our bill the beet-sugar industry to the extent of \$1.95, whilst the House had protected it to the extent of \$1.87. I mean in the sense of giving that advantage to our beet-sugar producers and our cane-sugar producers.

[Congressional Record, July 6, 1897, pages 2408, 2409.]

THURSTON.

Mr. THURSTON. When the Republicans of the Nebraska legislature passed the beet-sugar-bounty act of 1895, they did it over the veto of Governor Holcomb, our Populist governor. He vetoed the bill, and so far as was within the power of the Populists of the State of Nebraska they continued their consistent record of enmity to the beet-sugar industry.

The votes cast for the bill were all cast by Republicans; the votes cast against it were all cast by Populists.

Once more the Republican party stood for the encouragement of this great industry. Once more it declared in favor of a local policy under which our

beet-sugar manufactures would have greatly increased, for Mr. Oxnard, who has been referred to here, has repeatedly stated that with a bounty such as the Republican legislatures of the State of Nebraska have twice placed upon the product of beet sugar there would be no need for any further bounty from the National Government.

But my colleague says that the Republican party stands pledged in its national platform to another bounty. Not at all. The Republican party at the St. Louis convention declared that—

"We condemn the present Administration for not keeping faith with the sugar producers of this country. The Republican party favors such protection as will lead to the production on American soil of all the sugar which the American people use, and for which they pay other countries more than \$100,000,000 annually."

For protection that will lead to the upbuilding of the beet-sugar manufacture, not to any particular form of protection, not to a tariff per se, or a bounty per se, or a combination one with the other, but for whatever protection will adequately develop and build up and render successful this great national possibility, that, in my judgment, is one of the most promising features of our present industrial, agricultural, and commercial situation.

What has the Republican party done to keep this pledge? It has taken sugar from the list where my colleague placed and left it, without a bounty or an adequate compensatory tariff. So far as was in his power he stopped beet-sugar manufacture in Nebraska, and made it utterly impossible to build another factory.

Yes, Mr. President, I say my colleague virtually left sugar on the free list without a bounty so far as the State of Nebraska is concerned, because the tariff of the Wilson act amounted to nothing to the sugar producers of my State.

Mr. President, I love the interests of my State. I have been, perhaps, more instrumental than any other Senator in securing favorable action upon this beet-sugar bounty question from my Republican associates. But, Mr. President, I said then, and I say now, that I hold over and above any mere local interests of my State the interests of my country.

For myself, I have no apology to make. On that record I can face the American people and my constituents as well; and God knows, Mr. President, upon this question of beet-sugar encouragement in the State of Nebraska I will put that record beside the record which my colleague in this Chamber has deliberately made for himself.

The Republican party on this side of the Chamber is for an adequate protection to the beet-sugar industry. It stands to-day, and it will stand at the first available opportunity, for the passage of a law that will give the beet-sugar producers of my State fair and reasonable protection.

[Congressional Record, June 11, 1897, p. 1676.]

HOAR.

Mr. HOAR. Before the Senator sits down, I want to ask one question as to a part of his statement which goes to the country, and it is obvious enough, I suppose. Would not the transferring, as the result of an inadequate protection of the sugar-refining business, to other countries tend very largely to prevent the establishment in this country of the business of raising cane and beet sugar for our domestic consumption?

Mr. ALLISON. There is certainly no doubt of that. The dealing with this great sugar question, from the time of its production to its final consumption, is an entirety; and if we are to foster and protect it in our country, we have got to do it with the work in our country.

Mr. HOAR. I put that question to the Senator because I have heard it said more than once on this floor that the framers of this bill were indifferent to the agricultural interests of this country. Now, if I understand it—whether the details be right or wrong I am not competent to discuss, and there is no time to discuss them now—but if I understand the attempt of the Senator from Iowa and his associates, it has been to establish, encourage, and promote a great agricultural interest of this country, which shall be enabled to supply not foreign markets, but the home market, which is now largely possessed by other countries; and it seems to me that the gentleman shuts his eyes to the effort of the framers of this measure who does not see that the struggle over this sugar scheme which we are making with our Democratic and our other opponents is a struggle to establish one of the greatest, most profitable, and most valuable agricultural industries that we can possibly get for the purpose of supplying our home market.

Mr. ALLISON. I have failed to be understood if I did not say in the beginning that but for the fact that we all believe this schedule will secure an early period the production, from beets chiefly, of the sugar necessary for the consumption of the people of our country, I would not support this sugar schedule.

[Congressional Record, June 14, 1897, p. 1714.]

Mr. HOAR. Some Senators or some newspapers say we do nothing for agriculture. Mr. President, if you had in your hand the wand of a magician and could compel anything in the way of wealth or prosperity to spring up at its touch, you could not accomplish for agriculture any benefit like that which you could accomplish if you could cause the farmers of this country to raise the material for supplying this country with its sugar. Certainly next to the blessing which Providence gave us when we found these great and virgin wheat fields, ready for the cultivation of the immigrants, would be the benefit of such a condition as I have described, and that benefit can be accomplished and wrought by wise and judicious and bold legislation. I wish I could see both parties in this country eager and emulous in rivaling each other without political division to accomplish and bring about that great boon to the people of the Northwest.

Gentlemen of the committee, we Representatives of the Northwest urge you Representatives of the East and Northeast to remain true to the principles of the great Republican party and to your own convictions as repeatedly expressed here and elsewhere in former years. We ask you Representatives from Massachusetts to stand by the utterances of your distinguished Senator. From you Representatives of the other New England States we invoke a reciprocation of the assistance which we have always loyally given to your communities. We ask you Representatives from the States of Pennsylvania, New Jersey, and New York, to whom in past years we have given our votes most willingly to build up your splendid industries, do not forsake us in this hour of our trial, when we are looking to you to stand by us in maintaining this infant industry. [Applause.]

Before leaving this branch of the subject it will be in order to present the opinions of Hon. DAVID B. HENDERSON, of Iowa, the present Speaker of the House, on this subject, as expressed by him in an article recently published in the Moline (Ill.) Mail:

I am just in receipt of your letter, which I have read with care and interest. It seems to me that you do not segregate the questions before Congress.



There are three theories or questions pending or pressed upon us. First, the wiping out of all war taxes, which the party promised to do when we put them upon the people to carry on the war with Spain, and no one of any intelligence can say that the time has not come for wiping out these taxes, since we have \$176,000,000 surplus in the Treasury, with a working balance of about \$50,000,000 in the hands of disbursing agents for current work. If this pledge is ever to be fulfilled, it seems clear that it ought to be now. This first question stands alone without reference to any other.

The second question is, What are we going to do for Cuba? It is a separate and distinct proposition, and this is the situation: Those contending for Cuba want a reduction of 50 per cent or a clean sweep of duties between us and that country. Contending for this doctrine is, first, the American sugar trust, which is here in the person of its ablest managers; second, the money—the capital that has been put into the construction of railroads in Cuba, where a system of railroads extending along what may be termed the backbone of the island, with arms extending from the backbone into each part of it, is in process of construction.

All the money in this enterprise is anxious, of course, to build up the commerce of Cuba. Third, there are millions of dollars that have gone into Cuba buying up plantations, cheap lands, and with large syndicates formed, are seeking to make fortunes out of the sugar industry. Then, again, there are Americans over there with vast sums of money in various enterprises who are all anxious for this. Then, again, the Cubans themselves who have the capital are anxious to have free-trade relations with the United States. These all touch elbows and are working together.

On the other hand, the beet-sugar industry of the United States and the cane-sugar industry are fighting most vigorously against any reduction. The beet-sugar industry has developed to a wonderful extent, and so much so in the States of California, Colorado, Nebraska, Wisconsin, and Michigan that the delegations from those States have their faces set vigorously, firmly, and most determinedly against any reduction, their contention being that for the first time in the history of the country the farmer finds a direct interest in protection. They stand upon the doctrine of protection. The Secretary of Agriculture tells me that every acre of land in Iowa is capable of raising the sugar beet, and this is true of every State throughout the West and in the Mississippi Valley.

Now, in regard to my own position. You have accepted the lies sent out by the press, which is being manipulated in the interest of free trade with Cuba. I have never expressed an opinion against doing something, whatever we possibly can, to strengthen the hand of Cuba. I have stood side by side with the President and the Ways and Means Committee trying to devise some plan to do this without injuring the farmers of our own country and at the same time give encouragement to Cuba. The contention is brought to us from our own people that we have shed blood and money enough for Cuba, now an independent government, so to speak, without slaughtering the farming interests of our own country, and the most intense feeling exists.

I doubt if, with all the combined influence we have to bring to bear, we can dislodge or change the views of the States that I have named, that are operating in the beet-sugar industry, with sufficient force to carry the House. It may be that we can hit upon some other plan and harmonize matters, but I beg of a man of your intelligence and experience not to accept the flying reports and dispatches sent out and stimulated by the concrete organization, as I have indicated, who, indifferent to our own farming interests in this country, want to break down all the barriers between us and Cuba.

Representative EDGAR D. CRUMPACKER, of Indiana, in a recent able article on the subject in the Chicago Tribune, hit the nail on the head when he characterized the pending proposition as "crazy-quilt reciprocity." I quote him also, as follows:

We might grant concessions upon lines where we can not produce enough for our own consumption, such as sugar. It is insisted in many quarters that we should make substantial reductions of the tariff in favor of Cuban sugar out of considerations of benevolence as well as of business. Let us see what the result would be: Suppose we produce one-sixth of the sugar we consume and Cuba could produce three-sixths. If we should reduce the tariff on the Cuban importation, say, 25 per cent, it would take \$10,000,000 a year out of the Federal Treasury, and who would get it? The Cuban sugar grower. The Cuban importation and our own production would supply only two-thirds of the demand, and the price of all would be fixed by the cost of the other third, which would have to pay full tariff. It is an incontestable law of economics that the price of a commodity is fixed by that part of it which is necessary to supply the demand and which is produced at the greatest cost.

A reduction of the tariff on Cuban sugar of \$10,000,000 a year would not cheapen sugar a farthing to the American consumer, but it would take that amount out of the people's Treasury each year and put it into the pockets of the Cuban sugar producer. In order to cheapen the cost to the consumer the tariff upon the entire importation must be reduced, and that would be of no special benefit to Cuba. We can not help Cuba by special tariff reductions upon her sugar product, except at the direct expense of our own people.

But we are told that Cuba might buy more of our flour, bacon, etc. If she did it would be because we took the \$10,000,000 a year out of the Treasury and gave it to her sugar growers. It would have all the objectionable features of an export bounty without its chief virtue, for the bounty would be paid to the foreigner, and at the same time we would likely lose a market for twice as much in Germany and other countries on account of the discrimination. Is it a sound permanent policy to materially reduce the tariff upon a portion only of an imported commodity necessary for our consumption? Is it just to the millions of American consumers and taxpayers?

Any reciprocity arrangement that lets into our markets on special terms only a portion of a necessary commodity simply takes out of the Treasury so much money and puts it into the pocket of the importer without cheapening the commodity to the consumer a particle.

This crazy-quilt hit-and-miss reciprocity is illogical and unnatural, and is not the policy the late President spoke of in his magnificent address at Buffalo. Our reciprocity policy ought to be upon the broad foundation of principle and permanency. Wherever we can make concessions without material injury to home industries and home labor we ought to do so in the interest of foreign trade, but all concessions should be general. They should apply to all foreign countries alike, where our interests are given equal consideration. If any country discriminates against us, we should promptly and vigorously retaliate.

I respectfully call your attention further to the following declarations of the Republican party as expressed in its national campaign book of 1900:

[Republican Campaign Text-Book, 1900, p. 152.]

The first thought which came to the minds of the farmers, when the events following the war for the liberation of Cuba brought under our control certain tropical areas, was whether or not the possession or control of tropical territory by the United States would injure, or perhaps destroy, the opportunities which they believed they had almost within their grasp for supplying the \$100,000,000 worth of sugar which the people of the United

States annually consume. This fear—if it reached the stage in which it could be called by that name—was answered in the negative by the Republican party when it passed the Porto Rican bill. The Democratic party fought with all of its power to prevent the enactment of that measure which placed a duty upon articles coming into the United States from Porto Rico.

That duty was small, but it was an explicit declaration by the Republican party that it proposed to retain the power to fix such tariff as it might deem judicious against the products of cheap tropical labor, wherever located and under whatever conditions. In other words it was a distinct promise to the farmer that he need not fear that the Republican party would permit the cheap labor and cheap sugar of any tropical territory to be brought in in a manner which would destroy the infant industry of beet-sugar production which the farmers of the United States have, under the fostering care of the Republican party, been building up during the last few years. The farmers of the temperate zone can produce beet sugar successfully in competition with the sugar cane of the Tropics when both are handled by free labor, and this advantage which the farmer of the temperate zone has will be strengthened in the United States so long as the Republican party retains its control and is enabled to apply the protective principle in the interests of its farmers, as it did in the case of the Porto Rican bill, but against which the Democrats turned their every energy. With a few years of moderate protection against the cheap labor of the Tropics the beet-sugar industry in the United States will be placed fairly and squarely upon its feet, and will be fully able to contend with the cane-sugar industry of the Tropics, while meantime the improved condition of labor in the Tropics, and the opportunities for better earnings which the guidance of the United States will give them, will more nearly equalize the two systems of production.

One further fact in regard to the world's production and producing capacity is worthy of consideration in this connection, and that is that nearly one-half of the sugar now being imported into the United States comes from the islands of the Pacific. The total importation of sugar into the United States in the twelve months ending June, 1900, amounted to 4,018,000,000 pounds, and of this amount 1,756,000,000 pounds were from the East Indies, the Hawaiian Islands, and the Philippine Islands, thus indicating the possibilities of our Pacific territory to supply that portion of our consumption which it will be necessary to import until the farmers of the country are able to supply the home demand; and thus, instead of sending to other countries and other peoples the \$100,000,000 per year which we have been annually expending for foreign-grown sugar it may be expended under the American flag and in a manner which will benefit the people of those islands and incidentally those of our own people who may enter upon business enterprises in them.

I wish also to call attention to the following letter from Prof. C. F. Curtiss, B. Agr., M. S. A., who is the director and professor of agriculture in the Iowa Agricultural College, and one of the leading agricultural authorities and experts of the United States:

AMES, IOWA, September 11, 1900.

MR. EDWARD C. POST,  
Secretary Farmers' Cooperative Beet Sugar Company, Dundee, Mich.

DEAR SIR: I have your esteemed favor, and in reply beg to say that the following quotation from the National Sugar Beet Grower is correct: "During the past summer I had an opportunity of observing the industry as it exists in Germany, the locality from which so much of our import sugar comes. I had heard of high-priced lands, high rents, and expensive fertilizers, and I was a little incredulous about some of it, but I went out over the farms in the vicinity of Magdeburg and found that the best sugar-beet lands in the most favored localities were valued at \$800 to \$900 per acre, that ground rents were from \$20 to \$25 per acre, and that the beet grower was compelled to pay out \$12 to \$15 per acre in addition for commercial fertilizers. This seems like an enormous outlay, and, indeed, it is, and the land that commanded this rental, I am prepared to say is no better in any way, and will produce no more beets or no better beets than the best lands of northern Iowa and adjoining territory."—*National Sugar Beet Grower*.

I personally investigated these conditions in Germany last year and found them to be as reported in the above. I feel confident that the sugar industry is destined to occupy a permanent place in agriculture.

Very truly, yours,

C. F. CURTISS.

Give to the American farmer an opportunity to enhance his lands to the value of German lands, as he can do if given an opportunity. Think of the increased wealth in this country by so doing. Give to him the blessings of rural free delivery, telephones, and enlarged facilities by the building of electric railways, and you have transformed his life from one of monotony and dreary toil to one of broader mental activity and awakened interest in agricultural developments, which will tend to make farm life more attractive and lucrative.

Better still, you will have kept our young men and women at home on the farm and away from the villages and cities, where many of them go in pursuit of happiness and better employment, only to meet disappointment and defeat.

In view of all the past utterances of the prominent leaders of the party, of which the above are only short random samples, how can any Republican support this pending measure?

But some have taunted us with the statement that the sugar-beet industry has not made very rapid progress. It certainly has since 1896, for there are to-day in this country more than 40 factories. Michigan last year, with her 13 factories, produced 75 per cent of all the sugar that she consumed; and it is confidently hoped that during this present year her output will be sufficient to supply all of her consumption.

I point you to the progress of this industry in France and some other countries. Marggraf, an eminent Prussian chemist, gave to the world his discovery of sugar in the beet and kindred roots in a paper read before the Berlin Academy of Science in 1747. No practical results followed, however, for a generation. It remained for Napoleon, after the British had blockaded France, to make a practical test of the beet-sugar discovery and to establish it firmly in his country; and this is the greatest monument the victor of Marengo and Austerlitz left to his distracted countrymen and the world.

The struggle by which France produced beet sugar was a long and at times a discouraging one. But she won, and to-day is an exporter of beet sugar. This she has done by protecting the industry; and besides accomplishing this great result, she furnishes her people a better grade of sugar at less cost than consumers had paid for imported sugar. There were other and great results from the establishment of the beet-sugar industry in France, as there will be in this country. The soil, mellowed and fertilized by the beet, produces more wheat; the residuum of the sugar mills feeds more cattle than the same lands formerly sustained, while labor finds in the sugar factory remunerative employment.

Not only in France but in other foreign countries has this industry been zealously guarded until to-day it assumes monstrous proportions, and it should not be allowed to compete with our new and infant industry, at least not until the industry shall have been given an opportunity to gain a foothold and be firmly planted in this country. There are to-day in France 368 sugar-beet factories, in Germany 403, in Russia 226, in Austria-Hungary 213, in Belgium 121, in Holland 30, in Spain 15, and in Sweden 10. So we have only to encourage this industry, as we have many others in this country, under the wise and protective policy of the Republican party, and it will be but a few years more until we shall be able to raise the beets and manufacture all the sugar that we consume in this country. [Applause.]

In all parts of the United States the beet-sugar industry is still in its infancy, and this is emphatically the case as regards the industry in Michigan.

The gentleman from Kansas [Mr. LONG] has sought, in an able speech of more than two hours, to demonstrate the benefits of reciprocal trade relations between Cuba and the United States, and has endeavored to show what our trade with that country would be worth to the farmer in the sale of his flour, meats, and other products. I call your attention to the fact that the reciprocal commercial agreement with Spain, with relation to Cuba and Porto Rico, went into effect on September 1, 1891, and terminated on August 27, 1894, being in force almost exactly three years. The fiscal years 1892, 1893, and 1894, though not corresponding precisely with the above-named period, correspond sufficiently for the purposes of comparison.

Imports of merchandise from Cuba to the United States and exports of merchandise from the United States to Cuba, for the fiscal years 1892, 1893, and 1894 were as follows:

	1892.	1893.	1894.
Imports .....	\$77,931,671	\$78,706,506	\$75,678,261
Exports .....	17,953,570	24,157,698	20,125,321
Total .....	95,885,241	102,864,204	95,803,582

These figures show what has been done, and what can be reasonably hoped to be done, under reciprocity with Cuba. It will be seen that even in the most favorable year, 1893, under the reciprocal arrangement, we exported to Cuba goods valued at only a little more than \$24,000,000. On the other hand, there were imported into the United States during the year 1891 4,670,000,000 pounds of sugar, at a cost of about \$115,000,000. Now we are asked to throw off a part of the duty on sugar, in favor of Cuba, on the plea that we shall make up all the difference and save all that we pay out for foreign sugar by means of the immense increase in exports from this country to Cuba which would result from the new arrangement.

Judging from our past experience, it will be a long while before our exports to Cuba, which were less than \$25,000,000 during the year 1893, under our last reciprocal commercial agreement with Spain, will amount to the \$115,000,000 which we are annually sending abroad for sugar, and which we have promised the people we would try to keep at home by the building up of industries in this country.

While we are on the subject of commercial statistics it will be appropriate for me to quote a few facts and figures from recent official statements by our Treasury Department and the insular division of the War Department, showing that Cuba is not in such dire financial straits after all, and that she has been prospering better during the few years of her independence than the United States did for many decades. During the ten months ending October 31, 1900, Cuba imported in round numbers \$55,000,000 worth of goods and exported \$41,000,000 worth. In the corresponding eight months ending October 31, 1901, Cuba's imports were \$54,000,000 and her exports \$56,000,000, showing a balance of trade in her favor in the third year of her national existence. This is certainly a most remarkable showing, especially as compared with the record of the United States, which showed a balance of trade against us in all but fifteen years previous to 1874, the average annual adverse balance of trade being upward of \$120,000,000.

The record of the Cuban government receipts is equally striking, showing, as it does, that during the last two years they were almost as great as were the average receipts of the United States Government during the first seventy-five years of our national existence.

I quote from a recent official statement in regard to this matter, as follows:

*Cuban revenues.*

Receipts.	1900.	1901.
Customs .....	\$16,068,035.90	\$15,945,666.42
Postal .....	258,237.17	367,950.28
Internal .....	884,783.29	658,535.92
Miscellaneous .....	174,848.99	182,736.96
Total .....	17,385,905.35	17,154,939.58

UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT RECEIPTS.  
[1790 to 1863—seventy-four years.]

Total net ordinary receipts of the United States Government  
1790 to 1863—seventy-four years..... \$1,744,021,185  
Average net annual receipts..... 23,567,866

These comparative figures show that once Cuba is launched as an independent government she will have no difficulty in meeting her expenses, and will not need to ask favors of Uncle Sam or of anybody else.

The fact is that Cuba has not sought relief since we freed her from the Spanish yoke. Those who are begging for favors are the same old Spaniards we dragged off the Cubans, their numbers being augmented with representatives of the sugar trust and other Americans who have acquired enormous sugar plantations on the island.

In fact, of the 16 witnesses who pleaded the Cuban cause before the Committee on Ways and Means, 5 were Spanish owners of extensive sugar plantations, 3 were Americans interested with the sugar trust in Cuban sugar plantations covering 98,000 acres, 4 were sugar trust representatives, 2 represented New York exchanges, 1 was a civil engineer, and 1 was the collector of the port of Habana.

The Cuban was noticeable only by his absence.

In this connection it will be remembered that the American Beet Sugar Association sent a petition to the Committee on Ways and Means last February, in which petition the American Cane Growers' Association joined, asking for the appointment of a special committee to visit Cuba for the sake of examining and ascertaining the real facts of the situation there. This petition challenged General Wood's statement that the average cost of the production of sugar in Cuba was not less than 2 cents per pound and contended that it had been proved beyond controversy that said cost was not over 1½ cents per pound. The petitioners argued from this that Cuba was now raising and selling sugar at a profit, so that the proposed reduction of our tariff in her favor had no possible justification. It would have been no more than just to have granted this petition, and any such investigation as proposed therein would no doubt have proved the contention of the petitioners. [Applause.]

Before I close I desire to emphasize the bitter war which is being waged against the beet-sugar industry at the instance and in the interest of the sugar trust by a number of editorial comments and statements, culled from a large number of the leading journals of the United States, of all parties, Republican as well as Democratic, and of all other shades of political opinion. These extracts show plainly that the intelligent and patriotic press of the country has become fully aroused upon this question. They show how the trust is endeavoring to ruin the beet-sugar industry, how it fears its home rival, how the success of the trust will lead to higher prices, and how the war by the trust on beet sugar has been now transferred to Washington. Yes, gentlemen, I do not hesitate to say that the sugar trust has had its headquarters in the national capital all the past winter and is encamped here even now, exerting its malign influence to the utmost of its power. I call attention to the following pertinent extracts:

The reduction is a blow aimed directly at the beet-sugar interests of the country.—*New York Journal of Commerce.*

War to the knife with the Colorado beet-sugar refiners was declared to-day by the American Sugar Refining Company. The object is to deal a blow to the beet-sugar manufacturers in their own territory.—*Chicago Tribune (Republican).*

The cut recently made is designed to cripple the beet-sugar manufacturers.—*Denver Republican (Republican).*

Threats have been made that sugar prices will be sent down within a few days to a point that will bring the purveyors of the beet product to their knees.—*Chicago Chronicle (Democratic).*

The sugar trust has finally come out openly against the beet-sugar industry.—*Portland Oregonian (Republican).*

It is a means to fighting the beet-sugar producers.—*Sioux City Tribune (Democratic).*

Have they started this war with the object of demoralizing the beet-sugar industry.—*Lansing Journal (Democratic).*

It is a struggle of home industries, backed by millions of people, against a mercenary, soulless corporation with millions of money.—*Denver Times (Republican).*

The trust is trying to keep down the beet-sugar manufacturers that are being started all over the land.—*Peoria Journal.*

The trust is prepared to make a very considerable sacrifice in order to break down the beet-sugar industry, which stands in the way of its scheme to secure the free admission of raw Cuban sugar.—*Omaha Bee (Republican).*

The piratical sugar trust has declared war of extermination on the beet-sugar industry of the West.—*Denver Times (Republican).*

The sugar trust appears to have determined that, within the limits of its power to prevent it, no one but itself shall enjoy the benefit of the protection which American law gives to the sugar business.—*Lansing State Republican*.

The sugar trust is prosecuting its war on the beet-sugar industry with a vigor which plainly denotes a determination to destroy that industry if possible.—*Des Moines Farmers' Tribune*.

The sugar trust is bent upon the ruin of this new home industry.—*Denver Times (Republican)*.

The last move of the sugar trust against the beet-sugar producers is a demonstration of the fear it has of the new industry.—*Denver News (Independent)*.

The output of beet sugar has become sufficiently large to interfere with its (the trust's) desire to control the sugar market of the United States.—*Leavenworth Times (Republican)*.

There could be no surer indication of the increasing importance of the beet-sugar industry in this country than the war which the American Sugar Refining Company has declared on the makers of beet sugar.—*Syracuse Journal (Republican)*.

The trust fears that a rival may grow up in beet sugar which will wax as strong as itself, a situation incompatible for a trust.—*Portland Oregonian (Republican)*.

It is this development which has alarmed the Havemeyer interests and led it to enter upon a campaign for the annihilation of the beet-sugar refineries.—*Minneapolis Journal (Republican)*.

The trust sees in the rapid development of this (sugar beet) industry a competitor which must be destroyed if possible.—*Philadelphia Record (Democratic)*.

The laws will protect the beet-sugar growers and manufacturers until they can supply the home demand for sugar and enter into competition for the sugar trade of the world.—*Des Moines State Register (Republican)*.

The trust has been keeping more closely in touch with the development of the beet-sugar business than has anybody else, and has plainly reached the point where it is alarmed.—*Sioux City Tribune (Democratic)*.

Apparently the intention is to force the producers of beet sugar to sell their raw product to the trust.—*Chicago Tribune (Republican)*.

The trust has made a standing offer to the beet-sugar producers to take the raw product off their hands at the regular raw-sugar price.—*Chicago Post (Independent)*.

It (the trust) is fighting for monopoly within the usual methods, cutting prices in order to ruin the beet-sugar refiners, after which it hopes to fix prices to suit its own convenience.—*Chicago Tribune (Republican)*.

Its (the trust's) sole object, aim, and purpose is to crush out a rival industry in order that the stockholders and managers of the sugar trust may reap greater profit.—*Denver Republican*.

Should this warfare prove successful, every ounce of sugar that sweetens the poor man's tea would be at the absolute dictation of monopoly.—*Quincy Herald (Democratic)*.

The sugar war is spreading out to envelop Congress and to make of Cuba—its annexation or its admission to reciprocity with the United States—the ground of a most bitter industrial and political struggle.—*Springfield Republican (Independent)*.

The trust will doubtless make common cause with the Cuban sugar raisers in their warfare against the claims of the beet interests of the West.—*Boston Transcript (Independent)*.

The trust is trying to procure from Congress a change in the tariff which will admit raw sugar free or nearly free of duty.—*Denver News (Independent)*.

They (the trust) will attempt in some way to bring the product in free of duty, perhaps, from Cuba or some of our colonies.—*Colorado Springs Gazette (Republican)*.

The trust will come before Congress this winter with a proposition to admit crude cane sugar free.—*Peoria Journal*.

The trust has declared itself in favor of admitting Cuba raw sugar free and retaining the duty on refined. Under such a policy the domestic sugar industry would be destroyed and the trust would secure complete and absolute control of the American market. If it can now seriously cripple the beet-sugar industry and discourage its further development, it may achieve its object.—*Omaha Bee (Republican)*.

The trust first demanded free sugar from Cuba, then a reduction of 75 per cent, 50 per cent, 33 per cent, 25 per cent, and, finally, at the present writing, has reduced its demands to a 20 per cent reduction on tariffs on Cuban imports. Even this reduction to Cuba would yield the trust a trifle over \$3,000,000 extra profits annually with which to fight the home beet-sugar interests, and would not aid Cuba in the least, for there is no way in which she can force a demand for it, and it is hardly to be presumed that the trust will voluntarily turn it over to her. The purpose of the trust being perfectly obvious, there can be no doubt Congress will refuse to play into its hands by making such tariff concessions on Cuban raw sugar as would operate to the injury of, and perhaps ultimately destroy, the domestic industry.—*Philadelphia Record (Democratic)*.

Congress can ill afford to establish the policy of reducing the present rate of duty by reciprocity, or in any other way, which would have the certain effect of enriching the trust on one hand, and on the other the killing of the most promising industry in the agricultural business of America.—*Los Angeles Express (Republican)*.

It would be unfair to the beet-sugar interests of the United States to do anything in the way of tariff reductions that would give not only the Cuban growers, but also the American refiners of cane sugar, a further advantage in the cost of production.—*Milwaukee Wisconsin (Republican)*.

To conclude a reciprocity agreement with Cuba so as to admit her products into destructive competition with similar products of home growth is opposed to the policy expressed by both Presidents, and is not reflected in the doctrine of the Republican party in this manner. No such agreements are in accord with the spirit of section 4 of the Dingley bill. Adhesion to that declaration is all that home-protected interests demand, and that demand is justified. On the pledge of the Dingley bill the people invested heavily in these industries. Under it vast acreages have been redeemed to profitable cultivation and the development of the richest lands of America. Under that guaranty towns and cities have been built up, great communities founded, and countless fortunes been invested, while millions of men and women have entered upon employments dependent upon such industries. To cast all these down would be little less than criminal.—*Sacramento Record-Union (Republican)*.

It is undeniable that partial reduction of the duty on sugar to Cuba alone is a gift to the sugar-refining interest without any compensation to consumers of sugar in reduction of price. The American people are sure to be impatient of this. They endured the same thing for a long time in the case of Hawaii, but the amount of sugar involved was small and the American market affected was local. Here is a gift of five or six million dollars to a large manufacturing interest, which is considered to be sufficiently prosperous, although it conceals its profits carefully. There is certain to be a demand for a compensating reduction in the tariff on refined sugar.—*Minneapolis Tribune (Republican)*.

The sugar trust is playing for a high stake. It stands to win probably

\$5,000,000 if it can secure a 25 per cent reduction, and it can well afford the few thousands which it costs to send cablegrams from Cuba and to scatter letters and appeals throughout the United States.—*Newport Herald (Independent)*.

The sugar trust's cunning is limited only by the capacity of human brains to invent. It is behind the sanctimonious appeals for justice and favor for Cuba. It is inspiring the pleas for sympathy for the Cubans. It is working the reciprocity game for all there is in it. It is also instigating a large proportion of the manufactured demands for tariff revision.—*Denver Times (Republican)*.

The sugar trust does not benefit the people of this country. Its product comes from foreign countries in the raw state and is refined in this country; hence their anxiety to obtain raw sugar free of duty.—*Fremont News (Independent)*.

Congress will make a great mistake, we believe, if, at the demand of the sugar trust, it reduces the duty on raw sugar. Just at present the trust is working through the emotions of the Congressmen.—*Peoria Journal*.

Just now they have the proof that the trust is attempting to crush the beet-sugar manufacturers of this country, and will doubtless succeed if the tariff on sugar is reduced. Congress and the people should stand by the sugar producers of the nation, for only a few more years will be required to make that business as safe as the making of steel rails and tin plate, both of which the free traders insisted could not be manufactured in the United States.—*Des Moines State Register (Republican)*.

The president of the National Sugar Refining Company, who appeared before the committee to testify in favor of the concessions, frankly admitted that free sugar from Cuba, or anything approximating it, would entirely destroy the American sugar industry. There are 25,000,000 acres of land on the island available for sugar culture, of which only 300,000 acres are under cultivation. Under the impetus of tariff concession this acreage would rapidly be increased, and eventually, the committee feels certain, the result would be disastrous for the sugar business at home.—*Washington correspondence of Chicago Journal (Independent)*.

The movement for free raw sugar would attract little attention if it were not backed by the sugar trust. That great organization has been dictating rates on sugar ever since it came into existence. Its influence at Washington has always been great enough to get all, or nearly all, that it desired in the way of duties on sugar. Every tariff bill before Congress has been held up until the trust was satisfied, or at least placated. In the act of 1890 it got free raw sugar, but a bounty was paid to the domestic producer. Free raw sugar had afterwards to yield to the demand of the revenue, but the trust got what differential rates it demanded. Now that there is again a surplus of revenue, the trust is again in the field for free material and is making promises that it does not intend to keep about cheap sugar to the consumer.—*Louisville Courier-Journal (Democratic)*.

Whenever the sugar trust comes in the disguise of a philanthropist, the American people may well have their suspicions aroused. At present the trust is sending out computations to show that the consumers are paying a great many extra millions for their sugar by reason of the present tariff, and that the duties on raw sugar should be abolished. The trust's present attitude is in striking contrast with its position during the discussion of the Dingley bill in Congress. At that time the trust moved heaven and earth to have the tariff duties retained, awful scandals attended its work in the lobbies, and the reputations of several Senators were involved. Everybody knows what the disinterested work of the sugar trust means. It aims at the destruction of the sugar-beet industry, the only rival that has up to this time given it any concern. If the trust were sincere in its professed desire to lighten the burdens of the consumer, it would insist upon Congress removing the tariff on the refined product also, that the sugar of European countries might have a larger market here. But it would fight such a proposition, of course. It does not want more rivals. It wants to get rid of the only competitor that it now has in order to clinch its hold on the sugar trade of this country.—*Indianapolis News (Independent)*.

The following article from the Los Angeles Herald, on this subject, is conceived in such a novel spirit and written in such a graphic style that it is well worth quoting entire:

#### TEN THOUSAND MILES OF SUGAR.

It is difficult for the mind fully to comprehend the statement that the United States is annually importing about 2,000,000 tons of sugar. The thought instantly occurs, of course, that the figures represent a mountain of sweetness. The American mind, with its aptness for reducing things to cash valuation, sees at once that there would be "millions in it" if the United States could produce all its own sweet goods. But does anybody stop to figure out that aggregate sugar importation, so that the mind may readily grasp its magnitude? Glance at this object lesson.

One net ton—2,000 pounds—is a fair 2-horse wagonload on average country roads. Team and wagon in the road require approximately 25 feet of longitudinal room, allowing for a little margin, if other teams are in line. Now, load up that 2,000,000 tons of sugar, with one ton to each wagon, and start a procession from Los Angeles eastward to—where?

Four of the sugar turn-outs would reach 100 feet; 40 of them would cover 1,000 feet; 200 of them would extend almost a mile—call it a mile for concession in figuring. Then, 2,000 of them would reach eastward 10 miles; 20,000 would extend 100 miles; 200,000 would cover 1,000 miles, and 2,000,000 would stretch out 10,000 miles!

Ten thousand miles of sugar the United States is importing every year, when every pound of it might be produced at home. The line is even longer than the figures indicate, in fact, because bulk sugar is marketed in gross tons of 2,240 pounds. That adds 12 per cent to the total weight and extends our sweet procession in like proportion. With that addition the sugar line reaches 11,200 miles, nearly half the circumference of the earth.

Is it worth while to fight for the domestic production of that sugar or shall we continue to import it every year? That issue is involved in the present effort of the sugar trust to crush the beet-sugar industry? California alone is capable of producing every pound of sugar in that 12,000-mile procession. We may in time produce a large part of it, at least, if the sugar trust fails in its purpose. If the trust wins, however, good-by to our sugar-producing prospects and to cheaper sugar for American consumers.

#### [Applause.]

It would seem as though every true American's heart would swell with pride and joy in contemplating the magnificent future of the beet-sugar industry of the United States if its progress is not impeded by such adverse legislation as that which is now contemplated. On this point there is no better authority than our present well-informed Secretary of Agriculture, Hon. James Wilson. He has expressed his opinions in regard to the matter most positively and convincingly. In a recent statement by the Secretary he pointed out that the growth of the sugar-beet industry

had alarmed the sugar trust to such an extent that it was disposed to spend a large amount of money in opposition to the further development of the home industry. The Secretary said that he was not at all surprised at this, and added:

It would no doubt be very profitable to the members of the trust if they could destroy this new industry that promises to supply home demands within a reasonable number of years, but I think their efforts will be in vain. Our people are gradually learning the value of the by-products of the sugar-beet factories, and as soon as they fully comprehend these opposition from any quarter will be entirely in vain.

Mr. Wilson went on to state that the Department of Agriculture "has been well satisfied for some time that it is only a question of time when all the sugar used in America can be made within the States of the Union." Continuing, he said he believed also that "the time will come when none of the islands of the sea will be able to produce sugar as cheaply as it can be produced in connection with diversified agriculture in the prairie States of the Northwest." Secretary Wilson proceeded to elaborate his ideas on the subject in a most interesting and instructive manner, showing conclusively that he had good and sufficient reasons for prophesying the grand results to be expected from the development of this industry in the United States. His investigations, he said, had proved to his satisfaction that any one of the States of Michigan, Illinois, Indiana, Iowa, and Nebraska could produce from beets all the sugar needed in the United States. I quote from him as follows:

It will not be necessary in the United States, where sugar beets are grown, to fertilize the lands. Under a system of rotation, which can be practiced profitably, the lands of the Mississippi Valley can produce a crop of beets once in four or five years without detriment to the soil. It is only a question of time when the dairymen of the United States will discover that the by-product of the sugar mill is valuable for all domestic animals. In foreign countries it is even fed to horses. It will take the place with the Western dairymen of bran from the wheat mills and by-products from the oil mills, glucose factories, etc. The water will be pressed out of the pulp very soon, and, in fact, it is now being done in California, and the farmer will haul home the cake when he takes beets to the factory. The by-product contains all the elements of nutrition the domestic animal requires. Taking the sugar from the beet really reduces its feeding quality but little, because the animal gets all the carbonaceous matter it requires in its fodder.

About three years ago we had some 30,000 tons of beet sugar produced in the United States, two years ago about 55,000 tons, a year ago about 82,000 tons, and this year we will have something like 200,000. The following table shows an estimate of sugar-beet production in 1901, made by experts who have been watching the sugar beet development, and is particularly interesting:

*Estimated beet-sugar production, 1901.*

California.....	Tons.	80,000
Michigan.....		60,000
Colorado.....		20,000
Utah.....		15,000
Nebraska.....		7,000
New York.....		7,000
Wisconsin.....		3,000
Minnesota.....		2,000
Washington.....		2,000
Oregon.....		2,000
Total.....		198,000
<i>Cane sugar.</i>		
Southern States.....		300,000
Porto Rico.....		100,000
Hawaii.....		300,000
Total.....		700,000

It is eminently wise for the farmer to grow beets and sell sugar, because he only disposes of something that comes from the atmosphere, for the pulp is fed to the dairy cow, and everything taken from the soil is restored to the soil, and there is no deterioration whatever. It will not be many years before all the money now paid foreigners for agricultural products of all kinds, including sugar, will be kept at home.

The committee on statistics of the Michigan Sugar Manufacturers' Association in a recent report to the association furnished some striking and suggestive considerations which it would be well for the people of the United States to ponder. Among these considerations are the following: The beet-sugar industry in Michigan is carried on at present by 13 companies, with a daily capacity of 6,600 tons and a total investment of \$7,700,000. The number of acres of beets harvested in the State last year was 66,400, yielding to the farmers \$3,107,520. The number of laborers employed was about 30,000 on the farms and nearly 3,000 in the factories. The development of the industry in Michigan has greatly stimulated the manufacture of agricultural tools and machinery suitable for the cultivation of beets, and also the manufacture of American sugar machinery for the factories.

The report points out this interesting distinction, namely, that when the sugar trust buys and imports its raw sugar from other countries, and then refines it, the laborers employed by the trust get about 15 cents for refining every hundred pounds, and that is all they do get, because the labor required in producing the raw sugar is performed by foreign workmen in foreign countries; whereas the beet-sugar manufacturers of this country pay the farmers and other laborers both for the raw sugar and for the refined to the amount of about \$2.50 for every hundred pounds, and the difference between 15 cents and \$2.50 is the measure of the advantage to labor in this country from the development of

the beet-sugar industry as compared with the industry of the sugar trust. [Applause.]

As for the future of the industry in Michigan, I will add that four more companies besides the thirteen already alluded to will be in full operation this coming year, making the total daily capacity for next season about 9,000 tons, with a total investment of at least \$10,500,000. It is expected that Michigan will grow next summer very nearly, if not quite, 1,000,000 tons of beets and produce very nearly 200,000,000 pounds of granulated sugar, or an increase of over 50 per cent above the output of the last year. As the committee's report says, "This is a startling showing, but the rate of increase is no greater than it has been ever since the inauguration of the industry in Michigan four years ago." Besides the four new companies just mentioned, there are four other companies that have been organized in the State and are awaiting the action of Congress before going any further. The projects of these companies will be abandoned if the sugar tariff is reduced.

So far as the country at large is concerned, the annual consumption of sugar in the United States is now considerably above 2,500,000 tons and will probably reach 4,000,000 tons by the year 1910. This immense amount of sugar can be easily grown and furnished at home if no unfavorable legislation intervenes. If this statement appears at all wild, let it not be forgot that Europe, which has a much smaller area of land suitable for beet cultivation than the United States, produces annually 6,000,000 tons of beet sugar. Viewed in the light of this fact, the ability of the United States to produce its own sugar must appear much more practicable even to the most incredulous.

It all depends, Mr. Chairman and gentlemen, upon what is done in regard to the tariff. If the tariff is allowed to remain as it is, this glorious future of the American sugar-beet industry is absolutely assured. If the tariff is removed or reduced, this most promising and beneficial industry will be cut down instantly, like summer flowers beneath the first killing frost of autumn. Can this great deliberative body hesitate a moment as to what its conduct should be in regard to this very serious and important matter? I for one will not believe that the Congress of the United States will vote to strike down this new American industry so fraught with benefit and profit to the whole country in opposition to the time-honored principles of the dominant party, in violation of the dictates of patriotism and common sense, and at the behest and dictation of the sugar trust.

A word to the little band of faithful followers, who from the first have been actuated by a devotion to principle, and I am done. Let us present an unbroken front and the victory will yet be ours. Our numbers have been depleted, and many have been convinced against their will and better judgment. Let us stand upon that bed-rock principle of our party—protection—and that immortal principle that all men were created free and equal, which principles together brought into being that great organization—the Republican party.

So grounded and ever inspired by considerations of justice and right to all the people, we will move confidently forward to a great and enduring triumph. [Long-continued applause.]

#### MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES.

The committee informally rose; and Mr. DALZELL having taken the chair as Speaker pro tempore, a message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House of Representatives by Mr. CROOK, one of his secretaries.

#### RECIPROCITY WITH CUBA.

The committee resumed its session.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Chairman, while I regard the pending measure as important in some of its bearings as affecting the revenues of Government, not very materially, however, and as extending some relief to the people of Cuba, the most interesting phase of the subject, to my mind, is that the discussion of the bill will tend to dispel the delusion, which has so constantly been kept before the people of this country for political effect and for special interests and classes, that a high scale of tariff duties has brought all the happiness and prosperity we have enjoyed in recent years, for we have now the admitted fact here brought forward and advocated by those who have so persistently made this plea that this protective scale may be lowered upon one at least of the articles of daily use by the people—the sugar they consume—without destroying the domestic industries furnishing it, thereby presenting an ultimate hope to the great toiling masses of consumers of the country that a time may come when the various manufacturing interests supplying their necessities of life can reasonably be expected to pursue their business without being specially favored and fostered by Government aid at the expense of by far the more numerous classes of the people of this country, except to the extent the aid may be given in laying a just measure of tariff duties to raise revenue for the Government.

But we can not help but note the determined character of the struggle here being made to continue this protection, persistently

claimed now as a right, by the representatives of these favored industries. They almost shed tears in their pathetic appeals for the continuance of this favoritism to their particular sections and fostered industries, that accumulated corporate wealth may flourish at the expense of the people.

Thinking that these aspects of the case are made sufficiently manifest already by the discussion, I will ask the indulgence of the House to present my views briefly upon a matter which, to my mind, is of greater consequence to the American people than any other now asking for solution at their hands.

The policy pursued by the Government and the course of events in the Philippine Islands since the treaty of Paris mark an epoch in American history, not to be noted so much for the relinquishment of sovereignty over the islands by Spain as for the influence and ultimate effects upon our own country and its institutions; not so much to be weighed by any changed condition of the unfortunate inhabitants of these remote and to us worse than useless islands if the change has done aught but bring deeper gloom to them as by the drift and tendency upon our own political moorings and destiny.

Unhappy Filipinos, borne down by ages of foreign misrule, deprived of the boon of liberty and independence, seemingly won after years of repeated toil and suffering, stricken by an unlooked-for, irresistible hand, alluringly held out in apparent friendship and protection, when all your hopes and struggles for freedom appeared at successful termination, how doubly visited by a fate of adversity, an endless gloom of oppression!

It is well remembered how the negotiations of that treaty lingered; how it was soon known that Spanish authority would be withdrawn from Cuba, and Porto Rico ceded to us—conditions justified by the circumstances and approved by our people; how, when near the close of the treaty, the realization was first brought to our country that a cession of these Asiatic islands was to be forced upon Spain.

This result was not expected by the people of the United States, nor generally approved by them, but they awaited the course of events with feelings of uncertainty and apprehension. But little did they know the fateful consequences that were to follow. The event was of far-reaching, momentous importance; not, indeed, that the political power of one of the old monarchies of the world was to be removed, for Great Britain once before, in 1762, wrested these possessions from Spain, and after holding them two years, and finding them worthless, restored them by treaty; but the great and vital importance was that Spanish dominion over these distant territories was to be forever parted with at the mandate of the only nation of all ages founded upon principles of liberty and self-government, upon a solemn declaration on our part in the beginning that the purpose of the conflict which brought the result was to advance liberty, uplift humanity, and confer independence to those offering their lives for its blessings.

What result should have followed? What was the reasonable expectation? Why should we require this sacrifice by Spain of her ancient possessions improved by her efforts for centuries? Was it to compensate us for the cost of the war? No; for it was a coincident fact that the payment of \$20,000,000 came as a proposal from our commissioners upon demanding the cession of these islands. Was conquest the object? This was denied by our declaration and nowhere demanded by the great and generous people of this country.

No, Mr. Chairman, the motive inspiring the people of the United States had a higher purpose than paltry indemnity, useless conquest, or the acquisition of territory from a weaker adversary.

It was a motive to relieve the downtrodden—to strike the shackles of oppression from people contending for the right of self-government. And this high purpose should have been carried out by those intrusted with the Administration. There was but one rightful sequence, but one justification for the removal of Spanish power from the Philippines, and that was to confer upon the inhabitants the greatest of all political rights—that of free and independent government. The opportunity was then offered, as never before in all history, to vindicate to the world the strength, the grandeur, the beneficence, and humanity of our institutions, and recommend them to the intelligence of mankind.

To turn aside from this, our plain path of duty and sound policy, was to disregard the fundamental principles of our Government, the teachings and admonitions of its great founders, and every consideration of wisdom, peace, and safety. It was the greatest political mistake of any age. It was worse than a blunder; it was a crime.

The proposition may be laid down as easy of logical demonstration, if it is not self-evident, that the relative location of territory to that of our Union should form a controlling consideration in the question of making it a part of our national domain, whether with the consent of the inhabitants or not. No valid argument can be presented nor any just expectation entertained that islands or territory thousands of miles from our shores, not

a part even of our continent, can bring to us the unity of purpose, the same aspirations, joint efforts, and common interests that bind together the people of our States in the ties which constitute our pride in peace and bulwark in war.

If these elements of sympathy and joint interests are not to be found in the possessions and among the people to be united with us, if there is to be no cooperation in a common destiny and in public dangers, what desirable bond of union can there be? But when there is added the still greater obstacle, that of the determined opposition and hostility of this remote and numerous people, there is presented a barrier to a beneficial or peaceful union of the gravest nature, and in view of our form of Government, one that is insurmountable; especially as is the case here, when their numbers, geographical position, state of civilization, and capacity for self-government point to the conclusion that a separate nationality would be a measure of justice and an act of humanity to them—considerations which address themselves to our people as well as to the intelligence of mankind, in behalf of right and justice. For I hold the proposition as reasonable and supported by the history of the world that when these conditions to form a separate nation exist, the people possessing them, who aspire to independence, will never long submit to foreign dominion.

This is not a question of acquiring situations for commercial purposes, for coaling stations, or for military or naval operations; of taking possession of uninhabited country; of extending civilization to people incapable of governing themselves. A course of policy based on these motives and considerations is not found here. These are not the dominant questions, and when they are interwoven in the arguments in defense of this dangerous and unjust course suddenly thrust upon our people they only tend and are only meant to obscure the real purpose and objects of the advocates of military rule and force, always the first and always the greatest danger to republican institutions. There is no precedent to be found in former acquisitions of territory to our Union for this policy. It stands alone in all our history in its hideous characteristics of militarism, of useless conquest, of barbaric slaughter; of disregard of all primary principles and teachings underlying our political system, of utter and open departure from all of our former professions.

And how easy to have avoided this war—this useless waste of treasure and life. It only required a just and considerate application of the spirit of our laws, a due regard for the rights of others, sympathy for the distressed, and attention to the precepts of religion and cause of humanity. It needed only a friendly, candid, and honorable declaration by this Government that, subject to such control and occupation for peace and order as needed to protect life and property, upon the withdrawal of Spanish authority these islands should be free and independent when a stable government was established by their people, in the formation of which our Government would lend all needful assistance. Such a declaration would have been an act of the greatest wisdom and justice, of sublime duty and humanity.

But we are told that large commercial advantages will arise from our governing this archipelago rather than to allow the natives to do so themselves. How these benefits are to accrue, however, is not distinctly set forth, and in view of the admitted poverty of the people of these islands they are not made manifest, unless we shall further impoverish them by military rule and exactions, excessive taxes, or oppressive conditions imposed in trade. It must be noticed, however, that so far as our trade has increased with the country of these stricken people since our occupation, it is accounted for chiefly, if not solely, from supplying our military and naval forces there.

It is also claimed that the Filipinos are uncivilized and incapable of self-government. This is an assertion easily made and has often been the plea for oppression. It is equivalent to saying that Spanish rule has never brought advancement to its colonies, notwithstanding the building of churches, cities, institutions of learning, and all the establishments for national, religious, and educational progress. While Spain from time to time has lost her vast colonial possessions, she has always left remaining magnificent works of art, architecture, and learning—monuments to attest her power and civilization wherever she has ruled. And if Spain could not civilize these people in three hundred and seventy-five years, a mighty task indeed have we taken upon ourselves. But while portions of the inhabitants of these islands are uncivilized, the assertion is shown to be unfounded as to the classes and sections that would furnish the mental forces and energies that would control in forming and administering a government for their country. The conflicts of these people for their liberties have brought forward men of ability who have evinced to the world that they are fit and worthy to control the destinies of their country.

But if it were true that commercial benefits would result to our country by holding these islands permanently, or that their people are uncivilized, wherein moral and religious agencies might

be better applied than the sword, still these contentions are inadmissible and should not control if the structure of our institutions or considerations of sound policy should dictate that it is wrong to force our rule upon these people who once looked to us for succor, friendship, and protection.

And upon this question, which may be the turning point of our entry upon that course which has hitherto marked the destinies of nations, the experience, enlightened judgment, and patriotic sentiment of the American people must be invoked, until a final and just decision is made for the honor and for the weal or woe of this Republic.

Mr. Chairman, in all former additions of territory to our country that might affect its welfare, of Louisiana, Florida, Texas, California and New Mexico, Alaska—more especially all the first named—their fitness in our national boundary and system, that they might aid in the common advancement and national strength, weighed as the controlling considerations. They were but the natural extensions of our country, dictated by wise foresight and just policies.

So far as I am concerned, Mr. Chairman, the counsels and admonitions of those who laid the foundation of our political fabric shall be a sufficient guide. And it will be an evil day when the American people shall forget or turn aside from these warnings and teachings. The great author of our Declaration of Independence said:

Governments are instituted among men, deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed.

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

The Father of his Country said to us:

The great rule of conduct for us in regard to foreign nations is, in extending our commercial relations, to have with them as little political connections as possible. So far as we have already formed engagements, let them be fulfilled with perfect good faith. Here let us stop. \* \* \* Our detached and distant situation invites and enables us to pursue a different course. \* \* \* Why forego the advantages of so peculiar a situation? Why quit our own to stand upon foreign ground? \* \* \* In offering you, my countrymen, these counsels of an old and affectionate friend, I dare not hope they will make the strong and lasting impression I could wish—that they will control the usual current of passions or prevent our nation from running the course which has hitherto marked the destiny of nations.

In direct opposition to these teachings we now have proclaimed the uncertain and boastful doctrines, bounded by no determinate limits, of a liberal construction of our organic law; of strong, aggressive foreign policies; of making our nation a world power; of expanding our possessions to distant islands and countries for commercial purposes; of great and ever-increasing naval and military establishments.

A mission of peace to the people of the Philippine Islands will be sent from our people in the near future, I trust, bearing the message of freedom and independence for them. Let us hope that this blessing to them and honor to ourselves may not be long delayed. [Applause.]

Mr. SWANSON. Mr. Chairman, during the progress of this debate I may have said something to my friend from Georgia [Mr. BARTLETT]—I think it is possible I did—that may have been discourteous to him. I desire to say that there is no member on this floor on either side whose relations have been more intimate than those of the gentleman from Georgia and myself. We have been like two brothers. There is no man for whom I have a higher personal regard as to his patriotism, integrity, and ability than I have for him. His family and mine are as intimate as any two families in Congressional life can be. I desire to say that if I said anything that wounded his feelings or was in the least discourteous that I regret it, and I desire to disclaim to the House and through the House to him any intention to wound his feelings or to be in the remotest degree discourteous. [Applause.]

#### MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE.

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

S. R. 77. Joint resolution providing for printing the general index to published volumes of the diplomatic correspondence and foreign relations of the United States.

The message also announced that the Senate had agreed to the amendment of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 201) granting an increase of pension to Jane K. Hill.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed with amendment the bill (H. R. 13627) making appropriations to supply additional urgent deficiencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1902, and for other purposes; in which the concurrence of the House of Representatives was requested.

The message also announced that the Senate had insisted upon its amendment to the bill (H. R. 7018) for the relief of Robert J. Spottswood and the heirs of William C. McClellan, deceased, disagreed to by the House of Representatives, had agreed to the con-

ference asked by the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and had appointed Mr. PENROSE, Mr. LODGE, and Mr. CLAY as the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed without amendment bill of the following title:

H. R. 12536. An act to further amend section 2399 of the Revised Statutes of the United States.

#### RECIPROCITY WITH CUBA.

The committee resumed its session.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas is recognized for forty-five minutes.

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Chairman, this bill now offered to this Congress, stated in legal effect, means this: That America says to the independent established government of Cuba, if you will pass immigration-exclusion and contract-labor laws as restrictive as ours, the President of these United States will enter into negotiations with you, and if you will agree and bind yourself by treaty to so adjust your tariff laws as that American manufactures and products shall get admission into your territory at 20 per cent less than those of any other country on earth, then this country will agree that you can send your products into ours at 20 per cent less than the present tariff rates.

Now, as a Democrat, I can see no reason on earth why I should give my support to that bill. I see no reason, in fact, why any Republican should give his support to the bill. It is purely a Republican Administration measure, forced into this House under a party whip cracked as never before in its history, and attempted to be foisted upon the country by a combination of Republican and Democratic votes. There is no substantial reason to uphold it before the thinking and intelligent masses of this country.

It is offered under a pretended cry of relief for Cuba and moral obligation to Cuba. So far as I am concerned, I am frank to say that the action of this and the preceding Republican Administration with reference to the Philippines and the sullen silence of both while the governmental tragedy of the century is being enacted in Africa does not make me believe in its sympathy for any people anywhere. As I see it, Republican sympathy is a question of profit. It is trade wind solely. It is a mere interrogative emotion, and with Republicans the only question is, "Will it pay?" Nor do I believe that the facts justify sincere sympathy for Cuban distress.

The hearings before this committee have forced men who originally began to support this bill on the cry that Cuba was bankrupt to shift their position, and from the statement of facts take the position that it was a prophecy of the future. The hearings before the committee have demonstrated beyond question that labor is now employed and well paid in Cuba, that so far as present distress is concerned it does not exist in the islands. And I will tell you that, so far as threatened disaster is concerned, the chances are far greater for it to occur in Louisiana than in Cuba. I tell you the Cuban is not the only man who suffered by the low price of sugar. I tell you it has hurt the beet-sugar man of the West, and it has staggered the enterprise along that line in Texas and Louisiana.

I tell you if you dare assert that the Cuban can not make sugar at a profit at half the cost that it can be made in Louisiana and Texas, you simply do not know what you are talking about. I tell you that under the present price of raw sugar in the markets of the United States the Louisiana cane raiser is trembling on the verge of bankruptcy. I can call some names of those who within a year have had their plantations sold out from under them on account of their losses in the cane-sugar industry.

I tell you the distress is more threatening and imminent with them than the Cubans, and if you are going to base this matter on charity, I insist that it shall begin at home. The reasons why this is true are simple and obvious. In no part of the United States can cane be raised without replanting every two years. In Cuba it can be raised without replanting in from ten to fifteen years. It takes 1 acre of cane to plant 3 acres to get a crop, and it is easy to figure that upon that proposition the island of Cuba has 33 1/3 per cent advantage over the cane raiser in any section of the United States.

Not only that, but by reason of the soil and climatic condition more tons of cane per acre can be raised in Cuba than in any section of the United States. Not only that, but in Cuba there is a greater extraction of sugar per ton than in the United States. In Cuba they use no fertilizers, and in Louisiana this has gotten to be a considerable item of expense. In Louisiana the cost of drainage is another considerable item, and the planters are heavily taxed to maintain levees to protect the crops against high water.

Not only all this, but in Cuba there is never any danger from a freeze, while in Louisiana this is ever present, and scarcely a year passes but what the crop is to some extent injured by frosts, and some years nearly destroyed. These are the reasons why under the existing tariff law sugar production has so vastly increased in

three years in Cuba, while the growth of the industry in Louisiana and Texas has been slight. I am no protectionist, but I am frank to confess that to the limit admissible under Democratic principle so long as I am in Congress I shall remain the friend of the agriculturist and the stock raiser of this country.

They have the supreme merit in my eye of being the investors in American enterprises, and their interests are not to be compared with the American and Spanish land grabbers in Cuba, who seek to enrich themselves by investment in American and foreign enterprises, and who are hand in glove with the protected manufacturer of this country, who would filch from the consumer in both this and the Cuban market under this bill.

I am opposed to stimulating sugar production in Cuba and trust the sugar interests will prosper in this country, for it is clear that the increased sugar production in Cuba will aid no agricultural interest in this country, whereas the increase of cane acreage in this country offers a practical crop diversification in the reduction of cotton acreage, its decreased production, and a consequent increased price for cotton, the production of which now is not profitable, and but for the discovery and growth of the cottonseed industry would be ruined.

I believe the sugar tariff one of the best schedules of a tariff for revenue bill; that it produces more revenue with less injury to the toiling masses, and bears more evenly in burden in proportion to wealth than almost any article which produces any considerable revenue. When a tariff revision comes the raw materials of the South and West ought to be the last reached and the least reduced. Why not tackle and reduce the tariff on agricultural implements, barbed and smooth wire, locks, hinges, nails, and all those articles so highly protected which are essential to agricultural development, and the building of homes for the people?

I am for an honest tariff for revenue, for a revision of the present outrageous Dingley bill, so arranged as to break up and destroy the trusts and bring relief to the toiling masses. I am bitterly opposed, however, to free trade for the South and West and protection for the North and East, you may call it what you please. [Laughter and applause.] And that is the tendency of this Republican reciprocity scheme, to maintain protection in the North and East, while it seeks to broaden the markets for such protection by trading off tariff schedules on raw materials of the South and West.

I am for the old Democratic doctrine of equality in taxation, and I desire a revision of the tariff so arranged as that one section shall not be traded off for the benefit of another. Nor do I believe that the parties who would get this alleged 20 per cent reduction deserve it at our hands. Who are they? Who are these poor, distressed Cuban planters that seek a benefit of 0.34 of a cent a pound on sugar? I will tell you. All the testimony before the committee shows that at least 65 per cent of them are Spanish and American investors in an industry in a foreign country that asks us to surrender our revenues and facilitate the investment of American money under the flag of another country.

That is neither Democracy nor Republicanism, it is neither patriotism nor Americanism, and I will not support any measure that tends to throw out a life line to people who have not the nerve to plant their stuff in American soil. [Applause.] I have got no sympathy with the land grabber, whether he is in the Philippines or Cuba or Porto Rico or anywhere else.

We have lots of fine land all over this broad country, stretching from Maine to Mexico, and if you have any money and patriotism I want you to stay at home and plant it here, and keep your family here, and not invest it in Cuba, and then knock at the doors of the American Congress and ask for relief so that you can get rich and enjoy your European trips abroad. Get out, the whole brood, for I have no sympathy with such a gang. [Laughter and applause.]

Some of them have tried it, have money invested in Louisiana. I am not calling names, but I can do it. They found out that it did not pay under the existing tariff laws, and they went and invested their money in Cuba. They hid themselves away and planted it in Cuba, and I do not care if they lose every dollar of it. I would like to help do it. They deserve no consideration.

This is not attacking the bill on any party lines whatever. I want to say to you that, as a Democrat, I do not believe a single Cuban will get relief to the extent of a single nickel under this bill. I want to say to you that many Democrats are going to stand by me when I fling out what I believe to be the old flag of the Democratic party, that never trailed in the dust on the tariff issue no matter how much tattered and torn it may have been on other lines.

I understand the Democratic party contends that the consumer pays the tax. I understand that it was only the protectionist and the Republican that ever contended that the foreigner pays the tax. I can understand how the gentleman from New York [Mr. PAYNE] and the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. GROSVENOR] and the Republican leaders who have rocked its cradle—and I trust they

will live to stand by its grave—I understand how they can argue that the foreigner pays the tax, and that if you take off 34 cents you will put it in the pockets of the poor Cuban, but how a Democrat can believe that passes my comprehension.

I understand, as a Democrat, that the consumer pays the burden of the tariff tax which is put on the product that comes into this country. If that is true, then the reduction of this 20 per cent is a sham and a pretense, false from every Democratic standpoint, and ought not to receive any Democratic support. It will not get mine, I will tell you that right now. [Laughter.]

I am not going to vote for a miserable pretended policy that overturns every Democratic principle that I have fought for, whether in Congress or out of it, whether in office or out of it, since I attained my majority. [Applause.]

The true economic view, as I understand it, of tariff taxation is that it operates to interfere with the law of supply and demand—that it tends to shut out supply; and if we bar off supply, while the demand does not diminish, we increase the price; and that is why the consumer pays the tax.

Now, suppose we make this reduction of 34 cents on the 100 pounds, what would be the effect? Would the Cuban get the benefit of it? No. Why? Because it will not add a single purchaser to his present market; not one. Who buys the Cuban sugar that comes into this country now? The American sugar refiner, for purposes of profit. Will this bill add a single purchaser to the market for the Cuban crop? Not one.

Now, mark you, I admit that if this measure were to continue in operation for ten, fifteen, or twenty years, possibly it might open an inviting field to competition with the American Sugar Refining Company. Other companies might spring up, so that in the competition for the purchase of the Cuban sugar the Cuban might ultimately get more. But you fix a limit upon this thing, so that what I have just described can not possibly happen. You have so framed this measure that it applies only to the crop now in hand and the next crop. Into whose hands will the present crop go?

In my judgment it will all go to the benefit of the American Sugar Refining Company, giving only one more crop for this law to operate upon. No American capitalist will be foolish enough to start and organize another sugar refining company to become a competitor with the American Sugar Refining Company for the Cuban sugar crop. Hence the market for Cuban sugar will not be extended; the demand will not be increased; the supply will be the same. Hence the American Sugar Refining Company will purchase under the same market conditions and for the same price, and the Cubans will not get a nickel of relief. This I understand to be Democratic doctrine, hoary with age and sacred with legislative enactment.

Where, then, will the benefit from this measure go? Some say that the price of sugar in this country may be reduced, and we are urged, upon the theory that this is genuine tariff reduction, to support the measure. But, sir, there is not a man in this House who in his heart believes or who has the courage to proclaim it as a logical proposition growing out of this bill that there is to be a reduction in the price of sugar.

No one here has dared to make such a statement. The pretense here wobbles between the suggestion that this measure may give relief to the Cubans and the suggestion that it may give relief to the American consumer. But in fact there is no faith in any such relief. Gentlemen in their hearts doubt whether it will give Cubans or Americans any relief; and this proposition applies to the other side of the House just as well as this. I will not draw any party line on that proposition.

That is enough to condemn the measure—the fact that none of the experts of either party are agreed as to where the money will go, except that all agree that possibly it will go into the till of the American Sugar Refining Company. I do not propose to take that risk. I do not propose to have my intelligent and honorable constituency charge me with having contributed to that result and to have me explaining a much worse position than that which some Democrats are to be called upon to make for having voted for this bill.

Mr. Chairman, I maintain that the consumer in this country will not get any benefit under this bill. It really is not necessary to argue this proposition, because every member of the committee who reported the bill has agreed upon that. That is the one thing which no one seems to differ about. The gentleman from New York [Mr. PAYNE] says in his report:

All the experts who were called before the committee admit that the price of sugar will not be less to the consumer on account of the 20 per cent reduction proposed.

Who disputes that? Why is that true? Because of the differential on refined sugar, which increases the tariff, which gives life and existence to the American Sugar Refining Company, and which, it is pretended, amounts to only thirteen one-hundredths of a cent, does in fact, under the manipulation of the "Dutch

standard" test by the American Sugar Refining Company in its importations, amount to at least forty one-hundredths of a cent. That is the truth about the matter. Nobody knows—not even the expert can tell—exactly how much benefit the American Sugar Refining Company now gets under the miserable schedule rates of the Dingley bill on sugar.

In this way competition in refined sugar in this country is barred off. The sugar trust buys raw sugar in the Cuban market at the same price as before. He brings it into this country, pays a less tariff, puts the difference in his pocket, and sells in the same restricted market as before.

Do you believe the trust voluntarily surrenders any of its profits? I do not. Do you believe this trust, from motives of pure philanthropy, will reduce the price of sugar to the American consumer? Not much. So that I reach the logical conclusion that this bill of itself, by reason of trade conditions under the existing unaffected schedules of the Dingley bill, will not add one cent to the profits of the Cuban planter, nor will it cheapen the price of sugar to the American consumer. It is a Republican trust measure, pure and simple, and every particle of the reduced tariff will go into the till of the trust. The reason is obvious why its agents in public and private, by pamphlet, circular, lecture, and speech support the bill.

Now, I do not say that sugar may not decline in price after the passage of this bill. That is far less certain, however, than that the stock of the American Sugar Refining Company will go up. Nor do I say that the price for Cuban raw sugar may not slightly be advanced by the trust. If either or both occur, however, there will be method in the seeming madness of the trust.

I think it likely that the trust may decrease the price of sugar in this country at points where it competes with refined beet sugar for the purpose, not of benefiting the American consumer, but of injuring the beet-sugar industry, its only competitor in the American refined sugar market; and that it may increase the price for Cuban raw sugar in order to stimulate production there and check development here in Louisiana and Texas, its object in both instances being to ultimately increase its monopolistic power and profit.

The remainder they will doubtless contribute to such campaign funds as will inure to their benefit in the coming Congressional election, in the main in the interest of Republican nominees, for, while I do not contend that the American Sugar Refining Company exactly owns the Republican party, it has a good, solid lien upon it.

I do not say that it will contribute alone to Republican success. It is wonderfully impartial. It will help anybody that will help it. I believe Jay Gould told the truth of all these concerns when under oath he once said of himself:

In a Republican district I am a Republican, in a Democratic district a Democrat, in a doubtful district doubtful, but I am always an Erie man.

So with the trusts. But that is not the worst of this measure from a Democratic standpoint. My contention is that is a straight Republican policy outlined in this bill, that it is Republican reciprocity from start to finish, advocated in all their tariff legislation and national platforms since 1890 and denounced in all our platforms and voted against by Democrats in all tariff legislation since 1890. Now, let us see if I am not correct in that. The distinguished chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means says in his report:

The action of the committee is in entire accord with the reciprocity doctrine of the Republican platform and the declarations of President McKinley and President Roosevelt—proposed revision of the tariff or anything not entirely in harmony with the maintenance of the protective system.

Mr. GROSVENOR, who recently delivered a searching and critical lecture to the insurgents in his camp, leads up in an extended argument to the conclusive presumption that reciprocity found its place in the legislation of the country under the Blaine régime and the McKinley bill, and that that bill contained a provision, as well as the present Dingley law does, in exact accord with this policy of trading off the revenues of one agricultural country with the revenues of another agricultural country, condemned in express terms in the national Democratic platform of 1892.

Mr. PAYNE says in his argument in this House:

Why, the Republican party started out on the idea of reciprocity in 1890, and section 3 was ingrafted into the McKinley bill providing for reciprocal trade relations; and when the committee and Chairman Dingley were making the sugar schedule of the Dingley bill we had a section 3 that provided that the President might make reciprocal trade relations with other nations, and when he did, and proclaimed them a good deal after the manner as stated in this present bill, then that certain duties should be decreased, and one of the duties to be decreased was the duty on sugar.

Turning from these words of the two recognized leaders of the Republican party, and turning to their platforms of 1892, 1896, and 1900, you find they sing continually the joint praises of protection and reciprocity. They say in one sentence the two policies are "associated policies." They say in one platform, "Protection and reciprocity are twin measures of Republican policy

and go hand in hand." I believe that is true. "Democratic rule has recklessly struck down both, and both must be reestablished."

I believe the hand of Democracy and the Wilson bill struck down protection and reciprocity, and I hope that there will be another reunion of Democratic hosts of this country that will strike down both these twin doctrines that now stand on the statute books in the Dingley law. What has the Democratic party said on this subject? It is the one bright light that shines along its pathway from 1840 down to to-day.

It has forever declared we favor a tariff for revenue so levied as to meet the needs of honest government economically administered, and really there never could have been any other Democratic position than that. Why? Democracy from its birth draws its inspiration out of a strict construction of the Constitution of the United States in its just application to the conditions of the country.

The Constitution provides, as a means of raising revenue, for a tariff, and hence out of that grew the old Democratic position that a tariff for revenue was the only constitutional tax, and that to exceed a tariff for revenue to meet the needs of honest government economically administered was to violate the Constitution as well as sound economic principles.

That is one issue upon which the party has never divided, even in the exciting times that led from Grover Cleveland's last Administration down to our last defeat at the polls. Men of all shades of political thought in the Democratic party have adhered openly and unflinchingly to this flag "of tariff for revenue." Certain people are trying to proclaim the doctrine now in this country that the Republicans have torn a leaf from the gospel of Democracy and proclaimed it as true Republican dogma with reference to this question of reciprocity.

I deny that the Republicans stole reciprocity, but I am willing to admit that if they did, it was only after the chemistry of commerce had converted the drug into a poison, and it had been abandoned as useless and worthless, that the Republican party took it up to use to strengthen on their feet the staggering and intoxicated trust-ridden industries of this country.

But before I leave the platforms on this subject I want to read a declaration from the national Democracy that I think concludes this debate, fairly considered. Something has been said about the traditional policy of the Democratic party being in favor of reciprocal trade relations. Of course it is. It believes in the equality of trade everywhere, on equal terms, as well as just taxation. But that is not the question presented in this bill. This bill forces a reciprocal treaty with Cuba that is not equal and just to either of the contending parties, or just to the outside world with which we trade. What said the 1892 platform on reciprocity? Listen!

We denounce the sham reciprocity which juggles with the people's desire for an enlarged foreign market and freer exchanges by pretending to establish closer trade relations for a country whose articles of export are almost exclusively agricultural products—

Speaking of our own country at that time, in 1892—

with other countries that are also agricultural, while erecting a custom-house barrier of prohibitive tariff taxes against the richest countries of the world that stand ready to take our entire surplus of products and to exchange therefor commodities which are necessary and comforts of life among our own people.

That has the genuine ring of Democracy in it. It was these pretended trades that you want to make with countries that are agricultural, and hence in competition with the farmers of this country, whose products can not be protected here, and sham trades in the further interest of protection that can possibly bring no benefit to the toiling masses in this country.

So I find that by Democratic platforms, by Republican platforms, by Republican leadership, this bill is Republican reciprocity. And if GROSVENOR, of Ohio, and PAYNE, of New York, and DALZELL, of Pennsylvania, are not Republican authorities upon Republican doctrine, I do not know who is.

Turning from that, I say that the policy of reciprocity is wrong, even if the Democracy had never written a line on the subject and Republicans had never written a line on the subject, and it was a question of "first impression" for Democrats to consider now. Why? I say it violates every Democratic principle pertaining to correct domestic policy, and to correct foreign policy as well. A tariff for revenue fairly levied to meet the needs of an honest government economically administered—in such a system as that I ask you what place would exist for this traffic in revenue with another country?

What would you have to trade on if you had a just Democratic tariff? Upon what basis would you offer to trade with any country on earth? Can you answer that successfully? But you may say, "Well, we can not get that." The difference between you and me, then, narrows down to this: I believe we can, I hope we can, I am ready to fight for it, but you are ready to surrender at the firing of the first gun. That is the difference. The traffic in revenue says to another country, "You lick our skillet and we



will lick yours." This will invite the enmity of every other nation in the world and incite them to unite to break both skillet and lick us both. That is the narrow, short-sighted statesmanship of Republican reciprocity.

And that is not the worst of it. It was a scheme cunningly devised by the shrewdest protection leaders this country ever had to escape the clamor for tariff revision, to maintain protection in the East and North, and at the same time to appear to yield to the clamor by extending the power of these protected industries at home by trading off a few minor interests for a market extension abroad.

How did protection and reciprocity arise? They are twin children, born at the same time, and born of the same mother—protection. Why, many of these older Democrats can remember the time when the cry of the protectionist was the "home market." When you declaimed against protection he said to you, "The home market is abundant to meet and call for all the output of the manufacturers of this country. Protection can not hurt so long as it only forces the development of manufacturing industries here and the home market calls for their products."

But that period is past and gone forever. It is the dream of the gentleman from Ohio and the gentleman from New York that was dreamed years ago. It has long vanished. To-day the factories in this country are making more than the home market demands. What was the result when we reached that condition? Why, at once two things occurred. The trust was organized to prevent competition in the home market, and aid the organized manufacturers to hold up prices to the tariff limit and continue to filch from the pockets of the American consumer; and on the other hand reciprocity was invented to extend the foreign market and further aid the same protected manufacturer at home.

They are twin children of the same miserable mother, and no Democrat ought to think for a moment of supporting either one of the policies. For my part I had just as soon vote for Republican reciprocity as for Republican protection. I do not care a cent which one comes first. I know they are both unmitigated curses, if the Democratic view of the tariff is right, and I will vote for neither. On the Republican side they are both considered as "policies." Conceding reciprocity is a policy, I will not vote for a "policy" that overturns all the principles in which I believe. I believe the people of this country are clamoring for genuine, honest tariff revision. I believe it can not be much longer denied, and unless tariff reform is wounded in the house of its friends it will be effective in the next Presidential and Congressional elections.

The people are feeling the effects of these trusts having been formed in barbed wire and agricultural machinery, and that they are selling them cheaper to other countries than they are to our own, that the people of Cuba will get them for less than the United States, and these old farmers are pressing these truths home to their Republican Representatives in Congress; and that is why Mr. BABCOCK got a move on him, and that is what is the matter with that crowd. They see the handwriting on the wall. I tell you this country will not remain dominated by the protected trusts. It will be broken down ultimately or the Government itself will go down in wreck and ruin. Do not doubt it.

But I have said that this policy of reciprocity runs counter to the true Democratic American foreign policy. How? For one I am as proud as any living American of the great commerce and industrial supremacy of America. No man lives who loves the flag with a deeper devotion and who would be more willing if it was imperiled to give his life to defend it than the man who now addresses you.

I am proud as an American that we are capturing the markets everywhere, that American invention, American labor, American skill, and American enterprise, the "get up and get," that policy of "get there" that Sam Jones talks about, is making us the greatest nation in the world. Let me tell you that it is provoking the enmity of all the other nations. Sullenly and silently there is coming a feeling in Europe that the commercial supremacy of America must be checked and their markets rescued from this horde that have invaded them.

I am in favor of no policy that will give them just cause for resentment against America and throw us into a commercial war, as nearly all the wars of our country have been. I regard this as the immediate threatening danger to America, and that this policy will ultimately lead the European powers to enter into a combination to check our commercial power, the great power of American commercialism. Why do I say that? I say that you have not read the history of the world right if you do not recognize the fact that most wars we have had have had commercialism behind them.

Now, let us see how this foreign policy of reciprocity works. We have had members of the Republican and Democratic party with one glad acclaim hailing the wisdom and statesmanlike policy indorsed by Cleveland and McKinley of the open-door policy

in the Orient. It is a very good policy in China. Why is it not equally fair when applied to Cuba? Will not Europe think we are discriminating against their trade in a country foreign to ours as well as theirs.

Can they not justly say, You miserable traders in revenue, you talk about what you have done for Cuba, you prate about your patriotism. You took by war the gem of the ocean from Spain and pretended that you did it in the interest of freedom. You have hedged that about with Platt amendments; you have coerced them into tariff discrimination against all of us to their injury and to your benefit, and yet you ask us to join with you in maintaining an open-door policy of trade in the great markets of the Orient, and that in spite of your Chinese-exclusion acts, your restrictive immigration and contract-labor laws, all of which you have coerced Cuba into adopting. Why should we not join in coercing the countries of the Orient into closing this open door against American manufacturers, and leave it open only to us? Why should we not retaliate on account of your miserable Cuban policy? If you do this with one independent American republic, what assurance have we that you will not at the first opportunity take similar action with the other South American Republics under the wing of your Monroe doctrine. Why should we not unite in barring American products wherever possible in any of the world's markets. If you call on this commercial war, why should we not fight for our trade?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. COOPER of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that my colleague may be permitted to conclude his remarks.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair desires to say to the gentleman from Texas that he has agreed to recognize other gentlemen, and an extension of the time prevents other gentlemen from being heard and from speaking at the time they expected.

Mr. COOPER of Texas. My colleague thinks that ten minutes will be sufficient for him to conclude in.

The CHAIRMAN. If the committee desire to shut out other gentlemen the Chair is not responsible if they can not be heard. Unanimous consent is asked that the gentleman may be permitted to continue his remarks for ten minutes. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. BURGESS. Now, rapidly trying to conclude, Mr. Chairman and gentlemen, this foreign policy, in my judgment, to which we will be committed when we vote to support this bill is the most dangerous feature under existing conditions. My friend from Virginia [Mr. SWANSON] tried to meet the argument of my colleague [Mr. BALL of Texas] in discussing this bill of forcing on Cuba a protective wall of 20 per cent by saying that the Cubans could reduce the tariff in our favor and make up the necessary deficiency by an internal-revenue tax, and thus met Mr. BALL's argument. But it does not meet mine.

I do not care whether he lets the tariff up or down, it will be 20 per cent difference in favor of the United States against every nation on earth, and we will be charged with having, as the guardian of our ward, forced that international principle upon an independent nation against the interests of European countries, and they will say to us, you have no right under our international law to ask us to join with you in an open-door policy anywhere.

The diplomats of Europe, ever ready to take advantage of our mistakes and turn them to their commercial account, will turn this unreasonable proposition against the American people, and it will result in God knows what. For one I am not willing to commit myself to it. I would rather stand for the old doctrine of peace and amity with all nations and entangling alliances with none. And of all the entangling, contemptible, miserable alliances is the selfish one based on the dollar; having no patriotic sentiment in their union, and offering nothing on earth to posterity.

I have no feeling against Great Britain, but I have a bitter contempt for any sort of an alliance with her, commercially or otherwise, against any other European powers. I feel the same way toward Germany, France, and Russia. Let us have the old-time Democratic peace and amity and good will of all nations and no entangling alliances. Let us dare to hold the Democratic doctrine of tariff for revision for revenue, and repudiate the sham reciprocity which seeks to juggle with the revenues of the people.

In conclusion, gentlemen of the committee, I welcome the fact that this controversy has arisen, has been intense, has been bitter and prolonged, for I am one of those who believe that discussion which leads to thought and investigation is one of the surest aids to Democratic supremacy, and a benefit to the toiling masses of this country. Whether this bill passes or not, Democracy will be strengthened. Reciprocity and representation are two issues which will not bear honest investigation, and I regard the Cuban and CRUMPACKER as both unwittingly giving friendly comfort to Democratic hope of success.

It is time that the farmer and stock raiser of this country should awake to the realization of the fact that the Republican party offers him no substantial relief, and that if he is inclined to its

support he had better pause ere he trades off his birthright for a mess of political pottage.

In the coming Congressional and Presidential campaign, older and abler hands than mine will snatch the mask from the face of protection and her twin children, the trust and reciprocity, and then aroused patriotic conscience in the American voter will force at the polls, not a reorganization of the party of the people, but a reunion under the old flag and on the old battle ground that shall bring an overwhelming Democratic victory.

I can hear the tread of the gathering clans as they come from divers pathways, merging into the high road of tariff reform, which leads to the old and ever victorious Democratic battlefield of "Equal rights to all and special privileges to none."

I can see gathering on the one hand the battle-scarred veterans who followed the golden banner of Cleveland and Carlisle. I can see on the other hand the gathering of the great clan who followed the silver-starred banner of Bryan and Bland. I can see gathering and mingling with these the faces of thousands of patriotic recruits coming from paths leading from all parties, and mingling in the great patriotic reunion of the forces of the people against the oppression of protection, trusts, reciprocity, and imperialism.

I can see floating serenely among this great gathering of hosts the old-time Democratic banners with their old-time inscriptions, and I can hear the trumpet call to conflict, as of old. I can hear the shout of our great commander in that coming battle, whose obscure face I can not now define, as he calls to this host of people with the old cry, "We denounce the doctrine of protection as a fraud, a robbery of the many to enrich the few. Down with trusts and with imperialism and rescue this Republic from the hands of those who now would wreck it, and save 'the government of the people' to the people!"

The issue of that conflict can not remain in doubt. If this reunion occurs a triumphant victory will crown such a Democratic reunion, and again in the sweep of the century will be demonstrated the deathlessness of Democracy. [Prolonged applause.]

Mr. MEYER of Louisiana. Mr. Chairman, in what I shall say upon this bill I shall endeavor to avoid any personal reflection upon any member of this House, so far as motives are concerned, and also upon the Executive. But, sir, I can not speak or think of this bill without indignation. It violates the economic principles declared and recognized by both of the two great political parties of the land. It disregards their solemn pledges and plain duties. It makes war upon the most elementary principles by which the statesmanship of great and wise nations is managed and has been managed all over the world, including the better days of our own Republic. It flouts the teachings and maxims of our wisest and most renowned statesmen and Presidents. It makes war upon two of our industries, both agricultural industries, North and South and West, which are supporting hundreds of thousands of laborers, and which, though now temporarily depressed, promise upon the highest authority a great development in the immediate future.

#### SELECTION OF VICTIMS.

There is some impartiality, I concede, Mr. Chairman, in your selection of your victims. You assail directly and confiscate one hundred and thirty millions of capital invested in some eight or ten States of the Union under the implied pledge of your past legislation, and you injure, also, affiliated industries in these and many other States. The white man in Michigan who grows beets or makes beet sugar you are willing to ruin as quickly as the Louisiana planter. But this is not enough for you. You turn out of employment over a quarter of a million of black men whom you enfranchised in 1865, and to whom we are giving employment and bread, and will continue to give bread as long as we are allowed by you to do so. With all your loud professions you seem to think you owe these negroes nothing. Your bill says to them,

"ROOT, HOG, OR DIE."

It says, "Go to the cotton fields and labor markets, if you can pay your way there, and help to beat down the wages of your fellow colored man;" or, if you can not get work there, borrow an idea from the grand army of Cuban patriots, who by threatening robbery and brigandage secured three millions of bounty from the United States Government at the close of the Spanish war. But the black man of Louisiana no longer claims your sympathies. You have set up a new idol—a new object of worship. You are greatly concerned, or profess to be, about the Cubans, the Spaniards, the Africans there, the mass of Asiatics or coolies, and the planters, Spanish Cuban. I say "profess" carefully.

#### THE NEW YORK SUGAR TRUST THE BENEFICIARY.

The slightest knowledge and investigation of this question discloses the fact that the Cuban planter and his hands will get little benefit from this destruction of our sugar industries. The profit

will go almost entirely to the great New York buyer of this sugar, the only buyer—the New York sugar trust—who will fix the price and dictate terms. They will get the Cuban sugar now produced and in prospective at lower rates, and in this way their existing differential, out of which they have made such enormous dividends, will be largely increased. The title of this bill should be changed so as to read: "A bill to increase the differential of the sugar trust and to augment their profits, while the cane and beet-sugar industries are destroyed." The title of the bill should correspond to the actual facts and the known effect of the bill.

I propose to speak on this bill not as a mere partisan. [Applause.] It is really as hard to excuse a Democrat who votes for it as a Republican who does so. Although this is an Administration measure, and without the urgency of the Executive could not stand one hour in this House, we find a number of Democrats willing to support it. It is hard to conceive why they should do so. I counsel no mere factious opposition to the recommendations of the President on any subject, and in my service here for ten years I have never indulged in it. Now, the Democrats on the Ways and Means Committee endeavored to amend this bill. They tried first to abolish the differential duty of the sugar trust. The Republican members voted that proposition down. The Democrats have nothing to expect in the way of political help from the sugar trust; they know well its unscrupulous character; and it seems to me that this revelation of its purpose alone ought to have sufficed to lead them to vote against this bill first, last, and all the time.

There was another proposition of the Democratic members of the committee, namely, to have a

#### GENERAL REVISION OF THE TARIFF,

and not to pick out the sugar and tobacco industries as special victims of reduced duties. This proposition would have relieved the bill to some extent, at least, of the charge of being a harsh, invidious, and discriminating statute, singling out special industries for attack; but this, too, was rejected. The cut was to be applied to the farmer, or rather to two or three classes of farmers. The sugar grower and the tobacco grower are selected for the sacrifice. The farmer all along the northern border is now protected against his Canadian rival. His lumber, poultry, eggs, chickens, hops, butter, barley, oats, potatoes, and all farm products are protected by heavy duties. Is he a better man than the beet-sugar grower of Michigan and Minnesota?

Is not this bill a precedent for striking him down next by a Canadian reciprocity arrangement? Such a scheme is proposed and urged. It naturally finds favor among the New York capitalists, who seem to have such a strange and mysterious influence upon our legislation. I do not envy the Democrat representing an agricultural constituency who goes home and has to explain his course in voting for a bill which singles out large farming classes for various reductions, while it leaves untouched all the interests protected by the trusts. If he has to meet the charge that he helped the Republicans to cripple those agricultural interests and to enhance the profits of the New York sugar trust, he may have a hard time to explain his vote to a constituency of farmers. He may in the end have to call on the mountains to cover him from their wrath. [Applause.]

The farmers of the land are an intelligent class of men, and they know well by this time that their interest consists in standing together. Suppose they should say to this candidate, "We can not just now reach the real or chief authors of this unjust legislation, but you have helped to turn us over to the tender mercies of the sugar trust, and as you have indorsed this note we will hold you responsible." How about the representative of a tobacco-growing or manufacturing industry? He may attempt to excuse his vote by alleging that the tobacco grower in his district is not endangered by Cuban competition, but then he is confronted by the fact that the tobacco growers and manufacturers of this country have, with one voice, protested against this measure. This is significant. Do not these gentlemen—the tobacco growers—understand their interests quite as well as the Congressman? Who can measure the possibilities of Cuban tobacco and say with certainty that any kind of tobacco grown in the United States will be free from Cuban competition if the tariff be reduced?

#### TOBACCO INTERESTS.

The tobacco grower and manufacturer both protest against any reduction of duty, and the politician who endangers their livelihood may have an account to settle for the act. I think that Ohio, Pennsylvania, Connecticut, Virginia, and Maryland may all be heard from on this question of the tobacco duty. A few years ago nobody dreamed that Connecticut, Pennsylvania, and Ohio could enter the field of tobacco growing and produce the highest and most valuable grades. It was supposed by some that certain counties in southern Virginia and some North Carolina counties had this advantage exclusively, but now the Northern farmer is reaping high profits from tobacco culture. Such

discoveries as these, such changes in culture so common nowadays, ought to admonish incautious gentlemen that in throwing down the bars they may develop in Cuba rivals in all the brands and forms of tobacco; and here, leaving them entirely without excuse, comes in the indisputable fact that the Cuban tobacco industry is prosperous and has suffered nothing, as sugar has, from general overproduction or from European legislation.

In view of these considerations, Mr. Chairman, I think that the Representatives of agricultural districts who favor this legislation are laying up trouble for themselves at home by doing so, and that their own interest and that of their constituents would prompt a very different course. I am not willing to make my appeal to them based on the mere ground of personal interest. But they owe something to the great farming class of this country, and they owe everything to those great principles of justice and equity without which any tariff bill becomes iniquitous, oppressive, and criminal. How can any Democrat who votes for this bill hereafter arraign the Dingley tariff bill for its alleged discriminations, for being class legislation, for fostering and promoting trusts, and for treating the farmer class with injustice?

#### TRUST V. FARMER.

Have the farmers of this land come here from any section to ask for this bill? You have seen the work of the sugar trust and the Cuban speculators about the Capitol. Their literature is spread broadcast over the land, and according to the high authority of our Speaker they have manipulated a portion of the American press in favor of the policy of this bill, but the farmers, so far as they have spoken at all, have spoken against it. The sugar planters and the beet growers have asked you and begged you not to destroy their industry and wipe out their capital.

I do not see how any Democrat can consistently refuse to listen to this appeal. I feel that I have a right to appeal as a Louisiana Representative to every Democrat of this House not to give a vote which will strike down an industry which supports over half a million of people in the State of Louisiana. Remember, that our sugar lands are not adapted to other farming products which thrive elsewhere, such as wheat. Surely the bankruptcy and misery of our people will do no good to yours. Louisiana has done them and you no wrong. What is our crime that we are thus strangely and cruelly denied your sympathy in an hour of trial and danger?

Mr. Chairman, I am aware that some gentlemen will say that they desire a reduction and a general revision of the tariff, and that they feel bound to go for any bill which offers a reduction in any direction, even if they can not get more. It would be a full and complete answer to this position to say that even if the sugar tariff were excessive, which I deny, it would be the height of injustice to cut it down unless at the same time the planter is relieved of the high prices he has to pay for anything and everything used in his industry and in his household. If you can and will give him lower prices for his machinery, farming implements, and the like, clothing of all sorts, then you may fairly take up the question of the sugar duties for consideration, and not before. The Louisiana sugar planter did not suffer under the tariff of 1846 because, while he had to stand a lower rate of duty, the tariff was also reduced on everything he had to buy.

The question of the tariff has been a topic of political discussion at different periods of our history. It has rarely been made a strictly party question. Neither party has a consistent record on this subject. The public men of each party have differed and differed honestly. The tariff bill of 1846 was indeed a party question and was carried by a party vote of the Democracy. But the tariff bill of 1857, which made a general reduction of the rates of that of 1846, was carried through the two Houses of Congress by a nonpartisan vote. It was supported by a number of the most distinguished Republicans of both Houses of Congress. The Republicans acquired control of the National Government in 1861, and except for eight years have held it to this time—that is to say, thirty-three years out of forty-one years. These war tariffs were mainly to raise revenue, and it was so also for long years after the war. The issue of protection was not prominent at all.

In these years some of the leading Republicans in Congress had a warm side for the revenue idea of a tariff. General Garfield, one of their most accomplished and intellectual leaders, was, I recall, a member of the celebrated Cobden Club, a political, free-trade club, named for the great English statesman, who was the leader of the agitation which overthrew the corn laws and made England a free-trade country. The Republicans made many tariff changes, and, as time passed, have become more and more committed to the protective tariff theory, though I regret to say they are not applying it fairly in this bill. In 1890 they passed a bill highly protective, but they took sugar out of the class of protective industries. It is true they gave a liberal bounty to sugar, but they knew it was a mode of legislation which could not be expected to stand, and it was finally overthrown.

The Democrats have not been any more consistent on this issue than the Republicans. In the earlier party contests, and during the long period from 1789, when our first legislation was framed,

#### TARIFF WAS NOT PARTY ISSUE.

down to 1828, the tariff was not made a party issue. The first tariff bill passed—namely, that of July 4, 1789—in its preamble stated, among other objects, that it was necessary "for the encouragement and protection of manufacturers that duties be laid on goods, wares, and merchandise imported." These duties were not excessive, but the idea of protection and of building up manufactures was there in the preamble to that initial tariff statute. This thought was a very natural one, indeed. The thirteen colonies were then mainly agricultural, almost exclusively so in fact, and in their seven years' struggle with England they felt the lack of a development in the arts. The same trouble, I may here state, was felt in the South during the war between the States. The great men of that day, I mean 1787-1789, wanted a country independent in peace and also in war. In this light I am bound to construe the 8th section of article 1 of the Federal Constitution, which reads as follows:

The Congress shall have power to lay and collect taxes, duties, imposts, and excises, to pay the debts and provide for the common defense and general welfare of the United States.

I believe these last words are words of limitation rather than a general and original grant of power; but plainly enough it is said that duties and imposts may be laid in order to provide for the "common defense" of the United States. Such an object was a wise provision of statesmanship by men who had gone through a seven years' struggle, handicapped by the lack of manufacturers, and it comports with the tariff bill of 1789, which you remember was passed only two years after the United States Constitution was framed at Philadelphia.

My recollection is that the Democrats of that period made no issue on the tariff question, but they did object to the system of internal-revenue duties and excises enacted by the Federal party under John Adams, and when they came into power they proceeded to wipe them out. The effect of repealing internal-revenue taxes was, of course, to necessitate a higher tariff in order to support the Government.

I beg to say here that the language of the act of July 4, 1789, was not used lightly or carelessly. On the contrary, the text of the preamble I have quoted was reiterated word for word in the very next tariff act passed, namely, the act of August 10, 1790. Remember that at that time General Washington was President and Thomas Jefferson was his Secretary of State. I am very sure that you will not find in the writings and record of Washington, Jefferson, Madison, or Monroe anything in conflict with the idea of protecting our industries.

In 1888 the Hon. Samuel J. Randall, an honored leader of the Democracy and one of the truest friends the South ever had, was assailed because he would not support the famous Mills tariff bill. He defended himself by quoting from Jefferson's repeated letters, by citations from the recorded opinions of Madison, Monroe, and Jackson. I could easily quote these opinions, but I do not want to consume your time. If gentlemen think that the authority of these great Democratic leaders is entitled to any weight they can find them set forth in Mr. Randall's speech of May 18, 1888, on the tariff, delivered in this Hall.

Mr. Calhoun opposed, as he had a right to do, the bill of 1828, and under Mr. Clay's wise leadership that act was repealed and the compromise tariff bill of 1833 enacted, thus ending a painful controversy. It must be remembered, however, that Mr. Calhoun favored the tariff bill of 1816, which was a protective tariff bill, and when the tariff act of 1846 was under discussion he opposed the doctrine of free raw material on which some gentlemen insist.

I wish to observe here and emphasize this position and statement: The sugar duty has generally been maintained and insisted on by the Democratic party and by the revenue tariff men

#### SUGAR DUTY DEMOCRATIC.

as a revenue duty. The high duties imposed by the old statutes of 1789 and 1790 on sugar were, of course, revenue duties strictly, for at that time Louisiana had not been acquired and we were making no sugar. A duty is surely a revenue duty when it yields a big revenue, and this is what sugar has done all through our legislative history.

On the other hand, it is obvious that if you are to apply the protection principle to our industries fairly, the farmer and the sugar grower are equally entitled to full protection along with other industries. The protectionist who is not willing to concede such equality is not fair or logical, in my opinion.

I care not what principle you adopt, whether of protection or seeking to raise the large revenue we need, the sugar duty is defensible on either theory of public policy. [Applause.]

It is well, I think, Mr. Chairman, to consider the trend of public opinion on this question. In the early days of the tariff controversy it was urged by the friends of protection that protective or discriminating duties were necessary to protect the American laborer against the pauper labor of Europe. At that time Europe was the competitor we chiefly had to dread. The hordes of Asia were not then considered by the disputants. But since then the Asiatic peril has become a serious menace. We see in China over 400,000,000 of people—hardy, industrious, intelligent, and with a wonderful faculty in the arts. I do not mean discovery but imitation. They readily learn any branch of work. They will work as long as a white man or longer. They can live and thrive in their own land on 5 to 10 cents per day. They can live here on one-fourth of the wages of an American workingman. We have had to pass laws to exclude them. But the question is one of the admission of their products, with prices based on such a low scale of wages.

There are hundreds of millions more of Asiatics who live as cheaply in Asia as the Chinaman. So it is not so much a question of competing with the pauper labor of Europe as it is with the pauper labor of Asia. The position of the question is changed, and I think public opinion has finally settled down upon the position that the difference in the prices paid to labor must be taken into account in framing our tariffs. I do not expect to see in my time any struggle or dispute over that question. Sir, I consider that the best thought of the Democratic party and, I may say, of the country, is fairly embodied in the language of the Democratic platform of 1884, adopted at Chicago. It declared:

**DEMOCRATIC PLATFORM.**

Knowing full well, however, that legislation affecting the operations of the people should be cautious and conservative in method, not in advance of public opinion, but responsive to its demands, the Democratic party is pledged to revise the tariff in a spirit of fairness to all interests. But in making reduction in taxes it is not proposed to injure any domestic industries, but rather to promote their healthy growth. From the foundation of this Government taxes collected at the custom-house have been the chief source of Federal revenue. Such they must continue to be. Moreover, many industries have come to rely upon legislation for successful continuance, so that any change of law must be regardful of the labor and capital thus involved. The process of the reform must be subject in the execution to this plain dictate of justice—all taxation shall be limited to the requirements of economical government. The necessary reduction and taxation can and must be effected without depriving American labor of the ability to compete successfully with foreign labor and without imposing lower rates of duty than will be ample to cover any increased cost of production which may exist in consequence of the higher rate of wages prevailing in this country.

Such was the wise and considerate statesmanship of the Democratic national convention which assembled at Chicago in July, 1884. I ask the Democrats of this House—each and all of them—to test this bill by this platform, and say which is right, the platform or this sugar-trust bill.

What would that convention of 1884 have said to a proposition to give the power to the sugar trust—the power to crush out all competition in the United States and to monopolize absolutely the business of refining all our sugar and fixing the price to the consumer?

The Democratic national convention which met at St. Louis in 1888 recognized expressly the same principle embodied in the platform of 1884—that in adjusting the rates of a tariff "due allowance" must be made "for the difference between the wages of American and foreign labor."

So far as the Republicans are concerned, I might spend days and weeks in citing authorities, platforms, and expressions which absolutely condemn the present bill, but I will content myself with one or two extracts which I consider specially appropriate.

On April 30, 1901, the celebrated Home Market Club of Boston gave a grand dinner, at which were present a number of eminent Republicans. The principal speaker eulogized the tariff enacted by the Republicans (which is now to be attacked piecemeal by its own friends) and complimented the club by saying:

**PROTECT LABOR.**

But you have established the principle that the tariff shall always protect the conditions of American life by a duty at least equivalent to the difference in the labor cost here and abroad.

The orator who enunciated this sound principle was Vice-President Roosevelt, now the President of the United States. The situation in respect to the relative cost and conditions of labor between our own country and tropical countries has not changed one iota since April, 1901. Economic truth has certainly not changed in the past twelve months. There is hardly an intelligent high-school boy who does not know that the "conditions of American life" and of the American laborer are altogether different from those of the Cuban laborer, whether he be a negro, a Spaniard, or a cooly or some Cuban who may perchance be willing to work.

The tropical laborer can get along with far less rich food—less meat, butter, and other things—than the American laborer. It costs far less to feed him. The climate is mild. There is no winter, frost, or snow. His clothing need not cost him a third of what it would cost our laborers in Louisiana or Michigan. He does not

need fuel to keep him and his family warm. As for that, he is often not a family man. He can sleep outdoors in a hammock and not suffer. There are hundreds of comforts and necessities which the American laborer needs and is accustomed to have, and to which the Cuban or tropical laborer is absolutely indifferent. If he is a Chinaman or a cooly, the contrast is even stronger. Everyone who knows anything about tropical life in the East or the West Indies knows this to be true of the laboring or peasant class in these countries.

The condition of the American laborer, whether in Louisiana or Michigan, white or black, is altogether different. The American laborer wants comfort for himself and his family; he wants not a hammock, but a house well warmed; he wants nourishing food, expensive food, warm and more expensive clothing, fuel, and many other things, and he gets them and will continue to get them unless you take the bread from his mouth and make him a wanderer on the face of the earth.

With such facts we have a right to ask President Roosevelt to stand by his Home Market speech. [Applause.]

Mr. Chairman, there is one other Republican authority from whom I beg to quote, not merely on account of the high personal and official character of the witness, but because he vividly portrays the situation around this capital and throws a flood of light upon the abominable influences which have plotted and demanded the sacrifice of our domestic industries for the benefit of Cuban speculators and the New York sugar trust. I quote from a letter written on the 6th of February last, about two months ago, by the Hon. D. B. HENDERSON, Speaker of this House. Probably no man in this body has such ample opportunity for knowing all the ins and outs of legislative work and of penetrating the secret, occult influences which are brought to bear to pass or defeat a particular measure. His position usually constrains him to silence, but on this occasion he spoke out with refreshing vigor. In this letter he says:

**SPEAKER HENDERSON EXPOSES SUGAR TRUST.**

The second question is, What are we going to do for Cuba? It is a separate and distinct proposition, and this is the situation: Those contending for Cuba want a reduction of 50 per cent or a clean sweep of duties between us and that country. Contending for this doctrine is, first, the American sugar trust, which is here in the person of its ablest managers; second, the money, the capital that has been put into the construction of railroads in Cuba, where a system of railroads extending along what may be termed the backbone of the island, with arms extending from the backbone into each part of it, is in process of construction; all the money in this enterprise, of course, is anxious to build up the commerce of Cuba; third, there are millions of dollars that have gone into Cuba, buying up plantations, cheap lands, and, with large syndicates formed, are seeking to make fortunes out of the sugar industry. Then, again, there are Americans over there with vast sums of money in various enterprises who are all anxious for this. Then, again, the Cubans themselves who have the capital are anxious to have free-trade relations with the United States. These all touch elbows and are working together.

Mark well the language of our Speaker. Note the character of this allied army—the New York sugar trust, the American speculators and syndicates in Cuba, and the rich Cuban planters—all seeking to remodel our tariff system to put money in their pockets, and in order to secure this result, eager to destroy our sugar industries and to imperil our tobacco industry, to say nothing of others, the tariff is to be cut 20 per cent to satisfy this greedy crowd—sugar, tobacco, iron, and everything else—to enrich a class of men who probably did not contribute a dozen men, all told, to secure the freedom of Cuba. [Applause.]

The Speaker says in this letter that the Secretary of Agriculture told him that every acre of land in Iowa was capable of raising the sugar beet and that this was true of every State throughout the West. The sugar trust demands the sacrifice of this industry and the entire abandonment of this business. "Stand and deliver" is their modest request to the Western farmer.

I should like to have time to quote more of this very able letter. There is one passage worthy of the attention of members who have of late been inundated with sugar-trust literature. He speaks of the lies sent out by the "press which is being manipulated in the interest of free trade with Cuba."

If any member has any doubt of the connection of the sugar trust with this contest, let him study the quotations of this stock in the New York market. It was not the interest of the trust to let their hand be seen. It was not deemed advisable for them to put their known leaders in the foreground when they could put up before the committee men not notoriously connected with them to advocate their interests. Nor was it their interest or good policy for them to let their stock go up too rapidly, as that rise would challenge public attention, but the idea of outside parties that they would carry their project, at least in part, has had its natural effect on the sugar stock. It is a subject of comment in the daily press. If this bill should pass, the result of your benevolence will be promptly recorded in the stock market of New York by a big rise in sugar-trust stock.

In the month of January last the Ways and Means Committee gave nine days, beginning on the 15th and ending on the 29th, to the different interests that desired to be heard on this question.

They heard certain American interests favoring reciprocity legislation, and also Cuban interests on the same side, both Cubans and Americans. On the other side—the side of the American farmer—were heard the American interests opposed to this legislation. These included the beet-sugar manufacturing interests, the beet-growing interests, the American cane-sugar interests, and the American tobacco interests, cigar makers, manufacturers, dealers, and packers, and the tobacco growers. The doors were thrown open also to the Hawaii, San Domingo, and Porto Rican interests. In addition to this, Dr. Harvey W. Wiley, chief of the Bureau of Chemistry in the United States Department of Agriculture, was heard at length, and spoke with a fullness of knowledge and candor that can not be too highly commended. Other Government experts testified also. The committee have added in an appendix a number of valuable documents. The result is a volume of nearly 800 pages of the most instructive character.

I wish that every member of this House could have listened to these hearings, or at least would give a careful study to this volume before casting his vote. If this were done, I should have very little fear of the result.

#### PROFESSOR WILEY ON SUGAR.

Professor Wiley is a perfectly disinterested witness. He has not a dollar of interest in any beet-sugar or cane-growing industry, but he understands the subject thoroughly in its scientific, practical, and political aspects, and anyone who wishes to understand the whole question and its present conditions ought to study his testimony. It covers the whole ground. I wish here to call special attention to his statement of the cost of making refined beet sugar and cane sugar in this country. He puts the former at 4 cents a pound and he puts the cost of producing fair refining centrifugal sugar of 96 polarization in Louisiana at not less than  $3\frac{1}{2}$  cents per pound.

The State of Louisiana has such a deep, vital, and pressing interest in this question that she sent up a delegation of her most intelligent and representative citizens to protest against this legislation. There were representatives from every great interest—from the planters, all the commercial bodies, the associated banks of New Orleans, and gentlemen representing both the great political parties of the country. As I can not repeat, or even refer in detail, as I would like, to their testimony, I think I ought at least to specify the names and character of those witnesses and ask gentlemen of the House to read and weigh what they said before the Committee on Ways and Means.

#### STATEMENT OF LOUISIANA REPRESENTATIVES.

Col. James D. Hill, president of the Poydras Planting and Manufacturing Company of New Orleans, made the first statement. It was full, elaborate, and a candid presentation of the question, especially in reference to conditions in Louisiana and Cuba. He was followed by ex-Governor Warmoth, a prominent Republican, and a large sugar planter, who began planting twenty-odd years ago. Then came Mr. J. N. Pharr, a cane grower and sugar manufacturer, and Mr. James W. Porch, representing the Board of Trade of New Orleans and the New Orleans Progressive Union. Mr. Porch also presented the protest of the New Orleans Cotton Exchange against this proposed legislation. These three organizations, as Mr. Porch said, cover practically the entire commercial field in New Orleans. Mr. Porch has lived a good deal in Latin America or tropical countries, and was able to contrast the two civilizations.

Then came the Hon. T. S. Wilkinson, a large sugar planter, who for a long time ably represented Louisiana on this floor. Mr. G. W. Nott is not a sugar planter. He came in behalf of the associated banks of New Orleans to protest against this legislation and to say for these banks that already the mere threat of legislation is crippling the sugar industry by preventing the necessary advances to make the crop. He presented their letter to President Roosevelt to this effect. Another important witness was Mr. D. D. Colcock, secretary and superintendent of the Louisiana Sugar Exchange, secretary and treasurer of the Cane Growers' Association, and secretary of the Scientific Agricultural Association of Louisiana.

#### VARIED LOUISIANA INTERESTS.

Surely this enumeration ought to satisfy you that it is not a few planters only that you are dealing with, but all the varied interests of Louisiana—planting, cotton, sugar, manufacturing, commercial, and banking. Nor are you dealing alone with the white race. There are far more colored men employed in the sugar industry than whites, and in the suffering which will be the inevitable result of this legislation the black race will probably suffer the most. He rarely has any capital; he lives by his labor, and he can not afford to roam over the country to find employment. This class of laborers engaged in sugar can not find other employment in Louisiana, even at lower wages, and while in their distress they may not resort to robbery, they will have as good an excuse for it as the so-called Cuban army, to whom you gave three

millions of dollars, and the hybrid laborers of Cuba, whom to help and pacify is the alleged object of your bill.

The colored men of Louisiana understand the situation, and they have, by their Colored Men's Industrial League and the Colored Men's Laboring Alliances, protested against this policy of sacrificing them and their race under the pretense of aiding Cuba. In other forms and modes the black man has appealed to you to stay your hand. It is pretended that as the United States delivered Cuba from the Spanish yoke and relieved her from a multitude of taxes, imposts, and exactions, and has given her independence and a free hand, this country is bound to set her up in business.

Uncle Sam must put his hand into his own pocket, or, it would be more correct to say, into the pockets of the American beet-sugar and cane interests, in order to insure good wages and prosperity to the Cubans. Allow me to ask right there this question: You enfranchised the blacks at the close of the civil war. Did you do anything for the blacks then in the way of giving them employment or bread? You gave them the ballot, I know, and now and then a vote will buy a breakfast or a day's board, but it will not maintain a man or a family for a week, and still less for a month or a year. These eight or nine millions of negroes in the South whom for over thirty years you have turned over for employment to the whites who were left ruined and beggared by the war and your action—have not these negroes as good a claim on you for bread and employment as the Cuban laborers? How is it that in one direction you are so sentimental and hysterical and in the other cold, indifferent, and even cruel?

There was a time when Louisiana raised one-half of the sugar consumed in this country. In those days we had organized, steady labor and no hostile tariff. Sugar everywhere had a high price, largely exceeding present rates. We did not plant with a constant sense of insecurity. The idea of sacrificing our industry to benefit foreigners or speculators had not entered the mind of man. The war came with its havoc and desolation. Labor was disorganized and unreliable. The levees had been cut and our best lands for sugar and cotton were under water. Capital had been swept away. Under every discouragement possible our people went to work to restore this industry. We have had no help from the Federal Government. We have had continual tariff charges and a constant sense of insecurity.

#### HOSTILE SUGAR LEGISLATION.

We have had hostile tariffs and unfriendly legislation in respect to sugar. We have had to meet high duties on everything the planter needed in his business to support his household. We have had the sugar-beet industry of Europe, Germany especially, and the New York sugar trust, both seeking to destroy us. We have had to face of late years an extraordinary overproduction of sugar and a great fall in prices. This overproduction has operated against us in Louisiana, as well as against the Cuban sugar growers, and the American sugar-beet growers.

Notwithstanding all those obstacles and discouragements we kept up our industry. [Applause.] We have not gone on in the old ways, but have availed ourselves of every improvement in sugar culture and sugar manufacture, and of every method that science and experience could suggest. We are producing 300,000 tons of sugar per year. With an adequate and fair duty this product may be largely increased. I should say that with fair treatment and steady legislation Louisiana and other cane-growing sections of the South could finally supply the wants of the American people, but I am bound to consider in this connection that the consumption of this country is rapidly increasing and will be very large in the immediate future. And then there is the amazing growth of the sugar-beet culture in the United States, which began only the other day and already produces 150,000 tons per annum.

When you consider what has already been done with this industry, the prospect of further improvements in culture, and the great area of the United States and the number of States able to produce sugar beets with a high degree of saccharine matter, as shown by Professor Wiley's testimony and maps, and demonstrated by experience, it is hard to conceive any limits to the possibilities of the beet-sugar culture, unless, indeed, with a stupid purpose and reckless legislation this Government shall set to work to destroy it.

#### SUGAR SHOULD BE SUPPLIED BY UNITED STATES.

Mr. Chairman, it is certain that the cane-sugar growers and the beet-sugar producers at no distant day can supply the United States with sugar. Is not this a grand desideratum? Sugar is not an article of luxury but of necessity for all classes and conditions—the rich and the poor. It is a great article of our food supply. Ought we to be dependent on foreign nations for any part of our necessary food supply? Suppose you have a war, are you sure that you will have the command of the sea? Great Britain, with her immense navy, may, indeed, sacrifice one of her dependencies, as she has done, and trust to her navy to protect her trade, but even she is beginning at last to change her policy. She has announced that

she will no longer sacrifice her sugar refineries and her sugar producers to the German bounty-fed sugar.

But we are not the first country in naval power. Assuming that we are equal to Germany on the sea and will so continue—which is not certain at all—we are not equal to England, France, or Russia singly, and a combination of powers inferior to these nations would cut off our sugar supply. Is it not a wise act to be self-reliant and produce in our own country the sugar that we may need, or at least the bulk of it? Is it not rank folly to be dependent on a foreign country for our sugar? The country ought to be independent in war and in peace. The wisdom of the fathers, the experience of France in the Napoleonic wars, ought to teach you this much.

#### LOUISIANA'S CONDITIONS AND INTERSTATE RELATIONS.

Mr. Chairman, the population of Louisiana by the last census was a little under 1,400,000, very nearly equal to that of Cuba, but immeasurably superior to the people of Cuba both in the white and black population—superior in character, intelligence, industry, and the standard of comfort for all classes. Many persons have come there from all portions of the Union. They have had far greater difficulties than Cuba to contend with in the past forty years. They are at work building up a beautiful city and a great State. They have vastly more trade with the rest of the Union than we may expect to have with Cuba. The Cuban trade may increase, but our trade will increase more rapidly with our sister States of the Union than the trade of the United States with Cuba.

If you have any doubt about this, compare the trade of the Dominion of Canada with that of Mexico, rich as Mexico is in natural resources and with twice the population of Canada. Your trade with all the tropical regions is insignificant compared with your trade with the natives living in temperate climes. The latter are forced to labor; they produce and they consume. They have something to exchange. In the Tropics life is easy, the climate is enervating, and the great mass of the people are able to live with little exertion. A little labor suffices for their simple and inexpensive wants. Judging by our experience with these tropical countries, there is nothing to encourage us to sacrifice or imperil any of our own industries for schemes of reciprocity or to indulge in idle dreams of a vast trade with them. Our fiscal system and hope of a great trade development must be built on a broader basis and on calculations resting on a wide experience and observation.

Out of this 1,400,000 of people living in Louisiana, some 500,000 are directly or indirectly engaged in the sugar industry. This is over a third of our population. Destroy or cripple this industry, and the lands can be put to no other purpose that will support the present population. We can not raise wheat there at all, nor can we grow cotton to any advantage. Mr. Hill testified that the cotton goes to stalk. Perhaps we could grow some corn, but not enough to compete with our Western rivals and the States higher up the Mississippi Valley. Rice was discussed by Mr. Porch, a member of the New Orleans Board of Trade, which handles our rice crop. He said that it was one of those crops which are easily overproduced and that it was not one of those things generally consumed as is sugar.

It is the judgment of all our planters and experts that these sugar lands are not suitable for raising other products for profit. Even if they were, I suggest that it is very serious business to cripple and bankrupt one industry with the expectation that some day another industry may be substituted for the one abolished. It would not be a kind or a sensible thing to say to a man living in New York, Pennsylvania, or Massachusetts, "We are going to break you up, but after you are ruined you may perhaps turn your hand to something else."

#### \$100,000,000 INVESTED IN SUGAR INDUSTRY.

The capital invested in the sugar industry is \$100,000,000, and it was stated in the testimony before the committee that this property was one-third of the whole taxable values of the State of Louisiana.

If, therefore, the sugar industry be crippled and bankrupted, the result will be that the whole burden of supporting the State government will be thrown on the remainder of the States, and also of maintaining those who may be made destitute by your legislation. Thus you practically consign the whole State to bankruptcy. You crush New Orleans, a city which, after a very long period of depression, is once more becoming prosperous and has just begun certain necessary local improvements which involve a very heavy expenditure, say twenty or more millions of dollars. And yet, while you make your hand heavy on this people, you will go on to celebrate Jackson's victory over the British at New Orleans, and you appropriate \$5,000,000 to celebrate at St. Louis the acquisition of Louisiana by the Jefferson Administration.

According to Dr. Stubbs, of the Louisiana Experiment Station, great improvements are going on there in the sugar industry.

The output of sugar per acre and per ton of cane has been greatly increased. New lands are being opened. Old sugar lands are better drained and tilled. Every surplus dollar made in sugar since the war has gone into sugarhouses and improvements. The acreage is increased. The sum of \$100,000,000 has been invested. The present harvest of cane is from over 300,000 acres. The crop of 1900 brought about \$35,000,000. There are many things for which the planter must resort to other States. He wants machinery, lumber, bricks, mules and horses, coal and oil, flour and provisions of all kinds, feed for his stock, wagons, carriages, and agricultural implements, meats, lard, cheese, butter, beef, boots, shoes, clothing of every kind.

#### BENEFITS TO SISTER STATES.

The Louisiana sugar culture benefits Pennsylvania, Tennessee, New York, Illinois, Alabama, Mississippi, Kentucky, Missouri, Iowa, Kansas, Minnesota, and the New England States. This trade is a large one, and will increase all the time unless you cripple it. I speak of this point only in its material aspects. But your people of the North go down in numbers to New Orleans in the winter for health and enjoyment—to have a good time. If they go there another year and find a gloomy and stricken city they will ask who did all this, and your reputation as statesmen and patriots will not be enhanced by the suggestion that you were helping Cuba.

#### OVERPRODUCTION OF SUGAR.

The testimony before the Ways and Means Committee shows that the sugar industry has suffered everywhere by the overproduction of sugar, by bounties, and the cartel system of Europe. Cuba has suffered the past year, but Louisiana has suffered quite as much by all this, and we are making no profits. We are barely existing, but we have not asked you for new legislation or increased duties. We are content to struggle as best we may, and in the meantime we hope not to have any new burdens put upon us. We have not complained of your high duties on all the articles we need for our industries and for our daily wants. We are not threatening you with "disturbances" or brigandage if you do not help us out of our trouble; and here let me say that there is as good order and good feeling between the two races in the sugar country of Louisiana as in any part of the American Union. The papers tell us that in some parts of this Union the negro laborer is not allowed to compete for employment with the white man. This is not the case in the sugar-growing portion of Louisiana. The black man is welcomed as a laborer and will not be discharged from any plantation unless you make it impossible to employ him by legislation hostile to him and to us.

#### SUGAR AND TOBACCO PAY FOR CHARITY.

But it is urged that we are bound to assist Cuba and relieve her from the consequences of the low price of sugar caused by overproduction. You do not owe anything to your own people. Such is the position. Well, if you do owe anything to Cuba, why not give it from your full Treasury, as you did three millions to the insurgents at the close of the war? Why not let everybody contribute to this bounty instead of making two American industries bear the whole burden—sugar and tobacco. This would be the honest and fair way to do. But no. If it were a bounty given, it would be uphill work to ask the American people to renew it a year or two from now. Again, if the bounty system of European nations be swept away, as is now indicated, thus taking away all excuse for alleged unprofitable culture in Cuba, the planter there, in addition to the absence of low European sugar as a competitor, would still have the American market by a discriminating duty of 20 per cent in his favor. The Louisiana sugar grower and the beet grower would be out of the way and Cuba would have the field.

The Cuban planter would supply us with raw sugar and the New York sugar trust would have the whole American field of refining sugar and an increased differential; so it will not do to pay direct from the Treasury if this precious scheme is to work. The sugar trust would then have the beet grower as a rival growing more dangerous every year.

#### OWE CUBA NOTHING.

But, sir, I deny your proposition. I deny that the United States owe any debt to Cuba. The practice of every enlightened nation is to take care of its own people, not of foreigners. What it owes to foreigners is simple justice. There is not a government in the world that even professes to act on any other principle. Even England in her war on the Boers does not claim that she went to help the Boers, but to maintain, as she says, the rights of her own people and the glory and prestige of her imperial authority in South Africa. Take your Federal Constitution.

It does not set forth in the preamble that it is framed for the benefit of other countries, but for the "common defense and general welfare" of the United States—our own land. And then when you come to the taxing power, what does it say? Congress shall have power to lay and collect taxes and "to pay the debts

and provide for the common defense and general welfare" of the United States. It is not for Cuba or Spain or any other country. How much did you do for France, without whose timely help you could not have succeeded in the struggle for independence? You never gave her a dollar for it. You gave her in her death struggle a neutrality which was not even "benevolent," as the phrase goes.

#### ACCOUNT WITH CUBA.

State your account with Cuba, if you please. What is it? First, you forced Spain to moderate the harshness of her war on the Cuban insurgents, and after she had made every concession you required you next demanded that she should withdraw her land and naval forces from Cuba, relinquish her sovereignty, stating at the same time that you asked nothing for yourselves—only freedom and independence for Cuba. You spent some three hundred millions of money to enforce this demand. You spent your treasure and your blood to secure your object in two hemispheres. You got precious little help from the Cubans—nothing in money and hardly any fighting—and then, at the close of the war, you forked over three millions to those so-called patriots of the Cuban army to keep them from robbing and burning the cane fields, as they had been in the habit of doing. We kept our army there at a big expense after the war, and have maintained order at the critical period, while they were being manipulated and trained for self-government.

We have wiped out absolutely all the debt which Spain claimed to be due her from Cuba. So Cuba starts as a nation without any debt. There were export duties and a multitude of exactions on trade, production, and industry which were a burden to Cuban industry. These we have all swept away. All customs duties have been reduced or abolished.

Have we done Cuba any harm? I ask how, where, and when? We have cut her off from no market. She only sent in former days a trifling quantity of her sugar to Spain. The American market, which for a long period has been her main reliance, is as open to her as it has been in days gone by.

What is the result of our beneficence?

The Treasury Bureau of Statistics states the sugar output of Cuba in 1894 at 1,054,214 tons, the largest crop ever made in Cuba, but greatly below what could have been made under a good government, such a government as Cuba has under us to-day. The war of rebellion in 1895-96 followed, and this production fell to 225,221 tons, the lowest figure known in fifty years. In 1898 the Spanish-American war terminated Spanish rule. Peace came. After all this waste and havoc of war, such was the wonderful and natural fertility of the island and its special adaptation to sugar that in the year 1899-1900 Cuba made 300,000 tons; in 1900-1901 the production rose to 600,000 tons. The product for 1901-1902 is estimated at 850,000 tons. There is no reason to doubt that without this proposed legislation the sugar product of Cuba, which is now approximating her best year, will in two or three years greatly exceed any yield she has ever made.

The present crop is made from only 2 per cent of the cultivable area of Cuba. There has been a loss generally to many of the sugar planters everywhere in the last year, but the bounty system is doomed and overproduction will then cease. The Cuban sugar planter will set to work with a soil and climate superior to any in the world for sugar culture and free from the exactions and burdens of Spanish rule. [Applause.]

#### PLATT AMENDMENT.

It is said that we are bound to help Cuba because she agrees to the Platt amendment. Why, what is the Platt amendment? It does not prevent Cuba from making a reciprocity treaty with any European nation. It is simply a bond to guard against her allowing any European nation to use her soil as a base to strike a blow at us. Where and how does it cost Cuba a dollar? We are to get one or two naval stations the better to protect her against aggression, and for these we are to pay her.

Mr. Chairman, the Platt amendment is a boon and a blessing to Cuba. She need not create an army or a navy. We say to Europe "hands off." Suppose we did not do this? It would involve for Cuba the expense of an army and a navy. What that means anybody can find out by a glance at our annual appropriation bills.

There are many aspects of this question which I have not the time to discuss, but there is one feature of this proposition which demands the most serious attention. I refer to the employment of cooly or contract labor by Cuban plantations. The Ways and Means Committee claim that they have guarded against this danger. They admit that they have no right to expose our industries to the competition of Asiatic, or, rather, Chinese labor. This reciprocity is not to begin until after the new Cuban government shall have adopted immigration, exclusion, and contract labor laws as fully restrictive of immigration as our own laws.

Suppose they do go through this form? What guaranty have

we that they can or will be enforced? The coast of Cuba is 1,200 to 1,500 miles long, with countless places where laborers can be landed. Much of the coast line is unsettled—a mere jungle. Slaves were landed easily in the old days. Even if the people and government of Cuba were to act in perfect good faith the administration execution of such laws would be very difficult, if not impossible. Our friends on the Pacific coast tell us that it is very hard to keep out the Chinaman. In spite of every endeavor he slips by the Government officer and helps to beat down American wages. Yet the population of the Pacific coast are almost unanimously opposed to allowing the Chinese to come in. Public sentiment there and all over the Union is behind the exclusion laws. Then you have the American labor organizations, intelligent and vigilant, determined that the law shall be enforced.

You have no such burning public sentiment for exclusion in Cuba, and no such organizations constantly on the alert to help to enforce such statutes. The Cuban planter's interest is all on the side of the free admission of all the cheap labor he can get, and there will be no one with the power or the wish to keep out John Chinaman. He will run in and be welcome. Instead of 10 cents a day at home he will get 50 to 75 cents per day, and will live on nothing, or next to nothing; no fuel; little clothing; no house rent to pay. Three or four dollars will give him a shed and ample shelter. His food will cost him little more than in China. Perhaps there will be complaints made of the Chinese coming in. There will then come denials from Cuba, and plausible affidavits to back up the denials. The code of morals in tropical countries is none too strict. The Chinaman will have a field of labor open to him so long as you throw down the bars of the American market by this species of legislation.

#### NOT DEMOCRATIC DOCTRINE.

An attempt has been made to clothe the nakedness of this bill by the allegation that the plan of reciprocity treaties fixing customs duties is sanctioned by the Democratic faith and precedents. This I deny. You may find perhaps one or two tentative expressions in its favor by Mr. Jefferson, but at that time it was difficult for us to be a neutral power, and our fiscal policy was hardly unfettered. Mr. Jefferson, however, was President for eight years, and he had Congress fully in sympathy with him; but he made no reciprocity treaty in all that time. Madison followed with eight years of power, Monroe with eight years, and Jackson with eight years. Here were thirty-two years of Democratic rule and no reciprocity treaty. There was one, indeed, under Franklin Pierce with Canada, but it was not renewed.

When the Democrats came into power in March, 1885, they found a number of these treaties pending in the Senate, largely, I think, with tropical countries. Mr. Bayard was Secretary of State. All of these treaties were recalled and withdrawn and consigned to the wastebasket. My colleague, Mr. ROBERTSON, in his excellent report, has shown you that they were condemned in the Democratic platform of 1892. There are some considerations which ought to make every Democrat oppose such treaties. They operate to transfer the legislative power over taxation to the Executive. Instead of open, public action on the taxes to be paid by our people, you have secrecy and jobbery. In such arrangements the farming class is always sacrificed. The interest that can maintain a

#### LOBBY AT THE CAPITOL

controls the situation as we see to-day. [Applause.] Every corrupt interest in this Union will be glad to substitute for the regular public, healthy action of the two legislative bodies the stealthy methods of reciprocity treaties. You can rely on the sugar trust being with you for such methods of tariff arrangements. The argument of Mr. NEWLANDS, of the Ways and Means Committee, in his minority report, is, I conceive, overwhelming and unanswerable. If we by our legislation and power lead Cuba to make a discrimination of 20 per cent in favor of our products, with what grace can we demand an "open door" in the vast Empire of China, with its large prospective trade? There is danger that the other powers would laugh us to scorn.

#### CHAIRMAN PAYNE'S ARGUMENT REFUTED.

I have listened to the debate on this bill with deep interest. The chairman of the Ways and Means Committee always commands our attention by reason of his high ability and commanding position as the leader of the House. I think his speech, while wholly unsound in its conclusion, will be found equal or superior in interest to any delivered. I thought that it was intended chiefly to satisfy, if possible, those Republicans who were really and honestly in favor of the protection theory, and especially the Republicans representing States where the sugar-beet industry was in existence or was capable of existing. His language to them was in the nature of an emollient. The sum and substance of it was:

We are going to take off 20 per cent of your protection at this most critical stage of your industry, but it won't hurt you much. You can stand it. In

fact, it will not hurt you at all. All your uneasiness is the result of an excited imagination. Your delegations who came here lately to protest might just as well have stayed at home.

The Democrats were turned over by the chairman to his colleague from New York City, and if there was a thought for the Louisiana sugar growers and the negroes employed by us, it did not crop out on the surface of the chairman's speech. I think the Democrats who are following the lead of the chairman of the committee ought to have had a word of thanks and encouragement for their services.

The inaccuracies of the gentleman's speech are very striking. He told us that sugar was not going to be hurt; the sugar growers did not understand the subject. Then, too, that no one pretended to claim tobacco would be injured by the reduction, and this with the whole American tobacco trade and leaf growers of tobacco appearing before his own committee to make their protest.

Then, again, that the Cubans would get all the benefit of this 20 per cent reduction and the sugar trust would get nothing. He avowed himself an enemy of the sugar trust. I concede that the statement is perfectly sincere; but if this bill is the best fight he can make against them, I do not think the sugar trust will lie awake at nights studying how to guard against his hostility.

The Cuban planter has no market save the United States for his sugar at present. He must sell his raw sugar here, so he and his allies say, or not at all. He does not refine at all. He sells his raw sugar where he can. The

#### ONLY BUYER IS THE TRUST.

The trust can dictate terms and give him out of the 20 per cent just as much or as little as they please. They will give him enough and only enough to keep him agoing, and he will have to take it. Suppose the Cuban does not like the price, where is his remedy?

But I pass from the gross inaccuracies of the gentleman to his pregnant admissions. They are of the highest consequence in this debate. I will briefly notice some of them. There are a number of Democrats in this House who are sensible of the bad features of this bill and of its speculative origin and peculiar surroundings, but they have an idea that if it passes it will lower the price of the refined sugar of consumption to our own people. I mean the sugar that the American people use on their tables every day. Now, the chairman of the Ways and Means Committee, who has been over the whole ground of investigation, tells you Democrats that this idea of yours is all a delusion—he tells you that the—

universal testimony before the committee was that it would not reduce the price unless the reduction was continued for such a length of time as to enable Cuba to supply the principal part of the imported sugar.

He followed this up by his frank reply to a question of Mr. BARTLETT, of Georgia, that the bill "would not reduce the price of sugar to the consumer." Ponder this well, my friends, you who are willing to endanger our industry to get cheaper sugar for the people. You do not get it.

There is big money to be made by the bill, of course, by somebody. The American consumer is not to get any benefit, the cane grower none, the sugar-beet grower none. The sole question remaining is as to the relative shares of profit to the Cuban planter and speculator and the New York trust.

Mr. Chairman, remember that the Louisiana growers and the sugar-beet growers are the only people you can rely on to check by their competition the price of the refined sugar of the New York trust. The moment our crop enters the market the effect is perceptible.

Another important statement and admission of the distinguished gentleman who is responsible for this bill: He tells you that this 20 per cent bill is going to involve a loss of our revenue amounting to \$8,200,000, seven millions on sugar alone. Now, I ask you to weigh well this admission. Is our revenue redundant? No such excuse is put forth for this bill, for we have just repealed all the war-revenue taxes. We have heavy burdens to bear for our Army and Navy. We are maintaining a costly establishment in the Philippines. We shall have to increase our Navy at a heavy expense if we are to maintain the Monroe doctrine and our rights everywhere. We have a pension system to keep up. There is our costly postal system. Which of these do you propose to reduce?

#### MUST NOT SACRIFICE REVENUE.

We have had no river and harbor bill for three years. Commerce is suffering for the lack of such improvements. The commercial interest loudly demands a bill. Then there is the project of the isthmian canal, which the American people want constructed without delay. You must soon appropriate a large sum for much-needed public buildings. You will soon have to pay for the Danish West Indies and for naval stations in Cuba. Is this a time to sacrifice over eight millions of revenue? You can not reduce your revenue, and you will not. Therefore if you throw away

\$8,000,000 in this way, you must raise the money in some other way, and by taxation. This taxation and the hundreds of millions you have already spent to help Cuba—where do they come from? I answer, From the American people, and mainly from the laboring and producing classes. They are working and groaning while the trust barons are clipping coupons.

Mr. Jefferson, in the year 1793, in a peculiar situation of our affairs, favored some experiments in reciprocity, but in his after life I find nothing from him in its favor. His example as President is against it. In his early life, in the Notes on Virginia, he expressed himself against having manufactures, but it is well said, "Wise men change their opinions." In a letter written about January, 1816, to Mr. Benjamin Austen, twenty-three years later and after a wide experience in public affairs, he said that "he who contended against domestic manufactures must be for reducing us to dependence on foreign nations—that manufactures, to the extent of our own supply, were as necessary to our independence as to our comfort."

I ask that the wisdom embodied in this letter to Mr. Austen may be compared with the foolish policy which would make us dependent for our raw sugar on a foreign country.

Reciprocity can not plead the examples of Jefferson, Madison, Monroe, or Jackson. It lacks the sanction of all the Democratic national conventions which have assembled since the first one, in 1832. It is only a recent dogma of a portion of the Republicans. I am not aware that Hamilton, Clay, or Webster, the great founders of the protective theory, ever favored it. I remind Republicans that the tariff bill of 1890 was framed and fashioned by William McKinley, jr., who had made a study of the whole tariff question, and that the bill when it left this House to go to the Senate did not contain a line or a syllable of reciprocity legislation. How many Republicans in Congress to-day would vote for any kind of a reciprocity treaty with Canada? Would our chairman of the Ways and Means Committee vote for such a measure?

To conclude, I ask for justice to the farming class; I ask for some mercy at least to the black laborer in our fields; I appeal to you to spare your own industries and to be true to the people who sent you here, to your own country. "Why quit your own to stand upon foreign ground?" Recognize your

#### OBLIGATIONS TO THE AMERICAN TAXPAYER.

Discard all this silly, sentimental, and hysterical legislation, and substitute the practical good sense which is the characteristic of the American people in business and private life. All that you owe to foreigners is justice and good faith. Be true to your own people, your own workers, and study the methods that have conducted you to greatness and the respect of mankind. The poet well says:

This above all: To thine own self be true,  
And it must follow, as the night the day,  
Thou canst not then be false to any man.

[Prolonged applause.]

Mr. SUTHERLAND. Mr. Chairman, what I may say upon the pending question may have little if any effect upon the result. The discussion has already been so thorough that every member of this House has already determined how he will vote, but I can not, with decent regard to my own convictions on this subject, allow the vote to be taken without saying a word or two of protest against the proposed bill. Something like four months ago the country was startled by the sensational claim, that the people of Cuba were on the point of starvation. On December 3, 1901, the Cuban people themselves addressed a petition to the American people asking for action of the character now proposed. That petition was based upon two grounds—first, that the United States is under moral obligation to aid Cuba in the reestablishment of prosperity in the island so far as aid can be given without injury to American industry; second, that the commerce and industry of Cuba are in imminent danger of disaster if aid is not given immediately.

That was the claim of the Cuban people on December 3, 1901—over four months ago. In January, 1902, the Cuban Planters' Association appealed to the American people in this language:

An effort has been made to show that Cuba is in no need of help. Such a claim is wholly without foundation. The cry has come up from all over the island, "Save or we perish." It has come from the official heads of every municipality in the island. It has come from every organization of trade, commerce, or labor. It has come from planters, large and small. It has come from the Cuban people. It has been echoed by the President of the United States, by the Secretary of War, by the military governor of Cuba, by American boards of trade and commerce, and by every American newspaper of high standing, with the exception of the few which are published in the immediate locality of the special interest which now opposes the proposition for reciprocal trade relations with the island of Cuba. It is echoed in the hearts of the American people. We can not stand by and see the land for whose future we are now responsible fall into disaster. Much less can we allow it to be said that ours was the hand which dealt her ruin.

On January 13, 1902, the situation apparently became acute, and telegraphic applications for relief began to come to this country. One of these, a sample of the others, was addressed to



Mr. Corwine, who appeared before the Ways and Means Committee on this subject in behalf of the Cuban people. It read as follows:

Immediate relief to Cuba situation absolutely necessary. Your most energetic cooperation solicited. Condition of affairs so serious prompt solution has become a question of humanity.

We had a right to understand from that language that the situation was grave—acute—the necessity for help immediate, imperious, and overwhelming.

The Ways and Means Committee, however, refused to be stampeded by these appeals, and proceeded to enter upon an investigation. Among the witnesses who appeared before that committee was a gentleman named Mendoza, a Cuban planter. Mr. Mendoza, in the course of his examination, made this statement with reference to the situation in Cuba:

The military government has attended to the sanitary situation in the island. It has improved it a good deal. But the stomachs of the inhabitants are empty, and I fear that the consequences of the reconcentration policy of General Weyler are going to come up again in a different way.

Mr. Fowler, a native Cuban, who testified on this subject before the Ways and Means Committee, said:

The cry for aid has come to you from all over the island. It has come up from the heads of all the municipalities in the island. It has come up from every organization of trade, of commerce, and of labor. It has come from planters, large and small. It has come from the Cuban people. It has been echoed by the President of the United States, by the Secretary of War, by the military governor of Cuba, by American boards of trade and commerce, and by every American newspaper of high standing, with the exception of the very few which are published in the locality of the special interest which now opposes the proposition for reciprocal trade relations with Cuba. It is echoed in the hearts of the American people. Gentlemen, you can not stand by and see the land for whose future you are now responsible fall into disaster; much less can you allow it to be said that yours was the hand that dealt the ruin. We, therefore, as representatives of the suffering class, come to you with our last anguishing breath to say: "Help us or we perish!"

The newspapers of the country took up the cry. They insisted that while Congress was hesitating the Cuban people were starving. Our people, always quick to respond to the cry of distress, generous as only a great and splendid people can be, were swept by a wave of sympathy and demanded that something should be done for the relief of starving Cuba. We were led to believe by these various calls upon us that the gaunt figure of famine already stalked among the people of Cuba, and only the prompt action of the American Congress could save them from death by starvation.

But while the newspapers fumed and fretted, and the people demanded, the Ways and Means Committee patiently investigated; and we found, after we had proceeded with the investigation a little while, that the cry that Cuba was in distress—that the people were starving—was a myth; that it was simply a piece of cheap and false sensationalism. We discovered that we had been listening not to a sober statement of a solemn fact, but to the extravagant superlatives of an imaginative people.

Mr. Mendoza, who, in his direct examination to which I have already referred, declared that the people of Cuba were starving, testified upon cross-examination by Mr. TAWNEY as follows:

Mr. TAWNEY. Is labor generally employed on the island outside of Habana?

Mr. MENDOZA. Sir?

Mr. TAWNEY. Is the laboring class more generally employed on the island outside of Habana?

Mr. MENDOZA. It is. All the sugar plantations are working by this time. They are all employed. There is plenty of work for the workmen in Cuba to-day.

Mr. TAWNEY. And at good wages?

Mr. MENDOZA. Well, not very good, because the wages in Cuba increase according to the price of sugar. When sugar is low we can not afford to pay high wages.

Mr. TAWNEY. They are paying now for common laborers as high as \$30 a month, are they not?

Mr. MENDOZA. In some places in the island, but not in all. In the eastern part of the island, which is less populated, the wages of labor are higher.

Mr. TAWNEY. Then this condition of hunger or starvation which you have just outlined or detailed here does not exist to-day, does it?

Mr. MENDOZA. Not yet; it will exist.

Mr. TAWNEY. This request, then, for the admission of sugar is in anticipation of distress?

Mr. MENDOZA. Yes, sir. It will exist, and it will exist, not after the island has been left to the Cubans (as they say they are going to do; I do not believe it myself), but—

Mr. Atkins testified to similar effect. He and a number of other witnesses—among them Colonel Bliss—testified that there was absolutely no suffering, no distress of any character whatever in the island of Cuba to-day. Colonel Bliss clinched the matter in this manner:

Mr. TAWNEY. You have said that labor there is employed, all over the island. In what does this distress of which you speak consist?

Colonel Bliss. I have not spoken of any distress, except to deny that any existed so far as I knew. It is a long time since I have seen anyone begging on the streets, or anybody who wanted to work who was not at work at good wages.

To-day no well-informed person will contend that there is any present suffering in Cuba. Labor is better employed and better paid than ever before. Anyone who wants work can obtain it at remunerative wages. Instead of there being any scarcity of work there is actually a scarcity of workers.

So that the people who were demanding relief for Cuba were driven from the position that there was any immediate need—driven from the position that there was any suffering in Cuba at the present time; and they then insisted that they needed help along the lines that this bill provides, because if relief were not extended there would be suffering in the future. Now, upon that subject there has been very full investigation before the committee. The evidence is before this House; and we are just as capable of passing an opinion upon it and determining what the future will bring to the island of Cuba as the witnesses who came before the Committee on Ways and Means and gave their opinions on the subject, and I think that we are quite as likely to reach a correct conclusion upon this evidence as a gentleman like Mr. Mendoza, who is intensely interested in the final determination of this question.

Mr. Mendoza is the owner of something like 10,000 acres of sugar lands in the island of Cuba, lands that are capable of raising 25,000 tons of sugar per annum, and which at a reduction of duty of 20 per cent would mean a difference to Mr. Mendoza of \$150,000 upon a single year's crops. It can not be said that a man who owns that much land, who is going to reap that much benefit from this legislation, is to be regarded as a disinterested witness upon this subject. Up to the present time, therefore, it is settled beyond any question that there has been no loss to the island of Cuba. Mr. Atkins testified that he had not raised sugar at a loss. Mr. Mendoza testified that he made a profit upon his sugar in the year 1901; but Mr. Atkins said that he believed there were some upon the island of Cuba who had not made anything upon their sugar, and when he was asked to explain why it was that he had made a profit on his sugar and others had not, he shrugged his shoulders, and, with a smile, said that modesty forbade him giving an answer, implying that it was his superior business methods and, we may conclude, the superior business methods of Mr. Mendoza that had enabled them to make profits when other people on the island of Cuba had not.

Now, I submit that if that is true it is no part of the duty of the American Congress to make up the difference between good business ability and bad business ability. It is no part of the duty of the American Congress to equalize the difference between good business ability and bad business ability, even among our own people, let alone among the people of a foreign land. But it is said—

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Chairman—

The CHAIRMAN. To what point does the gentleman rise?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I rise to a question of personal privilege.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair does not think the gentleman can take the floor from another gentleman on a question of personal privilege.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. It is a question of the highest privilege. I do not like to interfere with the gentleman from Utah, but I do not think a debate on as important a matter as this should go on at this late hour without a quorum, and I make the point that there is no quorum present.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. I suggest to the gentleman that if he will permit me to proceed until half past 5 I will then yield to a motion to rise.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I will withdraw the point, if that is the agreement.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman withdraws the point. The gentleman from Utah may proceed.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. The whole case, therefore, it seems to me, Mr. Chairman, turns upon the question as to whether or not the Cuban people can make a profit upon their sugar at the prices they are able to realize for it at the present time and at the prices they will be able to realize for it during the period of nearly two years that this bill will be in effect if passed.

Now, upon that question I desire to call the attention of the House to a few facts that appear from the record made before the Ways and Means Committee. In the first place, there is certain direct evidence on the subject. It appears from the testimony before the Ways and Means Committee that in the island of Cuba they can raise about 25 tons of sugar cane to the acre; that that sugar cane will yield 2½ long tons of sugar, amounting in round figures to 5,600 pounds. There is the testimony of half a dozen absolutely disinterested witnesses upon this subject to the effect that that sugar can be raised at not to exceed an average of 1½ cents a pound. Mr. Saylor, the expert of the Agricultural Department, a gentleman who has absolutely no interest in this question, it seems to me, after a very thorough investigation into the conditions in Porto Rico, and an examination into the conditions in Cuba, testified that sugar could be raised there and be laid down at the ports of the island ready for shipment from Cuba at from 1½ to 1¾ cents per pound, an average of 1½ cents a pound. That testimony is borne out by the statements of Mr. Douré, a Frenchman, who made an examination of the same

subject in the island, and of Mr. Weinrich, and of other gentlemen whose names I do not now remember.

There was testimony to the contrary upon the subject. Mr. Atkins, whom I have already shown is intensely interested in this legislation, but who is modest and knows it and admits it, testified that it would cost over 2 cents a pound. Mr. Hawley, another man who was intensely interested in the subject, testified to the same effect; Mr. Machoda testified to the same effect, and Mr. Fowler, a native Cuban, testified to the same effect. Now, all these gentlemen are sugar planters, and are interested in the result of this bill. The only disinterested witness who testified to that effect was Colonel Bliss, and he based his statement upon certain written statements that had been made to him by planters. In other words, the statement of Colonel Bliss was based entirely upon hearsay. So that we have the hearsay testimony of Colonel Bliss and the statement of the planters on the island of Cuba, whose profits are to be enhanced by the passage of this bill, upon the one side, and the testimony of these disinterested witnesses upon the other side. It seems to me that, taking all the testimony into consideration, any unprejudiced investigator must come to the conclusion that sugar can be raised and laid down at the ports of Cuba for not to exceed 1½ cents per pound.

It appears from the testimony that the lowest price that has been realized for sugar up to the present time has been \$1.81 per hundred at the ports of Cuba. I think since that time it has risen to \$1.91 per hundred. If sugar can be raised and laid down at the ports of Cuba for 1½ cents a pound, then there is a profit of 81 cents per hundred, or 20 per cent upon the cost of the sugar, which ought to satisfy the Cuban planters.

But there is a piece of evidence which to my mind shows beyond any question whatever that up to the present time there has been absolutely no loss, and that there will be no loss in the future upon sugar. It has been testified that wages have advanced in that island from 50 to 75 per cent during the last year or two. Now, I never in my life heard of a case where a country was upon the verge of bankruptcy, where its business was about to fail, where the business men were not making profits and where the wages of the men employed in that business had risen as wages have risen in Cuba, from 50 to 75 per cent. The best barometer of the business prosperity of any industry is the wages paid to its laborers.

Another fact. It appears from the testimony that the amount of sugar produced in Cuba has been steadily increasing. Two years ago the amount produced was about 300,000 tons. The crop for this year, when finally gathered, will amount to over 850,000 tons, which indicates that instead of there being any hardship in the industry it is a thriving and growing industry.

One other fact. It appears, as I have said, that 25 tons of cane can be raised to the acre in Cuba; that that cane will produce 2½ long tons of sugar, or in round figures 5,600 pounds. The rule in Cuba, as I understand from the testimony, is that one-half of that goes to the planter. In other words, the planter raises the sugar cane and takes it to the centrales, and is there paid for his cane one-half of the sugar which is produced. It is not turned over to him in kind, but he receives the value of one-half of the sugar.

It is the same as if the planter had received from the 5,600 pounds of sugar which his cane will yield 2,800, which at \$1.81 per hundred, the lowest price, would mean \$50.68 per acre, or at 2 cents a pound, which is about the average price that he has received during this year, it will mean \$56 to the planter; \$56 for every acre of land planted in sugar cane in the island of Cuba. Now, in the United States we raise upon the beet-sugar lands an average of 10 tons of beets to the acre. That is a large average. In many of the States the average is only 9 tons. I am taking the largest amount. We raise 10 tons of beets at an average of \$4.39 per ton, which is paid to the farmer, and which would give to the farmer \$43.90 per acre. So that the planter in the island of Cuba receives a gross revenue from his land, at the lowest price that sugar has ever been, of \$50.68, while the beet-sugar planter in this country receives a gross profit on his land of \$43.90 per acre. Now, anyone who understands the situation knows that it costs the American farmer more to raise an acre of beets than it does the Cuban planter to raise an acre of sugar cane in Cuba. So that the point I make is this—that if the sugar-beet farmer in this country is doing well and making a profit upon his land with a gross income of \$43.90 per acre, the Cuban planter must be making a good profit when he receives a gross income of \$50.68. [Loud applause.]

But, Mr. Chairman, it is not sufficient to show that the Cuban people need this legislation. We must go further and show that it will not injure any American industry. We must pay some attention to the protests of our own citizens who are engaged in the production of cane and beet sugar. The injurious effect upon the cane growers of Louisiana and Texas has been so forcibly and so clearly demonstrated by gentlemen who represent those States that it is not necessary to further discuss it. The slightest

interference with the duty is sure to result disastrously to the industry in those States. Mr. Fowler, a native Cuban planter whose hysterical appeal for aid I read a moment ago, while apparently recognizing this fact, coolly and blandly suggests that the cane planters take their machinery to Cuba and turn their sugar estates into rice fields to supply Cuba with rice. He says:

Louisiana, producing refined sugar from cane, should find her markets in her own sphere of influence. If unable to do so, it is wholly clear that sugar cane is, as it is said to be, an artificial product for which her vicinity is unsuited, and her planters would do well to take their machinery to Cuba and turn their sugar estates into rice fields to supply the Cuban demand, for that article is largely consumed on the island.

An exceedingly generous proposition to come from an alien and a stranger who is himself seeking our aid for the preservation of his own sugar lands! It would not be unreasonable to commend to him his own advice. If Cuba can not produce sugar at a profit under existing conditions, let her turn her sugar lands into coffee farms and supply us with an article that will not come into competition with any product of our own.

But it has been argued here that the proposed reduction may be made without injury to the beet-sugar producers. It may be true, it probably is true, that there are factories in especially favored localities that will not be injured by a reduction of 20 per cent of the duty. The Utah Sugar Company's factory, at Lehi, in my own State, has been referred to. The gentleman from Kansas [Mr. LONG] called attention to the statement of Mr. Cutler, manager of that factory, on the subject. It is claimed that Mr. Cutler stated that the beet-sugar industry would not be injuriously affected by the proposed reduction.

I know Mr. Cutler very well indeed. I am glad to number him among my close personal friends. I am ready to stand by and vouch for any statement which he has made upon this subject; but I have searched Mr. Cutler's statement before the Ways and Means Committee in vain to find any such declaration. I think he does substantially say that the Lehi factory would not be injured. The Lehi factory, I think, is more favorably located and is in a better position to stand the reduction of the duty than any factory in the United States. It is an old factory, under excellent management, in which every expense has been reduced to the minimum. Auxiliary plants are situated 15 or 20 miles to the north and 15 or 20 miles to the south of the main factory, respectively, and with connecting pipe lines. The beets grown in their locality are taken to these auxiliary plants, and there sliced, and the juice sent to the main factory by means of the pipe lines, and thus a great saving in the cost of transportation is effected. There are other circumstances which result in cheapening the cost of the sugar product, and it is entirely safe to say that sugar can be produced at this factory very much more cheaply than at any other factory in the United States. So much for this exceptional case.

The question, however, is not whether this factory or that factory can stand the proposed reduction, but a broader question is presented: What will be the effect upon the sugar-beet industry itself? Will that be injured? The distinguished gentleman from Ohio [Mr. GROSVENOR] in his speech the other day answers this question in the negative, and he refers with somewhat contemptuous emphasis to the members upon this side of the Chamber who have had the hardihood to differ with him as "juvenile Republicans." Now, I submit, Mr. Chairman, that when a man is being arraigned for his party loyalty to a cardinal principle it is not so much a question as to how long he has been a protectionist as it is how good a protectionist he is. Tested by that rule, the men who are standing together upon this side in opposition to this bill are better protectionists by 20 per cent than those who are bending every effort to pass it. Less than three months ago the gentleman himself took the position which we occupy to-day. On January 28, in a hearing before the Ways and Means Committee, the following colloquy took place between him and Mr. Carey:

Mr. GROSVENOR. Allow me to ask you a question; and don't get me on the wrong side, either.

Mr. CAREY. I will assume that it comes from a friendly source this time. Mr. GROSVENOR. Is it possible, in your judgment, to make a concession to Cuban sugar that will benefit the Cuban people and still not injure the production in the United States of cane and beet sugar?

Mr. CAREY. I do not think anything about it; I know that it is not. Mr. GROSVENOR. Nobody could help knowing that who knew enough to put two and two together.

In other words, the position of the gentleman then was that it was as plain as two and two make four that any reduction which would help the cane-sugar growers of Cuba would injure the beet-sugar growers of the United States. If it was true then, it is true now. If it is not true now, then the gentleman was mistaken ten weeks ago, when he took the position that it was a self-evident truth. If he was mistaken ten weeks ago, at the end of an exhaustive investigation into this subject, upon this vital question, by what sort of consistency can he insist that we shall follow him to-day?

Mr. Chairman, "I appeal from Philip drunk to Philip sober."

I appeal from GROSVENOR filled with the intoxication of debate to GROSVENOR in the calm reflective atmosphere of the committee room. In my experience I have known of but one case where so complete a change of sentiment was wrought in a shorter time. Some years ago I had the honor of being a member of a Republican caucus charged with the important duty of selecting a candidate to be presented to the legislature as United States Senator. There were two candidates before the caucus. During the proceedings the supporters of one of these candidates concluded that it was to their interest to postpone action, and some gentleman moved that an adjournment be taken until the following evening. One of his colleagues had been partaking somewhat freely of the cup that cheers and also inebriates, and had not observed that the motion came from his side. He at once arose, and, addressing the chair, said: "Mr. Chairman, there are two propositions before this caucus. One of those propositions is, Shall we adjourn? Another of those propositions is, Shall we not adjourn? Now, Mr. Chairman, so far as I am individually concerned, I am unalterably opposed to adjourning." Just at this point he caught sight of his colleague who had made the motion shaking a warning finger at him, and, without changing his emphasis or tone, he proceeded, "But, Mr. Chairman, if there is any gentleman here who wants to adjourn, so far as I am concerned, I am entirely willing."

But in addition to being characterized as "juvenile Republicans" we are also derided as "amateur statesmen." I am willing to overlook the insult conveyed by the first word in the expression in consideration of the implied compliment contained in the second, and cheerfully plead guilty to the charge. I think I know what the distinguished gentleman means by the expression. An "amateur statesman" is a member of the House who has not been in the business long enough to have acquired the ability to be upon more than one side of the same question at the same session.

But, Mr. Chairman, I think it is beyond doubt that the sugar-beet industry of this country will be injured by this legislation. If in no other way, confidence will be destroyed. It will be difficult and in some instances impossible for many of the factories to obtain the credit so necessary to business enterprises. But in addition to this there will be a discouragement to the further extension of the industry. As shown by the statistics of the Agricultural Department, there is to-day in contemplation the erection of 93 factories in the United States, involving an expenditure of the enormous sum of \$49,000,000. The erection of these factories will be discouraged by this legislation. It has been well said that "there is nothing in this world so timid as a million dollars except two millions."

If you pass this legislation you will put money into the hands of the sugar trust to fight the beet-sugar industry. We are familiar with the history of the American Sugar Refining Company and we know its disposition. A year ago it reduced prices in the Missouri Valley below cost in order to crush its rivals. If the result of this legislation shall be to put into the hands of this gigantic monopoly \$6,000,000 that will go to somebody, or to put into its hands only one-half of this amount, you will simply give to it that much money to be used against its only competitor in the production of refined sugar. It is said, however, that the trust will not get the benefit of any part of this reduction, but that the whole of it will go to the Cuban planters. If anyone imagines that the American Sugar Refining Company will not get some benefit from this reduction he is credulous enough to be called foolish. The sugar trust has a monopoly of the refining of raw sugar in this country. The Cuban planters can sell their raw sugar to no other customer. It is perfectly clear that the sugar trust being the only purchaser, it can dictate its own price to the seller, who must sell. It will not be disputed that the trust has the disposition to rob the Cuban planters of the benefit they would otherwise derive from this reduction in order to enrich itself. If further proof of this disposition is required it will be found in the testimony of Mr. Havemeyer, its sole manager, before the Industrial Commission, as follows:

Q. Now, I also understood you to imply at least that it is the policy of the American Sugar Refining Company to crush out all competition, if possible?

A. But that is not so; there is no such testimony. I understand it has been put in that form by one of the gentlemen, but it is not the fact. What I said was that it was the policy of the American Company to maintain and protect its trade, and if it resulted in crushing a competitor it is no concern of the American Company. If he gets in the press that is his affair, not ours.

Q. And if anyone interferes with the business, profits, or competition of the American Sugar Refining Company it is its policy to prevent it, if possible?

A. By lowering profits to defy it.

Q. And if it results in crushing him out—

A. (Interrupting.) That is his affair.

Q. Not the affair of the American Sugar Refining Company?

A. No.

On page 117 Mr. Havemeyer's testimony reads as follows:

Q. I say he (the consumer) may be benefited temporarily for six months or a year; but if, after the crushing out has taken place, you then, as you said in your testimony, resume a margin of profit which you consider is the right

thing, and that is the only thing you were governed by, I ask you then whether the consumer will be materially benefited or not?

A. Is he not benefited to the extent of the reduction of the prices during the fight?

Q. He is; but if he has to pay double or three times the price after the fight is ended I fail to see where he is benefited.

A. He is not if he has to pay that.

Q. I understood you to say when the war was ended you evened up?

A. Yes.

Q. The price you put on was for the benefit of the stockholder?

A. Yes.

Q. Do you think it is fair that the consumer should pay a dividend to your company on brands, good will, etc.?

A. I think it is fair to get out of the consumer all you can consistent with the business proposition.

Q. You state that as an ethical proposition before this Commission, and you have to stand on that ethical position for fair play. Now, I want to know if you think—you stated that the consumer received the benefits of this consolidation of industry—it a fair ethical position, independent of the business view you put on, that the consumer should pay dividends on this \$25,000,000 of overcapitalization?

A. I do not care 2 cents for your ethics. I do not know enough of them to apply them.

Does anyone believe that this gentleman, as tender and gentle a commercial buccaneer as ever "cut a throat or scuttled a ship," having both the power and the disposition, would permit the Cuban planter to receive \$1 of the saving effected by the reduction of the duty that he was able to take for himself?

It is a significant fact that the stock of the sugar trust has advanced from about \$116 to \$133 per share since the time it became reasonably certain that this bill would be passed. The gentlemen who deal in this stock are willing to pay these enhanced prices, because they believe that the trust will be benefited by this legislation, and if they, shrewd business men and shrewd speculators, believe it, why should we doubt?

But it is said that this proposed law is to last for less than two years; that the beet-sugar industry will not be hurt in this short time. The difficulty is that this legislation is proposed at the most critical time in the history of this industry. As I have already said, 93 factories are projected. If their erection is discouraged—as I firmly believe will be the case—the money will be invested elsewhere, and the opportunity for this great development will be gone. It is not much consolation to a man who is to be ruined to tell him that it will be done quickly. I am reminded of the gentleman who undertook a trip down the Niagara River in a barrel, upon a wager. By some strange dispensation of Providence he was saved to relate his experience. He said that it was "all plain and easy and beautiful sailing above the falls, and all plain and easy and beautiful sailing below the falls, but going over was h—l."

I am not going to take the time to discuss at any length the question of our duty to Cuba, because it is now practically conceded that we are under no moral or legal obligation to the Cuban people to pass this law. It must be conceded by everyone that we have been more than generous to these people. We have relieved them of \$300,000,000 of Spanish debts; we have distributed \$3,000,000 in cash among her people; we have distributed 5,493,500 rations among her people; we have cleaned her harbors and cities; we have given her liberty and independence at the cost of uncounted treasure of our own and the sacrifice of the lives of the best and bravest of our sons, and still they come to us for more. In heaven's name, when will this "Oliver Twist" among peoples be satisfied?

It is said, however, that it is a good business proposition for the United States. In return for this reduction upon our duties we are to be given a similar reduction and thereby obtain the Cuban markets for ourselves. This particular question must be considered apart from the question of our duty to the Cuban people, and so considered we have a right to analyze it as we would analyze any other business proposition. We propose to give to Cuba (or somebody) the equivalent of over \$6,000,000. We turn aside from our Treasury this much money, and for all practical purposes it is precisely the same as if we first permitted it to go into the Treasury and then paid it out again. What do we get in return?

Cuba last year bought from us a little more than \$28,000,000 worth of goods. She bought from other countries a little more than \$37,000,000. No one supposes that we would secure this entire trade; but suppose, for the sake of argument, we do. In exchange for between six and seven millions of dollars some of our business men would secure the sale of \$37,000,000 worth of their goods. Let us assume that upon these goods these business men would receive a profit of 10 per cent net, which I think is a very large estimate. This would amount to \$3,700,000. Reduced to the last analysis, therefore, this is a proposition to give to the Cuban people or the sugar trust, or both, over \$6,000,000 in order that some business men in this country may reap a possible profit of \$3,700,000.

I wish I had time to discuss at length my objection to this legislation upon the ground that it is opposed to Republican principles, but I have not. Upon the plainest principles of common honesty the Republican party can not afford to be responsible for it. We specifically invited the people of the United States to

engage in the growing of sugar beets and in the manufacture of sugar therefrom, under a pledge, not made expressly but none the less explicit, that we would protect them against the cheap sugar of other lands.

The bill is not in line with the Republican idea of reciprocity. In 1900 we declared—the Republican platform declared—that we favored the “associated policy of reciprocity so directed as to open our markets on favorable terms for what we do not ourselves produce in return for free foreign markets.” It was never intended by that declaration, it is not a part of the Republican policy, it is contrary to every declaration which the party leaders have made, to say that we shall make a trade agreement with a foreign country by which there shall be admitted to our ports a class of goods which will come into direct competition with the products of our own people.

But Mr. Chairman, I must conclude. I am opposed to this bill because it is based upon a cry for aid that is shown to be false; because it will destroy confidence in the sugar industry of our own land; because its benefits will go to the grasping hands of a mercenary trust that has already grown fat by feeding upon the people; because it is contrary to the best teachings of the Republican party under which we have become the greatest producing nation the world has ever seen; in short, because it is unnecessary, unwise, unbusinesslike, and un-Republican. [Loud Applause.]

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Chairman, I move that the committee rise. The motion was agreed to.

The committee accordingly rose; and Mr. LACEY having resumed the chair as Speaker pro tempore, Mr. SHERMAN, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that the committee had had under consideration the bill H. R. 12765 and had come to no resolution thereon.

#### ANNUAL REPORT OF BUREAU OF THE AMERICAN REPUBLICS.

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and ordered to be printed:

To the Senate and House of Representatives:

I transmit herewith a communication from the Acting Secretary of State, submitting the annual report of the Director of the Bureau of the American Republics and accompanying papers.

THEODORE ROOSEVELT.

WHITE HOUSE, April 15, 1902.

#### MILITARY ACADEMY APPROPRIATION BILL.

Mr. HULL. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Military Affairs, I submit the report on the bill (H. R. 13676) making appropriations for the support of the Military Academy for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1903, and for other purposes, and ask that it be referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union and ordered to be printed.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The bill and the report will be referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, and ordered to be printed.

Mr. RICHARDSON of Tennessee. I desire to reserve all points of order on the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. All points of order are reserved by the gentleman from Tennessee.

#### 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. 911. An act authorizing the Federal Railroad Company to construct a combined railroad, wagon, and foot-passenger bridge across the Missouri River at or near the village of Oacoma, Lyman County, S. Dak.—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

S. 1153. An act for the relief of Mary E. Parker—to the Committee on Claims.

S. 4069. An act to establish a fish hatchery and fish station in the State of South Carolina—to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

S. 1104. An act providing for the use by the United States of devices invented by its naval officers while engaged in its service and covered by letters patent—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

S. R. 77. Joint resolution providing for printing the general index to published volumes of the diplomatic correspondence and foreign relations of the United States—to the Committee on Printing.

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

The motion was agreed to.

And accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 33 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned.

#### EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATION.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, the following executive communication was taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

A letter from the assistant clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting a copy of the conclusions of fact and law in the French spoliation cases relating to the schooner *George and Jane*, Clark Elliott, master, against the United States—to the Committee on Claims.

#### REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII, bill and resolutions of the following titles were severally reported from committees, delivered to the Clerk, and referred to the several Calendars therein named, as follows:

Mr. CORLISS, from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 1905) for the erection of a keeper's dwelling at Grosse Isle, North Channel Range, Detroit River, Michigan, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1611); which said bill and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 1906) for the erection of a keeper's dwelling at Grosse Isle, South Channel Range, Detroit River, Michigan, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1612); which said bill and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. FLEMING, from the Committee on the Judiciary, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 12205) to provide for circuit and district courts of the United States at Valdosta, Ga., and to transfer certain counties from the northern to the southern district in said State, reported the same with amendments, accompanied by a report (No. 1613); which said bill and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

#### REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII, private bills and resolutions of the following titles were severally reported from committees, delivered to the Clerk, and referred to the Committee of the Whole House, as follows:

Mr. THOMAS of Iowa, from the Committee on Claims, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 2218) for the relief of the legal devisees of James W. Schaumburg, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1615); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. SCHIRM, from the Committee on Claims, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 3692) for the relief of Elizabeth B. Eddy, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1616); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. BUTLER of Pennsylvania, from the Committee on Claims, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 2482) for the relief of W. J. Kountz, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1617); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. REID, from the Committee on Claims, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 12075) for the relief of Jacob Swigert, late deputy collector seventh Kentucky district, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1619); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

#### ADVERSE REPORTS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII, Mr. RAY of New York, from the Committee on the Judiciary, to which was referred the House resolution (H. Res. 203) requesting the Attorney-General to inform the House of Representatives what steps have been taken by the Department of Justice to prosecute alleged violations of anti-trust law, reported the same adversely, accompanied by a report (No. 1614); which said bill and report were laid on the table.

#### CHANGE OF REFERENCE.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXII, the Committee on Pensions was discharged from the consideration of the bill (H. R. 8021) granting a pension to Jonathan F. Martin, and the same was referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

## PUBLIC BILLS, RESOLUTIONS, AND MEMORIALS.

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, bills, resolutions, and memorials of the following titles were introduced, and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. NORTON (by request): A bill (H. R. 13628) for grading V street from North Capitol street to Lincoln avenue east—to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. BROWNLOW: A bill (H. R. 13629) amending an act approved February 26, 1881, providing for the payment of pensions to pensioners who are inmates of the National Home for Disabled Volunteer Soldiers—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BABCOCK: A bill (H. R. 13630) to provide for the abatement of nuisances in the District of Columbia by the Commissioners of said District, and for other purposes—to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. MARSHALL: A bill (H. R. 13631) to reserve 640 acres of land in the State of North Dakota, embracing the White Stone Hills battlefield and burial ground, as a memorial park, and to embellish and improve the same—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. ACHESON: A bill (H. R. 13632) providing for memorial tablets to mark the position of each regiment and battery of regular United States troops engaged in the battle of Gettysburg—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. LACEY: A bill (H. R. 13672) providing for the leasing of gilsonite mineral lands in the Uncompahgre Reservation in Utah—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. McLACHLAN: A bill (H. R. 13673) for the erection of a statue of Commodore John D. Sloat in the city of Monterey, Cal.—to the Committee on the Library.

By Mr. OVERSTREET: A bill (H. R. 13674) amendatory of sections 3339 and 3341 of the Revised Statutes of the United States, relative to internal-revenue tax on fermented liquors—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HULL, from the Committee on Military Affairs: A bill (H. R. 13676) making appropriations for the support of the Military Academy for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1903, and for other purposes—to the Union Calendar.

By Mr. KEHOE: A joint resolution (H. J. Res. 179) providing for the annual printing of franks used in sending out seeds—to the Committee on Printing.

By Mr. BURLISON: A resolution (H. Res. 211) requesting the Secretary of War to furnish the minutes of the court-martial of Maj. Littleton W. Waller—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. BURTON: A resolution (H. Res. 212) concerning compensation for clerical services rendered Committee on Rivers and Harbors—to the Committee on Accounts.

## PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills of the following titles were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BOWERSOCK: A bill (H. R. 13633) granting a pension to Laura M. Swan Anderson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BREAZEALE: A bill (H. R. 13634) granting an increase of pension to Helen Olivia Leckie—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. DE ARMOND (by request): A bill (H. R. 13635) granting an increase of pension to George W. Burgess—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. FOSTER of Vermont: A bill (H. R. 13636) granting a pension to Sarah A. Grinnell—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. GIBSON: A bill (H. R. 13637) granting a pension to Orlena Beasley—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13638) granting an increase of pension to Thomas Hickman—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. GRIFFITH: A bill (H. R. 13639) granting an increase of pension to Hannah Riley—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13640) granting an increase of pension to John Settle—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13641) for the relief of the heirs of Joseph Jennison—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13642) granting a pension to Joel O. White—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13643) granting an increase of pension to Arthur F. Devereux—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. GROW: A bill (H. R. 13644) granting a pension to Maletta Hill—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13645) granting a pension to Hiram B. Wilson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HALL: A bill (H. R. 13646) granting an increase of pension to John G. Heiser—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HAUGEN: A bill (H. R. 13647) granting an increase of pension to Hiram Booth—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. KEHOE: A bill (H. R. 13648) for the benefit of Elizabeth Redmon, Joseph Redmon, Charles Redmon, Frank Redmon, Mrs. M. L. Hull, Mrs. W. W. Hall, and Mrs. G. K. McProud, heirs of John Redmon—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. LACEY: A bill (H. R. 13649) granting a pension to Mary A. Baldrige—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. LOUD: A bill (H. R. 13650) to correct the military record of James M. Olmstead—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. NORTON: A bill (H. R. 13651) granting a pension to John Rodgers—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13652) granting an increase of pension to Anderson H. Ash—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13653) granting an increase of pension to Ermina A. Boss—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13654) granting an increase of pension to Charles Reiter—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. RIXEY: A bill (H. R. 13655) for the relief of the estate of James T. Ball, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13656) granting an increase of pension to Charles H. Baugher—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. ROBB: A bill (H. R. 13657) for the relief of George W. Mattingly—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13658) for the relief of Ellen Mansfield and Mattie Mansfield—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. SNODGRASS: A bill (H. R. 13659) for the relief of Daniel Ladd—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13660) for the relief of Jackson Pryor—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13661) for the relief of Joseph P. Rollins—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13662) granting a pension to Calvin E. Myers—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13663) granting a pension to Dempsey D. Driver—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13664) granting a pension to Solomon C. Robinson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13665) granting an increase of pension to George R. Baldwin—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13666) granting an increase of pension to Andrew F. Byers—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13667) granting an honorable discharge to George W. Peneyhouse—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. THOMAS of North Carolina: A bill (H. R. 13668) for the relief of the heirs of Nathan D. Adams—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. VAN VOORHIS: A bill (H. R. 13669) granting an increase of pension to James H. McVicker—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WILSON: A bill (H. R. 13670) granting an increase of pension to Annie Freeman—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WRIGHT: A bill (H. R. 13671) for the relief of Charles F. Sayles—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. McRAE: A bill (H. R. 13675) granting an increase of pension to George W. White—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 Mr. ACHESON: Resolutions of Polish Roman Catholic Societies, of Everson, Pa., favoring the erection of a statue to the late Brigadier-General Count Pulaski at Washington—to the Committee on the Library.

Also, papers to accompany House bill 4429, granting a pension to George W. Meanor—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, papers to accompany House bill 4426, granting increase of pension to Daniel Sims—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. ADAMSON: Resolutions of the Board of Trade of Columbus, Ga., indorsing the Ray bankruptcy bill—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BATES: Petition of officers and veterans of the Pennsylvania State Soldiers and Sailors' Home, Erie, Pa., for the passage of House bill 13438, to promote the efficiency of the clerical service in the Navy, etc.—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. BURKE of South Dakota: Petition of Owen Hoey and others, of South Dakota, in favor of House bills 170 and 179, for

the repeal of the tax on distilled spirits—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CALDERHEAD: Petition of John F. Jelke, Chicago, in relation to the oleomargarine bill—to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, resolutions of McAllister Lodge, No. 374, of Herrington, Kans., favoring an educational qualification for immigrants—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. COOMBS: Petition of D. R. Hess and others, in favor of House bills 178 and 179, for the repeal of the tax on distilled spirits—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CROMER: Resolution of Fire Insurance Agents' Union No. 8530, of Elwood, Ind., favoring an educational test for restriction of immigration—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. EMERSON: Resolutions of Laborers' Protective Union No. 9512, of Ticonderoga, N. Y., favoring a restriction of immigration and cheap labor—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. ESCH: Petition of Rabbi V. Caro, in the name of Jewish citizens of Milwaukee, Wis., in relation to the violation by Russia of its treaty with the United States, and in support of the Goldfogle bill—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. GIBSON: Papers to accompany House bill granting a pension to Orlena Beasley—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions. Also, papers to accompany House bill granting a pension to Thomas Hickman—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. GRAHAM: Petition of Woman's Board of Home Missions of the Presbyterian Church, New York, protesting against the passage of House bill 12543, for the admission of the Territories of Arizona and New Mexico to statehood—to the Committee on the Territories.

Also, resolution of United Mine Workers of Tarentum, Pa., for the further restriction of immigration—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, petition of T. J. Morgan and officers of various missionary boards in the United States, protesting against the teachings and institutions of Mormonism—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petitions of Major W. G. Lowry Post, No. 548, of Wilkesburg, and St. Kress Post, No. 284, of Slatington, Pa., Grand Army of the Republic, favoring House bill No. 3067, relating to pensions—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. GRIFFITH: Papers to accompany House bill 13641, granting an increase of pension to John Settle—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HAY: Petition of Walker Ritter, of Frederick County, Va., for reference of war claim to Court of Claims—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. HEMENWAY: Resolutions of Labor Union of Owensville, Ind., favoring an educational qualification for immigrants—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. KERN: Petition of sundry citizens and farmers of Smithton, Ill., favoring the oleomargarine bill—to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, resolutions of Foundry Employees' Union No. 9617, of Belleville, Labor Union No. 8769, of Muscota, Ill., and Labor Union No. 8306, of Sandoval, Ill., for the exclusion of illiterate immigrants—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. LINDSAY: Resolution of Eureka Lodge, No. 434, Association of Machinists, Brooklyn, N. Y., favoring an educational qualification for immigrants—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. LITTAUER: Resolutions of Laborers' Protective Union No. 9465, Corinth, N. Y., favoring a restriction of immigration and cheap labor—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. MARSHALL: Resolutions of Journeymen Tailors' Union No. 237, of Fargo, N. Dak., for the further restriction of immigration—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. MARTIN: Petition of citizens of South Dakota, in favor of the adoption of the metric system in the United States—to the Committee on Coinage, Weights, and Measures.

By Mr. McANDREWS: Petitions of various Polish societies of Chicago, Ill., favoring House bill 16, for the erection of an equestrian statue to the late General Pulaski at Washington, D. C.—to the Committee on the Library.

Also, resolutions of Reliable Lodge, No. 253, of Chicago, Ill., Association of Machinists, favoring the reenactment of the Chinese-exclusion act—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, resolution of the same lodge, favoring the construction of naval vessels at Government navy-yards—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Also, resolutions of Horse Nail Makers' Union No. 7180, Chicago,

Ill., favoring restriction of immigration—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. McCLEARY: Resolution of the St. Paul (Minn.) Jobbers' Union, favoring amendments to the national bankruptcy law—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, letters of Augusta A. Connor and other citizens of Minneapolis, Minn., asking for the appointment of a commission to investigate woman suffrage in the Western States—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MORRELL: Petition of the East End Suburban Citizens' Association of the District of Columbia, for the passage of bill authorizing the use of electric lights by means of wires on poles east of Rock Creek and beyond Florida avenue—to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Also, resolutions of Machinists' Association No. 348, Philadelphia, Pa., for the further restriction of immigration—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. NEVILLE: Paper to accompany House bill 5171, for the relief of Catherine Grace—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. NORTON: Petition of Merle Miller and other citizens of Sycamore, Ohio, and resolutions of American Flint Glass Workers' Union No. 81, of Fostoria, Ohio, favoring the Chinese-exclusion act—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, resolutions of Federal Labor Union, No. 88, Sandusky, Ohio, favoring an educational restriction on immigration—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, resolutions of Division No. 124, Locomotive Engineers, Bucyrus, Ohio, favoring the passage of the Hoar-Grosvenor anti-injunction bill—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, papers to accompany House bill to grade V street from North Capitol street to Lincoln avenue east—to the Committee on Appropriations.

Also, papers to accompany House bill granting an increase of pension to Charles Reiter, Tiffin, Ohio—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, paper to accompany House bill granting an increase of pension to Ermina A. Boss, Vermilion, Ohio—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, papers to accompany House bill granting an increase of pension to Anderson H. Ash, Marion, Ohio—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, papers to accompany House bill granting an increase of pension to John Rodgers, State Soldiers' Home, Ohio—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. PALMER: Resolutions of the Board of Trade of Pittston, Pa., urging the passage of House bill No. 8337, confirming certain powers of the Interstate Commerce Commission—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. RIXEY: Papers to accompany House bill granting an increase of pension to Charles H. Baugher—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. ROBB: Papers to accompany House bill for the relief of George W. Mattingly—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. SHATTUC: Papers to accompany House bill 13377, to place D. B. Jeffers on the retired list of the Army—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, papers to accompany House bill 5274, granting an honorable discharge to Isaac Dulhagen—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. SIBLEY: Petition of Mount Pleasant Grange No. 68, of Pennsylvania, protesting against the passage of bill for the irrigation of arid lands—to the Committee on Irrigation of Arid Lands.

By Mr. SNOOK: Petition of Subordinate Association No. 19 of Lithographers' International Protective and Beneficial Association, favoring an educational qualification for immigrants—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, paper to accompany House bill 12495, granting a pension to Amelia Hollinshead—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. STARK: Papers to accompany House bill 12751, granting an increase of pension to Martin L. Pembleton—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. STEELE: Resolutions of Kokomo Lodge, No. 463, Machinists Association of Kokomo, Ind., for the restriction on immigration—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. STEWART of New Jersey: Resolutions of Trenton, N. J., Lodge No. 28, Railroad Trainmen, favoring the passage of the Foraker-Corliss safety-appliance bill—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. SULZER: Resolutions of the New York Board of Trade and Transportation, in favor of the enactment of the Lovering bill in relation to the export trade—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. THOMAS of North Carolina: Paper to accompany

House bill for the relief of the heirs of Nathan D. Adams—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. VAN VOORHIS: Resolutions of Lithographers' Protective Beneficial Association, Coshocton, Ohio, for the exclusion of illiterate immigrants—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. WEEKS: Resolution of the board of control of State house of correction and prison at Marquette, Mich., relative to the restriction of transportation of prison-made merchandise—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

## SENATE.

WEDNESDAY, April 16, 1902.

The Senate met at 10 o'clock a. m.

Prayer by Rev. HENRY N. COUDEN, Chaplain of the House of Representatives.

The Secretary proceeded to read the Journal of yesterday's proceedings, when, on request of Mr. CLAPP, and by unanimous consent, the further reading was dispensed with.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the Journal will stand approved. It is approved.

### REPORT ON FRAUDULENT ENTRY OF CHINESE LABORERS.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following communication from the Secretary of the Treasury; which was read, and ordered to lie on the table:

TREASURY DEPARTMENT, OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY,  
Washington, April 14, 1902.

SIR: In response to Senate resolution of 9th instant, I have the honor to inform you that thus far the official report made to the Treasury Department by Inspector James E. Dunn, referred to in said Senate resolution, has not been found among the correspondence on file in the Department.

It is recalled in the Bureau of Immigration that such a report was made, embodying, as well, various other matters in relation to the enforcement of the Chinese-exclusion laws at the port of San Francisco; but under the system of filing of the said Bureau some question of administration would be taken as the subject of such a report, and it would be given an appropriate number designating that subject rather than a statement of the nature referred to in the Senate resolution. The search, however, will be continued, and when found, if still desirable, the official report referred to will be forwarded.

Respectfully,

L. M. SHAW,  
Secretary.

The PRESIDENT OF THE SENATE,  
Washington, D. C.

### STATUE OF GEN. ULYSSES S. GRANT.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the report of the Grant Statue or Memorial Commission relative to the selection of a site, plans, and designs for a statue or memorial of Gen. Ulysses S. Grant, late President of the United States and General of the armies thereof, etc.; which, with the accompanying papers, were referred to the Committee on the Library, and ordered to be printed.

### LANDS OF THE CHEROKEE NATION.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a memorial of the national council of the Cherokee Nation requesting the individualization of the lands and disbursements of moneys, etc., together with a draft of a bill prepared by direction of the Secretary; which, with the accompanying papers, was referred to the Committee on Indian Affairs, and ordered to be printed.

### CHINESE EXCLUSION.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The President of the Senate has received a communication from the executive council of the American Federation of Labor, relating to the pending Chinese bill, with the request that it be read. Is there any objection to its being read? The Chair hears none, and the Secretary will read the communication.

The communication was read, and ordered to lie on the table, as follows:

AMERICAN FEDERATION OF LABOR,  
Washington, D. C., April 15, 1902.

Hon. WILLIAM P. FRYE,  
President pro tempore United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: The undersigned, the executive council of the American Federation of Labor, being in session in this city of Washington, D. C., had under consideration the matter of legislation relative to the exclusion of the Chinese laborers from the United States and its insular territory. It may be unnecessary to indicate how deeply interested are the men and women of our country whom we have the honor to represent in the matter of this legislation, and desirous of serving them, as well as all people of our country, to the very best of our ability, we have adopted the following preambles and resolution:

"Whereas the Philippines, with their large Chinese population of the pure and mixed blood and their proximity to China, serve, and could to a greater degree serve, as a reservoir of Chinese laborers, and a bridge over which Chinese could and would come to the mainland territory of the United States unless stopped by effective legislation; and

"Whereas any law which does not exactly define the meaning to be given to the treaty terms 'official,' 'teacher,' 'student,' 'merchant,' and 'traveler' would, in view of Chinese duplicity, be a mockery and of no value; and

"Whereas the seamen are clearly entitled to equal protection from Chinese competition and contamination as are other workers in our common country; and

"Whereas the validity of the entire Scott Act of 1888 is in controversy in an appeal case now pending before the Supreme Court, and it is generally admitted that the attack will be sustained by the court, neither the Proctor bill nor the Platt amendment dealing in any way with these new questions or the emergency which will beyond doubt arise by the court's decision:

"Resolved by the executive council of the American Federation of Labor in session assembled. That we hold said Proctor bill and Platt amendment utterly inadequate and contrary to the best interests of labor all over the country, in the mills of New England or the Carolinas, as well as the workers on the Pacific coast and in the intermountain States; and

"Further resolved. That we are firmly convinced that the Mitchell-Kahn bill, as reported from the Committee on Immigration and passed by the House of Representatives, is the only exclusion bill that will exclude now before Congress; and we therefore urge all true friends of the policy of the exclusion of Chinese laborers from the United States to vote for this bill and to defeat any amendment offered thereto tending to weaken it in any of its essential or effective features."

We sincerely trust that this petition, embodying our best judgment, may meet with your favorable consideration, and that you may honor us by presenting the same to the Senate in session.

Thanking you in advance, in anticipation of your compliance with our request, we have the honor to remain,

Very respectfully,

Samuel Gompers, of New York, president; James Duncan, Boston, Mass., first vice-president; John Mitchell, Indianapolis, Ind., second vice-president; James O'Connell, Oil City, Pa., third vice-president; Max Morris, Denver, Colo., fourth vice-president; Thomas I. Kidd, Chicago, Ill., fifth vice-president; D. A. Hayes, Newark, Ohio, sixth vice-president; John B. Lennon, Illinois, treasurer; Frank Morrison, of Chicago, secretary, executive council American Federation of Labor [seal].

### PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The President of the Senate has received 61 additional telegraphic memorials from the Pacific coast against the Mitchell bill (so-called) and for the Platt amendment. Also 2 from Seattle, protesting against the seamen clause; also 12 from the labor unions of Portland, Me., in favor of the Mitchell bill and against the Platt amendment. The President of the Senate does not feel like filling the RECORD with these telegrams, and will suggest, if there be no objection, that they simply be noted in the RECORD. Is there objection? The Chair hears none.

Mr. TURNER. Do I understand that some of those telegrams are from Seattle?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. There are two from Seattle. Mr. TURNER. I should like to have an opportunity to examine them.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. They are by themselves here. The telegrams were ordered to lie on the table, as follows:

- A telegram from S. M. Mears, president of the board of trustees, Chamber of Commerce of Portland, Oreg.;
- A telegram from A. H. Mohler, president of the Portland and Asiatic Steamship Company of Portland, Oreg.;
- A telegram from John Breuner Company, of San Francisco, Cal.;
- A telegram from Charles Forman, ex-president of the Chamber of Commerce of Los Angeles, Cal.;
- A telegram from George H. Stewart, of Los Angeles, Cal.;
- A telegram from R. P. Burr, of Sacramento, Cal.;
- A telegram from Theodore B. Wilcox, president of the Portland Flouring Mills Company, of Portland, Oreg.;
- A telegram from John F. Francis, of Los Angeles, Cal.;
- A telegram from H. J. Knowles, secretary of the Pacific Steam Whaling Company, of San Francisco, Cal.;
- A telegram from William Wolfe & Co., of San Francisco, Cal.;
- A telegram from Lawrence Harris, of San Francisco, Cal.;
- A telegram from O. G. Sage, of Sacramento, Cal.;
- A telegram from W. A. Kelsey, of the Los Angeles Capital, of Los Angeles, Cal.;
- A telegram from J. F. Sims, of San Francisco, Cal.;
- A telegram from T. M. Stevens & Co., of Portland, Oreg.;
- A telegram from W. E. Dennison, president of the Steiger Terra Cotta and Pottery Works, of San Francisco, Cal.;
- A telegram from Gladding, McBean & Co., of San Francisco, Cal.;
- A telegram from Charles E. Fredericks, president of Joseph Fredericks & Co., Incorporated, of San Francisco, Cal.;
- A telegram from J. Eppinger, of San Francisco, Cal.;
- A telegram from G. W. McNear, jr., of San Francisco, Cal.;
- A telegram from H. L. Tatum, of San Francisco, Cal.;
- A telegram from Thomas C. Berry, of San Francisco, Cal.;
- A telegram from T. C. Gibbons, of San Francisco, Cal.;
- A telegram from L. Kauffman, of San Francisco, Cal.;
- A telegram from E. A. Bresse, of San Francisco, Cal.;
- A telegram from George H. Higbee, of San Francisco, Cal.;
- A telegram from Andrew E. Moseley, of San Francisco, Cal.;
- A telegram from George P. Morrow, of San Francisco, Cal.;
- A telegram from John Herd, of San Francisco, Cal.;
- A telegram from G. W. Hume, of San Francisco, Cal.;
- A telegram from George W. Scott, of the Scott & Van Arsdale Lumber Company, Incorporated, of San Francisco, Cal.;
- A telegram from Meyer Wilson & Co., of San Francisco, Cal.;