

at the port of San Francisco—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, resolution of the Chamber of Commerce of San Francisco, Cal., favoring the passage of House bill No. 887, in the interest of manufacturing and commercial industries—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. NORTON of South Carolina: Resolutions of the Mercantile Club of Kansas City, Mo., against sundry bills taxing oleomargarine and butterine—to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. O'GRADY: Petition of citizens of Fairport, N. Y., in favor of the bill to tax oleomargarine—to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. PEARRE: Petition of William A. Gordon, administrator of the estate of William D. C. Murdock, deceased, relating to a claim—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. RUSSELL: Petition of Mrs. Sylvanus Reed, regent of Manhattan Chapter, Daughters of the American Revolution, New York City, in favor of House bill No. 2577, to preserve the Fort Griswold property—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, resolutions of Sedgwick Post, No. 1, of Norwich, Conn., Grand Army of the Republic, in favor of House bill No. 7094, for the establishment of a Branch Soldiers' Home at or near Johnson City, Tenn.—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. SMITH of Kentucky: Petition of Posts 212, 11, and 217, Grand Army of the Republic, Department of Kentucky, favoring the location of a Branch Soldiers' Home at Johnson City, Tenn.—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, papers to accompany House bill No. 5251—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, papers to accompany House bill No. 9856—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, papers to accompany House bill No. 9857—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, papers to accompany House bill No. 9864—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, papers to accompany House bill No. 9866—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, papers to accompany House bill No. 9860—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, papers to accompany House bill No. 9865—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, papers to accompany House bill No. 9859—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, papers to accompany House bill No. 9861—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, papers to accompany House bill No. 9862—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, papers to accompany House bill No. 9863—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. SPALDING: Petition of Frank Ohman and other citizens of Rutland, N. Dak., in favor of the Grout bill taxing oleomargarine—to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, protest of the Retail Merchants' Association of Chicago, Ill., against the passage of the Grout bill—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

Also, petition of C. E. Thompson and other citizens of Cass County, N. Dak., in opposition to the passage of House bill No. 6071, relating to second-class mail matter—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

Also, resolutions of the San Diego (Cal.) Board of Trade, urging the immediate construction of the Nicaragua Canal—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of John A. Spellman Post, No. 13, Grand Army of the Republic, Department of North Dakota, in support of House bill No. 7094, to establish a Branch Soldiers' Home at Johnson City, Tenn.—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. SPERRY: Resolutions of the Trinity Methodist Episcopal Church, First Methodist Episcopal Church, and Young People's Society of Christian Endeavor of the First Congregational Church of Meriden, Conn., favoring the anti-canteen bill—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, resolutions of a mass meeting in Waterbury, Conn., expressing sympathy to the Transvaal Republic and the Orange Free State in their struggle with England—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. STARK: Petition of the World-Herald, Bee, and News, of Omaha; State Journal and Post, of Lincoln, Nebr., and Press, of Nebraska City, Nebr., urging the passage of House bill No. 5765, known as the Russell bill, relating to the revenue tax on alcohol in manufactures, etc.—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SULLOWAY: Petition of Wallridge & Taylor and 20 others, of Peterboro, N. H., in favor of the Grout bill taxing oleomargarine—to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. SULZER: Petition of the Manufacturers' Association of New York, relative to House bill No. 7097, providing for a reorganization of the consular service—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, petition of the Manufacturers' Association of New York, urging the passage of Senate bill No. 1439, known as the Cullom bill—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. SUTHERLAND: Petitions of Ben Franklin Post, No. 136, and S. A. Strickland Post, No. 13, Grand Army of the Republic, Department of Nebraska, in support of House bill No. 7094, to establish a Branch Soldiers' Home at Johnson City, Tenn.—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, petition of Ben Franklin Post, No. 136, Grand Army of the Republic, Department of Nebraska, against the passage of bill to legalize the detail of active and retired officers of the Army and Navy to assist in military instruction in the public schools—to the Committee on Militia.

Also, petition of Jessup Brothers, of Clay Center, Nebr., against the passage of House bill No. 6071, relating to second-class mail matter—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

Also, petition of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Wauneta, Nebr., urging the enactment of a law forbidding the manufacture and sale of intoxicating liquors and a prohibition of gambling and the opium trade in our new possessions—to the Committee on Alcoholic Liquor Traffic.

By Mr. VREELAND: Petition of First Methodist Episcopal Church of Jamestown, N. Y., and vicinity, for the suppression of the liquor traffic in the Philippines—to the Committee on Insular Affairs.

Also, petitions of C. C. Durham and others, in favor of the Grout oleomargarine bill—to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. WILSON of Arizona: Petition of Grand Army of the Republic Post of Phenix, Ariz., in support of House bill No. 7094, to establish a Branch Soldiers' Home at Johnson City, Tenn.—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. WILSON of New York: Resolutions of the Manufacturers' Association of New York, in favor of Senate bill No. 1439, relating to an act to regulate commerce—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. ZIEGLER: Papers to accompany House bill for an increase of pension to Joseph Glassick—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

## SENATE.

FRIDAY, March 23, 1900.

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

The Secretary proceeded to read the Journal of yesterday's proceedings, when, on motion of Mr. STEWART, and by unanimous consent, the further reading was dispensed with.

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

### MINING RIGHTS NEAR CAPE NOME, ALASKA.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of War, transmitting, in response to a resolution of the 21st instant, certain information relative to whether any concessions or grants have been made to any individual or corporations to excavate the gold-bearing bed of the sea at or in the vicinity of Cape Nome, in Alaska, or in other Alaskan waters, etc.; which, with the accompanying papers, was referred to the Committee on Public Lands, 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 agreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 5390) granting an increase of pension to Maria E. Mailley.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the concurrent resolution of the Senate to print 2,500 copies of the Annual Report of the Director of the Bureau of American Republics.

### PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS.

Mr. PLATT of New York presented a petition of the foremen, attendants, and laborers employed in the sixth division of the New York custom-house, praying for the enactment of legislation to provide for an increase in their salaries; which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented memorials of the congregations of the Immanuel, the Presbyterian, the Swedish Zion and Mission, the Swedish Baptist, the Free Methodist, and the Swedish Methodist churches, all of Jamestown, in the State of New York, remonstrating against the sale of liquor in canteens, and also against the sale of intoxicating liquors in the newly acquired possessions of the United States; which were referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

He also presented a memorial of the American Trade Press Association, of New York City, and a memorial of the Snap Shots Photographic Journal, of New York City, remonstrating against the



passage of the so-called Loud bill, relating to second-class mail matter; which were referred to the Committee on Post-Offices and Post-Roads.

He also presented a memorial of Local Union No. 33, Coopers' International Union, of Buffalo, N. Y., remonstrating against the enactment of legislation to abolish the use of revenue stamps on sixth and eighth beer kegs; which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented a petition of Dolan Lodge, No. 201, International Association of Machinists, of Hornellsville, N. Y., praying for the enactment of legislation to increase the salaries of machinists employed at the Government Printing Office; which was referred to the Committee on Printing.

He also presented a petition of Clinton Lodge, No. 99, International Association of Machinists, of Newburg, N. Y., praying for the enactment of legislation to limit the hours of daily service of laborers and mechanics employed upon the public works of the United States; which was referred to the Committee on Education and Labor.

Mr. ROSS presented the petition of Harry A. Slade and 56 other druggists, of Vermont, praying for the repeal of the stamp tax upon proprietary medicines, perfumeries, and cosmetics; which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. ALLEN presented a memorial of sundry citizens of Hooker County, Nebr., remonstrating against the sale or leasing of the public lands to individuals or corporations; which was referred to the Committee on Public Lands.

Mr. GALLINGER presented a petition of the New Hampshire Board of Trade, of Manchester, N. H., praying for the adoption of certain amendments to the interstate-commerce law; which was referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

He also presented a petition of the New Hampshire Board of Trade, of Manchester, N. H., praying that an appropriation of \$200,000 be made to continue the work of the Philadelphia Commercial Museum; which was referred to the Committee on Commerce.

Mr. McMILLAN presented a memorial of the congregations of sundry churches of Milford, Mich., remonstrating against the manufacture and sale of intoxicating liquors in the islands acquired by the United States, and also against the further sale of liquor by the Government to members of the Army, Navy, or other employees; which was referred to the Committee on Pacific Islands and Puerto Rico.

He also presented a petition of Ashland Grange, No. 545, Patrons of Husbandry, of Newaygo County, Mich., praying for the extension of free rural mail delivery, for the enactment of anti-trust laws, and for the establishment of postal savings banks; which was referred to the Committee on Post-Offices and Post-Roads.

He also presented a memorial of the North Capitol and Eckington Citizens' Association, of the District of Columbia, remonstrating against the diversion of any portion of the city parks and reservations to the use of any railroad company, etc.; which was referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Mr. FOSTER presented a petition of the Chamber of Commerce of Seattle, Wash., praying that a more liberal appropriation be made for the Bremerton Naval Station, on Puget Sound; which was referred to the Committee on Commerce.

He also presented a petition of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Sidney, Wash., praying for the enactment of legislation to prohibit the importation, manufacture, and sale of intoxicating liquors in Hawaii; which was referred to the Committee on Pacific Islands and Puerto Rico.

Mr. PRITCHARD presented a petition of the Chamber of Commerce of Wilmington, N. C., praying that an appropriation be made to continue the work of the Philadelphia Commercial Museum; which was referred to the Committee on Commerce.

He also presented a petition of the Chamber of Commerce of Raleigh, N. C., praying for the establishment of a national park in the western portion of that State; which was referred to the Committee on Commerce.

He also presented a petition of the Chamber of Commerce of Newbern, N. C., praying for the enactment of legislation to grant to the officers of the Revenue-Cutter Service actual equality with the officers of the Army and Navy; which was referred to the Committee on Commerce.

Mr. McLAURIN presented a petition of sundry citizens of Georgetown County, S. C., praying that an appropriation be made for the improvement of Lynch River, in that State; which was referred to the Committee on Commerce.

He also presented memorials of Richard W. Massey and F. M. Lupton; the Palmetto Pythian, of Sumter; the Keowee Courier, of Walhalla; the Piedmont Headlight, of Spartanburg; the Baptist Courier, of Greenville; Our Monthly, and of sundry citizens of Spartanburg, all in the State of South Carolina, and of the Manufacturers' Record and Southern Farm Magazine, of Baltimore, Md., remonstrating against the passage of the so-called Loud bill, relating to second-class mail matter; which were referred to the Committee on Post-Offices and Post-Roads.

Mr. BURROWS presented a petition of sundry fourth-class postmasters of Berrien County, Mich., praying for the enactment of legislation to increase the salaries of fourth-class postmasters; which was referred to the Committee on Post-Offices and Post-Roads.

He also presented memorials of the Training School Advocate, of Battle Creek; the Amerikan Utesit, of Calumet; the Times, of Lawrence; the Enterprise, of Fairgrove; the News, of Marshall, and the Gospel Herald, of Battlecreek; of Stella Miller and sundry other citizens of Leonidas, and of Mrs. Lottie Butler and 10 other citizens of Battlecreek, all in the State of Michigan, remonstrating against the passage of the so-called Loud bill, relating to second-class mail matter; which were referred to the Committee on Post-Offices and Post-Roads.

He also presented petitions of the Michigan State Millers' Association; the Valley City Milling Company, of Grand Rapids; the Voigt Milling Company, of Grand Rapids, and the T. S. Gurney Milling Company, of Hart, all in the State of Michigan, praying for the adoption of certain amendments to the interstate-commerce law; which were referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

He also presented a petition of the executive committee on temperance of the Friends' Association of Michigan, Indiana, and Ohio, praying for the enactment of legislation to prohibit the sale of intoxicating liquors in canteens, Soldiers' Homes, and all Government buildings; which was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

He also presented a memorial of Bowne Grange, No. 219, Patrons of Husbandry, of Bowne, Mich., remonstrating against the enactment of any legislation granting subsidies to shipping; which was ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. FORAKER presented a petition of the survivors of the One hundred and sixth Ohio Volunteer Infantry, praying for the enactment of a per diem service pension law; which was referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also presented a petition of the Mahoning Valley Drug Association, of Ohio, praying for the repeal of the stamp tax upon proprietary medicines, perfumeries, and cosmetics; which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented a petition of the Christian Union of Fair Haven, Ohio, praying for the enactment of legislation to prohibit the sale of intoxicating liquors in canteens and in all Government buildings; which was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

He also presented petitions of Logan Grange, No. 3; Champion Grange, No. 738; Canaan Grange, No. 857; Lindale Grange, No. 248; Pleasant Hill Grange, No. 598; Maple Grove Grange, No. 1430; Union Grange, No. 869; Shanesville Grange, No. 1443; Aurora Grange; Salem Grange, No. 1414; Auglaize Grange, No. 347; North Camden Grange, No. 1053; Hope Grana Grange, No. 406; McDonald Grange, No. 669; Trojan Grange; Guernsey Grange, No. 1366; Perry Grange, No. 266; Chatham Grange, No. 1437; Mount Nebo Grange, No. 664; Hampstead Grange; Elm Tree Grange, No. 1407; Trenton Grange, No. 998; Shady Vale Grange, No. 348; Westland Grange, No. 121; Shannon Grange, No. 1418; Bristol Grange, No. 80; Sunset Grange; Jackson Grange, No. 403; Wabash Grange, No. 236, and Lawrence Grange, all Patrons of Husbandry, in the State of Ohio, praying for the establishment of postal savings banks; which were referred to the Committee on Post-Offices and Post-Roads.

He also presented petitions of Wabash Grange, No. 236; Union Grange, No. 869; Enterprise Grange, No. 472; Oak Grove Grange, No. 1428; Canaan Grange, No. 857; Berlin Heights Grange, No. 345; Logan Grange, No. 8; North Camden Grange, No. 1053; Shady Vale Grange, No. 348; Shannon Grange, No. 1418; Auglaize Grange, No. 247; Laurel Grange; Salem Grange, No. 1414; Pleasant Hill Grange, No. 598; Mount Nebo Grange, No. 264; Perry Grange, No. 266; Lindale Grange, No. 248; Fulton Grange, No. 217; Line Grange; Guernsey Grange, No. 1366; McDonald Grange, No. 669; Mount Carmel Grange, No. 975; Meadow Grange; and Union Grange, No. 1078, all Patrons of Husbandry, in the State of Ohio, praying for the construction of the Nicaragua Canal; which were ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented memorials of Westland Grange, No. 121; Salem Grange, No. 1404; Logan Grange, No. 3; Berlin Heights Grange, No. 345; Oak Grove Grange, No. 428; Shady Vale Grange, No. 348; Elm Tree Grange, No. 1407; Mount Nebo Grange, No. 664; Mount Carmel Grange, No. 975; Shannon Grange, No. 1418; Auglaize Grange, No. 347; North Camden Grange, No. 1053; Hilton Grange, No. 520; Pleasant Hill Grange, No. 598; Hope Grange, No. 324; Maple Grove Grange, No. 1430; Lindale Grange, No. 248; Hilton Corner Grange, No. 600; Guernsey Grange, No. 1366; Angolia Grange, No. 360; Wabash Grange, No. 236; Hope Grange, No. 406; Enterprise Grange, No. 472; Clyde Grange, No. 364; Canaan Grange, No. 857; Perry Grange, No. 266; Garrettsville Grange, No. 1436; Excelsior Grange, No. 650; Fulton Grange, No. 217; Union Grange, No. 1078; McDonald Grange, No. 669; Trenton Grange, No. 998; Stillwell Grange, No. 920, and



Chatham Grange, No. 1437, all Patrons of Husbandry, in the State of Ohio, remonstrating against the construction of reservoirs or irrigating canals for the irrigation of arid lands; which were referred to the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation of Arid Lands.

He also presented petitions of Manchester Grange; Clyde Grange, No. 364; Pleasant Hill Grange, No. 598; Maple Grove Grange, No. 1480; Laurel Grange; Lebanon Grange, No. 1462; Jackson Grange, No. 341; Marlboro Grange, No. 1401; Manchester Grange, No. 47; New London Grange, No. 1422; Champion Grange, No. 738; Jennings Grange, No. 1320; Griggs Grange, No. 1463; Trenton Grange, No. 998; Canaan Grange, No. 857; Oxford Grange, No. 263; Liberty Hill Grange, No. 1087; Paulding Grange, No. 332; Mohawk Grange, No. 1420; Hartford Grange, No. 1479; Straw Camp Grange, No. 1204; Guilford Grange, No. 1423; Franklin Grange, No. 1193; Brunswick Grange, No. 1344; Meadow Grange; Ideal Grange, No. 1346; German Grange, No. 1348; Twin Valley Grange, No. 657; Jefferson Grange, No. 909; Star Grange; Pleasant Grange, No. 399; Union Grange, No. 1470; Shanesville Grange, No. 1443; McDonald Grange, No. 669; Meadow Grange; New Buffalo Grange, No. 1478; Greenwood Grange, No. 1061; Logan Grange, No. 3; Mount Nebo Grange, No. 664; Jackson Center Grange, No. 587; Washington Grange, No. 5; Union Grange, No. 869; Garrettsville Grange, No. 1426; Canaan Grange, No. 1280; Wabash Grange, No. 326; Andover Grange, No. 1468; Buckeye Valley Grange, No. 940; Margaretta Grange, No. 488; Enterprise Grange, No. 472; Harrison Grange, No. 151; Fulton Grange, No. 217; Shannon Grange, No. 1418; Salem Grange, No. 1414; North Lima Grange, No. 1476; O. B. Grange, No. 116; North Camden Grange, No. 1053; North Star Grange, No. 671; Anglaize Grange, No. 347; Little Hocking Grange, No. 873; Wyandot Grange, No. 499; Fulton Grange, No. 217; Westland Grange, No. 121; Plains Grange, No. 469, and Walnut Grove Grange, No. 1429, all Patrons of Husbandry, in the State of Ohio, praying for the enactment of legislation to secure protection against the adulteration of pure-food products; which were referred to the Committee on Manufactures.

He also presented memorials of Canaan Grange, No. 857; Trenton Grange, No. 998; Maple Grange, No. 554; Harrison Grange, No. 151; North Lima Grange, No. 1476; Camden Grange, No. 1053; North Star Grange, No. 671; Anglaize Grange, No. 1349; O. B. Grange, No. 116; Franklin Grange, No. 1193; Alma Grange, No. 424; German Grange, No. 1348; Ideal Grange, No. 1456; Shannon Grange, No. 1418; Little Hocking Grange, No. 873; Brunswick Grange, No. 1344; Champion Grange, No. 738; Wyandotte Grange, No. 549; Westland Grange, No. 121; Fulton Grange, No. 217; Enterprise Grange, No. 472; Salem Grange, No. 1414; Marlboro Grange, No. 1401; Oxford Grange, No. 263; Shanesville Grange, No. 1443; Pleasant Hill Grange, No. 598; Enterprise Grange; Maple Grove Grange, No. 1430; Mount Nebo Grange, No. 664; Walnut Grove Grange, No. 1429; Fulton Grange, No. 257; Griggs Grange, No. 1467; Huron Grange, No. 1389; Todds Grange, No. 1457; New London Grange, No. 1422; Manchester Grange, No. 47; Straw Camp Grange, No. 1204; Plains Grange, No. 459; Guilford Grange, No. 1423; Hartford Grange, No. 1479; Margaretta Grange, No. 488; Mohawk Grange, No. 1420; Paulding Grange, No. 332; Jennings Grange, No. 1320; Liberty Hill Grange, No. 1087; Wabash Grange, No. 236; Sunrise Grange, No. 1220; Garrettsville Grange, No. 1436; Washington Grange, No. 5; Union Grange, No. 869; Logan Grange, No. 3; Andover Grange, No. 1468; Buckeye Valley Grange, No. 640; Surprise Grange; Union Ridge Grange, No. 1470; McDonald Grange, No. 669; Jackson Center Grange, No. 587; Greenwood Grange, No. 1061; Twin Valley Grange, No. 657; Jefferson Grange, No. 909; Goodwill Grange; Pleasant Grange, No. 399; New Buffalo Grange, No. 1478, and Jackson Grange, No. 341, all Patrons of Husbandry, in the State of Ohio, praying for the enactment of adequate anti-trust laws; which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also presented petitions of Shannon Grange, No. 1478; Little Hocking Grange, No. 873; North Camden Grange, No. 1053; North Star Grange, No. 671; Anglaize Grange, No. 347; Ohio Grange, No. 347; O. B. Grange, No. 116; Twin Valley Grange, No. 657; Pleasant Grange, No. 399; Jefferson Grange, No. 909; North Lima Grange, No. 1476; Salem Grange; McDonald Grange, No. 669; Andover Grange, No. 1468; Wyandot Grange, No. 549; Jackson Grange, No. 341; Shanesville Grange, No. 1443; Logan Grange, No. 3; Enterprise Grange, No. 472; Harrison Grange, No. 151; Canaan Grange, No. 557; Union Ridge Grange, No. 1470; Meadow Grange; Buckeye Valley Grange, No. 940; Greenwood Grange, No. 1061; Jackson Center Grange, No. 587; Margaretta Grange, No. 488; New Buffalo Grange, No. 1478; Straw Camp Grange, No. 1204; Hartford Grange, No. 1479; Guilford Grange, No. 1423; Union Grange, No. 869; Oxford Grange, No. 263; Washington Grange, No. 5; Canaan Grange, No. 1280; Garrettsville Grange, No. 1436; Wabash Grange, No. 236; Jennings Grange, No. 1320; Liberty Hill Grange, No. 1078; Mohawk Grange, No. 1420; Paulding Grange, No. 332; Franklin Grange, No. 1193; Ideal

Grange, No. 1456; Olin Grange; Brunswick Grange, No. 1344; Champion Grange, No. 738; Marlboro Grange, No. 1401; Maple-grove Grange, No. 1490; Fulton Grange, No. 217; Mount Nebo Grange, No. 664; Salem Grange, No. 1414; Walnutgrove Grange, No. 1419; Westland Grange, No. 121; Fulton Grange, No. 217; Freedom Plains Grange; Clyde Grange, No. 364; New London Grange, No. 1422; Manchester Grange, No. 47; Huron Grange, No. 1385, and German Grange, No. 1348, all Patrons of Husbandry, in the State of Ohio, praying for the election of United States Senators by the popular vote of the people; which were referred to the Committee on Privileges and Elections.

He also presented petitions of Bristol Grange, No. 86; Fulton Grange, No. 217; Perry Grange, No. 266; Chatham Grange, No. 1439; Trenton Grange, No. 998; Elsie Grange, No. 625; Lindale Grange, No. 248; Mount Nebo Grange, No. 664; Maplegrove Grange, No. 1430; Grant Grange, No. 520; Lebanon Grange, No. 1462; Excelsior Grange, No. 420; Champion Grange, No. 738; Enterprise Grange, No. 1407; Pleasant Hill Grange, No. 598; Wabash Grange, No. 236; Center Grange, No. 788; Guernsey Grange, No. 1366; Junior Grange, No. 841; Salem Grange, No. 1414; Shady Vale Grange, No. 348; Garrettsville Grange, No. 1436; Union Grange, No. 869; Union Grange, No. 1078; Fairfield Grange, No. 278; Westland Grange, No. 121; Enterprise Grange, No. 472; Buckeye Valley Grange, No. 940; North Camden Grange, No. 1053; Mount Carmel Grange, No. 975; Logan Grange, No. 3; Berlin Heights Grange, No. 345; Hope Grange, No. 406; Oakgrove Grange, No. 1428, and McDonald Grange, No. 664, all Patrons of Husbandry, in the State of Ohio, praying for the extension of rural free mail delivery; which were referred to the Committee on Post-Offices and Post-Roads.

He also presented petitions of Salem Grange, No. 1414; Westland Grange, No. 121; Shannon Grange, No. 1418; Shady Vale Grange, No. 348; North Camden Grange, No. 1053; Angelize Grange, No. 347; Mount Carmel Grange, No. 975; Hope Grange, No. 406; McDonald Grange, No. 669; Perry Grange, No. 266; Fulton Grange, No. 217; Magog Grange; Chatham Grange, No. 1437; Mount Nebo Grange, No. 664; Elm Tree Grange, No. 1407; Logan Grange, No. 3; Berlin Heights Grange, No. 340; Bristol Grange, No. 80; Oak Grove Grange, No. 1425; Canaan Grange, No. 457; Union Grange, No. 1078; Prairie Grange; Guernsey Grange, No. 1366; Danube Grange; Wabash Grange, No. 236; Line Grange; Champion Grange, No. 1138; Maple Grove Grange, No. 430; Lindale Grange, No. 248; Union Grange, No. 869; Meadow Grange; Jackson Grange, No. 403, and Garrettsville Grange, No. 1436, all Patrons of Husbandry, in the State of Ohio, praying for the enactment of legislation to secure protection in the use of shoddy in manufactured goods; which were referred to the Committee on Manufactures.

Mr. SHOUP presented resolutions adopted by the National Live Stock Association, held at Fort Worth, Tex., favoring the admission of Oklahoma, New Mexico, and Arizona to statehood; which were referred to the Committee on Territories.

Mr. HOAR presented a petition of Lincoln Division, No. 101, Sons of Temperance, of Lawrence, Mass., praying for the enactment of legislation to prohibit the importation, manufacture, and sale of intoxicating liquors and opium, and the prohibition of gambling in Hawaii; which was referred to the Committee on Pacific Islands and Puerto Rico.

He also presented a petition of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Leicester, Mass., praying for the enactment of legislation to prevent the extension of the liquor traffic in the insular possessions of the United States; to prohibit the sale of liquor in Army canteens, immigrant stations, and all Government buildings; to adopt an amendment to the Constitution to prohibit polygamy; to correct the laws relating to divorce in the several States, and to prohibit the publication of accounts of prize fights; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. LODGE presented a memorial of the National Sportsman, of Boston, Mass., remonstrating against the passage of the so-called Loud bill, relating to second-class mail matter; which was referred to the Committee on Post-Offices and Post-Roads.

He also presented a petition of 37 citizens of Medford, Mass., and a petition of the congregation of the First Baptist Church of Medford, Mass., praying for the enactment of legislation to prohibit the importation, manufacture, and sale of intoxicating liquors in any of the new possessions of the United States; which were referred to the Committee on Pacific Islands and Puerto Rico.

Mr. FRYE presented the petition of Stephen F. Weston and 60 other citizens of Cleveland, Ohio, praying for the enactment of legislation to provide that no customs tariffs shall be permitted between the United States and Puerto Rico; which was ordered to lie on the table.

#### APPOINTMENTS TO NAVAL ACADEMY.

Mr. HALE. I present communications from the Secretary of the Navy, relative to Senate bill No. 3442, proposing to increase the number of cadets to be appointed at large by the President to



the United States Naval Academy. I move that the communications be printed as a document to accompany that bill, and that they be referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

The motion was agreed to.

#### REPORTS OF COMMITTEES.

Mr. HANSBROUGH, from the Committee on Public Lands, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. 4001) authorizing the adjustment of rights of settlers on the Navajo Indian Reservation, Territory of Arizona, asked to be discharged from its further consideration and that it be referred to the Committee on Indian Affairs; which was agreed to.

He also, from the Committee on the District of Columbia, to whom was referred the bill (S. 1027) for the transformation of the inner basin of the Potomac flats into a public bathing pool, reported it with amendments, and submitted a report thereon.

Mr. CULLOM, from the Committee on Foreign Relations, to whom was referred the bill (S. 2330) to authorize the President of the United States to invite the International Congress of Navigation to hold its ninth session in Washington, D. C., reported it with amendments.

Mr. PROCTOR, I am directed by the Committee on the District of Columbia, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. 8466) to amend an act entitled "An act in relation to taxes and tax sales in the District of Columbia," to report it without amendment, and to submit a report thereon.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be placed on the Calendar.

Mr. PROCTOR, I move that the bill (S. 3190) to amend an act entitled "An act in relation to taxes and tax sales in the District of Columbia," being Order of Business 468 on the Calendar, be postponed indefinitely, and that the House bill just reported by me be given the place of the Senate bill on the Calendar.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. STEWART, I am directed by the Committee on Indian Affairs, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. 4001) authorizing the adjustment of rights of settlers on the Navajo Indian Reservation, Territory of Arizona, to report it with an amendment. The bill belongs to the Committee on Indian Affairs and that committee has investigated it.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be placed on the Calendar.

Mr. ROSS, from the Committee to Examine the Several Branches of the Civil Service, to whom was referred the bill (S. 2000) regulating appointments to and removals from civil offices in outlying dependencies of the United States, reported it with amendments.

Mr. KENNEY, from the Committee on the District of Columbia, reported an amendment proposing to appropriate \$25,000 for grading and paving Connecticut avenue (extended) between Columbia road and Kalorama avenue, intended to be proposed to the District of Columbia appropriation bill, and moved that it be referred to the Committee on Appropriations and printed; which was agreed to.

He also, from the same committee, to whom was referred the bill (S. 3369) for the relief of Mary C. Henderson, submitted an adverse report thereon, which was agreed to; and the bill was postponed indefinitely.

Mr. GALLINGER, from the Committee on the District of Columbia, to whom was referred the amendment submitted by Mr. HAWLEY March 21, 1900, proposing to appropriate \$5,000 for the equipment and maintenance of an industrial institution for the employment of the blind of the District of Columbia, intended to be proposed to the District of Columbia appropriation bill, reported it with an amendment, and moved that it be referred to the Committee on Appropriations and printed; which was agreed to.

He also, from the Committee on Pensions, to whom was referred the bill (S. 3619) granting a pension to Mary A. Colhoun, reported it with amendments, and submitted a report thereon.

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

A bill (H. R. 4047) granting an increase of pension to James S. Jordan; and

A bill (H. R. 6161) granting an increase of pension to John Landegan.

Mr. McMILLAN, from the Committee on the District of Columbia, to whom was referred the bill (S. 3663) authorizing and requiring the Metropolitan Railroad Company to extend its lines on old Sixteenth street, reported it without amendment, and submitted a report thereon.

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

A bill (H. R. 6243) to amend the charter of the Capital Traction Company of the District of Columbia; and

A bill (H. R. 2826) authorizing and requiring certain extensions to be made to the lines of the Capital Traction Company of the District of Columbia.

Mr. SHOUP, from the Committee on Territories, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. 8463) ratifying an appropriation by the legislature of Oklahoma, out of the Morrill fund, for the use of the university at Langston for colored students, reported it without amendment, and submitted a report thereon.

Mr. PRITCHARD, from the Committee on Pensions, to whom was referred the bill (S. 3662) granting an increase of pension to Louise D. Smith, reported it without amendment, and submitted a report thereon.

#### PUBLIC-SCHOOL STUDIES IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA.

Mr. STEWART. From the Committee on the District of Columbia I beg leave to submit a report under the resolution of the Senate of February 7, and I ask that it be printed and referred to the Committee on Appropriations. Let the resolution be read.

The Secretary read the resolution adopted by the Senate February 7, 1900, as follows:

*Resolved*, That the Committee on the District of Columbia is hereby directed to make inquiry and inform the Senate what course of study is prescribed for the public schools of the District, and whether a thorough instruction in spelling, reading, writing, grammar, arithmetic, and geography supersede teaching of the higher branches of learning; and if not, why not.

Mr. STEWART. The report is in writing, and I ask that it be printed and referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. In pursuance of the resolution the Senator from Nevada submits a report, which will be printed and referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

#### BILLS INTRODUCED.

Mr. DAVIS (by request) introduced a bill (S. 3772) to authorize the compilation and revision of the Statutes of the United States; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Revision of the Laws.

Mr. LINDSAY introduced a bill (S. 3773) for the relief of Susan B. Chambers; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

Mr. ALLEN introduced a bill (S. 3774) granting pensions to certain prisoners of war; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. WARREN introduced a bill (S. 3775) authorizing certain officers of the United States Army to appear for reexamination for promotion; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying paper, referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. SHOUP introduced a bill (S. 3776) providing for the rental and preparation in the city of Manila, Philippine Islands, of a suitable building for use as a library for the convenience and use of the American soldiers and sailors; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Philippines.

Mr. FOSTER introduced a bill (S. 3777) making an appropriation for the improvement of the harbor of New Whatcom, in the State of Washington; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Commerce.

Mr. PRITCHARD introduced a bill (S. 3778) granting a pension to Martha Ray; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also (by request) introduced a bill (S. 3779) for the relief of Marcellus J. Edwards; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

Mr. FORAKER (by request) introduced a bill (S. 3780) to purchase the portraits of Chief Justices Marshall, Taney, Chase, and Waite; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Library.

Mr. MORGAN introduced a bill (S. 3781) for the relief of Mary S. Thompson; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

#### WITHDRAWAL OF TROOPS FROM SHOSHONE COUNTY, IDAHO.

Mr. ALLEN. I introduce a joint resolution, which I ask be read at length and lie on the table subject to call. I shall endeavor to call it up on Monday.

The joint resolution (S. R. 110) requesting the President of the United States to withdraw the Federal troops from Shoshone County, Idaho, was read the first time by its title and the second time at length, as follows:

Joint resolution (S. R. 110) requesting the President of the United States to withdraw the Federal troops from Shoshone County, Idaho.

Whereas on the 29th day of April, 1899, an armed mob destroyed the concentrating plant of the Bunker Hill and Sullivan mines at Wardner, in Shoshone County, State of Idaho, and killed one person and wounded two others, and thereafter dispersed from the scene of riot; and

Whereas on the 3d day of May, 1899, the governor of the State of Idaho declared said county to be in a state of insurrection and rebellion; and

Whereas the President of the United States, upon the request of said governor, sent to the said county of Shoshone Federal troops, under the command of Brigadier-General Merriam, to aid the governor in maintaining law and order therein; and

Whereas the said county was placed under martial law, and has ever since that date been and now is under martial law, and the Federal troops of the United States have at all times since said 3d day of May been, and now are, within said county by virtue of the request of said governor and the order of the President of the United States; and

Whereas at all times since the 3d day of May, 1899, the county of Shoshone



has been in a state of peace and not of war, nor invasion, nor insurrection, nor rebellion; and

Whereas the courts have in said county been at all times since said date in the free and unobstructed administration of the law, save only when interfered with by the military authorities administering martial law in said county, and the process of said courts could at all times since the said 3d day of May, and now can, be legally served and executed; and

Whereas the officers of the United States in charge of said military forces have duly reported to the War Department of the United States that the said county of Shoshone is, and at all times since the 3d day of May, 1899, has been, in a state of peace, and that no opposition has been met by said troops while in the county of Shoshone in exercising any jurisdiction therein; and

Whereas it is not within the power or authority of the governor of Idaho or the President of the United States in a time of peace to continue martial law on account of any fictitious necessity; and

Whereas at all times since said 3d day of May, and now, in violation of the fourteenth amendment of the Constitution, citizens have been arrested without due process of law and held for indefinite periods at the will of the authorities claiming to exercise martial law in said county, without any judicial process or legal warrant; and

Whereas the governor of said State has suspended the writ of habeas corpus in said county of Shoshone, and the same is now within said county suspended as against said martial authorities; and

Whereas the representative of said governor, one Bartlett Sinclair, claiming to be in charge of the Federal troops in said county, after an examination and approval by Brig. Gen. H. T. Merriam, has promulgated an order, edict, and proclamation, preventing persons from working or being employed within the county of Shoshone without first receiving a permit to do so; and

Whereas about 1,000 citizens have been deprived, by reason of said proclamation and order and the rules and regulations promulgated thereunder, from seeking employment in said county and from working therein ever since said 3d day of May, 1899, and have been denied the right to work therein, although their labor was in demand, and have been arbitrarily arrested without warrant and held in imprisonment without bail, and the right of the writ of habeas corpus denied; and

Whereas the right to work is a property right, and the abridgment thereof is a deprivation of the liberty of the citizens, and a taking of property and the liberty thereof without due process of law; and

Whereas such rules, proclamations, and regulations exceed the power exercisable by the State or Federal Government under any conditions of affairs, and is the inauguration of a blacklisting system against labor in violation of the statutes of Idaho and the Constitution of the United States and the Declaration of Independence; and

Whereas innocent citizens have, without any trial, warrant, or legal hearing, during and under martial law, been arrested and imprisoned because they were working within said county of Shoshone from time to time, without permits, a copy of the form of such commitments being as follows:

A copy of the form of commitment follows:

"To ANGUS SUTHERLAND.

"SIR: You are hereby requested to take and to hold in your custody one — who has been arrested for violating the proclamation of the governor of Idaho, declaring martial law, and the rules and regulations of the military district established thereunder, said — to be held by you as such military prisoner until further orders.

"HUGH FRANCE,  
"State Representative.

"WARDNER, IDAHO."

and

Whereas under such authority, without being informed of the nature and character of the charge against them, without being given a hearing before any committing magistrate, and being denied the right to give bail, the said Hugh France, who is not an officer exercising any civil power under the constitution of the said State of Idaho, is causing men to be imprisoned and detained at his will and pleasure, and other unauthorized persons are exercising the right of arbitrary arrest and imprisonment of citizens without any lawful warrant or authority; and

Whereas such form of commitment and warrant of arrest is a revival of the infamous system of lettres de cachet, by which innocent citizens were arbitrarily arrested and held during the reign of Louis the Fourteenth of France and his despotic ministry, resulting in the revolution of the people against such despotic tyranny, and the same is but a repetition of the unlawful arrests made under the warrant of the early kings of England, abolished by the Bill of Rights and the Magna Charta, and such warrants are illegal, unconstitutional, and unprecedented in the United States, and abhorrent to all classes of citizens; and

Whereas a punishment for working without a permit is the establishment of an industrial crime unknown to the law, and abrogates the right of contract, and creates, by virtue of its provisions, a master and a slave; and

Whereas the right of trial by jury is denied to persons held by such military authorities, and new crimes, known as "violations of the governor's proclamation," of vague and undefined character, are deemed to justify the arrest of innocent citizens at the will of such authorities exercising martial law: Therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the further use of the troops of the United States in aiding or assisting in the maintenance of martial law within the said county of Shoshone is improper, unnecessary, and unlawful, and that the President of the United States be requested forthwith to withdraw said troops now in Shoshone County, unless the said permit system be forthwith immediately revoked, the writ of habeas corpus restored to the citizens of said county, and martial law declared to be at an end.

SEC. 2. That the sense and purpose of this resolution is in no wise to influence the President of the United States in maintaining and keeping said troops within the limits of the said county of Shoshone to aid the proper officers in the execution of the civil law therein.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Nebraska asks that the joint resolution lie on the table. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. ALLEN. Subject to call. I shall endeavor to call it up on Monday next.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Subject to call. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

#### AMENDMENT TO DISTRICT APPROPRIATION BILL.

Mr. PROCTOR submitted an amendment proposing to appropriate \$25,000 for grading and paving S and Decatur streets from Twenty-third street to Phelps place, and Twenty-second street from Decatur street to S street, intended to be proposed by him to

the District of Columbia appropriation bill; which was referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia, and ordered to be printed.

#### DIPLOMATIC AND CONSULAR APPROPRIATION BILL.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the action of the House disagreeing to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 7941) making appropriations for the diplomatic and consular service for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1901, and requesting a conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon.

Mr. HALE. I move that the Senate insist on its amendments and agree to the conference asked by the House.

The motion was agreed to.

By unanimous consent, the President pro tempore was authorized to appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate; and Mr. HALE, Mr. CULLOM, and Mr. TELLER were appointed.

#### PRESIDENTIAL APPROVALS.

A message from the President of the United States, by Mr. O. L. PRUDEN, one of his secretaries, announced that the President had on the 22d instant approved and signed the act (S. 35) granting a pension to Louise Donath.

The message also announced that the President of the United States had on this day approved and signed the act (S. 2279) declaring Cuivre River to be not a navigable stream.

#### SCHEDULES OF CERTAIN POSTMASTERS' SALARIES.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair lays before the Senate a resolution coming over from a former day, which will be read.

The Secretary read the resolution submitted by Mr. MORGAN on the 21st instant, as follows:

Resolved, That the Postmaster-General be, and he hereby is, directed to return to the Senate certain schedules of salaries of postmasters in the States of Alabama, Arkansas, Kansas, and Kentucky computed under the act of March 3, 1883, which schedules were before the Committee on Post-Offices and Post-Roads of the Senate, but which were temporarily recalled by the Postmaster-General on the 30th day of September, 1890.

Mr. ALLISON. That resolution was offered by the senior Senator from Alabama [Mr. MORGAN], who is not now in the Chamber. I do not wish to take action in his absence, but I think the resolution itself should be referred to the Committee on Post-Offices and Post-Roads.

Mr. COCKRELL. Then make the motion and let it be pending. Mr. ALLISON. I do not care to make the motion now, but I will make it when the Senator from Alabama comes in.

Mr. CULLOM. Let the resolution lie on the table for the present.

Mr. PETTUS. I ask the Senator to let the resolution go over without prejudice until the Senator from Alabama can return.

Mr. ALLISON. Certainly; that is what I proposed.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Alabama asks unanimous consent that the resolution may lie on the table without prejudice.

Mr. ALLISON. That is what I desire.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

#### EXPENSES OF THE PHILIPPINE COMMISSION.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair lays before the Senate the following resolution coming over from a former day.

The resolution submitted yesterday by Mr. PETTIGREW was read, as follows:

Resolved, That the President be, and he is hereby, requested, if not incompatible with the public interest, to send to the Senate an itemized statement of the expenses of the Philippine Commission, together with a statement of the amount paid to each commissioner for his services and individual expenses.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

#### CHARLES RIVER BRIDGE.

Mr. HOAR. I ask unanimous consent to call up for present consideration the bill (S. 2882) to authorize the Cambridge Bridge Commission to construct a drawless bridge across the Charles River, in the State of Massachusetts.

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

Mr. GALLINGER. I ask the Senator, before the bill is read, to yield to me merely for a request.

Mr. HOAR. Certainly.

Mr. GALLINGER. I rise to request that, after the bill which the Senator from Massachusetts has asked unanimous consent to have considered shall be disposed of, thirty minutes be devoted to the consideration of unobjected pension cases on the Calendar.

Mr. ALLISON. I trust the Senator from New Hampshire will withhold that request until after we shall have completed the consideration of the conference report.

Mr. GALLINGER. I will do so, Mr. President, and if I have an opportunity during the day I will renew the request.



The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill called up by the Senator from Massachusetts will be read.

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

Mr. HOAR. I move to amend by adding a proviso, which I send to the desk.

Mr. COCKRELL. Let the amendment of the Committee on Commerce be acted on. There is an amendment by the committee.

Mr. GALLINGER. That is right.

Mr. HOAR. I move to amend by adding the proviso, and then the amendment agreed to by the committee can be acted on. The amendment I propose is agreed on by the committee and by all parties.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. There is a committee amendment to be acted upon.

Mr. HOAR. It makes no difference.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. No; it makes no difference.

Mr. HOAR. It is in order to move to amend the amendment of the committee.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Massachusetts proposes an amendment, which will be read.

The SECRETARY. It is proposed to add to the bill the following proviso:

*Provided, That the State of Massachusetts, within a reasonable time after the completion of the said bridge, by legislative enactment, shall provide for adequate compensation to the owner or owners of wharf property now used as such on said river above said bridge for damages, if any, sustained by said property by reason of interference with access by water to said property now and hitherto enjoyed because of the construction of said bridge without a draw.*

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Massachusetts.

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment of the committee will be stated.

The SECRETARY. The Committee on Commerce report to amend the bill, in line 11, page 1, by adding, after the word "channel," the words:

And the piers and other obstructions to the flow of the tide to be constructed in such form and in such places as the Secretary of War shall approve;

So as to read:

*Be it enacted, etc., That the Cambridge Bridge Commission be, and hereby is, authorized to construct a drawless bridge across the Charles River, in the State of Massachusetts, between the cities of Boston and Cambridge, as provided for by chapter 467 of the acts of 1898, and chapter 180 of the acts of 1899, of the legislature of the State of Massachusetts; said bridge to be at least 26 feet above mean high water over the main ship channel, and the piers and other obstructions to the flow of the tide to be constructed in such form and in such places as the Secretary of War shall approve.*

The amendment was agreed to.

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

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

#### PUERTO RICAN REVENUES.

Mr. ALLISON. I ask now that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the conference report.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair lays before the Senate the conference report, which will be stated.

The SECRETARY. Report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 9080) appropriating, for the benefit and government of Puerto Rico, revenues collected on importations therefrom since its evacuation by Spain and revenues hereafter collected on such importations under existing law.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Will the Senate agree to the conference report?

Mr. TILLMAN. Mr. President, when this bill was before the Committee on Appropriations there was no difference of opinion in that committee as to the propriety and necessity of making the amendments which were afterwards adopted by the Senate, and I took pleasure in helping to report the bill back here by my vote and afterwards in voting for it in the Senate.

I am sorry that the Senate conferees have seen proper to surrender to the House, and even have gone further than that, because they have returned the bill to us with an objectionable feature, to me the most objectionable one there is in the whole provision, and that is that they enlarge the purpose for which this money is to be used by including the words "for the aid and relief of the people thereof."

In the brief speech I made on this question the day the bill was passed through this body I called attention to the danger that would arise in that island by inaugurating a scheme of so-called charity there which would necessarily bring about a repetition of the abuses of the Freedman's Bureau, and I pointed out the inevitable demoralization of labor and the inevitable consequence to the industries of that island by having the Government undertake to feed the people.

Now, there are two motives behind this bill as it is presented here, or as the majority in the Senate have seen proper to present it. One is that the necessity for immediate relief of the starving people requires that the United States Government shall take this extraordinary method of supplying their wants and preventing hunger and starvation; the other is, and that is the one which is not paraded here, that our Republican friends are uneasy about the effect on the political situation in the country and the result in the coming election if this outrage of levying a tariff tax and erecting a tariff wall between one portion of the United States and another is not glossed over or explained away in some way.

Before I present the last phase of this question I will discuss the first. I beg the attention of Senators to a statement of facts taken from General Davis's report. On page 544 of the compilation known as the annual report of the War Department, embracing the reports of Generals Brooke, Otis, and Davis, I find these words. I ask the attention of the Senator from Iowa, if I may have it, to the language used by this distinguished officer, who is the representative of our Government in Puerto Rico and whose words have appeared to have great weight with his party. I am sorry that so few Senators appear to have examined this report and know so little about it. General Davis says:

The greatest difficulty is encountered in discriminating between those who are really needy and those who pretend to be so. While it is possible that every ration has not fed a really needy person, it is also certain that very little food has failed to reach those who were much pinched by hunger. Those who deserved assistance and have failed to receive it are very few, indeed.

Now listen here, Senators:

It has been found to be practicable to cut down the aggregate of food issued from about 1,000 tons per week to less than 500 tons.

This was last October—five months ago.

Constant and progressive reductions are being made in the issues as the people reach better conditions and reproduction of native fruits is accomplished.

I called attention the other day to the fact that, owing to that country being in the Tropics, if any person would go out and plant the vegetables which furnish the main supply of the food in those islands, long ere this the pinch of starvation would be over; that those people now are practically in a normal condition so far as their immediate food supply is concerned; that their present trouble and the condition of paralysis and the destruction of business arise from the fact that they have no market; that they are hedged about by a tariff on imports and a tariff on exports, and that therefore wages have fallen; that everything is in a condition of uncertainty; that the business of that country is paralyzed by reason of the fact that the farmers can not obtain money with which to start the process of rehabilitating their coffee plantations or raising cane and other products that they export—I spell the word "cane" c-a-n-e, and not C-a-i-n, as I see my friend from Wisconsin [Mr. SPOONER] laughing—and that the difficulty there is not that the people are starving, but that they are in a condition of business paralysis, owing to our adverse legislative action or our failure to legislate at all.

Now, I will go further in proving this by reading from the report of Surg. John Van R. Hoff, president of the board of charities, appointed by General Davis last August, in connection with several other officers, to take charge of the distribution of the food that had been contributed and of such relief in money for the purchase of seed as would soonest bring the island back to a normal condition. Surgeon Hoff says:

The responsibility of determining who is indigent is placed upon the local boards of charities, organized in accordance with the letter of August 9, above quoted.

#### WEAK POINT IN THE ORGANIZATION.

Herein lies the weak point of the organization, and an explanation of its cause would involve a discussion of the sociological conditions obtaining here, which are not pertinent to this report. Suffice it to say that these people are not accustomed to organize for any purpose, particularly charity; that a gift from the charitable people of our country to preserve the natives here from starvation is not regarded as a sacred charge to be honestly administered, but as a public contribution in which all are entitled to share; and, finally, a large proportion of the people are chronically indigent and always on the verge of starvation, so that it is no easy matter to discriminate between degrees of indigency.

The same gentleman further on reports:

The greatest difficulty is found in making the able-bodied men work for food, if they can, as they usually do, get it without work. It requires rather too fine reasoning for these people, and indeed much higher orders of intellect, to appreciate the fact that they are not working for food, but life; that the food is given them to prevent their starving to death, and that if there is no danger of such a result the charity of our people is misapplied.

Further on he states:

Some planting is being done, but not so much as desirable, and it is not likely in any event that the issue of food can be wholly stopped before the end of this year.

Here you have the man placed in charge of the distribution of food and the relief of the distressed telling you that the relief necessary to prevent starvation would have been ended by December.

Now, then, here it is March; and it is evident to any man who will deal honestly with this question that the effort to sustain the



action of the Senate and of the House in passing this bill in its present shape is not due to the necessity for relieving starvation, when your officers, who are there in charge and who have all the knowledge of the case that is necessary, tell you it is not so.

Mr. ALLISON. Mr. President—

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from South Carolina yield to the Senator from Iowa?

Mr. TILLMAN. With pleasure.

Mr. ALLISON. The Senator has probably overlooked the fact that within a very few days—within ten days, certainly—General Davis has made a request, which has been granted, that 500 tons of food and necessary supplies be sent to those people, and in that letter he states that such aid will be required for some time to come.

Mr. TILLMAN. I have not overlooked anything of the kind, because I saw a statement of it in the paper a few days ago. I saw also what purported to be a press dispatch from San Juan, proclaiming that some sixty or one hundred ragamuffins, who were on the verge of starvation, had marched to General Davis's headquarters in procession, urging and begging for something to keep them from starving, whereas here we have it stated that you can not discriminate as between those who are chronically on the verge of starvation and those who have been reduced to that condition by the hurricane.

Mr. ALLISON. But the Senator certainly has faith in the statement of General Davis, who made this positive statement to the Secretary of War, and the War Department has acted and is acting upon his statement. He certainly would not make this request if it was not necessary.

Mr. TILLMAN. Can the Senator certify to the fact that that is an official communication from General Davis, or does he merely get it out of the newspapers?

Mr. ALLISON rose.

Mr. TILLMAN. Now, wait, please. I will give the Senator my reasons for asking that. However, he may answer first whether he knows that this letter was a bona fide requisition, an official communication from the general in command there or not?

Mr. ALLISON. I do not know it from having seen the communication, but I know it was stated to me in the War Department that such a communication had been made. I do not see how it could be otherwise than official.

Mr. TILLMAN. Well, Mr. President, then we go back to the other prong of the proposition, or rather to the argument presented by me, that as long as you feed these people you may continue to feed them, because it is inherent in their blood, as we had it demonstrated in the South for two years, as long as the Freedman's Bureau ran, that if you will feed colored people free they will not work.

Now, there it is. The question is whether you propose to have this Government set itself up as an eleemosynary establishment to relieve that sort of distress perpetually to the demoralization of all the labor of the island, to the preventing of the planters from obtaining the necessary labor to restore their coffee plantations, and to the demoralization of our legislation here, because I do not think any man here will deny that while in an emergency such as the Mississippi floods and other devastations of nature that have occurred in this country Congress has stepped forward and felt willing to lend a helping hand temporarily toward preventing suffering and restoring in some degree, by the furnishing of seed and other assistance, a normal condition of affairs, I do not feel that it is possible for this appropriation to be sustained on any such ground; and if our friends would be honest with themselves and with us they would not contend for any such action here.

We all know that while these reports as to the condition of starvation or suffering there were before this body in December, and the President was in full knowledge of the facts, he advised that you give those islanders relief not by appropriating money that you had unlawfully collected from them—I use the word “unlawfully” as my word, not as the committee may, or as you—I say not by giving them out of the Treasury the money that you had unlawfully collected, but by giving them a chance to help themselves by removing the tariff barriers erected between them and us and allowing their products to get into the United States on such terms as would allow profit enough to restore the island to a degree of prosperity. The President declared that; the Secretary of War declared it. The chairman of the committee having this matter in charge brought in his bill for free trade, and the chairman of the committee at the other end of the Capitol brought in his bill for free trade; and there has been no contention that this—

Mr. SPOONER. Will the Senator allow me?

Mr. TILLMAN. Let me get through with my sentence.

There has been no contention that this action was necessary as a matter of charity to relieve the suffering until you Senators found yourselves face to face with a dilemma, and you sought to crawl out of that hole.

Mr. SPOONER. Will the Senator now allow me a question?

Mr. TILLMAN. With pleasure.

Mr. SPOONER. The Senator has referred to a bill for free trade introduced in the House of Representatives by the chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means. Has the Senator read that bill?

Mr. TILLMAN. No, I have not; but our friend from Missouri [Mr. COCKRELL], in whom we all have absolute confidence, yesterday morning explained the matter fully to the Senate.

Mr. SPOONER. But I am asking the Senator from South Carolina if he has read the bill?

Mr. TILLMAN. I say I have not.

Mr. SPOONER. Then the Senator can not say whether he approves that bill or not.

Mr. TILLMAN. I want free trade with Puerto Rico as a general proposition—as a concrete proposition.

Mr. SPOONER. Has the Senator read the provision in the bill introduced by the Senator from Ohio [Mr. FORAKER] on that subject?

Mr. TILLMAN. No, I have not; but that was a free-trade provision.

Mr. SPOONER. Is the Senator in favor of that free-trade provision?

Mr. TILLMAN. I do not know what it is; but I am in favor of free trade with Puerto Rico. I do not believe in one part of the United States taxing another part. There is already on foot in this Capitol an effort to discriminate against the industries in one portion of the United States in favor of the industries in other portions of the United States by incorporating into the Constitution of the United States an amendment allowing Congress to regulate the hours of labor. I do not believe in protecting a part of the Americans against the other Americans. Let everybody have the same rights under the flag. That is the proposition I am advancing here.

Mr. GALLINGER. If the Senator will permit a question for information, will he explain how there is any injustice done his people if uniform labor hours are given to the laborers in this country? I do not know that Congress has the power to enact such legislation; but admitting it to be a fact—

Mr. TILLMAN. We know that Congress has not such power, and so you have got to have a constitutional amendment in order to give it to Congress.

Mr. GALLINGER. Precisely. We will admit that as a starting point. How would that militate against the interests of the people of South Carolina; and what reason has the Senator for saying that there is such a purpose in the minds of those who are advocating uniform hours of labor for the workingmen?

Mr. TILLMAN. I will answer that question with pleasure, but I do not intend to be drawn off from the subject under discussion. Having incidentally mentioned it, however, I have no objection to answering the question of the Senator from New Hampshire. It is because the climate of the United States is not uniform.

In a section of country like mine, where there are only three months in the year when you are compelled to shut the doors because of the cold, and during half of those three months you can leave the doors and windows open with comfort, you can not regulate the hours of labor in the same way that you can where similar conditions do not exist and where you are required to close your doors for six months in the year and live in a hot and foul atmosphere. Therefore, we have the advantage that God gave us of sunshine, and you can not get around it.

Besides that question of labor, in this connection, as I stated, I am opposed to any discriminating features in our legislation under the Constitution, or otherwise, which interfere with local conditions, and I am opposed to having one part of the United States rob another part.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. President, will my friend permit me to ask him a question?

Mr. TILLMAN. With pleasure.

Mr. PERKINS. He has stated without reservation that he is in favor of free trade with Puerto Rico, our newly acquired colony, where labor is worth from 15 to 20 cents a day. Is he willing that that labor should come into competition with the high-priced labor of California and South Carolina? I also ask him if he is in favor of free trade with the Philippine Islands?

Mr. TILLMAN. If we continue to hold the Philippine Islands, I shall be in favor of letting the trade follow the flag and, likewise, of having no barrier between them and us.

Mr. PERKINS. The question of holding those islands is not under consideration. We have acquired them by a treaty to which the Senate was a party, and my friend from South Carolina, if he did not vote for the ratification of that treaty, was present and had an opportunity to give expression to his views. Those islands belong to the United States as much as Alaska or California or any State in the Union; but whether we are to give them away is a question for future legislation. They belong to us now. Is it right for that cheap labor, that peon, contract labor, to come into competition with American labor?



Mr. TILLMAN. Mr. President, there is an old legal maxim, I believe, that a man can not take advantage of his own wrong; and those who voted to bring into this country and under its jurisdiction and its flag and its citizenship this cheap contract labor, this peon labor, this Malay labor, and other forms of colored labor, were told what the results would be that would follow the ratification of that treaty; and it was very hard to get the votes necessary to make that treaty a law, and I have heard you had to buy some men to vote for it. The question as to whether a wrong is to be done to the American people, as to whether a wrong is to be done to our citizenship, as to whether a wrong is to be done to those suffering people, who have themselves protested by giving up their lives against being subjugated by the American Army—that question is before the American people to-day; and it is almost the only question before them. They will determine in November whether the flag shall mean one thing in the United States and another thing in Puerto Rico and still another thing in the Philippine Islands.

I, of course, must bow to their behests, and if the majority in the election of next November say that they want to have "subjects" and citizens under our flag; that they want "dependencies;" that they want colonies, and have Congress turned loose untrammelled to legislate as it pleases, to rob those people by sending them a new army of carpetbaggers, to be protected by the bayonet, I can not help it; but, so help me God, so long as I have got a voice I shall protest against it.

But, Mr. President, as we have got off on to the Philippines—I intended to get there anyway—as I said the other day, the Philippine fever is in the blood of the country. The question here at stake is not whether we shall have free trade with Puerto Rico, but whether by giving Puerto Rico free trade we shall establish a precedent which will require us to give free trade to the Philippines. That is the issue; that is the ghost that stares you Republicans in the face and warns you to beware of the ideo of November. You would willingly give Puerto Rico the same meed of government, the same opportunities, that you gave Hawaii, I presume; but you are afraid of the consequences of that, and therefore you are compelled to raise the cry that you must protect American labor against the pauper labor of the Philippines—the 20-cents-a-day man. You would not let that pauper labor alone. The same obligation to extend your civilization, if you choose, will apply to any other place you may reach out and steal or grab.

Here is Haiti or San Domingo at our doors. Why not go down there if we are under obligations to civilize and educate and rob through our Government every dependency or every other island lying around loose? If we choose to go to Haiti, nobody in Europe will object or dare to say "no;" and when we get ready to go from the Philippines on to the Asiatic mainland, and take a slice of China in furtherance of our commerce, our benefit as a people, and in a money-making way, England and the rest of Europe will be glad to see the so-called free Republic of the United States turn its face backward, carried away from the ideals of this country, reverse its action for one hundred and twenty-five years, and fall in behind the despotisms of Europe in the further enslavement of mankind.

It has been charged that it was the speech of the senior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. HOAR] which brought on the rebellion of the Filipinos. It is said that speech was cabled over there under the ocean at a cost of \$4,000, and that on that speech being read to the Filipinos they rose in rebellion and began to shoot our soldiers to death. That was one of the dodges of the Republican press, the imperialist press, that wanted to try to fix the fault somewhere and throw the blame on some one.

We have had a new story within a week. I am sorry that our young friend from Indiana [Mr. BEVERIDGE] is not in the Chamber. The latest news is that his great speech in the Senate, in which he outlined the policy to be followed by this Government—the kind of tyranny or despotism we were to set up—has been translated into Spanish and has been spread broadcast among the Filipinos. That, no doubt, accounts for the recent renewal of hostilities and the liveliness which the extinct rebellion is now exhibiting again. Instead of the long-promised peace coming, the outlook is that the war will last indefinitely, because those people have found, at last, that all our professions of humanitarianism and of philanthropy and of our intention to raise them up in the scale of citizenship and give them the blessings of American liberty are lies; that we propose to go there in order to exploit them, to get them so as to furnish a new field for a new set of thieves to go and rob and rob and rob under the American flag.

Then comes along another thorn in the side of our unhappy friends on the other side of the Chamber. President Schurman, one of the Filipino Commissioners, who went out to the Philippines and did not succeed in obtaining any conditions of peace or amity with the rebels, warns you that if you are going to treat Puerto Rico in this way with a discriminating tariff, and your refusal to grant them any rights under the flag, that will only increase the

determination of the Filipinos to resist to the death. So you are a very unhappy family, and I sympathize with you from the bottom of my heart. I only hope you will come to repentance some day after November, when the American people will have taught you that trade and the flag and liberty and the Constitution all go together.

What is the cause of this sudden change of front, this transformation of the purposes of the President and of Congress, as shown by the withdrawal of the free-trade bill and the introduction of the tariff provisions at the other end of the Capitol and also in this end? What caused all this change? I do not know. I have my suspicions, as I said, it was because you ran up against the proposition that if you treat Puerto Rico in a certain way, you would have to treat the Philippines in the same way; because we hold them under the same deed, and there can not be any differentiation in the treatment of the two, unless you propose to display such brassy and unadulterated and damnable selfishness and greed that you are afraid to trust your cause to the American voters.

I have here an editorial from a leading Republican newspaper, possibly the most influential paper in the West, one that is edited by a bosom friend of the President, one that has had more influence in the party councils than almost any other; and I will let the editor of that paper give his interpretation and explanation of the change of front on the part of the Republican party. If there is any Senator here who chooses to deny the soft impeachment, I will leave the brethren to settle it among themselves. This gentleman says that his paper—

has been besieged by requests "for fuller and definite information concerning the origin of the present folly which has been foisted upon the party by its 'leaders' in the House of Representatives," to use the words of "a life-long Republican," who writes from Earlville, this State. "If the President has solid base for his change," writes the pastor of a Methodist church in Lake Linden, Mich., "he is in duty bound to make it known to the country." From various sources come queries of the same tenor, all expressing wonder, amazement, regret, and indignation that the Republican party should have been placed in an utterly untenable position by its leaders in Washington, and all with one voice repudiating the action of those leaders.

That this man knows whereof he speaks is shown by the Associated Press dispatch this morning from Iowa, in which we have news of the action of the Iowa legislature yesterday denouncing this proposition to erect a tariff wall between Puerto Rico and the United States, and warning the Republicans from that State that if this course is not changed there will be a day of reckoning. "It never rains but it pours," but it seems that the avalanche of trouble, which up to a month ago no one even suspected to be in existence, has broken loose and it is now tumbling upon the heads of our friends on the other side, and they are each and every one looking for cover and trying to find some place to hide.

Our friend the editor goes on to say that he—frankly confesses that the reversal of the policy of the leaders of the Republican party in Congress is as inexplicable to-day as it was when the Committee on Ways and Means reported the 25 per cent tariff measure. In both the House and Senate the Puerto Rico bills went in free-trade lambs and came out tariff wolves.

#### That is Democatic doctrine, is it not?

There is nothing in the testimony before the Senate Committee on Puerto Rico reported February 5 that can in any way explain or justify the departure of that committee from its original bill, which gave free trade to Puerto Rico. True, Henry T. Oxnard, of Oxnard, Cal., the representative of the beet-sugar industry, and Herbert Myrick, of Springfield, Mass., chairman of the "League of Domestic Producers," and claiming to represent the beet-sugar, cane-sugar, tobacco, wool, cotton, fruit, vegetable, rice, and nut producers, appeared before the committee. The latter demanded the defeat of pending treaties of reciprocity with the British West Indies, whereby sugar and other products are to be admitted into the United States at a reduction in tariff rates, and of the admission to this market of Puerto Rican products duty free.

Mind you, now, two men only appeared here.

This Mr. Myrick fairly threatened the committee with the loss of 500,000 votes to the Republican party if it fulfilled the pledge of the President to give free trade to Puerto Rico. Some idea of what transpired in the committee may be learned from the following question asked by Senator PERKINS (Republican), of California:

"You speak of 500,000 of your subscribers through your publications every week. The question is troubling me."

It seems to be troubling others besides the Senator from California.

"This committee has before it a bill for the government of Puerto Rico. It belongs to the United States to-day—is as much a part of the United States as territory as the Hawaiian Islands or Alaska. How can we, in justice to this people and to the honor of our country, have a different law for the people of Puerto Rico than for those of Hawaii? I see the force of your argument, and I shall be very glad if you can show us a way out."

There is the Senator from California, with his honesty and his patriotism and his sense of fairness, asking that question just like he would in any other business proposition. Now, let us see what the answer was:

Mr. Myrick ducked, confessing that he was not posted "in the matters of social economy," his forte being "doctrines of agriculture."

The Senator from California did not get any answer. Then—

Senator DEWE tried his hand on Mr. Myrick with this question: Could any government sustain itself in having one kind of policy in the relations of Alaska to the United States and Hawaii to the United States, and another kind in the relations of Puerto Rico to the United States, those all being purchase places?



Another honest and natural question.

Again Mr. Myrick appreciated "the magnitude and the delicacy of the questions," but excused himself from illuminating the problem. The examination was turned to the "expediency and justice and fair play" of treating Puerto Rico differently from Hawaii and Alaska, and the following colloquy occurred between Senator NELSON and the witness.

Our honest old Norwegian went in to see if he could get any light out of this Mr. Myrick.

Senator NELSON. Are you opposed to free trade in any form with Puerto Rico?

Mr. MYRICK. Yes, sir.

Senator NELSON. Then you are in favor of Puerto Rico placing a tariff on our wheat and flour and meats exported from this country?

Mr. MYRICK. Yes, sir; as they always have.

Senator NELSON. You want them to put a tariff on it?

Mr. MYRICK. Yes, sir.

Senator NELSON. And that is the way you represent the Northwestern farmers?

The chairman of the committee, Senator FORAKER, asked Mr. Myrick this pointed question, which went to the very root of the matter.

As the Senator from Ohio always gets to the root of the matter whenever he tries.

"Leaving out constitutional questions, would you treat it [Puerto Rico] as a foreign country or as belonging to the United States?" What Mr. Myrick would do is enveloped in that dumbness which comes to every man who is cornered between "I dare not and I would."

In these questions and replies the reader has got as near as he is likely to get to the mysterious influence that has pushed the Republican party to the verge of a precipice, over which lie dishonor, injustice, and disaster. The hollow threat made by Mr. Myrick of what he could and would do with his 500,000 subscribers and his associated producers, coupled with the wild talk of cigar makers, stamped the committees of both Houses of Congress.

I want to finish all of this, although some of it is Republican at the tail; but we have had mighty good Democratic and patriotic doctrine announced here by this leading Republican editor.

We ask the careful perusal of the questions put by Senators PERKINS, DEPEW, NELSON, and FORAKER as demonstrating that up to January 20 no Republican leader in the Senate dreamed that it was either constitutionally or morally possible or expedient to treat Puerto Rico differently from any other territory belonging to the United States.

The truth is that the consistency and honor of the Republican party were sacrificed for cheap and cowardly political reasons, and the moral sense of the party was outraged at the bidding of the smallest fly that ever buzzed around the hub of progress.

Mr. President, I call attention to two or three points in this editorial for purposes of elucidation, if any Senator on that side who is authorized to speak, or who cares to assume the responsibility, will endeavor to explain. The first question asked here by a good old Methodist Republican up in the State of Michigan is: Has the President changed his mind or not? Is the President for free trade with Puerto Rico to-day or is he not? Is he leading his party, or has he surrendered to the dictates of the special interests that are mentioned here; and is he following the triumphal car like a prisoner of war, so to speak, and doing the bidding of those who seek to have certain American interests protected here against this little island in the Caribbean Sea? Will some gentleman please tell me whether the President is for free trade with Puerto Rico or is he not? [A pause.] Again that "dumbness" falls upon us all which fell upon the committee. [Laughter.] You either do not know or you are afraid to say.

The next question is—and I am not at all personal and have not the slightest intention of casting any reflection in any direction—why the Senator in charge of the Puerto Rican bill, the mouth-piece of his party on Puerto Rican legislation, who brought in a free-trade bill, has changed front, or, if he has not, where does he stand? Is he for free trade or is he not? The Senator will no doubt answer when he gets ready, or he can answer now.

Mr. FORAKER. What was the inquiry the Senator addressed to me? I did not hear it, as I was for the moment occupied otherwise.

Mr. TILLMAN. I am sorry that the Senator was so preoccupied; but if he desires me to repeat the question I will take pleasure in doing so.

Mr. FORAKER. I know I ought not to be failing at every moment to give my entire attention to the Senator from South Carolina when he is addressing the Senate, but I was not doing so at the moment.

Mr. TILLMAN. I know how impossible it is to always give attention; and when a dull, a prosy man gets up, I sometimes read or write letters, like other Senators; but if the Senator was not paying attention I thought I would wake him up.

Mr. FORAKER. I can give the Senator from South Carolina a certificate of character as against the character he is now applying to himself of being dull and prosy. The Senator is never that, and I always listen to him with very great interest.

Mr. TILLMAN. I am very much obliged to the Senator.

Mr. FORAKER. But as to the inquiry which has been addressed to me, I did not hear it, because I was trying to find some information which had been requested by a Senator.

Mr. TILLMAN. I was asking, if the Senator was willing to do so, whether he would explain his present attitude, as he was for free trade when he introduced the original bill, as I understand. Now he is either for free trade or he is not; nobody seems to know,

and, if he is willing to tell us, I should like to know what is his position.

Mr. FORAKER. I explained that formally in the report made on behalf of the committee to the Senate; and if the Senator will take the trouble to read Senate Report No. 249, he will find that there the whole question is discussed. It is stated on behalf of the committee in that report that we found when we came to make an investigation as to the conditions existing in Puerto Rico, that it was impossible by direct taxation on the property there to raise revenue sufficient to meet the necessary expenditures of the government we were seeking to create, and to relieve the people from that burden, as an act of mercy toward them, we cast about to find some indirect way of raising revenue, and came to the conclusion that the best way would be by tariff duties and by internal-revenue taxation provided by our bill to be levied and collected, and, in addition thereto, that, according to the estimate, amounting to \$1,000,000 less than was needed, we provided that there should be a very slight, and not at all burdensome, tax levied on commerce between Puerto Rico and the United States; that being, in the judgment of the committee, within the constitutional power of Congress to do, and a good thing to do in behalf of the people of Puerto Rico.

That is the reason given in the report, and it has been given time and again on the floor of the Senate, certainly as often as I have had occasion to speak upon the subject.

Mr. TILLMAN. I am obliged to the Senator, for he has brought my attention to the fact that I have not had time to read that report; and when we consider that there are a thousand or more subjects coming here every day of every conceivable kind, reports by the score and bills by the hundred, and I have some other duties here besides trying to follow the vagaries of a committee which changes about face every week, it is not surprising that I could not find time to read the report. I wanted to wait until the last thing got in, so as to see if the committee would stand by that for a week or two at least. [Laughter.] I expected the matter would be brought out in the debate, anyhow, and that I would have an opportunity to make it very clear that that is not your position. I do not believe it is, and I have a right to my belief. I do not believe the Senator has tried to deceive anybody.

Mr. FORAKER. The Senator is at liberty, of course, to disbelieve any statement I may make.

Mr. TILLMAN. No; but I do not believe that that is the purpose of this legislation; not that the Senator has made any misstatement of fact. I would not charge the Senator with such a thing, of course. I know he is incapable of anything of that kind. If there is a bold and brave fighter here, the Senator from Ohio is that man.

Mr. FORAKER. That squares the account. [Laughter.]

Mr. TILLMAN. The only thing that astonishes me is the fact that so brave and fair-minded a gentleman should lend himself to this subterfuge in trying to get his party out of the ditch into which it has fallen; and if it were not that he is more of a Republican than he is an American he would not do it.

But I did not intend to get off on that line just here. I wanted to call attention to the fact that I had, in my dull and blundering way, come to some conclusions on that subject myself and that I had interpreted the change of front on the part of the Senator from Ohio, and explained it as arising from an entirely different purpose, or rather from an entirely different power.

The editorial which I have read here happens to be from the Chicago Times-Herald, and everybody knows the brotherly Damon and Pythias like relations which exist between my friend from Ohio and Mr. Kohlsaat, and I felt constrained to believe, knowing the great love that these gentlemen have for each other, and knowing that they are both loyal to Mr. McKinley and the Republican party, that the Senator from Ohio simply got out of the free-trade boat because Mr. Kohlsaat got into it; that he could not live in an atmosphere contaminated by the presence of that person.

Mr. FORAKER. In answer to the Senator's remark, I will frankly confess, in the presence of the Senate, that I have felt since learning of Mr. Kohlsaat's attitude a great deal more confidence in my present position. [Laughter.]

Mr. TILLMAN. Mr. President, I have been right along that road myself. I have in my career come across editorials in papers that had fought and lied on me for years in which my action was commended, and immediately I set about to investigate in order to find out whether I had not been wrong when I got the approval of such papers, and I can understand why the Senator from Ohio should desert his own principles and his own calmly selected position because Kohlsaat took a position alongside of him. But at the same time it does not explain why the President, who was a warm friend and to whom Mr. Kohlsaat is a trusted adviser, has changed front, if he did change front.

Nobody can tell us whether he did or not. I want some gentleman here to explain to me the present attitude of the President. I have been trying to stand by him. I bore testimony the other day to what I said was his patriotism and nobility of character.



I do not hesitate any time to say that I think William McKinley is one of the most lovable men we have had in public life in America, but the trouble is Mr. McKinley will not stand up and have backbone sometimes. Republicans would have been in a heap better fix politically if he had stood by his free-trade proposition and let you gentlemen go on and fight it out among yourselves and pass a free-trade measure or not. "But whom the gods would destroy they first make mad," and confusion of counsel is the beginning of madness. That is my interpretation of the present situation.

We had testimony the other day that God Almighty had given us the Philippines; that the honored President pro tempore of the Senate and his collaborators on the Paris commission had very little or nothing to do with it; that it had come directly from the Almighty; that He had held us in the hollow of His hand; that the glory of our future history was to come from the fact that we were to reach out and grab up that island and this island; that we were to treat the colored races of those islands, not like we treat the colored people in the South, or not like you gentlemen once tried to treat them, but as we of the South have felt constrained to treat them; that you gentlemen have changed front on that subject, and that we were to have a glorious future, with so much money and emoluments and wealth flowing into our coffers in consequence of this new policy that we could not descend so low as to give the credit to the Senator from Minnesota and the Senator from Maine and their brethren on the commission, who had gone over to Paris and demanded the cession of these islands in the Pacific and had enforced that demand to the point that we got them, or got what title Spain had.

Nobody will tell us, as I said a moment ago, whether the President is for free trade or not. I wish I knew. I wanted to have the pleasure of supporting some measure that he had sent here, and that I could indorse honestly as an American without regard to being a South Carolinian or a Democrat, and now I am robbed of that pleasure. You gentlemen are cruel to us. Why do you not let us do something some time as Americans and not force us always back to the narrow rut of Democracy; and why do you not do something some time as Americans and not be such narrow, bitter partisans here?

Mr. PERKINS. My friend the Senator from South Carolina having mentioned my name in connection with the interview, perhaps it is proper that I should reply.

Mr. TILLMAN. Not the interview, but the examination before your committee.

Mr. PERKINS. Of course I am not authorized to speak for the President; but I am inclined to think that his views—I may have imitated them in that respect—were influenced by what was referred to by my friend the Senator from South Carolina, that great trusts were being formed in Puerto Rico for the purpose of controlling the sugar traffic. The Republican party is opposed to trusts and combinations, and knows that the only solution of that problem is the establishment of local beet-sugar factories, such as there are in Nebraska and in Utah and in Iowa and in Michigan and in California—which has some ten or twelve independent beet-sugar factories. They buy the raw product from the farmer, refine it in their own factories, and send it to the mechanics' table. That is the antidote for trusts.

Mr. TILLMAN. You mean the sugar trust?

Mr. PERKINS. For the sugar trust. These beet-sugar factories are buying from South Carolina the cotton cloth that is manufactured from the cotton grown in their fields. We are buying those sacks in which to put the sugar that we may send it out to our mechanics and our workingmen. We are paying from \$1.50 to \$3 a day for labor in those factories, and each farmer who is cultivating the soil and raising sugar beets is an independent sovereign in this fair land of ours. We are paying \$100,000,000 annually for sugar in this country. We want to manufacture it at home, from our beet sugar, raised by American farmers. We do not want the cheap peon contract labor, receiving 10, 15 or 20 cents a day, to come into competition with the labor of South Carolina and California. I think, perhaps, that is one of the reasons which influenced our good President, because his whole life has been devoted to protection to American industries and the elevation and dignity of labor. But this is a longer statement than I was going to make, and I see I am wearying the Senator from South Carolina.

Mr. TILLMAN. Oh, no; I have listened with a great deal of pleasure to the Senator from California.

Mr. PERKINS. I beg pardon.

Mr. TILLMAN. Because he has given us such a far-fetched explanation that it does not explain worth a cent. I have read somewhere that in the Koran there is a description of Mohammed's bridge over hell by which those entering heaven must pass, and I think he describes it as being so attenuated that it is about the breadth of a single hair on a woman's head. That is about the size of the bridge my friend the Senator from California has given the President to crawl out of the hole in which he was put

when he sent the free-trade message here and then backed water and changed front on it.

Mr. PERKINS. How about the tobacco industry of South Carolina?

Mr. TILLMAN. Speaking about the allusion which my friend has made, I will say to him, as to the purchase by the sugar producers of the cotton bags in which to put the sugar of the few factories in the United States, that we are very glad to furnish the cotton cloth, if it comes from my State, but the manufacturing industry of South Carolina—the manufacture of cotton principally—which we will say in 1890 showed that there were only 400,000 spindles, has doubled and trebled since, until they have now eighteen hundred thousand spindles and a proportionate number of looms. Since the 1st of January we have organized new mills or given charters to new enterprises to build mills to the amount of \$4,000,000, and we are reaching out hand over fist to overtake Massachusetts. We are already the second State in the manufacture of cotton.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. President—

Mr. TILLMAN. Let me get through. We do not find a bit of protection from the Dingley tariff, because we export all of that cloth to China; and we have to compete with England; and we do it, and we whip them, and make 20 to 40 per cent dividends on our cotton factories.

Mr. PERKINS. May I ask my friend the Senator from South Carolina whether it was the wise Democratic policy administered under President Cleveland, or the progressive policy under McKinley, which brought about this great revolution in his State, as well as in almost every other State of the Union?

Mr. TILLMAN. I do not think either McKinley or Cleveland had a thing in the world to do with it. It was because we had the cotton at our doors, we had the mills, we had the labor, we had the money, or went somewhere and got it; we built mills, and we can spin or weave cloth, and we can beat all creation making the coarser fabrics.

Mr. PERKINS. The Republican Administration gave confidence to the people of this country, Democrats, Populists, and Republicans alike, and it was that confidence which has enabled my good friend and his associates to build these factories, to build up and foster these great industries. I join hands with him and rejoice with him in the prosperity that has come to us under the McKinley Administration. You may call it what you please, but it means sunlight and happiness and joy to every home and family in this land, while before, under my good Democratic friend's Administration, there was a shadow, the sun was always behind a cloud, there was a want of confidence, and we expected that it might rain any time then. Now it is a reign of prosperity and happiness to all our people. May it long continue. It will continue so long as McKinley is President.

Mr. TILLMAN. The Senator imagines that he is before a Republican meeting somewhere in a schoolhouse in California talking to the faithful about the same old religion. [Laughter.]

Mr. PERKINS. It is good religion.

Mr. TILLMAN. When as a matter of fact the impetus to our industries in the way of cotton manufacturing did not begin with McKinley's Administration, but it began ten years ago, and the hard times of 1893 and the panic that followed did not cause any cessation, but only a slight retardation of that development. It was because we have found that we can make more money spinning cotton than we can by raising it and selling it to you to spin. When the Senator tells us that confidence brought all this back, I would tell him that we are still in sackcloth and ashes in South Carolina, because we are still free-silver people to the backbone, and we are still moaning in the outer darkness because of the recent iniquities you have perpetrated upon us in the way of the financial measure and the single gold standard, and all that kind of thing.

But we have decided that we are in the United States and must remain there, and if there is any good to come to us by working we will work and get it, and we do not want any help from outside; but we do not like to see you gentlemen, who proclaim the doctrine of equality of man and that trade follows the flag and that liberty and humanity and all that were the predominating influences in governing your conduct in the Spanish war and in the acquisition of the Philippines and Puerto Rico—we do not like to see you belie your professions. You have grown to be the most arrant hypocrites alive about it, and I am ashamed of you. [Laughter.]

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President, I have been unavoidably absent from the Senate during the past five days, and very likely I do not know exactly the status of this discussion. One week ago to-day I yielded the floor, without addressing the Senate as I was intending to do, for the purpose of having a vote on this particular bill, as I remember it, after a very lengthy speech had been delivered by the Senator from South Carolina. I enter the Chamber this morning to find that he is repeating that speech, and I wonder how it happens that this beneficent measure has not before now been sent to the President for his signature.



Mr. TILLMAN. If the Senator will permit just a slight interruption, I suppose it is one of those fortuitous conditions which will enable the Senator to wind up his eloquence and set it going, and I shall listen to him with a great deal of pleasure.

Mr. GALLINGER. I am always glad to yield to the Senator from South Carolina. He has always been courteous to me, and I am always courteous to him. I do not propose to indulge in any eloquence, but I desire to state two or three plain propositions in reference to the matter that is now under consideration.

Under the leadership of the senior Senator from Ohio [Mr. FORAKER], chairman of the Committee on Pacific Islands and Puerto Rico, I sat in the committee room for three long weeks listening to testimony given by Americans, residents of Puerto Rico, by native Puerto Ricans, and by citizens of the Kingdom of Spain in reference to the condition of the people of that little island. In that committee there was only one thought, and that was to do what was best for Puerto Rico. The quality of our mercy was not strained, and no thought, I feel sure, entered the mind of any member of that committee to recommend anything or to do anything that would not be for the best interests of that people, destitute and suffering as they were then and are to-day.

Mr. President, I have been one of the Senators who has voted for all kinds of appropriations during my membership in this body. I have voted for appropriations to build levees on the banks of the Mississippi River, spending millions upon millions of dollars for that purpose—appropriations the constitutionality of which I think might well be called in question—and then I have voted for appropriations to relieve the sufferings of the people of the Mississippi Valley, when those embankments that were constructed largely at public expense did not prove sufficient to protect the people from the overflows of that mighty river. I have never, Mr. President, indulged in technicalities or speechmaking on those occasions, but have come to the rescue of those people with my vote gladly and cordially, feeling that it was a beneficent thing for the Congress of the United States to do.

So, Mr. President, when we propose to make an appropriation from the public Treasury to relieve the sufferings of the people of Puerto Rico, I confess that I regret more than I can express that other considerations are brought into this controversy, and that we are treated to disquisitions on political subjects and the relative position of political parties on public questions. I think we ought to pass this bill promptly and without a moment's delay, and for that reason I yielded the floor one week ago to have the bill immediately acted upon.

The Senator from South Carolina [Mr. TILLMAN] in his speech on Friday last said that Puerto Rico was not being governed any better by the United States than it had been by the Kingdom of Spain. Mr. President, it hardly seems necessary for me to say that that is not so. Spain collected taxes on all the products of Puerto Rico, including coffee. The exports of Puerto Rico are four-fifths coffee, and yet Spain exacted tariff duties upon their coffee when it entered a Spanish port. We admit coffee into our country free of duty to-day, as we did while Puerto Rico was in possession of the Spanish Kingdom. We are treating Puerto Rico better than we are treating any of the Territories of the United States.

We collect internal-revenue taxes in New Mexico, Arizona, and Oklahoma, and those internal-revenue taxes go into the Treasury of the United States; but in dealing with Puerto Rico we propose that the internal-revenue taxes collected there, as well as the import duties collected against the products of that island, shall go back to Puerto Rico for the purpose of helping those people to rise from the degradation and suffering that are upon them at the present time.

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

Mr. GALLINGER. Certainly.

Mr. TILLMAN. Can you collect taxes without some expense attaching?

Mr. GALLINGER. Presumably not.

Mr. TILLMAN. Very well, then. If you leave with the people the taxes you collect and not put them to the expense of paying them into the Treasury of the United States, so that you may have the benefit of any philanthropy which you may claim for paying the money back to them, would they not be better off? If you leave them alone, would they not be better off than if you take the money out of their pockets and put it into your pockets, and then transfer it with the other hand and give it back to them after you have paid a whole swarm of officers to collect it?

Mr. GALLINGER. That does not answer the suggestion I was making at all. I simply say that we are treating those people better than we are treating the Territories of the United States over which the Constitution of the United States has been extended by direct legislation of Congress; and the few dollars which may be expended in collecting those taxes are certainly not worth considering in this connection.

Mr. President, the Senator from South Carolina last Friday,

and I think again to-day, has argued that after all there can not be very much destitution in Puerto Rico. To-day he read an opinion from somebody—

Mr. TILLMAN. I read it from the statement of the surgeon of the United States Army who by General Davis was placed in charge of the board of charities to distribute this food. He is not "somebody" or—well, he is somebody, sure enough.

Mr. GALLINGER. The Senator read an opinion, then, from the surgeon in charge whose duty it was to distribute the alms of the United States among those poor people, given several months ago. I do not know exactly when—

Mr. TILLMAN. October.

Mr. GALLINGER. In October last, saying that in all human probability we would not need to continue helping those people beyond the 1st day of January of the present year. General Davis, who has been governor of that island for a considerable length of time, gave testimony before our committee on the 17th day of January of the present year, and he seems to differ very materially with the gentleman quoted by the Senator from South Carolina.

Mr. TILLMAN. He simply differs with himself. I quoted from General Davis first, and then from the surgeon afterwards.

Mr. GALLINGER. The Senator from South Carolina, of course, will admit that General Davis may have expressed an opinion last July or August or September as to which events at the present time show that he was laboring under a misapprehension.

Mr. TILLMAN. I agree to that.

Mr. GALLINGER. The Senator from Indiana (Mr. FAIRBANKS) suggests to me that in General Davis's second report he expressly makes the statement that he had been laboring under a misapprehension. It will take a few minutes to read it, but I want to put into the RECORD what General Davis said about the island as he found it a very short time ago. He said, in his testimony before our committee:

This crop of sugar at this year's prices—about 80 pesos per ton—should therefore bring an income to the island of 3,000,000 pesos, or \$2,160,000, as a maximum.

In my report of September 5 I stated this at 5,000,000 pesos, and in report of September 30 at 60,000 tons; but revised and better studied figures give but \$2,160,000 as the value of the sugar for export.

In September I also estimated this year's coffee crop at 33 per cent of a normal one, or, say, 18,000,000 pounds, or about one-third of a normal output; but it appears that this estimate is not borne out by experience. What the tornado spared has now been harvested, and very careful and close inquiry reveals the fact that the yield varies from 0 to 33 per cent of an ordinary crop. I can find no well-informed person who believes that the total yield for export will exceed 10 per cent of a normal crop, the average having been for last five years of Spanish dominion 23,732,078 kilos, official figures.

Of the crop harvested last winter and exported this year, the custom-house officers report 29,478,329 kilos, which is somewhat above the normal export. It is conservative to estimate the total of this year's growth available for sale abroad at not more than 3,500,000 kilos.

The average prices obtained for coffee during the five years referred to was 51.9 centavos per kilo, or 23.6 centavos per pound, which is equal to 14½ cents gold. The loss of markets, and especially the Cuban, reduced the value of coffee to the producer to about 9 cents gold; but the restoration of the Cuban market, by recent Executive order, has practically restored the price, so that what remains on hand of the former crop and what may be sold from the one of this year will bring an average of about 12 cents, gold, per pound.

Taking the salvage from the hurricane at 2,273,000 kilos, or 5,000,000 pounds, it is readily seen that for this year the insular income from coffee will be only \$600,000 instead of the normal figures of about \$7,000,000.

My original opinion that the crop would fall off but two-thirds was based on the opinion that certain somewhat sheltered regions would give a half or two-thirds crop, and that other localities would make a showing of from a quarter to one-half, for enough berries were left on the bushes to justify this opinion; but the hope has proved illusory. The berries that survived were largely blighted, and as the necessary shade was gone, the direct rays of the tropical sun scorched and shriveled the green fruit. Much of what remained was worthless, and the harvest is most disappointing.

There are hundreds of coffee groves, indeed thousands, where no more remains than will suffice for home consumption, or none at all; and in the least exposed groves the quality is poor and the quantity is disappointing.

I shall be agreeably disappointed if the harvest surpasses 10 per cent of a normal crop. A few sanguine persons have expressed the belief that the percentage may reach 15.

The only other crop of magnitude that, exported, yields a revenue to the producer is tobacco. During the last five years under Spain the exports averaged 3,938,052 kilos, selling for 750,809 pesos, or 19.4 centavos the kilo, which is equal to 5.3 cents, gold, per pound. The poorer grades went direct to Europe, netting the producer 4 to 6 centavos per pound, and the better to Cuba, realizing from 25 to 35 centavos; but this market is now closed by a prohibitive import duty of \$5 per pound. Exported to the United States, the better grades pay a duty of \$1.85 and the poorer 35 cents per pound. Duties on tobacco are high in European countries, and as a consequence of these high taxes in all markets there is little commercial movement for this important Puerto Rican product.

In my cable of August 23 to the Assistant Secretary of War I estimated the tobacco then in the island at 4,000,000 pounds, which is about a normal crop. Since then some of this has been sold in Europe, a little in the United States, in leaf or manufactured, and a little has been exported to Cuba. The American Tobacco Company has lately bought the largest manufactory here, and the new management is understood to be arranging for a larger trade with the United States, the product of manufacture to be in the form of cigarettes.

The ever-recurring hope on the part of the inhabitants that there will soon be free trade with the United States, combined with the fact that some American capital has been invested in this industry, has stimulated the tobacco interests somewhat, and the planting of the new crop now going on will, contrary to my formerly expressed opinion, be of somewhat more magnitude than that of last year, probably yielding at least a normal crop of 4,000,000 pounds; and, at present prices, this would net to the producers about 750,000 pesos.



The custom-house returns show exportation since Spanish evacuation to September 30 of three and a quarter million pounds of tobacco, which includes some old stock of 1898, and this has brought returns to the farmers of about \$200,000; while the unsold residue now in the island may raise the total income for the sold and to be sold—i. e., the whole crop of 1899, with residue from 1898—to perhaps \$400,000.

The foregoing as respects the reasonably certain output for this year of the three great staples, and giving also the average export under Spain for five years ending 1897, we have the following:

Staple.	Estimated value for export, 1899-1900.	Actual average export, 1893-1897.	Reduction.
Coffee.....	\$900,000	\$6,080,409	\$5,480,409
Sugar and molasses.....	2,100,000	2,403,963	303,963
Tobacco.....	450,485	450,485	.....
Total.....	3,150,485	8,934,857	5,784,372

Here, then, is a presentation of the facts, as I interpret them, regarding trade conditions. The principal falling off is in coffee, which, as a commodity for considerable export, will not exist. This year's output of the three great products, compared with exports of the last five years of Spanish control, shows a falling off of very nearly 65 per cent of the insular wealth available for current needs.

The island has a few minor resources, but the aggregate of all exports other than the three staples amount to but a few hundred thousand dollars, and some of them are showing greatly diminished quantities and values.

The most important of these are live stock, but the exportation of beef brings another evil, an enhancement in the local value of fresh beef, so that it is quite too costly a food save for the well-to-do classes.

But the appalling diminution in exportable goods is not the worst feature of the existing situation. Credit is absolutely gone for all, save the sugar and tobacco producers, who have visible security. While the present price of sugar yields a margin of profit, there is little confidence that the ruling price will be permanent, unless the trade conditions are changed for the better. The best grades of centrifugal sugar sell for about \$50 per ton net to the producer, but not more than half the cane products are of this grade. The muscavado sugar commands but about \$40 per ton, or a little less, and at this price there is little or no margin of profit. It is only the large, central establishments that are now prospering.

Suffice it to say that General Davis estimates that the value of the coffee for export the present year is \$600,000, against an average export of \$6,080,409, and that the sugar exports will be \$2,100,000, against \$2,400,000, that the tobacco export will be \$450,000, against the same amount in former years, making an aggregate for the present year of \$3,150,485, as against \$8,934,857 in a normal year.

The sugar output—

General Davis says—

touched its maximum in 1879, 170,000 tons, while last year it fell to less than 45,000, or but a little more than one-fourth of the maximum. Very large expenditures in new plants and in restoring cultivation must be incurred before the sugar output can be increased, and this can not be made for the present.

The coffee fields, now smothered in weeds, uprooted trees, and debris of the storm, can not be cleaned and rehabilitated without capital, and this can not be secured. This year's sales of home productions in these commodities will bring returns of but about \$3,000,000, whereas the island is accustomed to receive almost \$10,000,000 for these same products, and there is nothing to replace them.

The condition of more than half the inhabitants has always been one of abject poverty. It is not difficult to foretell the consequence of the obliteration of two-thirds of former means of subsistence. It is doubtful if any land or district populated by nearly a million souls has, in modern times, been so devastated and overwhelmed as was Puerto Rico in one day of August last.

Heretofore coffee represented 70 per cent of the island's trade, but the next crop will probably not exceed 6 per cent of that value—the average of which, for the last five years, having been over sixteen and a half million pesos, representing the value of exports of the three principal commodities.

Mr. President, I have no disposition to enter into a discussion of the political situation. I will, as one member of that committee and as a Senator of the United States, say that the political exigencies to which the Senator from South Carolina alludes have had no influence whatever upon me. I have acted with the purpose of helping those people in the best possible way that could be devised, and I have no other object or purpose in mind.

The Senator from South Carolina pictures the disaster that is to come to the Republican party in November next because of the action that we have taken in the matter of Puerto Rican tariff duties. That is familiar talk to me. In my State the Democratic party carries the election every year in March, but it never carries it in November, and the Senator from South Carolina will very likely have his mind disabused on that point when the people of the country vote next November, after they have come to understand that we are endeavoring to legislate for the best interests of the people of Puerto Rico; and notwithstanding this clamor which has arisen in the country, the second sober thought will lead them to comprehend the fact that we have no other purpose than to legislate for their benefit and advantage.

Mr. President, we have given Puerto Rico a beneficent rule. The President selected as governor of that island General Davis—in my opinion, the ablest executive officer we have in the Army of the United States—an intelligent, broad-minded, conservative, generous man. Under his administration half a million dollars from

the Treasury of the United States has been expended to relieve the sufferings of those poor people, and now we propose in addition to that to vote more than \$2,000,000 out of the Treasury of the United States to further relieve their sufferings and their distress.

Mr. TILLMAN. There is a difference of opinion between the Senator from New Hampshire and me in regard to the source from which that money comes, and I confess I am not so certain that I will be disposed to dispute his statement; but if I did not misunderstand General Davis's figures and the sources of the income which he has expended, I think the Puerto Ricans have contributed to their government through such sources of taxation as import duties and local taxes the amount from which that relief fund came. If the Senator is positive, of course I will not dispute it; but I think he is mistaken.

Mr. GALLINGER. Well, Mr. President, I think I am not mistaken. I think we have expended the amount I named.

Mr. TILLMAN. The amount has been expended; there is no doubt about that, and General Davis expended it; at least it was expended under the board of charities which I have mentioned; but what I speak of is that the Senator is mistaken in supposing that it was contributed from the United States Treasury.

Mr. GALLINGER. I think the record will bear out the statement I have made.

Mr. President, a great hue and cry has been raised, and the Senator from South Carolina has added his eloquent voice in that direction, that we are in some way under the dictation of the trusts in this country in the legislation which is proposed for Puerto Rico. In other words, that the representatives of great aggregations of capital have come to Washington and taken this committee by the throat, taken the Republican Senators by the throat, and said to us that we must impose a tariff duty upon the products of Puerto Rico. It is familiar to every man who will recall the fact that when we imported sugar free from Hawaii the same cry was raised that the sugar trust had taken us by the throat; and now that we propose to impose a duty upon Puerto Rican sugar, the same old cry is revived and sent out to the country, that the trusts are dictating the policy of the Republican party.

Mr. TILLMAN. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. KEAN in the chair). Does the Senator from New Hampshire yield?

Mr. GALLINGER. With pleasure.

Mr. TILLMAN. Does the Senator recall the fact that his colleague from California [Mr. PERKINS] himself mentioned that what had brought his mind to see that a change in this matter was necessary was the fact that the beet-sugar producers of the United States would be injured by the influx into the United States of additional free sugar, and that he wished to guard against that from the Philippine Islands, and therefore he had altered his opinion. I am not the author of the accusation about trusts at all, but it comes from others. It is true, Mr. Oxnard is in the beet-sugar trust, if there be one, and it is also true that Mr. Claus Spreckels is in the cane-sugar trust in the Hawaiian Islands, where you have given the sugar free access here. And yet you turn around and levy a tariff duty on sugar from Puerto Rico and you have not explained why you do it.

Mr. GALLINGER. Now, Mr. President, the Senator says that Mr. Oxnard is in the beet-sugar trust, "if there be one." I am glad that the Senator qualified his statement, because I think I am safe in saying that there is no such trust; that if a trust exists in sugar it is entirely separate from the beet-sugar industry of the United States.

I only know, Mr. President, that in Nebraska, Iowa, and some other States of our country the people are investing their capital and are trying to raise beet sugar at a profit. I think it is safe to say that they have not made much profit out of the venture as yet. I have been glad to come to the rescue of those people and am willing to take the responsibility that may attach to my action by giving them a chance to invest American capital in the production of beet sugar and giving them a fair profit out of the investment of their capital and of their labor.

Mr. TILLMAN. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from New Hampshire yield?

Mr. GALLINGER. Certainly.

Mr. TILLMAN. Does the Senator contend that the 40,000 tons of sugar now produced in Puerto Rico, with the 170,000 tons which were produced when the industry was at its maximum growth, would affect the beet-sugar industry in the United States one-quarter of a mill?

Mr. GALLINGER. If the Senator will do me the honor to read the minority report from the Committee on Pacific Islands and Puerto Rico, which I was very happy to have my friend from California sign with me, he will find that I went a little beyond Puerto Rico in my discussion.

Mr. TILLMAN. Oh, the Philippines are the trouble here. That is the whole thing.



Mr. GALLINGER. And I undertook to give a good reason for the dissenting opinion that I wrote.

But, Mr. President, this talk about the trusts in this matter is simply for the purpose of influencing public opinion and nothing else, and I say there is nothing in it whatever. We have had only one trust that has been urging legislation through this committee and upon the American Congress, and that trust is to-day suffering at the Arlington Hotel with a British vice-consul at his head. That trust is composed of the men who bought last year's Puerto Rico sugar output, and who, I am informed, have an option upon the output of sugar in Puerto Rico for the coming year. They are the gentlemen who are raising this commotion to a very considerable extent, and they are the gentlemen whom we are oppressing, if we are oppressing anybody.

The British vice-consul, Mr. Finlay, appeared before our committee, and when I asked him the question as to whether he was engaged in business in Puerto Rico or not, he said, "Yes." "What is your business?" "I am a sugar planter." "Have you a very large sugar plantation, Mr. Finlay?" "Oh, fifteen hundred acres, and 5,000 acres in addition to that which are not very productive." Mr. Finlay and the gentlemen who are operating with him, who, as I say, are suffering to-day at the Arlington Hotel, bought the sugar upon the full Dingley rates, and if we pass the bill imposing a duty of 15 per cent they will get the benefit of 85 per cent and will make a very large fortune. But of course they would like the 100 per cent, because they would make a little more money than they would on 85 per cent.

Mr. TILLMAN. Mr. President—

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

Mr. GALLINGER. Certainly.

Mr. TILLMAN. Are we to dicker here with our consciences and our obligations as Senators in regard to a great constitutional question and an issue that is so important, and consider whether somebody somewhere may get a little money out of this change of legislation?

You can not levy a tariff at any time anywhere that somebody who has goods afloat or in bond will not get the benefit of it. I recollect that when passing the war-revenue measure I proposed a tariff on tea, and it went through. I asked my friends on both sides of the Chamber if I ought not to propose a tariff on coffee, and everybody said, "There ought to be a tariff on coffee, because there is no difference and it would be purely a revenue tariff, but if you do that the Arbuckles, or somebody else, I have forgotten whom, would make a great sum of money, because they had cornered the coffee of the country." You can not stop that kind of thing or prevent it. We are discussing principles here, not policy or the question whether somebody is going to make a few dollars out of any change in legislation.

Mr. GALLINGER. There may be a difference of opinion as to whether we are discussing principles or not. There might be, I think, a safe criticism offered upon the speeches made by the Senator from South Carolina as to whether or not he confined himself exclusively to the great constitutional principles which he sometimes elucidates.

I have no disposition to engage in any controversy or to make a single suggestion outside of the merits of this case. We propose to give Puerto Rico \$3,000,000 out of the Treasury of the United States. The Senator from South Carolina says we stole it from the people of Puerto Rico. Well, that is his opinion. My opinion is different. We collected it under the laws of the United States. It was legally collected. It is our money, it is in our Treasury, and now we propose as a humanity-loving people to put our hands into the Treasury of the United States and take \$2,000,000 out of it and send it to Puerto Rico as a humane offering to assist those people in their suffering and distress and poverty.

Mr. TILLMAN. Mr. President—

Mr. GALLINGER. And I will say that we ought not to take, as I did not one week ago, one single moment of the time of this body in getting this bill enacted into a law, so that those people can have the benefit of our generosity at the earliest possible moment.

Mr. TILLMAN. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. GALLINGER. Certainly.

Mr. TILLMAN. The amendments of the Senate to the House bill as it came over here gave the tax back as a specific sum, and for that I voted. The Senate conferees have submitted to the House, by which they continue to give back the taxes collected; and I do not see why you should continue to collect taxes and then turn around and restore them to the people from whom you take them. You have an ulterior purpose here, and you know it. When I say you, I do not mean the Senator from New Hampshire, but I mean the Republican party.

Mr. GALLINGER. Now, I will ask the Senator from South Carolina if he does not know that under the existing law we are compelled to collect those taxes? Has the President of the United

States any constitutional power to say to the people of Puerto Rico, We will exempt you from the payment of taxation?

Mr. TILLMAN. I believe not, but this Congress can, in an hour, pass a bill by which Puerto Rico will be relieved, and we will reach our arms around her and take her to our bosom. Instead of that you hold her throat with one arm and then cram charity down her throat with the other.

Mr. GALLINGER. I venture to say, in reply to the Senator from South Carolina, that the Congress of the United States will not pass the bill he alludes to in an hour, because I am sure the Senator would insist on making a speech on that bill.

Mr. TILLMAN. I dare you to bring it in. [Laughter.]

Mr. GALLINGER. I have not the authority, Mr. President.

Mr. TILLMAN. If the Senator will permit me, we had some dares here yesterday; but when the bob-tail flush of my friend from Ohio was sprung on the Senate, the Senator from Vermont came up missing, and therefore you did not win the game. Now, if you want to dare me not to make a speech and pass a bill bringing Puerto Rico within the United States and no limitations under our Constitution, with all its rights, I dare you, I say, to bring in a bill. Nobody on this side will debate it.

Mr. GALLINGER. The Senator has the advantage of me now by his use of language that I do not understand. [Laughter.] I have no authority to bring in any bill. I am not chairman of the committee, and of course the Senator can safely challenge me to do what it is in my power to do under any circumstances.

Mr. TILLMAN. I beg the Senator's pardon for using the word "you." It is not in the rules for a Senator to use that in a personal sense. When I say "you," I dare the Republican majority here to bring in such a bill.

Mr. GALLINGER. Well, Mr. President, the Republican majority probably will transact its business in its own way, un-intimidated and uninfluenced by threats or suggestions from the Senator from South Carolina. He has already relegated the Republican party into a minority party. He has already defeated the Republican party next November; and now I take it for granted that the Republican party, during the few months of life that have been allowed to it by the Senator from South Carolina, will go along in its own way and transact business without any reference to the dictation or suggestions from the distinguished Senator from South Carolina.

Mr. TILLMAN. Mr. President, with the Senator's permission, I beg pardon for having supposed for one moment that anything I would say—because I certainly had no such thought—would influence the majority in any way. They are bound to go their own road, and they are bound to whip in their minority, although they now appear to be in rebellion. You can not get a vote, you dare not come to a vote, for fear you will not have a majority to do your dirty work.

Mr. GALLINGER. Well, Mr. President, that is a matter of taste. Whether it is dirty work or otherwise, I will not enter into a discussion of that point with the Senator from South Carolina. The Republican party can stand on its record. Its legislation is known to the world. When this legislation is accomplished, I have no doubt whatever that while it will confound the Senator from South Carolina, it will be very gratifying to the people of the United States.

However, Mr. President, I did not rise to make a speech, but simply to make a suggestion, which I have endeavored in a desultory way to make, that in my opinion the time has come for us to vote on this report; and if the Senator from South Carolina will now enter into a contract with me, and not take any more time in its discussion, I will yield the floor in the hope that we may have an immediate vote.

Mr. SPOONER. Mr. President, I shall take but a few moments. That would be a very poverty-stricken intellect which could not discover that in all this discussion there has been very little said upon the question before the Senate. The debate, so far as it has been a debate at all, has consisted of political speeches, some of them, I venture to think, not entirely, in dignity, appropriate to this place. I think my friend from South Carolina can with propriety revise some of his remarks.

Mr. TILLMAN. Mr. President, if my kind friend—and I mean that in no perfunctory sense, because I consider myself honored by being able to claim the friendship of the Senator from Wisconsin—will indicate anything that I have said which was not proper for this presence I will take great pleasure in making such revision or recantation as I think would be necessary under the circumstances.

Mr. SPOONER. I have not had any desire that the Senator should recant or revise on my account—

Mr. TILLMAN. I know, but on my own account.

Mr. SPOONER. Or on account of the party to which I belong, but on his own account.

Mr. TILLMAN. I say on my own account. Will the Senator be kind enough to indicate the words to which he takes exception?



Mr. SPOONER. Yes, I will indicate them. When the Senator referred to some contemplated action or possible action by the "other side," as it happens to be from where I am now standing in this Chamber, I am quite unable to see how he can gain his own consent to denominate it as "dirty work." Nor am I quite able to see—and as the Senator asks me I will state it—how the Senator finds it entirely proper to refer to some of the votes upon the treaty as having been "bought." I leave that, however, for him to settle with the Senators who are involved, if there be any, in that suggestion. The Senator, if he desires me to file further a bill of particulars—

Mr. TILLMAN. I should like to hear it all, sir, if it is a dose of apology that I have here to take.

Mr. SPOONER. I ask for no apology.

Mr. TILLMAN. I want to get it all in at one time.

Mr. SPOONER. I doubt somewhat, and I am modest about it, if the Senator should have charged us, on the question of our adherence to the principle "equality among men," with "hypocrisy," with the adjective which he used. The Republican party has always been in favor of equality among men. I can not say the same of the Democratic party, nor can the Senator; but, Mr. President—

Mr. TILLMAN. Now will the Senator allow me? Are you through with this?

Mr. SPOONER. Certainly.

Mr. TILLMAN. I think it is very well to have the amende honorable, if I am to make one, come in immediately after the accusation or the attack. I do not consider it in any personal sense or as displaying any ill feeling on the part of the Senator from Wisconsin.

Mr. President, I am unfortunately one of that class of men who are quite as plentiful as they ought to be, who will sometimes say things in the heat of debate that in calmer moments they would not utter. But I never say anything that I do not mean, and therefore I think when the balance sheet is made up in the next world, as undoubtedly it will be, there will be a good deal to my credit for not having used words to conceal thoughts or taunted my tongue to practice deceit.

And now, to come down to particulars. On the matter of dirty work—that is perhaps a bad adjective; it is a Saxon adjective that leaves a little bad taste in the mouth. But the question is, What sort of work is the Republican party engaged in in this Capitol?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from South Carolina will suspend one moment. The Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business, which will be stated.

The SECRETARY. A bill (H. R. 8245) temporarily to provide revenues for the relief of the island of Puerto Rico, and for other purposes.

Mr. FORAKER. I ask that the unfinished business be temporarily laid aside until the Senator from South Carolina concludes.

Mr. TILLMAN. The Senator from Wisconsin has the floor and has kindly yielded to me to make answer to his catechism.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from South Carolina will suspend one moment. The Senator from Ohio asks unanimous consent that the unfinished business may be laid aside temporarily while the Senator from Wisconsin concludes his remarks. Is there objection? The Chair hears none.

Mr. ALLISON. I trust the Senator from Ohio will allow the consideration of this report to be completed.

Mr. FORAKER. Yes; I ask that its consideration may be completed.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Ohio asks that the unfinished business may be laid aside temporarily until the completion of the discussion upon the conference report. Is there objection? The Chair hears none. The Senator from South Carolina will proceed.

Mr. TILLMAN. The word "dirty," Mr. President, has various meanings. My purpose in using it a moment ago was to express my feeling as regards the class of legislation upon which we are now engaged. That is, that we are legislating here for an island and its people that came into the United States without any volition on their part, that gladly welcomed our army. The people were pledged by our general in command to all the rights of citizenship and the benefits under the flag.

I speak in general terms. I do not give the exact words. Therefore, if we have any bowels of compassion or any sense of honesty and decency among us as a people, we are in honor bound to see that that island and its inhabitants are not discriminated against or ill used or legislated against or imposed upon in any way possible for us to prevent.

Now, under the guise of charity we are here appropriating money collected under our laws, under the Dingley Act, in our own ports upon their exports to this country. Instead of removing the barrier—taking down the custom-houses as far as they are concerned, admitting their goods to our shores like people from any other

part of the United States would have the right to demand—we say to those people, "You are not citizens, you are not our equals, you have not the rights of the Constitution, we do not intend to give them to you except by piecemeal, if at all;" and you go on and you legislate in a way to show that greed and selfishness and party exigency are at the bottom of the legislation you propose here.

Well, "dirty" may be too strong. Will the Senator suggest some adjective that will fit the case? If I have not described it properly, I should like to have a substitute that will not offend his refinement and his good taste. What shall I call it?

Mr. SPOONER. Is the Senator speaking to me?

Mr. TILLMAN. I am speaking to the Senator from Wisconsin. What kind of work are you engaged in?

Mr. SPOONER. If the Senator will take time to consider, I think he will have no difficulty in calling it by some adjective which any gentleman would use in speaking of a matter upon which he differed with others. I think the Senator will have no difficulty when he stops to consider, if he will, in admitting that it may be possible for men to differ from him in opinion upon questions of legislation and public policy without subjecting themselves to any just imputation of dishonesty or trickery or mere party politics.

I will not undertake now to furnish the Senator with the adjective for the reason, among others, that it would not perhaps be proper for me to do it, and for the further reason that the Senator from South Carolina has a fine vocabulary and always uses the proper word when he chooses to use it. I know of no Senator better able to choose appropriate words and to use them than the Senator from South Carolina.

Mr. TILLMAN. Well, Mr. President, I think I am stumped. [Laughter.] The Senator from Wisconsin reads me a lecture, and I confess that in some things it is possibly deserved. I think that Senator and other Senators here will bear me out in claiming that I am not a narrow man. I am not a bitter partisan. Well, I will say that I am no more a bitter partisan than the Senator from Wisconsin, if he will compromise on that. I have been a man who would vote the Democratic ticket without regard to who was the nominee if he got his nomination regularly, but I even got above that once.

Mr. SPOONER. Was that by accident? [Laughter.]

Mr. TILLMAN. No; I got there by argument and in the light of day and by calmness and consideration when I decided that if Grover Cleveland was nominated by the Democrats as President in 1896 I would have to go somewhere else. But that is not the issue here. We are discussing the word "dirty." I confess that if it would offend the Senator, I will take the word out absolutely, and just say "do their work." I can not put any other word in there to express my idea and feeling of the work they are doing except that it is dirty.

But, if it hurts the gentleman's feelings or if it offends his party associates here, I will take it out. I have no desire to leave any sting by any of my words. I do not know what else to say in my idea of the work that is being done or proposed to be done here except to class it as dirty. It may be that that is more comprehensive and covers more points than any other one word would do. I suppose if I were to sit down and get a book of synonyms I would find some other word which would be more euphonious and appropriate; but I will leave it out and let it read that "the Republicans are to do the work."

Mr. GALLINGER. Why not say beneficent?

Mr. TILLMAN. Then that would be a lie, right red-hot. [Laughter.] Now, Mr. President, in regard to the word "hypocrite," which seems to have hurt the Senator's feelings in regard to the equality of the races, I do not know that I can even modify that; because if I have ever seen anything which indicated to my mind hypocrisy, it has been the attitude of the Republican party with regard to the colored races in Hawaii and with regard to the Filipinos, who are nearly all colored so far as we are concerned, and the attitude of the Republican party toward the negroes of the South.

I do not want to bring up the old race issue in this Chamber. I have already had my say on that subject. I have expressed my opinion and feeling as to the inconsistency of the attitude now occupied by the Republicans and their past attitude in the light of their treatment of these other colored people who have come to us by conquest and by acquisition under the Hawaiian joint resolution.

But I say I can not modify that word, because if the Republicans are not hypocrites on that subject, and if they are not hypocrites now in dealing with this Puerto Rican question in pretending that it is a charitable move they are engaged in and that they desire to uplift those people and prevent them from starving, I do not know what else it may be.

If the Senator can justify the taking of taxes by the Dingley tariff from one part of this country and putting them into the Treasury and turning right around and giving them back by Congress, he will have a much more difficult task to convince the people



of the United States—the plain, everyday people—than I think he will be able to accomplish.

If he can succeed in it, while he is one of the most eloquent and persuasive and honey-tongued men in this body, if he can go to Iowa, where the farmers have risen in their wrath and notified their legislators and the legislators have notified you; if he can go to Illinois, where I understand there is more of the anti-Puerto Rican fever than there is in Iowa; if he can go to Indiana, where I understand the fever is also very prevalent, and persuade those people that they do not understand it, but that you people here know more about it than they do, and that on their sober second thought after they have heard from headquarters their consciences will have to give way to their greed, I think the Senator will be congratulated. If the Republican party can persuade the people of the United States next November that this legislation is honest, that it is not hypocritical, and in some sense it is not dirty, then I will feel that the American people have entered upon a road that is, to say the least, one that does not portend to the glory and good of this country.

Mr. SPOONER. Mr. President, the Senator, when the settlement of accounts to which he refers comes, will, I have no doubt, be credited with a great many good things, a great many kind impulses; and I have no doubt, either, that he will not find it charged against him that an opportunity ever presented itself for him to use his tongue which he did not eagerly embrace. So far as the attitude of the Republican party as to the principle of equality among men is concerned, I take no time to speak of it; but the last place on earth where any impeachment of it should originate, in my judgment, is the State of South Carolina.

Mr. TILLMAN. Mr. President—

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Wisconsin yield to the Senator from South Carolina?

Mr. SPOONER. Yes, sir; I yield.

Mr. TILLMAN. I should like for the Senator, as he has particularized my State now, to hear the details. I am ready to give them to him if he wants to raise the issue, and to state how and why that has been able to be charged against us. I am not flinching.

Lay on, Macduff,  
And damn'd be him that first cries, "Hold, enough!"

It will not be me.

Mr. SPOONER. I based the observation, although it is not at all pertinent, as almost everything else which has been uttered here is not at all pertinent to the conference report, upon the testimony of the Senator from South Carolina as well as upon the history of this country. The Senator stated the other day on the floor of the Senate that they had made a great effort in South Carolina to disfranchise the "nigger;" that they had stuffed ballot boxes, and that they had used the shotgun against them. That is why I say that from South Carolina there ought not to come criticism upon the Republican party as being opposed to equality among men.

Mr. TILLMAN. Is that all?

Mr. SPOONER. That is all for this moment.

Mr. TILLMAN. All for that purpose. Get through with your indictment of my State, and then I will answer.

Mr. SPOONER. I did not indict anyone.

Mr. TILLMAN. You are indicting me as the representative of that State.

Mr. SPOONER. No.

Mr. TILLMAN. Are you through on that point?

Mr. SPOONER. I am through with that sentence.

Mr. TILLMAN. Have you any more? I should like to have you finish and bring in all the counts.

Mr. SPOONER. I will yield to the Senator. That is count enough.

Mr. TILLMAN. Mr. President, in rising here to explain my language, and to justify it, I have not the documents at hand to sustain all the charges I make, but I will, briefly and in the best way I can, recapitulate the conditions which brought about the necessity for stuffing ballot boxes, for shooting negroes, and for using violence and fraud in taking charge of our State government in South Carolina. The Senator, I suppose, did not understand me to say that such conditions exist there now, because I have never made any such acknowledgment.

I proclaimed the fact that in 1876, when we had stood eight years of carpetbag government and there was nothing left us of our civilization unless we rose in our might and took the government back from the carpetbag horde of thieves and scoundrels and their scalawag allies, the native-born rascals, who had been foisted upon us at the point of the bayonet—when government ceased to yield protection, when there was semianarchy, when 8,000 armed negro militia were parading up and down the roads, threatening our wives and our children and our homes, when at night burning houses were lighting up the horizon in almost every county, when the conditions were so appalling that any kind of government,

any military despotism, was preferable to that, we made up our minds that the fourteenth and fifteenth amendments to the Constitution were themselves null and void; that the acts of Congress under them placing our State under carpetbag rule were null and void; that oaths required by such laws were null and void, and we resolved that the intelligence, the wealth, and the patriotism of the State, belonging only to the white people, should seize the government from the horde of ignorance and vice; that we would not longer tolerate bribe-takers on the bench and thieves in our high places; that life was not worth having on the terms and under the conditions forced on us.

We swore by the memories of revolutionary sires that we would redeem our State from the grasp of aliens and negroes, and we did it; and I have no apologies to make for it. If you contend that no indictment of Republicans can come from South Carolina, I will tell you that the Republican party was responsible for that condition of things; I will tell you that Grant, who was then President, sent the army there to hold down the whites and perpetuate the condition of misrule and anarchy and robbery which prevailed, and where the troops were the white majorities, the Democratic majorities, were the greatest—not by reason of the presence of the troops, but because the whites did not hesitate to vote early and often and to carry the elections in any way that was found necessary. The Republican party did all that wrong blindly, but it does not now treat the colored races that have come to us as it treated the Southern negroes, and that is the reason why I charge it with hypocrisy.

Mr. SPOONER. Mr. President, the Republican party was not responsible for it. The Republican party, it is true, after the war had ended, gave to the colored man the right to vote. The Republican party did not enact that legislation upon the theory that it was necessary in order to prevent future Democratic successes. At that day no one dared to prophesy that the old Democratic party of the war times would live very much longer; no one foresaw its wonderful vitality.

The Republican party enacted that legislation, wisely or unwisely, because there had been enacted in the Southern States what were called "black codes," which almost restored the colored man to slavery. The Republican party enacted that legislation in order to give the negro a weapon of defense against such legislation; and they enacted it, Mr. President, in order to maintain in the sight of God and before all the world in good faith, in letter and in spirit, the proclamation of emancipation which had been signed by Abraham Lincoln; God bless his memory forever! [Applause in the galleries.]

Mr. TILLMAN. Will the Senator yield to me for a moment?

Mr. SPOONER. Certainly.

Mr. TILLMAN. In the first place, Mr. President, let it not be forgotten that in dealing with the race question in the South those of the Southern people who were engaged in the civil war, the Confederate war, had inherited those slaves. They had been taught from childhood that the existence of slavery was not wrong, morally or legally. The author of the Declaration of Independence was a slaveholder; the Constitution recognized slavery; and after the strife was over and the issue had been settled by the sword, the question as to the disposition of the emancipated slaves was, of course, a very perplexing one.

The Senator says that but for the enactment by the Southern legislatures of the "black codes," in which there was to be a practical restoration of slavery under the guise of liberty, there would have been no enfranchisement of the ex-slaves; that they would not have been given the ballot. History does not state that, and the condition of politics at the time does not warrant it.

Those who voted for it, or some of them, were no doubt honest in the belief that it was necessary, but there is no earthly doubt but that ulterior and baser motives were at the root of it. There was first a desire of revenge by putting the ex-slaves in control of the Southern States and putting white necks under black heels. There was next a desire to perpetuate the domination of the Republican party in the United States.

Then, when it comes to a comparison of the action of the two parties, I say to the Senator that there are a great many wrongs that the negroes have to suffer in the South, and there will continue to be many. Neither he nor anybody else can help it; we can not help it; and no legislation which can be enacted can help it. It can only cure itself in a better atmosphere, and be solved by the people concerned, because outside influence and outside interference would only aggravate the trouble and more embroil the fray.

But I want to call the attention of the Senate to the fact that we have in the past month had introduced here from a Republican committee a provision upon the Hawaiian bill by which contract slaves in that island were to be governed under a similar black code to that which we enacted in South Carolina and in other Southern States. You sought to perpetuate that condition in your own bill, for the benefit of the sugar planters, until it was stricken out by a motion on the part of the Senator from Massachusetts.



Mr. SPOONER. Oh, it is quite true, Mr. President, that the Hawaiian Committee reported a bill which contained many provisions which were amended by the Senate.

The Senator from South Carolina from my standpoint—doubtless not from his—is mistaken when he attributes the passage of the law giving to the colored man the right to vote to a mere desire for party supremacy or to any motive of revenge.

Mr. TILLMAN. Mr. President—

Mr. SPOONER. Allow me to proceed.

But, after all, that is a matter, perhaps, of little consequence. The negro during the war had won the eternal gratitude and appreciation of his old master. There never was a day during the war, Mr. President, nor a night, on which the negro slaves of the South could not have disbanded the Confederate army. They could have resorted to the torch; they could have resorted to all manner of violence. But they did not. They were left in charge of the plantations; they were left in charge of the wives and daughters, as well as the property there, and I believe it is true that during all those years there was nothing on their part but solicitude for the mistress, and loving, tender care for the children.

Mr. TILLMAN. Now, will the Senator permit me?

Mr. SPOONER. They knew perfectly well, then, that their masters were away in the army engaged in a struggle, the result, if not the object, of which would be to fasten more firmly upon them the shackles of slavery. They knew, even to the humblest of them, that our Army was an army of liberation; they knew that when the flag of the United States came into their vicinity it meant freedom to them; and yet they were a kindly, faithful people, resisting all temptations to remember the past. They had nothing in their hearts of vengeance.

All I mention that for is to say this in regard to it, that when the struggle was made to take by fraud and to take by violence, even to the extent of the shotgun, from the negroes, their participation in the government—whether that participation had been wisely authorized or unwisely authorized; perhaps some other scheme of protection should have been devised for them—it was violence against right.

The colored man had the same right to vote, Mr. President, under the laws of the United States that the white man qualified to vote possessed. The colored man has the same right to come to the Senate of the United States and sit here as a Senator in the place occupied by the Senator from South Carolina as the Senator has under the Constitution and laws of the United States.

I will not talk about a resort to fraud. That is peaceable, at least. I never yet, however, have been able to find justification for the use of the shotgun, for murder, against the man who had a right to vote, and whosoever, under our Constitution and our flag, to exercise that right.

Mr. TILLMAN. Will the Senator allow me now?

Mr. SPOONER. Let me finish, please.

But what happened happened. The right was practically taken from them—taken, as the Senator says, by fraud, by violence. Later it was taken by a constitutional provision. All I meant to say—and I say it again—was that, with that history, with that usurpation, with that trampling upon the rights of American citizens by violence and fraud, I am tired of hearing from South Carolina this eternal prating about "equality" as to Puerto Ricans and as to the citizenship of the Tagals.

But, Mr. President, this is all inconsequential. It has nothing to do with the measure before the Senate. If the Senator supposes that he has in his heart any more friendliness, or that Senators on his side of the Chamber have any more friendliness in purpose for the people of Puerto Rico who have recently come under our flag, he arrogates a vast deal to himself and to his associates.

I object, for one, to that persistent assumption. We are as anxious to do what is right and what is generous and what is honest by the people of Puerto Rico as the Senator, although we may differ in our opinion as to the measure which is wise and which is best adapted to the exigency.

Because the Senator differs from me and because his associates upon his side of the Chamber differ from me, I find no warrant for impeaching his integrity of purpose, I find no warrant for denouncing his action as an attempt to do the "dirty" work of a political party, as a campaign is approaching or a Presidential election is approaching. Mr. President, I am frank to say that, in my judgment, if this were an "off" year, if it were two years removed from a Presidential election, the debate in both Houses upon this subject, as well as upon the subject of the Philippines, would have been very different from what it is and from what it has been.

I think sometimes it would be a good thing for the people of the United States, save in very great exigencies, if the legislation in a Presidential year could be confined to the necessary appropriation bills. Nothing can come before either branch of Congress without political maneuvering upon it. Hardly anything which is debatable can be discussed upon its merits; and of all the time which has been taken here upon this conference report, which I

propose to discuss briefly in a moment, not thirty minutes have been devoted to the conference report itself. We have had political speeches from the beginning of it to the end of it.

The Senator from South Carolina has challenged us again and again to state the attitude of the President upon this subject or that. I am not here to speak for the President. I am here, just as every other Republican Senator is here, loyal, as we are, to the President, loyal, as we are, to our party, to do under our oaths what we think is right in meeting these questions, which are new questions, which are complicated questions, and which, Mr. President, require thought and care and moderation, instead of vituperation and political harangue.

Now, what is the question before the Senate? I understand that Senators on the other side who voted, I think, without a roll call for this appropriation bill will now vote against it. Why? Because the Senator from Iowa [Mr. ALLISON] and his associate conferees, barring the distinguished Senator from Missouri [Mr. COCKRELL], for whom I have very great respect, yielded to the House of Representatives and reported from the conference committee the bill substantially as it passed the House rather than as it passed the Senate. It has been attacked from the Democratic standpoint and from the Populist standpoint, whatever principles that standpoint involves.

The Senator from Iowa has been criticised for changing his mind. He has been asked here to rise and state how it happened that he changed his mind. The Senator from Iowa does not very often have occasion—and it is a just tribute to his wisdom—to change his mind after he has deliberately reached a conclusion; but between the two Houses we are obliged often to make concessions.

I think the bill ought not to have passed the Senate, Mr. President, with the Senate amendment in it. I think, if the Senator from Iowa came to the conclusion that the Senate amendment was ill-advised, he reached a correct conclusion; and I have little respect for a man who can not change his mind. He is either one of those men who thinks he is always right, or who would rather be consistent than to be right. Such a man is too narrow a man, too selfish a man, to be a fit public servant in high places.

I will not say that the opposition to this amendment is a pretext, for that would not be courteous; but I do venture to say, Mr. President, that the objections which are made to it here are as "baseless as the fabric of a dream."

The Senator from South Carolina says we robbed the Puerto Ricans of this money. We did not. He speaks of a constitutional principle involved in this bill. There is none, as I understand the bill. This is not a proposition to put in force a tariff between the United States and Puerto Rico.

Mr. TILLMAN. Will the Senator allow me, as he goes along, to make some points?

Mr. SPOONER. Always.

Mr. TILLMAN. Of course he has got off from the bone upon which he and I have been gnawing; but we shall come back to that after a while.

Mr. SPOONER. I thought I had allowed the Senator many times to interrupt me.

Mr. TILLMAN. I got up three times, but you were so enthused that you absolutely turned your back on me and went on with your speech; but that is neither here nor there. I will discuss the South Carolina case and the negro question just as soon as I get a chance; but right here I want to ask the Senator a question.

Mr. SPOONER. I have never consciously declined to yield to the Senator.

Mr. TILLMAN. I know the Senator did not intend to do it. He would not have been guilty of any intentional discourtesy, but he was so enthused with his speech, and wanted to finish his thought, that he did not yield to me. The Chair will say that I got up and asked to interrupt the Senator two or three times, but he would not yield. However, that is neither here nor there. We shall not dispute about that. I do not charge the Senator with any purpose of showing me any discourtesy or any indignity.

Mr. SPOONER. I disclaim any such intention.

Mr. TILLMAN. I know the Senator would not; but I desire to ask the Senator a question, with his leave. I am only a common farmer, and therefore I suppose it is perhaps presumptuous that I should ask a question of such a great lawyer as is the Senator. The question I wish to ask him is, Where do you get your authority to appropriate this money out of the Treasury of the United States? You do it under the general-welfare clause of the Constitution, do you not?

Mr. SPOONER. Well—

Mr. TILLMAN. Is that true or is it not true?

Mr. SPOONER. I do not care whether it is true or not.

Mr. TILLMAN. I want to know whether, in your opinion as a lawyer, it is true or not?

Mr. SPOONER. We have the power to appropriate, and I think we get it—

Mr. TILLMAN. Under which clause of the Constitution?



Mr. SPOONER. We get it from the same clause of the Constitution that we got the power to appropriate to relieve the sufferers from the floods in the South.

Mr. TILLMAN. That is under the general-welfare clause. Do not let us go to splitting hairs and to run off on these byways.

Mr. SPOONER. We get it under the same clause of the Constitution under which we got the power to govern Louisiana.

Mr. TILLMAN. That is under the general-welfare clause.

Mr. SPOONER. Well?

Mr. TILLMAN. Then is Puerto Rico a part of the United States or is it not?

Mr. SPOONER. We are not sitting in Puerto Rico.

Mr. TILLMAN. But we are sitting here legislating for Puerto Rico, to give her money out of the Treasury of the United States if she is a part of the United States; and if she is not in the United States and if you do not appropriate it under the general-welfare clause of the Constitution, you have no right to appropriate it at all.

Mr. SPOONER. Well, I heard the Senator. [Laughter.]

Mr. TILLMAN. I intended that the Senator should hear me and that everybody else should hear me.

Mr. SPOONER. Mr. President, we derive our power to appropriate money, of course, from the Constitution. Whatever may be said about the question of whether the Constitution follows the flag or not, or whether the Constitution *ex proprio vigore*—the Senator understands that, I suppose?

Mr. TILLMAN. I believe I know what it means. [Laughter.]

Mr. SPOONER. The Senator says he is "a common farmer." I deny it. He is an uncommon farmer. [Laughter.]

Whether the Constitution *ex proprio vigore* extends over Puerto Rico or not, there is no question whatever but that in some sense Puerto Rico is a part of the United States. Puerto Rico belongs to the United States. We obtain our right from the Constitution to legislate for Puerto Rico. I do not think the Constitution *ex proprio vigore* extends over Puerto Rico. I know, however, that it extends over us, and that we are exercising constitutional power here.

Mr. TILLMAN. To take money out of our Treasury and spend it outside of the United States?

Mr. SPOONER. Yes.

Mr. TILLMAN. Or in the United States? I am trying to get the Senator to determine whether Puerto Rico is in or out, and whether the Constitution is there or not. If it is not there, how do you get authority under the Constitution to give it any money?

Mr. SPOONER. I do not think the Constitution is there; nevertheless I think we have the power, as Puerto Rico belongs to the United States and as its people are in a way dependent upon the United States, to appropriate money for their relief, and to subserve their best interests in every way, which we propose to do.

Did the Senator vote for this bill?

Mr. TILLMAN. I did.

Mr. SPOONER. Where did you get the constitutional authority to do it? [Laughter.]

Mr. TILLMAN. It is not a question of my getting any constitutional authority for it at all. I often follow bad examples here; and when your committee brought in that proposition and said it was a humanitarian measure, intended to keep the people of Puerto Rico from starving to death, I voted for it, because I thought it was returning to those people the money you had unconstitutionally taken from them. That is why I did it.

Mr. SPOONER. Then the Senator voted for it believing it was unconstitutional and believing it was founded upon a lie?

Mr. TILLMAN. I believe it was founded upon a lie, undoubtedly.

Mr. SPOONER. Undoubtedly. Well, the Senator is rather suspicious.

Mr. TILLMAN. My associations have not tended to dispel any suspicions I brought into this body. [Laughter.]

Mr. SPOONER. The Senator sees nothing but ulterior purposes and mystery in everything and everybody. I have always found that a man who is suspicious of everybody in the world needed watching.

Mr. TILLMAN. Then watch me. [Laughter.]

Mr. SPOONER. I have watched the Senator from South Carolina, and I have never in my heart for one moment doubted his integrity—never. I must say that in order to make it clear that my remark had no personal application.

Mr. President, when this bill originally passed the Senate, it passed as a bill of mercy, did it not? It passed on the theory that by the fortunes of war a people had come to us out from under the paralysis which the tyranny of Spain brought to every people that Spain governed, a body of men, women, and children in distress, intensified by the forces of nature, by a hurricane which devastated that island; and upon that theory the Senator from South Carolina voted for this bill, and upon that theory all

Senators on his side of the Chamber voted for the bill. That was true then, and it is just as true now as it was true when this bill passed the Senate.

Mr. TILLMAN. There is an amendment as the bill is brought back here from the other House which changes the situation.

Mr. SPOONER. Yes, sir; there is an amendment, and I am going now to speak about that; and then I will finish.

What is the amendment to this bill, Mr. President? As the bill passed the Senate it limited the power of application by the President of this \$2,000,000 to entirely public purposes—

To be used for the government now existing and which may hereafter be established in Puerto Rico, and for public education, public works, and other governmental and public purposes therein.

The only relief that it could bring to those who were in individual distress would be in their ability to earn wages under the Government in the construction of public works, waterworks, sanitary improvements, roads, schoolhouses, and all that which with this money might be inaugurated in Puerto Rico.

It was urged here, among others by the Senator from Ohio [Mr. FORAKER], that it would not reach some cases which were pressing; and he suggested an amendment to it authorizing the President to use a portion of the money for "agricultural" relief. Some thought that it would be discriminating to use it for agricultural relief and not leave the President at liberty to use it for relief in any case where humanity demanded it.

We passed the bill, I think, with a wrong provision in it. We passed the bill because it was a gratuity, because it was a generous act to the people of Puerto Rico, but tying too much the hands of the President in his utilization of it.

I think the Senate conferees wisely yielded to those of the House of Representatives, and the measure is brought back in this situation from the conference committee, providing that the money shall be used for the Government—

now existing and which may hereafter be established in Puerto Rico, and for the aid and relief of the people thereof, and for public education, public works, and other governmental and public purposes therein until otherwise provided by law.

It can be used now, Mr. President, as it could not have been used as the bill went from the Senate, for the purchase of seed, where necessary to enable men who have not the money with which to purchase seed to plant their fields and rehabilitate their farms and to engage in productive labor. It can be used now, wherever the President finds there is pressing distress, to relieve that distress.

Of course it is without limitation as to the objects of relief. We can not know in detail the necessity for relief. That is a new people to us. This whole proposition is new to us. It is easy to criticize. As Byron says, I think in his "Review of the Scotch reviewers:"

A man must serve his time at every trade,  
Save censure; critics all are ready-made.

But we who have to act in formulating public policies, who have to study and think about them and every phase of them, have a very much more difficult and complex problem and burden upon our hands than those who are not charged especially with the duty, but who have the utmost liberty, with or without thought, to criticize what we do.

Mr. LINDSAY. I wish to make this suggestion to the Senator: Whether or not, whenever the necessities of any people are so great as to demand at the hands of the governing power intervention to relieve them from their personal distresses, the money appropriated for their relief is appropriated for a public purpose.

Mr. SPOONER. I so regard it in a general sense and in the general sense. It is a public purpose in one way.

Mr. LINDSAY. If that be true, where is the difference between the two bills in that respect?

Mr. SPOONER. Because of the doctrine *noscitur a sociis*. I think the President would have had, perhaps, great difficulty in distributing this fund to have reached the conclusion that he was at liberty to use it to alleviate cases of individual distress. If the Senator from Kentucky will permit me—and I am not technical about this at all—it is, under the bill as it passed the Senate—

To be used for the government now existing and which may hereafter be established in Puerto Rico, and for public education, public works, and other governmental and public purposes therein.

There was, I think my friend will agree, great danger that the clauses together, applying the doctrine of *noscitur a sociis*, would have forced the conclusion upon the President that he was limited to these special public and governmental uses.

At any rate, an administrative officer disbursing a fund under such a statute would feel compelled to be very careful to come within the law prescribed by Congress, and he might very well say to himself, as the Senator, I think, would say to himself, and as I know I would say to myself, that if Congress had intended that any portion of this fund might be utilized in cases of individual necessity, might be utilized for the purchase of seed for this farmer or the other, they would have said so in the bill.

Mr. LINDSAY. Does the amendment say so?



Mr. SPOONER. The amendment says so, I think. It says—now existing and which may hereafter be established in Puerto Rico, and for the aid and relief of the people thereof, and for public education, public works, and other governmental and public purposes therein until otherwise provided by law.

All the language that was in the bill as it passed here is in it now, except the conferees have added "for the aid and relief of the people thereof," and I think, especially in view of the discussion, the President will have no doubt of his authority to utilize this money as we intend it shall be utilized, in relieving whatever distress he finds there which it is absolutely necessary to relieve.

Whether he may draw the line between those who are chronically in want and those who are for the time being in want, as suggested by the Senator from South Carolina, I do not know. The Senator says that the experience of the South showed that where the colored man could get support without working he would not work.

Mr. TILLMAN. I say it again.

Mr. SPOONER. "I say it again," too. That is probably true; and I say, too, that I believe where a white man without working can get a living by the aid of colored labor, he will not work very much.

Mr. TILLMAN. Of course not, neither in South Carolina nor in the Hawaiian Islands.

Mr. SPOONER. No. So we not differ much about that.

Now comes the other provision which makes so much trouble here. It is said that by this bill, if it is passed as presented by the conference report, we in effect declare that the Dingley law is to be continued as against Puerto Rico. I deny it.

There is no proposition in this bill to affect the Dingley law at all. There was no proposition in the bill as it left the Senate to change the Dingley law at all. The Dingley law is in force as against Puerto Rico. It is in force because by the acquisition of territory the President acquires no right to repeal or modify an act of Congress. These duties were not "stolen." These duties were lawfully collected, Mr. President.

I read in the hearing of the Senate the other day, not in support of the proposition that we may constitutionally impose duties upon Puerto Rico differing from those which apply to the remainder of the United States, a statement from Fleming against Page, which I will read again only for the purpose of bringing to the attention of the Senate the fact that that proposition may be as our Democratic friends claim it, and yet it be absolutely true that it was lawful to collect these duties. The court says:

The principle thus adopted and acted upon by the executive department of the Government has been sanctioned by the decisions in this court and the circuit courts whenever the question came before them. We do not propose to comment upon the different cases cited in the argument. It is sufficient to say that there is no discrepancy between them. And all of them, so far as they apply, maintain that under our revenue laws every port is regarded as a foreign one unless the custom-house from which the vessel clears is within a collection district established by act of Congress, and the officers granting the clearance exercise their functions under the authority and control of the laws of the United States.

So it is stated by the court that in the Florida case, after Florida had been ceded to the United States, but before a collection district had been established there, the revenue officers, sustained by the Attorney-General, held that the port was a foreign port, and the duties then existing by law should be collected. Now, what is this proposition?

We have collected, and I say lawfully, in my opinion, this money. We are proposing to appropriate it from the public Treasury for the benefit of the people of Puerto Rico, not because we robbed them of it—for we did not—but because we wish to be generous to Puerto Rico, and because it is our duty to be generous to Puerto Rico. I said the other day that of the \$2,000,000 collected nearly \$1,800,000 were collected from duties on sugar imported; some from duties on tobacco.

I said that a comparatively few men paid that duty. I sought to ascertain how many paid that duty and who paid it. It was paid by the importers. I received this telegram in answer to my inquiry:

TREASURY DEPARTMENT, March 21, 1900.

Senator SPOONER:

The following telegram just received from the collector customs, New York: "The principal importers of sugar from Puerto Rico are A. S. Lascells & Co."

The gentlemen who are suing to recover it back—

"Lawrence, Turnure & Co., American Sugar Refining Company, L. W. & P. Armstrong, Muller, Schall & Co., John Farr, and Melchor, Armstrong & Dessau."

Mr. TILLMAN. Will the Senator permit me right here? It has been brought into this debate before, but it is just as well to put it in again, if he will allow me.

Mr. SPOONER. Certainly.

Mr. TILLMAN. Those gentlemen paid the import duty on sugar—those five or six firms.

Mr. SPOONER. They are the principal importers.

Mr. TILLMAN. No matter. We may say for our purposes that they alone paid it. Where did they get it? They bought the

sugar from men who grew it, who raised the cane and ground it up and manufactured and prepared it for market and sent it to them, did they not?

Mr. SPOONER. Yes, probably.

Mr. TILLMAN. Very well. The importers who paid this duty bought the sugar from the producers. They bought it at the usual price of sugar in New York, minus the tariff which we levy. In other words, the producer had to lose the tariff. Then that producer had to reduce the wages of everybody who had anything to do with raising that cane, and the whole burden fell back on the laborers in Puerto Rico and the owner of the plantation. It did not fall upon these importers at all. They are only the medium by which the money was paid into our Treasury.

The producers of the sugar are the ones who have received a less price for their product by reason of the fact that the duty existed. If it had not existed, if Puerto Rico had been under your construction of the law put in a collection district of the United States, and there had been no barrier between Puerto Rico and the United States, then the price of sugar would have been higher in Puerto Rico, and the wages of the laborer would have been higher, and you would have a benefit extending all along down the line through every person engaged in sugar production.

As it is, you have collected it from five importers over here, and you turn around and send the money back to Puerto Rico, and you make the people in Puerto Rico engaged in sugar production contribute to the support of the government there and to the support of all the other people of that island. I say it is unjust and dirty business.

Mr. SPOONER. Apparently everything with which the Senator from South Carolina does not happen to agree is unjust—that is bad enough—and dirty also.

Mr. FAIRBANKS. Will the Senator from Wisconsin permit me?

Mr. SPOONER. Certainly.

Mr. FAIRBANKS. I wish to say that the Senator from South Carolina is quite mistaken with respect to wages in Puerto Rico. The testimony before the committee is distinct and clear to the effect that wages are not lower in the island to-day than they were when the Government of the United States entered into possession of the island, and that in a large portion of the island the wages are higher to-day than they have ever been.

Mr. TILLMAN. Will the Senator from Wisconsin allow me?

Mr. SPOONER. I have not finished.

Mr. TILLMAN. You will not allow the Senator from Indiana to interpose and then not allow me to get back?

Mr. SPOONER. Proceed.

Mr. TILLMAN. I want to ask the Senator from Indiana if his information extends as to whether or not that increase in wages there has not arisen because of the public works, the building of roads, and other things which the Government has of itself undertaken and for which it has paid? Then, if your statement be true as a general thing, in the name of God, why are not the Puerto Ricans better off than they were before, and why do we want to go down there and establish soup houses to keep the people from starving to death if they can all get work at higher wages than they ever could before?

Mr. FAIRBANKS. I stand corrected by the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. GALLINGER]. He says there has been a slight increase in wages among agricultural labor, but the people are out of work in many places.

Mr. SPOONER. Mr. President, nearly all of the gentlemen whose names I have read from the telegram are bankers. They are the bankers, I am told, of the American Sugar Refining Company, and they imported this sugar for the American Sugar Refining Company. There is no proposition here, nor has there been, to pay any portion of this money to the laborer who produced at starvation wages this sugar. The Senator from South Carolina has made no suggestion of that. The Senator from South Carolina is in favor, I believe, of a refund of the cotton tax.

Mr. TILLMAN. I am.

Mr. SPOONER. Are you in favor of giving it to the labor which produced the cotton?

Mr. TILLMAN. If you can find it.

Mr. SPOONER. Well, you can not find it.

Mr. TILLMAN. In that connection, as the Senator is trying to rake up all the old sores between the Southern people—

Mr. SPOONER. This is not an old sore.

Mr. TILLMAN. It is an old sore, dragged in here by the horns. You have already gored me all around, and now you come at me from behind.

I call the attention of those whose bowels of compassion have been so stirred here over the terrible condition of the starving Puerto Ricans to the fact that after the Southern States—we will take South Carolina as an example—had been devastated by Sherman's army, and nothing but chimneys were left to mark the homes of our people from Savannah to Cheraw, in a swath 70 miles wide, when there was not enough left in the way of food to



keep a crow alive, in addition to all the ills we had to endure by reason of the disorganization of our labor, you turned around and in your love and kindness for the Southern people levied a tax of 3 cents a pound on cotton, a special product raised in the South only. There was a devastated and ruined country that had borne all the horrors of war, had been burned up, their labor system torn up, their government overturned and everything, and then your compassion and sense of justice put that special tax on. Why did you not put it on wheat and corn and tobacco and other agricultural products? Why did you go to the South only to do it?

Mr. SPOONER. All that that amounts to is that the Senator—

Mr. TILLMAN. That you loved us so, and you did not have any other feeling than love. You loved us so well that you pinned us to the flag with bayonets, and then turned around and took everything you could from us, and when you could not get anything more by law you turned the negroes and carpetbaggers loose to steal what little was left!

Mr. SPOONER. We pinned our flag around you with bayonets, and you ought to thank God for it, for with that flag around you we brought you all back into this Chamber and into your old home to stay.

Mr. TILLMAN. We are here to stay and we demand our rights, and we are not to be trampled on and badgered and patronized any longer. I say that as a South Carolinian I am the equal of any Senator on this floor, and I propose to have my say here, no matter whose feelings it hurts.

Mr. SPOONER. You do not hurt my feelings.

Mr. TILLMAN. Oh, I do not want to.

Mr. SPOONER. And you have not frightened me.

Mr. TILLMAN. I have not tried, and I could not if I did try.

Mr. SPOONER. The Senator from South Carolina is right again.

Mr. TILLMAN. I am nearly always right; at least I am honest.

Mr. SPOONER. I have admitted that, and if it will do the Senator any good I will admit it again. But all that the Senator's observation amounts to is that we are treating the people of Puerto Rico with infinitely more generosity than we have treated a portion of our own people.

Mr. TILLMAN. Indeed you do.

Mr. SPOONER. And yet, in the next breath, he stands here and almost froths at the mouth because we are treating Puerto Rico and its inhabitants with such horrible cruelty. We are treating the people of Puerto Rico with a generosity up to this date absolutely peculiar to the people of Puerto Rico. We have had no such case before.

Mr. TILLMAN. Why do you not wrap the flag around them?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from South Carolina must not interrupt without obtaining leave.

Mr. TILLMAN. I ask the Chair's pardon.

Mr. SPOONER. I stated that this sugar was imported by the American Sugar Refining Company almost entirely, as I understand it. I stated the other day that they paid the duty upon it. I stated that if it were refunded—and I think it has no effect upon the labor over there, and no one has proposed and no one will propose that a refund of it should be distributed among the producers of sugar. The producers of sugar are comparatively few.

One has been here in this city, one who is not a citizen of the United States and was not a Spanish subject. He does not propose to become a citizen of the United States. He produces, I think, or controls, 50 per cent of the sugar raised in Puerto Rico, and he is the only gentleman whose representatives have been to me concerning the tariff between Puerto Rico and the United States, and he asks that the trade shall be free.

Talk about trusts, protected industries! I never understood that this 15 per cent of the Dingley rates was a protective duty. No man on our side of the Chamber, so far as I know, has ever so regarded it—not at all. It is a duty levied solely for the benefit of the people of Puerto Rico. But I did not intend, nor do I now intend, to discuss that bill.

I want to say this, and this only, on that subject, that the only measure which has been proposed in either House of Congress, so far as I know, upon this subject, which could benefit directly or indirectly a "trust" was the amendment offered by the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. JONES] the other day to appropriate this money not to the people of Puerto Rico, but to the importers who paid the duty.

Mr. TILLMAN. He just simply made a mistake.

Mr. SPOONER. He did make a mistake, and he withdrew it.

Mr. BERRY. Which Senator from Arkansas?

Mr. TILLMAN. The Senator from Arkansas, Mr. JONES.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Wisconsin yield to the Senator from South Carolina?

Mr. SPOONER. Certainly.

Mr. TILLMAN. The Senator from Wisconsin touches me on so many sides.

Mr. SPOONER. I was not referring to the Senator just then. Where did I touch him?

Mr. TILLMAN. I had a good one for you, but I will wait.

Mr. SPOONER. The trouble with the Senator is that he is too "touchy." Under the bill—and I will be through in a moment—we collect these duties and we will continue lawfully to collect these duties until by law we have changed the Dingley rates. This bill provided—

That the sum of \$2,095,455.88, being the amount of customs revenue received on importations by the United States from Puerto Rico since the evacuation of Puerto Rico by the Spanish forces on the 18th of October, 1898, to the 1st day of January, 1900.

That was the way it passed the Senate. We were to appropriate for the benefit of Puerto Rico the money collected upon imports from Puerto Rico up to the 1st day of January last. Is there any reason why we should not have included in that appropriation the money collected from those imports since the 1st day of January last?

Mr. TILLMAN. Will the Senator allow me now?

Mr. SPOONER. Yes.

Mr. TILLMAN. The only reason why that provision should not be in there is that you do not accompany it with a provision that then duties shall stop. You ought not to inaugurate a system here of taking money out of those people's pockets with one hand and then handing it back to them with the other, and continuing that perpetually. Why do you not inaugurate a system for Puerto Rico which will have some lasting force to it? Why do you not announce your policy? Right here I have got back to the point which I had forgotten a moment ago.

It is to ask the Senator how he explains his statement that this 15 per cent is not a protective duty, which we know it is not in one sense, in connection with the statement of the Senator from Ohio [Mr. FORAKER] that you have to preserve the principle of the right of Congress to tax these people by import duties, and therefore you did this merely for that purpose and held on to it for that reason?

Mr. SPOONER. I do not square my statement with the statement of the Senator from Ohio as narrated by the Senator from South Carolina, because the Senator from Ohio never made any such statement.

Mr. TILLMAN. What did the Senator from Ohio say, then?

Mr. SPOONER. The Senator from Ohio said this: That this duty was imposed for revenue purposes, not for the purpose of raising revenue for the people of the United States—not a dollar to be appropriated for the use of the people of the United States—but all of it for the benefit of Puerto Rico; and the Senator from Ohio said he was glad that underlying this measure it happened that this question was involved and could be early presented to the Supreme Court of the United States. But my recollection of the utterance of the Senator from Ohio is that he distinctly disclaimed the purpose of introducing the bill or being influenced in any wise in his report on that bill by that question.

Mr. TILLMAN. Will the Senator let me state what I think the Senator from Ohio said?

Mr. SPOONER. If I am wrong, the Senator from Ohio can correct me.

Mr. FORAKER. The Senator from Wisconsin has stated in almost the same language my statement at the time, to which I understand the Senator from South Carolina to allude.

Mr. TILLMAN. If the Senator had allowed me to go on, then possibly he would have found out that he did not understand to what I was alluding. The Senator from Ohio, if I do not forget his language, declared that we had to maintain the open door in the Philippines, and therefore had the right to erect a tariff barrier between the Philippines and the United States, or we would have to abandon the Philippines. That was the inference, although he did not say so.

Mr. FORAKER. Will the Senator from Wisconsin allow me to correct the statement of the Senator from South Carolina?

Mr. SPOONER. Certainly.

Mr. FORAKER. What I said, to which the Senator must of necessity allude, was that in the committee we learned from the testimony there adduced that there was a commanding necessity for revenue and that the people of that island were unable by direct taxation to raise that revenue, and that we sought to raise it by this indirect method. It is one of the incidents and not the purpose of the case that these questions have arisen. I said in that connection that I was glad they were to be raised, for I thought it was of grave importance that they should be litigated and should be judicially determined. Beyond that point I did not say anything in regard to the matter.

But I want to say to the Senator from South Carolina that I said all that, or practically that, in the formal report filed here early in the session in support of the Senate bill 2264, and disclaimed particularly in that report that we had any idea of fixing a protective tariff, but only the idea of raising revenue.

Mr. TILLMAN. Does the Senator forget what he said in regard to maintaining the open door in the Philippines?

Mr. FORAKER. Not at all.



Mr. TILLMAN. That in order to carry out our implied pledges, our international obligations, or something of that kind; in other words, if I do not misquote him, he said that it would be very hard and difficult for us to demand an open door in China and then refuse the open door in the Philippines, and therefore we ought to welcome an opportunity to have the Supreme Court pass upon this question as to the power of Congress, and that would settle the other matter as well.

Mr. FORAKER. What I said was that we ought to know now, before we granted an open door in the Philippines, as we will undoubtedly be invited to grant one, whether or not we have the constitutional power to levy a duty on imports from this country into the Philippines; that if we did not have that power we can not find it out too soon; that if we do not have that power it would necessitate—that was the remark I made, in almost this exact language; I will have it in a moment, as I have the RECORD now handed to me—possibly a change of policy in respect to the Philippines from that which is now contemplated.

Mr. TILLMAN. Now, if the Senator from Wisconsin will permit me, the purpose of this Puerto Rican legislation is simply to maintain the principle that Congress has the right to legislate for these islands in any way it pleases, and can set up any barrier it pleases between them and us, and that we are now treating Puerto Rico in this way simply to maintain the principle that we intend to enforce in the Philippines hereafter.

Mr. SPOONER. I did not rise to discuss the Puerto Rican tariff bill, which is not before the Senate; but I want to say to the Senator from South Carolina, so far as I know anything about it, that it is not the purpose at all. When that bill comes before the Senate we will be able to make that perfectly plain.

The Senator from South Carolina says, Why do you not change this so as to change the revenue system? The Senator knows why we do not. Amendments were offered to this bill for that purpose, and it was agreed by common consent, upon the request of the Senator from Missouri, I think it was, and upon the request of Senators on the Republican side of the Chamber, that as this bill was one to carry relief to those who presently needed it, and as it was a bill about which there could be no dispute, we would offer no debatable amendments to it.

What I want to call to the attention of the Senate, and then I shall have finished, is that the only difference between this report and the bill as it passed the Senate is that the bill as it passed the Senate would have given to the people of Puerto Rico the moneys collected under the Dingley law up to the 1st of last January, and would have taken into the Treasury of the United States the moneys collected under the Dingley law since the 1st of January and up to the time that we pass some law repealing or modifying the Dingley law as to Puerto Rico.

As the bill is amended, all the money heretofore collected or hereafter collected under the Dingley law, until it is changed as to Puerto Rico, is appropriated to the benefit of Puerto Rico, and not one dollar of the money, as the conference report puts it—it was not so when the bill passed the Senate—goes into the Treasury of the United States for the benefit of our people, but it all goes to the benefit of Puerto Rico.

Now, Mr. President, I intended to speak ten minutes upon a single point in this conference report, but I have been interrupted so frequently that I have occupied the floor much longer. I will discuss the House tariff bill when it comes before the Senate. It is not here now.

Mr. TILLMAN. Mr. President, I regret that I feel the necessity of bringing up again some parts of the speech of the Senator who has just taken his seat. However, he would not allow me to answer or interject an objection as he went along. It has reference to the race question in the South, the question which has been the cause of more sorrow, more misery, more loss of life, more expenditure of treasure than any and all questions which have confronted the American people from the foundation of the Government to the present day. Out of it grew the war, and after the war came the results of the war, and those results are with us now. The South has this question always with it. It can not get rid of it. It is there. It is like Banquo's ghost, and will not down. If I have felt called on to attack the Republican policy of this day and time and to accuse the Republicans in this Chamber with being hypocrites in regard to that issue, I have felt constrained to do so by reason of the facts and of the events of the past few years.

The Senator from Wisconsin—and I hope he will not leave the Chamber, although I do not propose to deal in any sarcasm or in personalities in the slightest, but still I prefer him to remain here if he will—

Mr. SPOONER. The Senator from South Carolina need not have any anxiety about that. I have not the slightest intention of leaving the Chamber.

Mr. TILLMAN. Mr. President, I shall only advert briefly this evening in what I shall say now to the phases of this question which were alluded to so eloquently by the distinguished Senator from Wisconsin.

He gave us a picture of the condition of the slave during the war, and of the debt of gratitude which the Southern people owe to those slaves, who had charge of our wives and children and homes, and, to their everlasting credit, during those four long and bloody years not one solitary crime was reported against them of the kind that is now reported every week. I say that he can not exceed me in appreciation of the fact that the Southern people did owe and do owe and will everlastingly owe a debt of gratitude to their slaves for their behavior.

But I would call the Senator's attention to the absolute and inevitable corollary, that if the slaves of the South, with the opportunities which were afforded them during those years when all the men were at the front, and when their wrongs, if they had any, would have prompted revenge, were guilty of no crime against their mistresses and their children, it in thunder tones gives the lie to the charges as to the cruelty of the slave system in the South.

There were numerous instances, possibly too numerous, of cruelty and wrongdoing, and I shall not apologize for the system, for, thank God, it is gone—torn up by the roots at a great cost of life and sacrifice of property. I would not restore it if I could by the waving of a hand. But I say to him when he parades that as a reason why we ought to be grateful—and I acknowledge that we ought—he at once convicts himself and those of his fellows who went on that crusade of blood and destruction for the purpose of liberating those people of having been misled and of having given Harriet Beecher Stowe's Uncle Tom's Cabin undue weight in inaugurating that crusade. I have already given due credit on this floor to the North for patriotism and honesty of purpose, and I realize that the love of the Union was a mighty factor in that great struggle. But it can not be denied that the slaves of the South were a superior set of men and women to freedmen of to-day, and that the poison in their minds—the race hatred of the whites—is the result of the teachings of Northern fanatics. Ravishing a woman, white or black, was never known to occur in the South till after the reconstruction era. So much for that phase of the subject.

As to the rights of the negroes in the South, of which he now claims to be the champion—

Mr. SPOONER. No.

Mr. TILLMAN. Well, I do not understand the Senator. I am very unfortunate in being unable to gather his meaning. He speaks clearly, and I usually have the means of interpreting language that is plain and unmistakable; but he did say something about the rights of those people.

Mr. SPOONER. I did.

Mr. TILLMAN. And he said we had taken their rights away from them. He asked me was it right to murder them in order to carry the elections. I never saw one murdered. I never saw one shot at an election. It was the riots before the election, precipitated by their own hot-headedness in attempting to hold the government, that brought on conflicts between the races and caused the shotgun to be used. That is what I meant by saying we used the shotgun.

I want to call the Senator's attention to one fact. He said that the Republican party gave the negroes the ballot in order to protect themselves against the indignities and wrongs that were attempted to be heaped upon them by the enactment of the black code. I say it was because the Republicans of that day, led by Thad Stevens, wanted to put white necks under black heels and to get revenge. There is a difference of opinion. You have your opinion about it, and I have mine, and we can never agree.

I want to ask the Senator this proposition in arithmetic: In my State there were 135,000 negro voters, or negroes of voting age, and some 90,000 or 95,000 white voters. General Canby set up a carpetbag government there and turned our State over to this majority. Now, I want to ask you, with a free vote and a fair count, how are you going to beat 135,000 by 95,000? How are you going to do it? You had set us an impossible task. You had handcuffed us and thrown away the key, and you propped your carpetbag negro government with bayonets. Whenever it was necessary to sustain the government you held it up by the Army.

Mr. President, I have not the facts and figures here, but I want the country to get the full view of the Southern side of this question and the justification for anything we did. We were sorry we had the necessity forced upon us, but we could not help it, and as white men we are not sorry for it, and we do not propose to apologize for anything we have done in connection with it. We took the government away from them in 1876. We did take it. If no other Senator has come here previous to this time who would acknowledge it, more is the pity. We have had no fraud in our elections in South Carolina since 1884. There has been no organized Republican party in the State.

We did not disfranchise the negroes until 1895. Then we had a constitutional convention convened which took the matter up calmly, deliberately, and avowedly with the purpose of disfranchising as many of them as we could under the fourteenth and fifteenth amendments. We adopted the educational qualification as the



only means left to us, and the negro is as contented and as prosperous and as well protected in South Carolina to-day as in any State of the Union south of the Potomac. He is not meddling with politics, for he found that the more he meddled with them the worse off he got. As to his "rights"—I will not discuss them now. We of the South have never recognized the right of the negro to govern white men, and we never will. We have never believed him to be equal to the white man, and we will not submit to his gratifying his lust on our wives and daughters without lynching him. I would to God the last one of them was in Africa and that none of them had ever been brought to our shores. But I will not pursue the subject further.

I want to ask permission in this connection to print a speech which I made in the constitutional convention of South Carolina when it convened in 1895, in which the whole carpetbag régime and the indignities and wrongs heaped upon our people, the robberies which we suffered, and all the facts and figures there brought out are incorporated, and let the whole of the facts go to the country. I am not ashamed to have those facts go to the country. They are our justification for the present situation in our State. If I can get it, I should like that permission; otherwise I shall be forced to bring that speech here and read it when I can put my hand on it. I will then leave this matter and let the dead past bury its dead. I make the request, Mr. President, to have permission to print the speech delivered by me in the constitutional convention in South Carolina in 1895 in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. QUARLES in the chair). The Senator from South Carolina asks unanimous consent to print matter which he has just described as part of his speech, Is there objection?

Mr. ALLEN. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Nebraska rise to this question?

Mr. ALLEN. No, sir; there is no objection on my part. I rose to another matter of business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair hears no objection, and leave is granted.

[Mr. ALLEN introduced a joint resolution, which appears elsewhere in to-day's RECORD.]

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

Mr. BERRY and Mr. PETTUS called for the yeas and nays; and they were ordered.

The Secretary proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BURROWS (when his name was called). I am paired with the senior Senator from Louisiana [Mr. CAFFERY]. I suggest to the Senator from Florida [Mr. TALIAFERRO] to transfer his pair with the Senator from West Virginia to the senior Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. TALIAFERRO. I will be pleased to do so.

Mr. BURROWS. That will enable us both to vote. I vote "yea."

Mr. GALLINGER (when Mr. CHANDLER's name was called). My colleague [Mr. CHANDLER] is out of the city, and I understand that he is paired with the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. McENERY] on all questions.

Mr. CULBERSON (when Mr. CHILTON's name was called). My colleague [Mr. CHILTON] is paired with the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. DAVIS]. If my colleague were present, he would vote "nay."

Mr. DAVIS (when his name was called). I am paired with the Senator from Texas [Mr. CHILTON].

Mr. HANNA (when his name was called). I have a pair with the Senator from Utah [Mr. RAWLINS]. I do not see him in the Chamber. If he were here, I should vote "yea."

Mr. HANSBROUGH (when his name was called). I am paired with the senior Senator from Virginia [Mr. DANIEL]. If he were present, I should vote "yea."

Mr. HEITFELD (when his name was called). I am paired with the senior Senator from New York [Mr. PLATT]. If he were present, I should vote "nay."

Mr. JONES of Arkansas (when his name was called). I have a pair with the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. PLATT] who is absent from the Senate. If he were present, I should vote "nay" and he would vote "yea."

Mr. DAVIS (when the name of Mr. PLATT of New York was called). The Senator from New York [Mr. PLATT] was called away on an important matter, but he is paired. I desire to say in his behalf that if he were present he would vote "yea."

Mr. PROCTOR (when his name was called). I am paired with the senior Senator from Florida [Mr. MALLORY]. I will transfer that pair to the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. KYLE] and vote. I vote "yea."

Mr. SULLIVAN (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the junior Senator from Illinois [Mr. MASON]. As he is not present, I withhold my vote.

Mr. WARREN (when his name was called). I have a pair on

political questions with the senior Senator from Washington [Mr. TURNER]; and unless I am assured by some of his colleagues to the contrary, I shall presume that he would vote "nay" on this question. If permitted to vote, I should vote "yea." I will withhold my vote, being paired.

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. WETMORE. My colleague, the senior Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. ALDRICH], is absent. A pair has been arranged on this question with the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. CAFFERY]. If the senior Senator from Rhode Island were here he would vote "yea."

Mr. CLARK of Wyoming. I have a general pair with the junior Senator from Kansas [Mr. HARRIS]. I suggest to the Senator from Idaho [Mr. HEITFELD] that we exchange pairs, so that each of us can vote.

Mr. HEITFELD. That is agreeable.

Mr. CLARK of Wyoming. I vote "yea."

Mr. HEITFELD. I vote "nay."

Mr. TILLMAN. I have a general pair with the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. THURSTON]. At the suggestion of his colleague [Mr. ALLEN] I transfer that pair to him and I will vote. I vote "nay."

Mr. ALLEN. On this question I stand paired with my colleague [Mr. THURSTON].

Mr. PRITCHARD. My colleague [Mr. BUTLER] is unavoidably absent. I understand that he is paired with the senior Senator from Maryland [Mr. WELLINGTON].

Mr. HANSBROUGH. I transfer my pair with the senior Senator from Virginia [Mr. DANIEL] to the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. PLATT] and vote. I vote "yea."

Mr. CLARK of Montana (after having voted in the negative). I have a general pair with the junior Senator from Indiana [Mr. BEVERIDGE]. I see that he has not voted and I withdraw my vote.

The result was announced—yeas 35, nays 15; as follows:

## YEAS—35.

Allison,	Foraker,	Kean,	Ross,
Bard,	Foster,	Lodge,	Sewell,
Burrows,	Frye,	McComas,	Shoup,
Carter,	Gallinger,	McCumber,	Simon,
Clark, Wyo.	Gear,	McMillan,	Spooner,
Cullom,	Hale,	Perkins,	Stewart,
Deboe,	Hansbrough,	Pritchard,	Wetmore,
Depew,	Hawley,	Proctor,	Wolcott.
Fairbanks,	Hoar,	Quarles,	

## NAYS—15.

Bacon,	Cockrell,	McLaurin,	Taliaferro,
Bate,	Culbertson,	Martin,	Tillman,
Berry.	Heitfeld,	Morgan,	Turley.
Clay,	Lindsay,	Pettus,	

## NOT VOTING—37.

Aldrich,	Davis,	Mallory,	Sullivan,
Allen,	Elkins,	Mason,	Teller,
Baker,	Hanna,	Money,	Thurston,
Beveridge,	Harris,	Nelson,	Turner,
Butler,	Jones, Ark.	Penrose,	Vest,
Caffery,	Jones, Nev.	Pettigrew,	Warren,
Chandler,	Kenney,	Platt, Conn.	Wellington.
Chilton,	Kyle,	Platt, N. Y.	
Clark, Mont.	McBride,	Rawlins,	
Daniel,	McEnery,	Scott,	

So the report of the committee of conference was agreed to.

## CONSIDERATION OF PENSION BILLS.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President, the junior Senator from Ohio [Mr. FORAKER], in charge of the unfinished business, has kindly consented to allow me to ask for the consideration of the unobjected pension bills on the Calendar, which I now do.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from New Hampshire asks unanimous consent for the consideration of the unobjected pension cases on the Calendar. Is there objection? The Chair hears none.

## JOHN E. HIGGINS.

The bill (S. 1918) granting an increase of pension to John E. Higgins was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

The bill was reported from the Committee on Pensions with amendments, in line 6, after the word "late," to strike out "a member;" in line 8, before the word "dollars," to strike out "fifty" and insert "thirty;" and in the same line, before the word "he," to strike out "which;" so as to make the bill read:

*Be it enacted, etc.* That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to place on the pension roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws, the name of John E. Higgins, late of the band, Third United States Artillery, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The amendments were agreed to.

Mr. GALLINGER. I move to amend, in line 6, after the word "late," by striking out the words "of the band" and inserting "musician."

The amendment was agreed to.



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

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

HENRY HILL.

The bill (S. 2651) granting a pension to Henry Hill was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

The bill was reported from the Committee on Pensions with an amendment, to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to place on the pension roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws, the name of Henry Hill, late body servant to Gen. W. T. H. Brooks, United States Volunteers, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. COCKRELL. Let the report be read in that case.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The report will be read.

The Secretary read the report submitted by Mr. GALLINGER on the 13th instant, as follows:

The Committee on Pensions, to whom was referred the bill (S. 2651) granting a pension to Henry Hill, have examined the same and report:

This bill proposes to pension Henry Hill, of Tennytown, D. C., late body servant to Gen. W. T. H. Brooks, United States Volunteers.

From the evidence filed with this committee the following facts appear: Claimant was not an enlisted man, but was employed in the summer of 1861 as cook for the band of the Third Regiment Vermont Volunteer Infantry. He then became body servant to General Brooks, commanding the "Old Vermont Brigade," with whom he remained until July 1, 1862. On that day, in the battle of White Oak Swamp, Virginia, he was severely and dangerously wounded in the face, and, as one witness states, it looked as though half of his head had been shot away. He was sent to Cliffburne Hospital, Washington, D. C., and there treated for his wound.

Reports from the Auditor for the War Department showing claimant's service and from the Acting Chief Record and Pension Office, War Department, showing his hospital treatment, are appended hereto. He made claim for pension under the act of June 27, 1890, but his claim was rejected February 3, 1892, on the ground that he was not an enlisted man.

The claimant is now 63 years of age, and badly disfigured by the wound he received in battle. If he had been an enlisted man there could be no question about his title to pension. His case is an exceptional one and is not covered by existing law.

In view of all the circumstances of the case your committee believe the claimant should be allowed a pension for his wound.

The bill is therefore reported back favorably with a recommendation that it pass when amended as follows:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to place on the pension roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws, the name of Henry Hill, late body servant to Gen. W. T. H. Brooks, United States Volunteers, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month."

TREASURY DEPARTMENT,  
OFFICE OF AUDITOR FOR THE WAR DEPARTMENT,  
Washington, March 5, 1900.

SIR: Referring to your letters of the 21st and 28th ultimo, relative to obtaining information as to the service of Henry Hill as cook for the band, Third Vermont Infantry, during the summer of 1861, and as body servant to General (W. T. H.) Brooks, United States Volunteers, I have to inform you that the rolls of the band, Third Vermont Infantry, from its organization in June, 1861, to its muster out in August, 1862, and also pay vouchers of its leader, Nelson D. Adams, for the same period, have been examined and the name of Henry Hill, or a similar name, has not been found thereon.

The pay vouchers of W. T. H. Brooks, brigadier-general, United States Volunteers, from October 6, 1861 (date promoted to brigadier-general), to December 31, 1862, have also been examined with the result that on all the vouchers from November 1, 1861, to latter date, except for the month of July, 1862, the name of "Henry" appears, without surname, as a servant, described on same as follows: Complexion, colored; height, 5 feet 10 inches; eyes, dark; hair, dark; and on others as "black man" and "colored man." For July, 1862, another name appears in his stead as servant.

Respectfully,

F. H. MORRIS, Auditor.

Mr. JOHN H. WALKER,

Clerk to the Committee on Pensions, United States Senate.

RECORD AND PENSION OFFICE, WAR DEPARTMENT,  
Washington City, February 16, 1900.

SIR: Referring to your letter of the 14th instant, in which you request, for the use of your committee in connection with Senate bill No. 2651, the complete medical history of Henry Hill, who alleges that he was the body servant to General Brooks, commanding the Second Brigade, Second Division, Sixth Army Corps, and that during the summer of 1861 he cooked for the band of the Third Regiment Vermont Volunteer Infantry, I beg to state that an examination has been made of all records on file in this office deemed likely to afford information in the case, and the only record of his service or disability found on file consists of an unsigned report of John S. Billings, assistant surgeon, United States Army, showing the treatment of Henry Hill in Cliffburne Hospital, Washington, D. C. A copy of that report is as follows:

"Fractured bones of face. Dr. Otis. Recovery.

"Henry Hill (negro), cook to Brigadier General Brooks. Age 27. Stout and healthy man. Was wounded at the battle of White Oak Swamp, July 1, 1862. Was standing behind a frame house when a large solid shot passed through the house, and one of the fragments of wood struck him on the right side of the face, producing a large lacerated wound. On his admission to Cliffburne Hospital, July 5, 1862, a wound was found extending from the internal canthus of the right eye perpendicularly downward to the mouth, crossing and comminuting the nasal bones and left superior maxilla, separating the nasal bones, and then tearing open the cheek from the left corner of the mouth to the angle of the jaw. The eye was depressed, the upper lid falling with it, having been cut across horizontally—the ethmoid bone fractured horizontally, and the lower fragment, including the middle turbinated bones, being driven downward.

"This was removed, together with the left nasal bone and the fragments of the vomer, also the lachrymal bone, and with some difficulty the shattered jaw and malar bone restored to their normal position. The flesh wounds

were then closed with the twisted suture silver wire being used to unite the wound of the eyelid, and all the parts were fixed in position by isinglass plaster and collodion. The lower jaw was used as a splint, corks being placed between the teeth to support the shattered bones and a firm bandage applied from chin to vertex. Milk, beef essence, and egg-nog were administered at short intervals by means of a tube. The pins were removed on the third day and the plaster on the seventh, the wounds of the face having united perfectly. July 30—has been going on well and presents but little deformity. The septum of the nose has united well; vision, which was at first destroyed in the left eye, is now rapidly returning, and his general health and strength is perfect."

[Indorsement.]

"Washington, D. C., July 30, 1862. John S. Billings, assistant surgeon, U. S. A.

"Lacerating wound of face, comminuting nasal bone and left superior maxilla. Recovered."

It is proper to add that it was not customary to enter the record of the body servants of officers or civilian cooks on the military records on file in this office, and it is probable that additional information relative to the service of the man mentioned may be obtained upon application to the Auditor for the War Department, in whose office the vouchers containing the names of officers' body servants are filed.

Very respectfully,

JOHN TWEEDALE,  
Acting Chief Record and Pension Office.

Hon. JACOB H. GALLINGER,  
Chairman Committee on Pensions, United States Senate.

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.

THOMAS ADAMS.

The bill (H. R. 5180) granting an increase of pension to Thomas Adams was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension roll the name of Thomas Adams, late of Company F, Seventh Regiment West Virginia Volunteer Cavalry, and to pay him a pension of \$24 in lieu of that he is now receiving.

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

ELLEN NORWOOD.

The bill (H. R. 541) granting a pension to Ellen Norwood was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension roll the name of Ellen Norwood, as widow of Alfred Norwood, late of Company K, Second Regiment Massachusetts Volunteer Heavy Artillery, and to pay her a pension of \$12 per month.

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

LOUISA S. WILSON.

The bill (H. R. 539) granting a pension to Louisa S. Wilson was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension roll the name of Louisa S. Wilson, widow of George A. Wilson, late of Company I, Second Regiment Massachusetts Volunteer Heavy Artillery, and to pay her a pension of \$8 per month.

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

EDWARD BOYLE.

The bill (H. R. 2389) granting an increase of pension to Edward Boyle, was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension roll the name of Edward Boyle, late of Company D, Sixth Regiment United States Infantry, and to pay him a pension of \$24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

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

GEORGE W. CAMPBELL.

The bill (S. 1578) granting a pension to George W. Campbell was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

The bill was reported from the Committee on Pensions with an amendment, to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to place on the pension roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws, the name of George W. Campbell, alias George W. Smith, late of Battery I, Second Regiment United States Artillery, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

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.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill granting an increase of pension to George W. Campbell, alias George W. Smith."

CHARLES A. PERKINS.

The bill (S. 1246) granting a pension to Charles A. Perkins, was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

The bill was reported from the Committee on Pensions with an amendment, in line 6, after the name "Perkins," to strike out "of Omaha, Nebr.," at the rate of \$36 per month, in lieu of the pension he is now receiving," and insert "late of United States



Navy, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving;" so as to make the bill read:

*Be it enacted, etc.*, That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to place on the pension roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws, the name of Charles A. Perkins, late of United States Navy, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Mr. GALLINGER. I move to amend the amendment, after the word "of," in line 8, by inserting the words "U. S. S. *Antona* and *Carrabasset*;" so that it will read: "late of U. S. S. *Antona* and *Carrabasset*, United States Navy." This will identify him.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The amendment as amended 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.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill granting an increase of pension to Charles A. Perkins."

OLIVER DOMON.

The bill (S. 1245) granting a pension to Oliver Domon, was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension roll the name of Oliver Domon, late a member of Company A, Eighth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and to pay him a pension of \$30 per month in lieu of the pension he is now receiving.

Mr. GALLINGER. In line 8, after the words "in lieu of," I move to strike out the words "the pension" and insert the word "that;" so as to read: "in lieu of that he is now receiving."

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.

JAMES RICHARDSON.

The bill (S. 2290) granting a pension to James Richardson was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

The bill was reported from the Committee on Pensions with an amendment in line 7, after the word "Volunteers," to insert "and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month;" so as to make the bill read:

*Be it enacted, etc.*, That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to place on the pension roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws, the name of James Richardson, late of Company B, Nineteenth Regiment Kansas State Militia Volunteers, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

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.

DAVID H. MOREY.

The bill (S. 2753) granting an increase of pension to David H. Morey was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

The bill was reported from the Committee on Pensions with amendments, in line 6, after the word "Seventeenth," to insert "Regiment;" and in line 8, before the word "dollars," to strike out "fifty" and insert "forty;" so as to make the bill read:

*Be it enacted, etc.*, That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to place on the pension roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws, the name of David H. Morey, late of Company F, Seventeenth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The amendments were agreed to.

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

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

CHARLES ROSS.

The bill (H. R. 3538) granting an increase of pension to Charles Ross was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

The bill was reported from the Committee on Pensions with amendments, in line 6, after the word "Eleventh," to insert "Regiment;" and in line 7, after the word "Infantry," to insert "and pay him a pension;" so as to make the bill read:

*Be it enacted, etc.*, That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to place on the pension roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws, the name of Charles Ross, late private, Company B, Eleventh Regiment Missouri Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The amendments were agreed to.

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

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time, and passed.

JOHN THORNTON.

The bill (S. 1601) granting an increase of pension to John Thornton was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

The bill was reported from the Committee on Pensions with an amendment, in line 8, before the word "he," to strike out "the pension" and insert "that;" so as to make the bill read:

*Be it enacted, etc.*, That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to place on the pension roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws, the name of John Thornton, late of Company D, Seventh Regiment Wisconsin Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

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.

CHARLES KAUFFUNG.

The bill (H. R. 2597) granting an increase of pension to Charles Kauffung was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

The bill was reported from the Committee on Pensions with an amendment, in line 8, before the word "dollars," to strike out "thirty" and insert "forty;" so as to make the bill read:

*Be it enacted, etc.*, That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby is, authorized and directed to place on the pension roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws, the name of Charles Kauffung, late of Company G, First Wisconsin Heavy Artillery, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$40 per month in lieu of the pension he is now receiving.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. GALLINGER. I move to further amend in line 8, after the words "lieu of," to strike out "the pension" and insert "that."

The amendment was agreed to.

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

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read the third time.

The bill was read the third time, and passed.

JOHN W. KAUMP.

The bill (S. 1603) granting an increase of pension to John W. Kaump was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

The bill was reported from the Committee on Pensions with amendments, in line 8, before the word "dollars," to strike out "thirty-six" and insert "thirty;" and in line 9, before the word "he," to strike out "the pension" and insert "that;" so as to make the bill read:

*Be it enacted, etc.*, That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to place on the pension roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws, the name of John W. Kaump, late of Company K, Forty-fourth Regiment Wisconsin Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The amendments were agreed to.

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

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

CHARLES WEITFLE.

The bill (S. 3078) granting a pension to Charles Weitfle was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

The bill was reported from the Committee on Pensions with an amendment, in line 7, before the word "dollars," to strike out "thirty" and insert "twenty;" so as to make the bill read:

*Be it enacted, etc.*, That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to place on the pension roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws, the name of Charles Weitfle, late of United States Navy, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. GALLINGER. In line 6 I move to strike out the word "of," where it occurs the second time, and to insert the words "landsman, U. S. S. *Bainbridge*;" so as to read: "late landsman, U. S. S. *Bainbridge*, United States Navy."

The amendment was agreed to.

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

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

MILTON H. DANIELS.

The bill (S. 2539) granting an increase of pension to Capt. Milton H. Daniels was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension roll the name of Capt. Milton H. Daniels, late of Company C, Seventeenth Regiment Connecticut Volunteer Infantry, and to pay him a pension of \$34 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Mr. GALLINGER. I move to amend, in line 6, after the word "of," where it occurs the first time, by striking out the word "Captain;" and in the same line, after the word "late," by striking out "of" and inserting "captain;" so as to read: "late captain,



Company C, Seventeenth Regiment Connecticut Volunteer Infantry."

The amendments were agreed to.

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

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

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill granting an increase of pension to Milton H. Daniels."

ELI C. WALTON.

The bill (H. R. 1944) granting an increase of pension to Eli C. Walton was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension roll the name of Eli C. Walton, late of Company B, Fifty-fourth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and to pay him a pension of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

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

CORYDEN BEVANS.

The bill (S. 258) granting a pension to Coryden Bevans was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

The bill was reported from the Committee on Pensions with amendments, in line 6, after the word "late," to strike out "a member;" and in line 7, after the word "Illinois," to strike out "Volunteers" and insert:

Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving: *Provided*, That no deduction shall be made on account of any former payments of pension to the beneficiary under this bill—

So as to make the bill read:

*Be it enacted, etc.*, That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to place on the pension roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws, the name of Coryden Bevans, late of Company F, Fifty-fifth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving: *Provided*, That no deduction shall be made on account of any former payments of pension to the beneficiary under this bill.

The amendments were agreed to.

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

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

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill granting an increase of pension to Coryden Bevans."

JAMES L. WHIDDEN.

The bill (H. R. 4854) granting a pension to James L. Whidden was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension roll the name of James L. Whidden, late of Captain Hooker's company, Florida Seminole Indian war of 1856, 1857, and 1858, and to pay him a pension of \$8 per month.

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

GEORGE W. WEEDEN.

The bill (H. R. 3470) granting an increase of pension to George W. Weeden was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension roll the name of George W. Weeden, late captain Company F, Second Regiment Rhode Island Volunteer Infantry, and to pay him a pension of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

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

JOHN S. PARKER.

The bill (H. R. 7114) granting an increase of pension to John S. Parker was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension roll the name of John S. Parker, late of Company G, One hundred and seventh Regiment New York Volunteer Infantry, and to pay him a pension of \$24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

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

SAMUEL LYBARGER.

The bill (H. R. 7896) granting an increase of pension to Samuel Lybarger was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension roll the name of Samuel Lybarger, late a private in Company I, Tenth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and to pay him a pension of \$35 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

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

MARGARET GANGLOFF.

The bill (H. R. 4961) granting an increase of pension to Margaret Gangloff was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension roll the name of Margaret Gangloff, widow of Henry D. Gangloff, late a private of Company B, Third Regiment Missouri Volunteer Cavalry, and to pay her a pension of \$24 per month in lieu of that she now receives.

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

ELI OVERHULTZ.

The bill (H. R. 2382) granting an increase of pension to Eli Overhultz was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension roll the name of Eli Overhultz, late of Company I, One hundred and first Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and to pay him a pension of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

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

HAMILTON K. WILLIAMS.

The bill (S. 3380) granting an increase of pension to Hamilton K. Williams was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension roll the name of Hamilton K. Williams, late of Company E, Sixteenth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and to pay him a pension of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

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

JOHN W. BLAKE.

The bill (S. 2335) granting an increase of pension to Maj. John W. Blake was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

Mr. GALLINGER. In line 6, before the word "sergeant," I move to strike out the article "a" and to insert the word "late;" in line 10, after the word "Infantry," to strike out the words "in the war of the rebellion;" and in line 11, before the word "month," to strike out the article "a" and insert the word "per;" so as to make the bill read:

*Be it enacted, etc.*, That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to place on the pension roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws, the name of John W. Blake, late sergeant in Company E, Fourth Regiment Wisconsin Volunteer Infantry, captain of Company H, Twenty-ninth Regiment Wisconsin Volunteer Infantry, and major of the Forty-second Regiment, Wisconsin Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$72 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The amendments were agreed to.

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

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

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill granting an increase of pension to John W. Blake."

HANNAH G. HUFF.

The bill (S. 2900) granting a pension to Hannah G. Huff was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension roll at \$12 per month, the name of Hannah G. Huff, dependent mother of the late John D. Huff, private, Company D, Seventh Regiment Iowa Infantry Volunteers.

Mr. GALLINGER. I move to amend, in line 5, after the word "laws," by striking out the words "at the rate of \$12 per month;" in line 7, after the name "Huff," to strike out the word "private;" and to add to the bill the words "and pay her a pension at the rate of \$12 per month."

The amendments were agreed to.

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

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

MARIE WIERSANG.

The bill (H. R. 1939) granting a pension to Marie Wiersang was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension roll the name of Marie Wiersang, widow of Erick Wiersang, late of Company E, First Regiment Minnesota Volunteer Mounted Rangers, and to pay her a pension of \$12 per month.

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

DAVID TALMON.

The bill (H. R. 3966) granting an increase of pension to David Talmon was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension roll the name of David Talmon, late of Company H, Sixth Regiment Minnesota Volunteer Infantry, and to pay him a pension of \$24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

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

JOHN M. McCORD.

The bill (H. R. 4298) granting an increase of pension to John M. McCord was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension roll the name of John M. McCord, late a member of Company A, Sixth Regiment Missouri State Militia Cavalry, and also a member of Company A, Thirteenth Regiment Missouri Volunteer Cavalry, and to pay him a pension of \$24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

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

SAMUEL S. WHITE.

The bill (S. 351) to increase the pension of Samuel S. White was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

The bill was reported from the Committee on Pensions with an amendment, to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to place on the pension roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws, the name of Samuel S. White, late of Captain McMurtry's company, Illinois Mounted Volunteers, Black Hawk Indian war, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

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.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill granting an increase of pension to Samuel S. White."

WILLIAM LYMAN CHITTENDEN.

The bill (S. 1400) granting a pension to William Lyman Chittenden was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

The bill was reported from the Committee on Pensions with an amendment, to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to place on the pension roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws, the name of William Lyman Chittenden, late of Capt. L. J. Powell's company Minute Men Oregon Volunteers of 1856, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

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.

WILLIAM MURPHY.

The bill (S. 2764) granting an increase of pension to William Murphy was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

The bill was reported from the Committee on Pensions with an amendment, in line 7, after the words "rate of," to strike out "seventy-two" and insert "fifty;" so as to make the bill read:

*Be it enacted, etc.*, That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to place on the pension roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws, the name of William Murphy, late second lieutenant Company F. First Delaware Volunteers, at the rate of \$50 per month in lieu of the pension he is now receiving.

Mr. GALLINGER. I move to amend the amendment by reducing the amount to \$30 per month.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. GALLINGER. I move to further amend, in line 8, by striking out the words "the pension" and inserting "that."

The amendment was agreed to.

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

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

JOHN P. HINSLEY.

The bill (S. 3200) granting a pension to John P. Hinsley was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension roll the name of John P. Hinsley, late of Company G, Sixth Regiment Delaware Volunteer Infantry, and to pay him a pension of \$12 per month.

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

SARAH KERSEY.

The bill (S. 3352) granting a pension to Sarah Kersey was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension roll the name of Sarah Kersey, widow of William Kersey, late of Company G, Sixth Regiment Delaware Volunteer Infantry, and to pay her a pension of \$12 per month.

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

ISAAC D. SMITH.

The bill (H. R. 206) granting an increase of pension to Isaac D. Smith was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension roll the name of Isaac D. Smith, late of Company A, Fifteenth Regiment United States Infantry, and to pay him a pension of \$35 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

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

PETER CUMMINGS.

The bill (H. R. 2792) granting a pension to Peter Cummings was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension roll the name of Peter Cummings, late a private

in Company D, Eleventh Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Cavalry, and to pay him a pension of \$12 per month.

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

SAMUEL C. KRICKBAUM.

The bill (H. R. 4441) granting an increase of pension to Samuel C. Krickbaum was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension roll the name of Samuel C. Krickbaum, late of Company B, One hundred and ninety-ninth Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, and to pay him a pension of \$24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

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

FREDERICK WEBER.

The bill (H. R. 5949) granting a pension to Frederick Weber was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension roll the name of Frederick Weber, late a private in Company C, Second Potomac Home Brigade, Maryland Volunteer Infantry, and to pay him a pension of \$8 per month.

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

MARGARET A. PORTER.

The bill (H. R. 6144) granting an increase of pension to Margaret A. Porter was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension roll the name of Margaret A. Porter, widow of James R. Porter, late colonel One hundred and thirty-fifth Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, and to pay her a pension of \$24 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

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

LUKE H. MONSON.

The bill (S. 3300) granting an increase of pension to Luke H. Monson was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension roll the name of Luke H. Monson, late of Company I, First Regiment Missouri Volunteer Cavalry, and to pay him a pension of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

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

LEWIS C. BEARD.

The bill (S. 2483) granting an increase of pension to Lewis C. Beard was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension roll the name of Lewis C. Beard, late of Company D, Sixteenth Regiment Maine Volunteer Infantry, and to pay him a pension of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

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

ROBERT J. KOONCE.

The bill (S. 2215) granting an increase of pension to Robert J. Koonce was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension roll the name of Robert J. Koonce, late of Company B, Eighty-first Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and to pay him a pension of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

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

GEORGE W. RAGLAND.

The bill (S. 2276) granting an increase of pension to George W. Ragland was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

The bill was reported from the Committee on Pensions with an amendment, in line 8, before the word "dollars," to strike out "thirty" and insert "twenty;" so as to make the bill read:

*Be it enacted, etc.*, That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to place on the pension roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws, the name of George W. Ragland, late captain of Company H, One hundred and twenty-ninth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$20 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

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.

ELIZA ADELAIDE BALL.

The bill (S. 3418) granting an increase of pension to Eliza Adelaide Ball was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

The bill was reported from the Committee on Pensions with an amendment, in line 8, after the words "rate of," to strike out "fifty" and insert "forty;" so as to make the bill read:

*Be it enacted, etc.*, That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to place on the pension roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws, the name of Eliza Adelaide Ball, widow



of Edward Ball, late a major in the Seventh United States Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$40 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. GALLINGER. I move to further amend, in line 6, by striking out the article "a," before the word "major;" so as to read "late major in the Seventh United States Cavalry."

The amendment was agreed to.

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

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

ELISHA B. SEAMAN.

The bill (H. R. 3809) granting an increase of pension to Elisha B. Seaman was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to pension Elisha B. Seaman, late of Company A, Sixty-sixth Ohio Volunteer Infantry, at the rate of \$24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

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

JAMES J. M'MAINS.

The bill (H. R. 5126) granting an increase of pension to James J. McMains was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to pension James J. McMains, late of Company F, Thirty-sixth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, at the rate of \$50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

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

JOHN H. MEEKER.

The bill (H. R. 6028) granting a pension to John H. Meeker was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to pension John H. Meeker, late first-class pilot, U. S. S. *Oriole* and other vessels, at the rate of \$12 per month.

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

MARIA ANDREWS.

The bill (H. R. 6700) granting an increase of pension to Maria Andrews was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to pension Maria Andrews, widow of George Andrews, late private, Company K, Eighty-fifth Illinois Volunteers, at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

Mr. GALLINGER. In line 8 I move to strike out "thirty" and insert "twenty-four;" so as to read "\$24."

The amendment was agreed to.

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

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

The bill was read the third time, and passed.

SERELDA C. M'GREW.

The bill (H. R. 6701) granting a pension to Serelda C. McGrew was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

The bill was reported from the Committee on Pensions with amendments, in line 7, after the words "United States," to strike out "ship *Carondelet*, in the late war of rebellion" and insert "steamer *Carondelet*, United States Navy;" and in line 9, before the word "pay," to strike out "to;" so as to make the bill read:

*Be it enacted, etc.*, That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to place on the pension roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws, the name of Serelda C. McGrew, widow of James A. McGrew, late pilot and seaman on the U. S. S. *Carondelet*, United States Navy, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

Mr. GALLINGER. Let it be further amended by substituting "steamship" for "steamer."

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The amendment as amended was agreed to.

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

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time, and passed.

SARAH POTTER.

The bill (H. R. 5229) granting a pension to Sarah Potter was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to pension Sarah Potter, permanently helpless daughter of Andrew Potter, deceased, late of Company K, Eighth Michigan Volunteer Cavalry, at the rate of \$12 per month.

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

JOHN W. BRISBOIS.

The bill (H. R. 2802) granting an increase of pension to John W. Brisbois was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to pension John W. Brisbois, late private of Company A, Third Iowa Volunteer Infantry, at the rate of \$12 per month.

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

JAMES R. SAWTELL.

The bill (H. R. 6911) granting an increase of pension to James R. Sawtell was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to pension James R. Sawtell, late of Company F, Ninth Regiment Minnesota Volunteer Infantry, at the rate of \$24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

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

SHERMAN D. PLUES.

The bill (H. R. 7368) granting an increase of pension to Sherman D. Plues was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to pension Sherman D. Plues, late corporal, Company A, Fourth Regiment Michigan Volunteer Infantry, at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

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

SARAH CLAGGETT.

The bill (H. R. 3012) granting a pension to Sarah Claggett was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

The bill was reported from the Committee on Pensions with an amendment, to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to place on the pension roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws, the name of Sarah Claggett, former widow of Michael Dye, late of Company A, Seventy-eighth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The amendment was agreed to.

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

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

The bill was read the third time, and passed.

LOUA A. MORGAN.

The bill (H. R. 5544) granting a pension to Loua A. Morgan was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to pension Loua A. Morgan, dependent son of Alfred V. Morgan, late a private in Company I, One hundred and fifty-fifth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, at the rate of \$12 per month.

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

GEORGE WHITE.

The bill (H. R. 5546) granting an increase of pension to George White was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to pension George White, late a private in Company B, Fifteenth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, at the rate of \$24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

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

JAMES W. CARMODY.

The bill (H. R. 6031) granting an increase of pension to James W. Carmody was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to pension James W. Carmody, late a seaman on the U. S. ship *Wabash*, at the rate of \$50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

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

JOHN J. SEARS.

The bill (S. 2296) granting an increase of pension to John J. Sears was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to pension John J. Sears, late of Company C, First Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, in the war with Mexico, and who also served as captain Company K, Twelfth Regiment Kansas Volunteer Infantry, and as major of the Sixty-seventh Regiment United States Colored Infantry, and as lieutenant-colonel of the Eighteenth Regiment United States Colored Infantry, in the war of the rebellion, at the rate of \$25 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Mr. GALLINGER. In line 9 let the words "in the war of the rebellion" be stricken out. They are unnecessary.

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.

LOUANN A. PERRY.

The bill (S. 316) granting an increase of pension to Louann A. Perry, of Wallace, Kans., was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

The bill was reported from the Committee on Pensions with amendments, in line 7, before the word "captain," to strike out "who was" and insert "late;" in the same line, before the word "company," to strike out "of;" in the same line, before the word "cavalry," to insert "Volunteer;" in line 8, after the word "pension," to insert "at the rate;" and in line 9, before the word "she,"

to strike out "the pension" and insert "that;" so as to make the bill read:

*Be it enacted, etc.*, That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to place on the pension roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws, the name of Louann A. Perry, widow of T. J. R. Perry, late captain Company C, First Regiment Iowa Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The amendments were agreed to.

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

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

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill granting an increase of pension to Louann A. Perry."

JANE DYKES.

The bill (H. R. 470) granting a pension to Jane Dykes was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to pension Jane Dykes, mother of John B. and George Dykes, late privates of Company B, Third Regiment Tennessee Volunteer Mounted Infantry, at the rate of \$12 per month.

Mr. GALLINGER. Let the bill be amended by inserting the word "dependent" before the word "mother," in line 6; so as to read "dependent mother."

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.

LOUISA STEARNS.

The bill (H. R. 6093) granting a pension to Louisa Stearns was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to pension Louisa Stearns, widow of Lewis Stearns, late a private in Company A, Seventh Regiment Iowa Volunteer Cavalry, at the rate of \$12 per month, and to pay her \$2 per month additional for each of the minor children of the soldier under 16 years of age.

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

PETER M. HEATON.

The bill (H. R. 7622) granting an increase of pension to Peter M. Heaton was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to pension Peter M. Heaton, late a private in Company I, Forty-second Regiment Missouri Volunteer Infantry, at the rate of \$15 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

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

ISABELLA UNDERWOOD.

The bill (S. 3289) granting a pension to Isabella Underwood was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

The bill was reported from the Committee on Pensions with amendments, in line 7, after the word "Second," to insert "Regiment;" in the same line, after the words "North Carolina," to strike out "Volunteers" and to insert "Volunteer Infantry;" and in line 9, before the word "of," to insert "at the rate;" so as to make the bill read:

*Be it enacted, etc.*, That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to place on the pension roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws, the name of Isabella Underwood, widow of George W. Underwood, late a private of Company F, Second Regiment North Carolina Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The amendments were agreed to.

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

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

ELLA F. SYDNOR.

The bill (H. R. 1763) granting a pension to Ella F. Sydnor was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to pension Ella F. Sydnor, a nurse in the hospital of the Army of the United States at Winchester, Va., during the late war of the rebellion, at the rate of \$12 per month.

Mr. GALLINGER. I move to strike out in line 7 the words "during the late war of the rebellion."

The amendment was agreed to.

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

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

The bill was read the third time, and passed.

LUCINDA HAGGARD.

The bill (H. R. 6139) granting a pension to Lucinda Haggard was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to pension Lucinda Haggard, widow of Warren Haggard, late of Company H, Sixth Regiment Kentucky Volunteer Cavalry, at the rate of \$8 a month.

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

ANDREW F. DINSMORE.

The bill (S. 3215) granting an increase of pension to Andrew F. Dinsmore was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

The bill was reported from the Committee on Pensions with an amendment, to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to place on the pension roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws, the name of Andrew F. Dinsmore, late of Company E, Third Regiment Michigan Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$72 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

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.

WILLIAM A. OWENS.

The bill (S. 2154) granting an increase of pension to William A. Owens was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

The bill was reported from the Committee on Pensions with amendments, in line 7, after the word "Infantry," to insert "and pay him a pension;" and in line 9, before the word "he," to strike out "the pension" and insert "that;" so as to make the bill read:

*Be it enacted, etc.*, That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to place on the pension roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws, the name of William A. Owens, late of Company I, Second Regiment Wisconsin Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The amendments were agreed to.

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

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

SARAH E. TRADEWELL.

The bill (S. 1890) granting a pension to S. E. Treadway was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

The bill was reported from the Committee on Pensions with an amendment, to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to place on the pension roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws, the name of Sarah E. Tradewell, widow of Benjamin W. Tradewell, late of Captain Elmore's company, South Carolina Volunteers, Seminole Indian war, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$25 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

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.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill granting an increase of pension to Sarah E. Tradewell."

PENCOTE SUBDIVISION.

Mr. SULLIVAN. I ask for the present consideration, by unanimous consent, of the bill (S. 1996) revoking and annulling the subdivision of Pencote Heights, in the District of Columbia.

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

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

J. A. WARE.

Mr. COCKRELL. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill (H. R. 4686) for the relief of J. A. Ware. It was passed by the House, and is unanimously recommended by the Committee on Claims.

There being no objection, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill. It proposes to pay to J. A. Ware \$3,718.52, in full for all claims for extra expenditures incurred by him in the construction of the Mound City National Cemetery roadway.

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

RAFTS ON THE PACIFIC OCEAN.

Mr. PERKINS. I ask unanimous consent to call up the bill (S. 2926) to prevent dangers to navigation from rafts on the Pacific Ocean. The bill has been read, and I think there is no objection to it.

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

Mr. COCKRELL. The bill has already been read.

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



## GOVERNMENT FOR PUERTO RICO.

Mr. FORAKER. I ask unanimous consent that the unfinished business, being the bill (H. R. 8245) temporarily to provide revenues for the relief of the island of Puerto Rico, and for other purposes, may be temporarily laid aside without prejudice until Monday at 2 o'clock. The Senate, as I understand, will immediately after the routine business to-morrow enter upon the exercises in connection with the presentation by Indiana of the statue of Governor Morton, and there will, perhaps, be no other legislative business transacted anyhow.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Ohio asks unanimous consent that the unfinished business may be temporarily laid aside until Monday at 2 o'clock. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

## EXECUTIVE SESSION.

Mr. DAVIS. 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 ten minutes spent in executive session the doors were reopened, and (at 4 o'clock and 35 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until to-morrow, Saturday, March 24, 1900, at 12 o'clock m.

## NOMINATION.

*Executive nomination received by the Senate March 23, 1900.*

## ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS.

Walter H. Chamberlin, of Chicago, Ill., to be Assistant Commissioner of Patents, vice Arthur P. Greeley, resigned.

## CONFIRMATIONS.

*Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate March 23, 1900.*

## CONSUL.

Joseph F. Monaghan, of Rhode Island, to be consul of the United States at Chemnitz, Germany.

## PROMOTIONS IN THE ARMY.

## Ordnance Department.

Capt. James Rockwell, jr., Ordnance Department, to be major, March 5, 1900.

First Lieut. George Montgomery, Ordnance Department, to be captain, March 5, 1900.

## Artillery arm.

Second Lieut. Thomas Q. Ashburn, Seventh Artillery, to be first lieutenant, March 1, 1900.

## Cavalry arm.

Second Lieut. Elvin R. Heiberg, Sixth Cavalry, to be first lieutenant, March 13, 1900.

## APPOINTMENTS IN THE VOLUNTEER ARMY.

*To be assistant commissary of subsistence, with the rank of captain.*

First Lieut. Frank H. Lawton, Twenty-first Infantry, United States Army, March 12, 1900.

## Twenty-seventh Infantry.

Sergt. Charles E. Carpenter, Company D, Twenty-seventh Infantry, United States Volunteers, to be second lieutenant.

*To be assistant surgeon with the rank of first lieutenant.*

Stanley Mac C. Stuart, of the District of Columbia, acting assistant surgeon, United States Army, March 16, 1900.

## Thirty-fifth Infantry.

Sergt. Selwyn D. Smith, Company C, Thirty-fifth Infantry, United States Volunteers, to be second lieutenant, March 16, 1900.

## Puerto Rico Regiment of Infantry.

## TO BE FIRST LIEUTENANTS WITH RANK FROM MARCH 1, 1900.

Second Lieut. William W. Bessell, Puerto Rico Battalion.

Louis E. Bennett, late major, Fourth Illinois Volunteers.

A. Owen Seaman, late first lieutenant, Fourth Illinois Volunteers.

Morris E. Locke, of Ohio.

John O. Steger, of Virginia.

W. W. Ballard, jr., of Virginia.

## TO BE SECOND LIEUTENANTS WITH RANK FROM MARCH 1, 1900.

First Sergt. Terence Hamill, Troop L, Fifth Cavalry, United States Army.

Jean S. Oakes, of Ohio, late sergeant, Company F, Two hundred and first New York Volunteers.

## PROMOTIONS IN THE VOLUNTEER ARMY.

*To be surgeon with the rank of major.*

Capt. Alexander D. Ghiselin, assistant surgeon, Eleventh Cavalry, United States Volunteers, March 14, 1900.

*To be assistant surgeon with the rank of captain.*

First Lieut. Shadworth O. Beasley, assistant surgeon, Eleventh Cavalry, United States Volunteers, March 14, 1900.

## Fortieth Infantry.

Second Lieut. William E. Utterback, Fortieth Infantry, United States Volunteers, to be first lieutenant, February 23, 1900.

## PROMOTIONS IN THE NAVY.

Commander Washburn Maynard, to be a captain in the Navy, from the 9th day of March, 1900.

Maj. Benjamin R. Russell, to be a lieutenant-colonel in the United States Marine Corps, from the 31st day of January, 1900.

Capt. Charles A. Doyen, to be a major in the United States Marine Corps, from the 31st day of January, 1900.

Mr. Thomas H. Brown, a citizen of Maryland, to be a second lieutenant in the United States Marine Corps, from the 19th day of March, 1900.

Paymaster Josiah R. Stanton, to be a pay inspector in the Navy, from the 20th day of January, 1900.

P. A. Surg. John F. Urie, to be a surgeon in the Navy, from the 25th day of October, 1899.

Asst. Surg. William M. Wheeler, to be a passed assistant surgeon in the Navy, from the 27th day of May, 1899.

## APPOINTMENTS IN THE NAVY.

Frank Lester Pleadwell and Dudley Newcomb Carpenter, to be passed assistant surgeons in the Navy, from the 24th day of October, 1899.

## APPOINTMENTS IN THE MARINE CORPS.

Frank C. Lander, a citizen of Indiana, to be a second lieutenant in the United States Marine Corps, from the 15th day of March, 1900.

William H. Pritchett, a citizen of Georgia, to be a second lieutenant in the United States Marine Corps, from the 2d day of March, 1900.

## INDIAN INSPECTOR.

J. George Wright, of Rosebud Agency, S. Dak., to be an Indian inspector, to take effect March 27, 1900.

## POSTMASTER.

Ellef K. Myhre, to be postmaster at Valley City, in the county of Barnes and State of North Dakota.

## HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

FRIDAY, March 23, 1900.

The House met at 12 o'clock m., and was called to order by the Speaker.

Prayer by the Chaplain, Rev. HENRY N. COUDEN, D. D.  
The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

## THE LOUISIANA PURCHASE.

Mr. BOREING. Mr. Speaker, I am directed by the Committee on Printing to present a privileged report, and I ask for its present consideration.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Kentucky, from the Committee on Printing, by direction of that Committee, calls up for consideration a resolution which will be reported by the Clerk.

The resolution (H. C. Res. 16) was read, as follows:

*Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That there be printed 10,000 copies of the work entitled The Louisiana Purchase, by the honorable Commissioner of the General Land Office of the United States, 3,000 copies for the use of the Senate and 7,000 copies for the use of the House of Representatives.*

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

There was no objection.

The resolution was agreed to.

## REPORT OF DIRECTOR OF BUREAU OF AMERICAN REPUBLICS.

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