

By Mr. RICHARDSON of Alabama: Papers to accompany bill for the relief of John Smaw—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, papers to accompany bill for the relief of John T. Graves, of Madison County, Ala.—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. RIVES: Paper to accompany bill for relief of Solomon Trallood—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SHARTEL: Petition of citizens of the Fifteenth Congressional district of Missouri, favoring restriction of immigration—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. SHERMAN: Papers to accompany bill granting a pension to Herman A. Harris—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WM. ALDEN SMITH: Protest of the Farmers' Institute of Saginaw County, Mich., against reduction of tariff on sugar from the Philippine Islands—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. STERLING: Affidavit of Scott Arnold, to accompany bill (H. R. 2721) for an increase of pension—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. THOMAS of Ohio: Resolution of the Board of Trade, in favor of railway rate legislation—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of Edenburg and Tippecanoe councils, Junior Order United American Mechanics, in favor of restricting immigration—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. WILEY of Alabama: Petition of the Findlay Mercantile Company, of Pollard, Ala., urging repeal of the 15 per cent ad valorem tax on imported hides—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WEISSE: Resolution of the National Woman's Christian Temperance Union, urging reform on sundry subjects—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition for the relief of the victims of the *General Slocum* disaster—to the Committee on Claims.

SENATE.

MONDAY, January 15, 1906.

Prayer by the Chaplain, Rev. EDWARD E. HALE.

The Secretary proceeded to read the Journal of the proceedings of Thursday last, when, on request of Mr. KEAN, and by unanimous consent, the further reading was dispensed with.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Journal stands approved.

REFORM SCHOOL OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA.

The VICE-PRESIDENT appointed Mr. DILLINGHAM a consulting trustee, on the part of the Senate, of the Reform School of the District of Columbia in accordance with the act of Congress approved May 3, 1876.

ACCEPTANCE OF DECORATIONS.

The VICE-PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of State, requesting that Capt. D. E. Nolan, General Staff, United States Army, be authorized to accept the decoration of Chevalier of the Legion of Honor recently conferred upon him by the French Government; which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, and ordered to be printed.

He also laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of State, requesting that Capt. Thomas M. Miller, United States Navy; Commander Herbert O. Dunn, United States Navy; Chaplain William H. I. Reany, United States Navy; Lieut. Victor A. Kimberly, United States Navy; Lieut. Harry L. Brinser, United States Navy; Asst. Surg. Theodore N. Rees, United States Navy; Paymaster Charles R. O'Leary, United States Navy, and First Lieut. Frank C. Lander, United States Marine Corps, be authorized to accept certain photographs presented to them by the Mexican Government as a memorial of their services on board the U. S. S. *Columbia*, when she carried the remains of Mr. Azpiroz, the late ambassador from Mexico to the United States, from this country to his native land; which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, and ordered to be printed.

PRINTING OF GEOLOGICAL SURVEY MAPS.

The VICE-PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a letter from the Director of the Geological Survey requesting that there be inserted in the urgent deficiency appropriation bill a provision providing that any money arising in payment for the furnishing of engraved and lithographic data in the possession of the Survey be deposited in the Treasury and placed to the credit of the appropriation for engraving and printing the

Geological Survey maps of the United States, etc.; which, with the accompanying paper, was referred to the Committee on the Geological Survey, and ordered to be printed.

BUILDING FOR DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE AND LABOR.

The VICE-PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of Commerce and Labor, transmitting the draft of a bill authorizing the Secretary of Commerce and Labor to lease for the term of ten years a suitable building in the District of Columbia large enough to accommodate the various bureaus and offices of that Department, now occupying rented buildings; which, with the accompanying paper, was referred to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds, and ordered to be printed.

ANCHORAGE OF VESSELS.

The VICE-PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of Commerce and Labor, transmitting the draft of a bill to prohibit any vessel from anchoring in such a manner as to obstruct or interfere with the range lights established in any navigable waters of the United States by the United States Light-House Board; which, with the accompanying paper, was referred to the Committee on Commerce, and ordered to be printed.

SCHOOLS IN ALASKA.

The VICE-PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a letter from the Commissioner of Education relative to the employees of the school service in Alaska in regard to assignments of pay and reimbursement for expenses, etc., together with a prepared form of such remedial legislation as is necessary in the premises; which, with the accompanying papers, was referred to the Committee on Territories, and ordered to be printed.

DISPOSITION OF PROPERTY IN HAWAII.

The VICE-PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a letter from the governor of Hawaii relative to the enactment of further legislation providing for the disposition of personal property belonging to the United States and now in the possession of the Territorial government, etc., together with the draft of a bill to provide for the disposition of certain property in the Territory of Hawaii; which, with the accompanying papers, was referred to the Committee on Pacific Islands and Porto Rico, and ordered to be printed.

CHESAPEAKE AND POTOMAC TELEPHONE COMPANY.

The VICE-PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the annual report of the Chesapeake and Potomac Telephone Company for the year 1905; which was referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia, and ordered to be printed.

FRENCH SPOILIATION CLAIMS.

The VICE-PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the assistant clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting the conclusion of fact and of law filed under the act of January 20, 1885, in the French spoliation claims set out in the findings of the court relative to the vessel schooner *Whim*, John Boyd, master; which, with the accompanying paper, was referred to the Committee on Claims, and ordered to be printed.

FINDINGS OF COURT OF CLAIMS.

The VICE-PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the assistant clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting a certified copy of the findings of fact filed by the court in the cause of the Mount Zion Society, of Fairfield County, S. C., v. The United States; which, with the accompanying paper, was referred to the Committee on Claims, and ordered to be printed.

He also laid before the Senate a communication from the assistant clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting a certified copy of the findings of fact filed by the court in the cause of Odile Deslonde, sole heir of Eloise Deslonde, v. The United States; which, with the accompanying paper, was referred to the Committee on Claims, and ordered to be printed.

He also laid before the Senate a communication from the assistant clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting a certified copy of the findings of fact filed by the court in the cause of the trustees of Hiram Lodge, No. 7, Ancient Free and Accepted Masons, of Franklin, Tenn., v. The United States; which, with the accompanying paper, was referred to the Committee on Claims, and ordered to be printed.

He also laid before the Senate a communication from the assistant clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting a certified copy of the findings of fact filed by the court in the cause of the Trustees of the Presbyterian Church of Lumber Bridge, N. C., v. The United States; which, with the accompanying paper, was referred to the Committee on Claims, and ordered to be printed.

He also laid before the Senate a communication from the assistant clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting a certified copy of the findings of fact filed by the court in the cause of *The Trustees of the Methodist Episcopal Church South, of Moorhead, N. C., v. The United States*; which, with the accompanying paper, was referred to the Committee on Claims, and ordered to be printed.

ATCHISON, TOPEKA AND SANTE FE RAILWAY COMPANY.

The VICE-PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the Attorney-General, transmitting, in response to a resolution of the 8th instant, copies of correspondence between the President and the Attorney-General and others relating to a departure from the published rates of the Atchison, Topeka and Sante Fe Railway Company in the transportation of coal for the Colorado Fuel and Iron Company, together with a copy of the opinion of Judge Phillips in the contempt proceedings begun on account of the departure from published rates; which, with the accompanying papers, was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and ordered to be printed.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE.

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. W. J. BROWNING, its Chief Clerk, announced that the House had passed a joint resolution (H. J. Res. 68) relating to the contingent expenses of the House of Representatives; in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message also announced that the House had passed, with an amendment, the bill (S. 2558) authorizing the Washington Bridge Company to construct a bridge across the Columbia River near the city of Wenatchee, Wash.; in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS.

The VICE-PRESIDENT presented a petition of the Board of Trade of St. Paul, Minn., praying for the enactment of legislation to enlarge the powers of the Interstate Commerce Commission; which was referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

He also presented a petition of the American Association for the Advancement of Science, praying for the enactment of legislation to prevent the impending destruction of Niagara Falls on the American side by the diversion of the waters for manufacturing purposes; which was referred to the Committee on Forest Reservations and the Protection of Game.

Mr. GALLINGER presented a petition of the Board of Trade of Peterboro, N. H., praying that an appropriation be made providing for the erection of a statue in that city to the memory of Gen. James Miller, the hero of Lundys Lane; which was referred to the Committee on the Library.

He also presented the petition of Woodward & Lothrop, of Washington, D. C., praying for the enactment of legislation to restore the names of streets, avenues, alleys, highways, and reservations in the District of Columbia; which was referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

He also presented petitions of Lida J. Hart, president of the Woman's Relief Corps, Department of the Potomac, Grand Army of the Republic; of Byron W. Bonney, commander Phil Sheridan Post, No. 14, Department of the Potomac, Grand Army of the Republic; of Mrs. Sarah E. Pittman, president of the Ladies' Union Veteran Legion, Department of the Potomac, Grand Army of the Republic, and of Frank Hume and sundry citizens, all of Washington, D. C.; of Bishop Earl Cranston and sundry other ministers and clergymen of the United States; of 379 leading merchants and 2,180 citizens of the United States, and of John C. Smith, department commander, Grand Army of the Republic, of Chicago, Ill., praying for the enactment of legislation to establish a temporary home in the District of Columbia for ex soldiers and sailors of the late wars; which were referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Mr. SMOOT presented a petition of the Utah Medical Society, of Provo, Utah, praying for the passage of the so-called "pure-food bill"; which was ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. FRYE presented the petition of J. G. Harvey and sundry other citizens of Old Orchard, Me., praying for an investigation of the charges made and filed against Hon. REED SMOOT, a Senator from the State of Utah; which was referred to the Committee on Privileges and Elections.

He also presented a petition of the Board of Trade of Bangor, Me., praying for the enactment of legislation providing for the reorganization of the consular service; which was ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented a memorial of Local Lodge No. 82, Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen, of Portland, Me., remonstrating against the passage of the so-called "Esch-Townsend railroad-rate bill"; which was referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

He also presented petitions of Regal Council, No. 21, of Mexico; of Mount Blue Council, No. 22, of East Wilton; of Pine Tree Council, No. 41, of Cape Porpoise, and of Crystal Lake Council, No. 19, of Weld, all of the Junior Order of United American Mechanics, in the State of Maine, praying for the enactment of legislation to restrict immigration; which were referred to the Committee on Immigration.

He also presented memorials of Local Union No. 376, of Waterville; of Local Union No. 40, of Biddeford, and of Joe Hedrick, of Presque Isle, all in the State of Maine, remonstrating against the passage of the so-called "Philippine tariff bill"; which were referred to the Committee on the Philippines.

Mr. ALLISON presented the petition of Orin Parker, of Dubuque, Iowa, praying that he be retired as a second lieutenant in the Signal Corps of the United States Army; which was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

He also presented a memorial of the Federation of Labor of Cedar Rapids, Iowa, remonstrating against a reduction of duty on cigars imported from the Philippine Islands; which was referred to the Committee on the Philippines.

He also presented a petition of the Medical Society of Winnebago County, Iowa, praying for the enactment of legislation to provide for the control of the spread of tuberculosis; which was referred to the Committee on Public Health and National Quarantine.

He also presented a memorial of G. E. Boynton Lodge, No. 138, Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen, of Eagle Grove, Iowa, remonstrating against the enactment of legislation to enlarge the powers of the Interstate Commerce Commission; which was referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

Mr. HOPKINS presented a petition of the Chicago Historical Society, of Chicago, Ill., praying for the appointment of a national historical commission and that an appropriation be made for the erection of a building for the use of the commission; which was referred to the Committee on the Library.

Mr. SCOTT presented petitions of Tanner Council, No. 87, of Tanner; of Valley Star Council, No. 60, of Limestone; of Chester Council No. 81, of Chester; of the Island Council, No. 4, of Wheeling, and of Local Council No. 1, of Wheeling, all of the Junior Order United American Mechanics, in the State of West Virginia, praying for the enactment of legislation to restrict immigration, and also for the revision of the laws governing naturalization; which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. BURNHAM presented the petition of H. A. Lesure and 13 other citizens of Keene, N. H., praying for the adoption of an amendment to the postal laws relative to fraud orders; which was referred to the Committee on Post-Offices and Post-Roads.

He also presented the petition of Edward S. Miller, of Woodsville, N. H., praying for an investigation of the charges made and filed against Hon. REED SMOOT, a Senator from the State of Utah; which was referred to the Committee on Privileges and Elections.

He also presented the petition of Jesse P. Marshall, of Kingston, N. H., praying for the enactment of legislation to prevent the destruction of Niagara Falls on the American side by the diversion of the waters for manufacturing purposes; which was referred to the Committee on Forest Reservations and the Protection of Game.

Mr. DRYDEN presented petitions of the Orange Political Study Club, of Orange; of the Village Improvement Association, of Cranford, and of the Wednesday Morning Club, of Cranford, all in the State of New Jersey, praying for the passage of the so-called "pure-food bill"; which were ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented a petition of sundry citizens of Bloomfield, N. J., praying for the enactment of legislation to create in the War Department a special roll, to be known as the "Volunteer retired list"; which was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

He also presented a petition of the Organization of the General Slocum Survivors, of New York City, N. Y., praying for the enactment of legislation granting relief to the victims of the General Slocum disaster; which was referred to the Committee on Claims.

He also presented petitions of the Orange Political Club, of Orange; of the Woman's Club of Glen Ridge, and of the Equal Suffrage League of Plainfield, all in the State of New Jersey, praying for the enactment of legislation to regulate child labor in the District of Columbia; which were referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

He also presented petitions of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Collingswood; of the Pyne Poynt Library Company, of Camden; of the New Jersey Congress of Mothers, of Atlantic City, and of sundry citizens of Beverley and East Orange,

all in the State of New Jersey, and of Dr. William C. Stokes, of Philadelphia, Pa., praying for an investigation of the charges made and filed against Hon. REED SMOOT, a Senator from the State of Utah; which were referred to the Committee on Privileges and Elections.

He also presented a memorial of Local Union No. 138, Cigar Makers' International Union, of Newark, N. J., remonstrating against the passage of the so-called "Philippine tariff bill;" which was referred to the Committee on the Philippines.

He also presented petitions of sundry citizens of Elberon, Newark, Englewood, and Moorestown, of the Improvement Association of Moorestown, and of the Municipal Art League of East Orange, all in the State of New Jersey, praying for the enactment of legislation to prevent the impending destruction of Niagara Falls on the American side by the diversion of the waters for manufacturing purposes; which were referred to the Committee on Forest Reservations and the Protection of Game.

He also presented petitions of Local Division No. 22, Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers, of Camden; of Local Union No. 305, of Millville, and of Local Union No. 121, of Bridgeton, all of the Brotherhood of Carpenters and Joiners of America; of Fieldsboro Council, No. 52, of Bordentown, and of Anthony Wayne Council, No. 159, of Newark, all of the Junior Order of United American Mechanics; of Camp No. 14, of Trenton; of Washington Camp, No. 33, of New Egypt; of Washington Camp, No. 7, of Trenton; of Washington Camp, No. 23, of Palmyra, and of Washington Camp, No. 27, of Trenton, all of the Patriotic Order Sons of America, in the State of New Jersey, praying for the enactment of legislation to restrict immigration; which was referred to the Committee on Immigration.

Mr. TALIAFERRO presented a petition of sundry citizens of Orlando, Fla., praying for the ratification of international arbitration treaties; which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. WETMORE presented a petition of Local Grange No. 8, Patrons of Husbandry, of Davisville, R. I., praying that increased appropriations be made for the maintenance of agricultural experiment stations; which was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

Mr. ANKENY presented a petition of the Chamber of Commerce of Spokane, Wash., praying that an appropriation be made for the completion of the report on the mineral resources of the United States and the investigation of the black sands on the Pacific slope; which was referred to the Committee on Mines and Mining.

He also presented a memorial of sundry citizens of Tacoma, Wash., remonstrating against the ratification of the Isle of Pines treaty; which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

He also presented a petition of the Chamber of Commerce of Spokane, Wash., praying for the enactment of legislation to reorganize the consular service of the United States; which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

He also presented memorials of sundry citizens of Elma, Hoquiam, and Aberdeen, all in the State of Washington, remonstrating against any reduction of the duty on cigars imported from the Philippine Islands; which were referred to the Committee on the Philippines.

Mr. NELSON presented a memorial of sundry citizens of Minnesota, remonstrating against the ratification of the Isle of Pines treaty; which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

He also presented a petition of the Board of Trade of St. Paul, Minn., praying for the enactment of legislation to enlarge the powers of the Interstate Commerce Commission; which was referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

He also presented the petition of John L. Beveridge and 100 other generals of the Volunteer Army of the United States of the civil war, praying for the enactment of legislation creating a volunteer retired list for surviving generals; which was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. HEYBURN presented a petition of the clergy of the Diocese of Pennsylvania, praying for the passage of the so-called "pure-food bill;" which was ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. ALDRICH presented a petition of the Agricultural Federation of Rhode Island, praying that increased appropriations be made for the maintenance of agricultural experiment stations; which was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

Mr. SPOONER presented a memorial of sundry citizens of Hanover, Wis., remonstrating against the ratification of the Isle of Pines treaty; which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

He also presented the memorial of John Kessler and sundry other citizens of Watertown, Wis., and the memorial of Fred

C. Marl and sundry other citizens of Superior, Wis., remonstrating against any reduction of the duty on cigars imported from the Philippine Islands; which were referred to the Committee on the Philippines.

Mr. PENROSE presented a petition of sundry citizens of Philadelphia, Pa., praying for an investigation of the charges made and filed against Hon. REED SMOOT, a Senator from the State of Utah; which was referred to the Committee on Privileges and Elections.

He also presented a petition of the Trades League, of Philadelphia, Pa., praying for the enactment of legislation to permit the admission to this country of Chinese visitors and travelers not of the cooly class, on the same terms and conditions as now apply to travelers from any other country; which was referred to the Committee on Immigration.

He also presented petitions of sundry citizens of Johnsonburg; of Washington Camp, No. 404, of Philadelphia; Local Council No. 591, of Saxton; Local Camp No. 606, of Lloydell; of sundry citizens of Fredericksburg; of Washington Camp, No. 258, of Fredericksburg; of Brotherhood of Carpenters No. 227, of Philadelphia; of Local Union No. 462, Carpenters and Joiners, of Greensburg; Local Lodge No. 24, Knights of Pythias, of Dunlo; of George Washington Council, No. 423, of Sharpsburg; Old Monongahela Lodge, No. 209, of Elizabeth; Saratoga Council, No. 262, of Pittsburg; Local Union No. 1693, Carpenters and Joiners, of Harrisburg; Local Union No. 947, United Brotherhood of Carpenters and Joiners, of Ridgway; Stroh Council, No. 731, of Weissport; of Camp No. 215, of Ambler; of Oak Grove Council, No. 307, of Pleasant Corner; Jordan Council, No. 746, of Allentown; Blue Mountain Lodge, No. 694, Brotherhood of Railway Trainmen, of Marysville; of sundry citizens of Bridesburg; of Nicetown Division, No. 171, of Philadelphia; of sundry citizens of Danville; Local Union No. 847, of Harrisville; Good Will Council, No. 42, of Tyrone; of Falls City Council, No. 385, of Beaver Falls; of Camp No. 98, of Philadelphia; of Washington Camp, No. 77, of Philadelphia; of William Boyd Council, No. 964, of Pond Hill; of sundry citizens of Philadelphia; of Steelton Council, of Steelton; Reliable Council, No. 90, of Allegheny City; Western Council, of Belle Vernon; Mahoning Council, of Punxsutawney; Charles A. Gerasch Council, of Kutztown; Lewisburg Council, of Lewisburg; Columbia Council, of Wilkes-Barre; Mount Pisgah Council, of Mauch Chunk; Tunkhannock Council, of Tunkhannock; New Tripoli Grand Council, of New Tripoli; Cohocksink Tribe and Council, No. 126 and No. 150, of Philadelphia, all in the State of Pennsylvania, praying for the enactment of legislation to restrict immigration; which were referred to the Committee on Immigration.

Mr. CLAPP presented a memorial of Local Union No. 98, Cigar Makers' International Union, of St. Paul, Minn., remonstrating against any reduction of the duty on cigars imported from the Philippine Islands; which was referred to the Committee on the Philippines.

He also presented a petition of the Board of Trade of St. Paul, Minn., praying for the enactment of legislation to require common carriers engaged in interstate commerce to furnish all rolling stock for the safe carriage of freight originating on their several lines; which was referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

Mr. HANSBROUGH presented a petition of sundry citizens of Cass County, N. Dak., and a petition of sundry citizens of Grandin, N. Dak., praying for the enactment of legislation providing for the drainage of lands in the counties lying along the Red River Valley of the North, in that State; which were referred to the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation of Arid Lands.

He also presented a petition of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of North Dakota, and a petition of sundry citizens of Thompson, N. Dak., praying for an investigation of the charges made and filed against Hon. REED SMOOT, a Senator from the State of Utah; which were referred to the Committee on Privileges and Elections.

Mr. FRAZIER presented a petition of Wartburg Council, No. 15, Junior Order United American Mechanics, of Wartburg, Tenn., praying for the enactment of legislation to restrict immigration; which was referred to the Committee on Immigration.

Mr. CARTER presented sundry papers to accompany the bill (S. 2663) for the relief of James A. Fitzgerald; which were referred to the Committee on Claims.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES.

Mr. TALIAFERRO, from the Committee on Pensions, to whom was referred the bill (S. 1702) granting a pension to Adolphus N. Pacetty, reported it without amendment, and submitted a report thereon.

He also, from the same committee, to whom was referred the

bill (S. 1709) granting a pension to Florence Greeley De Veaux, reported it with amendments, and submitted a report thereon.

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

A bill (S. 2112) granting an increase of pension to John Heck;

A bill (S. 2113) granting an increase of pension to Agnes Zentz;

A bill (S. 622) granting an increase of pension to Hiram Swain; and

A bill (S. 238) granting an increase of pension to John Savage.

Mr. GEARIN, from the Committee on Pensions, to whom were referred the following bills, reported them each with an amendment, and submitted reports thereon:

A bill (S. 625) granting an increase of pension to Phebe J. Bennett;

A bill (S. 1042) granting an increase of pension to Francis Piccard; and

A bill (S. 1456) granting a pension to Joann Morris.

Mr. McCUMBER, from the Committee on Pensions, to whom were referred the following bills, reported them each with an amendment, and submitted reports thereon:

A bill (S. 1841) granting a pension to Robert Catlin;

A bill (S. 950) granting a pension to Emma M. Rea; and

A bill (S. 493) granting an increase of pension to Charles M. Wittig.

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

A bill (S. 142) granting an increase of pension to William Furlong;

A bill (S. 138) granting an increase of pension to Michael Linehan;

A bill (S. 943) granting an increase of pension to Oscar R. Arnold;

A bill (S. 206) granting an increase of pension to Gordon H. Shepard;

A bill (S. 209) granting an increase of pension to George F. Ross; and

A bill (S. 210) granting an increase of pension to Silas P. Hall.

Mr. McCUMBER, from the Committee on Pensions, to whom were referred the following bills, reported them severally with amendments, and submitted reports thereon:

A bill (S. 1163) granting an increase of pension to Martha G. Cushing;

A bill (S. 314) granting a pension to Aletha E. Reynolds;

A bill (S. 315) granting an increase of pension to George Pike; and

A bill (S. 472) granting an increase of pension to David F. Magee.

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

A bill (S. 575) granting an increase of pension to John Flynn;

A bill (S. 576) granting an increase of pension to Frederick J. Shelley;

A bill (S. 1466) granting an increase of pension to Philena Davis;

A bill (S. 715) granting a pension to Georgia A. Rollins;

A bill (S. 851) granting an increase of pension to Frederick Houser;

A bill (S. 74) granting an increase of pension to Aaron T. Currier;

A bill (S. 2481) granting an increase of pension to Elijah R. Wilkins; and

A bill (S. 1828) granting an increase of pension to Alvin Abbott.

Mr. BURNHAM, from the Committee on Pensions, to whom were referred the following bills, reported them each with an amendment, and submitted reports thereon:

A bill (S. 1467) granting an increase of pension to Laura A. Blodgett;

A bill (S. 16) granting a pension to Susan H. Cutler;

A bill (S. 183) granting an increase of pension to Henry F. Hunt;

A bill (S. 837) granting an increase of pension to Elizabeth C. Dunton; and

A bill (S. 707) granting a pension to Alice E. Gilley.

Mr. BURNHAM, from the Committee on Pensions, to whom were referred the following bills, reported them severally with amendments, and submitted reports thereon:

A bill (S. 1258) granting an increase of pension to Charles W. Paige;

A bill (S. 178) granting an increase of pension to Irene A. Cochrane;

A bill (S. 785) granting an increase of pension to Franklin C. Pierce; and

A bill (S. 9) granting an increase of pension to David P. Bolster.

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

A bill (S. 534) granting an increase of pension to Dennis A. Davis;

A bill (S. 531) granting an increase of pension to William H. Satterthwait; and

A bill (S. 923) granting an increase of pension to Nathaniel L. Badger.

Mr. PILES, from the Committee on Pensions, to whom was referred the bill (S. 991) granting a pension to Jane McMahon, reported it with amendments, and submitted a report thereon.

He also, from the same committee, to whom were referred the following bills, reported them each with an amendment, and submitted reports thereon:

A bill (S. 96) granting an increase of pension to George A. Francis;

A bill (S. 193) granting an increase of pension to John C. Eberly; and

A bill (S. 1035) granting an increase of pension to Andrew McClory.

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

A bill (S. 122) granting an increase of pension to Michael Stump;

A bill (S. 2825) granting an increase of pension to John M. Scott;

A bill (S. 2071) granting an increase of pension to Henry T. Anshutz; and

A bill (S. 1200) granting a pension to Esther G. Wharton.

Mr. SCOTT, from the Committee on Pensions, to whom was referred the bill (S. 515) granting an increase of pension to Dennis Buckley McCready, alias Dennis McCready, alias Thomas Buckley, reported it with amendments, and submitted a report thereon.

He also, from the same committee, to whom was referred the bill (S. 509) granting a pension to Annie L. Tredick, reported it with an amendment, and submitted a report thereon.

Mr. BURKETT, from the Committee on Pensions, to whom was referred the bill (S. 564) granting an increase of pension to Wilson Hyatt, reported it with an amendment, and submitted a report thereon.

He also, from the same committee, to whom was referred the bill (S. 565) granting an increase of pension to Lombard D. Aldrich, reported it with amendments, and submitted a report thereon.

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

A bill (S. 385) granting an increase of pension to George W. Gearey; and

A bill (S. 1474) granting an increase of pension to Joseph Davis.

Mr. TELLER, from the Committee on Indian Affairs, to whom was referred the bill (S. 1794) to ratify an agreement with the Indians of the Klamath Indian Reservation, in Oregon, and making appropriations to carry the same into effect, reported it without amendment, and submitted a report thereon.

Mr. HANSBROUGH, from the Committee on Public Lands, to whom was referred the bill (S. 1266) for the relief of John M. Hill, reported it without amendment, and submitted a report thereon.

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

A bill (S. 1368) granting an increase of pension to William H. Hicks;

A bill (S. 1525) granting an increase of pension to Zachariah Bradfield; and

A bill (S. 407) granting an increase of pension to George W. Purvis.

Mr. PATTERSON, from the Committee on Pensions, to whom were referred the following bills, reported them each with an amendment, and submitted reports thereon:

A bill (S. 596) granting an increase of pension to Eliza J. Harding;

A bill (S. 603) granting an increase of pension to Lide S. Leonard;

A bill (S. 1098) granting an increase of pension to William J. Grow;

A bill (S. 647) granting an increase of pension to Leonard Harmony;

A bill (S. 1524) granting an increase of pension to John M. Berkey; and

A bill (S. 1517) granting an increase of pension to John C. Kennedy.

Mr. CLAPP, from the Committee on Indian Affairs, to whom were referred the following bills, reported them severally without amendment, and submitted reports thereon:

A bill (S. 2783) to repeal section 11 of the act entitled "An act making appropriations for the current and contingent expenses of the Indian Department and for fulfilling treaty stipulations with various Indian tribes for the year ending June 30, 1890, and for other purposes;" and

A bill (S. 2786) to authorize the Secretary of the Treasury to refund to purchasers of pine timber on ceded Indian lands sums paid in excess of the correct amounts due for timber cut.

Mr. GORMAN, from the Committee on the District of Columbia, to whom was referred the bill (S. 2138) for the relief of the estate of William B. Todd, deceased, reported it without amendment, and submitted a report thereon.

Mr. CLARK of Wyoming, from the Committee on the Judiciary, to whom was referred the bill (S. 2286) to confer jurisdiction upon the circuit court of the United States for the ninth circuit to determine in equity the rights of American citizens under the award of the Bering Sea arbitration at Paris and to render judgment thereon, asked to be discharged from its further consideration, and that it be referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations; which was agreed to.

Mr. SMOOT, from the Committee on Pensions, to whom was referred the bill (S. 328) granting an increase of pension to John W. Warner, reported it with an amendment, and submitted a report thereon.

He also, from the same committee, to whom was referred the bill (S. 322) granting an increase of pension to Isabella Workman, reported it with amendments, and submitted a report thereon.

SETTLERS ON UTAH INDIAN RESERVATION LANDS.

Mr. SMOOT. I am directed by the Committee on Public Lands to report back favorably with an amendment the bill (S. 321) to provide for the extension of time within which homestead settlers may establish their residence upon certain lands which were heretofore a part of the Uinta Indian Reservation, within the counties of Uinta and Wasatch, in the State of Utah, and I ask for its present consideration.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The bill will be read for the information of the Senate.

The Secretary read the bill; and by unanimous consent the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to its consideration.

The amendment of the committee was, in line 12, page 1, to strike out the word "matter" and insert the word "manner;" so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the homestead settlers on lands which were heretofore a part of the Uinta Indian Reservation, within the counties of Uinta and Wasatch, in the State of Utah, opened under the acts of May 27, 1902, and March 3, 1903, and March 3, 1905, be, and they are hereby, granted an extension of time in which to establish their residence upon the lands so opened and filed upon until the 15th day of May, A. D. 1906: *Provided, however,* That this act shall in no manner affect the regularity or validity of such filings, or any of them, so made by the said settlers on the lands aforesaid; and it is only intended hereby to extend the time for the establishment of such residence as herein provided, and the provisions of said acts are in no other manner to be affected or modified.

Mr. ALLISON. I ask the Senator from Utah to make a brief statement of the bill.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, the object in asking the extension of time for the settlers to establish their residence within the Uinta Reservation is owing to the fact that it is impossible for people to go there in February and March.

Last July the President issued his proclamation opening the reservation, and in August the drawing took place, proceeding from the 1st to the 12th of August last year. August 28 was the day set for the first filings on those lands and they were to extend for sixty days from that time, so many filings each day; and that would throw the time of settlement into the dead of winter, as the law requires it must be done within six months.

It is absolutely impossible for people to get in there in the months of January, February, or March. The bill proposes that the time shall be extended until May 15 of the present year for the homesteaders to establish their residence on the land filed on. The people had no chance to say when they could file upon the land, for that was done by the regulation of the General Land Office, and it was at a time when, as I said, it was abso-

lutely impossible to establish their residence within six months on the lands filed on.

Therefore I ask that the bill be passed now, because February 28 is in the dead of winter, and if the time is not extended the settlers will have to go there and attempt to make their homes at that time, which would be impossible. The bill proposes to extend the time until May 15.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment reported by the committee.

The amendment was agreed to.

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

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

BILLS INTRODUCED.

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

A bill (S. 3007) for the relief of the wardens and vestry of Grace Church, of Charleston, S. C.;

A bill (S. 3008) for the relief of the Church of the Cross, of St. Lukes Parish, of Bluffton, S. C.;

A bill (S. 3009) for the relief of Trinity Church, on Edisto Island, S. C.;

A bill (S. 3010) for the relief of the Church of the Holy Trinity, of Grahamville, S. C.;

A bill (S. 3011) for the relief of the trustees of Enhau Baptist Church, of Grahamville, S. C.;

A bill (S. 3012) for the relief of the Protestant Episcopal Church of the Parish of St. Philip, in Charleston, in the State of South Carolina;

A bill (S. 3013) for the relief of Stony Creek Presbyterian Church, of McPhersonville, S. C.;

A bill (S. 3014) for the relief of the trustees of Black Swamp Baptist Church, of Robertville, S. C.;

A bill (S. 3015) for the relief of the French Protestant Church, in Charleston, S. C.;

A bill (S. 3016) for the relief of Winyah Lodge, No. 40, A. F. and A. M., of South Carolina;

A bill (S. 3017) for the relief of the wardens and vestry of St. Helena Episcopal Church, of Beaufort, S. C.;

A bill (S. 3018) for the relief of the trustees of the Baptist Church of Beaufort, S. C.;

A bill (S. 3019) for the relief of W. R. Parks and C. H. Stone (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 3020) for the relief of John P. Hunter (with accompanying papers); and

A bill (S. 3021) for the relief of Sheldon Episcopal Church, of Prince William Parish, South Carolina.

Mr. BLACKBURN introduced a bill (S. 3022) to provide for the distribution of the Annotated Statutes and Constitution of the United States; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also introduced a bill (S. 3023) raising the rank of Chief Engineer Robert Potts on the retired list of the Navy; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

He also introduced a bill (S. 3024) granting an increase of pension to David S. Trumbo; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. CLARK of Montana introduced a bill (S. 3025) for the survey and allotment of lands now embraced within the limits of the Fort Peck Indian Reservation, in the State of Montana, and the sale and disposal of all surplus lands after allotment; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

Mr. DRYDEN introduced a bill (S. 3026) to amend an act entitled "An act to establish the Department of Commerce and Labor," approved February 14, 1903, being chapter 552 of the United States Statutes enacted by the Fifty-seventh Congress; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also introduced a bill (S. 3027) to remove the charge of desertion standing against the name of Charles H. Colver; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

He also introduced a bill (S. 3028) granting an increase of pension to Helen C. Sanderson; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. CARTER introduced a bill (S. 3029) granting an increase of pension to Delia A. Hooker; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also introduced a bill (S. 3030) granting an increase of pension to William H. H. Scott; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. ALLEE introduced a bill (S. 3031) granting an increase of pension to Frank Westervelt; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. HEYBURN introduced a bill (S. 3032) for the ascertainment, survey, marking, and permanent establishment of the boundary line between the State of Idaho and the State of Washington; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Public Lands.

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

A bill (S. 3033) granting an increase of pension to Aaron F. Patten;

A bill (S. 3034) granting an increase of pension to Hollis W. Tinker;

A bill (S. 3035) granting an increase of pension to Charles W. Shedd (with an accompanying paper);

A bill (S. 3036) granting an increase of pension to John O. Thorn (with an accompanying paper); and

A bill (S. 3037) granting a pension to Elmira S. Tupper.

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

A bill (S. 3038) granting a pension to Tennessee England; and

A bill (S. 3039) granting an increase of pension to Joseph Smith.

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

A bill (S. 3040) granting a pension to Mary C. Wilsey; and

A bill (S. 3041) granting a pension to Mertilla Crawford.

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

A bill (S. 3042) granting an increase of pension to Abraham B. Morton; and

A bill (S. 3043) granting an increase of pension to Henry D. Hall (with accompanying papers).

Mr. FRYE introduced a bill (S. 3044) to promote the efficiency of the Revenue-Cutter Service; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Commerce.

Mr. PETTUS introduced a bill (S. 3045) to incorporate The American Cross of Honor within the District of Columbia; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying paper, referred to the Committee on Corporations Organized in the District of Columbia.

He also introduced the following bills; which were severally read twice by their titles, and referred to the Committee on Claims:

A bill (S. 3046) for the relief of Aaron Turner (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 3047) for the relief of the estate of Matthew N. Grimmett, deceased (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 3048) for the relief of John T. Graves (with an accompanying paper);

A bill (S. 3049) for the relief of the estate of William Curtis, deceased;

A bill (S. 3050) for the relief of the estate of Peter H. Gold, deceased;

A bill (S. 3051) for the relief of the estate of Green Guest, deceased;

A bill (S. 3052) for the relief of the estate of Elizabeth Thompson, deceased;

A bill (S. 3053) for the relief of the estate of H. S. Simmons, deceased;

A bill (S. 3054) for the relief of J. W. Smart;

A bill (S. 3055) for the relief of Mrs. Ann E. Sanders;

A bill (S. 3056) for the relief of heirs of George Orville Ragland, deceased;

A bill (S. 3057) for the relief of the estate of Dr. J. E. Prestridge, deceased;

A bill (S. 3058) for the relief of James R. Nance;

A bill (S. 3059) for the relief of the estate of Mary McCaa, deceased;

A bill (S. 3060) for the relief of the Masonic lodge of Bexar, Marion County, Ala.;

A bill (S. 3061) for the relief of Joseph Lightfoot;

A bill (S. 3062) for the relief of William M. Hilliard;

A bill (S. 3063) for the relief of the estate of Bradford Hambrick, deceased;

A bill (S. 3064) for the relief of the estate of Caswell B. Derrick, deceased;

A bill (S. 3065) for the relief of Ransom Day;

A bill (S. 3066) for the relief of the Methodist Episcopal Church of Bellefonte, Jackson County, Ala.;

A bill (S. 3067) for the relief of the estate of Sidney F. Tate, deceased;

A bill (S. 3068) for the relief of the estate of Preston Smith, deceased;

A bill (S. 3069) for the relief of the estate of Solomon Smith, deceased;

A bill (S. 3070) for the relief of the estate of Benjamin B. Coffey, deceased;

A bill (S. 3071) for the relief of William Cunningham;

A bill (S. 3072) for the relief of the estate of B. G. Chandler, deceased;

A bill (S. 3073) for the relief of Griffin Callahan;

A bill (S. 3074) for the relief of the estate of John Black, deceased;

A bill (S. 3075) for the relief of William C. Bragg;

A bill (S. 3076) for the relief of William M. Underwood;

A bill (S. 3077) for the relief of Amanda M. Warren;

A bill (S. 3078) for the relief of the estate of Joseph M. Witt, deceased;

A bill (S. 3079) for the relief of the estate of J. C. West, deceased;

A bill (S. 3080) for the relief of Dr. Ira G. Wood;

A bill (S. 3081) for the relief of Philip D. Wright;

A bill (S. 3082) for the relief of the estate of James Woosley, deceased;

A bill (S. 3083) for the relief of James H. Young, Benjamin F. Young, and F. A. Young;

A bill (S. 3084) for the relief of the estate of Thomas V. Provence, deceased;

A bill (S. 3085) for the relief of the estate of James H. Ware, deceased;

A bill (S. 3086) for the relief of the estate of Jonathan Paulk, deceased;

A bill (S. 3087) for the relief of the estate of Joseph Logan, deceased;

A bill (S. 3088) for the relief of Francis Wilkes;

A bill (S. 3089) for the relief of Sarah Autrey;

A bill (S. 3090) for the relief of the estate of Mirah Ballard, deceased;

A bill (S. 3091) for the relief of the estate of Elizabeth Blake, deceased;

A bill (S. 3092) for the relief of the estate of David Crowell, deceased;

A bill (S. 3093) for the relief of the estate of Levi Jones, deceased;

A bill (S. 3094) for the relief of the estate of M. Light, deceased;

A bill (S. 3095) for the relief of Jonathan Lewis;

A bill (S. 3096) for the relief of M. V. Stearnes;

A bill (S. 3097) for the relief of the estate of Annie Dunn, deceased;

A bill (S. 3098) for the relief of the estate of Minor Gwinn, deceased;

A bill (S. 3099) for the relief of the estate of Samuel H. Gilbert, deceased;

A bill (S. 3100) for the relief of the St. Louis, Iron Mountain and Southern Railway Company;

A bill (S. 3101) for the relief of the Northern Pacific Railway Company; and

A bill (S. 3102) for the relief of the estate of Dedrick Stokein.

Mr. WARNER introduced a bill (S. 3103) for the erection of a statue to the memory of Maj. Gen. Franz Sigel at Washington, D. C.; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Library.

He also introduced a bill (S. 3104) to establish a national military park to commemorate the battle of Pilot Knob; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

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

A bill (S. 3105) granting a pension to Elias R. Meliken;

A bill (S. 3106) granting a pension to David Silversmith;

A bill (S. 3107) granting a pension to Hugh L. Jones; and

A bill (S. 3108) granting an increase of pension to Mary M. Stark.

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

A bill (S. 3109) for the relief of W. W. Wright;

A bill (S. 3110) for the relief of the estate of Abraham Caswell, deceased; and

A bill (S. 3111) for the relief of Jesse Chilton.

Mr. TALIAFERRO introduced a bill (S. 3112) granting an increase of pension to James H. Gardner; which was read twice

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

Mr. McCREARY introduced a bill (S. 3113) for the relief of Louis Landram, administrator of William J. Landram, deceased; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

He also introduced a bill (S. 3114) granting a pension to Amanda Harris; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also introduced a bill (S. 3115) to correct the military record of Joseph H. Stroebel; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. OVERMAN introduced a bill (S. 3116) for the relief of John F. Foard; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

He also introduced a bill (S. 3117) for the relief of John H. Gray, administrator of J. W. Gray, deceased; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

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

A bill (S. 3118) granting a pension to Frances Biglow;

A bill (S. 3119) granting an increase of pension to F. A. Beranek;

A bill (S. 3120) granting an increase of pension to Mary Driscoll;

A bill (S. 3121) granting an increase of pension to John G. Blessing;

A bill (S. 3122) granting an increase of pension to E. C. Clark; and

A bill (S. 3123) granting an increase of pension to W. H. Alban.

Mr. FULTON introduced a bill (S. 3124) to establish an assay office at Portland, Oreg.; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. GALLINGER introduced a bill (S. 3125) granting a pension to Parthenia W. Baker; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also introduced a bill (S. 3126) granting an increase of pension to Stephen B. Tarlton; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. FRAZIER introduced the following bills; which were severally read twice by their titles, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Claims:

A bill (S. 3127) for the relief of Yandell Wood and the legal representatives of the estate of J. L. Wood, deceased;

A bill (S. 3128) for the relief of Charles R. Greene; and

A bill (S. 3129) for the relief of the estate of Dr. Alfred Martin, deceased.

Mr. HANSBROUGH introduced a bill (S. 3130) granting an increase of pension to George B. Vallandigham; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Pensions.

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

A bill (S. 3131) granting an increase of pension to Ann E. Gridley;

A bill (S. 3132) granting an increase of pension to Georgia D. Brown; and

A bill (S. 3133) granting an increase of pension to Ambrose P. Phillips.

Mr. HALE introduced a bill (S. 3134) providing for the erection of a monument in Arlington Cemetery to the memory of Charles Vernon Gridley, late captain, United States Navy; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

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

A bill (S. 3135) for the relief of the heirs of Nicholas Stone-street, deceased;

A bill (S. 3136) to reimburse and indemnify the town of Frederick, in the State of Maryland;

A bill (S. 3137) for the relief of Richard H. Marshall; and

A bill (S. 3138) for the relief of Caroline Murtagh.

Mr. GORMAN introduced a bill (S. 3139) for the relief of Lorenzo A. Bailey; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

He also introduced a bill (S. 3140) for the relief of the estate of Samuel Kirby, deceased; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

He also introduced a bill (S. 3141) granting an increase of pension to Amanda A. Birch; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. PENROSE introduced a bill (S. 3142) establishing a retirement or pension fund for railway postal clerks; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Post-Offices and Post-Roads.

He also introduced a bill (S. 3143) to provide for the extension and enlargement of the public building at Lancaster, Pa.; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

He also introduced a bill (S. 3144) to provide for the casting in bronze and erection in the city of Washington of the colossal equestrian group known as "The Indian Buffalo Hunt;" which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Library.

He also introduced a bill (S. 3145) for repayment of duty on refined sugar, and for other purposes; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also introduced the following bills; which were severally read twice by their titles, and referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs:

A bill (S. 3146) to authorize the President to place the name of Adam K. Baylor on the retired list of the United States Navy with the rank of mate, United States Navy;

A bill (S. 3147) to correct the naval record of John Clark, alias Daniel Andrews;

A bill (S. 3148) to appoint Wilbur F. Cogswell a chief engineer in the Navy and place him on the retired list;

A bill (S. 3149) for the relief of the estate of Henry C. Nields, deceased; and

A bill (S. 3150) to add a corps of dental surgeons to the Bureau of Medicine and Surgery of the Navy.

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

A bill (S. 3151) for the relief of George Rushberger;

A bill (S. 3152) to refer to the Court of Claims the claim of Reaney, Son & Archbold for the *Tunais*;

A bill (S. 3153) for the relief of Louisa Weaver (with accompanying papers); and

A bill (S. 3154) for the relief of Lena Foster (with accompanying papers).

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

A bill (S. 3155) fixing the status of the Porto Rico Provisional Regiment of Infantry (with an accompanying paper);

A bill (S. 3156) to grant an honorable discharge from the military service to Robert C. Gregg;

A bill (S. 3157) restoring the name of Henry L. Beck to the Army rolls as captain and providing that he then be placed on the retired list (with an accompanying paper);

A bill (S. 3158) to correct the military record of Edward A. Smith (with an accompanying paper);

A bill (S. 3159) to correct the military record of Philip Graham;

A bill (S. 3160) to authorize and direct the Secretary of War to purchase certain lands on the battlefield of Gettysburg, and making an appropriation therefor;

A bill (S. 3161) to correct the military record of Edward Means;

A bill (S. 3162) to correct the military record of Joseph Beck;

A bill (S. 3163) to correct the military record of Edward T. Lewis;

A bill (S. 3164) to correct the military record of Patrick F. McDermott;

A bill (S. 3165) for the relief of Charles Mummey; and

A bill (S. 3166) for the relief of Aaron Everly (with accompanying papers).

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

A bill (S. 3167) granting a pension to Theresa Fox;

A bill (S. 3168) granting an increase of pension to Obadiah Derr;

A bill (S. 3169) granting an increase of pension to William Major;

A bill (S. 3170) granting an increase of pension to Gilbert L. Eberhart;

A bill (S. 3171) granting an increase of pension to John F. Buttner;

A bill (S. 3172) granting an increase of pension to John W. Gummo;

A bill (S. 3173) granting an increase of pension to Albert F. Rightmyer;

A bill (S. 3174) granting an increase of pension to Condy Manelius;

A bill (S. 3175) granting a pension to Allison F. Kohler;

A bill (S. 3176) granting an increase of pension to W. H. H. Taylor;

A bill (S. 3177) granting a service pension to all officers and enlisted men of the United States Army, Navy, and Marine Corps, both Regular and Volunteer, who have been awarded medals of honor, or who may hereafter be awarded such medals, under acts of Congress approved December 21, 1861; July 12 and 16, 1862, and March 3, 1863, and any other act or acts amendatory thereof or supplemental thereto;

A bill (S. 3178) granting an increase of pension to Daniel Shelley;

A bill (S. 3179) granting a pension to Mary Irvin;

A bill (S. 3180) granting an increase of pension to Jacob A. Geiger;

A bill (S. 3181) granting an increase of pension to James Searles Mann;

A bill (S. 3182) granting an increase of pension to Walter Lynn;

A bill (S. 3183) granting a pension to Emma A. Davis (with an accompanying paper);

A bill (S. 3184) granting an increase of pension to Alfred T. Hawk (with an accompanying paper);

A bill (S. 3185) granting a pension to Frederic H. Milton;

A bill (S. 3186) granting an increase of pension to Charles L. Atwater (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 3187) granting a pension to John Harper (with an accompanying paper);

A bill (S. 3188) granting a pension to Isabella Britton;

A bill (S. 3189) granting an increase of pension to Elizabeth Rutherford;

A bill (S. 3190) granting a pension to W. V. Feltwell;

A bill (S. 3191) granting an increase of pension to Henry B. Arnold;

A bill (S. 3192) granting an increase of pension to Levi R. Fox;

A bill (S. 3193) granting a pension to Moses E. Osborn;

A bill (S. 3194) granting an increase of pension to James E. Howard;

A bill (S. 3195) granting pensions to soldiers and sailors confined in so-called Confederate prisons;

A bill (S. 3196) to pension certain soldiers and nonenlisted men who served in the war of the rebellion;

A bill (S. 3197) granting an increase of pension to Hiram Focht (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 3198) granting a pension to Arthur Kennedy (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 3199) granting an increase of pension to Andrew J. Coulton;

A bill (S. 3200) granting an increase of pension to Solomon McMaster (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 3201) granting an increase of pension to Robert L. Keith (with an accompanying paper);

A bill (S. 3202) granting an increase of pension to William Johnston (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 3203) granting an increase of pension to Arthur T. Duncan (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 3204) granting an increase of pension to Josiah H. Weakly (with an accompanying paper);

A bill (S. 3205) granting a pension to Sarah Haviland (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 3206) granting an increase of pension to Carrie Diefenbach;

A bill (S. 3207) granting a pension to G. D. Cowen;

A bill (S. 3208) granting a pension to F. Max Gress;

A bill (S. 3209) granting a pension to Silas R. Anderson;

A bill (S. 3210) granting a pension to Annie S. Jones (with an accompanying paper);

A bill (S. 3211) granting a pension to Fayette Sykes (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 3212) granting an increase of pension to Joseph Umsted;

A bill (S. 3213) granting an increase of pension to George Fusselman (with an accompanying paper);

A bill (S. 3214) granting a pension to William H. Richardson;

A bill (S. 3215) granting an increase of pension to Jacob Bickart (with an accompanying paper);

A bill (S. 3216) granting a pension to Robert J. Campbell;

A bill (S. 3217) granting a pension to M. Kate Monteith;

A bill (S. 3218) granting an increase of pension to Emanuel M. Leib;

A bill (S. 3219) granting an increase of pension to Joseph M. Allison;

A bill (S. 3220) granting an increase of pension to Wilbur H. Clark;

A bill (S. 3221) granting an increase of pension to Robert Mills;

A bill (S. 3222) granting an increase of pension to Henry Golder;

A bill (S. 3223) granting an increase of pension to Elizabeth M. Muller;

A bill (S. 3224) granting a pension to Nancy A. Teeters (with an accompanying paper);

A bill (S. 3225) granting a pension to Robert W. Shaffer (with an accompanying paper);

A bill (S. 3226) granting a pension to Henry Coleman (with an accompanying paper);

A bill (S. 3227) granting a pension to Mary A. Dunkle;

A bill (S. 3228) granting a pension to Katherine E. Kemble (with an accompanying paper);

A bill (S. 3229) granting an increase of pension to Jacob B. De Hart (with an accompanying paper);

A bill (S. 3230) granting an increase of pension to William C. Bourke (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 3231) granting an increase of pension to W. H. Brady;

A bill (S. 3232) granting an increase of pension to Mary Jane Schure;

A bill (S. 3233) granting an increase of pension to William S. Hosack;

A bill (S. 3234) granting an increase of pension to Henry Reynolds (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 3235) granting a pension to Philip S. Dale; and

A bill (S. 3236) granting a pension to Charles Hughes (with accompanying papers).

Mr. CLAPP introduced a bill (S. 3237) providing for public administrators in Indian Territory, and for other purposes; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

He also introduced a bill (S. 3238) for the relief of James Davidson; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

He also introduced a bill (S. 3239) granting a pension to Rebecca Dapron; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. FORAKER introduced a bill (S. 3240) granting an increase of pension to John T. Jones; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. LONG introduced a bill (S. 3241) to reimburse Ulysses G. Winn for money erroneously paid into the Treasury of the United States; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

He also introduced a bill (S. 3242) granting an increase of pension to Daniel Woolley; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying paper, referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. NELSON introduced a bill (S. 3243) granting an increase of pension to Akey C. Johnson; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. NIXON introduced a bill (S. 3244) granting an increase of pension to Anna F. Keith; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

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

A bill (S. 3245) creating the Mesa Verde National Park;

A bill (S. 3246) ceding to the city of Canyon City, Colo., certain lands for park purposes;

A bill (S. 3247) creating the Royal Gorge National Park;

A bill (S. 3248) to set aside portions of the public domain for experiment in rubber culture; and

A bill (S. 3249) for the relief of Leann S. King, assign of Thomas Leitensdorfer.

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

A bill (S. 3250) to establish a laboratory for the study of the criminal, pauper, and defective classes; and

A bill (S. 3251) providing that all contributions hereafter made to political committees engaged in promoting the election of Representatives or Delegates to the Congress of the United States or of Presidential electors at any election at which such Representatives or Delegates shall be voted for shall be reported by such committees to the Clerk of the House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States, and for other purposes.

Mr. PATTERSON introduced a bill (S. 3252) granting an in-

crease of pension to David F. Crampton; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also introduced a bill (S. 3253) to apply a portion of the proceeds of the sales of public lands to the endowment of schools or departments of mines and mining in connection with the colleges established in the several States under the provisions of an act approved July 2, 1862, entitled "An act donating public lands to the several States and Territories which may provide colleges for the benefit of agriculture and the mechanic arts," and for similar purposes, being a further supplement to said act; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Mines and Mining.

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

A bill (S. 3254) granting an increase of pension to Anna Frances Hall; and

A bill (S. 3255) granting an increase of pension to Joseph Cook.

Mr. SPOONER introduced a bill (S. 3256) for the relief of William Persons; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

He also introduced a bill (S. 3257) granting an increase of pension to Walter Green; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying paper, referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. SCOTT introduced a bill (S. 3258) to extend School street to Columbia road and connecting School street thus extended with Fourteenth street, and to establish a park at Fourteenth street and Columbia road; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

AMENDMENT TO DEFICIENCY APPROPRIATION BILL.

Mr. PENROSE submitted an amendment proposing to appropriate \$435 to pay the widow of Fergus G. Malone, late inspector of customs, for expense incurred in preserving and transporting his remains from Seattle, Wash., to Philadelphia, Pa., intended to be proposed by him to the general deficiency appropriation bill; which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

TRADE IN AMERICAN COTTON GOODS.

Mr. CLAY. I submit an amendment proposing to appropriate \$250,000, and providing for the appointment of a commission for the purpose of studying the conditions of the markets of the Far East and Central and South America with a view to opening new avenues to the trade in American cotton goods, which I intend to propose to the agricultural appropriation bill. I move that it be printed and referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. CLAY. In connection with the amendment which I have just offered, I present a joint resolution of the general assembly of the State of Georgia, which I ask to have read and referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

There being no objection, the joint resolution was read, and referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, as follows:

A joint resolution.

Whereas it is of the highest importance that new and wider markets should be found for American cotton goods; and

Whereas, while authentic reports show an encouraging increase in the volume of trade in American cotton goods in north China and in the Orient generally, there is an immense territory, both in the Far East and in Central and South America, whose people know practically nothing of cotton goods of American or other manufacture; and

Whereas the New Orleans convention of January, 1905, composed of cotton producers, southern cotton manufacturers, bankers, et al., suggested the creation of a national commission to inquire into and report in detail on the subject of additional markets for American cotton goods; and

Whereas the general assembly of Georgia is in hearty sympathy with the Southern Cotton Association in its great work: Therefore, be it

Resolved by the house of representatives (the senate concurring), That our Senators in Congress be instructed, and our Representatives in Congress be requested, to use their best and most persistent efforts to have Congress authorize His Excellency the President, without unnecessary delay, to appoint a commission of capable gentlemen, representatives not only of the South, but of the entire country, charged with the duty of visiting the territory referred to and studying its people and their condition with a view to opening up new avenues to the trade in American cotton goods.

Resolved further, That such commission should not only be composed of men qualified for the duties assigned them, but should be liberally provided for by the General Government, to the end that they may devote themselves enthusiastically to the important work and mission committed to their hands.

Resolved further, That a certified copy of the foregoing preamble and resolution, duly attested, as soon as approved by his excellency the governor, be transmitted by the secretary of the senate and the clerk of the house of representatives to each of our Senators and Representatives in Congress.

Resolved further, That as soon as the foregoing preamble and resolution have been approved by his excellency the governor it shall be the

duty of the secretary of state to prepare a certified copy and transmit the same, under the great seal of the State, to His Excellency the President of the United States.

JOHN M. SLATON, *Speaker of House.*
JOHN T. BOYDILL, *Clerk of House.*
C. S. NORTON, *Secretary of Senate.*

ACTS AND TREATIES RELATIVE TO ALASKA.

Mr. NELSON. I present a compilation of the acts and treaties relating to the district of Alaska, which has been prepared by the Bureau of Insular Affairs, War Department, together with indexes and references to decisions of the Supreme Court and the opinions of the Attorney-General, which I ask to have printed as a Senate document. In connection therewith I have a short letter from the Secretary of War, calling my attention to this matter, which is as follows:

WAR DEPARTMENT,
Washington, January 11, 1906.

MY DEAR SENATOR NELSON: I have written Senator BEVERIDGE, as chairman of the Committee on Territories, inviting his attention to the fact that some time ago I directed the law adviser of the Insular Bureau to have prepared a compilation of the statutes affecting Alaska. A very competent law clerk named Barker has made the compilation, and has introduced references to Supreme Court and other decisions affecting the Territory, and has made a very complete index. It is ready now for publication. I doubt my authority as Secretary of War to order its publication out of the War Department appropriation, and I write to see whether you could not possibly obtain its publication as a Congressional or Senate or House document. Will you kindly confer with Senator BEVERIDGE in regard to the matter, and also, if possible, with Mr. HAMILTON, of the House committee.

Very sincerely, yours,

WM. H. TAFT.

Hon. KNUTE NELSON,
United States Senate.

I will say further, Mr. President, that I have made a brief examination of the compilation. I think it is a very good piece of work, which has cost the Government nothing, and, therefore, I ask that it may be printed as a Senate document.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Senator from Minnesota asks that the compilation referred to by him may be printed as a Senate document. Is there objection to the request?

Mr. CULBERSON. Mr. President, I should like to inquire of the Senator from Minnesota what sized volume that would make, and what would be the cost of it?

Mr. NELSON. I do not think it will be a very large volume. Part of it is in manuscript. I am not able to say just how large a volume it will make, but I have looked it through. Including the index, it would not be a very large volume—not over 200 or 300 pages, I think.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Minnesota? The Chair hears none, and the order to print is made.

WITHDRAWAL OF PAPERS—JOHN W. DAMPMAN.

On motion of Mr. PENROSE, it was

Ordered, That leave be granted to withdraw from the files of the Senate the papers in the case of John W. Dampman, accompanying Senate bill 2571, Fifty-seventh Congress, first session, copies of the same to be left in the files, as provided by clause 2 of Rule XXX.

REORGANIZATION OF CONSULAR SERVICE.

Mr. LODGE. Copies of the bill (S. 1345) to provide for the reorganization of the consular service of the United States are entirely exhausted. I ask for a reprint of the bill, and that 1,000 additional copies be printed for the use of the State Department.

There being no objection, the order was agreed to, as follows:

Ordered, That Senate bill (S. 1345) to provide for the reorganization of the consular service of the United States be reprinted, and that 1,000 additional copies be printed for the use of the State Department.

NATIONAL BOARD OF CORPORATIONS.

Mr. HEYBURN. I am advised at the document room that the number of copies of the bill (S. 2398) to create the National Board of Corporations and to provide for the regulation thereby of corporations engaged in interstate, Territorial, district, or insular-possession business is reduced down to about thirty. There is call for the bill, and I ask that 500 additional copies be printed.

There being no objection, the order was agreed to, as follows:

Ordered, That 500 additional copies of Senate bill (S. 2398) to create the National Board of Corporations and to provide for the regulation thereby of corporations engaged in interstate, Territorial, district, or insular-possession business be printed for the use of the Senate document room.

AMENDMENT TO RULES.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President, I offer a proposed amendment to the rules, which I ask to have read, printed, and referred to the Committee on Rules.

The proposed amendment was read, ordered to be printed, and referred to the Committee on Rules, as follows:

Amend paragraph 5 of Rule XIV by substituting for said paragraph the following:

"All resolutions shall lie over one day for consideration unless by unanimous consent the Senate shall otherwise direct. After a resolu-

tion has had consideration on one day it shall go to the Calendar unless otherwise ordered, and while it remains on the Calendar no other resolution covering the same subject-matter shall be received except by unanimous consent."

HEARINGS BEFORE COMMITTEE ON MILITARY AFFAIRS.

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

Resolved, That the Committee on Military Affairs is authorized to employ a stenographer, when necessary, for hearings before said committee, to be paid out of the contingent fund of the Senate.

HEARINGS BEFORE COMMITTEE ON POST-OFFICES AND POST-ROADS.

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

Resolved, That the Committee on Post-Offices and Post-Roads be, and the same is hereby, authorized to employ a stenographer from time to time, as may be necessary, to report such hearings as may be had on bills or other matters pending before said committee, and to have the same printed for the use of the committee, and that such stenographer be paid out of the contingent fund of the Senate.

GEORGE A. RAHN.

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

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Senate be, and he hereby is, authorized and directed to pay from the "miscellaneous items" of the contingent fund of the Senate the funeral expenses and physician's bill of George A. Rahn, late a policeman of the Senate, not to exceed \$200, in full of all other allowances.

POTOMAC RIVER MEMORIAL BRIDGE.

Mr. DANIEL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Order of Business No. 10, being the bill (S. 1373) to provide for the construction of a memorial bridge across the Potomac River from Washington to the Arlington estate property, be now considered.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. If the Senator will withhold his motion until after the morning business has been closed, the Chair will then recognize him.

Mr. DANIEL. I beg pardon; I thought the morning business had been concluded.

THE PANAMA CANAL.

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

Resolved, That there be printed 1,500 copies of Senate Document No. 127, Fifty-ninth Congress, parts 1 and 2, in one volume, with paper cover, of which 1,000 shall be for the use of the Senate and 500 for the use of the Isthmian Canal Commission.

THE MERCHANT MARINE.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President, I have some valuable memoranda in reference to the shipping question, which were very carefully compiled for the late Merchant Marine Commission; which I ask to have printed as a Senate document.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Senator from New Hampshire asks that the matter referred to by him may be printed as a Senate document. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and that order is made.

EXISTING STATUS IN SANTO DOMINGO.

Mr. TILLMAN. Mr. President, I desire to give notice that on Wednesday next, immediately after the conclusion of the morning business, I shall ask the Senate to consider Senate resolution No. 39, in order that I may submit what few ideas I have got on the Santo Domingo status, which is the subject of the resolution. Since I submitted the resolution we have found out where Morales is, but I want to submit some remarks on the subject-matter.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The notice given by the Senator will be entered.

PARTICIPATION IN EUROPEAN INTERNATIONAL QUESTIONS.

Mr. BACON. Mr. President, I offer the resolution which I send to the desk, which I shall move to have referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations. Before that order is taken, however, I desire to submit some remarks on the matter of reference.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The resolution submitted by the Senator from Georgia will be read.

The Secretary read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved by the Senate, That interference with or participation in any controversy between European governments relating to European international questions is a violation of the well-settled, well-defined policy of this Government, which has been recognized and observed for more than a century past.

Mr. BACON addressed the Senate. After having spoken one hour—

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The hour of 2 o'clock having arrived, the Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business, which will be stated.

The SECRETARY. A bill (S. 529) to promote the national defense, to create a force of naval volunteers, to establish American ocean mail lines to foreign markets, to promote commerce, and to provide revenue from tonnage.

Mr. GALLINGER. I will ask the Senator from Georgia if he desires to continue?

Mr. BACON. If the Senator will kindly indulge me, I promise to be very short.

Mr. GALLINGER. I will state to the Senate that I have some amendments which I desire to offer to this bill, after which, if they are adopted, as I presume they will be, I shall ask that a reprint of the bill be ordered.

The Senator from Florida [Mr. MALLORY] gave notice that he would speak to-day, but he has not been in the Chamber, so I presume he will not occupy any time. The Senator from West Virginia [Mr. SCOTT] desires to speak very briefly, but there will be opportunity for that after the Senator from Georgia concludes. I ask unanimous consent that the unfinished business be temporarily laid aside until the matter now under discussion shall be disposed of.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Senator from New Hampshire asks unanimous consent that the unfinished business be temporarily laid aside. Without objection, it is so ordered. The Senator from Georgia will proceed.

Mr. BACON. Mr. President, on last Monday I introduced a resolution requesting of the President of the United States, if not incompatible with the public interest, that certain information be given to the Senate relative to the appointment of, or the alleged appointment of, delegates to a European conference in reference to the Moroccan matter. The question of the consideration of that resolution in public was by order of the Senate considered in secret session. What I shall have to say to-day will not in any manner contravene the order of the Senate in that regard. The particular scope of the resolution was one calling upon the Senate to ask certain information from the President. I shall not discuss the question of asking information from the President, nor shall I discuss any information received from the President, because it so happens that we have not received from the President any information with reference to the Moroccan matter. What I shall have to say will relate exclusively to a great public question of vital importance and with reference to the information we have upon that subject from the press of this country and of the world, which has not been communicated to us in confidence, which is not enjoyed by us alone, but which we have learned in this public manner and which is known to all the world.

I presume, Mr. President, whatever may be true in the future, at present, at least, the right to publicly discuss such matters upon information thus obtained in public, still remains to the American Senate.

Before discussing directly the question involved in the resolution, I desire to read to the Senate part of a news article which appeared on yesterday in the Washington Post under the head, "Data on Morocco." That article, in part, is as follows:

Secretary Root yesterday permitted without hesitation a representative of the Post to see all the papers bearing on the Moroccan question. This is the subject that excited so much interest in the Senate last week by reason of the introduction of a resolution by Mr. BACON calling upon the President to send to the Senate a copy of the instructions he has given to the two delegates he appointed to represent the United States at the international conference at Algeiras, Spain, beginning January 17.

As previously announced by the Post, any member of the Senate is at liberty to call at the State Department and examine the documents in the case and study minutely every phase of the issues involved as revealed by the correspondence which resulted in President Roosevelt appointing the delegates and the instructions sent to them. The instructions were conceived and written by Elihu Root. Those who know John Hay's successor at the head of the Department of State will understand from this that the instructions do not contain anything that savors of impingement by the Executive upon the legislative functions or that in any way is calculated to commit this Government to a policy that will embroil the United States in the politics of Europe.

Both President Roosevelt and Secretary Root are known to regret the fuss and fume created in the Senate last week by the Bacon resolution. It is also known that neither of them requested Senator Lodge or anybody else to oppose the adoption of the Bacon resolution, though they heartily approved the action of Messrs. LODGE, SPOONER, and other Senators, who in the secret sessions contested the position of Mr. BACON.

PUBLICITY MIGHT INTERFERE.

It is asserted by the President and Mr. Root that the only objection to a copy of the instructions being sent to the Senate as requested by Mr. BACON is based upon the fear that some of the correspondence of the State Department with its confidential agents in Morocco and in Europe touching upon the issues involved might gain publicity and thereby cause embarrassment to two or three European nations that will participate in the Algeiras conference.

All of this correspondence is included in the pamphlet containing the instructions to the United States delegates.

Mr. President, I think I may safely assume that that publication is by authority of the State Department—at least I think I may safely assume that every allegation in it is in consequence of a communication which this newspaper reporter has had with

the Secretary of State and that the allegations are in accordance with those statements thus made to him.

Mr. LODGE. Why does the Senator think he has the right to make that assumption?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. PERKINS in the chair). Does the Senator from Georgia yield to the Senator from Massachusetts?

Mr. BACON. I have yielded, Mr. President.

I make the statement because all of the allegations in this article are of a nature which import that they could not possibly have been learned except through the Secretary of State, and the article contains the indicia of authenticity, unless we are prepared to believe that so reputable a newspaper as the Washington Post, with its well-known writers of high character, integrity, and credibility, has deliberately falsified when it represents that this information has been received by it from the executive department. That is the ground upon which I base the statement that I think we may safely assume that this statement is issued by the authority and upon the representations of the Department of State.

Mr. LODGE. Is it stated there that the information was received directly from the Secretary of State?

Mr. BACON. I would call attention to several things; but the article begins by stating:

Secretary Root—

Calling him by name—

Secretary Root yesterday permitted without hesitation a representative of the Post to see all the papers bearing on the Moroccan question.

That is the way the narration begins.

Mr. LODGE. Does the Senator think that that makes the State Department responsible for that article?

Mr. BACON. I am going on to tell the Senate why I think the State Department is responsible. I do not have any pleasure in bringing this matter to the attention of the Senate, and I shall be more than delighted if the Senator, with his close relations to the State Department, can at any time be able to rise in his seat and say that that is not the correct representation of the information imparted by the Secretary of State to this newspaper writer. I will feel a personal obligation to the Senator if he can give that assurance, and this Senate—if I may be permitted to presume so far as to speak for it—will be under obligations to the Senator if he can secure from the Secretary of State a disavowal of the things which are stated in this article.

Mr. ALDRICH. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Georgia yield to the Senator from Rhode Island?

Mr. BACON. With great pleasure.

Mr. ALDRICH. From my knowledge of the personal characteristics of the Secretary of State, I should think it very unlikely, if he decided to communicate to the Senate or to Senators in reference to a matter of this kind, that he should do so through a newspaper correspondent.

Mr. BACON. Very well. I shall also be under equal obligations to the Senator from Rhode Island if he can bring to this Senate that assurance. But, Mr. President—

Mr. LODGE. The Senator misunderstood my question. I do not care to discuss the statements contained in that article or any other article, for I think that would be contravening the decision of the Senate. I merely wish to find out whether the Senator is prepared to state that that article was inspired or authorized by the Secretary of State.

Mr. BACON. Does the Senator mean that I can state it as a fact?

Mr. LODGE. I should like to have it stated as a fact.

Mr. BACON. The Senator very well knows that I have no opportunity to know that as a fact. I am judging simply by surface indications—by that which appears on the paper itself—not even by any information which I have received from the newspaper reporter or the slightest communication which I have had with him on the subject, but I judge of it just as a court would judge when a paper is presented as to the authenticity of it or as to the relation which it may bear to the question.

Mr. LODGE. The Senator said we were to assume it.

Mr. BACON. I said I think it is fair to assume it, and I still think so.

Mr. LODGE. The Senator has a right to assume anything he pleases, but I think he can hardly commit the entire Senate to that assumption.

Mr. BACON. Very well. I will say for myself, as I did say for myself, I can fairly assume it. I did not presume in that to speak for the Senate; but I do presume to speak for the Senate when I say that is not respectful to the Senate, and that if the Senator can secure the disavowal of the Secretary of State he will confer not only an obligation upon the Secretary of State, but also upon the Senate.

Mr. LODGE. It seems to me that is the very best reason for assuming that the Secretary of State is not responsible for it if it is disrespectful to the Senate.

Mr. BACON. That may be true; that is one argument. But if there are other evidences which bear out in a still greater degree the fact that it is not, we must strike the balance.

Mr. LODGE. The Senator has no right to charge disrespect or any intention or desire of being disrespectful to the Senate on the faith of a newspaper article of which he knows nothing.

Mr. BACON. Mr. President, throughout this article there are statements made by the newspaper reporter which represent as speaking the sentiments, if not the very words, of the President and of the Secretary of State.

Mr. LODGE. Well, Mr. President, last week the same newspaper stated that my motion to go into secret session was made after consulting with the President in view of shutting off public information, and the Senator from New Jersey and myself had made a careful canvass of the Senate to see that it was done. If this statement is as accurate as those statements, I think it is a rather doubtful form of assumption.

Mr. BACON. I will call the honorable Senator's attention to the fact that this particular paper which I now hold in my hand represents that the President and Secretary of State denied the authenticity of that statement.

Mr. LODGE. Well, Mr. President, what the same paper said last week, which I presume the Senator will now recognize is not correct, seems to me to impair its absolute certainty as a foundation for an assumption.

Mr. BACON. I had not assumed it as an absolute certainty.

Mr. LODGE. The Senator is assuming that the Secretary of State has been disrespectful to the Senate. I say that is an assumption no one has a right to make.

Mr. BACON. There might be a difference between the honorable Senator and myself as to whether what is contained here is disrespectful. I did not assume that. I said I would assume, and I thought I could fairly assume, that this publication was by his authority and under the statement made by him. Then, as to whether or not it is disrespectful is a matter for each Senator to determine for himself.

But I did not rise for the purpose of making specifically a charge against the Secretary of State with a view of bringing him to judgment in this tribunal as to whether or not he has been disrespectful. I think, however, if the Secretary of State is responsible for what appears in this article, it could properly be suggested in the most respectful language that it is not respectful to the Senate.

Mr. TILLMAN. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Georgia yield to the Senator from South Carolina?

Mr. BACON. I do.

Mr. TILLMAN. I wish to suggest that we could very easily settle this whole question in five minutes. When I introduced here a couple of weeks ago, or something like that, an article from the New York Herald which contained very serious imputations upon certain transactions in Panama, the Senator from Massachusetts felt so much concern that he went to the telephone and in a moment came in and in the most emphatic manner said upon the authority of the Secretary of War he pronounced the statement a lie. The same course is now open to him; the telephone is working, and with all due deference to the Senator, I think it would be entirely apropos that the Secretary of State, for whom I have the most profound admiration and respect, should be permitted now and instantly to clear himself from the supposition that in the slightest way he has done anything or permitted anything disrespectful to the Senate, because I do not believe he has done it.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President—

Mr. TILLMAN. But, if the Senator from Massachusetts will pardon me, we have fallen into such a condition in the relationship between the Executive and the Senate that I am prepared for almost any exhibition of disrespect as well as usurpation in that quarter.

Mr. LODGE. Will the Senator from Georgia allow me, as the Senator from South Carolina addressed me?

Mr. BACON. Certainly.

Mr. LODGE. I should certainly not show so little respect either for myself or for the Secretary of State as to invite him to enter on the office of publicly denying every unauthorized statement that appears in any newspaper. In the second place, Mr. President, I should be debarred from doing so in public, because the Senate has ordered that this subject should not be discussed in public, and I desire to conform to the rules of the Senate.

Mr. BACON. Mr. President, the Senate has not so ordered. There was but one thing in the resolution which I introduced and which the Senate has committed to its secret deliberations

and consideration and determination, and that was the question whether or not we should ask of the Executive certain information. That resolution, Mr. President, did not express any opinion as to the Moroccan question. It expressed no opinion as to the propriety of the appointment of delegates. It expressed no opinion as to the propriety of our being represented at that conference. It simply asked for certain information from the President.

I am not here pressing that we shall ask for information from the President. I am not discussing the question as to the propriety of asking information of the President, and I do not propose to do that. I may not either now or hereafter revive that question, because it is a matter entirely within the control of the majority of the Senate, and it is fruitless when a majority oppose a thing of that kind, or if it should be opposed to it, for the minority to continue to press it.

But, Mr. President, there is nothing in that resolution, there is nothing in the order of the Senate with reference to it, which debar the Senate from the consideration, in the first place, of a great abstract proposition, as expressed in the resolution which I have introduced to-day, or which will debar the Senate from a proper consideration of the question whether the particular instance now being developed in the history of this country is one which is applicable to that particular policy of this Government, and whether that particular instance is or is not in contravention of that policy.

So, Mr. President, with all due respect to the honorable Senator from Massachusetts, I must differ from him in the suggestion that there is anything in the resolution which I have submitted, or in the remarks which I propose to submit thereon, which contravenes the order of the Senate. There has been no decision on the part of the Senate that it would consider this subject in secret. As I have said before, I am not discussing any communication from the Executive. I am not discussing any subject upon which the Executive has communicated to us directly or indirectly. There was nothing in the annual message of the President on the subject, nor has there been any special communication to us on the subject. We are as free as we are upon any other question which relates to the interests of this Government. In discussing it there is nothing confidential in our possession.

Mr. President, I was proceeding to say, when I was interrupted by the Senator from Massachusetts, that I thought I might safely assume that this article was published by the authority of the Secretary of State and upon the basis of information received from the Secretary of State. Not only does the article set out the statement that in the interview, which was evidently for the purpose of conveying information to the newspaper reporter, the Secretary of State unhesitatingly showed him all these papers which have been withheld from the Senate, but there is also a general discussion of the subject of the Moroccan conference, and in that general discussion there is a statement and a repetition of the statement in more than one instance of what is said by the Secretary of State and also by the President, as well as a general statement of their views, as definitely ascertained, and not as in any manner surmised or guessed at.

Unless, sir, we are prepared to believe, which I do not, that the reporter of the Washington Post has falsified or misrepresented what occurred, we have every reason to believe from the statement made by him that these statements were made upon the authority of the Secretary of State. For this reason, while I do not assert it as a fact, I feel justified in assuming that what is published in this article has been written and published by the authority of the Secretary of State.

Now, what is the information conveyed to us in this newspaper excerpt from which I have read? It professes to give a statement of a part of what is the history of the appointment of delegates to the Algeiras conference, and then that part that it does not give it informs us each and any Senator can get if he will respectfully go to the State Department and ask permission to be allowed to see the papers.

As the Senator is talking about respect, I will not say that is an affront to the Senate or that it is an indignity to the Senate, but I will venture in all respect to the Secretary of State, for whom, like the Senator from South Carolina, I have a very profound respect and admiration—I will in that deferential and respectful manner, suggest that withholding the papers from the Senate, even though desired by a minority of Senators, and a display of them to newspaper reporters, and the information conveyed to the Senate, not in the ordinary official channel, but through the newspaper press, that if any Senator will go to the State Department and there humbly, hat in hand, ask permission to see these papers, he will be allowed to do so, is not respectful to the Senate. I shall be very much gratified to be

authoritatively informed that the reporter misunderstood the Secretary of State.

Mr. TILLMAN. Mr. President—

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Georgia yield to the Senator from South Carolina?

Mr. BACON. I do.

Mr. TILLMAN. I am sure the Senator from Georgia does not wish to do Mr. Root an injustice, and although it is none of my business, as the Senator from Massachusetts is here as the representative and defender of Cabinet officers, and I would not by any means be suspected of interfering with his pleasant work, I feel constrained to say the Senator is doing Secretary Root an injustice, because the resolution has never been passed by the Senate—at least that is my understanding. Probably the Secretary, feeling that a tempest in a teapot had been stirred up in the Senate by his overzealous friends, has taken this means of showing how harmless would have been the passage of the resolution of the Senator from Georgia and how little would have come out of it. That seems to be a common-sense view. I may be in error.

Mr. BACON. That may be true, Mr. President, and I am very glad to accept the suggestion that possibly the Secretary of State designed it as a rebuke to his officious friends on the other side of the Chamber. I understand that to be the suggestion of the Senator from South Carolina.

Mr. TILLMAN. It seems to me that that is the only logical and reasonable explanation of the action of the Secretary of State if he did give this information to the Post newspaper; and I have no doubt that he did.

Mr. BACON. I am very much obliged to the Senator from South Carolina for the suggestion, because there is another road out of the dilemma. Not only will we be relieved if the Senator from Massachusetts will have the information conveyed to us that this report is not the representation of what occurred between the reporter and the Secretary of State, but if it did occur that it was not regarded as a reflection upon the Senate, but as a rebuke to his friends on the other side of the Chamber who had put him in this awkward dilemma. In either case we shall be relieved, and I have no doubt that the Secretary of State will be very much gratified that he shall be relieved of such an imputation.

But, Mr. President, I did not rise for the purpose of making any special animadversion upon the Secretary of State. I rose for something of more grave importance I think; that is, to bring to the attention of the Senate, and through the Senate of the country, a consideration of the question whether or not this proposed conference at Algeiras (under the information which we have in common with the rest of the world, and which we do not enjoy from any confidential communication or any exclusive information) comports with the interest of this country, whether or not it is in accordance with the traditional time-honored policy of this Government, or whether in truth it is a most pronounced violation of the policy well defined and thoroughly established and of uninterrupted observance for more than a century. That is the question I wanted to bring to the consideration of the Senate and of the public, because I think it is a most vital one.

Mr. President, for a hundred years and more, for one hundred and ten years and more, it has been the announced and universally observed policy of this Government not to commit ourselves to any entanglements in European political or international affairs. Unless I am very much mistaken in my view as to what will be the necessary result of our participation in this conference, if this is recognized as a proper thing and becomes a precedent, then for all time in the future there can no possible international question come up in Europe when it will not be considered proper for us to participate in it and become entangled in it and be affected by its result and by the general policy which will therefrom result.

The resolution recites that this is a time-honored policy of more than a century. It had its origin in the Administration of Washington. The first treaty ever made by the United States with a foreign government was the treaty made in 1778, if I recollect correctly, between the United States and France. That treaty contained a provision of alliance, offensive and defensive, between the United States and France, the only one we ever did make, and I hope the only one we ever will make. In 1793, either in the closing of Washington's first Administration or in the beginning of his second, I am not sure which, France called upon the United States to make good its pledge, and there was a great controversy in this country as to whether or not in compliance with that pledge we should go to war with England, with which power France was then at war. There was great diversity of opinion. Washington's Cabinet was divided upon it. Finally Washington sided with Hamilton and

Randolph and himself took the position that we should not engage in foreign wars at the behest and will and in the interest of a foreign country. In consequence of that decision the obligation of that treaty was directly repudiated by the Government of the United States and we refused to take part in the war between France and Great Britain.

That policy had never theretofore been announced in any State paper, it had never been announced as the policy of this Government, and the first time, so far as I know, that it was ever formally presented is in Washington's Farewell Address.

Mr. President, I could get a great number of utterances by public men upon this subject, but I have not had time this morning to collect them. The article which has called this matter to my attention and made me feel the importance of bringing it more directly to the attention of the Senate appeared only yesterday morning, Sunday, when I had no opportunity to have access to libraries. But in Washington's Farewell Address, which we read here on the 22d of every February, occurs this, directly in accord with the position taken by him with reference to the French treaty:

Europe has a set of primary interests which to us have none or a very remote relation. Hence she must be engaged in frequent controversies, the causes of which are essentially foreign to our concerns. Hence, therefore, is must be unwise in us to implicate ourselves by artificial ties in the ordinary vicissitudes of her politics or the ordinary combinations and collisions of her friendships or enmities.

Our detached and distant situation invites and enables us to pursue a different course. If we remain one people, under an efficient government, the period is not far off when we may defy material injury from external annoyance; when we may take such an attitude as will cause the neutrality we may at any time resolve upon to be scrupulously respected; when belligerent nations, under the impossibility of making acquisitions upon us, will not legally hazard the giving us provocation; when we may choose peace or war, as our interests, guided by justice, shall counsel.

Why forego the advantages of so peculiar a situation? Why quit our own to stand upon foreign ground? Why, by interweaving our destiny with that of any part of Europe, entangle our peace and prosperity in the toils of European ambition, rivalry, interest, humor, or caprice?

That is from Washington's Farewell Address. In the message of President Monroe, in which he announced what is now known as the "Monroe doctrine," Mr. Monroe also used similar language, a part of which I will read. Said he:

In the wars of the European powers in matters relating to themselves we have never taken any part, nor does it comport with our policy so to do. Our policy in regard to Europe, which was adopted at an early stage of the wars which have so long agitated that quarter of the globe, nevertheless remains the same, which is, not to interfere in the internal concerns of any of its powers; to consider the government de facto as the legitimate government for us; to cultivate friendly relations with it, and to preserve those relations by a frank, firm, and manly policy, meeting in all instances the just claims of every power, submitting to injuries from none.

In the succeeding annual message by Monroe the same doctrine is as emphatically stated by him, as follows:

Separated as we are from Europe by the great Atlantic Ocean, we can have no concern in the wars of the European governments nor in the causes which produce them. The balance of power between them, into whichever scale it may turn in its various vibration, can not affect us. It is the interest of the United States to preserve the most friendly relations with every power, and on conditions fair, equal, and applicable to all.

Mr. President, I might not only give these utterances, but in unnumbered instances could I call to the attention of the Senate the utterances of our Presidents and of our Secretaries of State, of our publicists, and of our great men of all parties, enunciating the same doctrine and advocating adherence to the same policy. But it is scarcely necessary that I should take up the time of the Senate to do so, when in a general way they are so well known to all. From the day of Washington to the present time the doctrine of noninterference and nonentanglement in the international political controversies of Europe has been uniformly and continuously held by all Administrations and by all political parties in the United States, and it has become the fixed policy, the unwritten law as it were, of this country, recognized, advocated, respected, and obeyed by all.

While not taking the time to read these many utterances, I will read something which is extremely pertinent to the suggestion which I am just making as to the continuity and uninterrupted observance of this policy. I will read an extract from the proceedings of The Hague conference, showing the attitude of the United States as announced most formally there. When we so recently met with the nations of the world in that great conference, in the interest of peace and to discourage war and rob war of its atrocities, fearing that indirectly even our adherence to an agreement of such a character might be construed into an abandonment of this time-honored policy, this provision was inserted:

And whereas the said convention was signed by the plenipotentiaries of the United States of America under reservation of the following declaration,

That is a part of the proclamation of the President announcing the making of this treaty, and this is the language of the reservation made by the delegates of the United States when they signed the peace treaty at The Hague:

Nothing contained in this convention—

This is The Hague convention—

Nothing contained in this convention shall be so construed as to require the United States of America to depart from its traditional policy of not intruding upon, interfering with, or entangling itself in the political questions of policy or internal administration of any foreign state; nor shall anything contained in the said convention be construed to imply a relinquishment by the United States of America of its traditional attitude toward purely American questions.

This is as strong and distinct an enunciation of the position and policy of the United States on this subject as has been uttered by any one of our Presidents, or in any State paper which ever has been issued, or in any speech that has ever been made in Congress on the subject. I will read it again that we may weigh the words.

Nothing contained in this convention shall be so construed as to require the United States of America to depart from its traditional policy—

What is its traditional policy?

of not intruding upon, interfering with, or entangling itself in the political questions of policy or internal administration of any foreign state.

Mr. President, if the question whether or not the United States should take part in the Algeiras conference had then been before any body charged with its consideration, could the language descriptive of what should be done in observance of this policy be more accurate than that language is? Although intended as general language, could it be applied more specifically to any case than it can be and must be applied to the particular case before us? "Intruding upon, interfering with, or entangling itself in the political questions of policy or internal administration of any foreign state." That is the specific reservation we made in the adherence to the Hague treaty.

Now, is this participation in the Algeiras conference, in this language, "intruding upon, interfering with, or entangling" the United States "in the political questions of policy or internal administration of any foreign state?" What words more apt than these could be found to describe our action when we meet in conference the delegates of the nations of Europe to determine what shall be the European power which by virtue and authority of that conference shall hereafter dominate and control the political future of Morocco!

Mr. President, what gives rise to this Algeiras conference? The history of it is known to us all. France, having a contiguous territory, feeling that she has peculiar interests in Morocco, entered into an agreement with Great Britain and with other powers particularly interested in the Mediterranean—those contiguous to and bordering on its shores—by which she should have thereafter a controlling influence, a political influence and domination, in Morocco. Germany took offense; but I will not go through the details, which are known to us. I will state that the issue raised between Germany and France made such a tension as to threaten war. It drove the prime minister of France out of office, and it was only by so doing that war was averted. It is a question of that magnitude and of that menace to the peace of Europe—one which, if it caused war, would embroil, in all probability, all the great powers of Europe.

Then, in order that the matter might be settled amicably, if possible, it was arranged that this conference should be had. While there are minor questions in it, as the whole world knows, the great question to come before the conference at Algeiras is as to whether France shall have a political control and domination in Morocco or whether, as contended by Germany, that political control shall be shared by her with Germany and other European powers. When we needlessly participate in the consideration of this question between these irritated and rival nations we enter into a dynamite storehouse.

Mr. President, I say that is a question particularly and exclusively a European question. That is a controversy exclusively relative to European politics. That is a question which does not concern us. It is a question which may be settled in a way to bring peace. It is a question which may be determined in a way to result in war. All Europe recognizes the fact. All the press of Europe to-day is teeming with the question whether the result of the Algeiras conference will bring peace or bring war. The European governments are marshaling their forces and concentrating their fleets with reference to the fact that it may bring war.

Mr. President, I hope and believe that war will not result; I hope and believe that peace will come out of it; but I think that while of course we desire that there should be peace and

hope that there shall be peace, so far as the United States Government is concerned, if it shall participate in that conference and if there shall be peace as the result of it, our participation will be more disastrous to us in the long run than if war should come out of it. Why? Because if war results from it, it will be taken as a lesson. It will be said, "We should not have participated in this conference, and here is the result of it." It will be a warning as to the future. On the contrary, if peace results, especially if we ourselves should be instrumental in securing so desirable a result, then it will be said, "Behold the benefit of our entangling ourselves in foreign matters, of our participating in the settlement of foreign controversies," and thereafter for all time, whenever a complication arises in Europe growing out of controversies of an international character between European powers, we will be expected to take part in it, forsooth, to assist in arriving at a conclusion one way or the other.

Mr. President, I am reluctant to detain the Senate; but there are one or two things that I wish to suggest it is proper that we should consider and that the public should consider. It is suggested that this is premature; that the President of the United States has the right to enter upon negotiations for the purpose of making a treaty, and that until such treaty is made and submitted to the Senate there can be no possible propriety in the Senate or the House asking any question of the President relative thereto; that it is an encroachment upon his prerogatives, that it is an intrusion upon his domain, that it is not entirely respectful to the President.

I grant that is in a measure true, or at least that there is room for such contention, as to any matter where the negotiation is looking to the making of a treaty, as to a matter which is within treaty jurisdiction, but I respectfully submit and urge that the main question to which I have alluded which will be before the Algeiras conference is not a question within the treaty jurisdiction of the United States.

Of course I know, as every other one knows, that there is no limit in the Constitution of the United States upon the treaty-making power of the President and of the Senate. There is no limitation whatever. There could be, so far as the Constitution of the United States goes, a treaty between the United States and Germany by which it should be guaranteed that we would see to it that France should not have a controlling influence in Morocco. But while that would not be a violation of the Constitution of the United States, it would be a violation of a policy of this Government which has become as binding in its operation as if it were in the Constitution of the United States until the people of the United States themselves shall see fit to decree to the contrary.

There are two policies known to our Government which are not found in the Constitution of the United States, but which have practically become law. Of course such laws can not be enforced in the courts, but they are obligatory upon the political departments of the Government. The constitution of Great Britain is not a written constitution, and yet there are certain principles, certain policies, known to that constitution in Great Britain which are as binding upon the Parliament of Great Britain as if there were a written constitution expressly providing for such principles and such policies, and it is only when the question has been submitted to the people and decided upon by them in a general election that Parliament feels at liberty to change what is the recognized constitution of Great Britain.

We have a written Constitution, but we have, in addition to the written Constitution, these two principles of public policy, which have become ingrafted as a part of the unwritten constitution of this country, two policies which have become recognized as of authority, two policies so long and so well established that no Executive and no Congress has the right to depart therefrom except the authority so to do is received from the people in an election where that is the issue. I do not recognize that any unwritten law can amend or repeal any provision of the written Constitution; but when, by all Administrations, by all parties, by all the people, a policy not inconsistent with the written Constitution has been upheld and recognized for a century, that policy may be considered as a part of our unwritten constitution and binding as such.

Now, what are those two policies? One is the Monroe doctrine. The Monroe doctrine, until it shall have been decreed otherwise by the people themselves when they have an opportunity to so decide in elections when that question shall be in issue, is just as much the law of this land as the written Constitution of the United States.

Mr. ALDRICH. Will the Senator allow me to ask him a question right there?

Mr. BACON. With much pleasure.

Mr. ALDRICH. Whose understanding of the Monroe doctrine is to obtain as a law?

Mr. BACON. That is a political question, and of course it must be decided by the political department of the Government. When I say that Congress has no right to change it, I am not speaking of the decision as to how it should be properly interpreted. That rests in a man's conscience. I am speaking of a deliberate and an intentional setting aside of any provision of the Monroe doctrine as the Congress that sets it aside may understand it. I speak of it as Congress understands it, and within the conscience of each Senator and Representative making up that Congress it is the law to him, because it is the well-settled and well-understood policy of this Government. While it does not require that it should be changed in the manner that is prescribed in the Constitution for a constitutional change, there is none the less the great moral obligation upon every department of the Government to observe it until the people, in the method which they are authorized to pursue to change it, shall indicate to the Executive and to Congress their will that it shall be so changed.

Again, Mr. President, we have another great policy which belongs to the unwritten constitution of the United States, and that great policy is the one we are discussing to-day, the one first announced by Washington, a policy recognized by every Administration from that day to this, a policy advocated by every public man of prominence—if there is an exception, I do not now recall it—that we should avoid entangling alliances and that we should not be committed to controversies of an international character between European powers.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President—

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Georgia yield to the Senator from Massachusetts?

Mr. BACON. Certainly.

Mr. LODGE. I have listened with great interest to the Senator's eloquent defense of the Farewell Address of Washington.

Mr. BACON. That is very kind.

Mr. LODGE. Who is departing from it?

Mr. BACON. I hope the Senator will permit me a word to thank him for the compliment.

Mr. LODGE. Who has departed from it?

Mr. BACON. I say this will be a departure from it.

Mr. LODGE. What will be?

Mr. BACON. What I am arguing.

Mr. LODGE. Who has departed from it? That is what I want to get at.

Mr. BACON. We have not departed from it yet.

Mr. LODGE. Then what is the purpose?

Mr. BACON. But if we go into the Algeiras conference—

Mr. LODGE. Is this merely a warning?

Mr. BACON. No; it is not merely a warning.

Mr. LODGE. This is to keep us from violating it?

Mr. BACON. If possible.

Mr. LODGE. The point of the Senator's remarks is to keep us from violating it?

Mr. BACON. If possible.

Mr. LODGE. I am glad to know the object of it.

Mr. BACON. I am very unfortunate. I know that I am not very happy in the ability to express clearly my ideas, and with the Senator's well-known great and acute intellect of course when he does not understand it it must be the fault of the speaker. It could not possibly be suggested otherwise, and it is extremely mortifying to a speaker when he happens to fall under the very great misfortune of not being understood by the learned and distinguished and honorable Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President—

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Georgia yield to the Senator from Massachusetts?

Mr. BACON. With pleasure.

Mr. LODGE. I merely want to say that I knew, of course, the Senator had some great object in what he was saying, and that the fault was undoubtedly mine. I wanted only to know what the object was. Now I have found out that the object is to save the country from violating Washington's Farewell Address.

Mr. BACON. Mr. President, it is not simply Washington's Farewell Address. It is to save the country from the violation of the policy announced in Washington's Farewell Address, which has been the universally observed and recognized policy from that day to this. I will take the privilege of saying that the repeated assertion of the honorable Senator that he has not so far understood me adds to the mortification which I feel and the consciousness that I have not properly expressed myself. But, sir, the character of this colloquy does not comport with the gravity of the subject I am discussing.

Mr. LODGE. I understood what the Senator was saying. I did not understand before why he was saying it. Now I understand he is trying to preserve the great policy of the Government, which nobody has violated.

Mr. BACON. Possibly, then, I should be relieved somewhat of the humiliation and the mortification when the Senator kindly observed that he had not understood me, that so far he has not made application of what I said.

Mr. LODGE. That was it.

Mr. BACON. I was endeavoring to make the application, and I shall proceed to do it in the very great hope that I may have the ability to state it in a way in which the Senator may properly understand it.

Mr. LODGE. I hope so.

Mr. BACON. And if he fails to understand it, I know it will be due to my imperfection and not to his want of ability to thoroughly understand it.

Mr. President, to resume after the somewhat lengthy digression which has been occasioned by the facetious remarks of my honorable friend, I was endeavoring to make the application. The principle is that we shall not engage in any entanglements by participating in any conference which relates exclusively to a European controversy or a European issue or question. I was illustrating it. I had passed that by, however; but in view of the suggestion of the honorable Senator I shall return to it to the extent of stating it, in order that I may if possible escape the calamity of being misunderstood. I may possibly have been misunderstood by some other Senator. I have endeavored to show (and I only return to it because of the very serious suggestion of the Senator from Massachusetts that I had not expressed myself intelligibly) that this question is exclusively a European question. It matters not to us whether France has a controlling power in Morocco or whether she shares it with Germany.

[At this point Mr. BACON was interrupted by the expiration of the morning hour, and the unfinished business was informally laid aside that he might conclude.]

Mr. BACON. Mr. President, I will endeavor not to intrude upon the courtesy of the Senate at any great length. I simply desire to continue the direct line of thought upon which I was in the attempt at least to express, and when I have finished that I shall leave the subject, although it is a very broad one and I think is a very vital one, one which is to affect us unfortunately in the next hundred years or for all future time through a departure from the policy, as we have been affected advantageously in the past hundred years by an observance of it.

I was saying, Mr. President, that the question which relates to the political control of Morocco is necessarily a European question with which we have no right to interfere and with which it is not our interest to interfere.

Resuming the thread of my remarks where they were interrupted, I repeat that it is within the authority, of course, of the treaty-making power to make a treaty with all the other powers of Europe, or with any one power of Europe, relative to the political control of any particular part of Europe by any other part or any other government of Europe, but that while it is thus within the written Constitution, it would be in violation of that which I have denominated a part of the unwritten Constitution of the United States, which prohibits us from entering upon entangling alliances or participating in controversies purely political between European governments.

I had said that if there will result peace from this conference, as I think there will, while of course it would be gratifying to all lovers of humanity that there should be such a result, and while we desire such a result, it would have an unfortunate effect for the United States, because in a case where war resulted it would be an object lesson which would deter us in the future, and if peace resulted it will be pointed to as a reason why there is no danger in such political entanglements and we should engage in them in the future.

Mr. President, there is but one single ground upon which there can be, in my opinion, any defense made of our participation in the Algeiras conference; that is, as to its relation to our commercial interests and to the protection of our citizens there or those in whom we may be interested. As to that I desire to make two remarks. First, if it is the fact that our commercial interests are involved, and that be the ground of our interference, then there can be no possible conference between political powers in Europe relating to the political control of any part of Europe in which there will not be found the same warrant for our interference. The political control of a country necessarily exercises an influence on the business of such country, and in every instance of such a political conference it will be found for the same reasons and in the same way that we have commercial interests which are involved, be-

cause we have commercial interests in every country in Europe, and with every one of them, even the least of them, in larger degree than we have with the semibarbaric country of Morocco.

If that were the principle or the test by which we should be guided, then the policy of noninterference, of nonentanglement, would have been destroyed a hundred years ago; and the policy of noninterference and nonentanglement was made in view and in full recognition of the fact that we had such commercial relations with every other country, and the principle was adopted and has been adhered to by the United States for more than a hundred years in full knowledge of the fact and of the consequences involved in such fact.

The policy, Mr. President, is not a limited one. It is not a conditional one. It is an absolute policy as it has existed heretofore. It was not a policy that we should not become entangled in European controversies of a political character except in cases where we might have commercial interests in the country. It was a policy that we should not thus become entangled in any country of Europe, whether we had commercial interests there or not. It was not a policy that recognized as an exception that we should become entangled in political controversies in Europe in a case where by our assistance we might prevent a European war. If such were the policy, then there could be no conference called in Europe for the settlement of political controversies but what the exception would prevail, because there is no conference called with reference to a political question but what it is a conference called in the interest of peace and for the purpose of avoiding war. Therefore in every such we would be called upon to interfere on the ground that by so doing we could avert war and accomplish good.

It is an absolute unconditioned policy, for the highest and best of reasons that even though we may accomplish good, even though we may secure peace and avert war, nevertheless we shall refrain from entanglements in these conventions, because our highest and first duty is to guard the interests of our own country.

So I might go on and illustrate as to all other matters. It is not a policy that we shall refrain when we can not accomplish good and that we shall participate when we can accomplish good. It is a policy that we shall refrain at all times, whether we can accomplish good or not.

Now, Mr. President, to hasten to a conclusion so as not to impose upon the courtesy of the Senate, in what particular does the commercial interest of the United States in Morocco differentiate the present situation from any other situation where there shall be called a European conference with a view to the settlement of political disputes, and where the country out of which the questions arise has commercial relations with us? In what particular does the Moroccan commercial interest or the interest of the United States in Morocco differ from any other interest which will arise and which must necessarily exist in all cases where European countries meet together for the purpose of settling their peculiar international political differences? The only difference is one that accentuates the utter want of necessity of any participation by us in this matter.

Mr. SPOONER. Will the Senator allow me to ask him a question?

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Georgia yield to the Senator from Wisconsin?

Mr. BACON. I always do, with pleasure.

Mr. SPOONER. What conferences abroad, if any, would the Senator consider it proper for the United States to send representatives to, on his theory?

Mr. BACON. Mr. President, the question is an extremely pertinent one, and in response I will say to the Senator I think there are conferences in which the United States should be a party. I think, for instance, The Hague conference was one occasion when it was entirely proper for the United States to participate with the other civilized nations of the world, and I think that the United States were extremely prudent and guided by a proper action when they put in the proviso that nothing therein contained should be construed as committing this Government to the policy of intruding upon or interfering with any matter connected with a European international controversy.

I will say to the Senator, in order that I may give concrete instances and not have to confine myself to an abstract reply, that the conference of 1880 between the European powers and Morocco was an eminently proper one, because that did not relate to the question of the political control of Morocco. That had nothing to do with any international European controversy. It related solely to the question of the rights and privileges which should be granted to the subjects or citizens of other countries resident in Morocco, as to the privileges of ministers and consuls and their retinues, and as to the right of persons engaged in certain commercial pursuits there, and particularly as to the

right or privilege of each one of those nations to the most favored treatment that any nation received in commercial matters at the hands of Morocco. That was an eminently proper occasion for the United States to meet with the European nations and agree upon what treaty should be made with this semibarbaric country. There was there no question of international politics. There was no controversy between European nations which might lead to war. There was no question as to the control of Morocco politically by any other country commercially or in any other way.

If the Senator will consider that as a sufficient answer I will not detain the Senate by giving other concrete examples or abstract examples. I think that my reply so far made sufficiently illustrates not only those two concrete cases, but the classes of cases where it was proper for the United States to interfere.

But I will pause long enough to say in a general way that I think it entirely proper for the United States to join in a conference which relates to the regulation of commercial matters, which relates to anything outside of politics, which has no connection with controversies for dominion and power relatively between two great countries as in this case, or in a conference which has no relation to the great question of the balance of power in Europe, the great question which to-day keeps the great countries of Europe each an armed camp with its three hundred thousand and five hundred thousand armed men, a question with which, if we become connected, the time is only too short in our future when we also must be prepared to face the world in arms, in the maintenance of questions which now do not concern us but in the settlement of which we will then have the same obligation as the European nations now have.

But, Mr. President, to return, at the time the Senator interrogated me very properly, I was asking the question what differentiates this particular conference from any other conference which might be called in Europe for the settlement of European or international questions or controversies, when the fact exists that in each one of them there are and always will be commercial interests of the United States to be guarded, and which might rightfully and properly be said to be necessarily affected by whatever might be decided by such conference.

Mr. McCUMBER. Mr. President—

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Georgia yield to the Senator from North Dakota?

Mr. BACON. I will yield with pleasure, although I shall have to return again to the same point.

Mr. McCUMBER. May I ask a question or two of the Senator that I do not think have yet been answered? If they were answered, it was when I was not present.

Mr. BACON. Very well.

Mr. McCUMBER. I should like to ask the Senator whether he has any information that would justify the inference that the delegates selected to attend the Moroccan convention will go outside of what he declares is the settled policy of the country—that is, that they will take any part whatever in the discussion of the policing of that country or as to which power shall be the dominant power; and if there is no information to justify that inference, then I should like to ask the Senator another question.

Mr. BACON. Will the Senator permit me to answer one at a time?

Mr. McCUMBER. Very well; but this is connected with it, and the Senator can answer them both together. If there is nothing to justify that inference, then the next question is this: Suppose that we have treaty obligations with Morocco—

Mr. BACON. Now, I submit to the Senator that those are two questions, and must necessarily be answered separately. But the Senator may go ahead.

Mr. McCUMBER. Suppose we had, as it is assumed we have, a commercial treaty with Morocco, and suppose that in the settlement of this other matter the question of keeping the open door in Morocco should be discussed as between the powers, would not we be justified in sending delegates there for the very purpose of discussing that subject, and to prevent, if possible, any interference with our treaty rights or with our commercial interests?

Mr. BACON. If the Senator will permit me, I will endeavor to answer what I think are practically three questions propounded by him; and if I do not answer them, I hope he will do me the kindness to call my attention to anything I may omit, as I must bear his several questions in mind while I am endeavoring to answer one.

The Senator, as I understand, asks the question, What evidence there is that these delegates are to engage in any part of this conference relative to the political control of Morocco, or as to any of the political questions which are dividing some

countries of Europe and about which they are in controversy? That is the question of the Senator?

Mr. McCUMBER. Yes.

Mr. BACON. Mr. President, unfortunately we have no evidence of that fact, because we have received no information from the executive department as to what are the instructions of these delegates. Even, however, if the suggestion contained in the question of the Senator is correct, that our delegates are limited to questions of a commercial character, or rather that their instructions do not extend to participation in any conference relative to political questions, nevertheless there are several reasons why we should not be in this conference.

As I have previously said, there can be no conference in Europe as to international European political questions which concern any country in Europe which will not relate to a country with which we have commercial relations. Therefore, if the rule is to be laid down that wherever we have commercial relations with the countries in Europe and a political controversy grows up in Europe as to the political control of that country between the nations of Europe, and war is threatened on account of that political controversy and a conference is to be called for the purpose of settling the controversy, and, if possible, of avoiding war—if that rule is to be laid down then a conference can not at any time be called in Europe upon any political international European question which will not call for our participation also, because we will always have these commercial questions there which can be affected by the result of such a conference; and in consequence, as I have already endeavored to show, if this were recognized as a sufficient reason for participating in such conferences the precedent would be established which would require us to participate in all future European conferences called for the settlement of European political questions.

Mr. SPOONER. Let me ask the Senator a question.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Georgia yield to the Senator from Wisconsin?

Mr. BACON. With pleasure.

Mr. SPOONER. Suppose that be true, and our delegates to such a conference are limited absolutely to the questions or subjects of interest to the United States, what is the objection to that? Let me put another question.

Mr. BACON. Which one shall I answer first?

Mr. SPOONER. Answer them together. Does the Senator conceive it to be impossible, or at all difficult, where a conference is to be held that involves questions of interest to the United States and also questions of purely European interests, that the representatives of the United States may attend, and properly attend, that conference, and after having looked to the interests of the United States withdraw from it? Is that inconceivable?

Mr. BACON. I will take the first question, or answer both together.

Mr. SPOONER. Does the Senator conceive it impossible that the representatives of the United States may properly attend a foreign conference which deals with questions affecting the interests of the United States and also with European interests, limited in their powers to a consideration only of American interests, and instructed that when that is concluded they shall withdraw?

Mr. BACON. Mr. President—

Mr. SPOONER. If the Senator will pardon me one observation, on his doctrine, or his argument, in all cases and with all countries with which we have commercial interests and concern we would keep away from all conferences.

Mr. BACON. No; all political conferences.

Mr. SPOONER. Oh! But suppose it is both commercial and political. Is the Senator's argument that where both are combined we should keep entirely away?

Mr. BACON. Yes.

Mr. SPOONER. And that we should attend only those conferences across the sea where there is involved nothing but our commercial interests?

It will often happen, as it has happened before and happens now, perhaps, that a conference is called, which involves directly the commercial interests or treaty interests of the United States and also involves European political questions with which we have no concern. On the Senator's theory we should stay away from such a conference and leave American interests to go uncared for, rather than act on the theory, which seems to be a sound one, that we may attend it with perfect propriety, and when American interests are disposed of withdraw from it, taking no part whatever in the controversy as to European policies. Now, is not that a fair statement of the situation in this transaction so far as the Senator knows it?

Mr. BACON. Mr. President, the Senator has asked such a

number of questions, and has made comments upon them, that I can only answer in a general way, because it is not possible to answer specifically questions put with such complement of argument—sound argument, or, rather, plausible argument, if he will pardon my so denominating it.

Mr. SPOONER. The Senator will pardon me—

Mr. BACON. I always enjoy the interruptions of the Senator, even if the Senator prevails in the argument. I then have consolation in the consciousness of having been overthrown by an Ajax and not by one of small prowess.

Mr. SPOONER. I have rather a poor memory, Mr. President, and I fail to recall any time when the Senator admitted I had prevailed when there was a controversy with him. [Laughter.]

Mr. BACON. Probably that excuses the generous indisposition of the Senator to recognize that fact himself in my case, but in my struggles with him it might have been so recognized by others less magnanimous than he.

But, Mr. President, that brings me back really to what I was saying in response to the inquiries of the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. McCUMBER]. Here is a proposition, that if the controversy is a political controversy and relates to a country with which we have commercial interests and if the fact of the existence of such commercial interests is to determine the question whether we are to be parties to a conference, then there can be no conference in Europe with reference to a political controversy that will not call for our participation, at least in part, because there is no country about which a controversy can arise in Europe with which we have no commercial relations.

Mr. SPOONER. Mr. President—

Mr. BACON. If the Senator will pardon me, I will yield to him later in the fullest degree. I assure him of that. I wish him to allow me to state my proposition before I am compelled to break it in two.

The conclusion from that proposition is this: The avoidance of entanglement in European political controversies is so important, and the evils of participation in a conference over political controversies of an international European character are so great, and in consequence the necessity for the observance of the rule of nonentanglement is so imperative, that unless it can be shown to be utterly impossible to accomplish that result in any other way it would be unwise for us to participate in any European conferences which will endanger our being entangled in those controversies.

We have before had conferences in Europe, but they have always related to countries with which we had commercial interests; they have always related to countries with which we had tenfold more interest than we have or ever will have in Morocco; and yet the proposition has never before been advanced in the Congress of the United States, or in this branch of it, that because of that fact when European governments met together in conference for the purpose of settling the question of the political control of any part of Europe we should be there as a part of that conference for the purpose of protecting our commercial interests—never. If the suggestion of the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. McCUMBER] and the contention of the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. SPOONER] are to be adopted as the proper policy of the Government hereafter, the result of it must be that hereafter we must be parties to all political conferences in Europe, because they will always relate to countries in which we have commercial interests.

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. President—

Mr. BACON. If the Senator will pardon me until I finish my answer, then I will yield with pleasure. I will recall it to him if he does not remember it, and if he does not interrupt me for the purpose I will ask him to do so.

Mr. MORGAN. Very well.

Mr. BACON. In this particular instance there is absolutely no excuse for our going there for the protection of our commercial interests—that is, so far as we have information through the public press of the country, through dispatches from Europe, and the different statements as to what are the subjects-matter for consideration in this conference. We have every reason to rely upon what statements are made in the press as to these matters—these dispatches are from the great capitals of Europe—for the reason that these countries have not acted in secret as to what they proposed to do and as to what questions are to be under consideration at this conference.

France has issued a book (called the "Yellow Book") in which she has given the whole history of this matter from her standpoint, giving, as I am informed, all that she has done and all that she contends for. Germany has also issued a book (called there the "White Book") in which she has made public to the world every step that she has taken and every contention that she has made. Therefore, when the papers state that such and such are the provisions of the agreement of conference

we have every reason to believe that these statements are reliable from the fact that they are not based on rumor, but are based upon the published reports of the Governments, which, unlike the Government of the United States, have made public to the world what they propose to do and what are the issues they propose to have settled. It is stated emphatically and not denied, and I have no doubt it is absolutely true, that the agreement to be submitted in this matter to the conference especially excepts from all power of consideration by that conference the question of any change in the commercial relations as settled by the treaty of 1880.

The treaty of 1880 between Morocco and almost all the civilized countries on the globe, all the leading powers of Europe and the United States included, expressly provides that each nation shall have in its commercial intercourse in Morocco the benefit of the most favored terms which shall be given to any other nation. There is a permanent treaty containing that guaranty; and this submission to that conference expressly provides that while the delegates sent to that conference may settle the question as to whether France shall have the predominant control in Morocco or whether Germany shall share in it, and while it may settle other questions of a political character, it shall not touch the consideration of the question of the commercial relations of any country with that Government as settled by the treaty of 1880. Now, what possible excuse can there be, in view of that, for our participation in this conference? If that were not there, there would be every opportunity for us to have acted as we did in 1880 in a conference which related exclusively to these personal and commercial matters, and not be mingled and mixed up and take part in these great European questions which threaten war. It is because it is known that this controversy threatens war that the powers are ostentatiously parading their military and naval strength, that armies are being concentrated on the frontier, and that all these nations, and, I am sorry to say, including the United States, are concentrating their fleets to-day at Gibraltar. There is a warlike pageant there to-day that has no part in the assembling of a peaceful conference to determine on matters of friendly commerce and trade.

Mr. HALE. Mr. President—

Mr. BACON. I promised I would yield in a moment to the Senator from Alabama [Mr. MORGAN] and that I would call his attention to an interruption he desired to make, so I hope the Senator from Maine will excuse me for a moment.

Mr. MORGAN. I desire merely to make an inquiry of the Senator from Georgia or any other Senator. I want to know whether we have any authentic or official statement of any invitation for the Government of the United States to participate in this serious conference? Has that been brought to the attention of the Senate? I suppose, Mr. President, that the character of the invitation would, in a large measure, if not entirely, determine the character in which we accepted it, in which we are to be represented, and the purpose for which we are to be represented in that conference, if you call it such. Therefore I think the Senate ought to be informed of the nature of the invitation, so as to see whether it is proper for the President of the United States to accept it in full or to accept it in part, or whether the acceptance of it would create that state of entangling alliance with foreign European governments in respect particularly of political questions that we have always denounced in every action heretofore taken, more particularly in sending our delegates to the Panama conference.

Mr. HALE. Mr. President—

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Georgia yield to the Senator from Maine?

Mr. BACON. Will the Senator from Maine allow me to answer the question of the Senator from Alabama?

Mr. HALE. I am called from the Chamber, and desire to say only a few words.

Mr. BACON. I will yield to the Senator from Maine [Mr. HALE] now, and will reply to the Senator from Alabama [Mr. MORGAN] later.

Mr. HALE. I only desire to say, Mr. President, that I do not in the least regret this discussion. I think in all matters relating to not only action upon treaties submitted to the Senate, but upon grave considerations involving the negotiation of treaties, that the participation of the Senate was never by the framers of the Constitution intended to be shut out. I do not go so far as some Senators have gone in saying that until a treaty negotiated by the President is submitted to the Senate in terms the Senate shall stand dumb.

Mr. President, in that storehouse of information upon this subject, the Madison Papers—and the best form of those papers is the edition that was authorized by a resolution of Congress, edited by an eminent master of jurisprudence—whoever will go

back to that fountain head of discussion and of consideration of all these great subjects, including the treaty-making power, will find that the participation of the Senate in all matters relating to treaties was most jealously guarded. Both Mr. Rutledge and Mr. Pinckney submitted the grave proposition that the entire treaty-making power should be left with the Senate. Mr. Dickinson and Doctor Franklin believed that it should be left to an Executive, with an executive council. Whoever examines that record and goes to the fountain head of information will find that the compromise, that was at last agreed upon by one vote of all the States, only came after a determined resistance on the part of the advocates of the power of the Senate, that the Senate should still be in sympathy with all subjects-matter attending foreign relations either before or after a treaty should be submitted.

It is said that we may trust the Executive. I think we may; but what would happen if at some time there was an Executive that we could not trust? What would happen if an Executive should desire to rehabilitate his own fortunes or build up the waning strength of his party by a war issue, and the Senate believed and was convinced that there was danger of that? Must the Senate wait until the mischief is done?

Mr. SPOONER. Will the Senator allow me to ask him a question?

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Maine yield to the Senator from Wisconsin?

Mr. HALE. I do.

Mr. SPOONER. The Senator speaks outside of treaties. The Senator is not referring to treaties?

Mr. HALE. I am referring to steps that lead to treaties.

Mr. SPOONER. I should like to ask the Senator what would the Senate do in such a case?

Mr. HALE. I have no doubt, Mr. President, that if such a condition as that I have touched upon arose, and it was believed that an Executive for such reasons—they do not apply now, as I have indicated—was taking advantage of his power to commit the country to a war policy, I have no doubt that the Senate, in connection with the House of Representatives, could and would interfere by joint resolution and would not let that danger be presented to the lips of the Republic.

So, as I say, I do not go so far as some Senators do in believing that the Senate can do absolutely nothing until a treaty in form is launched before the Senate. But I am not troubled upon this matter now by any consideration of that kind. Under the administration of this Government as now conducted I do not believe that the Secretary of State, who has immediate charge of all these matters, will in any way involve this country, or let it be involved, in any of the controversies that will arise out of this conference between European powers. I think we may safely assume that the conservative interests of the country will be guarded in that respect, and that the Senator need have no alarm.

I wish—I am not hesitant in saying that I wish—that the Secretary of State and the President acting together had determined not to send delegates to this conference. The conference is, as the Senator from Georgia [Mr. BACON] says, not a conference called to meet commercial questions. It is a simon-pure outright political conference. It has given rise to great excitement; the European press has all been full of it, and, I am sorry to say, Mr. President, that our press has been full of it—a thing with which we have little or no concern, and the less concern that we have with it the better.

I do not find fault. I can see that the Secretary of State and the President, being called upon, as I think they were, by this little fought-over country of Morocco to send delegates, determined to send them. I can not speak for the President or the Secretary of State, but I should, if I made a guess, think that if the matter were to come up now, in view of the discussions, in view of all the conditions, the President and the Secretary of State would hesitate to send delegates to this conference. But they have gone there.

The danger, Mr. President, is not from the President nor from the Secretary of State. The danger of this whole business is the still ascending prominence of the war sentiment in the country. The President is not accountable for that; the Secretary of State is not accountable for that; we are not accountable for that.

I picked up a copy of this morning's Post, Mr. President, and I have it here. It is a newspaper which deserves all that has been said of it by the Senator from Georgia. It means to be a careful paper, and it is mainly a conservative paper; but the Washington Post this morning has more than a whole column showing that our danger of getting into these complications and getting into entangling alliances is not from the President nor from the Secretary of State nor from us, but from outside senti-

ment. More than a whole column is given to this Moroccan question, to what will come out of it, to the presence of our fleet at Gibraltar, and to the complications that will result. In the same paper, in a little inconspicuous place, is a notice of a common mine conference between all the operators of coal, all the representatives of the transportation of coal, and all the organizations that represent labor in the mining of coal and its transportation, but it is given no conspicuousness. Nobody thinks of that. The trouble is, Mr. President, that, under the incitement that the military sentiment is constantly pushing us forward to, with every officer of the Army and of the Navy eager and anxious for a complication that will bring us into war, the public attention is drifting away from the tremendous problems that at home are clutching at the foundation of our entire social and business and political fabric.

I hope to live long enough, it may be I shall not, when the obscure item which is given in the Post of this great meeting, involving all these great questions of coal transportation, of coal mining, and the interests of coal operators, the interests that labor has, will excite some attention, and that we will cease to give the best of our thought and our agitation to these foreign problems.

We have very little to do with Morocco. We could negotiate, if need be, another treaty with her in sixty days by sending commissioners for that purpose. In this conference between the European powers, who stand with hands at each other's throats, making an excuse for innovation and a policy that may mean war, the question of commerce will never have an ounce of consideration. The subject of commerce and of our commerce will never have the consideration of a moment in that conference. It is called for another purpose; the interest in it is in another purpose, and it would be much better if we kept our hands off of all such things.

I wanted to say this, and I want to say that I do not agree with the Senator in his apprehension that either the President or the Secretary of State is going to lead us into any trouble in this matter. The conservative instinct will take care of that. We shall get out of it without being entangled in the jealousies and strifes of the European powers. But I think this discussion itself is valuable, and I am very glad it has taken place.

Mr. BACON. Mr. President, I have listened with great pleasure and interest to what the distinguished Senator from Maine has said. I agree with him in almost everything he has said, and I will indicate a little later wherein I unfortunately differ from him, as slight as that difference may be. I certainly agree with him decidedly as to the principles announced on all matters.

First, however, before responding to what was said by the distinguished Senator from Maine, I will reply to the inquiry of the learned Senator from Alabama [Mr. MORGAN]. The Senator inquires whether we have any evidence of the nature of the invitation which has come to us for participation in this conference. I think it is extremely unfortunate, Mr. President—and I believe that every Senator who hears me thinks it is unfortunate—that the President had not taken us into his confidence when he sent his most elaborate message to the Senate at the beginning of this session, in which he treated of so vast a number of subjects.

It was extremely unfortunate that this most vital of all subjects, in my opinion, was not touched upon by him in his message, and I can only attribute his failure to do so to the fact that in the multitude of other matters he was not impressed with the importance of this step which he was about to take or had taken. I attribute it to no desire to withhold from the Congress of the United States information which it is proper to have and which the public should have. I say I think it is extremely unfortunate. I do not believe there is a Senator in the sound of my voice who does not agree with me now in that proposition, especially in view of the fact that the governments of Europe interested in this matter have without hesitation published to their countries and to the world everything that relates to the connection of each of their governments with this most important problem.

We are left to the information which we gather from other countries, and to the statement of newspaper correspondents of what has been given to them by the State Department. All I can state in answer definitely to the learned Senator from Alabama is in reading still further from the excerpt from which I read this morning from the Post, in which it is stated what is the character of the invitation which has been sent to this Government. The Senator will perceive that there is no invitation here to participate in any partial consideration. There is no invitation here to limit the action of the delegates of the United States to the consideration of commercial or per-

sonal questions; but it is a broad invitation to go into that conference on the same footing, and with the same powers, and with the same scope of duty as the delegates from the European countries thus vitally interested in the maintenance of the balance of power in Europe, and sensitive and alert even to the point of war in the prevention of undue advantage of any one country at the expense of the powers exercised by another.

I read further from the article from which I read this morning, beginning at the point where I left off. This article from the Washington Post appeared in yesterday's paper:

Examination of the correspondence shows that this Government was invited to participate in the conference by the Sultan of Morocco. The Mohammedan monarch was constrained to extend an invitation to the United States along with exactly worded invitations to all of the European nations of the first class, because this country was one of the signatories to the international agreement with Morocco in July, 1880, as the result of an international conference at Madrid, Spain, called at the request of the ruler of the Shereefian empire to bring his country within the pale of Christian civilization.

It is true that that statement is made as giving a reason why the invitation was the same to the United States as it was to the other countries, but that does not change the fact that the invitation is the same to this country as it is to the other countries. We all know, as stated by the distinguished Senator from Maine, that while there may be minute reference or attention paid to commercial matters, this conference is called for the settlement of questions on account of differences as to which France and Germany to-day have their hands ready to lay upon each other's throats.

Mr. President, there is a further fact that we learn from the European press, informed as it has been by its own governments. The very agreement upon which this conference is based specifies that the conference shall not have power to interfere with the commercial relations now settled by treaty as between Morocco and these other countries. So if such were the reason it is not a good reason.

There is no reason why the fact that the United States was a party to the Morocco treaty should require that it should be a party to this treaty, because the main thing in the Moroccan treaty, the treaty of 1880, it is stipulated shall not be interfered with by this conference.

Mr. President, in relation to the very interesting remarks of the distinguished Senator from Maine [Mr. HALE], I thoroughly agree with him, and not only so but I believe that nine out of ten men who have heard him to-day agree with him as to the principles which he has announced, and as to the policy which we should observe and of which we should be mindful. I do not expect to hear any Senator rise in his place to-day and take issue with him as to these principles and policies. There is but one point upon which I differ from the learned Senator. As I understand the position of the Senator, he very frankly says that he would have preferred if we had not been parties to this conference, and he gives the soundest and the best and most unanswerable reasons why his preference in that matter is well founded. But he says that in this particular case we have no particular reason to fear.

Well, Mr. President, I do not believe that any great injury is going to come to us out of this particular case, because I believe, as I hope, that it is going to be settled peaceably; but the question as to whether it is a prudent thing to do is not to be settled by the question of what is most likely to happen; it is to be considered in the light of what may possibly happen. I put to the Senator a question upon the result of this conference as to Germany, for instance, and I only speak of these countries because of the facts involved, and what I am saying does not relate in any manner to any relation between us and these countries, and consequently there is no indelicacy in speaking of it. If the result of this conference should be one which Germany would refuse to abide by, what would result? Where would stand the United States? Suppose, for instance, as is given out in the papers—and who will doubt it?—the European governments are looking to the United States as one power which is to exercise a great influence in determining what shall be the order and decree of that conference. It may be that there is a tie vote except the vote of the United States, which may be the one to decide upon the judgment and order of the conference. It may be that the deciding vote of the United States shall determine a policy to which Germany will object and on account of which she will go to war.

Mr. HALE. Now, I should hope—

Mr. BACON. I hope the Senator will pardon me and let me finish. I always listen to him with the greatest pleasure, but it is better that I should finish the proposition—

Mr. HALE. Very well.

Mr. BACON. Because there is another alternative that I wish to put, and I shall then be more than glad to hear the

Senator, as he always enlightens every question which he touches.

Suppose that in the vote, as I was saying, it should turn out as the result that the determination was reached in consequence of the casting vote of the United States Government, and that on account of the decree and order of that conference Germany should refuse to abide by what it should thus determine and should go to war, where would stand the Government of the United States? I understand the Senator, and I hope he will reply afterwards, because I will be more than glad to have him do so.

Mr. President, when European nations get together in a conference for the purpose of settling a question on account of which war is threatened, there is an implied and moral obligation, in the first place, that they will abide by the judgment and decree of the conference; and there is an implied and a moral obligation, in the second place, that if any power refuses to abide by the decree of that conference those who thus agree to it will compel its obedience. They are not there for idle play. They are not there for the solution of abstract conundrums. They are there for the practical and, if need be, the forcible settlement of great questions upon which will depend the powers of the world and who shall exercise them.

When they agree to get together in the conference the country which consents to that conference and then refuses to abide by it is at war with all the others, and all the others are under a moral obligation to enforce it. To-day a large part of Europe, an important part of it, is regulated and controlled by the decree of the Berlin conference. If there should be on the part of any one of the signatory powers an infraction of that decree, every government a party to that decree is under a moral obligation to support every other power in the enforcement of that decree. The United States can not take part in that conference, it can not be one to decide by its vote what shall be the decree, and then refuse to assist in the enforcement of the decree.

Now, I have one more suggestion to make, if the Senator will pardon me. It will be very short, and he can answer them both together, because they are cognate. Suppose, as in the European press it is suggested, that possibly the American delegates will not vote, but that they will simply counsel and advise, and suppose, in consequence of that counsel and advice there is a result reached which otherwise would not be reached, because sometimes a man's counsel and advice is worth very much more than his vote, as is the case with the learned and honorable Senator from Maine. Yet the moral obligation upon the United States, which would thus be imposed by its action would be no less great than the moral obligation in case it had itself voted. In either case to shirk the responsibility of the result brought about by its own act would be a pusillanimity.

Now I will hear from the Senator, although I have not quite completed what I had to say in response to his valuable suggestions.

Mr. HALE. The point on which the Senator arrested my attention was the proposition that it might happen, not upon some matter touching commerce, not upon some matter affecting our trade, but upon some matter vitally affecting the peace of Europe, that there might be a drawn condition among them, and that the vote of the delegates from the United States would decide the result.

My mind, Mr. President, is as clear as crystal upon what should be done and what I believe would be done in such a grave emergency. Conferences to-day are not like the old-fashioned world conferences, where the world learns the result after weeks and weeks have passed, where battles are fought after treaties have been concluded, but every nation is in hourly and momentary touch with its representative in any great conference.

I should have no doubt that in such a condition, in such a grave emergency as the Senator has arrayed before us, the Secretary of State would telegraph the approval of the President that the United States delegation should decline absolutely participation in that vote.

Mr. BACON. But, if the Senator will pardon me, would it not be better that they should be kept away from there altogether?

Mr. HALE. They are there. I wish they were not, but they are there; and when it comes to a critical condition, if it ever does, I should have no doubt that Secretary Root, backed up by the President, would send a swift dispatch over the wires that in these conditions the American delegation is instructed not to vote, and, if need be, to emphasize its absolute declination to participate in the grave problems that are confronting the powers of Europe, to withdraw from the conference and return home.

Mr. BACON. Exactly.

Mr. HALE. But I do not agree with the Senator in his intimation that that would involve any pusillanimity on our part. That is, we do not go into the conference in the way European powers do. The reason that is given is a slight one—the commercial relations; and if the other things, which mean war, horrid war, between European powers, jealous of each other, confront that conference and our deciding vote shall settle it either way, I have no more doubt than I doubt that I stand here before the Senate, the Administration would withdraw our delegates absolutely, if necessary, and that Europe would go on and fight its own fights out and take the dread arbitrament of war, in which we have no part and ought to have no part. I would not be troubled in the least by the situation that the Senator has pictured.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. Mr. President—

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Georgia yield to the Senator from Indiana?

Mr. BACON. I hope the Senator will allow me to reply to the Senator from Maine.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. I wish to ask only a question for information. How many European powers are requested to attend this conference? Senators have been talking about a deciding vote. I think there are seven.

Mr. BACON. So far as I can gather from the public press, France, Germany, Great Britain, Austria, Italy, Spain, and Russia.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. Seven. So there can not be a tie vote of seven.

Mr. BACON. Oh, well.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. But the Senator talks about a deciding vote.

Mr. BACON. Possibly one of them might withdraw. We can not tell. But that is not material.

Mr. President, replying to the Senator from Maine, as I catch the meaning, the kernel of the Senator's suggestion, when reduced to its last analysis, it at last comes back to what the Senator has substantially stated, although with very much more point than my words, to wit, that we really have no business there. What the Senator has last said, when reduced to its last analysis, means that we have no business there, because, according to the suggestion of the Senator, if the time ever comes when what we are to do is to influence the action of that convention our delegates should be telegraphed to withdraw from it. As the Senator says, we have no business there; it is a mere matter of tinsel, so far as that goes, a mere parade, so that we may hereafter be classed with the great war powers, a mere sending of delegates to cooperate with delegates from European powers as a matter of pompous show and display, with the simple understanding that they are there merely as a matter of ornament and not to accomplish anything, not to attend to anything; but that if it reaches a point where their participation will determine the result they will be telegraphed to withdraw. If so, why are they there at all?

This construction of his last utterance is all consistent with what the Senator from Maine says. The Senator from Maine said in his previous remarks that he not only wishes that they were not there, but he has practically said that they have no business there; that we have nothing to accomplish there for the good of this Government, but that we have great dangers to incur to this Government on account of our participation.

Then he goes further to express his confidence in the President and Secretary of State, and says if it should turn out that our presence there would be a matter which would exercise an influence on the determination of these grave questions by the conference, his mind is clear as crystal that they would be instructed to withdraw from it.

But I want to follow still further the suggestion of the Senator in the first part of his interesting remarks as to whether or not he would agree with me in my present contention so far as regards the present instance. Mr. President, if we concede all that the Senator says, if we recognize the propriety and correctness of his want of concurrence in the propriety of mingling in such matters, is the question as to such propriety met by the suggestion that in the present case there is such confidence in the President and in the Secretary of State that no harm will come, that no harm will come in this instance because of the confidence of the Senator that we now have a good President and a wise President and a good and wise Secretary of State?

Conceding that no harm will come, and conceding the soundness of all the confidence which he expresses in these high and distinguished officers, does the Senator shut his eyes to the fact that we are establishing a precedent? If a good President and a wise President and a good Secretary of State and a wise Secretary of State and a patriotic President and a patriotic Secre-

tary of State can send delegates to a European conference relative to European international controversies, can not an unwise President do it? Can not an unwise Secretary of State advise it? Can not a President not so good and not so patriotic and a Secretary of State not so good and so learned and so patriotic as the Senator believes these officers to be also do these things.

Mr. HALE. Mr. President—

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Georgia yield to the Senator from Maine?

Mr. BACON. Certainly.

Mr. HALE. I have already stated that such a condition might happen. There might be an Executive and an Administration that believed a policy which embroiled us in war would be to the advantage of the President or the Administration in precipitating a war. I have felt that we have a safe standing with the present President and Secretary of State, and that can not result.

And I do not believe that in such a condition the Senate and House of Representatives are robbed of all power and must wait until the mischief is done. The Senate is not an eleventh-hour body. It has not got to wait until the horse is stolen. There would be under such condition the right in Congress to arrest and prevent the great calamity which would fall upon the country from such an Administration.

Mr. BACON. I quite agree with the Senator in that opinion as to the powers and duties of the Senate.

Mr. NEWLANDS. May I ask the Senator a question?

Mr. BACON. If the Senator from Nevada will permit me to reply to the Senator from Maine first, I will then yield with pleasure.

I quite agree with the Senator from Maine in that regard, Mr. President, and I am only replying to so much of what he said as might be construed into a consent on his part to the propriety of such interference and such entanglement in a case where there happened to be a good President and a good Secretary of State. I said in the earlier part of my remarks that this rule is an absolute rule. It is not a rule with qualifications. It is not a rule with exceptions. It is a rule absolute and without exceptions that not only when we have a good President or when we have a good purpose are we to abstain from these entanglements, and not only when we fail to have them are we going to abstain from such entanglements, but also whether we have a good President or a bad President, or a good purpose or a bad purpose, we are to abstain, because the rule must apply equally in each case.

I was simply endeavoring to point out that while the Senator might be free from apprehensions on account of the particular facts in this case and the particular officials involved, still we are engaged in a matter which establishes a precedent, a precedent which may be followed in the future, and followed by one not good and not wise who may sit in the Executive chair, because it is altogether possible that there may be such a fate in store for this country. The time was when a man who was not a good man had in the electoral college a tie vote for the Presidency of the United States, a man who afterwards was tried for treason to the United States. Now, I will hear the Senator from Nevada.

Mr. NEWLANDS. Mr. President, on this very question of precedent I should like to ask the Senator from Georgia a question. I understand him to say that the question in this matter will be a question for the future, even though the action may be attended with no ill results. I wish to inquire whether there are any instances in the history of the country in which similar action has been taken by the Government. In this connection I would ask the Senator to differentiate between the action taken by the President in this case and the action taken by Mr. Hay at the time of the breaking out of the war between Russia and Japan when he addressed a letter to the great powers, including Russia and Japan, intended to secure the integrity of China and to confine the war entirely to Manchuria.

As I understand it, that was a political complication, not merely a commercial complication. I do not understand that the action was taken upon the ground that we had commercial interests there in jeopardy. It was just as much political action then as this action is to-day. How would the Senator differentiate between those two cases?

Mr. BACON. Mr. President, I may be very unfortunate in my view of the two cases, but it seems to me that they bear no similarity whatever. In the first place, there was no conference. There was no delegation of power to anybody.

Mr. NEWLANDS. Yes; if the Senator will permit me, there was an interference upon the part of the United States with a political complication existing upon the continent of Asia. How did the United States have anything more to do with that polit-

ical complication than it can have with a political complication in Europe? If we have no business in the political complications of Europe, have we any business in the political complications of Asia? Let me say to the Senator that I am not taking any position hostile to that which he assumes. On the contrary, I am quite sympathetic with the view that he expresses. I simply wish to inquire whether we have not gone already a considerable degree in the line of this policy of interfering with matters that are no concern of ours?

Mr. BACON. Mr. President, it is possibly true that we have, but that would be no reason why we should go still further. It would be rather a warning to us why we should be on our guard not to proceed still further.

Now as to whether or not the Senator's suggestion is entirely accurate, that in the matter of the suggestion of Secretary Hay we violated this rule which has been laid down and observed by our Government for more than a century, it would take, of course, a good deal of time to analyze all that and to discuss the relation of it and the question as to whether it was such a policy.

But there is this great distinguishing difference between the two, that in the one case there was no conference of the powers, no delegation of authority of the powers of Europe and of America, but there was simply a note, if I recollect correctly, sent by Mr. Hay to each of the representatives of this Government at the courts of the leading powers intimating that there should be a suggestion to the two great powers then engaged in war that they would limit the theater of war to the country in which it legitimately belonged, and that there would not be an intrusion by the armies of those countries into the adjacent country and territory of China. The question as to whether or not that was entirely proper I can not now stop to discuss, and if it did infringe upon the well-established principle I would deprecate it to that extent.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. I understand from the Senator that we were invited because we happened to be one of the signatory powers, of whom there were eight, seven of whom were European and the eighth ourselves. Does not the Senator think that it would have been extremely discourteous, being one of the signatory powers, if Morocco had asked all the others and had not asked us, when its action might modify the treaty or arrangement to which we were signatories?

Mr. BACON. Well, Mr. President, I will respond to the learned Senator that according to my understanding and according to the statements which I have seen in the published dispatches from Europe, this conference is based upon an agreement in which it is expressly stipulated that the commercial arrangements which are now secured by treaty shall not be called in question, and therefore I do not see that it would have been a matter of discourtesy on the part of Morocco to have failed to invite us to that conference.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. At all events the Senator will admit it was proper, since Morocco was inviting those powers who were signatory, to invite us?

Mr. BACON. No; I do not think so.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. And if we had not been invited it would be a matter of which we might make complaint, providing we wanted to make any complaint, all the other signatory powers having been invited. Now, if it was proper to invite us, it is certainly not improper to respond when all our sister signatory powers go there.

Mr. BACON. In the first place, I do not think it was at all important to invite us, or that we should have been slighted if we had not been invited, in view of our well-known policy of noninterference in European political questions, and of the fact that the powers which called this conference expressly stipulated that commercial matters shall not be interfered with, and that the conference shall have no power to discuss them or make any order or decree about them. In the second place, I do not think it would be discourteous on the part of this Government whenever it receives an invitation of that kind to reply that, there being questions of this grave character of European international politics, it is contrary to the traditional and well-recognized and thoroughly settled and defined policy of this Government to participate in such controversies, and, therefore, with utmost thanks and courtesy, to decline.

Now, Mr. President, if it were true that there were important commercial interests, or even vital commercial interests, whether large or small, involved which might be considered, it would certainly be perfectly practical for this Government to reply, "This is a question in which the commercial question is insignificant compared with the political questions involved; it is to have little or no attention. The great question which is to concern you is one on account of which one government is ordering 20,000 cars to transport troops, and another govern-

ment is concentrating troops on the border, and, on account of which, each of these governments is concentrating its fleets at Gibraltar, and on account of which the European press is teeming with apprehension as to war. It is a matter that we are not to be connected with, and therefore we respectfully decline. When you get through, if you have commercial matters to consider we will be glad to join with you in the consideration of them." But there is no room for that in this case, for, as I have said a dozen times, the commercial matters are expressly excepted from the jurisdiction of this conference.

Mr. President, I have detained the Senate very much longer than I intended, and very much longer than I would have done had it not been, I think, for the very proper and pertinent and interesting interruptions of Senators, and I shall not longer do so.

Now, Mr. President, I want to say one word in conclusion in order that I may not be misunderstood. There have at times been suggestions that this is an assault on the President. I have been influenced in this matter by no partisanship. I believe I am capable of supporting a principle for reasons higher than partisan reasons. If this were the act of a Democratic President I would be all the more earnest and emphatic in my dissent from its propriety. There is no basis for the suggestion that anything I have said or done can be construed as an assault on the President, or that any word I have uttered can be considered as personally or officially disrespectful to him. I have made it my rule in the Senate never to speak disrespectfully of the President of the United States. I have been in the Senate under three different Presidents, and it has always happened that with no one of the three have I been in entire accord on all matters. It has fallen to me to differ with each of them on particular matters and to express those differences plainly and earnestly in debate in the Senate, but I can challenge the record that no word has ever fallen from my lips in the Senate in disrespect to either President, whether he be Republican or Democrat, and so long as I can guard my utterances none ever shall.

Nor, sir, do I desire in any manner to reflect upon the President or to deprecate his services. For instance, coming back to this matter of international conferences, I recognize that he performed a great public service, a great service for humanity, one on account of which his name will go down to posterity in great honor, in bringing about peace between Japan and Russia. I think that he not only honored himself, but all the American people, when he did so, and I do not think that in so doing he in any manner contravened this great principle. It is always in order for the United States Government to interpose its good offices to stop the shedding of blood.

But, Mr. President, the corollary of that is not true. It is not in order for the Government of the United States to interpose in a conference called in Europe for the purpose of avoiding war, for if it is, then the doctrine is gone, and there is none of it left, because every conference of that kind that is called in Europe is called for the purpose of preventing war. I also recognize the character and ability of the Secretary of State. I know him to be a man of great ability, entitled to esteem and respect. He is a man with whom my personal relations are entirely pleasant and against whom I would not say a word that is disrespectful.

I believe the President of the United States is a patriotic man, but I believe he is also a strong-willed and an impulsive man, and I think it is the duty of the Senate of the United States, as well as of the House, but more particularly of the Senate, to endeavor in a respectful way to guard the institutions of this country and the policies of this country, not in antagonism, but in harmony with the President of the United States, whether he belongs to one party or the other party.

I have no reason, Mr. President, to have any other feeling toward the President of the United States than that which I have expressed. While he is a man of a different political party from myself, while he is a native of a different State, a part of his ancestry is from my own State, and not only from my own State, but from the immediate little community in which I myself was reared; and, in the cemetery of historic Midway there sleep some of his ancestors by the side of those who gave me life and being. I would say no word which would be disrespectful to him. But when I differ from him upon a grave public question, one in my opinion of vital importance to the safety of this country, I violate no propriety, on the contrary, I perform a public duty, in giving utterance to the reasons for my difference.

The President of the United States is not a lawyer, and according to him the utmost good faith, one who is not a lawyer will sometimes do things which are not in accordance with what would be done by one versed in the law. For instance, Senators who hear me know the fact that there is now included and

published among the treaties of the United States an agreement made with Cuba as to the extradition of criminals from the part of the country leased to us for naval stations which has never been submitted to the Senate, but which has been marked "approved" by the President of the United States and put in the files, and it is to-day printed in the volume entitled "Treaties in Force." Of course it is utterly without force and effect, because it has never been ratified by the Senate or submitted to this body for ratification.

I do not believe that the President of the United States did that advisedly. Who would believe it? But I give that simply as an illustration of the fact that in this great Government, with its vast interests, with its tremendous labors, with its multiplied duties of all kinds, one not a lawyer, one necessarily with his attention divided with myriads of uncounted things, will sometimes do things which otherwise he would not have done, and which more particularly one trained in the law would not have done.

Now, I do not believe that any harm is going to come to us out of this Algeciras conference except in the matter of precedent. I think it very possible if this matter had not been brought to the attention of the country, if it had not been discussed in the Senate, if it had not been most intelligently and widely discussed, as it has been, by the press from one end of this country to the other, possibly there might have been done there things which would not have been to our interest, and which would have contravened our vital policy of nonintervention in European political disputes. But I believe the effect of this discussion in the Senate, and I believe the effect of the very elaborate and able discussion which it has had in the public press, have awakened the whole country to the danger and will safeguard our interests there.

The great evil is the precedent, and to avoid that evil, Mr. President, it should be known in no uncertain words that it is not hereafter to be considered as a precedent, and that when the nations of Europe gather together in conference for the purpose of settling great international questions involving peace and war and involving questions of domination of this foreign country, or that, or the other, or of the balance of power, the United States Government will severely let it alone and confine itself to the consideration of its own affairs.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Chair will ask the Senator from Georgia what disposition he wishes to have made of his resolution?

Mr. BACON. I will ask that it be referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, unless some other Senator desires to speak on it.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. In the absence of objection, it is so referred.

PONCE RAILWAY AND LIGHT COMPANY OF PORTO RICO.

The VICE-PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States; which was read, and, with the accompanying paper, referred to the Committee on Pacific Islands and Porto Rico.

The Senate and House of Representatives:

Referring to section 32 of the act approved April 12, 1900, entitled "An act temporarily to provide revenues and a civil government for Porto Rico, and for other purposes," I transmit herewith an ordinance enacted by the executive council of Porto Rico granting to the Ponce Railway and Light Company, its successors and assigns, the right to pass its cars over a certain piece of track on Real street, Ponce Playa, Porto Rico, owned and operated by the American Railroad Company of Porto Rico.

This ordinance has been approved by the President.

Attention is invited to the accompanying report of the Secretary of State.

THEODORE ROOSEVELT.

THE WHITE HOUSE, January 15, 1906.

HOUSE BILL REFERRED.

The joint resolution (H. J. Res. 68) relating to the contingent expenses of the House of Representatives was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

COLUMBIA RIVER BRIDGE.

The VICE-PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the amendment of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 2558) authorizing W. T. Clark to construct a bridge across the Columbia River near the city of Wenatchee, Wash., which was, on page 3, line 23, to strike out the words "two years" and insert "one year."

Mr. ANKENY. I move that the Senate concur in the amendment of the House of Representatives.

The motion was agreed to.

THE MERCHANT MARINE.

Mr. GALLINGER. I ask that the unfinished business may now be laid before the Senate.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business.

The Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 529) to promote the national defense, to create a force of naval volunteers, to establish American ocean-mail lines to foreign markets, to promote commerce, and to provide revenue from tonnage.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President, it will be remembered that during the Fifty-eighth Congress there was before the Senate a bill, sent here, I think, by the Navy Department, for the creation of a so-called "naval reserve." The Navy Department thinks it is a very important matter, as does the Committee on Commerce of this body. The first section of the bill now under consideration provides for a force of naval volunteers, traversing substantially the same ground the Navy Department did in the bill we formerly had under consideration.

Upon consultation with the Navy Department the General Board of that Department drafted a provision which they desire shall be inserted in lieu of section 1 of the pending bill. It does not materially change the bill; it changes the phraseology somewhat, and there are more naval terms in it than there were in our bill. We are assured, if this provision shall go in the bill, we will not be troubled with a bill from the Department in reference to this matter.

I brought the matter to the attention of the Committee on Commerce at its last meeting and I was instructed by that committee to offer it as an amendment to the bill, which I now do.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The amendment proposed by the Senator from New Hampshire will be read.

The SECRETARY. Strike out section 1 of the bill and insert:

That there shall be enrolled in such manner and under such requirements as the Secretary of the Navy may prescribe, from the officers and men now and hereafter employed in the merchant marine and deep-sea fisheries of the United States, such officers, petty officers, and men as may be capable of rendering service as members of a naval reserve, for duty in time of war, and who are willing to undertake such service, to be classified in grades and ratings according to their capacity as shown at time of enrollment. No man shall be thus enrolled who is not a citizen of the United States, either by birth or naturalization. These members of the Naval Reserve shall be enrolled for a period of four years, during which period they shall be subject to render service on call of the President in time of war. They shall also possess such qualifications, receive such instruction, and be subject to such regulations as the Secretary of the Navy may prescribe. The Secretary of the Treasury is hereby authorized and directed, upon proper audit, to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to each officer, petty officer, or man thus enrolled and employed in the merchant marine or deep-sea fisheries, as hereinafter provided, an annual retainer, as follows: For each officer of the line or Engineer Corps having the rank of lieutenant of the Naval Reserve, \$110; for each officer of the line or Engineer Corps having the rank of lieutenant (junior grade) in the Naval Reserve, \$90; for each officer of the line or Engineer Corps having the rank of ensign in the Naval Reserve, \$80; for each man with a rating of chief petty officer, \$70; for each man with a rating of petty officer, first class, \$60; for each man with a rating of petty officer, second class, \$48; for each man with a rating of petty officer, third class, \$40; for each seaman, first class, \$36; for each seaman, second class, \$30; for each seaman, third class, \$24. Such retainer shall be paid at the end of each year of service on certificate by an officer, to be designated by the Secretary of the Navy, that the member of the Naval Reserve has satisfactorily complied with the regulations, and on certificate by the Commissioner of Navigation that such member has served satisfactorily for at least six months of the preceding twelve months on vessels of the United States in the merchant marine or in the deep-sea fisheries. Each officer, petty officer, or man of the Naval Reserve thus enrolled who has not served for six months of the preceding year on vessels of the United States in the merchant marine or in the deep-sea fisheries, but has complied with the other prescribed requirements for enrollment in the Naval Reserve, shall receive one-half the annual retainer as enumerated above.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Without objection, the amendment will be agreed to.

Mr. CLAY. I wish to call the attention of the Senator from New Hampshire to the fact that the senior Senator from Florida [Mr. MALLOY] intended to address the Senate to-day on the bill. I do not think he is opposed to this amendment, but I understood him to say that he expected to address the Senate to-day on the general features of the bill after this amendment was presented to the Senate. I should be glad if the Senator would allow the amendment to go over until the Senator from Florida reaches the Senate. I do not know why he is not here.

Mr. GALLINGER. I can assure the Senator from Georgia that the Senator from New Hampshire has no desire to take advantage of the absence of the Senator from Florida.

Mr. CLAY. I am sure of that.

Mr. GALLINGER. I will say to the Senator from Georgia that this amendment was submitted to the Senator from Florida. He examined it very critically and made some changes in it, which we agreed to, and it is entirely agreeable to that Senator.

Mr. CLAY. I think the Senator from New Hampshire is correct in that statement, but I also think he will find the Senator from Florida desires to address the Senate on the general features of the bill, and he expects to point out that the bill will be improved by the adoption of this amendment. I understood the Senator from Florida to say that he would desire to address the Senate when this amendment was presented.

Mr. GALLINGER. All the Senator from Florida, then, will have to do will be to call attention to the fact that the bill has been improved upon his suggestion by the adoption of this amendment. The only one change, I will say to the Senator, that is material in this amendment is that in the bill it was provided that the naval volunteers or naval reserves should be citizens of the United States, or men who had declared their intention to become citizens. The Senator from Florida made serious objection to that provision, and it has been eliminated in this amendment. The Senator from Florida, in the minority report, criticises that feature of the bill.

Mr. CLAY. Yes; I think that is true.

Mr. GALLINGER. That is true. I think I can safely say to the Senator from Georgia that the Senator from Florida will not object to the adoption of this amendment. My purpose is to get the bill reprinted with the amendments. Of course it will go over if the Senator from Georgia wishes it.

Mr. CLAY. With that understanding I will withdraw any further objection.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Without objection, the amendment is agreed to.

Mr. GALLINGER. I am instructed by the Committee on Commerce to offer a few other verbal amendments. I move, in section 2, page 4, line 5, after the word "or," where it occurs the second time, to insert the words "not to exceed two months;" on the same page, line 11, after the word "or," where it occurs the second time, to insert "not to exceed one month;" and on the same page, line 18, after the word "or," to insert "not to exceed one month;" so as to read:

SEC. 2. That in the interest of the national defense and for the performance of the public services hereinafter specified, after July 1, 1907, the Secretary of the Treasury is hereby authorized and directed to pay, subject to the provisions of this act, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to the owner or owners of any vessel hereafter built and registered in the United States or now duly registered by a citizen or citizens of the United States (including as such citizens any corporation created under the laws of the United States or any of the States thereof), subventions as hereinafter provided; that is to say, (a) the sum of \$5 per gross registered ton for each vessel which has been engaged in the foreign trade by sea or the deep-sea fisheries for a period of twelve months, including time necessarily consumed in receiving or discharging cargo, or not to exceed two months in making annual or extraordinary repairs; (b) the sum of \$4 per gross registered ton for each vessel which, during any twelve consecutive months, has been engaged in the foreign trade by sea or the deep-sea fisheries for a period of nine months or over, but less than twelve months, including time necessarily consumed in receiving or discharging cargo, or not to exceed one month in making extraordinary repairs; (c) the sum of \$2.50 per gross registered ton for each vessel which, during any twelve consecutive months, has been engaged in the foreign trade by sea or the deep-sea fisheries for a period of six months or over, but less than nine months, including time necessarily consumed in receiving or discharging cargo, or not to exceed one month in making extraordinary repairs.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. GALLINGER. In section 3, page 7, line 7, at the end of the line, I move to strike out the word "desired" and insert the word "needed;" so as to read:

Fifth. That all ordinary repair or overhauling of said vessel shall be made in the United States, except in cases where dry docking is necessary and no dry dock of sufficient capacity shall be within a distance of 500 miles of the location of the ship when the repairs shall be needed.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. GALLINGER. In section 3, page 7, line 12, after the word "naval," I move to strike out the word "volunteers" and insert the word "reserve;" and on the same page, line 16, after the word "naval," to strike out the word "volunteers" and insert the word "reserves;" so as to read:

Sixth. A vessel shall not be entitled to the subvention above provided for unless during the period of employment in the foreign trade or deep-sea fisheries the following proportions of the crew of the vessel after the dates specified shall have been enrolled in the naval reserve: After July 1, 1908, one-eighth; after July 1, 1912, one-sixth; after July 1, 1917, one-fourth; *Provided*, That if the foregoing stated proportions of naval reserves can not be obtained at a foreign port with reasonable effort, as certified by the consul, other persons may be substituted until the first return of said vessel to the United States, without forfeiture of the subvention.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. GALLINGER. In section 7, page 13, line 15, after the word "enrolled," I move to insert the words "in the;" in the same line, after the word "naval," to strike out "volunteers" and insert "reserve;" and in line 19, after the word "naval," to strike out "volunteers" and insert "reserves;" so as to make the section read:

SEC. 7. That all contracts hereafter made pursuant to the act of March 3, 1891, before mentioned, or pursuant to sections 5 and 6 of this act, shall provide that on each voyage the following proportion of the crew shall be enrolled in the naval reserve: After July 1, 1908, one-eighth; after July 1, 1912, one-sixth, and after July 1, 1917, one-fourth; *Provided*, That if the foregoing stated proportions of naval reserves can not be obtained at a foreign port with reasonable effort, as certified by the consul, other persons may be substituted until the first return of said vessel to the United States, without forfeiture of the compensation.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. GALLINGER. In section 9, page 15, line 1, after the word "enrolled," I move to insert the words "as seaman, third class;" and in the same line, after the word "naval," to strike out "volunteers" and insert "reserve;" so as to make the section read:

SEC. 9. That on proof to the satisfaction of the Commissioner of Navigation that a vessel of the United States has on any foreign voyage carried a boy or boys, a citizen or citizens of the United States, under 21 years of age, suitably trained during that voyage in seamanship or engineering, in the proportion of one for such vessel, and in addition one for each 1,000 tons of her net registered tonnage, there shall be paid to the owner or owners of the vessel, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, an allowance equivalent to 80 per cent of the tonnage duties paid in respect of the entry in the United States of that vessel from that voyage: *Provided*, That such payment shall not be made after July 1, 1908, except in respect of any boy who is enrolled as seaman, third class, in the naval reserve, or is an apprentice indentured in accordance with law.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. GALLINGER. I move to amend the title of the bill by striking out the words "force of," before the word "naval," and after the word "naval" by striking out the word "volunteers" and inserting the word "reserve;" so that the title will read: "A bill to promote the national defense, to create a naval reserve, to establish American ocean mail lines to foreign markets, to promote commerce, and to provide revenue from tonnage."

The amendment to the title was agreed to.

Mr. GALLINGER. Now, I ask that the bill may be reprinted showing the amendments adopted, such amendments to be printed in italics.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Without objection, the bill will be reprinted showing the amendments in italics, as requested by the Senator from New Hampshire.

Mr. GALLINGER. I do not know that any Senator is prepared to go on now with the discussion of the bill. The Senator from West Virginia [Mr. SCOTT] had intended to speak briefly, but he is not present, and I will yield for a motion to go into executive session.

EXECUTIVE SESSION.

Mr. KEAN. If the Senator yields, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business. After nineteen minutes spent in executive session the doors were reopened, and (at 4 o'clock and 2 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, January 16, 1906, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS.

Executive nominations received by the Senate January 15, 1906.

CHIEF JUSTICE OF SUPREME COURT.

John H. Burford, of Oklahoma, to be chief justice of the supreme court of the Territory of Oklahoma. A reappointment, his term expiring February 15, 1906.

ASSOCIATE JUSTICES OF SUPREME COURT.

Bayard T. Hainer, of Oklahoma, to be associate justice of the supreme court of the Territory of Oklahoma. A reappointment, his term expiring February 15, 1906.

Benjamin F. Burwell, of Oklahoma, to be associate justice of the supreme court of the Territory of Oklahoma. A reappointment, his term expiring March 21, 1906.

CHIEF OF BUREAU OF EQUIPMENT, NAVY DEPARTMENT.

Capt. William S. Cowles, United States Navy, to be chief of the Bureau of Equipment in the Department of the Navy, with the rank of rear-admiral, for a term of four years from January 22, 1906.

CONSUL-GENERAL.

Elmer E. E. McJimsey, of Missouri, to be consul-general of the United States at Callao, Peru, vice Alfred L. M. Gottschalk, appointed consul-general at Mexico.

COLLECTORS OF CUSTOMS.

James H. Cooper, of New York, to be collector of customs for the district of Oswego, in the State of New York. (Reappointment.)

Robert Carson, of New Jersey, to be collector of customs for the district of Perth Amboy, in the State of New Jersey. (Reappointment.)

Fred Enos, of Connecticut, to be collector of customs for the district of Fairfield, in the State of Connecticut, to succeed Frank J. Naramore, whose term of office will expire by limitation January 28, 1906. This nomination is made to take the place of the one made on the 18th day of December, 1905, wherein Mr. Enos was nominated as Frederick instead of Fred, and subsequently confirmed by the Senate as Frederick.

SURVEYOR OF CUSTOMS.

Julius S. Starr, of Illinois, to be surveyor of customs for the port of Peoria, in the State of Illinois, to succeed Richard W. Burt, resigned.

CONFIRMATIONS.

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate January 15, 1906.

SECRETARY OF OKLAHOMA.

Charles H. Filson, of Oklahoma, to be secretary of Oklahoma. SURVEYOR OF CUSTOMS.

Charles F. Gallenkamp, of Missouri, to be surveyor of customs for the port of St. Louis, in the State of Missouri.

COLLECTOR OF CUSTOMS.

Thacher T. Hallet, of Massachusetts, to be collector of customs for the district of Barnstable, in the State of Massachusetts.

RECEIVER OF PUBLIC MONEYS.

James M. Lawrence, of Bend, Oreg., to be receiver of public moneys at Roseburg, Oreg.

REGISTER OF THE LAND OFFICE.

Luther D. McGahan, of Minot, N. Dak., to be register of the land office at Minot, N. Dak.

DISTRICT ATTORNEY.

Abram M. Tillman, of Tennessee, to be United States attorney for the middle district of Tennessee.

TERRITORIAL DISTRICT JUDGE.

Luman F. Parker, jr., of Indian Territory, to be judge of the United States court of the northern district of Indian Territory.

PROMOTIONS IN THE ARMY.

Signal Corps.

First Lieut. Alfred T. Clifton, Signal Corps, to be captain from January 2, 1906.

Artillery Corps.

Maj. Henry A. Reed, Artillery Corps, to be lieutenant-colonel from September 16, 1905.

First Lieut. Frederick W. Stopford, Artillery Corps, to be captain from December 20, 1905.

Second Lieut. Alden F. Brewster, Artillery Corps, to be first lieutenant from November 6, 1905.

Second Lieut. John A. Berry, Artillery Corps, to be first lieutenant from December 20, 1905.

Cavalry Arm.

First Lieut. James C. Rhea, Seventh Cavalry, to be captain from December 28, 1905.

Infantry Arm.

Lieut. Col. Cornelius Gardener, Twenty-first Infantry, to be colonel from December 26, 1905.

Maj. John J. Crittenden, Twenty-second Infantry, to be lieutenant-colonel from December 26, 1905.

Medical Department.

Capt. George J. Newgarden, assistant surgeon, to be surgeon with the rank of major from November 23, 1905.

APPOINTMENTS IN THE ARMY.

CAVALRY ARM.

To be second lieutenants, to rank from January 2, 1906.

Sergt. Edgar J. Treacy, Troop H, Fourteenth Cavalry.

Sergt. Reynold F. Migdalski, Troop H, Thirteenth Cavalry.

Lance Corp. Henry R. Smalley, Troop K, Third Cavalry.

Sergt. James P. Wayland, Troop A, First Cavalry.

First Sergt. Robert Blaine, Troop H, Eleventh Cavalry.

Sergt. Luther Felker, Troop E, Eleventh Cavalry.

Squadron Sergt. Maj. Murray Blight Rush, First Cavalry.

INFANTRY ARM.

To be second lieutenants, to rank from January 2, 1906.

Sergt. Edward J. Cullen, One hundred and eighteenth Company, Coast Artillery.

Sergt. (First Class) John P. Adams, Hospital Corps.

Corp. Ira Longanecker, Company H, Eighteenth Infantry.

Sergt. Philip J. Golden, Company B, Signal Corps.

Sergt. William C. Whitener, Thirty-seventh Company, Coast Artillery.

Corp. William R. McCleary, Fifty-fifth Company, Coast Artillery.

Sergt. Frederick J. Ostermann, Third Company, Coast Artillery.

Q. M. Sergt. William J. Connolly, Thirtieth Company, Coast Artillery.

To be second lieutenants, to rank from January 3, 1906.

Sergt. Everett D. Barlow, jr., Company B, Twenty-sixth Infantry.

Corp. Lawrence E. Hohl, Company K, Sixth Infantry.

Sergt. James G. Boswell, One hundred and eighteenth Company, Coast Artillery.

Sergt. Robert E. Clarke, Company I, Eighth Infantry.

POSTMASTERS.

ARKANSAS.

William D. Foster to be postmaster at Gravette, in the county of Benton and State of Arkansas.

CALIFORNIA.

Edward H. Bautzer to be postmaster at San Pedro, in the county of Los Angeles and State of California.

John C. Boggs to be postmaster at Newcastle, in the county of Placer and State of California.

Harvey S. Clark, jr., to be postmaster at Lodi, in the county of San Joaquin and State of California.

Eugene Don to be postmaster at Santa Clara, in the county of Santa Clara and State of California.

Walter J. Ford to be postmaster at Quincy, in the county of Plumas and State of California.

William W. James to be postmaster at Monterey, in the county of Monterey and State of California.

Archie G. Madson to be postmaster at Angels Camp, in the county of Calaveras and State of California.

William Mullen to be postmaster at Mendocino, in the county of Mendocino and State of California.

Samuel L. Smith to be postmaster at Nordhoff, in the county of Ventura and State of California.

James H. Wamsley to be postmaster at Glendora, in the county of Los Angeles and State of California.

COLORADO.

Frederick S. Bruner to be postmaster at Fruita, in the county of Mesa and State of Colorado.

William Knearl to be postmaster at Brush, in the county of Morgan and State of Colorado.

William H. Wallace to be postmaster at Julesburg, in the county of Sedgwick and State of Colorado.

CONNECTICUT.

Thomas W. Beaumont to be postmaster at Cromwell, in the county of Middlesex and State of Connecticut.

Joshua A. Fessenden to be postmaster at Stamford, in the county of Fairfield and State of Connecticut.

Charles S. Hall to be postmaster at Wallingford, in the county of New Haven and State of Connecticut.

George H. Jackson to be postmaster at New Milford, in the county of Litchfield and State of Connecticut.

INDIAN TERRITORY.

Absalum B. Allen to be postmaster at Okemah, in District No. 9, Indian Territory.

L. W. Smith to be postmaster at Wewoka, in District No. 13, Indian Territory.

Alva A. Taylor to be postmaster at Wapanucka, in District No. 23, Indian Territory.

IOWA.

George R. Lochrie to be postmaster at Lorimor, in the county of Union and State of Iowa.

John M. Lytle to be postmaster at Washington, in the county of Washington and State of Iowa.

Ellsworth E. Secor to be postmaster at Buffalo Center, in the county of Winnebago and State of Iowa.

KANSAS.

Patrick H. Campbell to be postmaster at Alton, in the county of Osborne and State of Kansas.

MASSACHUSETTS.

Fred L. Atkinson to be postmaster at Newburyport, in the county of Essex and State of Massachusetts.

MICHIGAN.

Thomas H. Barnum to be postmaster at Iron River, in the county of Iron and State of Michigan.

Henry W. Coburn to be postmaster at Escanaba, in the county of Delta and State of Michigan.

Ross Leighton to be postmaster at Newberry, in the county of Luce and State of Michigan.

Homer Warren to be postmaster at Detroit, in the county of Wayne and State of Michigan.

MONTANA.

Alonzo H. Foster to be postmaster at Boulder, in the county of Jefferson and State of Montana.

NEBRASKA.

Mons Johnson to be postmaster at Valley, in the county of Douglas and State of Nebraska.

NEVADA.

L. L. Mushett to be postmaster at Tonopah (late Butler), in the county of Nye and State of Nevada.

OREGON.

Ephraim Miller to be postmaster at Lakeview, in the county of Lake and State of Oregon.

W. P. Pennebaker to be postmaster at Woodburn, in the county of Marion and State of Oregon.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

Monday, January 15, 1906.

The House met at 11 o'clock a. m.

Prayer by the Chaplain, Rev. HENRY N. COUDEN, D. D.

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

PERSONAL PRIVILEGE.

Mr. BABCOCK. Mr. Speaker, I rise to a question of personal privilege.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. BABCOCK. I send a clipping to the Clerk's desk and ask that it be read.

The Clerk read as follows:

HOW CAME BABCOCK TO REBEL.

A story was circulated yesterday, apparently from the stalwart faction in the House, to show how Mr. BABCOCK happened to become an insurgent. According to this story, Mr. BABCOCK has assumed the leadership of the rebel forces because he is disgruntled over having been turned down when he applied for the chairmanship of the Committee on Appropriations. It is stated that when Mr. HEMENWAY, who was chairman of the committee in the Fifty-eighth Congress, was elected to the Senate Mr. BABCOCK presented to the Speaker his claims for recognition by an assignment to the head of this important committee.

He represented that for ten years he had been chairman of the Republican Congressional committee, and that under his leadership large Republican majorities had been invariably returned to the House; that he had conducted these campaigns at no small amount of personal sacrifice, so much so, in fact, that at the last election he came near losing his seat in the House. Furthermore, that he had always been in line with the party organization, and had even surrendered his views on the question of tariff revision to party expediency, and that therefore his services should be recognized. Instead of getting the coveted place, he was turned down and Representative TAWNEY, of Minnesota, one of the chief among insurgents, was selected for the place. This action on the part of the Speaker, it was said, has caused Mr. BABCOCK to join the ranks of the insurgents, he having seen that rebels are rewarded and faithful services disregarded.

POSITION ON HAMILTON MEASURE.

It was also pointed out by the stalwarts in this connection that Mr. BABCOCK, in the last Congress, supported the same principle involved in the statehood bill which is embodied in the Hamilton measure.

There has been much discussion of Mr. BABCOCK's determined attitude as an insurgent in the present Congress, and this reason is assigned by the stalwarts for the position he has taken.

Mr. BABCOCK. Now, Mr. Speaker—

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Speaker, I have no objection, of course, to the gentleman making his statement; but I do not want this to go as a precedent in the matter of personal privilege. I do not think there is any, but I will not raise any question of that kind, as I do not desire to interfere with the gentleman's statement.

Mr. BABCOCK. Now, Mr. Speaker, if I am not entitled to consideration as a matter of personal privilege, I do not want the floor. When a Member is totally misrepresented in his attitude toward official matters before the House, if that is not personal privilege, I do not know what is.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will say to the gentleman that as there is no objection the Chair is not called upon to rule as to whether it presents a matter of personal privilege or not, and the gentleman will proceed.

Mr. BABCOCK. Mr. Speaker, I desire to say that this statement totally misrepresents me and misrepresents my position, as I believe it does the so-called "stalwarts," which evidently refers to the House organization. In the first place, Mr. Speaker, I have never been an applicant for the position of chairman of the Committee on Appropriations. I have never made a suggestion and never have applied for the place. I did not want it, Mr. Speaker, and had it been tendered to me I should have respectfully declined it, as I do not feel that under the circumstances and conditions of my health that I could fill it to the satisfaction of the House. Now, this article, Mr. Speaker, claims that on account of my disappointment it brought about my opposition to certain legislation. Mr. Speaker, ever since I have been a Member of this body I have been a consistent and earnest opponent of either single or joint statehood for Arizona and New Mexico. During the last session of Congress I declined to vote for the proposition. But I did support the Committee on Rules in the various propositions which were brought before the House. The proposition of joint statehood was brought about, not for the purpose of creating a single State out

of the two Territories, but as the lesser of two evils and for the purpose of defeating the whole proposition. This is well known to every Member of the House who had anything to do with that legislation. Mr. Speaker, I do not want to take the time of the House except to refer to one other matter in the statement which has been read by the Clerk, and that is "that Mr. BABCOCK had even surrendered his views on the question of tariff revision to party expediency." Well, Mr. Speaker, that may be intended as a compliment. I have always been an organization man. I have endeavored to act with the organization and with the party, but I want to say here now that I hold the same opinion on the question of tariff revision that I did three years ago; I never have experienced any change, but I have simply bowed to the will of the majority, and to explain my position, Mr. Speaker, I send this short resolution to be read by the Clerk, which expresses the position of the Wisconsin delegation, and with which I am in entire harmony.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That the Republican Members of the Wisconsin delegation in the House of Representatives favor an early revision of those schedules in the Dingley Act which are higher than is necessary to afford adequate protection.

January 14, 1905.

Mr. BABCOCK. That is the position, Mr. Speaker, that has been occupied by the Wisconsin delegation. There has been no division, and in a modest way I have given it my hearty support. I thank the gentlemen of the House for their kindness. [Applause.]

INFORMATION FROM SECRETARY OF THE NAVY.

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. 3—the Philippine tariff bill.

Mr. FOSS. Will the gentleman yield a moment?

Mr. PAYNE. I yield for a moment.

Mr. FOSS. Mr. Speaker, I desire to submit two privileged reports on House joint resolutions calling for information from the Secretary of the Navy. I call for the reading of the resolutions and the reading of the reports.

The Clerk read as follows:

House resolution 132.

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Navy be requested, if not incompatible with the public interests, to inform the House of Representatives whether since February 1, 1905, there has been any delay in the delivery of materials and armor for use in the construction of the United States ship Connecticut, building at the navy-yard at Brooklyn, N. Y., and what action, if any, has been taken by the Navy Department to obviate any such delay in the delivery of such materials and armor.

The Clerk read the report, as follows:

The Committee on Naval Affairs, to whom was referred House resolution No. 132, after careful consideration of the same, report it back and recommend its passage with the following amendments:

In lines 3 and 4 strike out the words "since February 1, 1905." In line 6 strike out the word "ship" and insert in lieu thereof the word "ships;" and after the word "Connecticut" insert the words "and Louisiana."

In lines 6 and 7 strike out the words "building at the navy-yard at Brooklyn, N. Y."

Mr. FOSS. Mr. Speaker, I move the adoption of the resolution as amended.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution as amended.

The question was taken, and the amendments were agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution as amended.

The question was taken, and the resolution as amended was agreed to.

U. S. STEAMSHIPS CONNECTICUT AND LOUISIANA.

Mr. FOSS. Mr. Speaker, I call for the reading of House resolution No. 133.

The Clerk read the following resolution:

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Navy be requested, if not incompatible with the public interests, to inform the House of Representatives whether there have been any changes, modifications, or alterations in the plans and specifications for the U. S. S. Louisiana since the awarding of the contract for its construction; what changes, modifications, or alterations, if any, have been made, and the estimated cost thereof in addition to the contract price of said Louisiana.

Also the following amendments:

In line 5 strike out the word "ship" and in lieu thereof insert the word "ships," and insert thereafter "Connecticut and."

In lines 5, 6, and 7 strike out the words "since the awarding of the contract for its construction, what changes, modifications, or alterations, if any, have been made."

In line 7, after the word "cost," insert the words "if any." In line 8, after the word "thereof," strike out the words "in addition to the contract price of said Louisiana" and insert in lieu thereof the words "for each ship."

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the amendments.

The question was taken, and the amendments were agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution as amended.

The question was taken, and the resolution as amended was agreed to.

THE PHILIPPINE TARIFF.

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Speaker, I renew my motion 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. 3—the Philippine tariff bill.

The motion was agreed to; and accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 3—the Philippine tariff bill—Mr. OLMSTED in the chair.

Mr. PARKER. Mr. Chairman, I speak for the principle of this bill—though I think it could be bettered in some respects by amendment—because it is for the welfare of the Philippine Islands and because the welfare of those islands is our welfare. Their prosperity means not only openings to our trade, but far more; it means happiness and contentment and peace and loyalty. One war, yes, not merely war, but brigandage, bankruptcy, trouble in raising Government funds, and deficiency in revenues, means more cost to us than all we could lose by every favor that we could show. It is not merely as our duty but as our interest that we seek their welfare. East Indian rebellions have cost England far more than she has gained from her narrow lords of trade policy of destroying their manufactures by her shop-made goods. The Boer war has cost her far more than she has gained by her aggressive commercial policy in the Rand. She lost the American colonies by interference here. On the other hand, she has bound to her Canada and Australia in a loyalty that is almost more than English by giving them the right to manage their own affairs, to settle their own business policy, to tax even her products for the protection of their manufactures, and to possess a substantial business independence with their own revenues and a prosperity of their own. May it be granted that we profit by that experience as to what we have to do.

The Philippines are not prosperous. It is not wholly our fault. When they came to us as sheep without a shepherd it was not our fault that the wolf-like ambitions of the dictator Aguinaldo brought war upon those islands. It was not our fault that business became impossible because of brigandage. It was not our fault that the plague struck the people or that the cattle plague destroyed all their farm animals and so ruined their agriculture. But it was our fault that when we had taken them away from Spain and from their market for their products there we gave them no other market. Those products, except hemp, are chiefly sugar and tobacco, and it is peculiar to sugar and tobacco that, unlike rice, wheat, or even lumber, they are under high tariffs by the laws of every country in the world. England taxes them for revenue, because she does not produce them. Germany taxes sugar for protection. Many countries tax tobacco as a government monopoly. It is idle to talk of the Philippines having the markets of the world in the face of tariffs which have broken down the sugar and tobacco production of the Tropics everywhere. The islands had a market in Spain. It was taken from them by the war that followed the destruction of the *Maine*. It was our duty as her trustee to give her a market at least as good, and we failed so to do. When our relations with the Philippines were adjusted in 1902 it was proposed that she should pay, as Porto Rico had done, only 25 per cent of the Dingley tariff, which tariff should be thrown around those islands; but Congress raised the percentage to 75 per cent of the Dingley tariff, which was practically prohibitory.

Their sugar and tobacco do not come here, but go to China, to the East Indies, and to Japan. Some little tobacco goes to Spain, where they know and like it. As a whole the insular exports have fallen off, and they are therefore not able to import. Customs receipts in two years have fallen a million dollars a year, or, in all, 4,000,000 pesos. Revenue has diminished just when more revenue is needed to open neglected roads, to restore order, to improve harbors, to introduce schools and sustain education, to introduce new productions and trades, and to open the minds of the people to the civilization of the modern world. There seems to be a deficit in the last two years, and revenues have not equaled expenditures. The attempt to give them a preference in our market by only 25 per cent rebate on the tariff absolutely failed. Out of their customs of some eight millions of dollars, only \$549,161.81—say, half a million dollars—comes from the return duties of the United States. Duties on hemp going to the United States have to be returned to the exporter.

Under these circumstances the Philippine government was confronted with a deficit, and to meet it they were forced to reestablish the Spanish system of taxation by an internal-revenue law in 1904 which is as strong as our revenue law in the worst part of the civil war.

Probably their peso, or 50-cent dollar, is as much to them as our whole dollar to us.

Distillers, rectifiers, wholesale liquor dealers, and brewers pay 200 pesos annually; retail liquor dealers, 48. A liter, or quart, of spirits pays 20 centavos, and beer 4 centavos, or Philippine cents; cigars pay a tax of over 10 per cent of their selling price; cigarettes, 1 and 2 pesos a thousand, and matches, 40 cents a gross. Banks pay half of 1 per cent on their capital stock, 1 per cent on their circulation, and two-thirds of 1 per cent on their deposits, paying monthly one-twelfth of these sums. There are stamp taxes on certificates of stock and bills of exchange, on insurance policies of life and fire, and on other written instruments of every kind, and then there is a tax on every occupation—doctors, lawyers, and all other employments pay a heavy tax.

Then we come to a singular arrangement. The cedula is a compulsory registration certificate. Every man must register annually and pay his poll tax, or else he can not go into court or be sworn as a witness or be examined or go before a notary. Nearly one and a half millions is collected by this register. It costs 1 peso in the first three months, and 2 pesos after April. Its payment is enforced by fines and by ten days' imprisonment if the man's property is not sufficient to pay the tax.

Merchants and manufacturers pay to the government a tax of one-third of 1 per cent on the gross value of all goods sold, and tax collectors inquire into that value. Common carriers, except cartmen who receive less than two thousand a year, pay 1 per cent of their receipts; brokers, 80 pesos; pawnbrokers, 200. Then there is a tax upon every trade or profession. The lawyer, doctor, surveyor, engineer, or auctioneer pays annually 50 pesos; dentist, chiropodist, manicurist, photographer, lithographer, engraver, or appraiser of tobacco or other product pays 40, and every veterinarian, farrier, repairer of bicycles and wagons, 20 pesos. Then there are taxes on lumber, perhaps more justifiable than some others. The government is expected to maintain most of the provincial and the municipal governments. They get the tax on amusements and half of the poll tax, but the government gives 10 per cent of all the other taxes to the provincial governments and 15 per cent to the municipal governments, according to population.

I append schedules embodying an abstract of these taxes and of the revenues of the fiscal year 1905 from customs and internal revenue.

The Philippine Commission assure us that this revenue law has become necessary in the Philippines. What a text this is! Necessary! It could only be necessary because there are no other sources of revenue, because exports and imports have been insufficient therefor, because this great country has not given them a market for their products, and because agriculture has become so unproductive that we dare not tax either their lands or their stock. This law tells us that in refusing them a market we have taken away the ordinary sources of revenue and have had to adopt permanently a system of taxation which is abhorrent to the American people and which cost England her colonies; a system which inquires into the particulars of every man's sales and manufactures, which supports an army of taxgatherers, which clogs enterprise, and which irritates the whole community.

I have here and append a statement from the Bureau of Insular Affairs showing the burden of these taxes. We wronged the islands when we gave them no market and refused them fair and reasonable access to our markets, which, if they had it, would give them revenue as well as prosperity. This wrong is endeavored to be corrected by this bill. It will help both prosperity and revenue. It will give them a market for their sugar, which will have a preference in our market over all other foreign sugar. Their imports are but a drop in the bucket and will not affect prices; but those prices will go to them. The bill, I think, will do something for their tobacco. It asks them not only to pay one-quarter of the Dingley rates, but also to pay the whole of our internal-revenue taxes, and this makes a total somewhat less than the total Dingley tariff on tobacco. But, on the other hand, the bill asks that all Americans and English who prefer American tobacco and cigars shall be allowed to have them in the Philippines free, except for the Philippine internal-revenue tax, and without any duty at all. It seems that what is fair for one might have been made fair for the other, but I do not know enough about this business to go into details.

I support this bill. It is a step in the right direction. I do

not support it, however, in allowing all other products of the Philippines to come in free, for I think it would be better to have 25 per cent of the Dingley duty put upon those goods, whether cloths, in which they make wonderful fabrics, or lumber, or whatever it may be. That money could be sent back to them, for they needed revenue, and taxes, whether on exports or imports, are far less oppressive than the odious taxes upon production which now take their place. Perhaps it would be better to allow them to tax exports up to 25 per cent of the Dingley rate, but that taxation is forbidden by that bill. The bill should do more than it does for us. I think it should give us a preference on our exports to the Philippines, so as to induce Americans to go there and take their goods there. I do not think that the Spanish treaty prevents our giving such preferential tariff when article four provides that the ships and merchandise of Spain shall be admitted to the ports of the Philippines upon the same terms (the Spanish word is "conditions") as the ships and merchandise of the United States.

Mr. Chairman, there is a great deal to be said in favor of the view that this provision only means that Spain shall be admitted to do business in the Philippine ports and that it has nothing to do with the tariff; but even if it does compel an equality of tariff rates we need not fear the rivalry of Spain. We could safely enact a law that all merchandise wholly the product of the United States and wholly the product of Spain should be admitted into the Philippines at a reduced rate of half or a quarter of the tariff rate to others. We could say it without endangering ourselves. We certainly could say it as to certain special products like steel rails, cotton goods, and machinery of all kinds. We could give the business which now goes to foreign countries almost altogether to the United States, and thus enter upon the great work of binding together these islands and ourselves in real sentiments of loyalty and fellowship because of our mutual interests.

Even if some trade went to Spain it would be well repaid if we thereby obtained the friendship of the Spanish merchants, who still form so large a part of the Philippine business world. Such a provision would improve the bill. Probably it would be still better if we did not attempt to legislate for the future. The bill provides that after 1909 we will have free trade, and the report says "that if the revenues are otherwise sufficient there will no longer exist any reason for a duty on imports either way," and we may have free trade. How are they to be made sufficient? I hope the tariff revenue from other countries will grow. But if free trade be established between us and the Philippines at that time there will be really no tariff revenues of any sort if we can supply their wants. Then where are revenues to come from? If there be not enough, they must continue this odious business of taxation upon production, the destruction of production for the sake of revenue.

It is dangerous to found legislation on an "if" and a possibility that those revenues will then be sufficiently increased. If they are to be derived from a tariff, that tariff must be maintained to such an extent at least as is requisite for revenue. It can not be possible that anyone who cares for these people can contemplate maintaining the internal-revenue act already referred to for any length of time.

Legislation is only safe as it is based on present facts. This tariff is now essential to Philippine revenue. I will go further, and say that while any Philippine tariff should prefer the United States, that tariff should be maintained against the United States not only for the revenue of those islands, but to protect their industries. We want to build them up—to build up their spinning and dyeing and cloth making, to build up their tobacco and sugar factories, to introduce the arts as now practiced, to utilize their water power, and to make of them a thriving nation, imitating the example set them by Japan. If we do not wish for them the prosperity that comes from diversified industries and progress in the mechanical arts that build up a nation, we are unfit to be their protectors and guardians. Each should ask a preference in the other's markets by preferential tariff, but both want that tariff not only for revenue, but to protect the necessarily independent and self-supporting progress of the one against the other.

In 1900 we passed a law for a tariff between the United States and Porto Rico of 25 per cent of the Dingley rates. What I said of Porto Rico then, on February 22, 1900, is equally applicable to the Philippines now:

It is our ward. It is for the people that we are legislating. . . . To my mind the alternative proposed of giving free trade to Porto Rico would be an unspeakable wrong to them. I say this with the less hesitation because my first impressions were in that very direction of free trade. The extension, through annexation of Porto Rico as part of the United States, to it of the Dingley tariff means, necessarily, that we also extend to them our internal revenue. No man can deny that. Otherwise they could distill liquor or make cigars, and make the things which are under our internal revenue, and could send their products free of duty into the United States.

But to extend the excise law to them means that all small manufacturing should be closed and that hundreds of people should be put out of business. It means that these poor people, for they are poor, could no longer smoke cigars, because the price would be so much increased. There is not a witness who does not say that the imposition of these excise taxes would be absolutely impossible in Porto Rico, and for that reason this bill does not impose them. Free trade means more to this island. Its people have lived without machinery, without organized manufacturing.

Small trades, like those of the shoemaker, the tailor, and the furniture maker, such as used to prevail with us, are there still supplying the wants of the people. All at once they would be subjected to the competition of great manufacturing industries which have almost driven these trades from without our midst and would drive them out from their island. We have welcomed the development of manufacturing in spite of that result. Our tradesmen have done better; the shoemaker became the shoe manufacturer, the tailor becomes a merchant tailor or engages in large manufacturing. Our eastern farmer, who finds that the railroads have made his farm unprofitable, moves to the West, where farming pays.

Our eastern manufacturer, if his materials become too expensive, goes where those materials are cheaper. The American can move everywhere, but the Porto Rican is not an American. He speaks Spanish; he is partly of Indian blood. He can not or will not come to this country, and any measure which would put that little island immediately under the unrestricted competition of our great manufacturing and drive out its small tradesmen would be an injury that we have no right to inflict.

There is one parallel case. It is Ireland. Let me ask what free trade has done for Ireland? Free trade for Ireland meant that England, the country which had the coal, the brains, and the organization, took the profits of an island that was turned into a poor farming country, on which its sister island held the title or the mortgage and from which it drew the rents. We do not mean to create this result in Porto Rico.

With free trade between Porto Rico and this country, whence is revenue to be got? Revenue is needed for roads and schools, such revenue as we always need for good government, for courts, and the administration of the laws. We can appropriate from the United States Treasury, but no one thinks that is a proper measure; or we can tax property there as we do here. Are we to increase the land taxes there upon a people whose plantations have been ruined by tornadoes? Or are we to increase a tax which they have already—the tax upon production? There every farm pays a certain proportion of its production to the government. But this produce tax is the worst kind of tax in the world, because it makes an army of assessors all over the country; because it is the most susceptible to fraud; because it is the most susceptible to oppression; because it seeks for money when there is nothing but the crop upon the ground. If that crop be taken away, the expense of its being taken away is to come out, as well as the expense of the tax collector.

We will adopt no such measure. This bill says that Porto Rico shall have what no State in this Union has ever had. It says, first, that these poor people shall have absolute freedom from the excise taxes of the United States, and from the tariff of the United States, so far as paying a single dollar into our Treasury. It says that they shall be treated as our friends. We do not ask them to contribute to our support or even to the repayment of what we have spent in the war which gave them good government. We reduce the Dingley tariff as against them by three-quarters.

We ask them only to do the same to us, and then we declare that the payments under the tariff shall not go into the Treasury of the United States, but go to the President for the benefit of the people of that island. Was ever so much generosity shown to any people? We give them just enough protection to maintain their own industries during the period of change, and we relieve them as far as we can from land tax or produce tax.

If the tariff that we lay on their goods is a tariff on their production, it is only when the goods have come here and are able to pay the tariff because at the market and the money is ready to pay for them.

And then we enact that the duties not only on goods that go to them but on goods that come here shall all go to the benefit of the island. This is what we have been told is tyranny!

What are we going to give the islands if we do not pass this bill? What are we to do for those people? How is the expense of their government to be paid?

In conclusion, only one word. It is idle to talk of law only. This is an intensely practical question. We must give some relief to these people. We must give them revenue; we must give them a reduction of the tariff; we must give them the means of getting a chance in the progress among nations. Unless that happens we might have revolution, and we shall certainly have poverty and discontent. This bill gives that relief.

On April 11, 1902, when Cuban reciprocity was under consideration, the Porto Rico tariff had been abolished. I was then sorry for it, and said so in the House, as follows:

At the time when the Porto Rican tariff was under consideration I opposed very strongly the abolition of that tariff. I believe time will bear out my view on that subject. I believe that through a succession of good crops Porto Rico has been more prosperous than might have been expected, but, on the other hand, she has had to substitute a land tax for the old-fashioned system of taxing the products when they reach the markets; and I am very fearful that if there should be at any time any failure of the crops she will suffer the fate of all agricultural communities similarly situated—the fate that has fallen especially upon the Indian ryot—that is to say, most of her landholders will be sold out.

I am glad the gentleman called my attention to this point. I believe that the continuation of the Porto Rican tariff would have been to the advantage of Porto Rico. For a similar reason I believe that the Philippines are rightly preserving their right to a protective tariff for their own benefit, and are taxing even our own goods that are sent there.

Mr. Chairman, these considerations as to the effects of free trade upon Porto Rico have, alas, been verified. At the request of her large planters, and with the supposition that we were benefiting that country, we have taken away from her the revenue and protection which was afforded by the small tariff between her and the United States. We have introduced our internal-revenue law, a law which is suitable to a wealthy nation, but utterly unsuitable to a poor one because of the sever-

ity of its taxation. We have driven its poor tradesmen out of business by the competition of our factory-made goods. And, remember, they can not go into our factories, but are left with no support but that of farm labor.

We have had to introduce oppressive taxes to take the place of those afforded by the tariff, and now that the wail of despair comes to us from Porto Rico let us beware of placing other communities who have made a little progress in civilization in direct rivalry with the tremendous forces of our own. Let us learn the lesson of experience. Compare the colonies of England. In India the old manufactures have been crowded out by England's cheap-made goods. The people have been impoverished. Land taxes oppress their farms and discontent prevails. Turn, then, to Canada and Australia—colonies permitted to legislate for themselves and to protect their own manufactures by tariffs, even against the home country. These colonies grow, and they are the more loyal because they are the more prosperous.

It is idle to compare the conditions in these distant territories with those in any one of the United States. Free trade is well where there is free trade in men. If western competition oppresses the New England farmer, he moves West. If factory shoes drive out the shoemaker, he goes into the factory. But the Filipinos, people of another race, can not come here and are not wanted here. We must help them to build up their own industries and to march in the progress of civilization in their own way on their own soil.

Mr. Chairman, I welcome this bill as a great step in advance. It gives to these poor people a market, and their welfare is ours. But it should also provide that articles that are wholly the product of the United States should enter the Philippines at reduced duty, even if articles wholly the product of Spain have the same privilege.

In my opinion this preferential tariff is all that is required, and absolute free trade with the islands would be an injury to them and therefore to ourselves.

APPENDIX.

Abstract of the Philippine internal-revenue law of 1904, No. 1189.

[License taxes in pesos.]

Distillers, rectifiers, and wholesale liquor dealers must pay annually	P200.00
For a brewer the same	200.00
Retail liquor dealers pay	48.00
Retail vino	8.00
Retail beer	48.00
Wholesale beer seller	60.00
Manufacturers of tobacco or cigars	20.00
Dealer in tobacco	8.00
Beer by the liter or quart pays	.04
Spirits by the liter or quart pays	.20
Snuff, by the kilogram	.32
Chewing and smoking tobacco	.48
Cigars, per thousand, selling for less than P20	2.00
Cigars selling between P20 and P50 pay	4.00
Cigarettes weighing under 1 kilo per thousand pay	1.00
Cigarettes weighing over 1 kilo per thousand pay	2.00

Matches, per gross, pay 40 centavos.
Banks pay on their deposits, monthly, one-eighteenth per cent, or, by the year, two-thirds per cent.

Banks pay annually on their capital one-half per cent.
On their circulation, monthly, one-twelfth per cent, or, yearly, 1 per cent.

The stamp taxes are heavy.

Corporate stocks and bonds, for P200 or fraction	Centavos. 20
Stock transfers	4
Certificate of profits	2
Bills of exchange for over P200	2
Foreign bills	4
Life policies or annuities, on every P200	10
Fire and other accident policies, on every P200	4
Notarial certificates	2
Receipts for over P30, including railroad tickets	4
Warehouse receipts	2
Bills of lading of over P5,000	20
Foreign passage tickets, for every P60 or a fraction	100
Leases under one year	20
Leases under three years	50
Leases over three years	100
Mortgages, for every P3,000 or a fraction	50
Conveyances, for every P1,000	50

The cedula, or poll tax and registry, is most interesting. Every male inhabitant must yearly pay for a certificate of registration—if between January and April, P1; if after April, P2. If he does not make this purchase he is subject to imprisonment for ten days unless he has property from which the money can be made. But without this certificate of registration he is practically an outlaw and can not vote, appear in court, convey his property, pay or receive taxes, or hold office. In the words of the statute (section 125):

"The certificate of registration provided for in this article may be used for all purposes of identification, admitted in evidence, and used for all the purposes to which the 'cedulas personales' were put under the Spanish laws. Any person required by law to possess a certificate of registration who does not possess one for the proper year shall not be allowed to vote in any election for public officers in the Philippine Islands. The certificates of registration shall be presented by the holder thereof whenever he or she (a) appears in any court in any capacity whatever, (b) transacts any business with any public office or

officer, (c) pays any taxes or receives money from any public funds, (d) acknowledges any document before a notary public, (e) assumes any public office whether by appointment or by election, (f) receives any license, certificate, or permit from any public authority. No contract, deed, or other document acknowledged before a notary public shall be valid or recognized by any court unless the notary shall have certified thereon that the certificates of registration of all the parties thereto have been presented and shall have entered in such certificate the number, place of issue, and date of each such certificate."

Merchants and manufacturers, except farmers, exporters, and the tobacco and liquor businesses, and very small dealers, pay to the government one-third of 1 per cent of the gross value of all the goods sold. Common carriers, except carriers receiving less than P2,000, pay 1 per cent of their receipts. Brokers in stocks, real estate, and merchandise, and at the custom-house, pay every year a license tax of P80; pawnbrokers pay P200; theaters, museums, cockpits, or concert halls, or a circus, P200; every billiard table pays P10; every lawyer, doctor, engineer, surveyor, or auctioneer pays P50; every dentist, chiropodist, manicurist, photographer, lithographer, engraver, appraiser of tobacco or products pays P40; every veterinarian, farrier, and bicycle or wagon repairer pays P20; but officials are exempt. Every race track for each racing day pays P60. Ten days' delinquency in paying the occupation tax adds a penalty of one quarter, and refusal to pay adds a penalty of a year.

RECEIPTS AND EXPENDITURES OF THE PHILIPPINE GOVERNMENT.

[See Report Bureau of Insular Affairs, 1905, p. 16.]

	1904.	1905.
REVENUES.		
Customs	\$8,790,016.97	\$7,997,489.21
Refundable export duties	453,563.32	483,701.03
Postal	133,784.72	138,670.80
Internal	272,404.49	1,499,408.25
Internal revenue refundable to provinces and municipalities		1,232,385.03
Provincial	3,235,839.47	3,107,912.91
City of Manila	1,931,129.97	1,441,192.81
Miscellaneous	1,053,067.80	1,703,610.08
Total	15,929,796.74	17,565,871.02
EXPENDITURES.		
Customs	680,173.28	579,067.79
Refundable export duties refunded	502,174.00	421,683.14
Postal	248,244.55	301,058.28
Provincial	1,587,458.33	1,474,330.43
Internal revenue refunded		1,008,714.06
Proportion of provincial revenues turned over to municipalities	2,020,546.97	2,370,172.24
City of Manila	2,530,027.01	2,586,729.33
Other expenditures	9,994,788.81	11,157,720.95
Total	17,563,412.95	19,900,066.82

These figures are based upon deposits with and withdrawals by warrants from the Philippine insular treasury.

STATEMENT OF CUSTOMS-REVENUE COLLECTIONS DURING THE FISCAL YEAR 1905.

[Expressed in United States currency.]

Duties on merchandise imported for immediate consumption	\$6,311,986.75
Duties on merchandise withdrawn from warehouse	350,080.40
Duties on merchandise exported	596,744.84
Wharfage on merchandise exported	217,026.66
Duties on merchandise sold under chapter 21, act 355	2,389.82
Surplus on same	2,141.44
Tonnage	62,337.36
Storage, labor, and drayage	7,934.43
Fines, penalties, and forfeitures	9,975.51
License issued under section 135, act 355	113,952.83
Sale of customs stamps	68,815.80
Sale of rolls	2,966.40
Immigration tax	23,429.98
Chinese registration fees	453.00
Sale of blank forms	2,904.58
Consular fees	32.00
Miscellaneous fees	46,576.10
Arrastre charges, section 2, act 897	59,644.08
Customs revenues collected in United States under act of Congress of March 18, 1902	548,269.64
Total	8,427,661.62
Refundable collections:	
Refundable export duties, act of Congress of March 8, 1902	\$486,701.03
Extra services of employees (refundable)	14,745.60
Salaries of officers in private bonded warehouses (refundable)	3,493.72
Salaries of officers discharging vessels out of port	716.26
Total	505,656.61
Total	8,933,318.23

STATEMENT OF INTERNAL-REVENUE TAXES REPORTED COLLECTED UNDER ACT NO. 1189, IN THE PHILIPPINE ISLANDS, FROM AUGUST 1, 1904, TO DECEMBER 31, 1904.

[Expressed in Philippine currency.]

Distilled spirits	P245,947.80
Fermented liquors	47,683.84
Manufactured tobacco	30,555.73
Cigars	53,481.67
Cigarettes	666,444.97
Matches, domestic	39,733.32
Matches, imported	17,726.07
Total	1,101,574.00

STATEMENT OF INTERNAL-REVENUE TAXES REPORTED COLLECTED UNDER ACT NO. 1189, IN THE PHILIPPINE ISLANDS, FROM JANUARY 1, 1905, TO JULY 31, 1905.

Distilled spirits	P609,758.42
Fermented liquors	84,612.20
Manufactured tobacco	62,319.46
Cigars	107,255.67
Cigarettes	1,329,686.60
Matches, domestic	69,228.00
Matches, imported	48,365.40
Brewers	350.00
Distillers	11,754.60
Rectifiers	5,700.00
Retail dealers in liquors	25,700.50
Retail vino dealers	36,677.44
Wholesale liquor dealers	36,886.34
Retail dealers in fermented liquors	19,025.00
Wholesale dealers in fermented liquors	6,960.00
Retail dealers in manufactured tobacco	59,332.90
Manufacturers of tobacco	1,582.00
Manufacturers of cigars and cigarettes	3,817.00
Total liquors and cigars	2,519,011.53
Peddlers, taxable articles	3,531.00
Merchants	474,578.13
Manufacturers	30,618.41
Common carriers	8,825.33
Stock brokers	1,894.00
Real-estate brokers	3,260.00
Custom-house brokers	1,665.00
Pawnbrokers	3,177.33
Proprietors of theaters, etc.	67,962.91
Proprietors of circuses, etc.	100.00
Proprietors of billiard rooms	3,846.54
Lawyers, doctors, etc.	20,071.67
Photographers, etc.	2,250.00
Veterinarians, etc.	2,683.00
Owners of race tracks	3,795.00
Mines and mining construction	4,230.99
Banks and bankers	106,353.87
Insurance companies	7,653.13
Forest products	190,285.73
Miscellaneous	50.28
Documentary stamps	96,564.85
Cedulas, class A	1,237,671.00
Cedulas, class B	101,669.00
Cedulas, class D	1,682.00
Total	4,893,430.70

RÉSUMÉ.

	Philippine currency.	Equivalent in United States currency.
Aug. 1 to Dec. 31, 1904	P1,101,574.00	\$550,787.00
Jan. 1 to July 31, 1905	4,893,430.70	2,446,715.35
Total	5,995,004.70	2,997,502.35

One dollar in United States currency equals 2 pesos Philippine currency.

Mr. GOEBEL. Mr. Chairman, the time allotted to me will not permit any extended remarks, and I shall attempt in a brief way to state my reasons for opposing this measure. The purpose of this measure is to establish after April 11, 1909, absolute free trade between the Philippine Islands and the United States. That seems to me to be an extraordinary measure urged by a Republican Administration. Its justification, however, is maintained on the ground that we owe to the Filipinos, by reason of our relation to them, a duty, quoting the language of the distinguished Secretary of War. He said:

If we are sincere, if we are conscientious, if we desire to be really altruistic in our position to the Philippines and the Filipinos, then we have no right to deny them the benefit which commercial association and freedom of trade as a part of our civilization will give them. A Filipino will question the good faith of our declaration that we are there for their good when we decline to open our ports to their products and refuse to give them the benefits of the markets of this great country for the things which they have to sell.

I have, Mr. Chairman, listened with care to many of the speeches which have been made on the floor of this House, and I have read with care the speech of the chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means in the hope that some other reason may be urged for the support of this measure. But, summing it all up, the paramount reason remains that we must be sincere in our love and affection for the "little brown fellow" and his savage brothers. For their welfare and prosperity we must put into jeopardy the industries of our great Commonwealth, and we must bring into active competition with our American labor the cheap labor of these islands, and from a Republican standpoint, we must sacrifice the great underlying principles of protection which have so long been maintained by that great party, and which have contributed so much to the uplifting and building up of this great nation. [Applause.] I wish I could bring myself to the belief that in my desire to aid the Filipinos at this time I am discharging my whole duty to the people of our country. I commend the Administration for the great work which it has performed in the Philippine Islands. Much more is to be done. I would protect them, I would uplift them, and

aid them to civilization and self-government. Our position as to the islands is an anomalous one. The relation of guardian and ward exists, and while that simply means that they have a right to insist upon such obligations as that relation calls for, they have no right to insist upon a higher or greater duty. [Applause.]

For purposes of tariff and revenue the islands have been treated by us as foreign country, and our relations applicable and incident in that regard as to any other foreign country have been adhered to and maintained as to these islands, and justly so. But it is now sought to wipe out that relation and place the islands upon the same footing of the several States of the Union. If conditions were such that these islands were more contiguous to our shores, that the people were our kind of people, that they were a class desired, there might be reason for this action; but when we consider their condition, contributing nothing to the welfare of our people, a people wholly unfit for self-government, with no possibility in the near future that they will be able to control their own domestic affairs, and when we are still in doubt as to what disposition shall be made of these islands, then it does seem to me that we are going a great length in giving them this relief. I know it has been urged that the relief granted by this measure, "free trade," is but little, and that we could afford in that regard to be generous. It either will be a great benefit or it will not. Why try the experiment? If it will be a benefit, so much greater is the danger to our people. It may be that the Filipino will not be able to take advantage of the situation, and will not grow and prosper so as to actively come with his products and his labor into competition with our American products and our American labor. That necessarily would be his fault, yet there is the soil, the cheap labor, the opportunity. It would open the door for others to benefit and to take advantage of the situation. The danger lies in permitting a wedge to be driven into that door with a possibility that at some other time another wedge, and still another wedge might be driven in, and by and by you will have broken down all the safeguards of protection and made it possible for different conditions.

I have been taught that a tariff high enough to prevent foreign products and foreign labor to come into competition with our own products and labor is the kind of protection which the Republican party stands for. [Applause.] I hope the time has not come when it is necessary in order to show our good faith to the Filipinos to violate those principles. Mr. Chairman, it will be observed that the tariff on sugar and tobacco is to be reduced 25 per cent of the present rate, and after April 11, 1909, to be entirely wiped out. Those are two of the most staple articles this country produces. I have no familiarity with the sugar industries, for little or no sugar beets and no cane sugar is raised in my district, but the State of Ohio is fourth in order of the greatest tobacco-producing States in the Union. In the year 1904 she produced in leaf tobacco 50,793,123 pounds. The average acreage was 59,827 and the yield was 849 pounds per acre. The total farm value was \$4,063,450. The total number of cigars manufactured in the State of Ohio was 699,995,998, there being but two other States in the Union which exceed Ohio in the manufacture of cigars. Statistics also show that the total import duties paid in the United States during the fiscal year 1904 on tobacco and manufactures thereof was \$21,176,293.09, and the total internal revenue from tobacco for the fiscal year 1904 was \$44,655,808.75, making a total of \$65,832,101.84. The internal-revenue receipts of the United States for the fiscal year 1905 were \$45,659,910. This amount was paid on cigars, cigarettes, snuff, chewing and smoking tobacco. Now, Mr. Chairman, this is a great industry; the revenues to the Government have been enormous and essential to its operation. Involved in that enterprise is the capital, the earnings, and labor of thousands upon thousands of our people. Let us be generous to our wards, but let us be just to our people. [Loud applause.]

Mr. LAMB. Mr. Chairman, the discussion on this measure has taken a wide range and embraced about as many subjects as the President's message sent us at the beginning of the session. The arguments have been able and suggestive. I can not hope to add anything, and would not say a word save that, in my judgment, Virginia's views should be heard here. I have been waiting for the older Members in years and experience to speak. Since they leave this to the most modest and youthful of the delegation I desire to say that Virginia has always opposed taxation without representation. Her sons fought against this in 1776 and her record is emblazoned on the monument at Yorktown. She believes that the Philippines are a part of this country and should not be treated as foreign territory. As one of her Representatives I shall vote for a free exchange of products between those islands and the States of this Union.

If the beet-sugar men on the other side of this Chamber will vote with us we can defeat the pending measure. So far from injuring them it will help us all by hastening the day when we shall be rid of these islands.

I take it that every Representative here, regardless of party, would be glad to dispose of the Philippines. For my part I would give them away to-morrow. If we will treat these people as we do Hawaii and Porto Rico, and develop their resources, we can soon dispose of them, either by granting them independence or transferring them to Japan. Why not do this at the earliest possible time?

With one-fourth of our own territory unoccupied and our resources as yet undeveloped, and problems of race and government staring us in the face demanding solution, why exhaust our energies in the Orient?

This road has been traveled by nations who preceded us to their undoing. Wouldn't it be well to profit by their experiences?

When the people of the United States learn the facts touching these islands, as they will in great part from the discussions had here during the progress of this debate, they will demand that we get rid of them, and the sooner they do this the better it will be for this Republic.

This debate has demonstrated one thing, that we need not fear any competition from tobacco and sugar made in the Philippines. The beet-sugar men are only scared; they will not be hurt. I represent tobacco raisers and tobacco manufacturers; they are shedding no tears save over the tyranny of the American Tobacco Company. If any of you gentlemen will devise some measure for destroying the American Tobacco Company you will go down to posterity as a benefactor. [Applause.] The people of several States in this Union will rise up and call you blessed. [Applause.] When the grand old party has revised the tariff and fixed the railroad rates we hope they will turn their batteries on the trusts.

We see around us evidences that the Republican party are hopelessly divided on this tariff question. They can no longer hold their people by declaring that the Democratic party is a free-trade party, for it never was and never can be.

When Democrats cease, as they are fast doing, the cry of "robber tariff" and declare for a tariff for revenue, with incidental protection, they will sweep this country. I look for this House to be carried in part by this issue next November. The Senate will follow in four years, and the Presidency as a natural consequence. Then we will dispose of the Philippines and not be responsible for slavery there or anywhere. Then we will free the beet-sugar men and have many of them for our allies.

The Republican party, hoary with age, intoxicated with power, and reckless of consequences, must reform or die. Can it reform without dying? This question, no doubt, its leaders are asking. Nature, science, religion all teach that corruption can not produce incorruption save it die. And die it will. We young men will be here to preach its funeral. [Applause.]

It came into being amidst the throes of a revolution. God grant it may go out in peace. The claims made for it on the floor of this House in the past four days are extravagant and amusing. The distinguished gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. HILL] claims that this party freed the negroes. Was it a constitutional or a revolutionary party when it did this thing? Did the whole of the Federal Army belong to the Republican party? The border States furnished 330,000 men for that conflict. Does any man believe that 20 per cent of them were Republicans? Do you recall the popular vote for McClellan in 1864?

If the border-State men had been on the other side in that conflict, who could have freed the negroes? I will tell you. The respective States of this Union. Virginia came within one vote of freeing hers in 1832. I happened to mention this to a gentleman on the other side of this Chamber a few days ago, one of the many over there whom I appreciate highly, and he was astonished. I could tell him a good deal more of Virginia history that would delight him, and hope he will come to Richmond, where I can entertain him and show him some of the best specimens of men and women on this continent. He must stay longer and learn more, however, than my friend from Wisconsin [Mr. ADAMS], who said in a speech on this floor on the 11th of this month:

A few months ago I had occasion to go down to Virginia to the beautiful city of Richmond and address a large gathering of farmers from every State in the Union. I came in personal contact with many ex-Confederate officers, dyed in the wool Democrats—good fellows, as we know them to be—and three out of four told me they were glad Theodore Roosevelt was elected, because the election of a Republican President meant the continuation of the protective tariff policy and greater prosperity, not only for the North, but prosperity for the South.

I happened to be over in the library when this remarkable statement was made or I would have at the time called attention to the fact that the election returns of 1904 for President showed that Parker received 3,749 votes and Roosevelt received 569 votes in Richmond. The negroes and a few white Republicans furnished the 569 votes. Perhaps there are a dozen ex-Confederate soldiers in Richmond who vote the Republican ticket. I do not know as many, while I do know a good number of white men who are Republicans.

A lady in my district was trying on one occasion to impress her little child with the importance of always telling the truth. She cited, as is always the habit, I think, in Virginia, the incident of Washington and his hatchet. Then it came the time for the child to interrogate. She said: "Ma, did you ever tell a story?" After some hesitation the lady had to admit that she had offended in this way. Then the child asked, "Ma, did papa ever tell a story?" This was likely easier to answer, and the wife had to say, "Papa may have told little stories when he was courting." Sadly the little girl remarked, "Oh, ma, I will be so lonesome in heaven. There will be no one there but George Washington and myself." [Laughter.] I just want to say that those ex-Confederate officers who "three out of every four" sung that song to my good friend from Wisconsin will stand slim chance for sitting down with George Washington and that dear Virginia child in the kingdom of heaven. [Laughter.]

The fact is that my friend was so enraptured with the city of Richmond and so delighted with the reception he and the distinguished gentleman from Georgia [Mr. LIVINGSTON] received that he thought every man he met must be a Republican. He saw such evidences of growth and prosperity that he was bewildered when some man said to him, "We are for a tariff for revenue and this gives incidental protection." He multiplied them by three and assumed that he must be a Confederate officer. He told me that he thought the best biscuit that a farmer's wife gave him "Massachusetts crackers," and that something they had called "batter bread" beat anything he had ever eaten. If he had remained there two weeks he would have gotten some flesh on his bones and learned not to take ex-Confederate soldiers too seriously when they are entertaining angels unawares. [Laughter.]

Then I must remind my friend and inform this House that the farmers' convention, with the citizens of Richmond, applauded to the echo the splendid speech of the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. LIVINGSTON], who made a plea for a freer trade, not free trade. The western men predominated largely in that convention. They gave the gentleman from Wisconsin a good send off, and we enjoyed his speech. I also enjoyed some sentences in the one from which I have quoted. See where he places you "stand-patters:"

The Republic will see the friends of this bill joining with the free-trade Democracy to diminish the protection which is to-day received by the men upon the farms of this country.

I reached the House as the gentleman from Wisconsin was closing. I asked him to continue. He said he was too tired. He has hurt himself smoking those cigars from Manila. They are too strong for fatter men than he. [Laughter.]

I wished to ask him some questions that would arouse him to tell this House something about Richmond. I would have told this long ago but for my extreme modesty, that oppresses me fearfully. [Laughter.] He might have told you that a city of 36,000 souls in 1865, with one-third of its territory destroyed by fire, numbered now nearly 100,000, and was the fourth richest per capita in the United States, notwithstanding the fact that over 30,000 of the inhabitants are negroes; that these negroes are the most thrifty, perhaps, in the country and the best behaved; that they vote upon a property and educational qualification just as the white man votes.

This prosperity has come not by reason of but in spite of your high protective tariff. Three years ago we had sixty-four independent manufacturers of tobacco in Virginia, to-day we have twenty-four. The American Tobacco Company has absorbed the forty.

Session before last we passed a bill through this House forbidding the use of coupons and the gift-giving feature on manufactured tobacco and cigarettes. The trusts were able to defeat this bill. They seem to be strong enough to defeat any reform measure offered here.

THE DEMOCRATIC PARTY NOT A FREE-TRADE PARTY.

The claim that the Democratic party is a free-trade party can not be maintained.

This claptrap argument will be heard on every stump in the country next fall. The history of eight Administrations under

Democratic rule gives contradiction to this false and misleading statement.

The advocates of a high tariff claim that the great prosperity for the past few years is the result of tariff legislation. This argument is almost too weak to deserve an answer. The facts are that this prosperity has come in spite of and not by reason of the tariff.

It has come from the immense exports of agricultural products; from a demand created by war; from the skill and enterprise of our citizens; from the unexpected and wonderful discoveries of gold, that have made good beyond dispute the Democratic contentions of 1896 and 1900.

The weak, not to say wicked, charge that business depression follows Democratic success is without foundation in fact. Our opponents often refer to the Wilson tariff bill as proof of this, thus exposing their ignorance. The Wilson tariff enacted in 1894 could not have produced the crisis that came in May, 1893, seventeen months before any tariff change.

The Democratic contention for a tariff for revenue with incidental protection is proved correct under the workings of the Walker tariff. The greatest era of prosperity this country has ever enjoyed was during the operation of this tariff of 1846. Our commerce went forward by leaps and bounds. Our American clippers became famous in song and story; the great era of railroad building began. Then all our people, including the manufacturers, enjoyed a prosperity the like of which had never been known before.

Since the Republican party stands on its record in the past and boasts of its age and experience, it may be well to glance at its history. An evil genius presided at its natal hour and smote it with the spirit of jealousy and envy and all uncharitableness. A sectional party in every sense of the word, it began its career by setting at defiance the supreme law of this land and through its chosen orators declared that our glorious Constitution was a covenant with death and a league with hell.

The contempt it felt for this noble instrument was clearly shown when in defiance of the famous Senate resolution of 1861, as well as that of 1865, instructing General Grant to make his southern tour, it disregarded his report, deliberately overthrew the policy of President Johnson, and established an oppressive, undemocratic, and unconstitutional rule in the Southern States. It divided these States into five military districts and appointed a brigadier-general of the Army to govern them. It overlooked section 4, Article IV, of the Constitution, which declares:

The United States shall guarantee to every State in this Union a republican form of government.

A fitting sequel to this cruel and inhuman work was the forcing of the fourteenth and fifteenth amendments upon the South. The pagan world in all its darkness never conceived such political iniquity. A Roman province revolted and was put down by armed force. The question arose in the Roman Senate, "What shall be done with these people?" The radical element cried out, "Disfranchise them; confiscate their property;" but nowhere was it said, "Make them vassals to their slaves." This crime against civilization and humanity was reserved through the dark ages to be inaugurated for the first time under the light of the nineteenth century and by the representatives of this grand old party of moral ideas.

Its infamous and futile attempt to impeach a President who stood with one hand on the Constitution and the other stretched over the shattered Commonwealths of this Southland furnishes another example of its high-handed and outrageous conduct.

Owing to the hurried march of events and the strenuous life of Americans, they have almost forgotten the attack the Republican party made on the Supreme Court in the Legal Tender cases.

Examine the history of the Republican party from the end of the civil war to the present time and you will find it step by step disregarding the mandates of the Constitution and violating its spirit.

On the morning of the 8th of November, 1876, it was proclaimed that Samuel J. Tilden had been elected President. It was true. He had over 250,000 majority and 196 electoral votes.

The crime by which he was robbed of his well-earned victory is a lasting shame and disgrace upon this party that appeals with pride to its record. On that trying day only two courses were left, war or compromise. The memories of the civil war prevented another at that time.

But you say these things are in the past. The party is not what it was. We have reformed, so to speak. Your sins of omission nearly equal your sins of commission. You boast of establishing the gold standard. Have you done this? Let the four hundred and forty-six million of silver dollars and the three hundred and thirty-six million of greenback currency un-

redeemed and unprovided for save in small part bear witness. What of your currency reform? The bankers all over this mighty land are now calling your attention to this practical legislation. What about the immigration laws so urgent, so absolutely necessary, if you are in earnest when you say, "We must protect our American laborers from the pauper labor of Europe?"

These questions were all postponed in the last Congress that your party might once more deceive and mislead a too credulous constituency. You represent the principles of force and centralized power in the Federal head. We stand for the imperishable rights of local self-government. You advocate tariff duties that are prohibitory and likely to bring us into serious complications with foreign powers, while they shelter the trusts and retard, if they do not destroy, our shipbuilding interests. We stand for a tariff for revenue, with incidental protection, that will produce revenue sufficient to carry on the Government and at the same time safeguard every American interest.

When the American voters once consider calmly and dispassionately the issues between the two contending parties they will decide against you. Then will begin a brighter and better era in this country, and our grand Republic, the exemplar of freedom and the hope of humanity, will have fair promise of accomplishing its manifest destiny. When under the providence of God, in the fullness of time, this boon shall come the historian shall make record that Virginia gave the statesman to America whose political philosophy shaped the course of events and laid solid and deep the foundations upon which rests the grandest structure of human government that ever arose to bless mankind. [Loud applause.]

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. Mr. Chairman, I presume that a sigh of relief will arise, not only from the Members of this House, but from the country at large, when the hour of 5 o'clock arrives, because at that time general debate upon the pending bill will close, the Members will be relieved from further listening and the country from reading a discussion which has continued for more than a week, and which in many instances contains a confusion of ideas, in some is tinctured with apparent logic, and in others with extreme sophistry. The fact has been disclosed that the stand-patters who believe that the Dingley tariff schedules are sacred for some other unaccountable reason assert that they will vote with the most pronounced free trader, largely from a sentimental standpoint, in matters pertaining to the Filipino, so-called "our little Brown Brother." In the brief time which I am permitted to occupy the attention of the House I must of necessity confine my statements to a few general remarks, almost wholly devoid of statistics, and shall define my position upon the pending bill as succinctly as possible.

First, I am a protectionist along Republican lines, as enunciated by our party since its formation, namely, that in conjunction with the raising of revenue with which to sustain our Government a tariff duty should be laid upon certain imports to encourage American industries, and in order that the American laborer may receive just compensation for his services. To this principle I attribute, in a large measure, the past and present prosperous condition of our country. A protective tariff such as this had its origin when the manufacturing industries of this land were in their extreme infancy, in fact, and the result of this policy produced many new industries, some of which still remain small in stature, but has also produced others of prodigious size, greater than any ever before known in the annals of the world. When, however, an industry, which has been fostered by this system, has grown so large, so wealthy, and so powerful that it can produce the articles in its line cheaper in price and better in quality than can be produced in the older nations of the world, even with their cheap labor, then in my judgment this policy of protection has fully accomplished its purpose and from thenceforth should be withheld. I believe that certain of our industries, and especially the one which now monopolizes and controls our oil industry, need no further protection; that the steel and iron industry, which is dominated by what is known as the "United Steel Corporation" to such an extent that it monopolizes and controls the production and output of this country and arbitrarily fixes the price therefor, is able to stand alone without further governmental aid; also that the lumber, coal, glass, and tin industries can be classed in this same category, with many others which I will not stop to mention. Again, when any particular industry becomes so powerful that it can or does control the output and regulate the price of any commodity, it is the duty of the American Congress to see to it at once that legislation be passed removing such protection. Also that the American consumer should be protected against this monopolist. True protection means protecting the whole people, and very often a downward revision is not only imperatively demanded, and is as

much in the line of protection, as revising the tariff upward. Being a Republican and a friend of the protective policy, properly adjusted and administered, my desire is that when revision comes it should be brought about by the Republican party, and it is quite apparent that this time has now arrived, and that the American people, by a vast majority in number of all political parties, demand revision at this time and of the downward kind.

The Republican doctrine, as strenuously taught heretofore, and is good to-day, was and is, that protection properly adjusted and administered in these United States would so rapidly increase any commodity that within a very few years the price to the consumer would be greatly decreased. True it was, that temporarily, or shortly after the Old World was excluded from our market, the price of the finished product to the consumer was necessarily enhanced; yet ultimately and as soon as the industry was thoroughly established, that, together with the resultant competition among our own people, caused the reduction in price. Instances of this character have been very numerous, and certainly the Republicans in this House are aware of them, because that was the burden of their campaign speeches, and history proves the truth of the claim. As an instance I cite that when the tariff was put upon lead a few years ago, shortly thereafter the price of lead was actually lower than the tariff. Many kinds of cotton goods could be instanced in which the same result was accomplished. When the Republican party through a protective tariff induced the manufacture of tin in this country, scoffers were numerous, claiming that it was folly to attempt to compete with this industry in Wales. But that is all dissipated now, for to-day the American tin can readily compete with all the world and needs no further protection. Mr. Chairman, party lines on the subject under discussion are badly mixed. Apparently each individual, whether Republican or Democrat, expresses his views based upon some particular principle which he champions; free trade being the principle of some, stand-pat protection of others. Our plain duty and justice to the Filipino is the guiding principle of a few; but it remains for the eminent chairman of the Ways and Means Committee [Mr. PAYNE] to first introduce in this discussion the idea or principle called "sentiment" in behalf of the half-civilized Filipino.

I wish, Mr. Chairman, to introduce another idea which I think is material in the consideration of the main question involved in the bill under discussion. It is the word "confidence," and it is not unfamiliar in Republican parlance. Before doing so, however, I quote the Republican platform of 1896, which was as follows: "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." Mr. Chairman, during the great and memorable campaign of 1896 the word "confidence" was the battle cry to rally to our standard the voters of the United States in order to secure what we then declared to be of the greatest importance, namely, the gold standard, and thus secure the stability of our currency. In my opinion this word "confidence" was then properly used, and this principle had a material effect in deciding that election, and in fact all others subsequent. Every platform orator loudly proclaimed the necessity for confidence in the stability of our currency in order to encourage the investment of capital in our industries; that sound money and a protective tariff would breed such confidence that renewed vigor would be inspired and prosperity to all would surely follow, and it did. Without confidence man is generally without hope, but with confidence hope and success follow. Without confidence the capitalist will not invest his means in any enterprise. The Dingley law was passed by the Republican party in 1897. At that time there were only six beet-sugar factories in the United States. At once, after the passage of this law and relying implicitly upon the Republican platform of 1896, men of capital, brains, and energy began constructing numerous other beet-sugar factories, and such was the remarkable growth of this industry that during the succeeding six years the number of these factories in more than one-third of the States of the Union had increased to fifty-two, and all doing a thriving and successful business, furnishing employment to thousands of laborers at good wage and making glad the hearts of the farmer in the raising of hundreds of thousands of tons of sugar beets.

Also at this time there were in contemplation of construction fifty-one other factories, and the business had gained such an impetus that only a few more years were required until a sufficient quantity of refined sugar would have been produced to have supplied the entire consumption of the United States. But, alas, during the year 1903 a law was enacted known as the "Cu-

ban reciprocity law," similar in effect and on all fours with the proposed legislation now under discussion. It permitted the introduction into this country of all raw sugar grown in Cuba at the reduced tariff of 20 per cent of the Dingley law. Stimulated by this law the sugar production of Cuba was increased many fold. Without stopping to attempt to analyze whether that law is in fact detrimental to our beet-sugar industry, yet there can be no doubt that lack of confidence is what called the halt in the construction of any more factories in this country, and to-day the number of factories in existence is about the same as in 1903.

Mr. Chairman, however, recently in some parts of the United States the spirit of progress in this line has again been awakened, and in the district which I represent in Minnesota a new factory, costing the sum of \$750,000, is now being erected with a capacity of manufacturing 750 tons of beets daily into refined sugar. The location of this factory is propitious, the quality and character of the soil of the very best for the purpose of raising sugar beets, and the territory ample. A sufficient quantity of beets are now already contracted for, to be grown and delivered by the farmers in that vicinity. They are confident and hopeful, that this industry, being started in their midst by the capital of their friends and neighbors will not only be a success, but that this Government will not for any reason, sentimental or otherwise, toward the millions of the semi-civilized tribes that inhabit the Philippine Islands, pass any law detrimental to their interests or bring their labor to the level of these inferior tribes. Therefore I beseech you, in the name of the American farmer and investors of capital in beet-sugar factories, not to pass this bill, for if you do, and it becomes a law, you will shake the confidence of every American sugar-beet and sugar-cane producer in the United States.

I am not going to discuss or attempt to point out the exact amount of damage or benefit which will result from the passage of this bill. Neither do I believe that this Congress can at this time assert with any definiteness what the result will be, and I call the attention of the House and of the country to the various discussions had thus far in support of my contention, that all is but conjecture. The chief supporters of the bill at times strenuously contend, that the Filipino has neither the stamina, intelligence, vigor, nor land wherewith to produce sugar in any quantity, at any time, to materially affect the American sugar producer. They argue that the Filipino is shiftless and lazy and will only work sufficient to maintain his existence. They further argue that the quantity of land in the Philippine Islands adapted to and upon which sugar can be grown is so small in area as to be immaterial, and in support of this last contention they present charts and maps, highly colored and entertaining to look at, and explain the same with volubility. Their figures and other data in this connection are so voluminous as to incite dizziness. Again, some of these supporters have, perhaps unguardedly, shown that the Filipino is capable of doing a vast amount of labor, equal or greater than that of any other nationality in or transported to their islands, and that vast areas of lands of the choicest and richest variety are now under cultivation in sugar cane, and much more is susceptible thereof. I shall not attempt to reconcile these various claims, but will stand upon the record evidence of such great and eminent statesmen as our present Secretary of War, Hon. William H. Taft, formerly Governor Taft of the islands, and General Wright, the present governor.

Each of these honorable gentlemen have extensive knowledge on the subject; their opportunities have been such that statements coming from them should carry great weight and, to my mind, are conclusive. Governor Wright, in his testimony before the Philippine Committee, in December, 1902, says that the soil of the Philippines is as good or better than that of Hawaii and will produce as much or more sugar per acre. Secretary Taft, in his testimony before the Insular Committee, states, in substance and as a fact, that these islands are, in respect to soil, climate, and labor conditions, capable of indefinite extension along the line of the production of sugar; and when asked by Mr. Moody if, in his judgment, the sugar of the world could not be produced there, he answered, "Yes;" and from this same authority we are given to know that these islands have very much more arable land and very much richer soil than have the Japanese islands, which support 48,000,000 people. Mr. Buencamino, who is certainly authority on this subject, testified before the Insular Committee that in the Philippine Islands there are 50,000,000 acres of land richer than the lands of either Hawaii or the United States. This, Mr. Chairman, is sufficient testimony for me to conclude, in the language of Governor Taft, that these islands can and probably will in the near future produce almost sugar enough to supply the whole world.

But the proponents and advocates of this bill urge that the

Filipino will not produce large quantities of raw material (and certainly they will never produce the finished product). In this contention I heartily agree. This fact, however, will not prevent the sugar lands in the islands from being exploited by outside sources. The area of the islands consists of 73,000,000 acres, in round numbers, of which a little over 68,000,000 are public lands owned by the government. Fifty million acres are very rich, and, according to the best estimates that I can obtain, about one million and a half acres of this land would grow sufficient sugar cane, properly managed, to supply the entire sugar consumption of the United States. I do not expect that the Filipino within himself will ever produce this quantity of sugar, but recent events in Cuba have demonstrated that outside capital has been the means of very rapidly increasing the acreage and production of raw sugar in Cuba about a million tons in the last six years. Is there any reason to suppose that this same procedure will not be had shortly after the passage of this bill in the Philippine Islands? Existing law, as I am informed, limits the quantity of land that may be purchased or held by any prospective sugar corporation in the islands to 2,500 acres. But Governor Taft, in his testimony before the Philippine Committee, says that that quantity of land is insufficient; that even 5,000 acres is too small a quantity to be thus owned, and suggests and recommends that the area be increased to 20,000 acres, and this recommendation has again been made in the year 1904, thus showing that the idea is prevalent, and it is in contemplation, that there are prospective sugar corporations contemplating the exploitation in the near future of large areas of this land, in case the duty on raw sugar is reduced by the passage of this bill and ultimately abrogated altogether in the year 1909, and to my mind this conclusion is irresistible.

Mr. Chairman, legislation is obtained not only for the present but for the future, and certainly this bill makes it not only possible, but it is apparently quite probable that these large sugar corporations will ultimately exploit these lands in the manner I have suggested. Can this result be other than detrimental to the cane and beet sugar industries of the United States?

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

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Minnesota yield to the gentleman from Wyoming?

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. I do.

Mr. MONDELL. In the relation of the gentleman's argument I want to ask him if it is not true that this stimulus has brought about the expansion of the sugar industry in Hawaii, so that at this time four-fifths of the arable area of those lands is in sugar?

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. I am informed that it is so. I do not pretend to be thoroughly posted on the subject, yet that is my information.

Mr. MONDELL. It is a fact, and they produce 5 tons of sugar per acre per annum. And in the line of the statement the gentleman has just made, is it not fair to assume that the same kind of development will occur in the Philippine Islands?

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. I am inclined to believe so, and assert that such evidence as I have comes from such authority as Governor Taft, who is, or ought to be, familiar with the conditions, having resided in the islands for a number of years, and also from General Wright, who is the present governor. That was their testimony recently, and I am convinced that such will be the case.

Mr. Chairman, I do not believe, after listening to the discussion, and neither did I believe it before I heard it, that the Filipino, unaided in his semi-civilized condition, and, as the testimony discloses, almost savage, no matter what the area of land of the islands, or how choice, would ever produce sufficient sugar to jeopardize our American industries. Neither do I believe, and I base this upon the statement which I have heard uttered upon this floor, that the Hawaiians would ever have produced as much sugar as is now being done, were it not in consequence of outside capital and aid. My belief in this regard also extends to Cuba, which is much older than the United States in point of civilization under Spanish rule, but as soon as the American people temporarily took possession of the island of Cuba and relieved them of certain of our tariff duties then it was that the large sugar plantations were exploited, not by their own capital or energy, but by Americans, until their output of sugar has increased about a million tons during the last five or six years.

Mr. Chairman, I can but anticipate that a similar result will speedily follow if this bill now under consideration is enacted into law.

Mr. HILL of Connecticut. Is not the gentleman aware that Cuba has about the same production of sugar to-day that she had

several years ago, and that there has been no such increase over her normal production as the gentleman speaks of?

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. My information is that during the last six years the production of raw sugar in Cuba has increased 1,000,000 tons.

Mr. HILL of Connecticut. Then the increase is undoubtedly over the production at the time of the late war. But if the gentleman will look back and study the statistics of sugar production in Cuba, I think he will find that the amount produced at the very highest point does not exceed, if it equals, what was produced several years ago, before the Spanish war began.

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. I shall not contradict the gentleman's statement.

Mr. HILL of Connecticut. I can not give the exact figures, but I think the gentleman will find that statement is correct.

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. I shall not contradict the gentleman's statement, because since his trip to the Philippine Islands, judging from the three hours' speech that he made here the other day, he has become an expert on the subject of tobacco. He delivered a discourse of about three hours on the "ethics" of tobacco raising. I was surprised also to hear the gentleman from California assert that that trip—I do not want to misquote him—was gotten up and instigated for the purpose of passing this bill; in other words that the trip was an incident of a bill which had been formulated before, and not the bill an incident of the trip. Now, we find the gentleman from Connecticut, when he puts his mind upon a subject, is capable of surrounding more figures in a short space of time than anyone I ever knew, and I think more than anyone who ever sat on the floor of this House.

But the chairman of the Ways and Means Committee tells you that his study upon that matter was for the purpose of doing justice to the Philippines. He says it is a matter of sentiment. As to whether they will be in any way benefited is problematical. Mr. Chairman, if the Filipino is not to be benefited, who is? Is the American sugar producer to be benefited? I can not see how or why. If the Filipino is not to be benefited, if the American sugar producer is not to be benefited, if the cost of sugar to the consumer is not to be reduced—and no one has claimed that it will be, but on the contrary facts and statistics all show that even with the increased production and shipment to this country from Hawaii, Porto Rico, and Cuba, the cost to the consumer has not only not been reduced, but has been increased in the last two or three years—if all these things are so, who can be benefited? There can only be one class or set of men who can be benefited under those conditions. It has been stated on the floor of this House that there are one or two concerns, the so-called "sugar trust" and a Mr. Spreckels, who purchase nearly, if not quite, all the raw sugar that enters our ports and refine the same. They dispose of it to the consumer. Now, if the Filipino is not benefited, if the American sugar producer is not benefited, if the sugar consumer does not get cheaper sugar, who is the beneficiary then except these two institutions which refine and dispose of that sugar?

Mr. HILL of Connecticut. Will the gentleman yield to me for a question?

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. Yes; I do not say I can answer your question, however.

Mr. HILL of Connecticut. I think the gentleman can answer the question. It is not a technical one in any sense, and I appreciate the gentleman's judgment. If the sugar trust and the tobacco trust are to be benefited by this legislation—

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. I have not said anything about the tobacco trust.

Mr. HILL of Connecticut. I am going to bring them in here. Why is it that the representatives of both of them appeared before the Ways and Means Committee and opposed this bill?

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. I can not answer the gentleman in that respect, but I can state to the gentleman that within my knowledge I have known transactions both from a legal standpoint and otherwise wherein, as a matter of fact, the man who pretended to oppose a proposition was secretly encouraging it. I do not say that is the case here, but I have known of instances of that kind.

Mr. Chairman, I deny the statement that the Filipino is our little "Brown Brother." No doubt he is brown, and no doubt, according to the idea that under Adam all men are kin, he may be our brother, but that is the only way in which he is so. He is not our brother as I look upon our American civilization and population. He has nothing whatever in common with us; and while it may be stated that the Philippine Islands belong to this domain in a certain sense temporarily, yet I assert that they are only temporarily under our charge; and it is the ultimate object of the Republican party, according to my idea, to turn

them adrift and let them look out for themselves as soon as capable of self-government.

Mr. Chairman, I do not believe that they are entitled to our sympathy, except wherein we can aid and encourage them in the building up of industries that possibly may in the future redound to our credit. If, however, we seek to aid and encourage them, let us do it along lines that will not in any manner affect or injure any American industry. [Applause.] Now, Mr. Chairman, practical aid to the Filipinos should far outrun sentiment. Let us, by protection or otherwise, encourage and aid them in growing immense quantities of coffee, for their island is adapted to that, and thus enable them to supply us with about \$85,000,000 worth which we are obliged annually to import. Also aid and encourage them in producing the \$50,000,000 worth of rubber and gutta-percha, which we annually import. Also aid and encourage them in producing fifteen or twenty million dollars worth of sisal grass, and nine or ten million dollars worth of cocoa which we are obliged annually to import, and other products, amounting to millions, of the natural products of their soil such as we can not possibly raise. Our annual import of these various tropical products, which they can produce in the greatest abundance and which we can not produce at all, amount in the aggregate to about two hundred million annually. This can all be done by the Filipino with slight aid and encouragement, and they would thereby be greatly benefited in fact, not sentimentally, and then their productions would not be brought in competition with our American industry.

Mr. Chairman, the American people are a practical people. They believe, first, in aiding and encouraging their own people, and then, if they have any charity to send it abroad. But if they do send that charity abroad, they do not believe in sending it abroad in the form of sentiment. They believe in sending abroad something that is material. We are sending to the Filipinos school-teachers, and we are investing our money in all ways for their benefit; but up to date we have not done it in such a manner as to discourage any industry in the United States. I firmly believe that if this bill is defeated, inside of the next five or ten years the beet-sugar industry in the United States will be so wonderfully developed, so enormously increased, that we will produce our own sugar and all we consume right upon this continent. [Applause.] I believe that when we arrive at that stage then the sugar-beet industry and the cane industry of this country will be independent of and above the reach and control of any sugar trust on earth. But as long as you leave the industry in its present struggling condition, those who are engaged in it will be very easily discouraged. They will lack the confidence which is necessary for the development of that enterprise. They will not build new factories as long as they find that the Congress of the United States does not propose to stand by, and back them, and encourage them.

I am a firm believer in the Republican party. I want it to revise the tariff. I want it to do so very soon. I want it to do so along lines that will be productive of the most good; and whenever an industry is found that has grown so large that those engaged in it can monopolize the entire product, and not only monopolize the production, but the output and sale of it and control the price of it, then I think the consumer is the man who should receive protection against mammoth organizations of that kind, instead of the organization itself receiving the protection. I believe the consumer at the present time is entitled to some thought and some consideration.

Thus far, since the passage of the Dingley law, none of the schedules has been touched, or threatened, or talked about except one schedule, and that is the schedule in which the farmer is interested. We talk about Canadian reciprocity. I believe in Canadian reciprocity, but I believe it should comprise all schedules, and do not believe in singling out wheat, oats, corn, butter, and goods that come in direct competition with the farmers along our border, and at the same time compel the farmers to pay the steel trust or the manufacturers of steel and iron and the implements manufactured therefrom the full protective price.

As I have before stated, I am thoroughly in sympathy with, and much desire a speedy, just, and equitable revision of the tariff. I believe that the many inequalities that now exist in the present Dingley law, which inequalities have become very apparent owing to changed conditions, should be remedied. I believe that when this revision is made it should be made all along the line. I believe that the free list should be enlarged so as to include every item where it is demonstrated that protection is no longer needed.

I believe that it is unjust and unfair that the American farmer and stock raiser should be the only one to be revised. The agriculturists of our country are willing and ready at all times to bear their share of any proper burden. Uncomplain-

ingly they will pay any tax levied upon an equitable basis. The American farmer, and especially those along the border line between Canada and the United States, are willing, in my judgment, to compete with his neighbors of the Dominion, and allow the great mills of Minneapolis—the greatest in the world—to grind his wheat into flour, provided, on the other hand, the manufacturer of the machinery with which he cultivates the land that raises his crop will remove the tariff on his wares, thus allowing the user of this farm machinery to purchase the same in the open markets of the world.

If you will give to the farmer the reaper, the mowing machine, the thrasher, and all other implements of husbandry at open-market prices, with tariff removed, then, Mr. Chairman, the farmers of this country are willing to have reciprocity all along the line between us and the Canadian border. But they do not wish to be singled out, and other large schedules left intact.

My friend the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HEDGE], who ably represents his district, in a speech during the last session enunciated a point that seemed to me to fit the entire case on the subject of reciprocity as far as the farmer is concerned. He said that in his district a petition was presented requesting him to support Canadian reciprocity. He found that it was chiefly signed by the implement manufacturers and dealers of the Tri-City Combination in the State of Iowa. He found there the plow manufacturer, the reaper manufacturer, the fanning-mill manufacturer, all signing this petition for Canadian reciprocity, in natural products. The gentleman from Iowa summed it all up in this statement: "I discovered," he said, "that the man who made the plow was endeavoring to reciprocate away the rights of the man who handled the plow." That seems to be the doctrine ever since the passage of the Dingley law. That law, imperfect though it was, was a good law, and one of the greatest ever passed by the Congress. However, the Republican platforms since then assert, that schedules should be altered to meet changed conditions, and certainly conditions have changed in the last eight or ten years.

Many previously small industries have during this period grown so large that they can compete with the entire world. Their schedules need revising. I do not wish to reduce the tariff by taking the duty off from hides and sole leather, the farmers' products, unless you take it off the manufactured article as well. [Applause.]

Mr. Chairman, I hear of no suggestion emanating from the leaders seeking to place the by-products of the Standard Oil Company upon the free list, and certainly the solicitude for Mr. Rockefeller's interests should not be greater than that of the American farmer. Again silence is the only response when allusion is made to the absolutely unnecessary tariff which surrounds the steel industry of the United States, an industry the greatest that he world has ever known, and which can and does produce and sell hundreds of millions of its finished products to residents of the Old World cheaper than to the American consumer. Certainly it can not be said that this all-powerful, world-supplying iron and steel corporation, which can and does accumulate the fortunes of a Carnegie, is in need of protection, and that the struggling infant industries of raising and manufacturing beets into sugar should be deprived of any protection, and compelled to come into competition with the cheapest labor on earth; that the forty or more millions now invested, not by a combination or trust, but by separate individuals, in one-third of the States of the Union be threatened with great damage and possible annihilation by the passage of this bill. The State of Massachusetts, which is a center of the boot and shoe manufactures and other finished products of leather, is clamoring for free hides, free raw material, the product of the farm, but still wish to retain governmental protection, full well knowing, as I believe, that they can successfully compete with all comers.

I wish to say that the farmer is the greatest and best wealth producer on earth, and yet he has no one, as it were, to speak for him. He has no tariff league behind him; he has no combination of capital to engage in his business. He starts out in the world independent and alone, and works industriously with his own hands. There is no combination that is here working for him, but you touch any of the tariff schedules of the great industries and you find at once springing up all around, combinations, backed by an organization that say, "Touch not," and they are not touched.

Mr. Chairman, in closing, I desire to say that the agriculturists of the great Western and Middle States are demanding a just and equitable revision of our tariff laws, and this demand is rapidly becoming more general, and to you, my Republican friends, who represent some of the larger manufacturing districts of this country, I say, in all seriousness, that you had better be wise in time and thus retain the friendship and coopera-

tion of the best friend you have in this Republic—the American farmer. [Applause.]

Mr. DE ARMOND. Mr. Chairman, I thought in the early stages of this debate that I would not ask the House to listen to me in the discussion; the debate has run, however, to such a length and has taken such wide range that, like many others, perhaps, I have been tempted to take part in it.

Some gentlemen have addressed themselves to the question, or have assumed to do so, as though a contest were to be waged between the free-trade party and the protection party. Some gentlemen especially who oppose this bill have talked about their opponents on this side of the aisle who are going to vote for it as representatives of the Democratic free-trade party desiring to strike down the policy of Republican protection. Whatever anyone may think about the relative merits of free trade and protection as principles, whatever anyone might do or might not do concerning them as original propositions, with a virgin country before him, with lines to be blazed and a policy to be adopted, it must be evident to everybody that now there is not in this country, and can not be in this country, any free-trade party. No party is trying to bring free trade.

We have embarked upon the policy of raising a large part of our revenue by resorting to tariff taxation. That policy has been pursued long years, with variations as to the incidental and sometimes as to the main purpose of the enactment. I am unaware that any person speaking for any party has proclaimed or will proclaim a purpose or a desire to depart from the gathering of revenue by virtue of tariff taxation. When a tariff is imposed upon any article the like of which is or may be produced here—no matter what the rate of duty, no matter what the mainspring that moves those who enact the law—it is and it must be in effect a "protective" tariff. If it be high, a high protective tariff; if low, a low protective tariff. If inordinately high, it may be even a prohibitive tariff.

Then may we not consider this pending bill, and the general subject of which it is a part, with reference to facts as facts are? Can it be necessary to assert—what is the temptation to make speeches and declamations upon the proposition—that there is upon this side of the Chamber a free-trade party trying to abolish tariff taxation? There is no proposition to substitute anything for it. There is no possibility on the one hand and no wish upon the other that anything be substituted for it. Then take it as a fact incontrovertible—a fact that the most casual observer, the most shallow thinker, ought to grasp and comprehend—that a large part of our revenues will be raised by tariff taxation; that whenever you impose a tariff of whatever degree upon anything the like of which is produced in this country or may be produced in this country, one of the inevitable effects of the imposition of that tariff tax will be what gentlemen call "protection." The real question at issue between the parties, the real question at issue between individuals and thinkers upon this subject, when they allow themselves to think upon it, is as to what the tariff tax shall be, not as to whether there shall be any; as to what shall be the purpose in imposing and maintaining a particular rate of tariff duty upon a particular article; what probably will come from it in revenue, and what probably, if you please, in what is called "protection."

Now, I think that everyone upon either side, whether voting for this bill or against it, everyone believing in a revision of the tariff and everyone in favor of the policy of "standing pat," as it has been elegantly phrased, must agree that we all start and all must start—unless we presume upon the ignorance of others and make a display of our own—upon the proposition that a large share of our revenues will continue to be gathered by tariff taxation, and that the tariff by means of which they are gathered will inevitably operate as "protection."

A large part of the people of this country, not confined to one party, one section, or one pursuit, believe that the tariff should be revised. There is another considerable group of individuals who affect to believe, not that the tariff ought not to be revised, not that it is what it should be, not that it is perfection beyond the possibility or hope of improvement, but strike out "who" and put in "that it is enough to" proclaim that they stand pat. They believe that for the present they can not be driven to revision, and their inclination and disposition, their hopes and their fears, repel the thought of consideration of the subject which so many others believe now challenges the consideration of every thoughtful man in all the broad domain of these United States of America. The statement of the proposition upon which the "stand-patter" places himself is a refutation, it seems to me, of all his claims. It is inconceivable that any tariff, made by anybody, at any time, in any country, for any purpose, could have inherent in it that degree of perfection that neither the lapse of time nor the development of industries, no change or diversification

of pursuits, no inventions or growth, could bring about a state of things where some change would be desirable, much less a state of things where some change would be imperative, if justice is to be done to the people of the country.

If such a thing were possible as that there could be given now a tariff schedule, not fresh from the brain of the greatest men in this land or any land, but fresh from the throne on high, the sun would scarcely set behind the western hills and be lost to sight beyond the western ocean before some changes would have been wrought by the subtle, tremendous powers of the mighty agencies that operate in this country and this world, by means of which that bit of perfection of this morning would in some respects be imperfection this evening. And yet gentlemen tell us—no; they do not tell us, but they act as if they think we believe and as if they suppose the country would believe and act upon the assumption—that all the mighty changes of the years since the Dingley tariff law was enacted, all the great discoveries and inventions, the progress and the growth of a marvelous era, sending the United States and all the world forward with leaps and bounds—all this change everywhere, all this enlightenment and growth over the broad face of the earth—that all this has left one thing, and one thing alone, sacred, lofty, great, and perfect, beyond the touch of the finger of time, beyond the power of human intellect and patriotism and genius to bring a single improvement or a single amendment; the one thing, according to these gentlemen, against which the waves of time and all the play of circumstances, all the forces of nature, and all the development of man may be exercised in vain is this Dingley tariff law; a thing so perfect, not only at the time of its creation, but so perfectly adapted to all the changes and variations and vicissitudes of national and individual life, that while vast revolutions have swept over the earth and through the industries of men, this one thing remains so complete that the highest expression of statesmanship with regard to it is to "stand pat" upon it.

The very fact that certain gentlemen, or a large section of them, stand pat upon this tariff bill is the most severe arraignment of it, is the most tremendous condemnation of it, that it would be possible to find or to pronounce. Stand pat upon it, why? Because it needs no amendment, because there is no chance for a betterment, because in it or through it there is no partiality, no advantage, no disadvantage, no unlawful or unrighteous oppression, no unmerited hardship or suffering? Why, no; of course not; but because the gentlemen who assume to take that position dare not attempt revision. But it is imperative that statesmanship undertake and patriotism perform a reformation and revision of the tariff law. No one need talk of the virtues of protection or the vices of it; for, as I have said, here and now free trade is an idle, academic dream. I have no time for it, and I have no time for an abstract discussion of a live subject.

And what is the matter with your protection and your protective theory? Aye, what is the matter with the school of protectionists who dare not, although greatly in the majority in all the avenues in which and through which legislation must pass; with an overwhelming majority here and an overwhelming majority at the other end of the Capitol, and a most decided majority at the White House, what is the reason that these men, not foes to protection, not free traders, or, if you please, not falsely dubbed free traders—what is the reason that these advocates, promulgators, prophets, seers, and apologists of protection, as we have it, what is the reason that they can not, will not, do something, in the household of "its friends," with this subject of tariff revision?

Now, there is no answer to be made, in view of what has transpired and what is transpiring in this country; in view of the situation as it is, and as it has been; in view of the prospect that is before us—there is no answer except that they dare not revise, that they fear to do it. Why? Because A says: "If you interfere with the schedule in which I am interested, if you dare to lay unclean hands upon this holy schedule which has made me and my associates rich, no matter how many have been beggared, dare lay impious hands upon my schedule, you will have to prepare to meet my opposition." And immediately B, who is interested in another schedule, echoes the sentiment; and C and D and the others follow, clear through your protective alphabet. All this must suggest to those who are not blinded, those who are not wedded to names, those who believe in the rights of the American people—those plain people who are occasionally mentioned in speech and forgotten in action—that you are buying the favor of the monopolists and trifling with the interests and the rights of their victims.

Who can arraign the system, who can criticize the law, who can point out the dereliction from duty of the representatives of a

great party, in terms more scathing than those which state the facts, or with more effect than that which the cold logic of the existing facts must produce?

The most defenseless man in these United States, so far as logic is concerned, so far as reason is involved—the man who stands in the position of the least strength and greatest danger, the man who places himself upon the shifting sands of the present, taking no heed of the waves and the winds which are threatening the foundations of things—is the “stand-patter.” The day may not come soon, though I think it will, but the day certainly will come when those who, having the opportunity lack the disposition to do anything better than to label themselves “stand-patters,” will have prepared, each for himself, an accusing epitaph which time with all its ravages never will rub out so long as a memory of them remains. [Loud Applause.]

In the Washington Post of yesterday morning I saw, and others of you saw no doubt, a very clever cartoon of the original “stand-patter,” by that very clever artist, Mr. Berryman. I commend it to the consideration of the stand-patter of to-day, who, in full view of the robbery, answers the cry of monopoly's victim for help with the exclamation “What! While you have anything left?” With a few touches put in, if anything could be added to it, let it be framed and hung up in every stand-patter sanctum. I suggest even placing it in the council chamber of the leaders of to-day in this House and in the other.

The cartoon represents an old man with his chair tilted against a shabby cabin with a hole in the roof, and when a neighbor asks him why he does not mend his roof, he exclaims: “What! When the sun is shining?” The sun has been shining long for you, my stand-patter friends. You have basked long in the sunshine. But in this world all is not sunshine. Occasionally clouds gather; sometimes the storm breaks; and if you will not repair your building in time, if you will not do something in the way of affording relief to an outraged people while the sun is shining, possibly a storm may come, a storm which may sweep you so far out that the resurrectionist will scarcely find you. Let me say that I am not trying to save you from yourselves; but you have the power to help the people by being just to them, and I would welcome good to them from any source. It is very evident though that a large share of our friends on the other side are so wrapped up in this Dingley bill, so dependent upon those who are interested in it, that they will enjoy while they can the sunshine, and will take chances upon the storms.

It was suggested by the last speaker, the gentleman from Minnesota, that the time may come when the farmers of this country may not rally to the support of the Republican party, as too many of them have done. Yes; that time may come. That time ought to come soon; that time will come soon if you persist in the policy which has forced upon the people of this country that attention to their own affairs which you in power ought to give and refuse to give.

The advantage which is given to the farmer is comparatively rare in this tariff legislation. It is true that the farmer is seldom legislated for in the fixing of tariff schedules. It is true that in the existing tariff schedules the farmer is given a gauze of words, the monopolist the valuable substance of things. As a matter of fact, they do not protect him, and never were intended to protect him. And yet somehow you gentlemen upon the other side have succeeded in enjoying too large a share of the votes of the farmers, to their own prejudice.

It was suggested also that there might be some consideration for the consumer. A new thought! An inspiration from the other side! Some consideration for the consumer, from the standpoint of a stand-patter! Why, the consideration is for the person who consumes the consumer. [Laughter and applause on the Democratic side.]

I do think there might be a little thought for the consumer. I really believe that this large and, I think, respectable, and surely neglected, class might come in pretty soon for a little consideration. Whether or not that consideration will be given soon, whether it will ever be given until there is a complete change of party control, of course I do not know. One way of giving consideration to the consumer with reference to this sugar matter would be to take off the differential duty upon sugar, to take off the extra duty upon refined and high-grade unrefined sugar, a duty that confessedly and notoriously is a sugar-trust duty. How strange it is that so much difficulty lies in the way of those who would remove the trust duty from sugar—that is, the differential duty; the extra duty from refined and high-grade unrefined sugar. The farmers would not be hurt by it. The consumer would clearly be benefited by it. The sugar trust would not be wronged, and it could be done so easily! Will it be done in this legislation? If I were to ven-

ture a prediction, based on experience and observation of the facts heretofore, I should have to say, “Hardly.” Why? Let those who are opposed to the proposition answer. Let those who talk about looking after the interests of the farmer and the consumer and to the interests of the plain people of the land, a land glorious because of its plain people, let them answer for themselves and to their constituents, answer here and elsewhere, why it is that they will not join with us on this side to remove the differential sugar-trust duty from sugar.

There is impending right now, as we all know, something in the nature of a crisis in trade relations between this country and Germany, and there is an incidental advantage that we might derive from the removal of the differential duty now, an advantage without cost to us, an advantage purchased only at the price of doing justice to our own people and refusing longer to legislate and maintain legislation for the benefit of a mighty, soulless monopoly. Such legislation would remove in considerable part the friction and the difficulties now existing and increasing between Americans and Germans.

Why ought we not, in view of the provisions of the German tariff soon to be put into force and effect, and which threatens serious injury, if not disaster, to farming communities in this country in certain quarters and in certain lines—why ought we not, simply by taking the differential duty from sugar, open up, without cost or disadvantage to us, the way for larger importations from Germany of refined sugar, upon terms more satisfactory to the Germans, bringing, of course, in the train of such legislation terms more satisfactory to us as exporters, in our dealings with the German people? There may be a good reason, outside of the countingroom of the sugar trust, for continuing this differential sugar duty; but if so, I do not know what it is, and certainly I should be obliged for the enlightenment if some gentleman who knows of any good reason would tell us what it is. Nothing, it seems to me, but the tremendous power of monopoly, and the impotent dependence of a mighty party upon it, stands in the way to-day of the removal of this differential duty upon sugar. Its abolition would do away with many obstructions, not only to the prosecution of business with Germany upon as good terms as possible, but to an expansion of our export trade generally. It would be, in every way, to the manifest profit and advantage of the people of this country. Why not do it? Let those who are opposed to removing the differential sugar duty answer for themselves.

Mr. Chairman, I was very much impressed by the speech of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCall]. Like all of the speeches made by that gentleman—all to which I ever have listened, all which I ever have read—it was clear, calm, and dispassionate; full of thought, logical, and elegant in diction. There is in it also, it seems to me, the subtle spirit of prophecy; not the blatant prophecy which is employed in the place of argument and as an adornment of declamation, but that illuminating prophecy which comes from a comprehension of broad principles and an understanding of what probably is to be the result of the coordination of different forces in human affairs. He spoke of his great Commonwealth as having been “torn by force from the breast of her natural mother, which is the sea.” True, Massachusetts has done well under this protective-tariff system, a system forced upon her, as we are told; a system which she to some extent would modify, so far as its grosser abuses are concerned, if those less wise and more intolerant, who belong to the same political party, would not obstruct and prevent.

Why may not Massachusetts again go to the breast of her natural mother, the sea? Why may not American shipping again whiten every ocean, and the American flag appear again upon American merchantmen at every port in the wide world, as before, when we had less protection and used more common sense? But the way proposed to bring Massachusetts and other parts of the Union to the breast of that natural mother, the sea, is not the old way; it is not the way of nature; not the way of reason. The suggestion is to pay the child for resorting to the breast of the mother. It is by means of a subsidy, we are told, that we are to rehabilitate the American merchant marine; not by removing obstacles, not by giving fair play, not by resorting to reason and profiting from experience, but by paying certain men to build certain ships and navigate them for their own purposes, and thus treat the people, about whom some now and then speak, but seldom act, as if the people and their interests could be left to the mercy of the monopolies you propose to build up. Assured of one thing, that whichever party prevails in this country, there will be a large amount of revenue raised by tariff taxation, and that the imposition of this tariff tax will operate as protection; assured of that, with no question about tearing down factories or about the smoke vanishing from

factory chimneys, with no danger to industries, with no danger to trade or production, why is it that we may not set ourselves rationally, in the light of human experience, in the light of our own experience, in the light of the history of our own land, counseling in our own wisdom, warned by our own folly, why may we not legislate so as to put American shipping again upon the seas, with the American flag over it—without subsidies? Why not again as before, without subsidies, have the productions of this mighty land carried to foreign shores and products of foreign countries brought to this great land of ours in American ships, under the American flag, to the glory and profit of American citizens, instead of continuing the miserable policy which has prevailed for years and years? And yet the only cure, the only remedy, now offered by those in power is the miserable, dishonest, degraded, compromising, wronging subsidy—wringing money from the people to put into the Treasury, to take out and give to a few men to do that which, if you give all fair play and justice, would be done better without it.

I really believe it is high time, in this general era of good feeling, when partisanship does not run high and partisan bitterness seems to have gone, to consider great questions which essentially are not political at all, in a spirit of American patriotism and with regard to the rights and interests of the great American Republic and all its people.

Now, why not revise the tariff, bring it into such condition as your best judgment, not ours—the judgment of your wise men who dare think; the judgment of patriotic men who dare act—will suggest? The revision of the tariff under present conditions, with Congress constituted as it is, with the Executive of your own party, would not be a revision of the tariff by the Democrats. It would not be a revision of the tariff with which the Democrats could interfere, if you please. The question is whether you yourselves will revise it. That is the question.

Do not talk about Democratic free traders; do not talk about a free-trade Democratic party which does not exist. The question is, Will you do anything? It is not what we will do; it is not what we would wish to do; it is not what anyone but you would wish to do. It is not a matter of danger or of experiment into which alien and hostile hands will be thrust; it is a question of your will. What will you do?

Now, do you wish to do anything? Will you do anything? Take the matter of the rehabilitation of the American merchant marine. The question is, What will you do? Do you still wish to force the American who desires to invest his money in shipping to be employed in foreign trade, as he has for a generation been forced, to put that money into foreign ships sailed under foreign flags? If you do, continue your policy.

Do you wish to give Americans an opportunity to put money into American ships and sail them under the American flag, carrying our beautiful banner to the uttermost parts of the earth, and giving it to every breeze that blows over salt water, and have it appear in every port in the world? If so, do it yourselves; you have the power to do it. The way is open before you. Do not say there is partisan danger, for here you have a majority of a hundred and twelve, and your majority in the Senate is great. In each body the minority is equally impotent, so far as legislation is concerned. When you people control both Houses and have your own Executive in the White House, if there is not something done upon these subjects it is not because we obstruct, but because you will not act.

There is a good deal said about American opportunity in foreign countries. Every now and then gentlemen grow vociferous, and sometimes eloquent, in proclaiming their great desire to extend American commerce; to open better and wider and more numerous markets for the products of the farm and the factory and keep them open. It is a very popular theme, but how are you going to open those foreign markets? What is your process? Is it one of legislative hostility to all the nations of the earth? Trade is a peaceful pursuit. Trade is hardly ever carried on at the mouth of the cannon or near to the point of the bayonet. Trade is hardly ever stimulated by the roar of hostile cannon or the rattle of musketry, by charge of cavalry or steady tramp of deadly infantry. It is best when all that is far from the haunts and marts where trade moves and has its being.

The American manufacturer is invited, coddled, bribed, by the present system into hurtful dependence upon the home market, in which he is protected against rivals from abroad. You have said: "We give you this market for your own; exploit it and do the best you can. Prepare for the conquest; make the most out of those who are merely our helpless brethren." What is this but a temptation, an invitation, a bribe, to the manufacturer to produce his wares for the American market, and make what he can out of the American consumer? As to those wares

which he sends abroad, that is incidental, is of small consequence; is a comparatively little thing. That is what you proclaim by what you do and what you refuse to do. The result is he does not manufacture in a way to compete as best he might with his rivals in other lands. When he goes to other shores, when he crosses the ocean or crosses the border line between our country and one adjoining us, he leaves behind this blessed, this sacred, this holy thing, the Dingley tariff law. There mutation and change and riot and chaos prevail because no Dingley tariff law is in force to bring order and enforce order, and to hasten, if not actually usher in, the millennium itself. There he must compete with the Englishman, the Frenchman, the German, the Italian, the Japanese, the Chinese, anybody, everybody under God's shining sun. In order to compete with them as fully and as successfully as possible, it is necessary that he center his attention upon the manufacture of such things in such a way, and pack, ship, and deliver them in such a way, as suits the particular requirements and prejudices, if you please, of the people with whom he deals. The German does it, the Englishman does it, and the Frenchman does it. Being merely an incident in our trade relations, being a little thing, comparatively, with this mighty American market all his own, where the buyers are handed over gagged and bound, with nothing left except the lining of their pockets, with that condition of things, the American manufacturer gives but little attention to the foreign market. Talk about extending our foreign trade! If you greatly extend that foreign trade you must make things and ship things and handle things according to the wants of the foreigners, studying their tastes and even their prejudices.

Let us not be eternally preaching about the value of this home market. It is a great market, and everybody knows it; a mighty market in a great land of progressive people. That is commonplace. We all know it. Any tariff at all, as I said before, and I repeat—because it is marvelous how gentlemen base what they call "arguments" upon the assumption to the contrary—any tariff at all gives to the American manufacturer in this great American market an advantage over all the rest of the world. Sure of this home market, shall monopoly have it for all it can be made to yield, with foreign trade but an incident, or shall agriculture and mining and manufacturing and commerce all thrive and flourish?

Will you give shipbuilders a chance, and by really protecting the people from the evils of monopoly protection inspire our manufacturers to systematically seek foreign markets? Upon the decision of these questions is going to depend very largely the issue of our efforts to expand and extend our trade in the far lands of the earth. If we are to continue on the plan of directing attention to the home market and pressing for legislation to enable the favored few to get more out of it, if the masses who are the sufferers by this policy are willing to submit indefinitely, then it is a matter of little difference, of little concern, to the monopolist whether we shall have much or little trade with other countries. But if by patriotic statesmanship, profiting by experience and looking into the future even so far only as the dimmest eye can pierce, we are guided by what, manifestly, reason and judgment suggest, we will set about so legislating that soon there will not only be a great American market in which the American manufacturer shall have the advantage over the manufacturers of every other part of the earth, but there shall be lying beyond it the wide expanses of earth, in all the lands where things may be sold, into every place where people have money to buy and wants to satisfy, the world's great markets, in which Americans may lead. The ingenious American manufacturer and the bold and unhampered American trader, if you will unhamper them, may go in prosperity beyond the dreams of avarice, distancing even the glowing colors of prediction.

Is it not time for us to get out of our swaddling clothes? Is it not time for us to assert our majority and cease all whining and puling as infants? Is it not time for us to arise in the majesty of the mightiest of peoples and be the mightiest nation under the best conditions ever known since the first recorded syllable of the history of mankind? This policy of proscription, this policy of repression, this policy of ministering to the rich and grinding the faces of the poor, can not make us greater, and if persisted in, instead of becoming greater and greater, we shall be stunted and dwarfed.

Have we reached the summit? Are we gazing now from our loftiest camping place upon the vast plain over which we have passed, and which is marked with the monuments of our progress? Are we upon the heights? Are we about to descend? Or are we upon the first elevation of American progress and glory? Are we to climb to still greater heights? Are we to view a broader expanse of the world of commerce, to peacefully invade

all the nations, and by genius and enterprise win trade victories everywhere? Are we to be greater by being freer? Are we to be greater by being fairer? Are we to be greater by looking after the people, or are we to give ourselves over to mammon and have inscribed upon the tombstone of this great Republic, perhaps at no very distant day, the sad epitaph in which others may read of the rise and fall of another of the great republics of the world? There is no such thing possible as long continuing to be a free government, without fairness and justice to the masses of the people.

Free government and partiality by legislation—partiality for the few at the expense of the many—are things which can not be thought of at the same time, things which can not long coexist. A great people, with an inheritance of freedom, with promises and prospects such as have never before been spread out to greet the eyes of men, we have made marvelous progress, not in consequence of wrong but in spite of wrong. How much further we might have gone, how much higher we might be, how much greater might be the average of prosperity in this country, how much more complete might be the opportunity for all today, had we pursued a different policy, I can not answer and no man can answer. Fair distribution is more essential to national glory and perpetuity than vast accumulation ever can be.

Now is the fit time for doing what experience, justice, and patriotism admonish us to do. Now is the time and now is the opportunity, when the passions and the heat of prejudice and political excitement and political bitterness have well-nigh vanished, to set ourselves seriously and soberly and honestly to the solving of the great problems with which we are confronted. Will we do it? Upon this side we have not the power. It is for you gentlemen on the other side to act. You should be up and doing. You have an opportunity which comes seldom to a party or to the representatives of a party in a great National Congress. You have the opportunity to do what ought to be done, even from your own standpoint. Will you rise above the temptations that have enthralled you? Will you regard the interests of the American citizen, the plain American citizen, and change the laws, or will you depend upon the trusts by serving the trusts? I do not care to answer, though I think the indications are such that one might venture to answer without great danger of finding himself in error.

Now, the discussion of this particular bill is curious in some respects. Some of the proponents of this measure, some of the leading gentlemen on the other side, have explained carefully, diligently, with painstaking and much ingenuity and considerable invention, that this bill is no invasion of the sacred thing called "protection," for which their party stands. It is merely a measure of justice to the Filipinos, and not harmful to anybody here in the United States. As my friend from Missouri [Mr. CLARK] suggested in his most admirable speech, those who now cry aloud in opposition to this measure, and whose voices and whose votes were for taking and holding the Philippines—they are seven or eight years behind time in making their fuss. They "stand pat" after the manner of the man who locked his stable, after and not before the horse was stolen.

I do not believe the passage of this bill is going to hurt the American sugar planter. If it does, why not let the Philippine Islands go? Why insist upon holding them? Why talk of not pulling down the flag or of having been sent over there by a beneficent Providence to hold the Philippines? Having seen the error of your ways, why not repent, make amends, and sin no more? If injury to your sugar interests be part of the price of your folly, why grumble? If you have to fulfill part of the obligation which you contracted, why not fulfill it like men? Why do you not say—in this human life how easy a thing it ought to be to say—"I was wrong?" Being wrong, take now the right course rather than stay out of it. Shake off the yoke of that petty tyrant, the consistency of vanity, which would hold you forever the slave of wrong because you began wrong.

These Filipinos are under the flag. They are subject to our domination, and by every principle of the Constitution, by every sense of fairness, by every aspiration of patriotism, by every mark of statesmanship, we are bound to give them what they are entitled to. If you are tired of your experiment, if you have enough of the dear little Brown Brother, if you really doubt whether he is a brother of yours, then let us provide in a decent way for turning the little Brown Brother loose to shift for himself, as he longs to do, first securing by international arrangement a guaranty against the aggression of other nations. [Loud applause.]

Great questions demand something of greatness in consideration and in solution. The greatest statesmanship is ever the wisest partisanship. The tariff is a great issue, and standing pat is meeting it as the ostrich meets the issue of hiding himself, when he buries his head in the desert sand. The resto-

ration of the American merchant marine is a matter of tremendous importance, and the attempt to get ships by means of subsidies is like trying to make men rich by gifts of pilferings from the poor, instead of permitting them to gather the gold which willing industry would gladly labor for and win. The peaceful conquest by Americans of the world's markets is something to be hoped for and worked for, but it is not possible while the masses are given over in the home market for wholesale pillage by the classes.

Just in proportion as the masses at home recover their lost rights, the American manufacturer will turn to, prepare for, and succeed in the foreign market. That can not be won in sharp competition against formidable competitors which is not sought earnestly, persistently, intelligently. Justice to our own people will increase our trade abroad, to the great good of all. But "stand pat" will accomplish none of these desirable things. "Stand pat" is an obstruction in the highway of commerce. It would provide a shield for the oppressor, a weight upon the oppressed. "Stand pat" is the inertia of wrong.

If the Philippines be given free trade with the nation of which against their will we have made them a part, and if the sugar-trust differential duty on sugar be removed, then will Filipino and American be benefited legitimately, without wrong or partiality to anyone. Then a great deal would be accomplished. Then at last the Constitution, the old Constitution, the Constitution of the fathers, the Constitution revered by all men who have pride in this country or hope for its future, the Constitution which is the ark of our safety—then the great Constitution, in letter and in spirit, would be vindicated and observed. Hardship would not be inflicted upon anybody; complete justice would be done; and that justice would comprehend and include in its beneficence that oft-spoken-about but oft-forgotten element of our population, the plain, common people. [Prolonged applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. BENNET of New York. Mr. Chairman, I rise simply for the purpose of putting on the record some information which I think ought to be in the possession of the House in view of certain statements made by the gentleman from Utah on Friday last, and in view of certain inferences which he somewhat nebulously drew from those statements. In substance he stated that the State of New York was not interested in the beet-sugar matter, and that the votes of her representatives would be influenced by that fact. Both the alleged fact and the inference meant to be drawn are incorrect. We do raise beet sugar in New York, and we are interested in the industry, and our votes are not going to be influenced by the fact of the existence of such an industry.

Mr. Chairman, the State of New York since 1897 has contributed more from the State funds to the promotion of the beet industry than have all the other States of the Union combined, the figures being for the seven years \$404,913. And each year since 1897 the legislature has put upon the statute book this statement:

This appropriation is made by the legislature in continuance of the policy adopted at the session of 1897, in the faith and with the declared purpose of making direct appropriations from the State for a successive period of not less than five years from said first appropriation, in aid of the permanent establishment of a beet-sugar industry in this State.

I propose to vote for this bill, not because we have the beet-sugar industry in the State of New York, for we have it; not because we have tobacco, for we have that, and not in spite of either of those facts, and not for any reason relating to either industry, but because I believe that there is a duty which only Congress can perform in relation to our helpless wards so far away across the Pacific. [Applause.]

Mr. RANDELL of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I do not deem it necessary to make any very extended remarks upon this bill, but desire to put myself on record in reference to its provisions, and to comment upon some of the issues that have been brought into this discussion. The act approved March 8, 1902, entitled "An act temporarily to provide revenue for the Philippine Islands, and for other purposes," levied a tariff on products of the Philippine Islands imported into the United States equal to 75 per cent of the Dingley rate. This bill proposes to amend section 2 of that act, placing all such imports from the Philippine Islands on the free list, except sugar and tobacco, and on these two articles it proposes to retain 25 per cent of the Dingley rates, which is one-third of the present tariff now levied on those articles.

This bill is presented by the majority of Committee on Ways and Means, the minority of that committee offering a substitute admitting all such imports free of duty.

In order properly to consider the issues involved here, we must understand the situation and the relationship between the United States and the Philippine Islands.

If the archipelago is a constituent part of the United States, it is clear that under our Constitution there can be no lawful tariff levied on its imports into this country, and we ought to support the substitute measure giving them free trade with us. If the party in power will not permit this, then we should support the bill, as it is more just and less obnoxious to the Constitution than the present law.

The Philippine Islands are far across the sea, 6,000 miles from our western coast. Its people are different from us—different in race, lineage, color, characteristics, and education, different in hopes and aspirations—with a future not to be naturally blended with ours. They inherited that country from their ancestors, and it has been their home as long as we have had America for our home, and longer than we have owned the greater portion of our country upon the American continent. They have hopes and aspirations, love of liberty and natural rights the same as other men and other peoples. They, like our forefathers, suffered by the hand of oppression, bound down four hundred years, subjects per force of the Spanish monarchy. They, like our forefathers, tired of oppression, fought for their freedom, and, in that fight which was waged for many years with varying success and much bloodshed, thousands and tens of thousands of lives were given for freedom, as our forefathers fought and died for freedom. And during all that time we sympathized with the Filipinos in their fight.

When by their own prowess they were about to accomplish as a fact that freedom which they craved, the Spanish-American war was declared. We made a common cause against Spain. We were allies. The result of that war brought the Philippine Islands into the hands of this Government and under the power of this Government. They who were our allies and our friends, who were supporting us in that war as we supported them, were, by the terms of our treaty with Spain, purchased by us for \$20,000,000; or, as some have expressed it, for two dollars and a half a head. But possession of that country and dominion over it could not be obtained by mere purchase. It required force. The Filipino desired his liberty. He had been fighting for that for years, and continued that fight, and it is scarcely over to-day. The war there is over in name only; they are only partially subjected; they are still fighting fitfully for that liberty which is the birthright of every human being—still disputing the right of this country to control them. We have forced them into the attitude of being a part of this Government. Without their consent we have made them a part of the United States.

From that standpoint, Mr. Chairman, it seems to me that the dictates of conscience, common honesty, and respect for our own Constitution would impel us to give to these people the same rights that they would have if they had become a part of this country by their own will and our consent. [Applause.] Not only is it our duty to give them the rights they would have under our Constitution had they come to us by their own consent and our agreement, but the fact that we forced them into this position, it seems to me, only emphasizes our duty and appeals the more strongly to our justice and magnanimity. Therefore, under the Constitution, according to common sense and in fairness to these people, as long as they occupy the position that they are now forced to occupy by the arms of the United States and by the policy of the Republican party, managing the affairs of this Government at the present time, it is right that they should be accorded all the accruing benefits under the Constitution to which they are entitled as a part of this Government; and the tariff wall should be entirely torn down.

But there are some who oppose it; some men who claim to be Democrats who oppose it. There are many men who claim to be Democrats because they belong to the Democratic organization, affiliate with the Democratic party, but are really no more Democrats in policy and in principle than if they affiliated with the Republican party. Then there are men who are Democratic on some things and un-Democratic on others.

Without attempting to criticize anybody, I am here to say for one, as a member of the Democratic party and as a citizen representing the State of Texas in part in this House, that it is not the sentiment of our people, it is not Democracy in Texas to treat one part of this country in one way and another part in another way when it comes to the question of tariff. [Applause.]

We are a young and growing State; we have rice, we have sugar, we have tobacco, and they are the principal things that will be affected by this legislation; but, I tell you here and now, standing in my place as a Representative from Texas, that the people of Texas—yes, even regardless of party—are not in favor of discriminating against the Filipino for fear that he may interfere with our trade and progress. [Applause.]

If we can not raise rice in Texas at a profit we will stop rais-

ing it. But the fact is we can raise rice there at a tremendous profit. The only trouble is that the organization of trusts is so easy under Republican administration, under our tariff and transportation laws as they stand to-day, that the menace to the rice producers in Texas is from the trusts and not from the Filipinos; not from importation of rice into this country. The Philippine Islands are importers, not exporters, of rice.

So far as Texas is concerned, our interests are the same as those of the rest of the people. It is a part of the United States; it is a miniature United States in itself. It has every variety of climate, soil, and product that the United States is capable of; and every industrial interest in the United States appeals to us as personal, because we can build up the same industry in Texas if it does not already exist.

But the real question is, What is right by these people? One of my colleagues, a good friend of mine, has advocated the doctrine, astonishing to me—I do not know how it may appear to other Members of this House—that under the Constitution it is his duty to support the substitute, and, that failing, to oppose the bill; that to vote for the bill would be voting for a tariff which is unconstitutional—namely, the tariff on sugar and tobacco, the same being 25 per cent of the Dingley rate.

Mr. Chairman, if this were initiative legislation, if the question was whether or not we would have to put a tariff of 25 per cent of the Dingley rate upon sugar and tobacco imported from the Philippine Islands the product of those islands, I, like my colleague from Texas, would oppose the bill, because I believe we have no constitutional right to levy a tariff between the Philippine Islands and the United States, or any part of the United States. But this is not initiative legislation.

If the substitute is rejected, we must vote for or against the bill. A Member of this House that votes against the bill—if the substitute fails—votes to retain the present tariff of 75 per cent of the Dingley rate on all imports from the Philippines. Would not that be voting for a tariff? Suppose the Member refrained from voting and the bill were defeated. Would not that be permitting an unconstitutional tariff to remain on our statutes, when he had an opportunity to cast his vote for the abolition of nearly all of it, and to greatly reduce the remainder?

Now, how can a man be conscientiously impelled to vote for the substitute and yet conscientiously prevented from supporting the bill if the substitute is lost? When he votes against this bill he votes to retain, as I said, all the present tariff wall between this country and the Philippines. He votes to retain three times the tariff on sugar and tobacco that this bill provides, and yet he says his conscience will not permit him to vote for any tariff at all. The effect of the vote will be to maintain the tariff if he votes against the bill; the effect if he votes for the bill is to take away all the tariff except on sugar and on tobacco, and to take away two-thirds of the unconstitutional tariff on those articles. I will not take time to further discuss a proposition like that. The gentleman's position is that the Philippines are being robbed, but he will not vote to reduce the amount of the robbery for fear of making himself a party to it. I will not discuss this point further. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. CASSEL] says it will ruin the trade of this country if you allow the tobacco from the Philippines to come in.

I do not believe that we should consider primarily the question as to what effect it would have upon our trade. We should consider first the question as to what is right. But, if you will consider the question of policy and expediency, let us see: It seems that he is afraid of the Philippine product. The gentleman in his speech said there is a little over \$2,000,000 worth of tobacco that is shipped from the Philippine Islands to all parts of the world. According to his statement, his district in Pennsylvania makes nearly \$3,000,000 net profit to the producers of tobacco leaf. Following out his reasoning, his district will have more influence on the American market than all the Philippine export, and would be such a menace to the tobacco industry in the United States that we ought to put a tariff wall around that district in Pennsylvania to keep its tobacco from taking the market and ruining the producers of tobacco in other parts of the United States. [Applause on the Democratic side.] And a tariff wall around his district would be just as constitutional as a tariff wall between any other parts of the United States.

The fact of the matter is that we do not need prohibitive tariff walls around this country. It used to be the accepted doctrine that the condition of a people as to their civilization and advancement would largely be indicated by the amount of commerce in which they were engaged; but, it seems, in these latter days commerce is considered as a great evil. We must bar it out. We must adopt a system that will give a premium on things the production of which is less in this country than its

consumption; and the same policy by the people of all other countries would necessarily lead to the result that everything consumed in each country would be produced there in the country where it was consumed, and there would be no need of commerce or trade whatever. The only commerce that would be possible under those circumstances would be a commerce with reference to those articles which could not be universally made.

But, my friends of the beet-sugar variety, when you protest against this bill remember that you are responsible for having the Filipinos as a part of this Government. If you made a mistake then, you ought to correct it now. If you did not make a mistake then, you have no right to complain now that they will be taken really as a part of this country. Why not get consistent? Why not join with the patriotic element of both parties of this country and give the Filipinos justice? Why not give them that liberty that they had won by the sword and have now lost by the overwhelming power of this Government. [Applause on the Democratic side.] You who are complaining about this matter, will you not come to the relief and help of those whose patriotic motives are to let America be a country of white men; a country of Caucasians—America to lead not only now but forever in the progress of human civilization? Come now, before it is too late, and help us to free ourselves from the entanglements of the Philippine Islands.

In this connection why not give to us what you have promised for these years? For the several years I have been a Member of this House I have waited patiently and hopefully, hearing your leaders say that while the Democratic party should have nothing to do with the revision of the tariff, yet that the great Republican party, managed by its great leaders, were speedily to give relief to the people of the United States by tariff revision, and that they, the friends of the tariff, would revise the tariff. Why do you not do it? We have waited long and patiently. Do you mean it? If not, why continue to deceive the people? If you mean it, why not act? Take up the question and revise the tariff. We live in a great section, where so many Members of this Hall reside—in the great Mississippi Valley of the United States—a farming country, where the farmer to-day controls; and I want to tell them and you now that the Republican party understands that the farmers of this country are getting to be a smaller factor every day and year; each election they are becoming a smaller factor in the policies and in the politics of the United States.

The policy of the Republican party is building up trusts by protective and prohibitive tariffs—trusts that are gaining more and more power, and spreading out their interests so that they combine many elements and interests. They take so much of the actual labor of the country into their ranks that the farmer is becoming less and less the powerful and controlling factor that he once was. It is time for you to realize this. It is time for you, the people, the farmers, all over the country, the great industrial classes that are not protected by legislation, that are not protected by any tariff, and that are not favored by any class legislation, to wake up on these propositions. Do justice in all things, separating yourselves from the Filipinos and from every foreign race. Break down the prohibitive tariff walls around this country, levy a reasonable tariff for revenue, fair to all the people, and depend upon it that our citizenship, the inventive genius of our people, the salubrious climate of these United States, the wonderful fertility of its soil, the destiny and the power of the Caucasian race, the Anglo-Saxon and the Teuton, will continue to move forward, not to a theoretical free trade, but to an untrammelled trade; one that is fair and just, one where tariffs are levied for revenue, wisely levied with reference to the interests of all classes; and this country will be what our forefathers dreamed that it would be. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. TYNDALL. Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, I will promise not to detain you but a very few moments, for the question has been discussed long and very thoroughly, but I wanted to just merely give my views and express myself on the faith that is in me in regard to the subject under discussion.

Now, I remember, Mr. Chairman and gentlemen, some of the principles that we have stood by and for which the Republican party has fought for these many years, and I want to cite you one of the planks of our platform of 1896, in which we said we denominated the Administration for not keeping faith with the producers of this country. They said:

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.

That was in the platform of 1896. In the Republican National Campaign Book of 1900, Mr. Chairman, I read this clause:

That (the Porto Rican) duty * * *

Which you remember was a very small tariff; 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, gentlemen, it was a distinct promise to the farmers of this country that they need have no fear that the Republican party would not protect them against cheap labor and products of the tropical climes.

Now, the Philippine Islands, Mr. Chairman, contain an area of 73,000,000 acres, in round numbers. Now, more than 68,000,000 acres of that land is public—belongs to the Government. The population of the Philippine Islands is over seven and one-half millions, while that of Cuba is a little less than one and one-half millions. Hawaii has 200,000 population. The Philippine Islands have much more arable lands, much richer soil than have the Japanese islands, which support 48,000,000 of people. Now, the Japanese islands support this many people on a much less arable or productive soil than does the Philippine Islands support their population. That is the testimony given by Governor Taft before the Philippine Committee, on page 712. In the Philippine Islands there are 50,000,000 acres of land richer than the lands of either Hawaii or the United States. That is the testimony of Buencanimo before the Insular Committee, on page 445 of the hearings. The 800,000 acres of Philippine sugar estates would produce all the sugar which we import from foreign countries. Secretary Taft estimates that the Filipinos can produce, and that the islands are capable of producing, all the sugar we import from all countries from which we import any sugar. Mr. Moody asked this question of Mr. Taft:

Mr. MOODY. Are the Philippine Islands in respect to soil and climate and labor conditions, capable of indefinite extension along the line of the production of sugar?

Governor TAFT. Yes, sir.

Mr. MOODY. Therefore, it is another place where the sugar of the world can be produced?

Governor TAFT. I have no doubt there is enough land there, if the sugar were properly cultivated, to raise—well, I do not know how much Cuba can raise, but if conditions favor us—

and he hesitated to use the word "we," Mr. Chairman, simply because I see all along through all of the data I have been able to get on this question that the Philippine Islands are held to be a ward of ours, and hence not, strictly speaking, a part of us in the same sense as are the different States in the United States of America.

Therefore, I unfortunately spoke of the Philippine Islands as "we," in speaking of the products and the conditions existing over there. He says:

But if conditions favor us, we are going to be a great sugar-producing archipelago.

Mr. HERR asked him this question:

It is said by experts on the Hawaiian and Philippine and Cuban lands that the Philippine lands are as good as the Cuban lands.

Governor Taft answered, "Yes, sir."

Now, Mr. Chairman, I know that we must take care of the Philippine Islands; that they are in a way a ward of ours. I have a word to say on that, and let me say that it is this: Our duty is to care for them and protect them as we have been doing there, but I do think we should do it from the Treasury or from taxes collected equally on all sections and industries of our country and not at the risk or hazard of any particular section or class of our people. It was only after the enactment of the Dingley law in 1897 that the beet-sugar industry began to develop. The beet-sugar industry practically had its conception or beginning since 1897, when the present tariff law was passed. When that law was passed, in 1897, there were but six beet-sugar factories in the United States, all located in California, Nebraska, and Utah. I believe there were a few in Utah. To-day there are fifty-four American beet-sugar factories, located in twelve different States, representing an investment of between \$40,000,000 and \$50,000,000.

At the time that the present tariff bill was passed the United States production of beet sugar amounted to only 40,000 tons. For the present season the beet-sugar production of the United States is estimated at over 300,000 tons, an increase of 645 per cent in eight years. The States supplying the fifty-four American beet-sugar factories are New York, Ohio, Michigan, Illinois, Wisconsin, Minnesota, Iowa, Kansas, Nebraska, Wyoming, Montana, Colorado, Utah, Idaho, Washington, Oregon, and California. In 1905 over a hundred thousand farmers of the above-named States supplied the factories with about 2,800,000 tons of beets, for which they received between fourteen and fifteen millions of dollars. Is it good business policy, Mr. Chairman,

just after the moment that you see such success achieved, that you pass a law that would destroy this great industry we have built up, and which is just now marching, as it were, from infancy into manhood? To produce in the United States the sugar now imported from foreign countries would require the erection of 300 new plants at an expense of \$120,000,000 for machinery and \$60,000,000 for buildings, every dollar of which would be distributed and go into the hands of American workmen and producers. To operate these factories in the product of the sugar that is now imported annually would require about 16,000,000 tons of beets, for which the American farmers would receive \$80,000,000 annually.

Now, why stop such an industry as that? Why do we go and do that which would have a tendency or that would tend to retard the progress we have been making along this line. Ah, but they tell us it will not hurt this industry.

Now, I want to say, Mr. Chairman, that I am not from a State that is producing sugar beets nor engaged in that industry, but because we do not in my State produce them and are not engaged in this industry, I am opposed to anything that will injure the American farmer or any of those industries of the United States. I am not selfish enough to go off and say that because we do not produce this, because my State does not produce beets, that I should not care for this, which strikes directly the American farmers.

The only question here is this: The Philippine Islands are ours, and if they were thrust upon us as the result of war we must do the best we can for them, and we are doing that. We have given them liberty the like of which they never enjoyed before. Thousands and thousands of children in that sunny country are sent to school every morning at the sound of the gong. They are being cared for now. Do not let us sacrifice any industry or sacrifice our home people for those abroad. They are so far removed—7,000 miles away—surrounded by such a condition of circumstances there, and so easily accessible to the pauper, cheap, oriental labor, that it is hard for us to maintain restrictions on emigrants to that country and raise the standard of wages there. These people labor for 10 to 15 cents a day and board themselves. Boys can be employed for even 5 cents a day. With that condition of things existing there, Mr. Chairman, I do not think we can maintain the same standard of commerce and the same rules between these people as we can between the different States of these United States of America.

They are part of us, but not in the sense that we on this continent are part and parcel, bone and sinew of each other; therefore we can not maintain this system, Mr. Chairman, and from what I can gather and from what I have listened to and from the statistics I am satisfied that we make a mistake if we undertake to help them by destroying or crippling our industries here. Now, I believe in protection. I believe in a protective tariff. I believe in the Republican principle of protection. As was fittingly said the other day, I am not for protection because I am a Republican, but I am a Republican because I am in favor of a protective tariff.

That is what makes me a Republican; that is what has builded up our industries all over this country; that is what has elevated the farmer; that is what has sent the tall, gaunt form of poverty that stalked up and down this country from the Atlantic to the Pacific, from the Great Lakes to the hot waters of the Gulf; that is what has sent the tall, gaunt form of starvation beyond the borders of our country. You all remember how a few years ago men were hunting for work and the wages which they had a right to expect in return for work, but were turned away and could not get an honest day's work. The protective tariff is what has opened up the shops of the country, put the farmers to work, and given us these blessings that we now enjoy. Therefore I am in favor of maintaining this tariff between this country and other countries, and even between this country and the Philippine Islands, taking care of them in some other way than by destroying and ruining our own American industries. Let us encourage them in some other line, Mr. Chairman. We must have coffee, we must have many things in this country that we can not produce and that they can produce over there—the \$84,000,000 worth of coffee that we annually bring to this country, the \$49,000,000 worth of rubber and gutta-percha, which they can produce, the \$15,000,000 of sisal grass, \$8,500,000 worth of cocoa, \$2,000,000 worth of cabinet woods, \$2,000,000 worth of copra, \$1,000,000 worth of indigo, and various other tropical products, which can be grown in that country. Let us encourage them along those lines. Let us not sacrifice our own resources here in order to give them encouragement and assistance. [Applause on the Republican side.]

[Here the hammer fell.]

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES.

The committee informally rose; and Mr. GILLET of Massachusetts 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. BARNES, one of his secretaries, who also informed the House of Representatives that the President had approved and signed bill of the following title.

On January 11, 1906:

H. R. 99. An act to aid the Council City and Solomon River Railroad Company.

PHILIPPINE TARIFF.

The committee resumed its session.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I am opposed to the passage of this bill. It contemplates a heavy reduction of the import duties on sugar and tobacco produced in the Philippines now, and complete free trade with the islands in April, 1909. The friends of this bill say that if it becomes a law it will not affect the sugar and tobacco industries in this country. The burden of proof is upon the friends of the bill to show this. Realizing that the burden of proof lies with them, the advocates of this bill on our side of the House tell us that we shall not be harmed, because the tobacco grown in the Philippines is so vile that no American will ever use it. If this be true, then nothing need be done to encourage bringing it here. If it is true that the tobacco is such poor stuff that our people will not use it, then there is no occasion to pass this bill, so far as tobacco is concerned, because the Filipino will derive no benefit therefrom. But if, on the other hand, the lowering of the duty will bring this tobacco into this country, then every pound of it so imported may displace an equal amount of American tobacco. This means harm to the American tobacco grower, and places American labor and the American farmer on a level with cheap Filipino labor.

The friends of the bill say that no Philippine sugar is likely to come into this country—at least, no increased amount of it—because of the lowering of the duty, but that the sugar raised in the islands will find, as it always has, an oriental market. If this be true, then there is no occasion for the passage of the bill, because it will afford no relief to the Philippine sugar grower. He will still be selling his sugar in the markets of the Orient at their prices. But if it is not true, and the sugar is brought into this country, then it must come into our markets at a great advantage over any other sugar. There might be some excuse for so letting in this sugar if it would benefit our sugar consumer, but it will not benefit him. The sugar trust would simply have the opportunity to buy some thousands of tons of raw sugar at a reduced price and sell their refined product at the same old prices. Such has been our experience since we reduced the duty on Cuban raw sugar. It does not seem to be questioned on this floor that since we lowered the duty on Cuban raw sugar our sugar consumers have not obtained their sugar any cheaper, while, on the other hand, the Cuban sugar grower obtains but a small share of the benefit of the reduction in duty. The friends of the bill say to us that we are now paying \$150,000,000 for imported sugar each year and why not buy from the Philippines instead of elsewhere. The answer is that we ought to discourage the buying of any sugar from abroad and encourage our own sugar industry, by a protective tariff, until we shall produce all our sugar. This is the true protective policy, that everything we can produce in sufficient quantities to materially supply our wants we shall protect by proper duties to the end that our people may supply our home market. It is an unquestioned fact that we have in this country the soil, climate, and facilities to produce all the sugar our people can use. Why shall we send abroad \$150,000,000 each year for sugar? Why are not our farmers producing this sugar and putting into their pockets each year this vast sum? I want to see this done. I want to see our farmers grow this sugar. I am ready and anxious to do everything to aid and encourage them to do so. I am not willing to do anything that I believe, or even fear, will injure our sugar grower or in any degree postpone the time when he shall produce all the sugar we consume.

One of the great benefits of our protective policy is that it tends to diversify our industries. The increased production of sugar on our farms benefits every farmer in the country whether he is a sugar grower or not. Build up the industry of sugar growing, foster it, protect it, and in so doing you will benefit every farmer. The lowering of the duty on Philippine sugar can not help any farmer in this country. It will not give him cheaper sugar, and it may reduce the amount of sugar produced here. Why should we pursue a course that can not help our own people and may harm them? [Applause.]

No friend of this bill—at least no protectionist—admits that he would favor this bill if it will tend to harm our own people. So they belittle the bill and its effect. They make it a trivial matter by claiming that there is so little arable land in the Philippines that no appreciable amount of sugar, as compared with our capacity of consumption, can ever be raised there. Hours have been used on this floor, and elsewhere in committee hearings, and experts have been employed to prove that the Philippine Islands are nonproductive. The experts have testified on the question—many of them on both sides of it—and yet we who are here to vote on a measure involving the fact of the productive area of those islands are but little, if any, wiser upon that question. But, sir, if we must guess on a question vital in any degree to our interests, then let us guess on the safe side.

It is within the recollection of some of the older Members of this body when learned men, great statesmen, scientific and Government experts, published on this floor and to the world at large that we had no arable land beyond the Missouri River. It is easily within the recollection of the younger Members of this body when we were told by those supposed to know, and presumably having the means to know, that the great Canadian Northwest provinces were a cold, desolate, barren waste. Today, hardly a generation since, we know that this great so-called "barren West and Northwest" is the granary of the world, so rich and fertile that it can and will feed the people of all the earth. It is idle, gentlemen, for you to even attempt to make the American sugar producer believe this tale of an unproductive country in the islands. He does not believe you, and, not believing, he takes no chances based upon such statements. However, seemingly, having little confidence in their ability to convince the American farmer and laborer that the passage of this bill will not harm them, the friends of this measure, with a benevolent smile upon their faces, say to the American farmer: "You owe a duty, a plain duty, to the Filipino. Providence has placed him in your keeping and you must not shrink from your duty." Gentlemen, the American farmer always has done his duty, done it when others failed, and he will continue to do it, I have no doubt, but I deny that he owes any such duty toward the Filipino as requires him to sacrifice either his property or his prosperity. He owes to the Filipino the opportunity to use his own, not ours. The American farmer and laborer did not take the Filipino under any promise, express or implied, or under any duty to give him free access to the American markets, the best markets in the world. We have been generous and fair in our treatment of the Filipino. We have given him for the first time in his history the chance to use his own. We have taken nothing from him and given him much. We collect a duty from him on his sugar and tobacco brought into our markets that we may protect our own, and give it back to him to use for his own benefit. This course of ours protects our own people and affords revenue to the Philippines. [Applause.]

The growing of sugar beets in this country is comparatively a new industry. Until the passage of the Dingley tariff bill there were but few sugar beets grown and but little money invested in beet-sugar factories. Under the beneficent influences of the Dingley law the sugar-beet production has increased almost eightfold. More than \$40,000,000 is now invested in beet-sugar factories in the country, and new ones are rapidly being built. Thousands of farmers are engaged in raising sugar beets, and the number is rapidly increasing. More than 300,000 tons of beet sugar were produced in this country last year. We are spending millions of dollars in the West in vast irrigation projects, and a large part of the lands to be reclaimed by these projects are singularly adapted to the cultivation of the sugar beet. There has never been in our history an industry more worthy of protection than the sugar-beet industry. It is a peculiar industry, one that in its very nature needs protection. The sugar beet can not, like corn, wheat, and other agricultural products, be shipped long distances to be manufactured. It can not be stored in elevators, but must be converted into sugar almost immediately after it is grown and in the near vicinity of its production. This results in the erection of large and costly plants in small farming communities—plants costing hundreds of thousands of dollars each. They are entirely useless for any other business, and when not used as sugar factories can not be devoted to any other purpose. These peculiar conditions of the business make capital slow to invest in beet-sugar factories. Again, the factory can not go into the open market and get its raw material, but is dependent upon the neighboring farmer to supply the same. These facts make the business one in which the farmer is better able to protect his interests, because he deals directly with the consumer of his raw material. There are no commission men, middlemen, elevators, or vexing questions of freight rates to impede the farmer in marketing his

product. Dealing directly with the factory owner, who is entirely dependent on the neighboring farmer for his raw material, it enables the farmer to obtain the best price for his crop; indeed, he knows in advance what price he can reckon upon. These conditions tend to make stability of prices for the farmer. It will readily be seen, therefore, that the factory must precede the raising of the beet. Capital is slow to invest in any uncertain venture, and so we say to the friends of this bill that the introduction of any more free raw sugar into this country, or the reduction of the duty on such sugars, tends to create doubt and uncertainty in the minds of the sugar-beet people and capital interested therein, so that the growth of the business will stop.

We can not afford to take the proposed step, gentlemen. There is no duty levied on a raw material that more directly affects the farmers' interest than the duty on raw sugar. Protect the farmer and laborer of the country and you protect every person and interest therein, for upon the prosperity and welfare of the farmer and laborer depends the welfare and prosperity of every other person in the community.

Mr. Chairman, I have not sought to go into figures and statistics in my remarks. Other gentlemen who have spoken on this proposed measure have used figures and statistics until we are dazed with the array. But whether one set of figures be more nearly correct than another is of comparatively little importance, since the fact remains that we shall consume a certain amount of sugar, more or less, and use a certain amount of tobacco, more or less, as the case may be, and we can and ought to produce all we consume of both products.

We should be paying to the American farmer the vast sum we pay abroad each year for these articles, and we should be paying American labor for manufacturing the sugar and tobacco out of the raw material grown by the American farmer. It is enough for me to know that every pound of sugar or tobacco we buy abroad ought to be produced in my own country, and I am in favor of every measure that will encourage and protect that production and against every measure that will discourage or hinder it. [Loud applause.]

Mr. KELHER. Mr. Chairman, the poor Filipino merits the unmeasured thanks of the American people for being the cause of one of the most intelligent and instructive debates that have taken place in this body for years. Especially does he commend himself to the gratitude of the people of Massachusetts, who always did and always will take a keen interest in his welfare. Massachusetts is given a long-sought opportunity to deal over the shoulder of the unhappy Filipino a blow at existing tariff conditions that are working such havoc with her industries.

Her people have spoken upon the subject in no uncertain tones of late. They placed the sturdy manufacturer Douglas in the gubernatorial chair one year ago simply and solely because he embodied the movement for a revision of the tariff—particularly the abolition of the burdensome duty on hides. This year they gave the Republicans another shock by nearly retiring an exponent of "stand-patism," Eben Draper, who ran for lieutenant-governor, and they would have done so if he had not wisely recanted.

The Republican majorities that for years have consistently kept up in the sixty and seventy thousands have so dwindled that to-day Massachusetts is a doubtful State. Our people are keenly alive to the fact that they are being jollied when they ask tariff relief. They realize that the prayer of Massachusetts does not avail when the mandate of Pennsylvania is "stand pat." She is surfeited with idle promises and irritated by the appeal of the Republican leaders to wait till the friends of the tariff undertake its revision. She has been talked to in a kindly manner, but her pleas for relief have been answered in an unsatisfactory way.

Like the little girl in the song we sang in our boyhood days—

Mother, may I go out to swim?
Yes, my darling daughter;
Hang your clothes on a hickory limb,
But don't go near the water.

[Laughter and loud applause.]

So it is with Massachusetts. Her requests can hardly be said to be refused, but she gets—not what she wants—only the promise that some day in the hopeful future she is going to enjoy the sweet fulfillment of her wishes. During this debate much has been said upon the question of the hide schedule. Upon this phase, so vitally interesting to the people of Massachusetts, two distinguished members of this body, Messrs. KEIFER and GROSVENOR, of Ohio, held forth. Massachusetts was the object of their sarcasm, and her recent declarations through party platforms and at the polls in favor of tariff revision aroused their contempt.

They said nothing that could be construed as enlightening upon the subject. The ex-Speaker took ex-Governor Douglas of my State to task for having expressed some opinions upon the effect of the duty upon hides on the price of manufactured shoes. He appeared to enjoy himself, and certainly did nobody any harm.

General GROSVENOR, too, took a fling at Governor Douglas. The intent of his speech was to convince his listeners that Governor Douglas was grossly ignorant of the economic feature of the question. Naturally, when one hears from such "careful, thoughtful, profound" students of great public questions, their words carry weight, but I confess my unwillingness to believe that any intelligent, unbiased Member will pause to choose his authority as between either the ex-Speaker and General Grosvenor and the largest manufacturer of fine shoes in the world—Governor William L. Douglas, of Massachusetts.

It is only just that we briefly examine into the respective qualifications of Messrs. KEIFER, GROSVENOR, and Douglas to pronounce expert opinion upon the mooted question of whether the price upon shoes would be affected by the removal of the duty upon hides. Mr. KEIFER's life has been a busy one. He has earned great honor and distinction on the battlefields and in the practice of law. For years he has given freely of his talents as trustee of a college, as president of a bank, as commander of the Ohio Department of the Grand Army, and for many years has been a shining light in this body.

His colleague from Ohio has been a busy and conspicuous figure in the politics of his State and country, all his time being absorbed by the multifarious duties such a position in public life imposes.

William L. Douglas is a product of a Massachusetts farm, who served his time in early life as an apprentice to a shoemaker, and has followed that trade ever since, rising by dint of perseverance and marked intelligence to the proud position of the largest and most successful manufacturer of high-class shoes in the world. If you want expert opinion on the effect of the tariff on hides upon the price of shoes, will you ask it of the soldier, bank president, the politician, or the man whose life has been spent at the bench and in the counting room of a pre-eminently successful shoe factory? [Applause.]

But if you are still in doubt, let us call up the utterance of one of the greatest statesmen the Republican party has produced in fifty years. James G. Blaine was a shining exponent of the theory of protection. His knowledge and experience and profound reasoning upon the subject made him the acknowledged leader of the movement in his time. What did this prince of protection say upon the question of taxing hides? When that other great and ever-to-be-loved statesman, William McKinley, was formulating his tariff bill in 1890, James G. Blaine, addressing Chairman McKinley, wrote, under date of April 10, 1890:

It is a great mistake to take hides from the free list, where they have been for so many years. It will benefit the farmer by adding 5 to 8 per cent to the price of his children's shoes. It will yield a profit to the butcher—the last man that needs it. The movement is injudicious from beginning to end in every form and phase. Pray stop it before it sees the light. Such movements as these for protection will protect the Republican party into a speedy retirement.

[Applause.]

This was the advice of Blaine, and the wise McKinley agreed with his reasoning, and hides remained on the free list. When Nelson W. Dingley undertook his task he, too, respected the prayer of Blaine and followed the example of his illustrious predecessor, McKinley. Notwithstanding this, we find hides upon the dutiable list. How did they get there? Rumor hath it that it was found, a squealing infant swathed in the richest clothing, carefully ensconced in an expensive basket, without a name, on the door of the Dingley tariff mansion. It was said that one Philip D. Armour, head of the great Armour packing house, had been seen in the neighborhood about that time. Suffice it to say that the foundling was taken into the house, fed, nurtured, and given the same care and protection that were accorded the legitimate Dingley tariff children. [Loud laughter.]

Massachusetts resents the charge that she asks and is not willing to give. She says as clearly and concisely as it is possible to declare a simple proposition, "Remove the duty from hides, and if you deem it fair and equitable take off also the duty on manufactured shoes." Is that not a fair proposition? Our shoe manufacturers go into Canada now and undersell the Canadian. Is it not fair to assume that with the reduction in the price of manufactured shoes that would follow the taking off the duty on hides that they would increase our market?

Our shoe manufacturers are not theorists, sentimentalists,

nor politicians—they are keen, shrewd business men. They have studied this question from a business standpoint, and they declare if the duty on hides is removed they will take their chances with the so-called "pauper labor" of the world. They say, "If we must do so, let a foreign manufactured shoes duty free." To-day they are in the markets of the world, handicapped as they are, broadening their fields of trade and promise to make greater strides if this unjust tax is wiped out. But along comes the cry—the same old stereotyped wail—"Protect the farmer!" [Applause.]

The farmer and his hides. Why is it that a ripple of laughter invariably follows the coupling of the tiller of the soil with the business of selling hides? When the gentleman from New Jersey arose the other day and declared himself a farmer, and, further, that he had disposed of the hides of six steers, the membership present were surprised into silence, and his words fell upon a stillness one rarely enjoys in this Chamber. Why? Because the sight of an American farmer who sells hides is an exceedingly rare one. It is an indisputable fact that those great packers who are part and parcel of the beef trust buy the cattle alive, and that the percentage of distinct sales of hides by the small farmer is infinitesimal.

"Save the farmer." "Protect the farmer." If the men who stand opposed to the striking off of the duty on hides are sincerely solicitous for the welfare of the farmer, why don't they amend tariff conditions that permits the farmer of Europe—the competitors of the American farmer—to buy American manufactured farming implements in Europe cheaper than the American farmer can buy them in the home of their manufacture? It is purely buncombe, this cry of "Keep the duty on hides in the interest of the American farmer." 'Tis the packers' campaign contribution, not the farmer's welfare, that postpones the wiping off the duty on hides. My distinguished colleague [Mr. WEEKS] expresses considerable concern lest the American laborer be not protected. He asks if we would protect American labor. I answer, yes. I would protect it from the extortions that are practiced upon it as a result of the present tariff schedules.

I would protect the wage-earner's envelope, that is rapaciously eaten into by the exorbitant prices demanded for the necessities of life by the beef, sugar, coal, and other trusts that came into life, were nurtured, and now fatten off the protection of the Dingley schedules. Don't weep for the American laborer. He has abundantly proven his ability to care for himself. It is not the Dingley tariff that makes it possible for him to command a living wage, reasonable hours, and healthy environment—it is his demonstrated ability to organize, and through intelligent organization to obtain justice. [Loud applause.]

Massachusetts is restless at the inaction of her Representatives on the other side of the House. She wants action and wants it quickly. Words won't do. She is tired of hearing brilliant excomiums upon her patriotism, intelligence, and industry. Mere philippics cease to interest her. She is weary of listening to the bellicose threats of her Republican Representatives, who, with the belligerent strenuousness of their great leader in the White House, tear up and down our State on the eve of an election, declaring what is going to happen if their party does not offer relief, only to subside into docile party subservency when the portals of Congress are crossed. [Applause.] What can they do? Charles Stewart Parnell organized his few Irish followers in the British House of Commons and paralyzed the business of that great legislative body till England listened to Ireland's story of her wrongs and took steps to relieve her unhappy condition. If the delegation from Massachusetts on the other side would but emulate the example of the great Irish statesman and bring into play their unquestioned influence, magnificent parliamentary equipment, and demonstrated familiarity with the rules of the House it would be but a short time before the obdurate few that stand between Massachusetts and her needs would capitulate. [Applause.] Nearly every other speaker on this great question, disclaiming powers of prophecy, has proceeded to record a prediction. I, too, am going to venture into the mystic fields of prophecy. Unless this Congress takes cognizance of the memorial of Massachusetts for the free raw materials her industrial prosperity demands, the State will swing into the Democratic column and many of the faces that stand forth in the picture of the other side will be missing in the next Congress, and if you would glance upon the features of their successors it will be necessary to gaze across the middle aisle into this section of the House. [Loud applause.]

There has been so much misrepresentation of the views of the effect of the duty on hides upon the cost of shoes that I append hereto a statement of the Hon. W. L. Douglas, late governor

of Massachusetts, and the largest manufacturer of men's fine shoes in the world:

BROCKTON, January 14.

Ex-Governor William L. Douglas and what he has said on the tariff question were much discussed last week in the National House of Representatives. He has received many inquiries from Washington as well as from all sections of Massachusetts as to what is the "Massachusetts idea" of tariff reform, of which he seems to be the leader. Ex-Governor Douglas expressed himself as much amused at some of the statements attributed to him by Members of Congress in debate. He was made to say many things he never uttered, and was credited with statements regarding the manufacture of shoes that were not only untrue, but ridiculous. The ex-governor is still the champion of immediate tariff revision in the interest of Massachusetts industries.

Giving his reasons why the tariff should be revised, he quotes from his previous public utterances, saying: The three leading manufacturing States, with reference to products of manufactures per capita of population, according to the census of 1900, were Connecticut, Rhode Island, and Massachusetts. Each man, woman, and child of Massachusetts produced a manufactured product of \$369 and an agricultural product of \$15. Pennsylvania produced a manufactured product of \$33. The total value of the agricultural products in Massachusetts in 1900 was but \$42,298,274, while the total gross value of the manufactured products was \$1,035,198,989.

Massachusetts, standing seventh in population and fourth in manufactures, sinks to the thirty-first place in agriculture, while the density of manufactured product per square mile reaches the sum of \$125,000. The total gross value of the manufactured product per square mile in New York and Pennsylvania, respectively, was \$45,000 and \$40,000. We are not an agricultural State and can not look to this industry for the compensating relief which agriculture gives to those States where the manufacturing interest is not so well established. In density of manufactured product we have three times as much on every square mile as the great manufacturing States of Pennsylvania and New York. We may, therefore, justly claim that the revision of the tariff is of greater moment to every citizen of Massachusetts than it is to the citizens of any other State, excepting Rhode Island and Connecticut.

Massachusetts needs free hides, free sole leather, free coal, free lumber, free iron ore, and free wool pulp.

THE DUTY ON HIDES.

The hide duty adds about 7 cents per pair to the cost of producing the grade of shoes I manufacture. I also wish it made quite plain to the public that, while an increase of but 7 cents in the cost of manufacture of a pair of \$3.50 shoes may seem a small and unimportant matter, that amount represents more than the net profit to the average manufacturer.

Of course, the duty on hides should come off. It is a tax on industry that benefits a very few people and injures everyone who wears boots and shoes, or who is engaged in the manufacture of leather or leather goods.

The total value of the hides of cattle imported into the United States for the twelve months ending June 30, 1905, was \$14,949,628, while the total of all hides and skins, other than furs, exported for the same period was \$1,051,641. We can produce only about three-fourths of the hides needed for the supply of our home manufacturers of leather, and must annually draw about one-fourth of our supply from abroad. A tariff tax of \$2,500,000 upon this fourth results in an entirely unwarranted increase in the price of all sole leather used by American manufacturers.

To put \$2,250,000 into the Treasury of the United States as the result of our duty upon hides, we put about \$7,000,000 of unnecessary tariff profit in the hands of the beef and leather trusts. This puts an iniquitous tax upon the sole-leather industry of about \$10,000,000 and disables that industry in its fight for the markets of the world.

The total value of the product of the shoe industry in Massachusetts for 1904 was \$165,709,642, which is considerably more than half the total product of the country, which for the year 1905 is estimated at \$313,000,000. The number of people employed in Massachusetts was 66,692, including men, women, and boys. The total amount of money paid for labor was \$34,586,282, or an average of \$9.97 per week, equaling \$518.59 per year. With free hides, free sole leather, and free coal I believe the shoe manufacturers of Massachusetts could show an increase in their export trade equal to 25 per cent of the present product, which would be \$41,427,410. That would necessitate 16,673 more employees, which would, on the basis of the cost of the product in 1904, entail the payment of \$8,646,570 more to labor. The average labor cost of shoes produced in Massachusetts is about 21 per cent of the total cost. In my factories the labor cost is 27 per cent of the total cost.

LABOR COST.

As a manufacturer I ask for a revised tariff. I would gladly give up the duty of 25 per cent on shoes for free raw materials. I will go further than this and say that I would exchange the duty on shoes for free hides and free sole leather. If the handicap of taxed leather were taken away I could manufacture shoes as cheaply as any foreign manufacturer and could safely meet the competition of the world. We have the most approved mechanical appliances; we have the advantage of the economical division of labor, and our workmen are equal to any in the world. We are held back, however, by the high cost of the materials that enter into our product. This increased cost is not a natural cost. It is artificial and unjust. It benefits no worthy industry. It fosters gigantic combinations of capital, injures labor, and destroys foreign trade. Give our manufacturers free raw materials and they will carry Massachusetts goods into every market of the world.

Nor am I the only boot and shoe man who desires a change. In 1903, 311 out of 375 important boot and shoe manufacturers in New England offered to give up the duty on shoes for free hides. I do not believe that this sentiment has changed.

The sole leather I use in my \$3.50 shoes costs 40 per cent more now than it did in 1897. Most of the leathers used in the top of the shoes has increased but 10 per cent. This great increase in the cost of sole leather demonstrates conclusively that the 15 per cent tariff on hides and the 20 per cent duty on finished sole leather is responsible for the advance, as the duty on hides has produced a shortage of the supply to such an extent that sole leather is a great deal higher than it should be if we only had to pay for sole leather just what the 15 per cent duty on hides adds to the normal cost.

Manufacturers have been able to overcome this great increase in cost of raw materials by the improvement in machinery, change of method in manufacture, and by doing a larger volume of business at a lower percentage of profit. But now we have reached our limit. All the advantages that should naturally have been reaped by the wearer of

shoes has been consumed by the increased cost of materials. To-day shoe manufacturers can not reduce the cost of labor or the cost of materials, and they can not take a smaller profit and remain in business. We must secure relief by the repeal of the duty on hides and the duty on shoe leather. Failing in this, we must either increase the price of shoes or make them of less value for money now paid by the wearer.

The export trade in shoes is very small, amounting last year to about \$8,000,000. Nearly this amount of business is transacted by the Douglas concern alone. It would therefore appear that the foreign field is not to any great extent available to American shoe manufacturers, owing to the fact that they must meet the competition of manufacturers on the other side who do not pay the tariff taxes levied on the industry in this country.

Speaking of reciprocity with Canada—if we could sell our shoes in the Dominion free of duty, from my experience with the trade I have had there—I could easily add another factory to the three large factories my company now has under operation, which would employ certainly 1,000 men and women with a pay roll of about \$750,000 a year, the average pay in the Douglas factories being considerably more than the average of the State as a whole. If, even having reciprocity with Canada alone I could establish that, how much more could I accomplish if I and my fellow shoe manufacturers could have reciprocity with all nations of the world, which we are entitled to; and what is true of the shoe business would be equally true of all other manufactures in the Commonwealth.

[Loud applause.]

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Massachusetts asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the Record. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

The Chair will state that several gentlemen who had expressed a desire to speak to-day have withdrawn their requests. Every gentleman who has expressed a desire to do so has now spoken except the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. BOUTELL], a member of the Ways and Means Committee, whom the Chair thinks proper to recognize to conclude the debate. Before doing so the Chair will ask if any gentleman opposed to the bill desires now to be heard? No gentleman desiring to be heard, the gentleman from Illinois is recognized.

Mr. BOUTELL. Mr. Chairman, this discussion has now proceeded without limitation until every Member of the House who desired to do so has had an opportunity to submit his views upon the question under consideration. The arguments for and against this measure have been presented with unusual vigor, but at the same time with uniform candor and good feeling and with far less exaggeration than often characterizes an important debate. The speeches have been all full of interest and information. The Members of the House who had the good fortune to go to the Orient with the Secretary of War who have addressed the committee have placed not only us who had the pleasure of listening to them, but the whole country under a distinct debt of gratitude to them for the thoroughness with which they made their investigation and for the painstaking manner in which they presented their conclusions to the committee. We are now in possession of all the available facts bearing upon the pending question. It might seem that nothing remains except for us to vote upon the proposition before us.

It occurred to me, however, Mr. Chairman, that it might aid us in coming to just conclusions on this very important measure if we should endeavor now to resolve ourselves, as it were, into a judicial frame of mind and to attempt to marshal before us the facts and arguments that have been so ably and exhaustively presented and to give to each one its proper proportion and its due weight. For this purpose alone, Mr. Chairman, I venture to indulge at this late hour upon the patience of the committee. The debate upon this measure has discovered plainly the enemies of the proposed legislation and the strength and character of their opposition. They are ranged in two camps, whose heaviest artillery, however, is directed against each other. Those on the right flank are fighting this measure because, as they assert, there is too much free trade in it, while those on the left flank are fighting it in its present form not less fiercely on the ground that there is too much protection in it. Those who occupy the former camp are Republicans who believe that the time-honored protective principles of the Republican party are being violated by this bill and by some Democrats who assert that the time-honored protective policy of the Democratic party is being profaned by this measure; while those in the other camp are exclusively Democrats who believe that the time-honored free-trade principle, the constitutional free-trade principle of the great historic and only consistent free-trade party, is being desecrated and polluted.

Any attempt, therefore, Mr. Chairman, to make this measure conform to the views of either camp of opponents would simply render more energetic the opposition of the other camp. They are apparently fundamentally irreconcilable. The leaders, however, on the left assure us that they and their followers, if they shall not be able to amend this bill to conform with their views, will accept it as it is, giving as their reason for this course that they believe that it contains less of the virus

of protection than the legislation which is now in force. This, Mr. Chairman, seems to be the strategic situation. The objections that have been so vigorously made to this measure are neither trivial nor captious, but are rather of such a character as to command most accurate analysis and open-minded unprejudiced consideration. Let us then at the outset, Mr. Chairman, recall the exact status of the laws that now govern the commercial intercourse between the United States and the Philippine Islands, which this bill seeks in some way to modify. In the first place, when we emerged from chaos resulting from the war with Spain, we passed on the 8th of March, 1902, an act entitled "An act temporarily to provide revenues for the Philippine Islands, and for other purposes." This act, which is now in force, provides that goods coming into the United States from the Philippine Islands, if they are wholly the growth and product of those islands, shall pay 75 per cent of the Dingley rate. All other goods coming to the United States by way of the Philippine Islands pay, of course, the full Dingley duty. On the 3d of March, 1905, we passed a Philippine tariff bill to take the place of the Philippine tariff legislation provided by the Insular Commission.

This act provides for duties on goods coming into the Philippine Islands from all the world, including the United States, and I wish to call special attention, Mr. Chairman, to the fact that this act of March 3, 1905, provides for certain export duties, especially on hemp, indigo, cocoa, sugar, and tobacco. Now, then, in what respect does the present bill modify existing law? The measure which we are now considering is as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the second section of the act entitled "An act temporarily to provide revenue for the Philippine Islands, and for other purposes," approved March 8, 1902, is hereby amended to read as follows:

"Sec. 2. That on and after the passage of this act there shall be levied, collected, and paid upon all articles coming into the United States from the Philippine Islands the rates of duty which are required to be levied, collected, and paid upon like articles imported from foreign countries: *Provided*, That all articles wholly the growth and product of the Philippine Islands coming into the United States from the Philippine Islands shall hereafter be admitted free of duty, except sugar and tobacco, manufactured and unmanufactured, upon which there shall be levied, collected, and paid only 25 per centum of the rates of duty aforesaid: *And provided further*, That the rates of duty which are required hereby to be levied, collected, and paid upon products of the Philippine Islands coming into the United States shall be less any duty or taxes levied, collected, and paid thereon upon the shipment thereof from the Philippine Islands, as provided by the act of the United States Philippine Commission referred to in section 1 of this act, under such rules and regulations as the Secretary of the Treasury may prescribe; but all articles the growth and product of the Philippine Islands admitted into the ports of the United States free of duty under the provisions of this act, and coming directly from said islands to the United States for use and consumption therein, shall be hereafter exempt from any export duties imposed in the Philippine Islands: *Provided, however*, That in consideration of the rates of duty aforesaid, all articles wholly the growth and product of the United States, going into the Philippine Islands, shall hereafter be admitted free of duty, except sugar and tobacco, manufactured and unmanufactured, upon which no higher rate of duty shall be levied, collected, and paid than is laid upon articles of like character coming from the Philippine Islands into the United States:

And provided further, That on and after the 11th day of April, 1909, all articles and merchandise going from the United States into the Philippine Islands, and all articles wholly the growth and product of the Philippine Islands coming into the United States from the Philippine Islands shall be admitted free of duty: *And provided further*, That in addition to said duty when levied and in case said articles are admitted into the United States free of duty, there shall be paid upon articles of merchandise of Philippine Islands manufacture coming into the United States and withdrawn for consumption or sale a tax equal to the internal-revenue tax imposed in the United States upon the like articles of merchandise of domestic manufacture; such tax to be paid by internal-revenue stamp or stamps to be purchased and provided by the Commissioner of Internal Revenue and to be procured from the collector of internal revenue at or most convenient to the port of entry of said merchandise in the United States, and to be affixed under such regulations as the Commissioner of Internal Revenue, with the approval of the Secretary of the Treasury, shall prescribe, and such articles of Philippine Islands manufacture mentioned in this proviso shall be exempt from payment of any tax imposed by the internal-revenue laws of the Philippine Islands: *And provided further*, That in addition to the duty heretofore provided when levied and in case said articles are admitted into the Philippine Islands free of duty, there shall be paid upon articles of merchandise manufactured in the United States and going into the Philippine Islands and withdrawn for consumption or sale, a tax equal to the internal-revenue tax imposed in the Philippine Islands upon the like articles of merchandise when manufactured in the Philippine Islands; such tax to be paid by internal-revenue stamps or otherwise as provided by the laws in force in the Philippine Islands upon the like articles; and such articles manufactured in the United States mentioned in this proviso and going into the Philippine Islands shall be exempt from payment of any tax imposed by the internal-revenue laws of the United States. All the moneys collected under this section as amended shall be paid over and disposed of as provided in section 4 of the act hereby amended, and shall not be covered into the Treasury of the United States."

As will be seen, it contains four principal features: First, that all goods wholly the growth of the Philippine Islands coming into the United States shall be admitted free except sugar and tobacco, which shall pay 25 per cent of the Dingley rate; and that all other goods coming by way of the Philippine

Islands shall, of course, pay the full Dingley rates. Second, that sugar and tobacco in their various forms going from the United States shall be admitted into the Philippines free of duty. Third, that these provisions are to remain in force until April 11, 1909, when there is to be free interchange of all commodities between the United States and the archipelago. Fourth, that goods that were imported into the United States and held in bond and withdrawn after the passage of this bill shall pay the rates that were in force when the goods were brought in.

Now, stated in their broadest terms, the reasons for the passage of this bill are these:

First, we believe it is approved by the great majority of the people in the United States;

Second, it will prove of mutual benefit to the people of the Philippine Islands and the United States in their commercial intercourse with each other; and

Third, we know that the passage of this bill is earnestly desired by all intelligent Filipinos.

Now, Mr. Chairman, let us direct our attention to the objections that have been made to this measure, and at the outset let us consider our sources of knowledge respecting the present situation. We have, first, the report of the officers of the United States who have been in the Philippine Islands, including the reports of the Philippine Commission. We have the testimony of witnesses taken at various times and before various bodies, including the testimony taken for and against this bill by the Ways and Means Committee during the early days of this session.

Now, we have noticed, Mr. Chairman, that in discussing some of this evidence various and contradictory conclusions have been drawn. The variety of conclusions that have been drawn from some of the public testimony reminds me very much of the traditional versatility of Dean Swift in finding texts for his wonderful discourses suitable for all occasions. Tradition has it that at one time he informed a party of wits with whom he was spending the evening that on the following Sunday he proposed to preach a sermon against the extravagant headdresses of the women which were the prevailing fashion at that time. One of his friends laid a wager that he would not be able to find any appropriate text in the scriptures for such a sermon. The versatile Dean accepted the wager, and on the following Sunday the church was crowded to hear his discourse. He announced his text from the twenty-fourth chapter of St. Matthew, in these words:

And let him that is on the house top not come down.

And, said the wily Dean:

I invite the attention of the ladies especially to that clause of the phrase which says "top not come down."

[Laughter.]

Now, if I were going to sermonize on this occasion and were to adopt a text relating to any of the testimony that has been adduced for and against the bill, I should be inclined to direct the sermon against the highly exaggerated testimony of some of the witnesses, and I would shorten up even the text of the Dean and confine it solely to two words, namely, "Come down." [Laughter.]

But, Mr. Chairman, just as this irreverent usage of the scriptures was unbecoming the sacred office of this distinguished ecclesiastic, so it seems to me it ill comports with the dignity and character of this House and the traditions of this Chamber to take testimony before us and use it in a scrappy, disjointed, illogical, and unfair manner for the purpose of maintaining any contention. We all know that opinions that were formed by those who visited the Philippine Islands in 1898 were changed by them in 1902, and many of them had reason to change their views again before 1906. And so, in examining this evidence, and in taking the reports of our officers, we should make all due allowances for changes that have taken place in the opinions of men due to entirely new discoveries.

Now, then, let me call your attention to the views that come from the camp on the left, from those who maintain that this bill should provide at once for free trade between the islands and the United States, and who base this contention very largely upon what they claim to be constitutional grounds. The gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WILLIAMS], whom I regret to see is not here to-day, the undaunted leader of a reduced but undismayed minority, and his very spirited lieutenant, the Prince Rupert of the legions of free trade [laughter], the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CLARK], in opposing the bill in its present form have reverted to the arguments that were made in this House seven or eight years ago on questions relating to the acquisition and control of new territory by the United States. How well do we recall here this afternoon, those of us who were in the Fifty-fifth Congress, the rush of events, as we were constantly confronted with propositions which were un-

familiar to the present generation of statesmen. When we began to discuss the question of how we should treat Porto Rico and the Philippine Islands, I remember very distinctly an eminent leader on the other side of the Chamber saying in debate: "Every man who has read the Constitution knows that it provides that all our Territories shall have a Delegate in the National Congress."

It goes without saying that when he himself, at the suggestion of one of his colleagues, had read the Constitution in the quiet hours of the evening that that part of his speech was dropped when it appeared in permanent form. The problems were new and we had forgotten history. We were rushing to the library for atlases and maps to find out where the Philippine Islands were and how to spell Manila and what the products of the islands were and what the form of government. I remember very well in the closing days of the Fifty-fifth Congress sitting by one of my colleagues who was a distinguished Republican anti-imperialist, when an equally distinguished Democratic anti-imperialist came over and sat beside him and said: "Tell me, are these 'Philippians' the same chaps that St. Paul wrote the epistle to?" [Laughter.] And the Republican said, "Yes, I think they are the same." [Renewed laughter.] And the Democrat said, "I thought so;" and I remember that he wrote to those fellows to work out their own salvation [renewed laughter], with fear and trembling [laughter], and I think that is a pretty good reason for leaving them alone. [Renewed laughter.]

So with these new problems and with considerable confusion of ideas in reference to the territory itself and to the principles which we should apply in governing them, the minority, who were not responsible for the government of these islands, opposed the Republican policy because, as they claimed, any territory that was acquired by the United States, whether by war or by cession or by treaty, passed automatically under the Constitution, and the inhabitants of those territories automatically received all the rights and privileges that were possessed by the inhabitants of the States within the Union. So the Republicans, who were called upon to make legislation and pass laws for those islands, reverting to history, found that in the acquisition of territory in 1803 and 1819, and again after the war with Mexico, and in the Gadsden purchase, Congress had always maintained the right to legislate for these newly acquired territories, free from restrictions applicable to the States themselves. So the Republicans have always maintained that in legislating for Porto Rico and for the Philippines Congress has full plenary powers, and may establish free trade or a tariff, as we deem wise and best for all parties in interest. I want to call attention here to that clause in the Constitution which gives us that power. It is found in the second paragraph of section 3 of Article IV of the Constitution:

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

So we proceeded to legislate upon that basis. The Supreme Court, in the various cases that came before it, approved of that policy, and the elections that have taken place since 1898—the Congressional and the Presidential elections—have shown that the people of the United States approved of that as a national policy. So to-day, instead of our being under the necessity, as claimed by the gentleman from Mississippi, of giving to these islands free trade, we reserve the right to so legislate for those islands from time to time, and temporarily it may be, for the best interest of all parties concerned.

Now, that being so, the Republicans, who are responsible for the management of this territory, at the present time are called upon to provide revenue for carrying on the government of the Philippine Islands, and the necessity for this revenue is the reason for levying in the present bill a 25 per cent proportion of the Dingley duties on sugar and tobacco coming into this country.

Now, it has been asked why we can not give free trade at once from an economic standpoint. Simply for this reason, and we should keep it clearly in mind, that the United States is now endeavoring to provide a suitable system of internal taxation for raising sufficient revenue for these islands, and we are making good progress.

During the last fiscal year the total revenues from these islands, insular and provincial, amounted to \$17,500,000, against the average amount under the Spanish régime of something like \$13,500,000 a year.

As to the necessity of changing the revenue system and providing new sources of income, and as showing the changes which were needed in the Philippine Islands, let me call your

attention to a few paragraphs in the first report of the Philippine Commission, published in Volume I, 1900, on page 81:

The scheme of government instituted by Spain for the Philippines was in itself far from perfect, and in its practical operations it was open to the gravest objections. It failed to accomplish even the primary ends of good government—the maintenance of peace and order and the even administration of justice; nor can there be any doubt that it proved an engine of oppression and exploitation of the Filipinos. It took their substance in the form of taxes and contributions and gave no equivalent in return. The preceding sections have shown the use made of the public moneys, which was in general an unproductive one. The people paid heavy taxes and were subject to annoying and vexatious restrictions on their rights; yet the country was not developed, roads were not made, popular education was not established. It almost seemed as though the great trust of government had been perverted into a mere instrument for the benefit of the governing class at the expense of their subjects. The revenues were swallowed up by salaries, most of which seemed unnecessary. The very category of public works is only another designation for salaries. There were in reality no public works. The revenues of the archipelago were exhausted by unproductive expenditures on naval and military establishments, on salaries and pensions, on the church, and on the colonial office in Madrid. And the people governed had no redress, as they had no control or voice in the matter.

The most prominent defects in this scheme of government were: (1) The boundless and autocratic powers of the governor-general; (2) the centralization of all governmental functions in Manila; (3) the absence of representative institutions in which the Filipinos might make their needs and desires known; (4) a pernicious system of taxation; (5) a plethora of officials who lived on the country and by their very numbers obstructed, like a circumlocution office, the public business they professed to transact; (6) division of minor responsibilities through the establishment of rival boards and offices; (7) the costliness of the system and the corruption it bred; and (8) confusion between the functions of the state and the functions of the church and of the religious orders.

If these abuses are remedied, if a capable and honest government is instituted, if the Filipinos are permitted to the full extent of their ability to participate in it, if all unnecessary offices are abolished, if church is separated from state, if the public revenues are used solely to defray the legitimate expenses of the government and the cost of duly authorized public works and improvements, including the beginnings of a system of elementary schools—if, in a word, government is administered in the Philippines in the spirit in which it is administered in the United States, the people of that archipelago will, as already a few of them foresee, enjoy more benefits than they dreamed of when they took up arms against the corrupt and oppressive domination of Spain.

And after the lapse of five years, Mr. Chairman, we may congratulate ourselves that all or most of these abuses have been corrected. One of the principal things which has been accomplished has been the doing away with the old system of taxation by which the revenues contributed by the people went into the pockets of the taxgatherers and not for the benefit of the community. Under our régime taxes have been honestly collected, the revenues have been largely increased, roads have been built, the cities have been cleansed, schools have been established, and the people already have begun to enjoy the benefits which are referred to in this report.

But, Mr. Chairman, there can be no such thing as a state without revenue. The government can not be carried on without resources, and in our efforts to lead the Filipinos up to the position of independence it has seemed wise to us who are responsible for this government that the revenues of the Filipinos should come from some established system of taxation and not as charity from the American people.

This is the reason, Mr. Chairman, for leaving 25 per cent duty on the sugar and tobacco coming into the United States and for not granting free trade until after the expiration of the concession given by us in the treaty to Spain. Now, as showing further the benefits that have already accrued in a most striking form under our administration of the archipelago, I would like to insert here an editorial from the Chicago Tribune, entitled "Railways in the Philippine Islands."

RAILWAYS IN THE PHILIPPINES.

One of the chief needs—perhaps the chief need—of the Philippine Islands is adequate means of transportation. The people can not be prosperous until they can get their productions to market. They can not do that without roads, railways, ships. The Philippine government is making the best speed it can to provide these essentials for the people's material well-being and advancement. It has effected great betterments in the roads, which were in an extremely sorry condition at the close of the period of insurrection. Legislation has been enacted for the improvement of interisland shipping, and Colonel Edwards, of the bureau of insular affairs, believes it is a matter of but a short time until there will be a satisfactory system of railways.

Almost thirty years ago Mr. Navarro, a Spanish engineer in the department of public works at Manila, got up a plan for a system of railways on the island of Luzon. The Spanish Government advertised three times for bids before it finally in 1886 got an offer from an English company for the construction of one of the proposed lines, that from Manila to Dagupan, approximately 221 miles in length. The Government guaranteed an income of 8 per cent on \$5,353,700, the cost of building the line, for ninety-nine years. Since American occupation the company owning this road has been granted concessions for extending it about 108 miles.

The Cooper bill authorized the government of the Philippine Islands to assume a contingent liability of \$1,200,000 a year for a period of thirty years to encourage the building of railways. Under this act Secretary Taft advertised for bids for the construction, equipment, maintenance, and operation of lines aggregating 1,233 miles in length. The

800 miles on the island of Luzon are to be built practically according to the original plans of Mr. Navarro. The rest of the system will be on the Visayan Islands and on Panay, Negros, Cebu, Leyte, and Samar. Our Government had better success in getting offers than that of Spain. Spain guaranteed an income from the roads of 8 per cent for ninety-nine years and advertised three times before a single bid was received. The United States offers to guarantee a maximum of 4 per cent for thirty years. When the bids were opened at Washington on December 15 last it was found that one bidder proposed to build 425 miles on Luzon at the rate of 75 miles a year without any guarantee of interest by the government. Another offered to construct 290 miles on Panay, Negros, and Cebu. The latter asked a guarantee of 4 per cent on 95 per cent of the cost of construction.

The responses received on this occasion will doubtless encourage the government to advertise for bids again at an early date. They tend to justify Colonel Edwards's optimistic prediction that it will not be long before the Philippines will have railways covering all routes where they can be made profitable. The railway is destined to play a leading part not only in the industrial development, but in the civilization of the islands. The locomotive will be an able assistant to the educator and the administrator.

And this new condition of things, by which the investment of capital has been made not only safe but profitable, has been brought about by the wise administration of the islands by this Government during the past five years. But the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WILLIAMS], who is now in a position where he can simply criticize, insists that we ought to give free trade at once to the islands, and that then we ought to give independence. No one knows, Mr. Chairman, better than the learned and scholarly gentleman from Mississippi—and I know of no better student of history in this body—no one knows better that he that the progress of civilization and the development of government always proceeds per gradum and not per saltum. Those who are responsible for government, bearing this principle in mind, must see to it that all advances are made gradually and as conditions will permit.

The contention of the gentleman from Mississippi that we should at once give free trade, and then give independence, reminds me of the traveler who was leaving on a steamboat, and after the ship had got 20 feet from the dock found that his companion was left behind, and called out to him, "Come on, don't be a coward, you can make it in two jumps." [Laughter.]

Well, Mr. Chairman, just as air and water would have been an unsubstantial footing for the traveler's second leap, so the superheated, declamatory atmosphere of the hustings that sometimes escapes almost unconsciously in this Chamber is an extremely unsubstantial footing from which to take a step in an important matter of Government development.

If the gentleman from Mississippi were the leader of the majority in this House, or if he were the President of the United States—and I know of no abler man for his party to select as leader—if he were in a position responsible for this Government, he, in his wisdom, would know that in proceeding thus gradually we are proceeding in the only wise and safe way.

Now, let me invite your attention to the objections that have been made by those in the right camp, the objections that came from those who believe that in this bill we are violating the protection policy of the Republican party. The views of these gentlemen are entitled to most careful consideration, because, as I have said, we do not admit that we are passing this legislation because we must, but because we think it is wise and prudent. In my opinion the gentlemen who oppose this legislation because they are fearful that it will injure certain important interests are perfectly correct in the stand which they take, that nothing in the Constitution or the laws makes this legislation compulsory, as is contended by the leaders on the other side. And before we pass to the consideration more in detail of these objections I want, Mr. Chairman, to speak of one exaggerated statement which I am sure we all regret very much has crept into this debate.

A few gentlemen have strayed so far away from the paths of probabilities even as to suggest that this largely altruistic measure—favored by the President, seconded by the Secretary of War, asked for by the majority of American people—is conceived and pressed in the interests of some trust or combination.

Mr. Chairman, I know that it has been somewhat of a fashion of late outside of this Chamber to cast some aspersions and ridicule upon it. Mostly these criticisms are good-natured gibes at a public body. Now and then, however, we hear in this Chamber, as we heard during the last session of Congress from an eloquent gentleman on the other side of the House, some reflections cast upon the ability, the character, and the dignity of this body. Mr. Chairman, the good-natured flings of the public orator and the sincere criticism of friends of this Government we can accept in the spirit in which they are offered. But I think we should on all suitable occasions, Mr. Chairman, rebuke, and rebuke with all the emphasis in our power, all aspersions, whether from without or from within, upon the integrity of

this great assembly. I say to you, Mr. Chairman, that from the time that Muhlenberg called to order the first session of the First Congress and looked down into the eyes of such men as Sherman and Trumbull and Ames and Van Rensselaer, Hugh Williamson, and James Madison—from that time to this there never, in my opinion, has been a time when the character of this body, on both sides of the aisle, for ability, integrity, and devotion to the public interests has been greater than it is at the present time. [Applause.]

Why, Mr. Chairman, the octopus has not been spawned that can ever influence this body to advance any legislation that is dishonest or dishonorable or that seeks to thwart the will or violate the national conscience. And, Mr. Chairman, it has not entered into the imagination of any man to conceive of an octopus who would be so far lost to all sense of his octocean safety as to attempt to tackle the President of the United States [applause]; and if he should attempt to take the President and manage him in one tentacle and the Secretary of War in another he would think that he had been struck by a typhoon from above and an earthquake from below off the island of Negros. [Laughter and applause.] Why, I should not have been surprised if somebody had risen and maintained that, as the carabao would be admitted under this bill free of duty, therefore capital in the United States was eager and impatient to go to the Philippines and gather together in flocks or herds or shoals or beavies or schools, or in whatever other forms these beasts migrate, and swim them over here to the port of San Francisco without any cost of transportation, so that they could bring them in here to compete with our cattle upon a thousand hills in furnishing to the free-born American citizen an oriental substitute for the traditional beefsteak of our fathers, and that this bill was really in the interest of the beef trust. [Laughter and applause.] Mr. Chairman, such exaggerated statements, it seems to me, are hardly worthy of consideration or of mention, unless it be to show the unsubstantial grounds upon which some of the opponents of this bill stand.

But, Mr. Chairman, I have great sympathy for those who really feel that the interests in which they have embarked are going to be ruined or seriously retarded by the passage of this bill, and I have a great respect for the arguments that have been adduced here by those gentlemen representing districts in which such persons reside. I have thought, myself, that some of us who favor this bill have not been sufficiently alive to the business situations in some of those districts represented by Members who oppose the measure. The distinguished gentleman from Missouri who thinks that this bill should provide at once for free trade might take a different view of it if his environments were different. If, for example, the Filipino could produce and lay down in the city of St. Louis as good wine as they make in the State of Missouri, and at a less price and in unlimited quantities, I am sure that the gentleman from Missouri would scan the measure with great care before giving it his unqualified approval as a Democratic measure. But the gentleman from Missouri goes much further than to insist that this should be a free-trade measure. The gentleman from Missouri, in a colloquy between himself and the gentleman from Louisiana, made the statement that the Dingley tariff bill is a curse to the whole American people. Well, Mr. Chairman, if it has been a curse to the whole American people it has been pro tanto a curse to a very large part of them who reside in the glorious Commonwealth of Missouri, so ably represented by our eloquent friend.

How has the Dingley law cursed Missouri? Why, it seems to me it has cursed that great State in just the way that Balaam uttered his curse for Balak the son of Zippor. His curses turned to blessings in his mouth before he could utter them, and he said, "How shall I curse, whom God hath not cursed?" and looking forward to the great prosperity which the chosen people were to enjoy, he uttered that splendid prophecy of what he saw in his vision: "How goodly are thy tents, O Jacob! and thy tabernacles, O Israel! As the valleys are they spread forth, as gardens by the river's side, as the trees of lign aloes, which the Lord hath planted, and as cedar trees beside the waters." What a perfectly ideal picture of Missouri at the present time—a garden by the river's side [applause on the Republican side] and a very fruitful garden indeed.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the gentleman a question if it will not interrupt him.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Illinois yield?

Mr. BOUTELL. Certainly; it will not interrupt me at all, and I yield with great pleasure.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Do you think that Missouri owes its rich land and its fine crops and splendid climate to the Dingley bill?

Mr. BOUTELL. No, it does not, but it owes to the Dingley

bill the opportunity to sell those crops to people in the United States who have the money to buy them. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Let me ask you another question.

Mr. BOUTELL. Yes.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Has the Dingley bill ever enabled the Missouri farmers to sell a bushel of corn or a bushel of wheat or a pound of pork or a pound of beef in any foreign markets?

Mr. BOUTELL. The Dingley bill has enabled the people of Missouri to sell barrels and barrels of great red apples, and cases and cases of grapes, and stooks and stooks of wine a great deal higher than they could have sold them without the Dingley bill. Mr. Chairman, nine years ago the State of Missouri was in a desolate condition. The mortgages covered that State until it looked like a tented field. To-day there are not enough mortgages on Missouri farms to furnish paper on which to write the gentleman's speech in which he assailed the system under which these mortgages were paid off. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Why, Mr. Chairman, the State of Missouri to-day literally flows in milk and honey, and it is the greatest honey-producing State in the country. The laboring man in the State of Missouri has buckwheat cakes and honey for breakfast, roast beef for dinner, and fried chicken for supper. [Applause on the Republican side.] Blessings have flowed in upon that State during the past eight years from all sides and to all people. The farmers have been prosperous, the manufacturers have been prosperous, the laboring men have been well paid, and they get more for their money. The lead and zinc works in the gentleman's State, under the Dingley law, which doubled the duties on these minerals, have increased their output nearly 300 per cent. The men employed have increased nearly 50 per cent. On all sides and from all sources prosperity and blessings, instead of curses, have come to Missouri.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Now, Mr. Chairman—

Mr. BOUTELL. Just a moment, until I have described the rest of the blessings, and then we will take them all in at once. [Laughter.] During the last year they held the largest and finest, or perhaps I ought to say next to the largest and the finest, exposition that was ever held on earth. And why? Because when that exposition was planned the National Treasury had money available, and we were glad to use it for the purpose of putting that exposition on its feet—money brought into the Treasury under the Dingley law, when it was empty and when the Dingley law was passed. [Applause on the Republican side.] And it put the money into the pockets of the people, so that they could go to Missouri and spend their money, and to some people it gave pockets—who did not have even these before the law was passed; and the greatest of all the blessings that the Dingley law brought was that at the last election the great Commonwealth of Missouri was brought into the Republican column for Roosevelt and Fairbanks, and put a Republican Senator at the other end of the Capitol, and brought nine Republican Congressmen from Missouri into this Chamber. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Now, Mr. Chairman—

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. Chairman—

Mr. BOUTELL. I have just come to the last blessing. [Laughter.] It is one that interests the gentleman especially.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. All right.

Mr. BOUTELL. I do not want to leave this out; this is the best of all.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. All right; put it in.

Mr. BOUTELL. Now, Mr. Chairman, in view of all this that has taken place under the blessings of the Dingley law, I can think of only one other blessing that it could confer upon the State of Missouri, and that is, as it has induced his colleague, the learned gentleman who addressed us this morning [Mr. DE ARMOND], finally to make up his mind that free trade is an idle and academic dream, the last, the greatest, the supreme blessing that the Dingley law could confer upon Missouri and her able Representative who sits before me would be to convert him, body, soul, and spirit, to the principles of the Republican party, and to send him here as a Republican Senator to see that these blessings are not lost in the future. [Loud applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. Chairman—

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. BOUTELL] has expired.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman be allowed to finish his speech without limit.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CLARK]

asks that the gentleman from Illinois be permitted to finish his speech without limit. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. BOUTELL. I thank the gentleman from Missouri for his courtesy, and I would say, Mr. Chairman, that it would take this entire session to give all the blessings that have come to the State of Missouri under the Dingley law. [Laughter.]

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I want to make two remarks. One of them is, that I desire to thank the gentleman for his splendid eulogy on Missouri and, second, one is to inform him and the House and the country that we were brought up on that bill of fare that he has described, and have always used it, namely, high tariff, low tariff, and no tariff. God Almighty gave it to us and the Republican party can not take it away from us. [Laughter and applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. BOUTELL. And the Dingley bill has given your people the money with which to buy it. Now, if the gentleman wants to put to a fair test his proposition that the Dingley bill is a curse, or his proposition to tear down the custom-houses of the country, I will just meet him on fair grounds. We are going to have a Congressional election before very long, and if the gentleman will accept my proposition I will agree to go over in his district and spend all the time that is necessary to demonstrate that the people of Missouri don't approve of these propositions. If he will go before the people of his district next November with the alternative proposition of either tearing down the custom-houses and removing the duty on musical instruments—including the great Schwarzer zither, which surpasses any instrument of the kind in the world—on pearl buttons, on wines, on grapes, on apples, on horses, on Portland cement, on lead, on zinc ore, or of slightly increasing the duties on these different articles, I will undertake to get nine out of ten men of that district to vote for the latter alternative.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Is that your proposition?

Mr. BOUTELL (continuing). And the morning after the election I think we will find that the candidate who was in favor of a slight increase rather than the total abolition of all duties will have been elected, and in the "cold, gray morning" we shall see the gentleman from Missouri sitting in solitary but dejected grandeur amid the ruins of the custom-houses and the wreck of his own political fortune, murmuring sadly to himself the words of that pathetic Pike County ballad:

How vain it was for me to play

When all the rest stood pat;

[Laughter.]

I hardly know what hit me,

Or even where I am at.

[Great laughter.]

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I want to make one statement and ask the gentleman one question. I will welcome the gentleman to my district in a joint discussion in every county in it on the proposition that he has made. More than that, I will welcome any living Republican to a joint discussion in that district of this proposition. Now, the speech from which he was quoting about tearing down custom-houses was made nine years ago. I want to ask the gentleman this question: How many gentlemen on that side of the Chamber he thinks are going to make a speech that will live nine years? [Great laughter.]

Mr. BOUTELL. Mr. Chairman, I can only make a guess that the part of this speech at least which describes the great blessings that have been conferred upon the people of Missouri under the Dingley bill and the present glorious condition of that State will last not only nine years, but ninety and nine years. [Laughter and applause.]

Now coming back to what I was saying before these digressions relating to blessings—coming back and gathering up the thread of my argument—I think that we all should perhaps feel more deeply the force of the arguments of those who represent rice, sugar, and tobacco constituencies if we were similarly situated.

Now, Mr. Chairman, it has been maintained by those on the right in opposition to this bill that this measure will ruin certain industries—that, I think, must be considered an exaggerated statement—or that it will prejudicially retard the development of certain industries. Let us consider first the facts and then the probabilities. The industries which are supposed to be prejudicially affected by this bill are rice, tobacco, cigars, and sugar. What is the situation as regards rice, Mr. Chairman? I want to assure the committee that I am not going into any elaborate details or any complicated figures. As I said in my opening remarks, I should be glad if in closing this debate we can consider the facts and arguments before us from a

judicial point of view. Let us, then, take the facts as they actually exist and then the probabilities.

Now, the facts in reference to the rice industry are these: The Philippine Islanders consume annually something over a billion and a quarter pounds of rice, as nearly as I have been able to make out from the statement of the Department. The Philippine Islanders produced last year, say, 850,000,000 pounds of rice, and imported from other countries, say, 500,000,000 pounds. The Philippine Islanders export no rice. The United States produces and consumes about 500,000,000 pounds of rice, and exports about 100,000,000 pounds, and offsets that by imports of about the same amount. It does not seem possible—certainly it does not seem probable—that this great rice-consuming country, the Philippine Archipelago, will ever be in a position to ship rice to the United States in anything but very insignificant quantities. It should be borne in mind that rice is almost the sole article of food among the Filipinos.

As I said, they consume about a billion and a quarter pounds of rice annually, whereas the United States, with more than ten times the population of the Philippine Islands, only consume about 500,000,000 pounds. There is this to be said for the encouragement of the rice industry in this country, that the consumption of rice is increasing rapidly in this country as its value as a food product is becoming better known; so that I do not think that those engaged in the rice culture in this country have any ground for fear. On the other hand, with freedom of trade between the archipelago and the United States, with the people of the Philippine Islands prospering in their staple products of hemp and copra, they will become importers themselves of rice from the United States.

Next let me speak of the cigars and the tobacco. What are the great striking facts in reference to this industry? These, without wearying you with details, mentioning just what we can carry in our minds, are as follows: We produce and consume in the United States annually 7,500,000,000 cigars. Our importations, mostly those of a superior quality, are far less than 100,000,000. Our annual average increase in the consumption of cigars is about 325,000,000. What were the importations to the United States from the Philippine Islands last year, with a preferential against other countries by the refunding of the exports? Leaf tobacco, none; cigars, \$6,700 worth, barely enough to cover returning travelers and Army and Navy officers. Substantially no Philippine cigars have been imported commercially into the United States; cigarettes, \$30 worth; other forms of manufactured tobacco, including snuff and the like, none. That is the story of the total effect of Philippine cigars and tobacco upon the United States under the preferences given to the archipelago last year.

My view of this matter, Mr. Chairman, bearing these facts in mind, is that never under any possible circumstances will Philippine tobacco or Philippine cigars compete in any way with the American product. When our people want a low-priced cigar, we can now make in this country from American tobacco and by well-paid American labor the best low-priced cigar that is made in the world. If it were not too late, speaking of the quality of the Philippine cigars, I should like to illustrate their quality by the names given to them by a humorous cigar manufacturer and retailer in my district, because it seems to me they illustrate what we have at present to fear from the Philippine cigars better than anything that I have heard. I want to talk about facts now, and I propose to talk of probabilities a few minutes later on.

I went into one of these stores, kept by a friend of mine, who has a small factory in the rear and a fine store in front, and although I myself do not smoke, I asked him if he had any Philippine cigars. He smiled a peculiar, incredulous smile, and said, "Yes; he had three varieties." I said I would like to see them, and he put his weird-looking products of oriental manufacture before me and told me their names. He said he called one brand the "New Year's Eve," the second, "One Hundred Per Cent," and the third, the "Boomerang." I said: "Where in the world did you get those names for those peculiar-looking cigars?" He said: "Those names are my own. Those cigars came here nameless. They are orphans, and I gave them their names. The 'New Year's Eve' is the cigar I sell to the man who has sworn off. He smokes one of those on New Year's eve and he never wants to smoke another cigar as long as he lives." I said, "What is the 'One Hundred Per Cent'?" He said, "Well, I give away cigars occasionally to my customers, but of course whenever I give away a cigar I expect that the man will buy twice as much on account of the cigar I gave him. So when I give away a cigar I offer him the 'One Hundred Per Cent,' and when he has smoked it he has to smoke two of my best cigars to take the taste of that one out of his mouth." Then I said, "Well, what is the 'Boomerang'?" "The 'Boomerang,'" said he, "is a campaign cigar." I said, "I do not understand why you give it that name. I should be afraid to give one of those to anybody during a campaign." He said: "That is just the point. When you are running for office you get somebody to give about a thousand of those cigars to your opponent, and the cigars that come to him in that way he naturally distributes freely to his acquaintances. Every time he gives one of those cigars away he loses a vote." [Laughter.]

So that even popular humor and wit have thrown a character around those products and given them a name and reputation, and I do not think the American workman need have any fear whatever of competition from cigars of this character.

Mr. KEIFER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman let me ask him one question?

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

Mr. BOUTELL. Certainly.

Mr. KEIFER. I have listened to the gentleman's splendid speech and agree with most of it, but I should like to know how much revenue is expected to arise, if this bill becomes a law, from the introduction into this country of such cigars as he has just described?

Mr. BOUTELL. That is quite a fair question and one that I expected to answer later in detail. My best guess, and it is only a guess—I am simply telling what I know of Philippine cigars—is that the revenue on cigars coming from the Philippine Islands will be substantially nothing. I do think, however, that of course there will be some revenue from sugar, and I think that this sugar feature of the measure is one that we should scrutinize with great care. Now, what are the facts with regard to sugar?

As I recollect it, we consume in this country annually about 2,700,000 tons of sugar. Now, where do we get this sugar? From the cane fields in this country, from the beet-sugar farms in the country, from Hawaii and Porto Rico—about, in round figures, 900,000 tons. From foreign countries now paying the full Dingley rates, 600,000 tons. From Cuba, 1,200,000 tons, paying 80 per cent of the Dingley rates.

It will be observed, Mr. Chairman, that we are now compelled to import in the neighborhood of 2,000,000 tons of sugar a year. What, if anything, have we had from the Philippine Islands? During the time of our occupation the importation into this country from the Philippine Islands has ranged from 2,000 tons up to 38,000 tons. The arguments that have been made on the floor of this House in favor of the sugar industry, it seems to me, has been remarkably fair and candid, but these arguments have necessarily proceeded upon the testimony that was given before the Commission, and before the committee of the House. And some of the statements before that committee, and some of the statements that have been published for the purpose of influencing Members, have been of that highly exaggerated character as to be away beyond our serious attention, and merit, it seems to me, only ridicule.

I know of no better thing that has been said in this debate than the summing up of the character of that testimony by the eloquent gentleman from Missouri. It seems as though some of the witnesses were basing their calculation on three crops in the Philippine Islands. First, the entire arable land was sown with sugar, and then after that was garnered the entire arable land was sown with tobacco, and when that had been cut the entire arable land was sown with rice, and all three crops were sent yearly to the United States. I have seen a printed statement giving the acreage in sugar last year. I think it was 150,000 acres, and then showing how much sugar could be raised by increasing the acreage. It went on in a grand crescendo, until it stated that 1,500,000 acres would furnish all the sugar needed in the United States, and 3,000,000 acres all the sugar needed in Europe. When I had read this statement, and other similar documents intended to influence the judgment of the Members of this House, I could not think but that they were worthy only of that consideration which we should give to those portentous suppositions with which our mothers and our nurses used to startle us in infancy:

If all the world were water.
And all the water were ink,
What should we do for bread and cheese?
What should we do for drink?

Such wild exaggerations can only be answered by suppositions still more ridiculous:

If all the isles were sugar
And all the sugar cigars,
The Philippines could serve the earth
And export some to Mars.

[Great laughter.]

Of course we expect this bill to help the Filipinos; of course we expect this bill to encourage cigar and tobacco production

in the Philippines; of course we expect the importations to this country to increase, and in my opinion—now comes the matter of probability—they will not increase to any large extent. What is the great export of the Philippines? Hemp. There were \$22,000,000 worth of hemp exported last year as against two or three millions of sugar, the next largest crop. What is the greatest food crop of the Philippines? Rice. Nearly 900,000,000 pounds were raised last year. The sugar and tobacco of the Philippine Islands, so far as we can judge from evidence worthy of consideration, beyond that necessary to supply their own wants will naturally seek the markets at their doors, namely, the Orient. There will be a slightly increased importation of sugar into this country, but I should doubt whether for many years to come it would ever go beyond the 200,000 tons limit. So that it seems to me, Mr. Chairman, that those who are interested in the sugar industry need have no fear of the effect of this measure on their industry.

As the gentleman from Massachusetts so well said, the Americans are an energetic people; they are an advancing people, and they are going, I hope, in some numbers to the Philippine Islands. Some one once said at a banquet in Alaska that since the landing at Plymouth Rock and Jamestown the great army of American pioneers had never disbanded. And it never will. They have crossed the plains, scaled the mountains, and breasted the waves of the Pacific. Ordinarily immigration and capital move along isothermal lines, but isothermal lines are too narrow and restricted to restrain the energy and progress of the American people, and we may hope assuredly to do something by American energy and American capital to advance the condition of the Philippine Islands. But, Mr. Chairman, we need have no fear in this country of competition with the laborers of those islands. We all know that our immigration laws have been thrown around them; we know the Chinese can not come in there, and our farmers and our tobacco raisers and our cigar manufacturers, with all the capital and energy that will be attracted from this country need have no fear of the only labor which is there, namely, the Filipino labor. Look over the history of the world, Mr. Chairman and gentlemen. Never since the dawn of history in the competition for the world's supremacy has a man with a coat ever had need to fear competition with a man who wears only sunshine. [Laughter.] So it will be to the end of time.

Now, Mr. Chairman, let me say, in closing, a few words in reference to what I think is the strongest reason why we should pass this bill. I stated some time ago that in broad terms one of the reasons for passing this bill is because all the intelligent people of the Philippine Islands want it. That, Mr. Chairman, is my principal reason for voting for this bill. Without going into the details of the reason why the Filipinos want this bill, let me give you briefly the grounds for this position which I take. I have heard, if my recollection serves me right, even in this debate, that old wish expressed, "Oh, that Dewey had sailed away from Manila the day after he destroyed the Spanish fleet." I should like, Mr. Chairman, at this time to use whatever influence I have to give final and decent burial to the phrase. Whenever that phrase is uttered it is uttered by men, however good their motive, who forget that Dewey's victory at Manila was the first and not the last act of the war with Spain; that the Philippine Islands were Spanish territory; that it was three months before the war was closed. For Dewey on his own motion to have sailed away from Manila the day after his victory would have been a crime. For the National Administration to have withdrawn him would have been worse than a crime, it would have been a grave national blunder. [Applause on the Republican side.]

So, then, we were compelled by a decent regard, if you please, for the opinion of mankind to keep the Philippine Islands. The treaty with Spain ceded them to us and provided the status of their citizens should be fixed by Congress. Now, without expressing my personal wish for the future of the islands, let me say that, so far as I am aware, no man in this country, whether in or out of the sphere of political influence, has ever expressed the view that the Philippine Islands should be left by us at once. In other words, whether we occupy the Philippine Islands for a year or a century, or whatever the ultimate outcome will be, while we hold them we need their friendship. We have heard it stated in this debate by many gentlemen that they would like to see the Philippines given their independence by the United States. But I ask you, Mr. Chairman, is there any man in this Chamber, any man within the sound of my voice, any man within the confines of this Republic, who would like to see the Philippine Islands taken from us? When our war with Spain broke out the Philippine Islands constituted Spain's weakest point. So long as we hold the Philippine Islands they will be our weakest point in any naval contest.

While we hold them it is of the utmost importance that we should conciliate them.

As we look back over the pages of history we find that no partnership of any kind between two people has ever been successful, no amalgamation has ever been peaceful except where the stronger party, by every possible means, has conciliated the weaker. The victories of Greece were lost because she treated the inhabitants of all conquered territory as barbarians. The legions of Rome were unable to stand against the hatred that Rome herself had put into the hearts of the Germans. The spirit of those Teutons that slept under the drums and trampings of innumerable conquests rose and spurred on their descendants to victory. The Napoleonic system fell to pieces on account of the scorn and contempt with which he treated the people whom he had released from the thralldom of feudalism. To-day Finland and Poland are crouching lion's whelps beside the Russian bear because of the attempt to Russify these patriotic, liberty-loving, intelligent people. [Applause.] Great Britain learned from her American colonies a lesson for all time, and at once began a conciliatory course toward her other colonies, with the result that to-day her over-sea possessions contain the most loyal subjects of the Empire. So whatever may be in the future it is of the utmost importance that the Filipinos should be our friends.

You conciliate a nation as you conciliate an individual, by giving him what he wishes, not by offering him something equally as good in your opinion or by forcing upon him something that he does not wish. And the friendship that we want with all the people whom we control is not the subservient, time-serving regard of a sycophant to a condescending almoner. What we want is the frank and open friendship that may exist between nations as between individuals. And in passing this bill we give the Filipinos the right hand of fellowship and a pledge of friendship.

Mr. Chairman, I do not belong to that school of philosophers which believes that, unlike individuals, nations must always be governed by selfish motives. I believe that in a democracy especially there is among the people what we may call national generosity and a national conscience. St. Paul, who wrote that letter to the Philippians, was the broadest-minded man of his day. He was not only an enthusiastic missionary, he was a great statesman. He would have adorned the councils of any country in ancient or modern times. And when he said to those people in that letter, "Think not every man of his own things, but every man also on the things of others," he enunciated a principle of conduct as applicable to nations as to individuals. If we take this principle as our guide, every dictate of national honor should lead us to give the Filipinos what they ask. The warning voice of all the ages cries to us:

Go put your creed into your deed,
Nor speak with double tongue.

Let us, so far as in us lies, show those people what we mean by civil liberty and self-government; and if the strain ever comes while we have control over them, let us hope that they will be amongst the most loyal supporters of our flag.

Now, then, with what, it seems to me, is this strong, this absolutely unanswerable reason for voting for this bill, what shall we say for these economic grounds of opposition that simply rest in the future? Those who fear that their industries will be injured have simply been alarmed by phantoms of their imagination. Our worst fears, Mr. Chairman, are always those which are never realized. The phantoms that have appeared to disturb those who antagonize this legislation are phantoms of the mist. They are only visible in the lower places. Let us take a broad view of this proposition. We are summoned to discharge a great responsibility, to take an important step in government development. To you, my friends, who have honestly opposed this measure let me say, stand on the height, face the rising sun,

And in thinnest air shall melt away those phantom shapes forlorn,
When across your brow you feel the odor-winds of morn.

Mr. Chairman, in determining our course in the present emergency, it seems clear to me that the path of economic wisdom is also the path of national duty and of national honor, and that this measure should receive the unanimous vote of the House of Representatives. [Loud applause.]

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Chairman, as I understand this is the last speech, and there are no other requests to speak, I move that the committee do now rise; and then we can take up the bill in the morning for amendment.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. OLMSTED, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that

committee had further considered House bill No. 3—the Philippine tariff bill—and had come to no resolution thereon.

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. 21. An act granting a pension to Mary G. Bright—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

S. 783. An act granting an increase of pension to Moses H. Sawyer—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

S. 1408. An act granting an increase of pension to Julia W. Estes—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

S. 988. An act granting a pension to Russell A. McKinley—to the Committee on Pensions.

S. 336. An act granting a pension to Abraham M. Cory—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

S. 2082. An act granting an increase of pension to Elizabeth T. Carpenter—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

SWEARING IN OF A MEMBER.

Mr. Hermann appeared at the bar of the House and took the oath of office.

Mr. PAYNE. I move that the House do now adjourn.

The SPEAKER. Will the gentleman withhold that motion for a moment?

PONCE RAILWAY AND LIGHT COMPANY, PORTO RICO.

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

The Senate and House of Representatives:

Referring to section 32 of the act approved April 12, 1900, entitled "An act temporarily to provide revenues and a civil government for Porto Rico, and for other purposes," I transmit herewith an ordinance enacted by the executive council of Porto Rico granting to the Ponce Railway and Light Company, its successors and assigns, the right to pass its cars over a certain piece of track on Real street, Ponce Playa, P. R., owned and operated by the American Railroad Company of Porto Rico.

This ordinance has been approved by the President.

Attention is invited to the accompanying report of the Secretary of State.

THEODORE ROOSEVELT.

THE WHITE HOUSE, January 15, 1906.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE.

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to Mr. ALLEN of New Jersey, indefinitely, on account of illness.

Mr. PAYNE. I renew my motion to adjourn, Mr. Speaker.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly (at 4 o'clock and 34 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, the following executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a copy of a communication from the Acting Secretary of War submitting an estimate of appropriation for the Isthmian Canal Commission—to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a copy of a communication from the Secretary of the Interior submitting an estimate of appropriation for the International Seismological Association—to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a copy of a communication from the chief clerk of the Court of Claims submitting an estimate of appropriation for contingent expenses of the court—to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, recommending an appropriation for an improved Government telephone service—to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII, bills and resolutions of the following titles were severally reported from committees, delivered to the Clerk, and referred to the several Calendars therein named, as follows:

Mr. WILEY of New Jersey, from the Committee on the District of Columbia, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 7048) changing names of Pierce place, Blake street, Swann street, Cedar street or place, and Oregon avenue to Samson street, reported the same without amendment, accompanied

by a report (No. 241); which said bill and report were referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. ADAMS of Wisconsin, from the Committee on Agriculture, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 345) to provide for an increased annual appropriation for agricultural experiment stations and regulating the expenditure thereof, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 242); 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. MAHON, from the Committee on War Claims, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 7679) for the relief of J. B. Orbison, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 243); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

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. HOWELL of New Jersey: A bill (H. R. 11934) to provide for the purchase of a site and the erection of a public building at Asbury Park, N. J.—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. SHARTEL: A bill (H. R. 11935) for the erection of a public building at Webb City, Mo.—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. FITZGERALD: A bill (H. R. 11936) to classify domestic mail matter and to fix the rates of postage thereon—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. BONYNGE: A bill (H. R. 11937) to provide for exchanging certain public lands of the United States with owners of lands heretofore granted in aid of the construction of any railway—to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. RIVES: A bill (H. R. 11938) for the erection of a public building at Litchfield, Ill.—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. ANDREWS: A bill (H. R. 11939) to amend sections 1 and 10 of an act of Congress approved June 21, 1898, to make certain grants of land to the Territory of New Mexico, and for other purposes—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11940) to make the provisions of an act of Congress approved February 28, 1891 (26 Stats., 796), applicable to the Territory of New Mexico—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11941) to make appropriations for the survey of unsurveyed public lands in the southern and southeastern portions of the Territory of New Mexico, under the direction of the surveyor-general of said Territory—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11942) to ratify and confirm chapter 111 of the acts of the thirty-sixth legislative assembly of the Territory of New Mexico—to the Committee on the Territories.

By Mr. BENNET of New York: A bill (H. R. 11943) to amend Title LX, chapter 3, of the Revised Statutes of the United States, relating to copyrights—to the Committee on Patents.

By Mr. DARRAGH: A bill (H. R. 11944) to establish a fish-hatching and fish-culture station at Charlevoix, in the State of Michigan—to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. VAN DUZER: A bill (H. R. 11945) to increase the limit of cost for the purchase of site and the erection of a public building at Reno, Nev.—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. BURKE of South Dakota: A bill (H. R. 11946) to amend section 6 of an act approved February 8, 1887, entitled "An act to provide for the allotment of lands in severalty to Indians on the various reservations, and to extend the protection of the laws of the United States and the Territories over the Indians, and for other purposes"—to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

Mr. PEARRE (by request): A bill (H. R. 11947) to authorize the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to settle claims for special assessments, and so forth—to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Also (by request), a bill (H. R. 11948) to authorize the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to compromise and settle

claims for special assessments, and for other purposes—to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. LACEY: A bill (H. R. 11949) to prohibit the use of the automatic shotgun in hunting in the Territories of the United States—to the Committee on the Territories.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11950) to prohibit the use of the automatic shotgun in hunting in the District of Columbia—to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. HOUSTON: A bill (H. R. 11951) to establish a national military park at the battlefield of Stones River—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. BATES: A bill (H. R. 11952) to adjust the rank and pay of certain officers of the Navy—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11953) to provide for the raising of Commodore Perry's flagship *Niagara*—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11954) authorizing the procuring of additional land for site of public building at Erie, Pa.—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. BROOKS of Colorado: A bill (H. R. 11955) leasing and demising certain lands in La Plata County, Colo., to the P. F. U. Rubber Company—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. GILLET of California: A joint resolution (H. J. Res. 77) accepting the recession by the State of California of the Yosemite Valley grant and the Mariposa big tree grove, and including the same, together with fractional sections 5 and 6, township 5 south, range 22 east, Mount Diablo meridian, California, within the meets and bounds of the Yosemite National Park—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. ACHESON: A resolution (H. Res. 150) for the relief of the estate of Norton McGiffin, deceased—to the Committee on Accounts.

By Mr. HOGG: Memorial of the legislature of Colorado, respecting repeal of the desert-land laws—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ACHESON: A bill (H. R. 11956) for the relief of R. P. Burhaus—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. ANDREWS: A bill (H. R. 11957) granting to the town of Albuquerque a section of land for public purposes—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. BARTLETT: A bill (H. R. 11958) for the relief of the heirs of Martha McLeroy—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. BEIDLER: A bill (H. R. 11959) granting an increase of pension to Henry J. Rice—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BROUSSARD: A bill (H. R. 11960) for the relief of the estate of James R. Young, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11961) for the relief of Pierre Breaux—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11962) for the relief of Mrs. Katherine Smith—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11963) for the relief of Raphael Seguro—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11964) for the relief of J. B. Cheppert—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11965) for the relief of the estate of Henry Vedrine and Alexis Hebert, both deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11966) for the relief of Arvillien Broussard—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11967) for the relief of Sylvester Chevalier—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11968) for the relief of Julien Semere—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11969) for the relief of Bennett Lilly—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11970) for the relief of the estate of Edward Sigur, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11971) for the relief of the estate of Oneziphor Delahoussaye, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11972) for the relief of Leo P. Dupuis, administrator—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11973) for the relief of the estate of Elie H. Flory, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11974) for the relief of Marie Vives, as

administratrix and in her own right—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11975) for the relief of the estate of Dr. Joseph Richard Martin—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. BUTLER of Pennsylvania: A bill (H. R. 11976) for the relief of Compañía de los Ferrocarriles de Puerto Rico—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. BURTON of Delaware: A bill (H. R. 11977) referring the claim of the heirs of Henry Hackfeld, Frank Molteno, and James I. Dowsett to the Court of Claims—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. CHANEY (by request): A bill (H. R. 11978) to reimburse Toney E. Proctor for services as appraiser of the town of Wagoner, Ind. T.—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11979) granting a pension to Michael Cosgrove—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. COLE: A bill (H. R. 11980) granting an increase of pension to William B. Boulton—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. DICKSON of Illinois: A bill (H. R. 11981) granting a pension to Hudson M. Fisher—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11982) granting an increase of pension to Isaac W. Waters—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. FLOYD: A bill (H. R. 11983) for the relief of and to correct the military record of Henry Crandell—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. GILBERT of Indiana: A bill (H. R. 11984) granting a pension to Vesta M. Swarts—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11985) granting an increase of pension to Samuel Wyland—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. GILLET of Massachusetts: A bill (H. R. 11986) granting a pension to Cynthia L. Allen—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. GOULDEN: A bill (H. R. 11987) for the relief of the estate of Simon Sterne, deceased—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GUDGER: A bill (H. R. 11988) granting a pension to George W. Davis—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HALE: A bill (H. R. 11989) granting an increase of pension to F. M. Hinds—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11990) granting an increase of pension to Daniel M. Coffman—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. HAMILTON: A bill (H. R. 11991) for the relief of Myron Sutherland—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. HINSHAW: A bill (H. R. 11992) granting an increase of pension to John Thompson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11993) granting a pension to Mary Cox—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HOWELL of New Jersey: A bill (H. R. 11994) granting an increase of pension to Martha W. Wright—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11995) granting an increase of pension to Wesley Layton—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. KELIHER: A bill (H. R. 11996) granting an increase of pension to Timothy McCartney—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. KINKAID: A bill (H. R. 11997) granting a pension to Dora M. Dowhower—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. KLEPPER: A bill (H. R. 11998) granting a pension to James Overton—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11999) granting a pension to Eli Spitzer—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12000) granting a pension to Rowland Stark—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12001) granting a pension to Thomas T. Pratt—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12002) granting an increase of pension to James B. Sanders—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12003) granting an increase of pension to William Dilley—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12004) to remove the charge of desertion from the military record of John O'Connor—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12005) removing the charge of desertion from the military record of George W. Hann—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. LAMB: A bill (H. R. 12006) for the relief of the trustees of Ivey Memorial Chapel, Chesterfield County, Va.—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. LAW: A bill (H. R. 12007) granting an increase of pension to Lewis Leavens—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LEVER: A bill (H. R. 12008) granting an increase of pension to James D. Blanding—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. LONGWORTH: A bill (H. R. 12009) for the relief of the heirs at law of M. A. Phelps and the heirs at law of John W. Renner—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12010) granting an increase of pension to Louis Hoffmann—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12011) granting an increase of pension to Mary E. Shomaker—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LOUD: A bill (H. R. 12012) for the relief of Charles L. Jenney—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12013) granting a pension to Emma Fox—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12014) granting an increase of pension to Francis H. Frasier—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12015) to correct the military record of George S. Smith—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. MARSHALL: A bill (H. R. 12016) granting an increase of pension to James Cassaday—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MARTIN: A bill (H. R. 12017) granting an increase of pension to James B. Simkins—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. PEARRE: A bill (H. R. 12018) for the relief of Andrew Jackson Moudy—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12019) granting an increase of pension to Henry Jacob Fox—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. RICHARDSON of Alabama: A bill (H. R. 12020) for the relief of the Methodist Episcopal Church South, of Bellefonte, Ala.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12021) granting a pension to James M. Wood—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12022) for the relief of certain churches, Masonic lodges, and colleges in the State of Alabama, and for other purposes—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. REEDER: A bill (H. R. 12023) granting an increase of pension to William C. Brown—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. RHINOCK: A bill (H. R. 12024) granting an increase of pension to Stephen Rickey—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. RIXEY: A bill (H. R. 12025) for the relief of Rachel Dyer, of Fairfax County, Va.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12026) for the relief of William Bushby—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12027) granting an increase of pension to Nathan C. Bradley—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. RUCKER: A bill (H. R. 12028) granting relief to John W. Donovan—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. SCROGGY: A bill (H. R. 12029) granting an increase of pension to Jacon Eckle—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12030) granting an increase of pension to Odine Petard—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12031) granting an increase of pension to James B. Winter—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12032) granting an increase of pension to John W. Dakin—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12033) granting an increase of pension to George W. Irwin—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12034) granting an increase of pension to Thomas Davis—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SIMS: A bill (H. R. 12035) for the relief of John P. McKinney—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. SULLIVAN of Massachusetts: A bill (H. R. 12036) granting a pension to Charles H. Tighe, guardian—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12037) for the relief of the heirs and legal representatives of Samuel Svenson—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. SULLOWAY: A bill (H. R. 12038) granting a pension to Charles H. Burleigh—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. VAN DUZER: A bill (H. R. 12039) for the relief of Chris Deiss—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12040) for the relief of B. Klucny—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. WALLACE: A bill (H. R. 12041) for the relief of John H. Hamiter, of Walnut Hills, Lafayette County, Ark.—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12042) for the relief of the heirs of J. J. Myers, deceased, of Spring Bank, Lafayette County, Ark.—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. WATSON: A bill (H. R. 12043) granting a pension to Eliza J. Crisler—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12044) granting a pension to Luvernia Leonard—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12045) granting an increase of pension to Louisa McConnell—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12046) granting an increase of pension to Isaac H. Cohee—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12047) granting an increase of pension to David Fateley—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12048) granting an increase of pension to George F. Snider—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12049) granting an increase of pension to Rolland Havens—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12050) granting an increase of pension to Harrison Wilkins—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12051) granting an increase of pension to George W. Eshelman—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WOOD of New Jersey: A bill (H. R. 12052) for the relief of Stephen W. Stryker—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12053) granting an increase of pension to George Van Marter—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. ADAMSON: A bill (H. R. 12054) granting an increase of pension to Martha E. Hallowell—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12055) for the relief of the legal representatives of E. H. Abercrombie—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. HOPKINS: A bill (H. R. 12056) to correct the record of Andrew Napier and grant him a pension—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12057) granting a pension to Samuel Pack—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12058) granting a pension to Lucy A. Branham—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WILLIAM W. KITCHIN: A bill (H. R. 12059) granting an increase of pension to Mildred W. Mitchell—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. CHARLES B. LANDIS: A bill (H. R. 12060) for the relief of Joseph H. Johnson—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. WILLIAMS: A bill (H. R. 12061) for the relief of the heirs of Joseph Wilson, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

CHANGE OF REFERENCE.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXII, committees were discharged from the consideration of bills of the following titles; which were thereupon referred as follows:

A bill (H. R. 10457) granting a pension to Lizzie Brenner—Committee on Invalid Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

A bill (H. R. 1017) for the relief of Alberth Pires—Committee on Military Affairs discharged, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

A bill (H. R. 1019) for the relief of Harry D. Dickerson—Committee on War Claims discharged, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

A bill (H. R. 11657) granting a pension to Madison M. Burnett—Committee on Invalid Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause I of Rule XXII, the following petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER: Petition of the Goehring Manufacturing Company, for repeal of the tax on domestic alcohol used in the arts—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of the legislative committee of the Pennsylvania State Grange, for repeal of tax on domestic alcohol—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, supplemental petition of Liliuokalani, for a settlement of her claim against the United States—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ACHESON: Petition of the civic committee of the Current Events Club, against spoliation of Niagara—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Also, petition of Morning Star Council, Junior Order United American Mechanics, favoring restriction of immigration—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. BARCHFELD: Petition of citizens of Pennsylvania and Triune Lodge, No. 406, Knights of Pythias, favoring restriction of Immigration—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. BEIDLER: Petition of the Cleveland Credit Men's Association, for retention of the bankruptcy law—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BONYNGE: Petition of the Organization of *General Slocum* Survivors, for relief of heirs of the victims of the disaster to said steamboat—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. BURLEIGH: Paper to accompany bill for relief of Lorenzo D. Libby—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, paper to accompany bill for relief of Alfred H. Rose—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. BUTLER of Tennessee: Paper to accompany bill for relief of Eliza C. Jones—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas: Petition of Kenesaw Post, Grand Army of the Republic, Department of California and Nevada, for an amendment of the law of June 27, 1890, to grant totally helpless Union soldiers \$30 per month—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CAPRON: Petition of Cumberland (R. I.) Grange, No. 2, Patrons of Husbandry, favoring passage of the Adams bill—to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Millville, Mass., against the Army canteen—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, petition of the Horticultural Society of Newport, R. I., favoring the Adams bill—to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. CURTIS: Petition of citizens of Seneca, Kans., favoring restriction of immigration—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. DARRAGH: Petition of citizens of Gratiot County, Mich.; W. O. Watson and 100 others, and the Saginaw County Farmers' Institute, against bill H. R. 3—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DAWSON: Petition of the State Association of County Attorneys of Iowa, for the Hepburn-Dolliver bill—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of the Columbia Sick Relief Society, of Davenport, Iowa, against spoliation of Niagara Falls—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. DIXON of Montana: Petition of citizens of Carlton, favoring restriction of immigration—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. DRESSER: Petitions of the Marvindale Chemical Company, the National Chemical Company, the Liberty Chemical Company, the Alton Chemical Company, the Bradford Chemical Company, the Wyman Chemical Company, the Board of Trade, and the Coryville Chemical Company, all of Bradford, Pa., against bill H. R. 7079—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of Marvindale Chemical Company, of Bradford, Pa., for repeal of the tax on denaturized alcohol—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ESCH: Petition of the Milwaukee College Endowment Association, for a national forest reservation in the White Mountains—to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition of citizens of Fairfield, Falls Creek, and Greenwood, Wis., against bill H. R. 3—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FITZGERALD: Petition of the Organization of *General Slocum* Survivors, for relief of the injured and heirs of victims of the disaster—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, petition of the New York Board of Trade, favoring repeal of the shipping act of April 15, 1904, between the Philippine ports and the United States—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. FULLER: Petition of F. D. Power and others, relative to liquor selling in the Territories—to the Committee on the Territories.

Also, petition of the Chicago Historical Society, for a hall of historical records at Washington—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, petition of citizens of Shabbona, Ill., against a parcels-post law—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. GARNER: Paper to accompany bill for relief of A. M. Beall—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. GARRETT: Paper to accompany bill for relief of Robert M. Whitson—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. GRAFF: Petition of Carpenters' Union No. 183, favoring restriction of immigration—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. GRAHAM: Petition of Young Woman's Home Missionary Society of the North Avenue Methodist Episcopal Church, of Allegheny, Pa., favoring prohibition of liquor in the Indian Territory—to the Committee on the Territories.

Also, petition of the Young Woman's Home Mission Society

of Allegheny, Pa., against sale of liquor in Government buildings—to the Committee on Alcoholic Liquor Traffic.

Also, petition of the Young Woman's Home Mission Society, against sale of opium—to the Committee on Alcoholic Liquor Traffic.

Also, petition of Conroy, Prugh & Co., against an internal-revenue tax on domestic alcohol—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GUDGER: Paper to accompany bill for relief of G. W. Davis—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, paper to accompany bill for relief of Thomas J. Bradshaw—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. HAYES: Paper to accompany bill for relief of Josephine D. Jones—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, petition of the Merchants' Association of San Francisco, for recognition by Congress of the Milan exposition—to the Committee on Industrial Arts and Expositions.

Also, petition of the Merchants' Association of San Francisco, for proposed national stamping act—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. HINSHAW: Paper to accompanying bill for relief of William McBeta—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HOWELL of New Jersey: Petitions of Mahuah Council, No. 245, and Relief Council, No. 40, Junior Order United American Mechanics, favoring restriction of immigration—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, paper to accompany bill for relief of Harry W. Tolbert—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. HUNT: Petition of the St. Louis Manufacturers' Association, favoring the President's ideas of railway freight rate control—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. KEIFER: Petition of Charles Dersch et al., for relief of the victims of the *Slocum* disaster—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. LEE: Paper to accompany bill for relief of estate of James Johnson, of Whitfield County, Ga.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, paper to accompany bill for relief of Joel Cross—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, paper to accompany bill for relief of William L. Strain—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, paper to accompany bill for relief of Simeon Stevens—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, paper to accompany bill for relief of Edward Sebastian—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. LINDSAY: Petition of the Organization of *General Slocum* Survivors, for relief of the injured and heirs of the victims of the disaster—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, paper to accompany bill for relief of Emil H. Brie—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, petition of the New York Board of Trade and Transportation, for repeal of the shipping act relative to the Philippine ports and those of the United States proper—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. LITTLE: Paper to accompany bill for relief of Benjamin F. Moore—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, paper to accompany bill for relief of Frances M. Pearce—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, paper to accompany bill for relief of Eliza Slone—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, paper to accompany bill for relief of Mary Bailey—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. LOUD: Paper to accompany bill for relief of Francis H. Frasier—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. NEEDHAM: Petition of the Bar Association of San Francisco for appointment of an additional district judge for the northern district of California—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of the Pomona Board of Trade, favoring the President's ideas relative to control of railway freight rates—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of the Pomona Board of Trade, favoring restriction of immigration—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, petition of the Pomona Board of Trade, favoring establishment of game refuges in the national forest reserves—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, petition of the counties committee of the California Promotion Commission, for Federal control of rivers, etc.—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Also, petition of the International Printing Pressmen's Association, for a foreman of presswork in Government Printing Office—to the Committee on Printing.

Also, petition of the Board of Trade of San Francisco, favor-

ing a law to favor a better class of Chinese immigrants—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, petition of the San Bernardino County Fruit Exchange, for Interstate Commerce Commission control of freight rates—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of the Redlands Chamber of Commerce, favoring game refuges in the national forest reserves—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, petition of Kenesaw Post, Grand Army of the Republic, Department of California and Nevada, for an amendment of the law of June 27, 1890, relative to totally helpless Union soldiers of the civil war—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. PERKINS: Petition of the Defender Photo Supply Company, the J. W. Gillis Company, and the N. L. Lockhart Company, against the tax on denaturized alcohol—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. RHINOCK: Paper to accompany bill for relief of John L. Stevens—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. RICHARDSON of Alabama: Paper to accompany bill for relief of the estate of M. F. Cromwell—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, paper to accompany bill for relief of Susan McBroom—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, paper to accompany bill for relief of Absalom T. Phillips—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, paper to accompany bill for relief of the estate of Heskiah Boech—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, paper to accompany bill for relief of James Smithers—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, paper to accompany bill for relief of Andrew J. Schrimsher—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, paper to accompany bill for relief of Silas H. Scott—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, paper to accompany bill for relief of the estate of David Crow—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, paper to accompany bill for relief of the estate of W. R. Hanserd—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, paper to accompany bill for relief of heirs of Woodson C. Sanders—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. RIXEY: Petition of citizens of Dumfries, Va., and Lovettsville Council, Junior Order United American Mechanics, favoring restriction of immigration—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, paper to accompany bill for relief of N. C. Bradley—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. ROBERTSON of Louisiana: Paper to accompany bill for relief of Alfred Morgan, heir of James A. Morgan—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, paper to accompany bill for relief of Louis V. Porche—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, paper to accompany bill for relief of James A. Morgan—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, paper to accompany bill for relief of H. B. Benjamin—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. SAMUEL: Petition of Berwick Council, No. 698, Junior Order United American Mechanics, favoring restriction of immigration—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. SCROGGY: Petition of Bowersville Council, Junior Order United American Mechanics; citizens of Neville, Ohio, and Vesper Lodge, No. 131, favoring restriction of immigration—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. SPERRY: Petition of the New Haven and Coastwise Lumber Dealers' Association, for a national forest reservation in the White Mountains—to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. STEENERSON: Petition of the Minnesota State Art Society, for removal of duty on the fine arts—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of the Minnesota Good Roads Association, for the improvement of highways proposed by the Brownlow bill—to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition of J. T. Redland, of Shelby, Minn., against the tax on denaturized alcohol—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SULLIVAN of New York: Petition of the general assembly of Indiana, for an auditorium in the New Albany National Soldiers' Home Cemetery—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, paper to accompany bill for relief of Emile E. Bore—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, petition of the Republican Club of the City of New York, favoring the President's plan on railway freight rates—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of 60,000 Americans in Alaska, for representation in Congress—to the Committee on the Territories.

Also, petition of the Indian Territory Press Association, relative to Indian lands in the Territory—to the Committee on the Territories.

Also, petition of the New York Board of Trade and Transportation, for reduction of duties on sugar and tobacco from the Philippines—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SULZER: Petition of the National Woman's Christian Temperance Union, favoring a law to prohibit the importation into prohibition States of liquor under protection of Federal law, etc.—to the Committee on Alcoholic Liquor Traffic.

Also, petition of George H. Smiley, against the Parker bill—to the Committee on Alcoholic Traffic.

Also, petition of the Organization of General Slocum Survivors, for relief of the heirs of victims of the disaster—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, petition of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Lockport, N. Y., and protest of 30,000 women of the Empire State, against repeal of the canteen law—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, petition of the Berkshire Woman's Christian Temperance Union against the Parker bill—to the Committee on Alcoholic Liquor Traffic.

Also, petition of Charles Lipkovitz, of New York City, against bill H. R. 3—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WEEMS: Petition of Hand in Hand Council, Junior Order United American Mechanics, favoring restriction of immigration—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. WOODYARD: Petition of Farmer and Arnoldsbury councils, Junior Order United American Mechanics, favoring restriction of immigration—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

SENATE.

TUESDAY, January 16, 1906.

Prayer by Rev. ULYSSES G. B. PIERCE, of the city of Washington.

THE JOURNAL.

The Secretary proceeded to read the Journal of yesterday's proceedings.

Mr. BURROWS. I ask unanimous consent that the further reading of the Journal be dispensed with.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Senator from Michigan asks unanimous consent that the further reading of the Journal be dispensed with. Is there objection?

Mr. FRYE. Mr. President, I will make no objection in this case, but I think it is a great deal better, when the Senate is not pressed with business, that the Journal shall be read in full. In this case I shall enter no objection. When there is a heavy pressure of business it is absolutely necessary at times to have the reading of the Journal dispensed with, but not now at the early meeting of the Senate.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. In the absence of objection, the reading will be dispensed with. The Journal stands approved.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS.

The VICE-PRESIDENT presented the petition of Liliuokalani, ex-Queen of the Hawaiian Islands, praying that she be reimbursed for certain lands in that island taken from her by the United States; which was referred to the Committee on Claims.

Mr. GALLINGER presented a petition of the board of directors of the Eastern Star Home of the District of Columbia, praying for the enactment of legislation authorizing the Baltimore and Washington Transit Company of Maryland to extend its street railway in the District of Columbia; which was referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Mr. LODGE presented a petition of sundry citizens of Gloucester, Mass., praying for the repeal of the duty on domestic alcohol; which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. FORAKER. I present a memorial to the Congress of the United States by citizens of the Indian Territory, praying, and setting forth an argument in behalf of their prayer, for separate statehood in the name of Sequoyah. I ask in their behalf that the memorial may be printed as a separate document. It contains a great deal of very valuable information.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Senator from Ohio asks that the memorial be printed as a document. The Chair hears no objection, and it is so ordered. It will be referred to the Committee on Territories.

Mr. WARNER presented a petition of the Manufacturers' Association of St. Louis, Mo., praying for the enactment of legislation to enlarge the powers of the Interstate Commerce Com-