

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS INTRODUCED.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BINGHAM: A bill (H. R. 10656) granting a pension to Henrietta Payton, widow of Caleb E. Payton, late of United States steamship *Miami*, of United States Navy—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CALLAHAN: A bill (H. R. 10657) granting a pension to David Inman—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. FOOTE: A bill (H. R. 10658) for the relief of William Brown, alias Daniel Mulligan—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10659) for the relief of Alice Weber—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. GREENE: A bill (H. R. 10660) to correct the military record of Thomas Stevenson—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. HURLEY: A bill (H. R. 10661) to remove the charge of desertion standing against the name of Thomas Sullivan—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. SMITH of Kentucky: A bill (H. R. 10662) to grant a pension to John M. Calloway and correct his military record—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WISE: A bill (H. R. 10663) for the relief of Bolivar Shield—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10664) for the relief of Mrs. Sarah C. Jones and Mrs. Lucy F. Tvier—to the Committee on War Claims.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, the following petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

By Mr. BOUTELLE of Maine: Petition of Rev. H. B. Long and other citizens of the State of Maine, in opposition to the so-called anti-scalping bill or any similar measure—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. GROUT: Petition of the Methodist Episcopal Church of South Royalton, Vt., Rev. E. W. Sharp, presiding, favoring legislation providing that cigarettes imported in original packages on entering any State shall become subject to its laws—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petitions of Rev. H. M. Goddard and the two Congregational churches of Royalton and South Royalton, Vt., and the Methodist Episcopal Church of South Royalton, Rev. E. W. Sharp, presiding, to forbid the transmission of lottery messages by telegraph—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petitions of Rev. H. M. Goddard and the two Congregational churches of Royalton and South Royalton, Vt., and the Epworth League of Trinity Methodist Episcopal Church of South Royalton, Rev. E. W. Sharp, presiding, asking for the passage of the bill to raise the age of protection for girls to 18 years in the District of Columbia—to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Also, petition of W. L. Paine and 14 other members of the Independent Order of Good Templars Lodge of South Royalton, Vt., in favor of the passage of a bill to prohibit the sale of intoxicating liquors in all Government buildings—to the Committee on Alcoholic Liquor Traffic.

By Mr. HURLEY: Resolutions of the eleventh annual convention of the International Association of Factory Inspectors in favor of legislation which will more effectually restrict immigration and prevent the admission of illiterate, pauper, and criminal classes to the United States—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. PRINCE: Petition of the First Methodist Episcopal Church of Rock Island, Ill., asking for the passage of the bill to raise the age of protection for girls—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of the Young People's Christian Union of the United Presbyterian Church of Aledo, Ill., praying for the enactment of legislation prohibiting interstate gambling by telegraph, telephone, or otherwise—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. THORP: Petition of J. E. Robertson and other citizens of Fort Mitchell, Va., favoring the passage of the anti-scalping bill—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. WISE: Papers to accompany House bill No. 10471, for the relief of Louisa S. Guthrie, widow and executrix of John I. Guthrie, deceased—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, papers to accompany House bill to pay Boliver Shield for property taken by the Government during the war—to the Committee on War Claims.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

SATURDAY, June 11, 1898.

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

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

EXPLANATION.

Mr. GROSVENOR. Mr. Speaker, I respectfully request the attention of the House in regard to a matter that transpired at the night session of the House on Thursday night, at the time of the debate on the war revenue bill; and I do it upon the ground, first, that I do not claim to be infallible in my judgment as to what I ought to do on many occasions. I distrust my judgment as to what I did on that occasion. In the heat of debate, Mr. Speaker, as a matter of apology, I think I am more liable to use strong and sometimes bitter language than most men at a time of excitement such as then arose.

I do not care to claim, however, that anything that I said was by any means unpremeditated, and the conditions that surrounded the House at the time, in my judgment, were to some extent, doubtless, a sufficient apology. But I believe I did injustice to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SWANSON] in attributing to him a condition of opinion and sentiment which was objectionable and would be very injurious to that gentleman. And so far as my language on that occasion conveyed that sort of sentiment, it shall be cheerfully withdrawn and retracted. I should have made this much of explanation at the time but for a statement made by that gentleman, which I felt put it beyond possibility, without any further conference, that I could enter upon any withdrawal or explanation.

I have toward that gentleman nothing but the very kindest feeling. He is a very shining mark for Republican criticism, because of the earnest and sometimes, as I have thought, possibly, savage attacks upon the Republican party which he makes, but beyond recognizing him as a foe "worthy of any man's steel," I have not had any feeling against him. Personally, I have always liked him. He is a member of the committee on which I serve, and is a vigilant and valuable member of the House. I desire here and now to be authorized by the silence of the House to so modify my language on that occasion that it will not be injurious and personally objectionable in any respect to him.

Mr. SWANSON. Mr. Speaker, in consideration of the statement made by the gentleman from Ohio, and the fact that he withdraws what he says was objectionable and injurious to me, a statement which is alike creditable to himself and satisfactory to me, I desire also to withdraw anything I may have said that was offensive to or reflected on the gentleman from Ohio.

MEDICAL CORPS OF THE NAVY OF THE UNITED STATES.

Mr. BOUTELLE of Maine. Mr. Speaker, there is a very important bill on the Speaker's table, which reached here from the Senate yesterday, with regard to the organization of the hospital corps of the Navy, the emergency and importance of which is obvious to every member of the House. The amendments of the Senate are entirely unimportant, and I ask that the pending order may be deferred for a moment, in order that the House may put that bill into immediate operation.

Mr. HITT. Will it take any time?

Mr. BOUTELLE of Maine. I have no idea that it will take any time at all.

The Clerk read as follows:

A bill (H. R. 10220) to organize a hospital corps of the Navy of the United States, to define its duty and regulate its pay, with the following Senate amendments:

Page 1, line 8, after "officers" insert "removable in the discretion of the Secretary."

Page 3, lines 2, 3, and 4, strike out "Provided, That the operation of the provisions of this act shall be limited to the duration of the present war with Spain."

Mr. BOUTELLE of Maine. The amendments of the Senate make no substantial alteration of the bill, and I ask that the amendments may be concurred in, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. MCEWAN. Mr. Speaker, I understand that the amendments of the Senate make it for all time, instead of during this war.

Mr. BOUTELLE of Maine. Precisely; but it is entirely within the control of Congress.

Mr. MCEWAN. I think that was disputed when it was last before the House. But I withdraw any objection to its consideration.

Mr. BOUTELLE of Maine. I move to concur in the Senate amendments.

Mr. WHEELER of Kentucky. I ask that the section be read as it will read if amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 4. That all benefits derived from existing laws, or that may hereafter be allowed by law, to other warrant officers or enlisted men in the Navy shall

be allowed in the same manner to the warrant officers or enlisted men in the hospital corps of the Navy.

Mr. WHEELER of Kentucky. That is not the amendment.

Mr. BOUTELLE of Maine. I will state to the gentleman if he will permit. The only difference is that the House inserted a proviso that the bill should be operative only during the present war. There was probably a misunderstanding that this created some new authority in the Navy Department, but it does not, and the operations of the bill will be subject to the discretion of the Department as to appointments of all these warrant officers and petty officers as now.

Mr. WHEELER of Kentucky. Does it not provide for a permanent increase of the hospital corps of the Navy after the cessation of hostilities?

Mr. BOUTELLE of Maine. All these petty officers and warrant officers are within the limitation of the number of men provided for, and the Navy Department has always rated the men in the service to petty officers and warrant officers, according to the rules of the service. It provides no increase in the number of employees of the Navy at all.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I will ask the gentleman from Maine, Is not this bill one that was up in the House before?

Mr. BOUTELLE of Maine. Precisely. It is the bill to which the gentleman offered an amendment.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. And the bill as it stood then increased the amount of pay for those officers at that time?

Mr. BOUTELLE of Maine. It changes the rate of some compensations in a slight degree, but very small. This bill is exceedingly important. The gentleman himself, from the latitude from which he hails, is perfectly well aware that the season admonishes us that we ought to put our hospital corps into a state of good organization at once; and we have other information urging the necessity for it.

This amendment of the Senate is really nothing substantial. I was willing to allow the gentleman's amendment to prevail in the House, because Congress would have it in its power at any time to continue this, and the same power exists in Congress to abrogate it at any time.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Has the bill been to conference?

Mr. BOUTELLE of Maine. It has not. I did not deem it of sufficient importance to ask that it go to conference.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. My main objection is not to this bill, but I think now that we are increasing the taxes, now that we have these great war expenditures which we have got to meet, there ought to be no steps taken toward putting a permanent increase in any of these branches. If you start here an increased pay in this one branch, the next branch of the service will come forward and say, "You have increased the pay of these men, now why not increase our pay?"

Mr. BOUTELLE of Maine. After the present war the number will be reduced, just as it will in other branches of the service. As soon as the exigencies have passed there will be a reorganization, but this measure is now needed in order that the sick and wounded may be properly taken care of.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. It was admitted when we had the subject up before us that this meant a permanent increase in this little branch of the service of about \$11,000 a year.

Mr. BOUTELLE of Maine. Yes, \$11,000 a year.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Now, I think, in view of the fact that the vote in the House was 183 to 3, 4, or 5 in favor of striking that out, the Naval Committee should insist on a conference in this matter.

Mr. BOUTELLE of Maine. I am positive the Senate would not yield in this matter, because it provides the requisite organization and to increase the rating applicable to the present exigency. The increase is slight, and, as is reported by the Surgeon-General, it is absolutely necessary to obtain the men that are required. I hope there will be no objection to agreeing to the Senate amendment.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I do not want to object to the bill; I am willing that it should hold during the present war; but to make any permanent increase at the present time I think is not wise. I am willing for a vote, but I desire to make a motion to nonconcur.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. BOUTELLE of Maine. Mr. Speaker, I move to concur in the Senate amendment.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry. Does the motion to concur have precedence over a motion to nonconcur?

The SPEAKER. It has. A negative vote to concur is equivalent to a vote to nonconcur. The question is, Will the House concur in the Senate amendment?

The Senate amendment was agreed to.

On motion of Mr. BOUTELLE of Maine, a motion to reconsider the vote whereby the amendment was concurred in was laid on the table.

PRINTING WAR REVENUE ACT.

Mr. DINGLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the resolution for the printing of the war revenue act, 16,000 copies for the use of the House and 8,000 copies for the use of the Senate.

Mr. MARSH. How many copies will that give to each member of the House?

Mr. PAYNE. Something over forty.

Mr. MARSH. I suggest to the gentleman from Maine that that is not a sufficient number, because in every little village of the country there are parties who are taxed under this bill who will want copies.

Mr. DINGLEY. I have no objection to increasing the number. I placed the whole amount at 24,000 copies.

Mr. MARSH. I think it ought to be twice as large.

Mr. MORAE. This is to be in the usual document form?

Mr. DINGLEY. Yes.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the resolution.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That 24,000 copies of an act entitled "An act to provide ways and means to meet war expenditures, and for other purposes," be printed, 16,000 copies for the use of the House and 8,000 copies for the use of the Senate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. PERKINS. Has the gentleman from Maine any estimate of the cost of printing these copies?

Mr. DINGLEY. I have not obtained an estimate of the cost, but of course the difference between 10,000 copies and 20,000 copies the gentleman from Iowa knows, as a practical printer, is substantially the cost of the paper and the printing.

Mr. PERKINS. Might it not be well to provide in the resolution that the copies should be distributed through the folding room?

Mr. DINGLEY. I suppose they would be. If desirable, I will add "to be distributed through the folding room."

Mr. MARSH. I make this suggestion because there is not a village which has a drug store that is not taxed and is not interested in this bill, and letters are coming in all over the country for copies of it in order that parties interested may inform themselves as to its provisions and as to their liability under the law. I hope the gentleman will consent to double the number of copies.

Mr. DINGLEY. I am perfectly willing that the number should be increased.

Mr. RICHARDSON. Is this a concurrent resolution?

Mr. DINGLEY. It is a concurrent resolution.

Mr. RICHARDSON. Then it does not make any difference as to the number of copies.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Speaker, I think there will be occasion for a larger number of copies than is provided for in this resolution, and I move to amend by increasing the number to 32,000 copies for the House and 16,000 copies for the Senate, making 48,000 in all.

The Clerk read as follows:

Strike out "twenty-four" and insert "forty-eight;" so as to read "48,000." Strike out "sixteen" and insert "thirty-two;" strike out "eight" and insert "sixteen;" so as to read 32,000 for the use of the House and 16,000 for the use of the Senate."

Mr. DINGLEY. That amendment is satisfactory, so far as I am concerned.

Mr. BLAND. I suggest a provision that the documents be distributed through the folding room.

Mr. DINGLEY. That would be done, at any rate.

The question being taken, the amendment was agreed to.

The resolution as amended was adopted.

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

HAWAII.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. HITT] is entitled to the floor upon the joint resolution (H. Res. 259) to provide for annexing the Hawaiian Islands to the United States.

Mr. HITT. Mr. Speaker, I am informed that all the copies of the report accompanying this joint resolution have been exhausted. I therefore move that it be reprinted.

Mr. GROSVENOR. The bill and report.

Mr. HITT. Yes; the bill and report, as the bill also has been exhausted.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois asks unanimous consent that the bill and report on this joint resolution be reprinted. Without objection, that order will be made.

Mr. RICHARDSON. I suppose this order will include the views of the minority.

Mr. HITT. Yes, sir; they are included as a part of the report.

The SPEAKER. The views of the minority will be included in the order. The Chair hears no objection.

Mr. HITT. Mr. Speaker, the measure which is now before the House for the annexation of the Hawaiian Islands is substantially the same as a treaty negotiated last year, which is here put into the

form of a joint resolution. The treaty was duly ratified by the Senate of the Republic of Hawaii. We therefore know that we are acting with the cordial assent of the Government of the country proposed to be annexed. That treaty was preceded by another, negotiated by President Harrison five years ago between the two countries, providing for the annexation of the Hawaiian Islands to the United States, which treaty was duly ratified by the Government of Hawaii and would probably have been ratified by our Senate had it not been withdrawn by reason of a change of the occupant of our Executive office.

This is not a novel question at all. It is not an emergency proposition sprung upon us suddenly. It is not a case of greed for territory and overweening influence brought to bear by a great and powerful Government upon one of the smallest in the world to constrain it to give up its independent existence and be absorbed by the other under the form of a legal proceeding. There is no oppression on our side, there is no unwillingness on the other side. The whole proceeding is with the cordial assent of the duly constituted authorities of the Hawaiian Republic, and in accordance with the terms of the constitution of that Republic.

It is in pursuance of a policy long discussed and well known there and to our people here and to all the world. It is a result often contemplated by the successive governments of those islands for fifty years, because the circumstances surrounding the little nation in all the changes in its history have plainly made this a foregone conclusion. So slender, so tottering a political existence in the midst of the mighty political powers of the world had a precarious tenure of life. It was a continual temptation to them—an all important possession of a weak power. It has often been threatened. Several times it has been seized and occupied by a passing commander of a frigate—by a French captain in 1829, by a British commander in 1843, again by the French in 1849.

Conscious of its feeble ability to maintain independence among the nations, the subject of union with our country has been contemplated long. One of the kings of Hawaii executed a deed of cession to the United States in 1816. Another of the kings prepared a draft of a treaty of annexation to the United States in 1854, but before it was executed he died. As I have said, treaties of annexation to the United States have twice been negotiated with this Government within the last five years. It is the natural result of events and causes long operating and now concluding with mutual, cordial consent.

There is nothing that can impute to us, though this is so great and mighty a nation, any purpose of exercising undue pressure, as has ordinarily been the case in European history where a powerful government has taken possession of, absorbed, and extinguished a smaller. The only question we have to consider, when this little commonwealth with open hands offers itself to us, is whether we would be better off by taking this step; whether it would be advantageous to us to accept these islands; whether they are worth owning; whether their possession is of any value to us or not.

ARE THE ISLANDS WORTH ANNEXING?

That is a simple question and ought to be easily answered. Other nations have long since expressed their opinion of the value of the islands in many ways. Though it is a very small nationality, a very small extent of the earth's surface, not equal in people to a Congressional district represented on this floor, yet nineteen nations continually maintain representatives at Honolulu to watch their interests. We keep there to-day an envoy extraordinary and minister plenipotentiary. Why? Not because they are fertile and beautiful islands, not because there are a little over a hundred thousand people there. No; it is because of the supreme importance and value of the islands on account of their position.

They sit facing our western coast—that long stretch confronting the great Pacific Ocean, the most extensive body of water in the world, stretching away for six, seven, eight thousand miles—and they are the nearest point to our coast, and far, very far, removed from any other point in that vast sea. They are 2,000 miles away from us. That seems a very considerable distance, but the immense stretch beyond them to the other portions of the earth is so much greater that they seem comparatively near and are a part of our own system.

With the great change in the construction of fighting ships, all of which are now moved by steam, coal has become an essential of maritime war, as much so as powder or guns, and across that wide ocean any vessel of war coming to attack the United States must stop for coal and supplies at the Hawaiian Islands before it can attack us. No ship can be constructed, no battle ship exists in the world, which can make the trip from the other side of that wide sea to our shores, conduct any operation of hostility against us, and ever get back unless it has its supply of coal renewed.

Mr. KELLEY. Will the gentleman permit an interruption?

Mr. HITT. I should prefer to make my statement consecutively. There will be nearly a whole week for debate and plenty of time for the gentleman to state his views.

Mr. KELLEY. I simply want to call the gentleman's attention to the map.

Mr. HITT. I will hear the gentleman with interest when he comes to address the House. We are all pretty familiar with the map—the remarkable position of these islands and the routes that ships are accustomed to follow. I do not suppose that my personal opinion is worth more than that of the average of mankind who are not specially qualified as commanders and mariners, nor that any member of the House is so presumptuous as to consider his own personal opinion itself an important fact.

But we have on this critical and central question, which is not one of common judgment, the opinions of the most distinguished, specially expert, and able men of the age, the greatest commanders of our armies and our fleets who are living. It is an impressive and convincing fact that all have given the same opinion. There has been no divergence. Everyone has stated that the possession of those islands was to us of great importance, many of them say indispensable; that it will diminish, not increase, the necessity for naval force, economize ships of war and not require more; that in the possession of an enemy, if we shall so foolishly and unwisely act as to refuse annexation and permit them to pass into the hands of an enemy, they will furnish a secure base for active operations to harass and destroy the cities of our western coast; that in our possession, duly fortified, those islands will paralyze any fleet, however strong, however superior to our own naval force in the Pacific, before it can attack our coast.

I accept the opinion of men like Admiral Walker and Captain Mahan and General Schofield, Admiral Belknap, General Alexander, and Admiral Dupont and Chief Engineer Melville. It is a long list of great sailors and soldiers, distinguished strategists and authorities. The striking fact is that there is no dissent among them. These men, who are authorities, have all concurred as to the great importance of the islands. On one of the islands is Pearl Harbor, now unimproved, a possible stronghold and a refuge for a fleet, which, fortified by the expenditure of half a million dollars and garrisoned and aided by the militia of the island and its resources, can be made impregnable to any naval force, however large.

I speak of a naval force. To capture it there must be a land force also. The possession of all the islands was stated by these able men, who were before the committee, to be essential, as they would furnish a valuable militia to promptly cooperate with a garrison of one or two regiments of artillery until, in the short distance from our shore, we could reinforce them with abundant military strength to repel the assault of the disembarking troops, who must come many thousands of miles farther than our own.

This is not my mere assertion or opinion on so grave and technical a question. I am merely giving some of the leading points made by those whose names command the respect of the military and naval professions throughout the world and who have said that the possession not only of Pearl Harbor but of all that little group of islands is to us a necessity. I will give some expressions used by these distinguished authorities. I might give many more.

Captain Mahan, the most distinguished writer and authority of our time on the history of sea power, says:

It is obvious that if we do not hold the islands ourselves, we can not expect the neutrals in the war to prevent the other belligerent from occupying them; nor can the inhabitants themselves prevent such occupation. The commercial value is not great enough to provoke neutral interposition. In short, in war we should need a larger Navy to defend the Pacific coast, because we should have not only to defend our own coast, but to prevent, by naval force, an enemy from occupying the islands; whereas, if we preoccupied them, fortifications could preserve them to us.

In my opinion it is not practicable for any trans-Pacific country to invade our Pacific coast without occupying Hawaii as a base.

General Schofield, who spent three months on the islands and made a careful survey of Pearl River Harbor, stated to our committee:

Its secure anchorage for large fleets, its distance from the sea, beyond the reach of the guns of war ships, and the great ease with which the entrance to the harbor could be defended by batteries so as to make it a perfectly safe refuge for merchant shipping or naval cruisers, or even a fleet which might find it necessary under any circumstances to take refuge there; for coaling grounds, for navy-yard repair shops, storehouses, and everything of that kind.

The most important feature of all is that it economizes the naval force rather than increases it. It is capable of absolute defense by shore batteries; so that a naval fleet, after going there and replenishing its supplies and making what repairs are needed, can go away and leave the harbor perfectly safe under the protection of the army. Then arises at once the question why this harbor will be of consequence to the United States. It has not been easy to make that perfectly clear to the minds of men who have not made such subjects the study of a lifetime till now; but the conditions of the present war, it seems to me, ought to make it clear to everybody.

At this moment the Government is fitting out quite a large fleet of steamers at San Francisco to carry large detachments of troops and military supplies of all kinds to the Philippine Islands. Honolulu is almost in the direct route. That fleet, of course, will want very much to recanal at Honolulu, thus saving that amount of freight and tonnage for essential stores to be carried with it. Otherwise they would have to carry coal enough to carry them all the way from San Francisco to Manila and that would occupy a large amount of the carrying capacity of the fleet, and if they recanal at Honolulu all that will be saved. More than that, a fleet is liable at any time to meet with stress of weather, or perhaps a heavy storm, and there might be an accident to the machinery which will make it necessary to put into the nearest port possible

for repairs and additional supplies. By the time it reaches there its coal supply may be well-nigh exhausted; it then has to replenish its coal supply to carry it to whatever port it could reach.

If I am not misinformed in regard to the laws of neutrality, the supply of coal that can be taken on board at neutral ports is only sufficient to bring it back to the nearest home port, and not enough to carry it across the ocean, so that if we had to regard Honolulu as a neutral port, we could only load up coal enough to bring us back to San Francisco. Now, let us suppose, on the other hand, that the Spanish navy in the Pacific as well as in the Atlantic, or both, were a little stronger than ours instead of being somewhat weaker. The first thing they would do would be to go and take possession of the Sandwich Islands and make them the base of naval operations against the Pacific coast.

You have only to consider the state of mind which exists all along the Atlantic coast under the erroneous apprehension that the Spanish fleet might possibly assail our coast to see what would be the case if the Spanish fleet were a good deal stronger than ours and took possession of Honolulu and made it a base of operations in attacking the points on the Pacific coast. We would be absolutely powerless, because we would have no fleet there to dispute the possession of the Sandwich Islands, whereas, if we held that place and fortified it so that a foreign navy could not take it, it could not operate against the Pacific coast at all, for it could not bring coal enough across the Pacific Ocean to sustain an attack on the Pacific coast. Then the Sandwich Islands would be a base for naval operations just as Puerto Rico is against the Atlantic coast. If Spain is strong enough to hold Puerto Rico, so that a squadron can replenish with supplies—coal, ammunition, and provisions—there, the whole Spanish fleet can raid our Atlantic coast at will.

It happens that in this war we have picked out the only nation in the world that is a little weaker than ourselves. The Spanish fleet on the Asiatic station was the only one of all the fleets we could have overcome as we did. Of course that can not again happen, for we will not be able to pick up so weak an enemy next time. We are liable at any time to get into a war with a nation which has a more powerful fleet than ours, and it is of vital importance, therefore, if we can, to hold the point from which they can conduct operations against our Pacific coast. Especially is that true until the Nicaragua Canal is finished, because we can not send a fleet from the Atlantic to the Pacific. We can not send them around Cape Horn and repel an attack there. If we had the canal finished, we would be much better off in that respect; but even then we would want the possession of a base very much.

We get a preemption title to those islands through the volunteer action of our American missionaries who went there and civilized and Christianized those people and established a Government that has no parallel in the history of the world, considering its age, and we made a preemption which nobody in the world thinks of disputing, provided we perfect our title. If we do not perfect it in due time, we have lost those islands. Anybody else can come in and undertake to get them.

So it seems to me the time is now ripe when this Government should do that which has been in contemplation from the beginning as a necessary consequence of the first action of our people in going there and settling those islands and establishing a good Government and education and the action of our Government from that time forward on every suitable occasion in claiming the right of American influence over those islands, absolutely excluding any other foreign power from any interference.

The same eminent and experienced soldier, when asked whether it would be sufficient to have Pearl Harbor without the islands, said we ought to have the islands to hold the harbor; that if left free and neutral complications would arise with foreign nations, who would take advantage of a weak little Republic with claims for damages enforced by war ships, as is frequently seen. If annexed, we would settle any dispute with a foreign nation; that we would be much stronger if we owned the islands as part of our territory, and would then also have the resources of the islands, which are so fertile, for military supplies; that if we do not have the political control they may become Japanese; and we would be surrounded by a hostile people.

Admiral Walker, who has had long experience in the waters of the Hawaiian Islands, emphatically confirmed the views of General Schofield, especially that it would cost far less to protect the Pacific coast with the Hawaiian Islands than without them; that it would be taking a point of advantage instead of giving it to your enemy.

Admiral Dupont, in a report made as long ago as 1851, expressed his view in these words:

It is impossible to estimate too highly the value and importance of the Sandwich Islands, whether in a commercial or military point of view. Should circumstances ever place them in our hands, they would prove the most important acquisition we could make in the whole Pacific Ocean—an acquisition intimately connected with our commercial and naval supremacy in those seas.

THE TEACHING OF RECENT EVENTS.

For a war of defense the Hawaiian Islands are to us inestimably important, most essential, and in this light they have been most often discussed. The discussion in past years has attracted little public attention, because our people, until they were lately awakened by the war and the movement to reinforce Dewey, have not thought much about the exposed situation of our western coast in case of war with a really great power or the necessity of possessing these islands confronting our Pacific coast.

We learn fast in war time. Not long ago, when the air was filled with rumors of Spanish war ships coming to our eastern and northeastern coast, many members here, and I was one of them, received telegrams from the coast cities, to use their influence to have an adequate naval force sent to the threatened coast on the northeast. Now we have fleets and strong land forces and coast defenses on the east. We have comparatively slender preparations on the west coast. There is not anywhere on the east a group of islands of such cardinal and unique importance as the Sandwich Islands—not even the Bermudas.

Not only in defensive war but in war of any kind they are necessary to us. In the events of the hour we have an illustration of the importance and the military necessity of possessing those islands. The present war was begun for the declared purpose of

expelling Spain from Cuba and liberating the struggling people of that island; but once involved in war, it is the duty of the President, who is Commander of the Army and Navy, to strike at Spain wherever he can effectively; and a great and successful blow was struck in Manila by gallant Admiral Dewey and his fleet. [Applause.]

There is no one in our country so recreant to his duty as an American that he would refuse to support the President in succoring Dewey after his magnificent victory, lying in Manila Bay, holding in control the Spanish power there, but unable to land for want of reinforcements and surrounded by millions of Spanish subjects. Yet it is not possible to send support to Dewey to-day without taking on coal and supplies at Honolulu in the Hawaiian Islands—a neutral power.

By the law of nations, that power is bound to refuse to allow ships engaged in war to take on supplies or stay in port over twenty-four hours and is liable for all damages to Spanish interests caused by allowing the rules of neutrality in war to be violated by us. We are strong; Hawaii is weak. We absolutely must use that port, and do use it.

If the rights and duties of neutrality were enforced by the Hawaiian Government, and the *Monadnock* and the *Montevoy*, which are leaving San Francisco for Manila, were compelled to go through with such coal as they could carry, they could not get half way before their fires would go out and they would lie weltering, helpless, dead, like derelicts, in the Pacific. In order to reach the Philippine Islands it is a necessity that the transports, battle ships, and other vessels of the fleet shall take on supplies at Honolulu, and they are doing it.

IS OUR PRESENT POSITION HONORABLE?

There is a feature connected with this that is humiliating to an American who loves the consistent dignity and honor of his country and desires to have it command the respect of the world. Within the last two weeks I have heard, in conversation among members of this House, expressions of great impatience at the conduct of European powers, upon newspaper rumor that Spanish ships of war had been permitted to recalc in one French island, that a Spanish ship of war had been allowed to stay thirty-six hours in a port of another island belonging to France, that supplies had been derived by Spain from Germany, even in this time of war. The discontent expressed throughout our country in the press was so wide, the criticism so sharp, that M. Hanotaux, the French minister of foreign affairs, in order to preserve and promote amicable relations and kindly sentiments, made a public statement disposing of all these disquieting rumors, and declaring that France loyally and faithfully observes and will observe her obligations as a neutral toward both belligerents everywhere.

While we have been giving notice to France, Germany, and Great Britain that war was existing and calling their attention to their duty as neutral powers, in order that they might issue neutrality proclamations, while on the east we respectfully approached German William, who commands a hundred legions, with long formal notices of our belligerency, trusting that he would adhere to the rules of neutrality, we came on the west to the little Republic of Hawaii, and without a word of courtesy or request took possession of all we cared to take, in utter contempt of her neutrality, of our duties as a belligerent nation dealing with a neutral country, and in disregard of the heavy liabilities we forced upon Hawaii.

We had even piled up 10,000 tons of coal in Honolulu Harbor for our Navy, a considerable part of it before the declaration of war. Yesterday came the news that the *Charleston*, one of our battle ships, entered the harbor of Honolulu without so much as saying "by your leave," to stay there as long as she will. All the other ships in the fleet going over to our Asiatic squadron do the same thing. We have the superior physical force to do this, but we are not in a position to do it with impunity in the face of the public opinion of the world, if we desire to command the respect of mankind and our own self-respect.

THE THREE RULES GOVERNING NEUTRALITY.

What is the law that governs the conduct of a neutral nation and its liability? When the treaty of Washington was negotiated in this city in 1871, the United States presented and proposed three general rules which should be observed by a neutral nation and determine its liability. The English refused to assent to them in the language first proposed, and after long debate and modification at last those rules were put in due form, accepted, and solemnly placed in that famous treaty. Both nations agreed to observe and be bound by them in future, and to invite the adherence and cooperation of all other nations.

You have recently seen the spirit and substance of those rules reflected in the proclamations of neutrality issued by many nations. Those famous rules sprang from our suggestion. Let me read their words, and then see the liability to which we put a neutral nation which, willingly or unwillingly, must submit to what we are doing to-day at Honolulu, and notice especially the second

rule which we then pressed and now disregard, and under which Hawaii is liable to Spain. By the sixth article of the treaty of Washington of 1871 a neutral is bound—

First, to use due diligence to prevent the fitting out, arming, or equipping within its jurisdiction of any vessel which it has reasonable ground to believe is intended to cruise or carry on war against a power with which it is at peace, and also to use like diligence to prevent the departure from its jurisdiction of any vessel intended to cruise or carry on war as above, such vessel having been specially adapted, in whole or in part, within such jurisdiction to warlike use.

Secondly, not to permit or suffer either belligerent—

Either Spain or the United States—

to make use of its ports or waters as the base of naval operations against the other or for the purpose of renewal or augmentation of military supplies or arms or the recruitment of men.

Thirdly, to exercise due diligence in its own ports and waters, and as to all persons within its jurisdiction, to prevent any violation of the foregoing obligation and duty.

That is the law of nations as we pressed it unsparingly, and under which we collected \$15,500,000 from Great Britain for depredations committed on our interests by ships that had been coaled or harbored in British ports in violation of that law. So for every damage done to Spanish interests by an American war ship which has been supplied, repaired, or coaled in the Sandwich Islands that Government, the property of the people of those islands, is liable to pay to Spain the full amount of loss.

When this war is over and peace is declared, if the gentlemen opposed to this resolution prevail and prevent annexation and continue Hawaii's independent existence, if the liabilities of the islands on the claims of Spain against the Republic of Hawaii should be referred to arbitration, and the President of the United States should be one of the arbitrators, he would have to vote to compel them to pay the last cent, no matter how vast might be the burden of taxation it would impose on that little people.

PRESSURE NOW BY FOREIGN POWERS.

Now, this is not a vague speculation. It is not merely hypothetical. The property owners in the island are alarmed. The foreign powers represented there are active. I hold in my hand a dispatch from our minister at Honolulu of May 10, a part of which I can not with propriety read, and have not authority to do so; but I will read this part:

The strongest influence has been brought to bear upon the Government urging it to proclaim neutrality, give notice to the *Bennington* to leave port, and invite the cooperation of other powers to protect the neutrality of the group.

He proceeds to state that this is the opinion of the diplomatic corps here, and not only them, but the foreign merchants also, "and I regret to say many who heretofore have been classed as American sympathizers and urgent annexationists." Do you wonder at them? With the prospect of such trouble and taxation amounting to confiscation, fearing that the United States, with the powerful influences at work in Washington hostile to Hawaii, may not come to their rescue, when we have not given a hint, much less a pledge, to stand between the little Republic and danger, do you wonder that merchants and all property owners are disquieted?

But without any words from us or any assurance from our Government, notwithstanding the pressure to which it has been subjected, the brave little Hawaiian Government, loving America better than Spain and confident in the justice of the great American people as a child trusts its father, remains unchanged in its purpose. [Applause.]

Are you not as Americans proud of that little colony, the only true American colony, the only spot on earth beyond our boundaries in the wide world where our country is preferred above all others? [Renewed applause.] That steadfast body of men, pressed and menaced by the influence of so many empires and kingdoms, threatening them with the danger that would follow if they permitted the American flag to stay in their harbor, remained constant in their devotion to the colors they loved and the people they always trusted. They are the same men who, when threatened with an unscrupulous, corrupt, and arbitrary monarchy, which had violated the constitution, besieged the King in his palace and shook his throne, overcame his army, and compelled him to swear observance of the constitution which he had violated.

The same resolute men drove a worthless Queen from the throne when she again attempted to overthrow the constitution and destroy the guaranties of property—the woman who, when she talked with Minister Willis of restoration, wished one condition, that she might behead the Americans. I have no apology to make for men sprung from our blood who have borne themselves with such enlightenment, courage, and energy as these men have done [applause], whose only fault is that they love our flag more than their own. They love the flag under which many of them once fought. Some of them fought under another, the bonnie blue flag, during our great war; but at heart brave Americans all, they have united there to sustain the cause of the United States in this war with Spain, animated by a love of American institutions and love of liberty. They are men who can not be intimidated or turned aside from their purpose, men who have successfully resisted every influence to bring them under the control of other foreign governments or any domestic tyranny.

OUR NATIONAL HONOR IN QUESTION.

This is a very practical and important question with them, and it is important to us. I said we had only the question of interest to consider here to-day, whether it would be advantageous to us to annex. Have we not also a high question of national honor?

While we are demanding the observance of neutrality by other nations, we disregard it ourselves. We are compelled to it by military necessity. That is the fact. What is the honorable solution? Annex them and end it all. In a war of defense, as I have stated, these islands are to us indispensable. We find, too, that in this contest with Spain, which has taken the form of offensive war, as we are attacking them in the Orient, we are compelled to use them in order to support Dewey.

DANGER OF DELAY.

Can we put this question off indefinitely? Can we play with our duty under the law of nations, or shall we try to turn about and treat them sincerely as neutral? We know that the actual real neutrality of the islands would to-day work us a great injury. The minority propose that we should guarantee the independence of the islands, which, of course, perpetuates their neutrality and puts us in a position that we can not endure.

Mr. JOHNSON of Indiana. I hope the gentleman will not turn too much to one side. If he turns too short to the right, gentlemen can not hear him on that side, and if he turns too sharp to the left we can not hear him on this; and we all want to hear the gentleman.

Mr. HITT. I appreciate the gentleman's suggestion, as it implies that my remarks have his attention.

We can not afford to let them alone. We must possess and fortify and hold and use them or leave them to their fate. The other side of the House propose to guarantee their independence by a declaration of Congress. That is a mere matter of words, and when war arises words are brushed aside and armies and navies decide; and we should prepare not by declarations, but by taking the islands. Besides, independence implies all the duties and rights of neutrality. The gentlemen would put our Government in the dishonorable position of declaring and guaranteeing Hawaiian independence as a neutral nation at the very moment when we are disregarding their neutrality and independence.

THEIR FUTURE THREATENED.

They can not remain as they are. The future is threatening. Sagacious statesmen have long foreseen it.

Mr. Willis, whom so many old members will recollect as a valuable member of this House, was sent to these islands by Mr. Cleveland to demand the overthrow of the republican government. We all recollect his dispatches. Many of us had the advantage of conversation with him when he returned to this country.

RIISING POWER OF JAPAN IN HAWAII.

In one of those dispatches he mentioned, incidentally, what he also said here in conversation, that far the most threatening fact in the condition of the islands was the rapid growth of the Japanese element, and the purpose for which it was being sent there. There are over 24,000 Japanese on the island. They are mostly men, grown men; 19,000 of them are men.

If they voted, it would be converted into a Japanese commonwealth immediately. This is not a light thing.

A BIT OF HISTORY.

Over twelve years ago the planters, desirous of having other labor to diversify their Chinese and Portuguese labor, tried to have an additional supply from Japan. An arrangement was made, which was put into a convention in 1886, permitting the Japanese Immigration Company to send over Japanese laborers upon due authorization from the Hawaiian Government. These Japanese came at first in small numbers; but pretty soon they began to come faster, and the Japanese Government, which is directed by able statesmen, anxious to take advantage of all opportunities, made a demand that these Japanese subjects going there should have the same rights as the natives.

A JAPANESE FUTURE NOW PLAINLY THREATENED THEM.

That startled the Hawaiian Government. That was what Mr. Willis referred to when we met him here in conversation. The demand was ingeniously presented and energetically sustained. It might seem surprising that such a demand should be made. It was based upon an old treaty made by Japan in 1873 with one of the kings, which it was claimed granted to all Japanese forever the rights of the most favored nation. In truth, that treaty related only to traders and their privileges in the ports, and was so meant. It gave to Japanese liberty to come with ships and cargoes to ports where trade with other nations was permitted, where they might hire houses and warehouses and trade, enjoying the same privileges as were granted to other nations. I will give the exact language of the article, with the incidental expression in the middle of it, on which so broad a claim was built up.

ART. II. The subjects of each of the two high contracting parties, respectively, shall have the liberty freely and securely to come with their ships and cargoes to all places, ports, and rivers in the territories of the other where trade with other nations is permitted; they may remain and reside in

any such ports and places, respectively, and hire and occupy houses and warehouses, and may trade in all kinds of produce, manufactures, and merchandise of lawful commerce, enjoying at all times the same privileges as may have been or may hereafter be granted to the citizens or subjects of any other nation, paying at all times such duties and taxes as may be exacted from the citizens or subjects of other nations doing business or residing within the territories of each of the high contracting parties.

The sixth article provides that the treaty may be revised, on six months' notice, by mutual consent. As the Japanese did not propose to give consent, by their way of doing business it would be perpetual.

However, it did not amount to anything without finding a "favored nation." They found an old treaty, made way back in 1863, by one of the native kings with Spain, drawn apparently in very liberal terms, and meant to enable the traders to come and trade in the ports, which provided that they should "enjoy the same rights and privileges which are granted to natives."

So, by carrying over these privileges given to Spanish traders as such by a Kanaka king thirty-five years ago, and under which Spain had never thought of claiming the voting franchise, by distributing them to the Japanese traders in 1873 they spread them out in their demand over the whole Japanese population, laborers and all. That population was being poured in at a tremendous pace, sometimes 1,000 a week, and they would have soon overwhelmed everything on the island by sheer numbers. The Hawaiian Republic made its utmost endeavors to struggle against this flood. They protested, they denied any such interpretation of a treaty which concerned not laborers, but merely traders, such as came on trading voyages in that old time.

They demanded that only those should land who had permits by the convention of 1886. They adopted a police restriction against paupers, such as all governments have a right to make. The police regulation required every one who came to have \$50. The immigration company in Japan was up to the exigency. They sent them still without permits and met the pauper restriction by a curious device. As the coolie left the vessel to go off, he was handed \$50, which he took in one hand, and after he passed the inspector he handed it back to the Japanese agent; and so they pretended to comply with the literal terms of the restriction.

The Hawaiian Government would not submit to such proceedings. They arrested those without permits or bona fide money and turned back hundreds of them—over 1,100. The Japanese Government were in dead earnest by this time. The game was in sight. If they could once get these men in sufficient numbers there with the voting power, they would soon turn the whole Government into a Japanese commonwealth, and then they would quickly end the reciprocity treaty with the United States and all our special rights to Pearl Harbor or anything else. Japan sent a ship of war, which might well alarm them, and a high official with it, who demanded that the permit should not be required, and that they should be free to come in as voluntary immigrants without stint; that Hawaii had no right to inquire into the bona fide character of the fifty-dollar transaction, and presented a great claim for indemnity to those turned back.

The little Republic held out stoutly and asked for arbitration. Japan said, "We will arbitrate; we will soon let you know exactly what we will do;" and the next month they said they would arbitrate all questions between the two countries except as to the bona fide character of the fifty-dollar transaction and the permit for immigration, nor would they arbitrate the treaty-construction question. In short, they were willing to refer to arbitration everything except the questions to be arbitrated. The horizon looked dark for Hawaii.

But at this point the little Republic made a treaty of annexation with the United States, and Japan learned that they could not discuss the matter further with them, because they had made a treaty of annexation with the United States, which, by its very nature, would extinguish all other treaties. Even that did not stop Japan, and she made an earnest protest to the United States against the treaty of annexation. Our Government answered promptly that Japan was not concerned in it; that we could deal only with the Hawaiian Republic, and refused to consider the protest, and this in such terms that Japan formally withdrew it. But she has not withdrawn these claims, she has not withdrawn the demand against the Hawaiian Government of the right to pour in Japanese without permit, or the right to demand for all Japanese any privileges or rights of the natives, which would include the right to vote and hold office.

Now, suppose we reject this offer of the Hawaiian Republic to join our country and become part of us. They are then left an independent government, with no hope of joining us, and become responsible for their own international relations and must answer to Japan. If Japan should succeed in her contention as to the old treaty rights, her people will vote and soon change the administration of affairs there. They would elect their own officials and government in Hawaii.

RECIPROCITY AND PEARL HARBOR RIGHTS THREATENED.

They could at once attack the reciprocity treaty with the United States. By the terms of that treaty either party may terminate

it on twelve months' notice. Pearl Harbor is therein granted to us; that is, we have a right to enter the harbor to improve it and use it as a coaling and naval station.

We have never done any of these things. The entrance has not even been opened. No ship of ours has gone in there. Nothing whatever has been done in that direction. I tried vainly to have an appropriation made by Congress over a year ago to have the harbor opened and improved and our flag raised, in order to strengthen our title by possession, so that when the question of our tenure should come up we might have that point in our favor—an important point in any contention which might arise under international law. But since we have done nothing the case stands thus: The Pearl Harbor grant to us in the reciprocity treaty was in a new article, Article II, added when the treaty was renewed in 1887. After that amendment had been put on in the Senate, and before exchange of ratifications of the renewed reciprocity treaty thus modified, there was an exchange of official notes between Minister Carter, of the Hawaiian Islands, and Mr. Bayard, Secretary of State of the United States.

Mr. Carter stated that they wanted it distinctly understood that in assenting to the Senate provision in a reciprocity treaty granting to the United States the use of Pearl Harbor as a coaling station they did not propose any derogation of the sovereignty or jurisdiction of the Hawaiian Islands or any cession of territory whatever; that it was to be regarded as a privilege granted as compensation for the advantages they obtained by reciprocity, and that with the cessation of reciprocity the Pearl Harbor grant would cease.

Mr. TAWNEY. In the line of what the gentleman is saying, will he pardon an interruption?

Mr. HITT. If the gentleman will wait a moment I will read Mr. Bayard's words in reply, so as to make my statement complete:

No ambiguity or obscurity in that amendment is observable; and I can discern therein no subtraction from Hawaiian sovereignty over the harbor to which it relates, nor any language importing a longer duration for the interpolated Article II—

That is, the grant of Pearl Harbor—than is provided for in Article I of the supplementary convention.

Article I provides that this arrangement may be abrogated on one year's notice. There is our tenure of Pearl River.

Mr. TAWNEY. Is it not a fact that under that grant the Government of the United States obtains absolutely nothing except the use of the water—that we obtain no land at all for the purpose of utilizing the harbor as a coaling station?

Mr. HITT. I will read the language of Article II:

His Majesty the King of the Hawaiian Islands grants to the Government of the United States the exclusive right to enter the harbor of Pearl River, in the Island of Oahu, and to establish and maintain there a coaling and repair station for the use of the vessels of the United States, and to that end the United States may improve the entrance to said harbor and do all other things needful to the purpose aforesaid.

As the honorable gentleman says, we get nothing but the use of the water in that grant.

Mr. Speaker, I have held the floor so much longer than I intended that I will hasten to conclude.

COMMERCIAL INTERESTS.

The commercial value of the islands, the great interests that are to be promoted or are to languish, dependent upon our possession of the islands, which are the crossing place of almost all the lines of steamers in that sea, have been often discussed. We have a very large trade there, over \$18,000,000 annually of late years, and increasing. Not only do we admit their unrefined sugar free to our country, but, under the reciprocity treaty, they admit our products free of duty, and last year we sold to them \$6,800,000 worth of goods.

Of course, if the islands are diverted to other control—if that treaty terminates—we will rapidly lose their trade. At present they purchase from us three-fourths of all their imports. We have a great shipping trade there, American ships carrying nearly all the trade of the island. Honolulu is the only port in the world where American shipping is so greatly in the ascendant as to outnumber that of all other countries put together. Of the seven trans-Pacific steamship lines, six make Honolulu a way station. Shall we let it pass into rival or hostile control?

Mr. GAINES. Will the gentleman allow me just one question for information? I understand from reliable sources that the population of that island is more or less afflicted with leprosy. Will the gentleman please let us know what are the facts on that point?

CHARACTER OF THE POPULATION—LEPROSY.

Mr. HITT. The population of the island, 109,000, is a mixed population. About half, or nearly half, are Asiatic—Chinese and Japanese. About twenty to twenty-five thousand are people of European or American origin—a good many Americans, a good many Germans, British, and a large number Portuguese and other nationalities. This Caucasian element is the strong intellectual and industrial force of the island. The Portuguese are people who have been there for some time. More than half of them were born

on the island; were educated in the schools there, which are similar to the schools here, and those children speak English as an ordinary American child. There is little or no leprosy among them or any cleanly, highly civilized people anywhere. After annexation the Asiatics would rapidly disappear in numbers under the operation of our laws and under the penal code of the islands, which would send back Chinese laborers very soon.

The contract system would be terminated. The immigration from this country would no doubt increase. I have seen little reason to believe that there would be any difficulty whatever in regard to any maladies save among those Asiatic elements and the Kanakas. There is leprosy, brought to the islands, it is said, by the Chinese. I am not familiar with the facts, personally, never having visited the islands. There is a vague impression, especially among Bible readers, who are very prevalent in this House [laughter], as to that word "leprosy" in descriptions of the islands, which is not correct as to the form of disease called leprosy as it exists in Hawaii, and which I have myself often seen in the Orient.

It is a malady that rarely affects people of the Caucasian race of the better class, who use an abundance of soap and water. It is not contagious in the ordinary sense. Why, I have seen children in the huts of lepers in Turkey, sons and daughters of lepers, 8 and 10 years of age, who were beautiful children, and who had never been away from the leper village. That is a common sight in the Orient. It is not the loathsome, running disease mentioned so often in the Bible. It seems to be a paralysis and withering of the ears, fingers, etc., and they drop away painlessly.

It is communicated by long association and intercourse; but it is not communicated like the smallpox, or yellow fever, or any of those rapidly contagious maladies. The present vigorous, well-organized, well-arranged government of the islands has segregated it at Molokai; and though the elements there for the spread of such maladies are very favorable, in that oriental population, and among those weak and diseased natives, yet it is a comparatively small detraction from the condition of the general population of the island, and it would probably never be found to affect us in this country. We have had it in a sporadic way in our country for a long time and it is controlled. There is a leper colony in Louisiana and one in Canada. I will leave that question to experts.

Mr. LOVE. I should like to ask the gentleman what number of American citizens there are in the island?

Mr. HITT. I do not think there are any American citizens except some travelers and sojourners. There are many people there of American origin, but they are Hawaiians, some of them sons and grandsons of men who went from the United States. But they are not American citizens, except partially, by a peculiar provision of their law, which allows men to retain a title to foreign citizenship. I think there are a good many of them; but what is ordinarily meant by strictly American citizens relates to people who travel or sojourn there from this country and go away. There are several thousands there of American origin, and who are very strongly American at heart.

Mr. WHEELER of Kentucky. I have listened with a great deal of interest to what the gentleman has said about this; but there is one phase of the question that I think the House would hear with a great deal of interest, and that is the result and effect of annexation, not upon the commercial or military welfare of this country, but as a departure from the established customs of our country. I should like to hear the gentleman upon that phase of the question.

NO NEW POLICY.

Mr. HITT. This measure does not launch us upon any new policy, as I tried to explain; but the importance of the question lies, first of all, in the necessity of possessing these islands for the defense of our western shore, the protection and promotion of our commercial interests, and the welfare and security of our own country generally. Mr. Blaine stated it very well in a dispatch where he said the Panama Canal connecting our two shores, facilitating their defense and communication, was a purely American question, and that the possession of the Sandwich or Hawaiian Islands, giving them strategic control of the North Pacific, was one of purely American policy.

In the whole of what I have said I have discussed this question solely as it affected our own country. The population there is so small that it can not be considered an element of much comparative importance. It is not one seven-hundredth part of our population at home. It is the importance of the group as a point, what military and naval men call a strategic point, that makes it of extreme importance and should make us prompt to seize upon the first opportunity to have rightful possession of the islands.

SUGAR COMPETITION.

Something is said about the danger to our beet-sugar interests in this country from the competition of Hawaiian cane sugar after annexation coming in free of duty. There may well be some persons connected with the sugar-refining interest who are hostile to annexation; but the producers of beet sugar or unre-

fined sugar have nothing to apprehend. The total available natural cane lands in the islands do not amount to four townships of our land. They could not supply a tenth of what we consume. Besides, annexation will make no difference to the farmer here, as the raw or unrefined sugar of the Hawaiian Islands now comes in as free of duty under the Hawaiian reciprocity treaty as it would after annexation, and the only man who is affected is the refiner, who is protected now by the tariff against refined Hawaiian sugar. Refined sugar does not come in free under the treaty, and if annexation comes the refined sugar will come in free, and of course the refiners are hostile to it.

Mr. RIDGELY. A short time ago I asked the gentleman's permission to ask a question.

Mr. CLARDY. I should like to ask the gentlemen a question.

Mr. HITT. I will yield to the gentleman from Kansas first.

Mr. RIDGELY. My question is this: The chairman of the Committee on Foreign Affairs stated what is a very important matter in regard to the treaty existing between the Sandwich Islands and Japan. Under that treaty the Japanese Government claimed the right of citizenship for Japanese subjects who are now on the island, or who may hereafter go there under this treaty. Now, my question is, if we accept the islands under the present bill, will we have to accept those Japanese subjects under that treaty?

Mr. HITT. Not at all—not as citizens.

Mr. RIDGELY. And involve ourselves in that affair.

Mr. HITT. This action extinguishing the sovereignty of Hawaii and incorporating the islands in the United States would abrogate all her treaties. The only part that would survive would be claims arising or accruing prior to this time under former treaties: All treaties fall with the extinction of the existence of a nation. Their foreign affairs pass under our control.

POSSIBLE STATEHOOD.

Mr. CLARDY. The gentleman has very interestingly and very instructively explained various features of this question, but there is one point that I should like to know still further about, and that is this: Suppose these islands are received into the United States under this resolution, what does this Administration intend, or what do the people of the United States intend, to do with them? Will they be admitted as a State? It seems to me that is a very important question.

Mr. HITT. I am not a mind reader, and the Almighty alone can answer what is in men's minds.

Mr. CLARDY. The gentleman ought to have some idea of what the Government intends to do.

Mr. HITT. You will have to find that out from other sources. By the terms of this resolution all such questions will be determined by Congress, and Congress will and should do what the American people want done. The President will have no power over the subject.

Mr. RIDGELY. Do the Japanese in Hawaii vote?

Mr. HITT. They do not vote now, and the disposition and mode of government of those islands and everything connected with them is, under the terms of the joint resolution, left in the control of Congress.

Mr. FLEMING. I should like to ask this question, which I think is a legitimate one: What is the personal opinion of the gentleman himself as to the status that the Hawaiian Islands ought to occupy in future developments of the country? I should like to know if the gentleman has any information on the subject.

Mr. HITT. It is nothing but the private opinion of one individual, and is of little value.

Mr. FLEMING. It would carry a great deal of weight, and it is a question that is troubling some of us as to the development that is to come in the future.

Mr. HITT. It is a development that relates to the future. Chief Justice Taney, in the Dred Scott decision, speaking of the constitutionality of the acquisition of territory, said that there was no power granted in the Constitution of the United States to acquire any territory in any way; that there was only a grant to Congress to admit States. A State is a civil political organization of people occupying territory or land previously possessed by the United States. That has been the fact as to all States admitted except Texas, which was acquired as a Territory or possession, and admitted as a State at the same time.

Judge Taney added that in the construction of the power to admit States it authorizes the acquisition of territory not fit for admission at the time, and the power to acquire territory for that purpose rests upon the same discretion; and is a question for the political department of the Government.

In truth, it is impossible to imagine a sovereign state without the power of increasing its boundaries. It enters into the very idea of sovereignty, and Chief Justice Fuller said in the Mormon Church case that the power to make acquisitions of territory by consent, by treaty, or by cession is an incident of national sovereignty. Chief Justice Taney said in his supplemental remark, after his comments on the restricted grant in the Constitution to

admit States, that territory that was acquired was always acquired with a theoretical view to ultimately being a State or a part of a State, a condition of statehood in some form at some time.

Mr. FLEMING. That is what I meant.

Mr. HITT. When we admitted those vast stretches of ice and rock in Alaska that border upon the Arctic Ocean it was with the theoretical view that some day, under some conditions, they might be a part of the United States as States, not merely as a landed possession or territory; but we have waited a generation, and we may wait a thousand years. There are gentlemen sitting all around me who represent districts in States made out of territory which we kept waiting the greater part of a century. How long was the region which is Montana a territorial possession? I do not know what will be the ultimate destiny of this little group of islands and their population, but we may imagine that, with the assent of California or Oregon or Washington, they may become a county or counties and a part of one of those States, and thus assume the quality of statehood. But this I give merely as a suggestion, and representing the opinion of nobody else, and I did not intend to bring it into the debate.

Mr. SIMS. Will the gentleman allow me to ask him a practical question which he has not touched upon?

Mr. DINSMORE. I should like to call attention to the fact that the chairman of the committee [Mr. HITT] requested that he should not be interrupted. It is manifest to everybody that he is not physically strong.

Mr. SIMS. I want to ask about the expense that it will be to this Government to maintain this territory. If the gentleman does not care to answer it, it does not make any difference.

Mr. HITT. That is a question no man can answer with precision. It is a well-managed little republic on a sound financial basis. There is a balance to credit now in the budget of the islands. They are not running in debt, but have a margin of surplus. I trust we can administer them as economically as that Government does. With the gentleman who has asked me the question and other gentlemen who will be here in Congress, I have confidence enough in their wisdom to feel sure that the affairs of a little added population, numbering but one seven-hundredth part of our own people, will be successfully cared for in our future legislation.

I have detained the House very long, and I hope that I have not failed to answer any question.

Mr. HENRY of Mississippi. I want to ask the gentleman one question for information. I do not want to insist on the gentleman answering if it will inconvenience him: If we take these islands and annex them, have we to pay anything in the way of debts?

Mr. HITT. Well, they have assets and liabilities, the assets being twice as great as the liabilities. We take both when we take the Government. There is a provision in the resolution that the debt shall not in any case exceed \$4,000,000. The assets of the islands are given in the statement of the financial officer showing that they are nearly twice that.

Mr. HENRY of Mississippi. Do we assume the indebtedness?

Mr. HITT. With their assets we take their liabilities. The assets are \$7,938,000, and the liabilities about \$3,900,000.

Mr. BARTLETT. I want to ask the gentleman a question for information on a point upon which I have no information. If the gentleman does not desire to answer it, I shall not ask the question.

Mr. HITT. I will endeavor to answer the gentleman.

Mr. BARTLETT. Is there anything in the shape of paper money or bills which this Government becomes responsible to redeem; and if so, how much?

Mr. HITT. There are liabilities; but they are all easily ascertainable by the official reports before us. There are three series of bonds, in all \$3,330,200. There are deposits in postal savings bank of \$882,345.29, making \$4,212,545.29, less bond proceeds cash in the treasury of \$221,565.90 and postal bank deposits of \$111,371.04, in all \$332,936.94, leaving total net debt \$3,879,608.35. I think there are no other bills or paper money. It does not appear in the report.

Mr. BARTLETT. I understand that there are several hundred thousand—probably \$280,000.

Mr. HITT. It is a pretty sound Government financially; the public credit there is good.

I have consumed so much time I should ask the pardon of the House. The consideration of this measure has been long deferred. There has been so much discussion throughout the country, such manifest impatience for its consideration here, that at last there is a pretty clear perception by almost everyone that the annexation resolution before us is in response and obedience to the demands of the whole country. I think the constituency of nine-tenths of the gentlemen here, if they could utter their will by votes, would command us to promptly pass this resolution. Our votes in passing it will voice the earnest purpose of the American people; the conservative sentiment of the country is expressed by it, as a measure for the welfare, for the security and prosperity of the whole nation. Let us pass it and carry out the will of the

American people. I thank the House for such patient attention. [Loud applause.]

Mr. PAYNE. Will the gentleman from Arkansas yield a moment, that I may make a request of the House to pass a couple of bills that the War Department are very urgent to have passed at this time?

Mr. DINSMORE. Does the gentleman think the bills will provoke any discussion at all?

Mr. PAYNE. Not at all. If they do, I will withdraw them.

Mr. DINSMORE. How long will it take?

Mr. PAYNE. Not more than five minutes.

Mr. DINSMORE. Of course I do not object.

Mr. BLAND. Mr. Speaker, I think that when we assign a certain time for a great debate in this House, it ought not to be interfered with. Unless there is an overpowering necessity it can certainly wait until next Wednesday.

Mr. PAYNE. It is very urgently required by the War Department to provide ships to transport troops.

Mr. BLAND. I will not object to this, but I think we ought not to take the time that has been given to debate of important questions.

Mr. SIMS. What is the character of the bills the gentleman speaks of?

Mr. PAYNE. It is to secure vessels for the transportation of troops.

Mr. SIMS. I do not think the debate ought to be interrupted.

Mr. PAYNE. It will not take five minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PARKER of New Jersey). Does the gentleman from Arkansas yield to the gentleman from New York?

Mr. SIMS. Now, I want a straight understanding about this.

Mr. PAYNE. It will not take as much time as the gentleman is consuming.

Mr. SIMS. Do you suppose any war measure so important as to grab these islands?

Mr. PAYNE. It will not take any time.

Mr. SIMS. I will object unless there is an understanding that the time for debate shall be extended.

Mr. PAYNE. So far as I am concerned, I am willing that the time shall be extended.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Unanimous consent is asked by the gentleman from New York to suspend the debate for the passage of the bills he has mentioned.

Mr. SIMS. I object, unless that other agreement goes into it—that the debate is to be postponed beyond 5 o'clock.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

Mr. SIMS. I do, without that is agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Objection is made.

Mr. SIMS. Now, I do not want to be misunderstood— [Cries of "Go on!"]

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Objection has to be made or not made.

Mr. SIMS. I will make it, then. I object.

Mr. DINSMORE. Mr. Speaker, it must be assumed—it can not be denied—that members who represent constituencies in this House of any party must and do desire that the best shall happen to our common country. We may differ and do differ in our political opinions on many questions, and yet we may all be honest. It is often the case that members put aside their own convictions in obedience to party demand, and I have grave fears—indeed, am sure—that this incident will be a notable example.

The question presented for consideration of the House to-day is one upon which I have thought much in the past, during different administrations of power in this country. It is a question upon which I have undergone a change in my own views, for at one time I thought, without having investigated or studied the question in all its bearings, that the United States should take to itself the Islands of Hawaii. But, sir, I am to-day and have long been opposed to adding these islands to our territory.

I am opposed to it, in the first place, at this time, because I do not believe that we have any constitutional authority by the method proposed to us now to take them. Secondly, I think that if we could do it lawfully, it is not desirable that we should do so for many reasons. Subjecting myself to the criticism which was placed upon those pointed out by the honorable chairman of the committee who has just taken his seat, who take issue with the different distinguished gentlemen skilled in military and naval affairs, I must be allowed, as only one humble citizen and a Representative in this House, to say that I do not accept the theory presented by those gentlemen that "the possession of the Hawaiian Islands by the United States is indispensable to us."

That is the way it was stated in its strongest terms by the chairman of the committee. I do not believe that the ownership and possession of the Hawaiian Islands is essential to the United States, either as a permanent defense against war in time of peace or as a present war emergency. I frankly concede that their possession affords advantage—one advantage as against possession in

the hands of a formidable hostile power—but that advantage is greatly exaggerated, and the evils that would result, in my judgment, outweigh this advantage. I do not believe that we have the power to take them to ourselves except as a State, and I do not believe that the people of these islands are suitable for citizenship of the United States. I am opposed to it because the people of Hawaii have not been consulted in the matter.

I am opposed to it, and here again I place myself in opposition to the military experts, and I grant now that these gentlemen are much more capable of forming correct opinions with reference to military matters than I am, but it is a poor man who, until he is convinced of his error, will yield because of any man's superior advantages or position. I do not believe that it is correct, as stated by these gentlemen, that it will require less military strength upon our part on the seas, but I believe it will require more, and I shall attempt to give the reason for that opinion.

Mr. Speaker, whatever may be the advantage to our country from a military standpoint in acquiring the Hawaiian Islands, I am opposed to annexation, because it is but the first step that these gentlemen ask us to take upon a policy which is strictly in conflict with every tradition of our Government and the prospect of its honorable success and prosperity. I noticed when I alluded to the Constitution there were smiles on some of the countenances of gentlemen in the House. I know it has become quite old-fashioned to talk about the Constitution. I know that in these degenerate days it is not considered up to date to talk about being governed and restrained by the Constitution of the United States.

But, sir, I for one wish to declare in this honorable presence that I hope never to arrive at a time when I shall be induced by any temptation to say that I recognize any higher law for the government of this nation and the Congress in its duties toward it than the Constitution which I swore before the Speaker to defend against all enemies, foreign and domestic. It is not only the men who are guilty of treason at home who attempt by cooperation with a foreign enemy to break down and destroy the Constitution or that are distinguished as domestic enemies; they are enemies of the Constitution who, for any cause, in any way, attempt at home to nullify and render inoperative the provisions of that Constitution and trample them under foot.

For a century and more this Government has grown from its small beginning until it has become the greatest of states. I would have it continue so, Mr. Speaker, not by enlarging its territory, but by strengthening it in its internal affairs; by strengthening our institutions at home; by building up patriotism in the hearts of the people; by conserving the public interest; by promoting all industrial methods, and above all by strengthening our unity, restricting extension from our compact form, thus keeping every part of the country in touch and sympathy with every other. While we have refrained from interference with foreign nations, we have prospered under the direction of those wholesome admonitions, the sage advice of the wise and patriotic who built the ship of state. We have avoided entangling alliances with foreign nations, while we have maintained peace, commerce, and honest friendship, in the language of Mr. Jefferson, with all.

I regret to see any part of our people desiring to depart from the ancient traditional policy of our Government. We adopted the Monroe doctrine. That doctrine declared not only that we would resent and oppose if necessary any interference on the American continent by foreign powers or the upbuilding of monarchical institutions here, but there was on our part an undertaking in good faith to refrain from interference with the affairs of foreign countries. And while on this point I would like to read from a statement of a gentleman for whom the whole country has respect on account of the greatness of his intellect and the ripeness of his wisdom—I mean ex-Senator Edmunds, of Vermont.

In what I am about to read he is speaking with reference to our proposed retention of the Philippine Islands. I admit that the considerations are not exactly the same as those which apply to Hawaii. I do not mean to say that there would be an absolute violation of the Monroe doctrine if we should acquire Hawaii, because the Hawaiian Islands are nearest to the American Continent—are an outpost, as it were, of ours. I go further and say candidly that I appreciate, I think, such advantages as would accrue to the United States from the possession of the Hawaiian Islands.

I say with respect for gentlemen who may differ from me, that the single advantage upon which our possession of those islands can be maintained with any show of logic or consistency is that if the Hawaiian Islands were in the hands of a strong foreign hostile power that power would be in better position to attack us than if we were in possession of them. But I shall go further into that question a little later on.

Let me remark before reading this extract that if we acquire Hawaii it is but the first step in the progress of colonial aggrandizement. We all know it. I hear it every day, not only from uninformed and impulsive people at the hotels and on the street, but from dignified, sober, reflective members of Congress. The

press teems with it. "We are going on!" "We are not going to stop at Hawaii!" "We will take the Philippines and Puerto Rico and the Canaries, and establish ourselves upon every Spanish possession on the seas!"

These are expressions we hear every day. Newspapers assuming to speak for the President tell us from twice to thrice a week that he is anxious to get complete possession of Puerto Rico and the Philippines before Spain capitulates—that no overtures for peace will be entertained until these islands are reduced to our possession. Think of it! And this war was inaugurated for humanity's sake, with a distinct disavowal of motives of conquest! Who speaks of the suffering reconcentrados now, though suffering ten-fold more than when the war began? The public mind is diseased with the fever of war, judgment is fled to brutish beasts, and men have lost their reason. American blood is to be spilled, American treasure wasted, for acquisition of territory which, if permanently acquired, threatens the sacrifice of peace, the happiness of our people, the very life of our Republic.

It is against this policy that I protest, because I believe it is inimical to the interests of this great country, that it portends disaster to us as a nation.

Here is the language of Mr. Edmunds:

If the United States were to hold those islands for a coaling station or as a colony the European nations might lodge a protest similar to this: "As America has always tried to follow the Monroe doctrine and succeeded in her attempt, it would be like putting this doctrine into the other balance of the scale. She has always asked us to leave the Western Hemisphere alone, which we have done, supposing that she would continue to follow the same doctrine; but now America is interfering with our province in the East, and if she intends to hold it she can not expect us to respect her wishes in regard to the western part of the world."

Should America thoroughly subdue the insurrection in the Philippines, and keep the country with the sanction of Spain after the termination of the war, she could dispose of it as she thinks fit, but it would not be policy to do this, as it would show favoritism toward the country to whom it was sold and make enemies of those nations who wished for it and did not obtain it.

Should the United States wish to dispose of the islands after peace has been proclaimed, she could not do better than offer them back to Spain, either as a purchase or as a present, after the war indemnity had been paid. To this proceeding the European nations could lodge no reasonable objection, and it would show them that America did not wish to tread upon a foe after she had defeated her, and that the war was really carried on for the sake of humanity.

What shall we do with these islands? Are we to establish at once a colonial policy? I shall read briefly from the opinion of the United States Supreme Court as to our constitutional powers with respect to colonial possessions. If we acquire the Philippines, shall we sell them? If so, as ex-Senator Edmunds says, we probably make enemies of the countries who would object to the possession of the Philippines by the purchasing power.

But over and above this consideration, Mr. Speaker, there is a greater and a higher reason which commends itself to me as an American and a believer in republican institutions, and is a basic principle of our national polity—the right of an individual to have a controlling power in fixing and determining his own destiny. If you sell the Philippines, you not only sell the territory, but you undertake to sell the people.

What right have we to sell the inhabitants of the Philippine Islands, 13,000,000 of people, into the dominion and sovereignty of any power on earth without their consent? I protest against such a proceeding. I shall not give my consent to any measure that does not recognize the right of the American people to determine for themselves their destiny and that does not at the same time consult the wishes of people where their destiny is involved.

Mr. Speaker, upon this question of a colonial policy let me add a word further. It is denied by some that the annexation of Hawaii is in conflict with our policy in the past. They say that we have annexed territory before. But what I want to call attention to is the fact that no territory has ever been acquired into the possession of the United States by the method proposed in this resolution.

It is contended by some that this proposed resolution is authorized by precedents in our past history. The learned Senators who made their report on this subject have embodied this idea in that document, indeed have distinctly declared it, and so have the majority in their report to this branch of the Congress; but I shall undertake to show to the House in such poor way as may be within my ability that it is not so; that the cases cited are no precedents.

Under the Constitution, Congress has the right to admit new States into the Union. Let me read from the decision of the Supreme Court in 19 Howard, the celebrated Dred Scott decision, which treats directly of this subject. In delivering the opinion of the court the learned Chief Justice Taney said, amongst other things:

There is certainly no power given by the Constitution to the Federal Government to establish or maintain colonies bordering on the United States or at a distance, to be ruled and governed at its own pleasure; nor to enlarge its territorial limits in any way except by the admission of new States. That power is plainly given; and if a new State is admitted it needs no further legislation by Congress, because the Constitution itself defines the relative powers and duties of the State and citizens of the State and the Federal

Government. But no power is given to acquire territory to be held and governed permanently in that character.

And he also said, quoting from Mr. Madison:

He speaks of the acquisition of the Northwestern Territory by the confederated States, by the cession from Virginia and the establishment of a government there, as an exercise of power unwarranted by the Articles of Confederation, and dangerous to the liberties of the people, and he urges the adoption of a constitution as a security and safeguard against the exercise of such power.

In an "obiter dictum" in the same decision the learned Chief Justice says that—

The different departments of the Government have recognized the right of the United States to acquire territory which, at the time, it is intended to admit as a new State into the Union.

Mr. Jefferson acquired Louisiana under this view, but by treaty confirmed by the Senate, and to become a State or several States.

Is that the question presented here? Is there anything in these resolutions of the majority proposing that Hawaii shall be admitted as a State into the Union? Would any gentleman have the temerity to stand up in this assembly and say that he would take it into the Union as a State? Do the committee reporting these resolutions say that at any time in the future it is expected to admit them to statehood? What is the population? This "gallant little republic" that the distinguished gentleman from Illinois, my colleague upon the committee, Mr. HITT, referred to a while ago, has 20 per cent of white blood—European and American.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Let me suggest to my colleague that of that 20 per cent, 16 per cent are Portuguese, from the Azores Islands.

The SPEAKER pro tempore [Mr. PARKER of New Jersey]. Does the gentleman from Arkansas yield to the gentleman from Missouri?

Mr. DINSMORE. I understand the fact stated by the gentleman from Missouri to be correct, and I was going to state it myself.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I do not think the Speaker pro tempore ought to object to my question, if the gentleman from Arkansas does not.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman had stated that he did not desire to be interrupted, and the Chair desired to know.

Mr. DINSMORE. It is true, as my colleague states, that that proportion of the white population are Portuguese; but they are superior to the rest not of pure white blood. Forty-two per cent of the population of the island are Mongolian, Chinese and Japanese. Are you to take into full citizenship the Chinese whom your laws exclude from coming into this country? Are you going to confer upon them the immunities and privileges and sovereignty of American citizenship, when you say that they are not good enough even to come among us upon our own territory temporarily?

Nobody pretends any purpose to take the Hawaiian Islands into the Union as a State, but the purpose is simply and solely, so far as the contention goes, to acquire them for the purpose of assisting us in our military and commercial operations.

But they say that Texas furnishes a precedent. When gentlemen ask such extraordinary legislation as this from the Congress they see the necessity of showing some precedent for the action which is requested here. They strain for precedents. All the vast territory that has been acquired upon our continent came by treaty. I do not stop to recite history, because everybody knows. But they say Texas was acquired to the possession of the United States by a resolution similar to this.

Are gentlemen familiar with the history of the admission of Texas into the Union? Texas never was annexed. They tried to annex it after the treaty failed, but Congress refused to annex. Resolutions somewhat akin to this were introduced in Congress, but Congress rejected them. What did they do? They passed a resolution of Congress looking to the introduction and admission of Texas into the Union as a State; when? After it had organized itself into a State, with a constitution republican in form, constructed by a convention of delegates selected by the people, and after that constitution had been submitted to and ratified by its people, all in pursuance of the resolution I have referred to first passed through the Congress of the United States.

For emphasis, I repeat, a convention was called in Texas, at which a constitution was submitted and adopted, and afterwards it was ratified by a direct vote of the people. Was Texas then in the Union? Such is not the history of the legislation. Then Texas had placed herself in a position to become a State of the Union. She had a constitution republican in form; she had submitted that constitution to the people; it had been ratified by the people, not only by the existing government in Texas, but by the people of the State.

Then they were in a condition to be received into the Union, not annexed. Then Congress passed another resolution on the 29th of December, 1845, the former resolution having been passed in March prior thereto, and took Texas into the body of the free, sovereign States of this Union, giving to every man in it the right of citizenship. Is that a precedent for this legislation? What do the majority propose? It is well to measure their proposal by

their precedent. Simply by a joint resolution of Congress to make the Hawaiian Islands a possession of the United States, not even with the purpose of statehood, and without the consent of the people of the islands. The distinguished committee who reported to the Senate say that where consent has been obtained from the state in any authentic way it is legitimate to annex it to the Union.

I say Texas never was annexed. I say further that the consent of the people of Hawaii has never been received in any way. There is only the form of a dead treaty which was rejected or abandoned by the United States Senate after it was agreed to by the plenipotentiaries of the United States and the oligarchy in Hawaii, but which had not and has never been consented to by the people of the islands. It might as well be said, and far more justly, that a treaty signed by a plenipotentiary of the British Crown, ratified by a British Parliament, would impart the consent of the people of Canada to be annexed to the United States.

You must admit as a State. Such is the Constitution, and such is the precedent to which you refer. I should like to hear some gentleman argue this case in detail, and try to show the analogy between the resolutions passed in the Texas case and the one here. The resolutions in the Texas case were alternative in form. They provided that if the President of the United States should deem it more proper or wiser—I do not remember the exact language—not to submit the resolutions to Texas for a constitution and form of government, to be ratified by the people, that a commission should be appointed to settle with the Texas Government and people the terms upon which they might be, not annexed, but admitted into the Union as a State. But as a matter of fact, the former method was adopted. They took the constitutional method and organized it in convention, and ratified it by the people, made themselves ready for statehood, and then, by another resolution, they were taken into the sisterhood of States.

Mr. Speaker, it seems to me that it is feeble of gentlemen to cite Texas as authority for the procedure asked in this present emergency. It seems to me, sir, that it is a giving away of their case to do it; that they are grasping at straws and bringing to their aid authority which is directly in the teeth of their position. But they say, and my distinguished friend from Minnesota [Mr. TAWNEY] in his very entertaining speech of not long ago said, and the Committee on Foreign Affairs in the majority report say, that there are other precedents; that we have annexed islands in the Caribbean Sea; that we annexed Midway Island in the Pacific. Read their report. I can not take the time to read it, but look at the report and see what they cite as precedents for the action proposed here. Did we annex those islands?

Mr. Speaker, we did no such thing. We have never annexed an island. By discovery the United States flag was ordered to be placed over Midway Island, for the purpose of establishing a naval station, and that is the only circumstance to prove it, except an appropriation made for that purpose, but it was abandoned afterwards. We claim to exercise no sovereignty over it now.

They say that Navassa was annexed; that all the guano islands were annexed. Are gentlemen familiar with the statute by which those islands were taken into our possession for a time? They were not annexed.

Congress, in 1856, passed an act which said that where a citizen of the United States discovered an island in the sea, an island, rock, or key containing guano, an island uninhabited and not under the sovereignty of any other power, that that island should be considered as "appertaining to" the United States. Did you ever know of that word "appertaining" being used by anybody in good conscience, by any lawyer in the writing of a deed of conveyance, by any State, corporation, or individual attempting to set up title to property? How careful they seem to have been to avoid such language as would confer, upon the part of the United States, any sovereignty or ownership on those islands.

They should "appertain" to the United States, but for what purpose? Permanently? The statute does not say so. For the purpose of enabling the citizens of the United States to procure guano, after having entered into bonds to the United States Government that he would sell that guano to no other person than United States citizens, and at a fixed price, and Congress specifically declares in the act that the United States shall not be considered as bound to retain possession of the islands? Is that all?

No, Mr. Speaker; in this apt and appropriate precedent mentioned by the Committee on Foreign Affairs to guide us in this serious undertaking the United States Congress says that crimes committed upon these islands shall be considered as crimes committed—in the territory of the United States? Oh, no; but on the high seas, and punishable as such. And these careful and dignified gentlemen, representing the people of the United States, coming and asking us to depart from the firmly established and time-honored policy of this nation, give us as a justification that the United States rendered guano islands in the Caribbean Sea "appertaining" to the United States temporarily for the purpose of obtaining guano, and in the act specifically disclaiming ownership or sovereignty.

They must be inhabited by nobody, not under the sovereignty of any other power, and be taken only for a specific purpose. Is this a precedent? These gentlemen say so. I will not discuss it further. It is too palpable. There are no other precedents offered but the ones I have referred to; and these but prove the desperation of the annexation party.

So much for precedents. The distinguished chairman of the committee this morning said that the possession of the Hawaiian Islands was necessary for the defense of the United States and our commerce, and necessary in the present emergency in the war with Spain, because, said he, our ships can not traverse the broad expanse of the Pacific and carry their own coal; and they must have some coaling station by the way. There is no place, said he, but Hawaii.

I mention the remarks of my distinguished friend from Minnesota who spoke of having our guns on the Hawaiian Islands, to protect our trade, when the Nicaraguan Canal shall be built, an event we all hope for. He said that we must have Hawaii to protect our trade through that canal with our guns in Pearl Harbor. It was at the time ridiculed by my versatile friend from Mississippi [Mr. WILLIAMS] who remarked, "What guns they would have to be."

Now, Mr. Speaker, I want it distinctly understood that I take issue with that proposition. I want to tell you, and if gentlemen do not know it they ought to know it, there is a better way now to Manila, in the Philippines, than by Hawaii. There is a nearer way than by Hawaii—over 800 miles nearer, with good harborage, a good coaling station, and coal already there provided, within the jurisdiction and control of the United States. Gentlemen seem startled by this statement.

Let me tell gentlemen, Mr. Speaker, that from San Francisco, by way of Kiska, in the Aleutian Islands, and by way of Unalaska, where there is already a coaling station, to Yokohama and Hongkong and to Manila is over 800 miles nearer, according to the official maps made by the accredited scientific authorities of the United States, than by way of Honolulu. You gentlemen have got down in the document room, coming from the Navy Department, the Hydrographic Bureau, a map which will verify every statement I make, and the official figures are there given, made by Lieutenant-Commander Clover. The document is called "Highways of Commerce," and each volume contains the map or chart. Here it is, and if anybody wants to examine it he can take it and look at it.

Now, listen to me, and I will give you the distances. I will ask gentlemen to listen attentively to this, because, in view of the position taken by my distinguished friend, the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and the annexationists here, it is very pertinent. You look at the map they had here. It was made on the Mercator's projection, which is misleading in its appearance, because it makes no allowance for the earth's curvature. You measure the distances with a tape on that map and it will seem that my statements are erroneous.

But follow the curvature of the earth, which is adhered to in the Hydrographic Office, and you will find that from San Francisco to Kiska it is 2,608 miles; from Kiska to Yokohama, 1,964 miles; Yokohama to Manila, 1,752 miles, making 6,344 miles from San Francisco to Manila. By way of Honolulu it is from San Francisco to Honolulu 2,083 miles; from Honolulu to Manila, 5,067 miles, making 7,150 miles, a difference in favor of the American route of 803 miles.

Mr. RICHARDSON. By our own route?

Mr. DINSMORE. By our own route.

Mr. FLEMING. And a much greater difference if you start from Portland.

Mr. DINSMORE. Why, certainly. This is the official map. Examine that map, and you will find from San Francisco via Kiska to Yokohama it is 4,592 miles, and from San Francisco to Yokohama by Honolulu 5,480 miles, a difference of 888 miles in favor of the American route.

Mr. RICHARDSON. Any difference in navigation?

Mr. DINSMORE. There is no difference in the navigation of material importance.

I would like to have the attention of gentlemen upon this point. I will go to the map presently and point out these different routes. Now, then, I come to Nicaragua; and if the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. TAWNEY] is in the House, I would ask his attention particularly to Nicaragua, for he insisted that possession of Hawaii was necessary for the defense of the Nicaragua Canal. You look at the map made on the Mercator's projection, which would verify, seemingly, their position. From Nicaragua to Honolulu it is 4,210 miles, and from Nicaragua to San Francisco is 2,700 miles, 1,510 miles nearer to San Francisco than Honolulu.

You do not need to turn to Honolulu as a basis of protection for the Nicaragua Canal when you have it on your own coast, from San Francisco, which is nearer.

Now, Mr. Speaker, let me tell you about Kyska. There is a harbor there more than a mile and a half long and a mile wide. There is deep water with a good anchorage bottom, several fath-

oms of water throughout its whole area, enough at all points and more for vessels of the deepest draft; and not only so, but in an island 25 miles long, and right upon the shore is fresh water in abundance.

Mr. HARTMAN. There is a fresh-water lake on the island.

Mr. DINSMORE. There is a fresh-water lake near its margin. There is a harbor that will float the navies of the world, 800 miles nearer to Manila from our own coast than by way of the Honolulu route. Then what need for a coaling station at Honolulu? Mr. Speaker, there is absolutely nothing in the annexationist coal theory, but if it is necessary, we have the exclusive privilege already by treaty with Hawaii. That treaty provides that no other nation but the United States shall have the privilege even of entering Pearl Harbor, and we are given the right to do all things necessary to make it an efficient coaling and repair station, to the exclusion of every other power, even Hawaii herself, and that carries with it the right to strengthen and fortify it, to make of it a naval station with the armament to defend it. What more do we want than this?

The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. HITT] says this treaty, according to its terms, may be terminated by either party to the treaty. So it may. But who will abrogate the treaty? Will the Hawaiians? Never, if we avail ourselves of the rights granted, because the Hawaiians know they have more to expect from us than from any other nation. But, says the gentleman, some other power or people may get control of the Government in Hawaii, and they would terminate the treaty. An event the anticipation of which there is nothing to justify. The mere assertion of our purpose not to allow any other power to control Hawaii has been sufficient to prevent it for fifty years, and the world respects our wishes more to-day than ever before. They have regarded them because hitherto we have in good faith refrained from interference with foreign territory, while insisting upon the enforcement of the Monroe doctrine with reference to European control in our hemisphere. If we depart from our honorable course we need not wonder if Europe ignores our contention.

Mr. HARTMAN. Will the gentleman allow me, before he leaves the subject? With reference to Kiska, the reports of the Weather Bureau show that the temperature is never down to zero.

Mr. DINSMORE. I am coming to that. I know that many people have believed that navigation in that region is obstructed by ice. So I sent to the Weather Bureau, and I have a letter from the Chief of the Bureau on the subject, and I want to tell you that it does not get as cold at Kiska as it gets here. They are never troubled with ice, for they never have any. You must be informed that they never knew the mercury to get lower than 7 degrees above zero.

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
WEATHER BUREAU,
Washington, D. C., June 9, 1893.

DEAR SIR: I beg to acknowledge the receipt of your letter of even date in regard to the climate of certain of the Aleutian Islands.

I have pleasure in transmitting herewith a copy of the daily extremes of temperature at Kiska Island for November and December, 1883, January and February, 1886, the only time during which observations were made at this place. I also inclose a tabular statement of the lowest temperatures ever recorded at Unalaska during a period of seven years. At the latter point the lowest temperature ever recorded was 9° above zero. Westward the weather is not quite so cold.

We have little data as regards the freedom of the harbor from ice. At Unalaska moving ice obstructed the harbor during a short period in the winter of 1872. We should say that interruptions to navigation due to ice at Kiska, to the westward, are not serious.

The mean winter temperature at Atka Island, longitude 185° 45' W. from Greenwich, is 33°. The sea temperature is, of course, a few degrees higher.

Very respectfully,

WILLIS L. MOORE,
Chief of Bureau.

Mr. HUGH A. DINSMORE,
United States House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

CLIMATE OF ALASKA.

[By A. J. Henry, Chief of Division of Records and Meteorological Data.]

The statistics of temperature of central and interior Alaska given below are of especial interest at the present time. The climate of the coast is comparatively well known, chiefly through the compilation of Dr. William H. Dall, published in the Pacific Coast Pilot, Alaska, Appendix I, Meteorology and Bibliography, Washington, 1879.

The chain of coast stations in Alaska maintained by the Signal Service (now Weather Bureau) was extended up the Yukon in the fall of 1882, and a few fragmentary series of meteorological observations were maintained at the trading posts of the Alaska Commercial Company during the closed season. As soon as the ice went out of the river observations were discontinued, not to be resumed until the end of the open season, about the middle of September. The observing stations, with their geographical coordinates, are given below. The names of the stations are those now in use, with the following exceptions: Nuklukayet is given on the most recent Coast Survey map of Alaska as "Tuklukyut."

The post is but a few miles below the junction of the Yukon and Tanana rivers; indeed, it is not certain but that observations were made at the mouth of the Tanana for a portion of the time. Tchatawokin was known in 1883 as Johnny's Village or Klat-ol-Klin (Schwatka). The Coast Survey map gives the name as "Belle Isle." Camp Colonna, the station on the Porcupine River at its intersection with the one hundred and forty-first meridian, was occupied by the boundary survey party sent out by the United States Coast and Geodetic Survey, under the leadership of Mr. J. H. Turner. Camp Davidson is the station at the intersection of the one hundred and forty-first meridian and the Yukon. It was occupied by a Coast Survey party under the charge of Mr. J. E. McGrath.

Monthly and annual mean temperature (in degrees Fahrenheit).

MEAN TEMPERATURE.

Table with columns: Stations, Latitude, Longitude, Elevation, and monthly mean temperatures (January to December), Annual, and Length of record (From, To, Years, Months). Rows include Fort Wrangell, Sitka, Killisnoo, Juneau, Kadiak, Unalaska, St. Michaels, Point Barrow, Anvik, Nuklukayet, Fort Yukon, Tchatowklin, Fort Reliance, Camp Davidson, and Camp Colonna.

EXTREMES OF TEMPERATURE—MAXIMUM.

Table showing maximum temperature extremes for various stations: Anvik, Nuklukayet, Tchatowklin, Fort Reliance, Camp Davidson, and Camp Colonna.

EXTREMES OF TEMPERATURE—MINIMUM.

Table showing minimum temperature extremes for various stations: Anvik, Nuklukayet, Tchatowklin, Fort Reliance, Camp Davidson, and Camp Colonna.

NOTE.—The number of years during which observations were made continuously is given under the heading "Years." The total number of months, exclusive of the whole years, is given under the heading "Months."

* Russian series. † Signal Service. ‡ Means from 1889-1896, inclusive, used; means prior to that time not computed.

Daily maximum and minimum temperatures at Kiska, Alaska.

Table with columns: Day, Jan., 1886, Feb., 1886, Nov., 1885, Dec., 1885. Sub-columns for Maximum and Minimum temperatures.

Mean temperature of Attu Island, Alaska; latitude 52° 58'; longitude, 117° 34' W. Degrees.

Table with columns: Month (January, February, March) and Mean Temperature.

Why, it is not so cold in Kiska as it is in Unalaska, and it is not cold enough in Unalaska to make ice enough to obstruct navigation.

Vessels go at all times in the winter to those places. Ask any sailing master, any captain, and they will all tell you there is no fear of ice or of obstruction to navigation there.

Now, to what does that bring us? To the recognition of the fact absolutely that from the standpoint of coal the Hawaiian Islands are needless to us. It is nonsense to talk about the necessity for coaling purposes, because you have got it 800 miles nearer on another route, in our own possession. We can make a naval station at Kiska, in a temperate climate, with all the advantages, everything required, and but one point remains. If into the hands of a hostile strong power Hawaii should fall, it would be a danger to the United States.

Now, just a few observations upon this point. We were told by the chairman of the committee this morning, and correctly, that the great ships of war are not able to steam across the Pacific Ocean and carry their coal supply with them. That is true; but has the gentleman reflected that it was argued, and correctly, by the gentleman who spoke on a former occasion, the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. TAWNEY], and the gentleman himself also this morning said, I believe, that ships could not come and attack us at Honolulu if we owned the islands, because their coal supply would be exhausted and they could not get back.

Do gentlemen reflect that when in the hands of a foreign power, if it controlled Hawaii, ships could not come from Honolulu and attack our western coast, because when they got to the United States they dare not engage us in battle unless they know that they could overcome us, because if they do, their coal supply is exhausted at once, and they can not get away? They will be as helpless and inoffensive as painted ships upon a painted ocean. I do not admit the correctness of the theory that possession of Hawaii will render us able to do with less military and naval establishment than is necessary without it. A navy will be indispensable for protection of a station there, and just as strong a naval force will be necessary for defense of our coast as if we owned the islands and a naval station there.

Mr. Speaker, ships of war can carry colliers; they do carry colliers. We know from the testimony of Admiral Irwin before

Minimum temperature of Unalaska, Alaska.

Table with columns: Year, Jan., Feb., Mar., Apr., May, June, July, Aug., Sept., Oct., Nov., Dec.

our committee that during the war he coaled from colliers at sea. All of you who remember the *Alabama* during the war know that while she did not carry colliers or coal from colliers, she sailed around the world. She procured her coal in violation of the neutrality laws, possibly, and she paid big prices for it; but she got it, and she ran for years until finally, off the coast of France near Cherbourg, Captain Winslow took her in.

But, as I said, vessels of war can carry colliers, and do carry them. Admiral Dewey, when he found war was coming on, made preparations at Hongkong. He knew he would have to get out of there when war was declared. I had a letter from one of his officers, written the day before he sailed, and he said: "We are all ready and the Admiral has provided himself with everything. He has colliers and takes them with him."

Mr. Speaker, everybody knows that when a vessel of war is out in a heavy sea in mid-ocean it is practically impossible to take on coal from a collier. But it is not so in a time of comparative calm. Under the lee of an island or a coast anywhere or in a period of comparative calm in the open sea coal can be taken on board. What are colliers for? Sir, we would be compelled to keep a fleet at Honolulu in order to protect commerce. We must keep ships of war there, because if we do not the navies of the world can go there and batter down our forts and disable our guns, as Admiral Sampson has just been doing in Santiago de Cuba.

But, in addition to that, we must keep ships upon our own coast. If we were at war with Great Britain, she would not have to cross the Pacific; she has naval stations on the westward American coast. But from the Asiatic side they can avoid Hawaii, go around it, and come to our coast exactly as for weeks and weeks in the Caribbean Sea. Admiral Cervera eluded the two fleets that were looking after and chasing him every day in the great trackless waste of waters. Vessels must come in sight before they can be engaged in combat. So that after all as a strategic point the Hawaiian Islands are not of so much consequence as gentlemen contend.

Mr. Speaker, before going further let me ask how much time have I remaining?

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PARKER of New Jersey). Ten minutes.

Mr. HITT. Mr. Speaker, the remark just made by the Chair implies that in this debate the hour rule prevails. Was there not an agreement made yesterday that the time allotted to this debate should be under the control of the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. DINSMORE] on the side of those opposed to the resolution and under the control of myself on the affirmative side?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The present occupant of the chair has understood the time to be under the control of the gentleman from Illinois and the gentleman from Arkansas.

Mr. PAYNE. I do not think that was agreed to last evening.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Then, as the Chair understands, consent is now asked that the time to be occupied in this debate be under the control of the gentleman from Illinois and the gentleman from Arkansas. Is there objection? The Chair hears none.

The Chair, in replying to the question of the gentleman from Arkansas, simply stated for the convenience of that gentleman at what time the hour would expire.

Mr. DINSMORE. I want to stop within the hour, out of consideration for other gentlemen who want to be heard.

Now, there is the map, if any gentleman wants to examine this question. It gives the curvature of the earth. Take a steel tape and draw it from point to point on an ordinary globe and you will see the relative distances. And if you want to satisfy yourselves as to the accuracy of this map, here are the certificates from an officer of the United States who has sent it to the House in obedience to our demand.

I can not dwell longer on that point; but there is another matter to which I wish to allude.

Mr. Speaker, what is the necessity for our entering upon a policy of annexation? We are engaged in a war. For what purpose was this war inaugurated? What was the motive assigned for our action at the time when we made the demands upon Spain to which she did not accede? The motive was humanitarian. We said: "We will not tolerate right here at our doors a condition which we consider barbarous and inhuman, even though it is not upon our own soil; no civilized nation would tolerate the cruel persecution going on at the instance of Spain in the Island of Cuba; and it must stop."

We disavowed any intention of aggression on our part. We disavowed any purpose to make Cuba a part of our territory or to exercise any sovereignty over it. In view of such declarations, is it good faith upon our part to inaugurate such a policy with reference to Puerto Rico and the Canaries and the Philippines? I say it is unworthy of respectable manhood, and what is not respectable for man is not decent for a nation. [Applause.] And

even if it were, I contend it is contrary to the welfare and interest of our country.

What must we expect if we enter upon a colonial policy? Suppose we set our feet upon territory in the Orient. From that moment we become involved in every European controversy with reference to aggressions and the acquirement of territory there. No longer will our ancient peace abide with us. That angel which has extended her beneficent wings over our heads for so many years and enabled our people to build up their homes and to live happily with their families, to lie down at night restful and at their ease because no danger threatened, will be gone. She will desert us; and we shall never have a moment that we can confidently rely upon as a time of peace.

Mr. Joseph Chamberlain, the colonial secretary of Great Britain, the other day said in a public speech:

The time has arrived when Great Britain may be confronted by a combination of powers, and our first duty, therefore, is to draw all parts of the Empire into close unity, and our next to maintain the bonds of permanent unity with our kinsmen across the Atlantic. [Loud cheers.]

There is a powerful and generous nation, speaking our language—

Speaking of us—

bred of our race and having interests identical with ours. I would go so far as to say that, terrible as war may be, even war itself would be cheaply purchased if in a great and noble cause the Stars and Stripes and the Union Jack should wave together over an Anglo-Saxon alliance. [Prolonged cheers.]

Do you get the full significance of that statement? There is an appeal to the pride of every American. Who does not feel the temptation? Who does not feel a warm throbbing of his heart at the contemplation of the spectacle presented to us by a cousin across the ocean, the spectacle of our flag side by side with the flag of the other great English-speaking nation of the world? But it is not a consummation to be wished, from the standpoint of American citizenship. We honor and respect the British. I like them. But we seek no alliance. What is it that Mr. Chamberlain says is the motive?

We are like to be confronted by a combination of powers. Our first duty, therefore, is to draw all parts of the Empire into close unity.

Think of the possibility of the necessity for such a statement with reference to our Government! Think of our being likely to be confronted by a combination of powers making it necessary to draw all parts of our country into close unity. Great Britain is scattered over the whole face of the globe. She has her colonies in every clime. She has never stayed her hand in reaching for the possession of territory, and it is a difficult task to bring all those peoples together into unity.

But, Mr. Speaker, it should be a matter of profound pride and gratification to every American to know that in our compact form on this great continent, whenever the American heart throbs, the blood goes bounding through the veins to every extremity of the great national body, as quickly and as responsively as the electric fluid flies from the touch of the operator's hand to the farthermost end of the wire. And why so? Because we have not scattered possessions.

We are not a colonial nation; we have concentrated rather than diffused our power; we have a compact republican government here, made strong by the union of States touching arm to arm; we have followed the policy laid down to us by our fathers and have avoided entangling alliances, and have respected and obeyed the Monroe doctrine to such an extent that up to this good day, at least, not a nation in all the world has dared to plant her colors upon Hawaii and keep them there and call it her own.

Great Britain did it once. France did it once, but out of respect to the demands and wishes of America in the assertion of the Monroe doctrine those colors were pulled down, and for more than fifty years the powers of the earth have respected our right there; and so long as we are decent and honest, and respect the principles and spirit of the Monroe doctrine ourselves, they will continue to respect them. But, as Mr. Edmonds says practically, the moment we depart from it, we may then begin to prepare for our defense.

Mr. Speaker, hastening to a conclusion, let me read from the great English author, Mr. Anthony Froude.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman's hour has expired.

Mr. SIMS. The gentleman from Arkansas can use any time he has given to me.

Mr. DINSMORE. I thank my friend very much. Here is an Englishman talking. I quote from first chapter of Mr. Anthony Froude's *Cæsar*. He is speaking from an English standpoint:

To the student of political history, and to the English student above all others, the conversion of the Roman Republic into a military empire commands a peculiar interest. Notwithstanding many differences, the English and the Romans essentially resemble one another. The early Romans possessed the faculty of self-government beyond any people of whom we have historical knowledge, with the one exception of ourselves. In virtue of their temporal freedom they became the most powerful nation in the known world, and their liberties perished only when Rome became the mistress of conquered races to whom she was unable or unwilling to extend her privileges.

If England were similarly supreme, if all rival powers were eclipsed by her or laid under her feet, the imperial tendencies, which are as strongly marked in us as our love of liberty, might lead us over the same course to the same end. If there be one lesson which history clearly teaches, it is this, that free nations can not govern subject provinces. If they are unable or unwilling to admit their dependencies to share their own constitution, the constitution itself will fall in pieces from mere incompetence for its duties.

Mr. JOHNSON of Indiana. What is the gentleman reading from?

Mr. DINSMORE. From the first chapter of Froude's *Cæsar*, from an Englishman comparing England, the colonial country, to Rome, and predicting the fall that must come, and that Mr. Chamberlain the other day stated was imminent, because he says she is like to be confronted by a combination of powers rendering it necessary for her to concentrate into unity the national forces of the government; a condition which is impossible to us; and God grant we may be wise enough to pursue such a policy that it will ever be impossible that we shall be divided, and it shall be necessary to concentrate our national unity.

Mr. Speaker, eminent men have been quoted in this debate. Mr. Marcy was the first who ever hinted at the acquisition of Hawaii itself. I admit here that it has been thought for a long time that it might be necessary. I do not say that the time may not come when it will be legitimate; but it is not now, in its present condition, and by the unlawful methods which are invoked in the resolution brought here by the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Sir, for one I hope that we shall continue to pursue the policy of the past, and I can do no better in conclusion than to quote from the language of the late Secretary of State, Mr. Sherman. A recent letter from him as Secretary of State has been printed, in which he recommends the acquisition of Hawaii to the territory of the United States. But, sir, let it not be forgotten—it is a matter of common note and everybody knows it, for the newspapers have discussed it from one end of the land to the other—that during this present Administration that distinguished man, who stood so high in his party for so many years, was not the actual acting Secretary of State, but that his duties, because of ill health and the physical weakness of advanced age, were performed by the present Secretary of State, Mr. Day. Everybody knew it.

What did Mr. Sherman say just a few years ago, when he was rounding out his life and leaving behind him a monument to speak in the future of his acts done in the past? I speak now of his recently published book. And however much there may be in the public life of that man in the past of which I disapprove, however much I may reprobate and condemn his public policies, we are forced to respect the concluding statement in the book which records his life work. The man stood looking back upon his past, reverently thinking of his future. His course was finished. He was leaving to the world his own estimate of his public service and the men associated with him. If there be a period in a man's life when he is sincere and speaks from a patriotic heart, it is then. And these words come sounding like words of the sages of the past, who devoted their lives to public duty, forgetful of self, with patriotism pure next to religion. Mr. Sherman says:

The events of the future are beyond the vision of mankind, but I hope that our people will be content with internal growth and avoid the complications of foreign acquisitions. Our family of States is already large enough to create embarrassment in the Senate, and a republic should not hold dependent provinces or possessions. Every new acquisition will create embarrassments. Canada and Mexico as independent republics will be more valuable to the United States than if carved into additional States. The Union already embraces discordant elements enough without adding others. If my life is prolonged, I will do all I can to add to the strength and prosperity of the United States, but nothing to extend its limits or to add new dangers by acquisition of foreign territory.

What grand sentiments are these, Mr. Speaker! These are the words of our present President's lately retired Secretary of State, written as the final lines in passing from the stage of life.

Mr. Speaker, I hope that we shall be able to act in this matter as cool, deliberate, and patriotic statesmen. I hope that we may not yield to the feverish feelings of war which have taken possession of men's minds and hearts. Within the last two months we have seen men by the dozen, by the score, in this very body change their opinion on this question.

The war fever has got into their blood, and they are about to do a foolish thing. It will be the greatest blunder in our national history. It is mere vanity, a desire to place ourselves alongside other nations who depend upon acquiring and holding territory abroad. We may take Manila; we may acquire Puerto Rico; we may take the Canaries and set up our flag, our dominion, and our sovereignty. If we do, Mr. Speaker, we may expect to see the disintegration of this giant Republic of ours, which nothing else, in my judgment, can accomplish. If you will take them, do it; but God help us! [Loud applause on the Democratic side.]

I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks in the RECORD, and also to print certain documents which I referred to, but did not take time to read, but which I wish to make a part of my remarks.

Mr. HITT. I also ask unanimous consent that gentlemen may be allowed to print remarks on this subject for ten days.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Unanimous consent is asked that gentlemen have leave to print remarks on this subject in the RECORD within ten days from the close of the debate. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

WAR REVENUE BILL.

Mr. DINGLEY. Mr. Speaker, in enrolling the war revenue bill it has been found necessary to give directions to the enrolling clerk, and I ask consideration of the concurrent resolution which I send to the Chair.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Unanimous consent is asked to interrupt the debate for the passage of the resolution which the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That the enrolling clerk of the House be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to enroll the act (H. R. 10100) entitled "An act to provide ways and means to meet war expenditures, and for other purposes," in accordance with the text of said act as submitted to both Houses in connection with the report of the managers of the two Houses on the disagreeing votes.

Mr. BAILEY. I desire to know the necessity for this.

Mr. DINGLEY. It has been found that there was an omission of one or two sections of the last part of the bill in the report down at the Printing Office; but the bill itself as submitted as the result of the conference was correct, and we simply desire to authorize the enrolling clerk to follow the bill which was submitted as a result of the conference, that being correct.

Mr. BAILEY. And this omission relates to mixed flour?

Mr. DINGLEY. Yes, sir.

Mr. BAILEY. I desire to ask the gentleman from Maine if this is the mistake of the enrolling clerk or the mistake—

Mr. DINGLEY. It is a mistake of some one in the omission of one page of copy in making up the report, but the bill itself is correct—that which was submitted to the House.

Mr. BAILEY. Of course it was the conference report and not the bill which was submitted to the House.

Mr. DINGLEY. We had it before us, as the gentleman will remember, as the result of our action. The printed bill itself is correct.

Mr. BAILEY. If any objection on my part would defeat that flour provision of the bill, I would certainly object; but I realize that it would only delay the matter, and I do not offer any objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the consideration of the concurrent resolution? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

The question was taken; and the concurrent resolution was adopted.

Mr. HITT. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GILLET] twenty minutes.

Mr. GILLET of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, when a few years ago the annexation of Hawaii became a live issue I was instinctively opposed to it. I felt then, as I feel now, the great force of the arguments against it. I appreciate that to our isolation and compactness we owe much of our security and strength; that to extend our possessions outside of this continent is to extend our vulnerability; that we still have undeveloped resources here sufficient to occupy our energy for another century; that the great menace to our future prosperity is lowering the character of our citizenship, and that to enter upon a career of imperial expansion is to break our cherished traditions, to expose ourselves to foreign complications and war, and to win a broader empire at the risk of heavy taxes, corrupt administration, and a deteriorating suffrage.

The one answer to all this was the imperious argument of military necessity. But to me that hardly seemed sufficient. War seemed improbable, the rational era of peace seemed near, and especially unlikely seemed a war with any oriental power which could make Hawaii essential. Yet, while the question was still unsettled and we were academically discussing it, suddenly the whole problem is lighted up by the flame of actual war. We suddenly find ourselves, by a most dramatic and unforeseen change, the probable possessor of a vast Eastern territory and our fleet there in urgent need of help. We suddenly find the neutrality or hostility of Hawaii inconsistent with our most pressing needs, and the annexation, which we considered of doubtful expediency when war seemed almost impossible, suddenly becomes almost a necessary step in the prosecution of actual war.

The transformation is indeed startling. We were looking on with some jealousy while European nations were partitioning among themselves the Chinese Empire and making for themselves new provinces and markets and establishing permanent trade footings in that vast and populous East, which is just entering into the commercial current of the world; and we were wondering if we ought not to have our share in this dismemberment, and how we could accomplish it, when in the twinkling of an eye,

without any plan or thought of our own, we find ourselves prospective masters of a vaster area and population than any of our rivals, and plunged at once into the responsibilities and politics of the far East, and Hawaii, which had seemed so useless and unnecessary, became our essential stepping-stone and base. Seldom has the force of a theoretical argument been so startlingly illustrated and vindicated. It may not be conclusive or permanent, but I suspect that the dazzling victory of our fleet in Manila Bay not only overthrew Spanish supremacy, but overcame the force of many traditions at home. We must be cautious not to become intoxicated with success and be tempted by pride into dangerous projects.

The present war has opened our eyes to many facts seldom thought of before. One is that the age of amicable adjustment of all disputes has not yet arrived, though I trust we all feel that the United States ought always to lead the van of the international movement in that direction. Another is that we can not hope to be always free from European entanglements. Inventions have brought us nearer to Europe than Massachusetts was to Pennsylvania when Washington gave us his famous advice, and the mutual exchange of the products of the soil and of the brain is bringing the whole world daily into closer touch. Moreover, the colonizing policy of the great powers, just now illustrated by the partition of China, is occasioning new and wide opportunities for interests to clash and disputes to arise.

Nor ought we in forecasting the future to overlook the manifest tendency of our own people. A restless, belligerent spirit has been evident here for some years, a willingness to interfere in international matters even at the risk of war, a growing pride in and liking for our war equipment, which will inevitably receive a great impetus from the present conflict. So I think we must fairly recognize that while our people feel that the great mission of this country is a peaceful one, to lead the world in the march of scientific, material, and political development, yet there is here a strong, self-assertive pride which may at any time embroil us in armed conflict.

Recognizing this, it is but prudent for us to be prepared for war. From the sudden appreciation of the utter inadequacy of our late peace armament, under which we are yet smarting, it is but fair to conclude that in the immediate future at least we will not again allow our defenses to be so weak. Our Navy particularly is likely to be kept increasingly large and formidable. But a navy is powerless without coal, and the Geneva award has settled conclusively that neutral ports can not be made the basis of a coal supply. If, therefore, our Navy is to be effective in the Pacific, we must have there coaling stations of our own; and by far the most desirable spot in the whole ocean, the central point of navigation and commerce, is Hawaii.

By a singular combination of circumstances we can take it today with the cordial assent of its Government and without giving just cause of offense to any nation. That there are strong arguments against it I have already acknowledged; that the problem of its future government is difficult I admit; that it will ever attain a population or importance entitling it to statehood I doubt, but that as a military outpost it is indispensable I am convinced, and that suffices to end my objections.

The argument is often advanced that we have already, by treaty with Hawaii, the right to a coaling station in Pearl Harbor sufficient for all our needs without annexation. But it is a question whether that title can not be at any moment annulled by Hawaii. Moreover, we must make of Pearl Harbor a veritable Gibraltar, fortified and garrisoned and supplied against attack from land as well as sea, for if not annexed we can not be sure of the eternal friendship of Hawaii. But if we annex it we attach to ourselves a population intelligent, friendly, and self-supporting; able of themselves to make a good defense against any common foe, and requiring only such fortification and support as we give to our own cities.

Nor will I deny that I am in some measure influenced by a special sympathy with these islands, which were first redeemed from savagery by the devotion of our American missionaries, and which are perhaps the most conspicuous example upon the globe of the good accomplished by those noble religious societies organized for the redemption of distant and unknown heathen. After many days the bread they cast upon the waters is returning to us again, and a little band of Americans, following in the footsteps of our missionaries, popular and respected because of their national spirit of freedom and order, has so won the confidence of the people as to lead them in throwing off the debauched monarchy and instituting a republic modeled on our own, and they now show their love for their native country by asking to return to our allegiance and to bring with them as a gift the rich and fertile province they have won and to share in the honor and protection of our flag. Such a petition it is hard to deny.

And now, Mr. Speaker, I wish to use the balance of my time in discussing a question not relevant to the measure before us, but in which I am greatly interested, and which, apparently, I shall have

no other opportunity to bring to the attention of the House. At the beginning of the war I introduced the following resolutions:

Whereas neither the United States nor Spain were parties to the Declaration of Paris in 1856, respecting the conduct of war upon the high seas; and

Whereas the United States refused its assent to said declaration on the ground that it did not exempt from capture all private property except contraband of war: Therefore,

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That during the present war with Spain no privateers shall be commissioned by the United States.

Resolved, That merchant ships and their cargoes shall be exempt from capture as prizes unless they carry contraband of war or try to violate a blockade.

Resolved, That merchant ships already captured shall be released.

These resolutions have been much criticised by the press as Utopian and impracticable and inconsistent with successful war; but I think the critics have not understood either how fully these resolutions accord with the general principles on which civilized war is waged to-day or how completely we are committed to their support by our past diplomatic history. I think I can show that the privateering or prize-taking practice on the ocean, which these resolutions are intended to prevent, is a relic of barbarism which is wholly at variance with the conduct of war on land, which is opposed to the whole trend of modern civilization and the current of international law, and which has been especially attacked and disowned by nearly all our most prominent statesmen from Washington to Lincoln. And I think now, when we are engaged in a contest with a fourth-rate power whose material resources are inconsiderable, we can well afford to give up the profit of a few prizes in order to put ourselves on record as unselfishly practicing in war the noble and rational doctrine which we have preached to others through a century of peace.

From the time of the Thirty Years' War there has been an ever-increasing international movement to mitigate the horrors of military campaigns as far as is possible without diminishing their effectiveness. The principle has come to be more and more recognized that the real enemy in war, the real object of attack, is the hostile state itself, with its armed defenders—not its inoffensive, noncombatant private citizens or subjects. Attack upon the latter produces a maximum of human suffering with a minimum of military effect; and besides, it is radically unjust, for the private citizens on either side are not necessarily enemies in fact; many of them have brothers, friends, even children, under the adverse flag; many have bitterly opposed the war and used all their efforts for a speedy peace. These two reasons are at the basis of the change which has very gradually but very surely come over the law of war since Grotius's time—a change admirably and succinctly expressed in our Instructions for the Government of Armies in the Field:

As civilization has advanced during the last centuries, so has likewise steadily advanced, especially in war on land, the distinction between the private individual belonging to a hostile country and the hostile country itself with its men in arms. The principle has been more and more acknowledged that the unarmed citizen is to be spared in person, property, and honor as much as the exigencies of war will permit.

Examples of the application of this principle are numerous, but I need cite only a few. In the days of the Thirty Years' War cities taken by assault were sacked, many of the inhabitants put to the sword, others held for ransom, and all property, public and private, treated as booty. To-day proceedings such as these would provoke intervention by the powers. To-day even the garrison may not be put to the sword, and the unarmed portion of the population, as long as it behaves quietly and refrains from hostile demonstrations, may not be maltreated at all.

Again, in former times an army on the march pillaged indiscriminately, taking all the private property it could find. To-day it takes what it needs, it is true, but not by way of pillage—only by way of requisition, signed by the commander, who is responsible for it, and who consequently takes no more than is necessary. The practice is gradually growing to pay for it all afterwards. It is the English rule, and the one to be gathered from our Instructions before referred to, and it is provided for by our treaty of Guadalupe Hidalgo with Mexico.

Private property, under these circumstances, is not taken, but borrowed—not wrenched as from an enemy, but exacted from inhabitants of a district by the power which is the ruling power de facto there at the time. On this ground only is the right of contribution and requisition supported by modern writers, whereas formerly it was simply a corollary of the general principle that all private property was booty.

In other words, the absolute rights of the victor over (1) the persons and (2) the property of the unarmed and inoffensive vanquished, which were recognized up to the time of Grotius, are admitted no longer, and in their stead we acknowledge the principle which I quoted a moment ago from the United States Instructions for the Government of Armies in the Field.

Now, it is plain that the same reasons which conspire to exempt private property on land apply with precisely the same force to private property at sea. We go to war, let us say, with Spain. Our quarrel is with Spain, not with private Spanish individuals;

not with Spanish women and children, nor peaceable Spanish farmers, nor, for the same reason, peaceable Spanish merchants and merchant sailors. It is true, again, just as in war on land, that to attack harmless merchants combines the maximum of distress to inoffensive individuals with the minimum of effect in bringing the hostile Government to terms. The parallel is perfect; the conclusion is irresistible. The laws of war ought to exempt from hostile capture private property at sea as well as on land. Yet for some reason they do not, and though with every year we have drifted nearer to it, the change which is necessary to make the laws of war at sea consistent with those of war on land has not yet come.

The question may well be asked, Why should this matter concern the United States more than another nation? Why should we go out of our way to help change the law, when the existing law is not galling, but rather favorable, to ourselves? There are two answers, I think. First, the law ought to be changed; in the interest of civilization, in the name of humanity, for the sake of all mankind, this step ought to be taken to wipe away another useless horror of war, simply because it is a horror and because it is useless. The United States has always aspired to lead the van of enterprises such as this, and what more fitting occasion to take a step in the interest of civilization and humanity than a war of which civilization and humanity were the cause? But, secondly, the United States is concerned because it already stands committed, to the whole extent of its national credit, to the policy of abolishing the capture of private property on the ocean.

My resolutions have been criticised in various quarters as innovations. Do my critics know that the principles they are deriding are not my principles, but the principles of Franklin, of both the Adamases, of Jefferson, of Monroe, of Pierce, of Clay, of Marcy, of Cass, of Seward, and of Lincoln? That they are provided for by the United States in two of its existing treaties? That the refusal of other powers to agree to them in 1856 was the sole reason for the failure of the United States to sign the Declaration of Paris? I do not know how anyone with a knowledge of American history can fail to know or have forgotten these things. A very brief review of what the United States has done already and bound itself to do for the future in this direction will be sufficient, I think, to relieve me from the charge of innovation.

In 1785 Franklin inserted a provision in our treaty with Prussia to the effect that in case of war between Prussia and us merchant vessels on both sides "shall be allowed to pass free and unmolested." The idea, and even the words, had been previously authorized by Congress in its general plan for treaties, adopted April 2, 1784, as may be seen in its secret journals. Franklin was the only one of our diplomatic agents abroad who succeeded in incorporating this provision into a treaty, but they all tried. These efforts, interrupted by the disturbances of the Napoleonic wars and our own war of 1812, were vigorously renewed under the second Administration of Monroe.

The war of 1823, between France and Spain, was conducted on these principles, as far at least as France was concerned, and President Monroe expressed his admiration and sympathy for France's conduct, and our ministers at Paris, London, and St. Petersburg were instructed by John Quincy Adams, then Secretary of State, to press the matter "upon the moral sense" of the Governments to which they were respectively accredited, with a view to an international agreement. France and Russia proved good ground for the seed thus sown, but for various reasons the negotiations with England fell through and nothing was done. But Adams never forgot it, and afterwards as President he referred to the "abolition of private war upon the ocean" as one of the cherished objects of the diplomacy of the United States.

From 1825 to 1854 the question slept, the rebuffs which the United States had encountered at the Court of St. James and our own internal dissensions conspiring to cause it to drop out of the public eye. At the outbreak of the Crimean war, however, it became apparent that the deadly hatred of privateers which the excesses of the Napoleonic wars had sown in the weak and habitually neutral states of Europe was about to bear fruit and ripen into an overwhelming movement for their abolition, in which, as a matter of course, the United States would be asked to join. The danger of such a step was at once obvious to the Pierce Cabinet.

It was all very well for great naval powers, who maintained huge armaments at prodigious cost, even in time of peace, to desire the abolition of privateering; but for a power with a large carrying trade, a weak navy, and a long coast line it would be national suicide, unless at the same time the principle of Franklin and Adams and Monroe, which for thirty years had lain on the shelf, were taken out and adopted. So President Pierce, in his annual message (1854), foreshadowed our policy in this regard, saying that if the European powers would go the whole way with us and abolish all capture of private property at sea we would "readily meet them on that broad ground;" but that if they would not, then a proposition to abolish privateering simply

would be, from the point of view of American diplomacy, a disastrous proposition, and one to which "this Government could never listen."

This, as everybody knows, is just what happened. The Congress of Paris in 1856 framed a declaration on the subject of maritime rights, which consisted of four articles:

- (1) Privateering is and remains abolished.
- (2) The neutral flag protects the enemy's goods except contraband of war.
- (3) Neutral goods, except contraband of war, are not subject to seizure under the enemy's flag.
- (4) Blockades, to be binding, must be effective, i. e., maintained by a force sufficient to render approach to the enemy's coast really dangerous.

The third and fourth articles were already part of international law. The second had always been a great favorite with the United States, and its principle had been incorporated in many of our treaties. In the declaration, however, the four articles were inseparable, and they were presented in turn to all the powers to sign or refuse to sign as a whole. All except three signed. Spain and Mexico refused absolutely, on account of the first article, being powers with long coast lines and weak navies. The United States acted, firmly and decorously, on the lines foreshadowed by President Pierce in 1854. Mr. Marcy, Secretary of State, proposed to amend the first article as follows:

And the private property of the subjects or citizens of a belligerent on the high seas shall be exempted from seizure by public armed vessels of the other belligerent, except it be contraband.

It is true that the Buchanan Cabinet afterwards withdrew this amendment before it had been definitely rejected by the European powers; but the withdrawal was probably on account of something in the wording, certainly not from any sympathy with the existing practice of capturing private property at sea, for Mr. Buchanan had declared against it in a most outspoken way when he was minister to England, and Mr. Cass, while still in office, in 1859, referred to it bitterly as something "not adapted to the sentiments of the age in which we live." Whatever the reasons, we know, though, that the proposition was withdrawn, and the United States was not a party to the Declaration of Paris when the civil war broke out and the dread of Confederate privateers fell like a dark shadow over the great commerce of the North.

Then, when the government at Montgomery announced its intention to issue letters of marque, Mr. Seward renewed the proposition which is now usually referred to as the "Marcy amendment." Further, Mr. Seward offered on the part of the United States to sign the declaration as it stood if the Marcy amendment were unacceptable; but he was quite clear about this point, that the Marcy amendment was the "greater good" and the bare declaration the "lesser." The negotiations fell through again, the European powers holding that an accession to the declaration at that time by the United States would be too late to bind the revolted States; and so we had to struggle through the civil war with all our commerce exposed.

Since then we have had no war, and we have made no further attempt to establish the principle for which we have fought so constantly that we may, I think, almost call it "our principle"—a principle which to-day is referred to by continental writers in conjunction with the name of an American Secretary of State. It has been in our thoughts, however, and as recently as 1871 we incorporated it into another treaty—with Italy—which is still in force. And now comes this war with Spain, a poor, bankrupt, fourth-class power, and we have already taken over \$2,000,000 worth of private property at sea; and it seems to me that if ever we are going to have a time and an opportunity to show that we are sincere, and always have been sincere, in our diplomatic struggle for this principle now is the time and here is the opportunity.

Other nations have occasionally offered at the outbreak of war to admit the immunity of private property at sea. France did in 1823; England and France together in 1860; Austria and Italy and Prussia in 1866; Prussia in 1870. But in nearly all these cases, especially the last, the offer lost half its value as a precedent because it was clearly dictated by self-interest. Prussia, for example, in 1870, had a large commerce and no navy to protect it, and her offer to adopt the "Marcy amendment" at that time was regarded by France as a piece of colossal impudence and rejected forthwith. So suppose Spain should say to us now, "You have taken \$2,000,000 worth of our ships, but this is a barbarous kind of warfare, so let us stop it from this time, and we will both restore our captures;" the proposition would be neither valuable nor graceful coming from Spain.

But how different if it came from us! If we in this war, which we have entered into without idea of gain, solely for the sake of humanity and the wiping out of a black blot on nineteenth century civilization—if we should make such an offer, would not that be a triumphant vindication of our past and a magnificent precedent for the future? And if we do not make it, how shall we ever afterwards be able to urge it, and how shall we endure the inevitable comment that America puts forward great principles when it suits American pockets, but tramples them quietly under foot when they curtail her revenue?

I am aware that what I am urging is not likely to be popular with that Executive Department on which we are most relying in this present crisis—I mean the Department of the Navy. Officers and men alike are interested in prize money and would naturally decry any legislation which diminished it. But why should sailors need to have any pecuniary inducement to assail the enemy more than soldiers? On land there is no longer prize money, or booty, or ransom. That on the sea it is conducive to better service or more efficient discipline I should doubt. Certainly it is open to the charge of favoritism and unfairness. Compensation ought not to depend on mere chance, and I should think the winnings of the fortunate might make others dissatisfied.

Moreover, if compensation beyond their pay is granted the sailors, justice would seem to demand that it be granted for perilous and daring service—to those who have engaged in deadly battle, who have fought the enemy's ships of war or fortifications. But prize money goes principally to the captors of merchantmen, generally unarmed and defenseless. It is won without risk by the light, swift boats, while the heavy men-of-war who must bear the brunt of the fighting and are our main reliance have little chance of winning prizes. I saw by the papers recently that the little *Mangrove*, with a crew of less than forty men, captured a prize worth over \$800,000, giving the men \$20,000 apiece.

That hardly seems fair when the men in our battle ships, to whom we look mainly for our defense and who undertake the real hazards of the war, get nothing. The whole system is antiquated and obsolete and unfair as well as barbarous, and it should be ended. And, in ending it, we are the nation which should take the lead. We must do so to be consistent with our past diplomatic history, as I have shown. We must do so to be consistent with what is our constant endeavor as well as our boast—to lead the world in progress and civilization. We believe that we have contributed more than any other nation to the discoveries and advances which have made this century such a marvelous epoch in the world's history.

In one sphere we have lagged behind—in armament for war. The reason for this was creditable; we have thought that war should be avoided; that it was an indication of discarded savagery, and that we should act so reasonably and justly as not to give occasion for it. Yet, when suddenly plunged into a civil war, we astounded the world by our capacity for development in that direction, and again astounded it as much by our sudden resumption of our peaceful avocations and the immediate absorption of a million soldiers into civil pursuits. Now, again, we find ourselves plunged suddenly into war, and though unprepared, we are apparently going to show the world again our surprising capacity for the speedy development of warlike power and prowess.

But we ought at the same time to show that in adopting the barbarity of war we do not forget our mission of progress and civilization. War is essentially destructive. No one can hope or desire to make it harmless. Modern inventions have immensely increased its deadliness, and the same tendency will doubtless continue.

All that civilization can hope to accomplish in mitigation is to limit its scope, to remove classes of individuals and property from its increasing severity, and thus concentrate its damage and exempt from its blight as much of the nation as possible. Thus, while growing ever more terrible and more destructive within its sphere, that sphere ought ever to be growing narrower and wars growing shorter; more destructive momentarily to the actual combatants, but less exhausting to the nation and the world. This has been the history of the development of war, and it is along these lines only that we can aid in future development.

If it is wise in peace to prepare for war, as we have recently learned to our cost, so it is wise in war to prepare for peace—to wage it so that we shall win not only victory, but the future respect of the world; shall achieve not only an honorable peace, but an amelioration of the condition of war; shall be proud not only of the valor of our arms, but of the statesmanship in our councils. All this we can in some measure achieve by adopting or offering to adopt as our policy the principle of these resolutions. I say offering to adopt, but if we make the proposition I think there can be no doubt that Spain will be glad to accept it, since it is so obviously for her interest, and then both nations would be proceeding under modern, civilized rules of war.

Of course, if Spain declined to recognize our magnanimity and reciprocate by adopting a similar resolution, it could not be expected that we would allow her to make war on one plan while we acted on another, and we should be obliged to abandon our plan and, by way of reprisal, descend to her level. But that is barely conceivable. We may reasonably conclude, I think, that she will follow the course that is most to her interest, and be very glad and eager to exempt private property from capture if we will.

By adopting the principle of these resolutions, then; by adopting it now when it is to our disadvantage, we shall prove to the world that we are ready to sacrifice some material gain for the establishment of a noble American policy, and that though we

are a peaceful people, preferring the rule of reason to the rule of brute strength, yet we may be moved to interference by the sufferings of others and that even then, in the heat of conflict, we do not forget our duty as the nation of progress and civilization.

War gives phenomenal opportunity for distinction, both to nations and to men. The glamour of martial renown is so brilliant and dazzling that it tends to obscure the victories of peace. But no matter how glittering in this war the gallantry of our Army and Navy may be, no matter how we may enhance our prestige and broaden our future history by our military achievements, I believe it is possible for us also to do something noteworthy and enduring by legislation. And if we should adopt this principle of the exemption of private property from capture on the sea, and thus inscribe a new paragraph in the ever-progressing code of international law, I believe future historians, in describing the triumphs of this war, would not exhaust all their admiration on the Army and Navy, but would record that the Congress also, which at some cost had championed and established this American doctrine, had accomplished something for the glory of the United States and for the advancement of the world, had marked an epoch in the practice of war and in the progress of civilization whose beneficent influence might even outlive the fame of military success.

Mr. HITT. I yield ten minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. ALEXANDER].

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. Speaker, the annexation of the Hawaiian Islands, for the first time in our history, is presented to us as a war necessity. Their strategic features have long been understood. Ever since steam supplanted wind these islands have been recognized as the only bridge over which the vast Pacific could be safely passed by a fleet of modern war vessels. The cession of Pearl Harbor was advocated because it was the key to the full defense of our western shore and because that key should rest only in the grasp of the United States.

Naval officers have written, and their readers have believed, that under present conditions it is not practicable for any trans-Pacific nation to invade our western coast without occupying Hawaii as a base, and for years it has been admitted that it would be vastly easier to defend these islands by preoccupying and fortifying them. It has been demonstrated by the highest naval experts that a navy sufficient to protect our Pacific coast would also be ample to protect these islands, for in the event of war Hawaii must be occupied by the United States not only for a base, but to prevent an enemy from using it against us as his base. In a war neutrals would not prevent belligerents from taking possession of it.

All this has long been known. There is not a word written or spoken to-day in favor of the annexation of these islands that has not often been heard during the past thirty years. Yet not until we are in the presence of necessities growing out of actual war are these facts sufficiently and fully realized and appreciated to arouse the country to proper action. Necessity is not more the mother of invention than it is the schoolmaster of a great people. To-day we need the Hawaiian Islands much more than they ever needed us. Since the splendid achievement of Admiral Dewey Hawaii has become as absolutely necessary to the successful conduct of war as it has heretofore appeared to be necessary in the theories of astute strategists. And yet the reasons for annexation are no stronger or truer to-day than they were a year ago.

A STARTLING ADMISSION.

A few weeks ago I listened with great interest to the able speech of the distinguished gentleman from Indiana [Mr. JOHNSON] in opposition to the annexation of Hawaii. It was forceful and highly patriotic and will take its place among the best speeches delivered on the negative of this question. But at the very outset he made an admission, almost startling, coming from him, that "the very few of our countrymen who have given any attention to the subject are inclined to favor annexation!" Is the converse of this proposition also true? Are we to understand from the gentleman that those of our countrymen who have given no attention to the subject are inclined to oppose annexation?

I do not charge this as true, although the gentleman from Indiana seems to admit it, but I do believe that the better informed one becomes upon this subject the more inclined he is to accept annexation as the only wise and patriotic escape from the present situation.

JAPAN'S INCREASING INFLUENCE.

The question is not only, Shall we annex Hawaii, but are we willing to allow some other nation to annex it? Whatever may be the declarations or political intentions of the Japanese Government as a Government, it is no longer a secret that the people of Hawaii are in danger of passing under the domination of Japan "by a peaceful process," as Captain Mahan says, "of overrunning and assimilation." For several months during 1896 and 1897 the Japanese entered Hawaii at the rate of 2,000 per month, until now they number 25,000, or nearly one-quarter of the total population. When Hawaii attempts to stay such an inva-

sion by a resort to laws similar to our own against contract laborers and paupers. Japan refuses to recognize its right so to legislate and demands unrestricted immigration.

Add to this demand the tremendous leap which Japan has taken within the past two years, becoming a recognized great power of the Pacific, if not of the world, and it is easy to understand why the conditions and attitude of Japan have changed quickly and radically with respect to Hawaii. If these changing conditions are permitted to go on, it is only a question of time, and possibly of very short time, how soon the supremacy of Japan will be completed.

THE WORK OF THE ANGLO-SAXON.

This fact, if unaccepted or disregarded by the people of the United States, is fully and startlingly recognized by the Anglo-Saxon residents and their supporters, who have given to Hawaii its civilization, its schools, its churches, its commerce, and its great producing capacity, who own more than three-fourths of all the property of the country, who have transferred to it the institutions, the laws, and the helpful civilizing influences of America, filling the land with railroads, cars, engines, waterworks, telephones, and all the latest inventions, improvements, and conveniences, which aid in making our country so desirable and so progressive.

These 8,000 Americans, English, and Germans, who have accomplished all this and more, will not suffer themselves to be swallowed up by the civilization of a remote East whose standards of living are so much lower than ours that satisfactory existence to them is equivalent to destitution and despair to us. These people have not toiled and endured privations for two generations, turning Hawaii into a garden spot, rich in everything that makes home and life desirable, only at last to have it fall into the possession of Japan, either by the fiat of Government or by its inundation with orientalism.

THEIR OFFER AND THEIR APPEAL.

These heroic souls, backed by a large proportion of native Hawaiians, are now facing this problem. They offer to us four and one-half millions of acres, an extent of territory larger than Connecticut and Rhode Island combined, which are practically owned as well as governed by a people who are bone of our bone and flesh of our flesh.

Under laws similar to those in the United States they are striving to hold back the flow of oriental immigration, that these favored isles of the sea may come to the great Republic as free as possible from Asiatic influences; they appeal to us to study and understand the seriousness of their situation and the importance to us of their country; they call attention to the fact that Hawaii imports more of the products of the United States than any other country bordering on the Pacific; that it bought more largely in 1896 than any other nation save Australia; that it was the second largest wine customer, the third best purchaser of salmon and barley, and the sixth best purchaser of American flour; that twice as many American vessels visit Hawaii in the course of a year as enter any other country on the globe; that in all the ports of Europe in 1896 the American flag floated at the masthead of only 30 ships, that in the ports of Asia it was seen flying from the topmasts of but 98 ships, that in all the ports of the United Kingdom our flag flying from the mast of a ship could be counted but 88 times, while in the ports of Hawaii it floated gracefully in the trade winds from the mainmasts of 191 vessels.

THE NEED OF A STRONG ARM.

The whole trend of trade, of law, of government, and of thought is American. The President of the Republic, who is a type of the men responsible for this wonderful growth, is a native of Hawaii and the son of two Maine missionaries, who went to the Sandwich Islands in the early decades of the century to aid in the work of civilization. For the last five years these people have desired to fly our flag, to give us their sovereignty, to accept our laws, and to obey our commands; but they can not continue this invitation forever.

The need of some strong arm to uphold them is apparent. With the eyes of Japan fixed in deadly fascination upon their country, backed by its new life born of successful war, by its powerful navy sweeping in broadening circles about their domain, by its modern steel guns ranged upon their one great city, and, worse than all, by its commercial element already settled in position to compete with and gradually destroy its merchants, these people are compelled to come to us or to go elsewhere to prevent being swallowed up by the Orient.

ENGLAND WILLING TO TAKE THEM.

Where else can they go? It is an open secret that England, like Barkis, is perfectly willing. Under the English flag their property, their civilization, their laws, everything they hold dear and wish to conserve, will be entirely secure. No oriental or other power ever treads on that flag. Once under its folds, Hawaii would form a part of the great Anglo-Saxon community growing

up in the Pacific Ocean. Australia, larger than the United States if we except Alaska, with its wonderful resources, developed and undeveloped, stops the flow of two oceans under the Southern Cross. To the north and east a whole fleet of islands, marshaled as if for war, are flying the same flag and controlled by the same world-inspiring, progress-making people. Between that fleet of islands and British America is Hawaii, affording the only port between Asia and America where a ton of coal or a barrel of water can be obtained.

Would England reject this Gibraltar of the Pacific? Not while the spirit of commerce guides the statesmen who define her policy throughout the world and the keen eye of its admiralty office conserves her interests by providing in times of peace greater security and advantage for times of war.

THE MONROE DOCTRINE.

The question, therefore, presents itself, Shall America or England accept the invitation of this Anglo-Saxon blood that is holding Hawaii to-day against the progressive, commercial, and national spirit which dominates this New World power that is projected into the domain of international politics?

For more than fifty years we have maintained that these islands are more nearly related to us than to any other nation and that no power should take possession of or control them. In 1842 Mr. Webster, then Secretary of State, in replying to the application of the Hawaiian Government for recognition, wrote as follows:

The President is of opinion that the interests of all the commercial nations require that that Government (Hawaii) shall not be interfered with by foreign powers. The United States are more interested in the fate of the islands and of their Government than any other nation can be, and this consideration induces the President to be quite willing to declare, as the sense of the Government of the United States, that the Government of the Sandwich Islands must not be interfered with as a conquest or for the purpose of colonization, and that no power ought to seek for any undue control over the existing Government or any exclusive privileges or preferences in matters of commerce.

In 1843, after England had seized the islands, Mr. Legare, then Secretary of State under President Polk, wrote the United States minister at London as follows:

It is well known that we have no wish to plant or to acquire colonies abroad. Yet there is something so entirely peculiar in the relations between this little Commonwealth, Hawaii, and ourselves that we might even feel justified, consistently with our own principles, in interfering by force to prevent its falling into the hands of one of the great powers of Europe. These relations spring out of the local situation, the history and the character and institutions of the Hawaiian Islands, as well as out of the declarations formally made by this Government during the course of the last session of Congress, to which I beg leave to call your particular attention.

If the attempts now making by ourselves as well as other Christian powers to open the markets of China to a more general commerce be successful, there can be no doubt but that a great part of that commerce will find its way over the isthmus. In that event it will be impossible to overrate the importance of the Hawaiian group as a stage in the long voyage between Asia and America. But without anticipating events which, however, seem inevitable and even approaching, the actual demands of an immense navigation make the free use of these roadsteads and ports indispensable to us. It seems doubtful whether even the undisputed possession of the Oregon Territory and the use of the Columbia River, or indeed anything short of the acquisition of California (if that were possible), would be sufficient indemnity to us for the loss of these harbors.

In 1849, when the French showed a disposition hostile to the Hawaiian Government, Mr. Buchanan, then Secretary of State, sent the following dispatch to the United States minister resident at Honolulu:

We ardently desire that the Hawaiian Islands may maintain their independence. It would be highly injurious to our interests if, tempted by their weakness, they should be seized by Great Britain or France; more especially so since our recent acquisitions from Mexico on the Pacific Ocean.

Again, in 1850, Secretary of State Clayton, and later, in 1851, Mr. Webster addressed the United States minister at Paris, their language having no uncertain meaning. Mr. Webster, referring to the further demands against Hawaii, said:

A step like this could not fail to be viewed by the Government and people of the United States with a dissatisfaction which would tend seriously to disturb our existing friendly relations with the French Government.

A few months later, upon hearing that the French still threatened Hawaii, Mr. Webster wrote as follows to the American consul at Honolulu:

I trust the French will not take possession; but if they do, they will be dislodged, if my advice is taken, if the whole power of the Government is required to do it.

From that day to this our Government has maintained the same position respecting these islands, and are we now to be told that we do not wish to increase our Navy to defend them, or our appropriations to fortify them? That in order to avoid entangling alliances with other countries we must refuse to make Hawaii a part of our territory? Is it no longer true, as Mr. Webster said, that "the United States are more interested in the fate of the islands and of their Government than any other nation can be?" Was Secretary Legare wrong when he said that "it will be impossible to overrate the importance of the Hawaiian group as a stage in the long voyage between Asia and America?"

Shall it be said that Secretary Clayton was misinformed when he proclaimed the fact that "the situation of the Sandwich Islands in respect to our possessions on the Pacific and the commercial bonds between them and the United States are such that we could never with indifference allow them to pass under the domination or exclusive control of any other power"? The great Secretary of State under President Fillmore believed "the Hawaiian Islands are ten times nearer to the United States than to any of the powers of Europe. Five-sixths of all their commercial intercourse is with the United States, and these considerations have fixed the course which the Government of the United States will pursue in regard to them."

Are these statesmanlike views less true to-day than in 1851? Shall the fears of the gentleman from Indiana "that Hawaii will be a source of irritation for all time to come;" that it may cost us something to fortify and protect it; that because it is not contiguous to our territory and its inhabitants are not homogeneous—shall such and similar fears overturn the sentiments of our greatest statesmen and change the policy of our Government that has been adhered to for more than half a century?

HAWAII NEVER BEFORE OFFERED US.

The gentleman from Indiana was misinformed when he asserted several weeks ago that in 1853 these islands were offered to us for the mere acceptance of them and that the statesmanship of that day was sensible and patriotic enough to respectfully decline them. In August, 1853, and again in January, 1854, petitions in favor of annexation to the United States were presented to the King, and, although opposed by the missionaries and many others, the King, disheartened by the demands of foreign powers, by threats of filibusters and by conspirators at home, commanded Mr. Wyllie, his secretary of state, to ascertain on what terms a treaty of annexation could be negotiated. Acting under instructions from Mr. Marcy, our minister, Mr. Gregg completed such a treaty on August 7, 1854, but the King's death occurred before he had concluded his consideration of it, and his successor refused to ratify it. This closed all negotiations between the two countries until July 20, 1865, when a treaty of reciprocity was concluded.

AMERICA WILL NEVER CONSENT TO ENGLAND'S CONTROL.

But what do gentlemen say to the proposition that these islands, being refused by us, shall pass, upon the invitation of the Hawaiian Government, under the control of England? Would they have the United States play the part of "the dog in the manger?" Shall we decline annexation and disallow the great, protecting Anglo-Saxon arm of England to take them within her embrace? If, as gentlemen say, we do not wish to increase our Navy to defend them or our appropriations to fortify them; if their trade and their strategic position are of less value to us than the money it might cost to uphold them, why longer consider them within the Monroe doctrine?

If our view of their value has changed since the days of Webster and Marcy and Legare; if in 1831 Mr. Blaine was wrong in his statement that "the situation of the Hawaiian Islands, giving them strategic control of the North Pacific, brings their possession within the range of questions of purely American policy, as much so as that of the Isthmus itself;" if everything that has been said and done respecting these islands for half a century is wrong, then why care who owns them or controls them?

But let me say to the gentlemen that this country will never consent that the great statesmen of the past were wrong. Whatever be the cost of defending them, whatever be the fears of entangling foreign alliances, whatever be the character of their population, their distance from the Pacific coast, or the undesirability of further annexation of territory, the people of the United States will never willingly allow England or any other country to possess or control Hawaii.

THE PEOPLE FRIENDLY TO ANNEXATION.

I can not credit the statement that the people of Hawaii are opposed to annexation. They favored it in 1854, but their King refused to ratify the treaty. In 1867 Secretary Seward feared that the reciprocity treaty would be actively opposed on the ground that it would "hinder and defeat an early annexation, to which the people of the Sandwich Islands are supposed to be now strongly inclined." "Annexation," continued the great War Secretary of State, "is in every case to be preferred to reciprocity." Secretary Fish and Mr. Blaine, although more guarded, perhaps, in their language, were of the same opinion.

The "monster petition" opposing annexation to which reference has been made is neither representative nor honest. It is well understood that it was prepared by the immediate followers of the late Queen; that the methods employed to obtain it were not of a high character, and that what it purports to show is untrue and unfounded. That the native Hawaiians, as well as half-breeds, are as friendly to annexation as the Germans, Scandinavians, and

Anglo-Saxons is well understood by those who have been in position, official and otherwise, to know the true feeling that obtains upon those islands.

ITS TERRITORY NOT CONTIGUOUS.

Mr. Speaker, I do not reject annexation because Hawaii is not contiguous. Alaska is not contiguous; the Aleutian Islands are not contiguous; Midway Island, 1,200 miles west of Honolulu, which we annexed in 1867, and for the development of which we appropriated \$50,000, is not contiguous territory. When we annexed Louisiana, it was farther away from our seat of government than Hawaii is to-day.

True, it was contiguous by land as Alaska is, but no one in 1803 went to New Orleans by land any more than they now go to Alaska by an overland route. England is 2,800 miles from New York, but no one thinks of it being farther away or more difficult to reach than San Francisco. Water plowed by the modern steamship is no more of a barrier than land traversed by a modern railroad train. In the days of Rome's greatness it was easier to reach Alexandria or Athens or Carthage than to cross into the contiguous territory of the Gauls. It was by land, too, let us remember, that the peoples came who finally conquered Rome.

CHARACTER OF THE HAWAIIAN PEOPLE.

But the principal objection to annexation seems to be its people. The entire population of these islands is less in number than the number that sometimes passes through the gates of Castle Garden in a single month; but among them all there is not a beggar, a pauper, or a tramp. A prison may be necessary, but not a poor-house. Their producing capacity per capita is larger than in any other nation of the world. School attendance is compulsory, and instead of ignorance being the general rule and intelligence the exception, as the gentleman from Indiana charges, outside of the Japanese and Chinese, ignorance is said to be the exception and intelligence the general rule.

The gentleman admits as much when he affirms that "a monster petition has been presented by two-thirds of the native inhabitants of that island." Ignorance does not sign and present petitions upon any subject, and when two-thirds of 30,000 people can thus make themselves heard and felt, they are not to be classified or compared, as the gentleman from Indiana would have us believe, with "the ignorance, the pauperism, and the crime of the Old World," such as are excluded from our shores by a recent act of Congress.

The Chinese rushed into Hawaii when California was being filled by three times as many Orientals; but a country which under better conditions will be able to support 1,000,000, instead of 100,000 population, as now, need not fear 21,000 Chinese. The State of California, with 1,200,000 people, has no fear of its 72,000 Asiatics. In ten years, from 1880 to 1890, this class of its population fell off over 3,000.

There is no reason to believe that the Chinese of Hawaii will form an exception, for they are there only to accumulate, anxiously looking forward to the day when, having a few hundred dollars, the steamer shall return them to their own people and homes. Within ten years after the sources of supply are cut off as effectually as in the United States the Orientals of Hawaii will be found infrequently, and then only washing the dirty linen of a superior and more prosperous people.

CHARACTER OF PEOPLE FORMERLY ANNEXED BY THE UNITED STATES.

Mr. Speaker, what has been the character of the people heretofore annexed? We purchased the province of Louisiana in 1803; Spain ceded Florida in 1819; Texas was annexed in 1846; the great territory of Utah, Arizona, and California was ceded by Mexico in 1848; the Gadsden purchase was consummated in 1853, and Alaska came to us in 1867; yet not one of these cessions brought a homogeneous or desirable people. Louisiana had a few thousand Frenchmen and a few hundred thousand Indians. The population of Florida was composed of Spaniards and Indians. Texas added only Mexicans to more Spanish and Indians. With the exception of a few Americans and some Spanish priests, the cession of California brought us nothing but more Mexicans and Indians. The Gadsden purchase increased this number, while Alaska enriched us with several hundred Russians and 40,000 Arctic Indians. Undesirable as these people were, the country survives, and no one to-day would part with an inch of territory so acquired.

NO DANGER FROM LEPROSY.

But from these acquisitions we got no leprosy, I hear it said. No, but we got the yellow-fever scourge, which, under the wiser treatment and conditions of these latter days, is gradually disappearing. Under similar wise treatment and segregation now in force in Hawaii, no one sees leprosy or thinks of it, or is in danger from it. Like the leprosy of Egypt, one must inquire where it is and seek it out if he would see it. Such a reason is unworthy serious consideration.

INFLUENCE OF AMERICAN CIVILIZATION.

Mr. Speaker, excluding the Chinese and Japanese, who, as I have shown, will gradually disappear of their own volition, there are about 60,000 people—men, women, and children—in Hawaii. Of these, 39,000 are native and half-breed Hawaiians—a race which, it is claimed by the opponents of annexation, is dying out. The remaining 21,000 are Anglo-Saxon, Germans, Scandinavians, and Portuguese, such people as are scattered all over our country, with whom we are familiar, to whom we do not object, and among whom we live and associate, without a thought that they are not homogeneous or desirable.

Among these 60,000 people there are to-day 195 schools in which only English is studied, and 14,000 pupils, taught by 426 teachers, receiving an average salary of \$626 per year, 46.5 per cent of whom are Americans and 26.5 are Hawaiians and part Hawaiians. Of the pupils 56.5 per cent are Hawaiians and 25 per cent Portuguese.

In 1897 the total number of children of school age (6 to 15 years) was 14,286, of whom 96.20 per cent were in school. Of the total Hawaiian population above 6 years of age, 85.28 per cent can read and write.

It is a mistake the gentleman from Indiana makes when he says these people "have not been educated as we have; that they have not our habits of thought." For seventy years they have been living under the influences of American civilization. They speak and study our language; the Stars and Stripes are as familiar as their own flag; their laws are copied from those of the United States; their rulers, whether under the Crown or the Republic, have been largely of American birth or ancestry; they know and see only United States money; the English is the language of their courts and of the educated classes, and among their holidays are the Fourth of July, Decoration Day, and Washington's and Lincoln's birthdays. Outside of the United States there is no people so American, so closely allied with our institutions, and so well acquainted with our history and our life.

In eighty years we have absorbed more than 40,000,000 foreigners, and the mixture of these races has developed a people which stands out in the world's history as the most intelligent, the most inventive, the most prosperous, and the best equipped for war or peace; a people which the world calls "American," as distinctive and homogeneous, as loyal and patriotic, as proud and as resentful of insult to their country's honor as is the Englishman or German or Frenchman. Some may not read and speak the language as readily as others; the glorious history of the past, the shaded lines between State and Federal Government, and the relation of liberty and license may not be known with equal clearness to all; but the flag is recognized, the law is respected, the school is attended, and the peace is kept better than in any other country on the globe.

Mr. HITT. I do not see the gentleman from Arkansas on the floor, but the arrangement is that he is to yield to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CLARK].

Mr. DINSMORE. I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CLARK].

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I this day speak for the integrity, the honor, the perpetuity of the American Republic.

"Hear me for my cause," your cause, our country's cause, the cause of representative government—aye, the cause of humanity itself.

GRAVITY OF THE SUBJECT.

Since that fateful shot was fired at Sumter, which was heard round the world, a greater question has not been debated in the American Congress.

No such privileges, opportunities, and immunities as ours have ever been vouchsafed to any other of the children of men.

Into our keeping has been committed the ark of the covenant of human liberty. To preserve it free from contamination, not only for ourselves but for all peoples and kindred and tongues, is the stupendous task set by the fathers for our accomplishment. We can not, we will not, we must not, we dare not, prove recreant to this momentous trust.

Should we shrink from our high destiny, should we shirk this paramount duty to our country and our kind, should we wantonly or foolishly jeopardize our birthright of freedom bought with the treasure, the suffering, the heroism, the blood, and the lives of our Revolutionary sires, we will not only receive but will richly deserve the execration of our posterity and of the world till the last syllable of recorded time.

Job's momentous question, "If a man die shall he live again?" has been answered in the affirmative with practical unanimity by all wearing the human form divine except "the fool who hath said in his heart, 'there is no God.'"

But to that other important query, "If a nation die shall it live again?" the history of our race for six thousand years gives for response a melancholy but emphatic "No!"

Annexationists appear to labor under the delusion that in the twinkling of an eye any sort of a human being, no matter how

ignorant, vicious, or degraded, can be made worthy of American citizenship by a simple act of Congress. Not so, however. Fitness for that exalted privilege can be obtained only by having the right sort of natural qualifications to build on and then by being educated for centuries in the hard school of experience.

Confidence is said to be a plant of slow growth. So is human liberty. It is marvelous to remember at what a snail's pace, with what painful steps, we have advanced from barbarism to self-government.

It is precisely a thousand years since Alfred the Great died; yet he is universally recognized as one of the founders of our system of jurisprudence and one of the authors of our freedom. But back of him, extending to the dawn of civilization in the woods of Germany, were thousands of humbler friends of liberty working with feeble lights, but with stout hearts, whose very names have perished from the memory of the living.

Magna Charta, Trial by Jury, the Bill of Rights, the Petition of Right, the Long Parliament, the Commonwealth, the Revolution of 1688, the Right of the Writ of Habeas Corpus, the American Revolution, the Declaration of Independence, the old Articles of Confederation, the Constitution of the United States—these are only the luminous mileposts on the long, tedious, hazardous, and triumphal road by which we have traveled to the proud position which we occupy this hour.

All the aspirations, all the efforts, all the sacrifices of all the English-speaking patriots who have lived and wrought and fought and bled and died in the sacred cause of liberty since the unlettered barons wrenched the Great Charter from the feeble hands of Craven John at Runnymede have found their perfect consummation in the American Republic.

That we might be free great Oliver charged the feudal lords of Britain at Naseby, Marston Moor, and Dunbar, beheaded the King in front of his own banqueting house, and made royalty throughout the ends of the earth tremble at the mere mention of his name.

For us John Hampden died at Chalgrove, John Milton was reduced to beggary, and Algernon Sidney went to ignominious death upon the scaffold.

To secure this fair heritage the elder Pitt wore away his mighty energies and Wolfe ascended to immortal glory from the Plains of Abraham.

For us English lovers of freedom had their ears cut off, their noses slit, were attainted, whipped at the cart's tail, transported, broken on the wheel, burned at the stake, hanged upon the gibbet, buried at the crossroads with stakes driven through their bodies, and had their rotting heads exhibited on every castle wall throughout the three Kingdoms.

To establish representative government our Revolutionary fathers endured untold hardships through seven long, weary, bloody, terrible years of war, and the doubt and gloom of seven more terrible years of peace.

The heads of the men who in Europe and America have given up their lives that we might enjoy the inestimable blessings of freedom would form a pyramid of skulls far loftier than that erected by Tamerlane upon the plains of Asia.

Our institutions have indeed been purchased with a very great price; and yet we are about to imperil them by entering upon a vainglorious policy of imperial aggrandizement, gorgeous in appearance, but surely fatal in its effect, or all history is a lie.

WHY TERRITORIAL EXPANSION?

Why do we desire to expand our territory? It is too large already. You know, Mr. Speaker, with your long service here and your keen powers of observation, that from the beginning of things—ab urbe condita—the most perplexing questions of legislation, of government, and of politics have grown out of our abnormal size. The largeness of our territory, our wide diversity of soil, climate, employment, and interest, have always been the stumbling blocks to perfect unity. On this rock—when our area was insignificant compared with what it is now—the constitutional convention of 1787, with George Washington at its head, came near going to pieces. These things caused the most titanic civil war that the world ever saw, which raged with insatiable fury until this Republic became another Rachel weeping for her children and refusing to be comforted because they were not. These things divide us here now into warring factions, for, loath as we are to admit it, our political differences are in the main founded on issues purely sectional or local.

Vastness of area, wealth of resources, variety of climate, abundance of navigable waters, multitudes of population—these alone are not all the necessary constituent elements from which a great, free, and enduring government must be builded.

Russia has all these galore, and yet she is the veriest despotism on which the sun looks down.

The Austrian Empire possesses these in an extraordinary degree; nevertheless she presents this moment to the astonished gaze of men only a dissolving view, and is held together solely by the

personal influence of her Emperor, the venerable and well-beloved Francis Joseph.

Ages ago Sir William Jones stated the question and gave the answer in immortal verse:

What constitutes a state?
Not high-raised battlement or labour'd mound,
Thick wall or moated gate;
Not cities proud with spires and turrets crown'd;
Not bays and broad-arm'd ports,
Where, laughing at the storm, rich navies ride;
Not starr'd and spangled courts,
Where low-brow'd baseness wafts perfume to pride
No! Men—high-minded men—
With pow'rs as far above dull brutes endued
In forest, brake, or den,
As beasts excel cold rocks and brambles rude;
Men who their duties know,
But know their rights, and, knowing, dare maintain;
Prevent the long-aim'd blow
And crush the tyrant while they rend the chain.
These constitute a state;
And sovereign law, that state's collected will,
O'er thrones and globes elate,
Sits empress, crowning good, repressing ill.

CUI BONO?

What shall it profit us, even temporarily, to do this thing? The annexationists draw a picture of these islands in rosy hues, and tell a dulcet story of the free homesteads awaiting us in that tropical region. We are to get the crown lands in return for this four millions we are now appropriating and for the other countless millions which we will expend in the future. As a matter of fact, the crown lands are absolutely worthless. Rest assured that the sugar barons have already secured titles to every foot of land of any value. The free homesteads to be carved out of the crown lands are a fake, pure and simple. All the crown lands which will ever be opened to homestead entry are too dry to till without irrigation and so high up in the air that irrigation is impossible.

Even if there are valuable crown lands which have never been broken to the plow and fertilized by water, they are not for our children and other white people of our breed, for the all-sufficient reason that they can not endure outdoor work in that sultry climate. More farming lands there simply mean more Chinese cheap labor, more Chinese contract labor, more Chinese and Japanese slave labor, brought into our country to compete with our free white labor. Such an outrageous and iniquitous performance is forbidden by good morals, as well as by an exalted love of country.

But the annexationists have their plan like the nigger's coon trap, "set to catch 'em gwine and comin'."

They at first gave it out that the reason we needed the islands was that we could then grow for ourselves all the sugar we wanted, representing that the cane-sugar industry out there was only in its infancy, and could be increased ad libitum. That statement so alarmed the sugar-beet enthusiasts that they howled so loud that the annexationists hauled in their horns on the sugar question and declared that they had been mistaken about that, and that what we really needed the islands for was to raise our own coffee, so that neither Spain nor any other nation could prevent us from having an abundance of that delightful tippie.

Within the last few days the nimble advocates of annexation have abandoned both sugar and coffee as reasons and have found a brand new one—Comodore Dewey's splendid victory at Manila! Since he performed that immortal deed without our owning these islands, they say that it is absolutely necessary for us to buy them in order that we may send reinforcements to him. Suppose Dewey had lost that battle; what then? Do you not know that the annexationists would have been yelling at the top of their voices that we need these islands because of his defeat?

Now, if his great victory proves anything at all about these islands, it is that we have no earthly use for them, for he could not have done any better if we had owned all the islands in all the seas. [Applause.]

We are told that we need these islands as a strategic base in military operations. All the admirals, rear-admirals, commodores, generals, colonels, majors, and captains say so. How does it happen, then, that we have gotten along splendidly for one hundred and nine years without these volcanic rocks? If we did not need them when we were only three millions strong, or only ten, twenty, thirty, forty, fifty, or sixty millions strong, why are we likely to perish for want of them now that our census would show 75,000,000 souls? Some of the learned Thebans will do well to address themselves to that question. Have we grown weaker as we have multiplied in population? Certainly no jingo will have the hardihood to maintain a proposition so preposterous. And yet that is precisely the conclusion to which their logic inevitably leads—which is the reductio ad absurdum.

But we had before the Committee on Foreign Affairs certain illustrious witnesses to testify in favor of annexation, to enlighten the beclouded intellects of the minority, and to convert us from plain patriotism to wild jingoism. Among others was Lieut. Gen.

John M. Schofield. Part of his evidence appeared in the public press after it was edited carefully by some expert annexationist. By one of those curious coincidences that sometimes appear in human affairs the only portion of the General's evidence that was of any consequence or which could throw any light on the subject was eliminated from the press report. It was this, that on the entire coast of the Sandwich Islands there is but one harbor valuable for military or naval purposes or susceptible of being fortified. That is Pearl Harbor, and we already have that. So General Schofield, once commander of the American Army, testified, and he testified from personal observation and information. What does this prove? It knocks the bottom clear out of the annexation scheme; it demonstrates that we do not need them even for strategic purposes, for, having Pearl Harbor, we possess all that portion of the islands that we need for strategic, military, or naval purposes without polluting and weakening our system of government by taking to our bosom a horde of Asiatic savages. Why, then, run the awful risk of beginning a policy of imperial aggrandizement and territorial expansion of which no prophet, not even General GROSVENOR, can see the end or foretell the evil?

General I will go as far as any man here or elsewhere in doing all those things necessary to the defense of my country. I permit no man to excel me in patriotism; but I am unwilling to do an unnecessary thing, a dangerous thing, which is proved to be unnecessary by a witness produced to testify in its behalf.

What is our patriotic duty, then? It is as clear as the noonday sun shining in a cloudless sky, and it is this: To hold Pearl Harbor and fortify it to the utmost, even until it is as strong as Gibraltar, if that be possible. That is the part of patriotism and of wisdom. That removes all the dangers to our institutions. I am willing to vote every dollar necessary for that great work; and the fact that gentlemen will not accept that solution of the question is proof positive that their intention is to make the annexation of these islands the beginning of a general and extensive policy of territorial expansion.

And I warn gentlemen who solemnly aver that they are opposed to the policy of imperial aggrandizement, and yet who advocate this senseless scheme, that when some party in the days to come shall openly declare the whole programme they will be estopped by this week's work from objecting. Now is the accepted time for killing this thing. This is the day of salvation.

MUST HAVE AN ISLAND.

We are told that we must have an island or we must perish. The jingoes here are as much fascinated by the prospect of having an island as was Sancho Panza. [Laughter.] It was his vision by day and his dream by night, and it brought him nothing but misfortune and unrest. Why this sudden and urgent necessity for an island?

It is said that we need it in case of foreign war, especially in case of a war with a great naval power. Is that true or not? Will we never learn anything from experience? How stands the record? We have waged three foreign wars, and come off victors in every one of them, without an island. In two of them we defeated England, the greatest sea power of the world, without an island to our name—once when we were only 3,000,000 strong, and again when we could muster only 12,000,000 men, women, and children, counting the slaves. The strangest part of this glorious history is that the ocean was the very place where we thrashed England the most soundly—without an island. Indeed, had it not been for our victories upon the water and for that matchless achievement of the Iron Soldier of the Hermitage at Chalmette, we would not have been in strictly prime condition for crowing over the war of 1812.

Reflections upon Hull's surrender and the vandal burning of this Capitol and the White House are not conducive to a heavenly frame of mind even at this late date. "A horse! A horse! My kingdom for a horse!" was Hunchback Richard's cry on Bosworth Field. That certainly was a good stiff price for a charger, but our jingoes are willing to pay a greater price for an island. They are willing to let the Trojan horse into the citadel of our safety. An island is necessary in a time of war, is it? It is a fine thing old Andrew Jackson did not know that, or he might have retreated up the Mississippi and left Pakenham's troops to enjoy at their leisure "the booty and the beauty of New Orleans." I have a question which I wish to ask the mathematical jingo solely for information. If with a handful of raw militia Andrew Jackson in one hour killed 2,600 English soldiers—the picked veterans of the peninsula—with a loss of only 7 killed and 8 wounded, without an island, what in heaven's name would he have done to them if he had only had an island? [Laughter and applause.]

AS TO SAGEBRUSH STATES.

There constantly ascends to heaven an ear-splitting, heartrending, and ridiculous wail from our Eastern brethren as to the evils of sagebrush States and the sins of sagebrush statesmen, as though a robust patriotism could not flourish as well in Cripple Creek as on Beacon street, upon the Great Plains as well as on Wall street,

within the shadow of Pikes Peak as well as in sight of Bunker Hill Monument, upon the Snake River as well as on Narragansett Bay. [Applause.]

According to the solar-walk and milky-way statesmen of the East [laughter] it is a crime against liberty, especially against the Manhattanese, that fifty or one hundred thousand pioneer Americans, brave, sober, industrious State builders, who conquered the wilderness with a rifle in one hand and an ax in the other, in Nevada, Utah, Idaho, Wyoming, or Montana, should have as much representation in the Senate of the United States as five or six million New Yorkers. They gnaw a file with deafening racket about this all the time, forgetful that equal representation in the Senate was one of the compromises without which there could have been no Constitution and no Union.

In their arrogant ignorance they have even clamored for an act of Congress or a constitutional amendment depriving Nevada and other nascent Commonwealths in the Rocky Mountain region of their equal representation in the Senate, oblivious of the insuperable obstacle that the Constitution itself provides that no State can be deprived of its equal representation in the Senate without its own consent, which, of course, can never be obtained, for, whatever else may be said of the Rocky Mountaineers, they are not natural-born fools.

The plain, unvarnished truth is that the proposition to diminish the Senatorial representation of these States is nothing but a scheme to punish them for not voting the goldbug ticket. [Applause.]

Evil inventions sometimes return to plague the inventors. Several of these States were admitted for the sole purpose of perpetuating Republican ascendancy in the Senate and in the Electoral College. Now that they have sense enough to vote their own interests, very much to the amazement of their godfathers, the wise men of the East must grin and bear it with what patience they can muster. [Applause.]

There are four more Territories which we Southwesterners are anxious to bring within the sisterhood of States—Arizona, New Mexico, Oklahoma, and Indianola. They are kept out now—most unjustly because they are liable to vote the Democratic ticket and corksore to vote for the free and unlimited coinage of gold and silver at the ratio of 16 to 1.

For fifty years New Mexico has been knocking at the doors of Congress, asking for statehood, and she is still cooling her heels on the outside, notwithstanding the fact that she possesses all the constitutional qualifications, having a population greater than that of Nevada, Idaho, Montana, Utah, or Delaware.

The population in the mountain States is sparse. That much is true. But they are American citizens of the bravest, thriftiest, most industrious, most adventurous, and most patriotic sort. After these hardy pioneers have builded cities, constructed railroads, erected churches and schoolhouses, digged canals, bridged the streams, and made that region a more delectable place for human habitation, Easterners will pour in, and amid the grandeur of the Rocky Mountains will calmly go to celebrating the landing of the Mayflower. [Laughter and applause.]

What shall we think of the consistency of people who denounce these young mountain Commonwealths as sage brush and rotten borough States, unfit to touch the immaculate skirts of prim, precise Massachusetts or to kiss the hem of the gorgeous garments of her imperial highness New York, and in the same breath propose to admit Hawaii, which is removed by 2,500 miles of ocean from our borders and whose mongrel population consists of Hawaiians (pure and mixed), 39,504; Japanese, 25,407; Chinese, 21,616; Portuguese, 15,291; British, 2,250; Germans, 1,432; Americans, 3,080, including the largest and most repulsive collection of lepers beneath the sun?

O judgment! thou art fled to brutish beasts,
And men have lost their reason!

[Applause.]

THE REASONS WHY.

Why is this monstrous proposition made? Let us be plain and state the truth though it shame the devil. This crime against free government is to be committed for three reasons:

1. Because some \$5,000,000 of Hawaiian bonds have been sold in this country at about 30 cents on the dollar. We are asked to guarantee the payment of four millions of these bonds. The moment we annex the islands those bonds will soar to par and certain favored patriots possessed of inside information will reap a profit of 70 cents for every 30 cents invested, making a total of three and one-half millions—a very comfortable nest egg to have in the family.

2. There is a pressing necessity for two rotten borough Senators to eke out the single gold-standard majority at the other end of the Capitol.

3. But, above all, William McKinley will have sore need for the three electoral votes of Hawaii in the melancholy days of November in 1900, when he again faces at the polls the great tribune of the people, William Jennings Bryan, of Nebraska. [Applause.]

For these base and forbidden ends we are asked to do an act which will jeopardize the American Republic.

Mr. Speaker, ever since we could read, you and I and all of us, in our self-gratulations upon the success of our experiment in representative government, have held up to the scornful gaze of men the farcical elections in Old Sarum, Pocket, Breeches, and other rotten English boroughs. But should we do this foolish, this wicked thing, Johnnie Bull, dull as he is in matters of wit and humor, will have the joke on us and will make us the perpetual butt for his ridicule. The half dozen voters at Old Sarum were not a lot of nondescript Asiatico-Polynesian ignoramuses, but were Englishmen, habituated to representative government, whose fathers fought at Hastings, at Crécy, and at Agincourt. They belonged to that great Teutonic stock, the imperial race of the world, which for nineteen hundred years has gone forth conquering and to conquer, governing and to govern. But how can we justify either to ourselves or to our posterity the act we are about to commit? How can we endure our shame when a Chinese Senator from Hawaii, with his pigtail hanging down his back, with his pagan joss in his hand, shall rise from his curule chair and in pigeon English proceed to chop logic with GEORGE FRISBIE HOAR or HENRY CABOT LODGE? O tempora! O mores! [Laughter and applause.]

Then will true patriots—the descendants of the Pilgrims—hide their diminished heads and in agony of soul exclaim in the language of Truthful James on a celebrated occasion:

Do I sleep? Do I dream?
Do I wonder and doubt?
Are things what they seem,
Or is visions about?
Is our civilization a failure,
Or is the Caucasian played out?

[Laughter and applause.]

FIGHT FOR CHINESE EXCLUSION.

For more than a quarter of a century a persistent fight has been waged by the denizens of the Pacific Slope against the sublimated humanitarianism of the East to exclude Chinese immigrants from our shores. When in the Fifty-third Congress we passed a bill requiring every almond-eyed disciple of Confucius domiciled in the United States to file his photograph and the mold of his thumb—not as works of art or souvenirs of affection, but as evidences of good faith—for purposes of identification when about to revisit his native land, we supposed that we had finally settled the difficulty; but we are now coolly invited to stultify ourselves and undo the labor of many years by an act which will in one moment admit more Chinese into this country than the Chinese Six Companies of San Francisco would have imported in fifty years.

I press these questions home upon your minds and consciences: Are we ready to admit Chinese to citizenship? Are we willing that they shall have a voice in our affairs? Do we propose deliberately and absolutely without provocation to take that reckless leap into the dark? Do not a great many people believe that we have already gone too far in the attempt to assimilate all the peoples of the earth? Is not this question constantly asked: Is the American Republic endowed with the stomach of an ostrich that there is no limit to its digestive powers? Is there not a large, insistent, and growing sentiment in this country in favor of restricting even white immigration to the able-bodied, the virtuous, the intelligent?

We might as well look these questions squarely and courageously in the face. We can not shunt them out of the way. They will not down at our bidding or for our convenience.

A Chinaman never can be fit for American citizenship. His color, his diet, his mental conformation, his habits of thought, his methods of conduct, his style of living, his ideas of government, his theory of the domestic relations, his code of morals, his religion, his passiveness in servitude, his ultra conservatism, his manners, his amusements, the very fashion of his dress, are radically un-American. In all these he is thoroughly incorrigible. His ways are not our ways. He is among us, but not of us. What he was when the Great Wall was a-building he is now while William of Hohenzollern is incorporating him *vi et armis* into his body politic. He changes his allegiance (or, speaking more accurately, his allegiance is changed for him) from the Emperor of China to the Emperor of Germany with a sangfroid that is amazing, and with a smile that is childlike and bland. Empires may fall, empires may rise, empires may be sliced up, dismembered, atomized—the Yellow Sea may be reddened with the blood of his countrymen—he cares not. He holds his peace. He keeps the even tenor of his way. And what he is now he will be in the last day—suave, stolid, imperturbable, indefatigable, unpatriotic.

But one thing he does to perfection—he accumulates money. Having money, he must be taxed. Taxation and representation go together. That proposition was the essence of that historic preamble for which our Revolutionary fathers flung their gage of battle at the feet of the haughty son of a hundred kings. If the Chinese go on increasing in this country and we continue to tax

them, we must, as a vindication of the patriots who performed the immortal tea act in Boston Harbor, let them vote. Indeed, a Federal judge in Oregon naturalized one the other day. To do that habitually is surely to write the epitaph of free government on this continent; for at the last census there were 550,000,000 people in the Chinese Empire—perhaps they number 700,000,000 by this time—and the Emperor could send 100,000,000 of his subjects to this country and never miss them. Naturalized here, they could outvote us, underbid us in all work, secure all the contracts, get all our money, and run things generally.

Could old Ben Franklin return to us in the flesh, he would propound to us this question: "Gentlemen, are you not paying too much for the little Hawaiian whistle?"

How does the prospect of heathen Chinese domination suit you philosophers, statesmen, and jingoes?

'Tis but the same rehearsal of the past,
First freedom, then glory; when that fails,
Wealth, vice, corruption—barbarism at last.

But we will be told that it will be made unlawful for Hawaiian Chinese to come to America. Believe them not. It can not be done. The American Congress on a historic occasion by a superhuman effort solemnly enacted that it could not be done. I plant myself on the doctrine of stare decisis and declare that we must not violate the precedents of nearly a hundred years. History repeats itself with startling accuracy. The pioneer Missouri State makers, though in their honored graves, are avenged at last. They placed a clause in their first constitution prohibiting free persons of color from coming from other States and settling in that imperial Commonwealth.

But north of Mason and Dixon's Line,

At once there rose so wild a yell,
As all the fiends from heaven that fell
Had pealed the banner cry of hell.

Secession was loudly threatened by the Northern contingent in Congress if that clause were not eliminated. For two years Missouri, the richest-dowered Territory that ever knocked at these doors for admission, was kept out, and finally, as a condition precedent to her entrance into the Union, Congress required that her legislature should by solemn ordinance declare that that clause should forever remain a dead letter, and it was so ordained.

Now, after seventy-seven years, in order to smuggle in a few volcanic rocks in mid ocean and to endow the variegated inhabitants thereof with the invaluable privileges and immunities of American citizens—in order to protect them with the old flag and to gladden their hearts with a four million appropriation—this Congress proposes to do the identical thing which it declared it an unpardonable sin for Missouri to do. Missouri did not exclude free persons of color. Neither can Congress keep out the Hawaiian Celestials.

THE DISEASE CONTAGIOUS.

Annexionists with one accord will pooh-pooh the idea of danger to the Republic and will solemnly asseverate that the acquisition of Hawaii does not presage further territorial expansion.

Believe them not, Mr. Speaker. Put not your faith in jingoes. Study that strange and intricate machine, the human heart. Consider the unconquerable Anglo-Saxon lust for land. Revolve in your mind whether greed has ever yet set limits to its possessions. Reflect upon the question whether the rolling snowball grows larger or smaller in its journey down the hill. Gaze on the picture of the Macedonian madman, drunk in the palace of the Babylonish kings, mingling his tears with his wine because there were no more worlds to conquer.

Remember Napoleon's dazzling dream of universal empire, and how he ended dismally, the modern Prometheus bound to the rock of St. Helena with the vulture of ambition preying on his vitals.

Think of the sad plaint of Queen Mary, who so mourned her lost French city as to declare that after death they would find the word "Calais" engraved upon her heart.

Recall the almost incredible story of how Frederick the Great bravely and doggedly waged what to all others seemed a hopeless fight with his multitudinous enemies, during which his fortunes were so desperate and his literary ambition so great that he carried a bottle of corrosive sublimate in one pocket and a ream of his own lame verses in the other, and how at the end of the Seven Years' War all Europe in arms could not wrest Silesia from his iron grasp.

Review the whole history of the human race and tell us how many rulers have ever willingly alienated one foot of land over which they exercised dominion.

There is only one, and he shines forth a bright particular star among the sovereigns of the earth—the Emperor Adrian, who voluntarily relinquished vast territories, thereby setting bounds to the Empire and preserving its life for centuries.

The way to remain sober is to resolutely refuse the first drink. The way to cultivate "peace, commerce, and honest friendship with all nations," which Jefferson enjoined upon us, and to have

"entangling alliances with none," which was part of his creed, and also of Washington's, is to decline this glittering Hawaiian bauble.

All history proves that the passion for acquiring territory grows with what it feeds on.

The man who asserted that his modest desires would be satisfied when he owned all the land which joined his was the typical American.

The moment we go beyond low-water mark, our feet take hold of national death. There is no limit to our foreign acquisitions except our own wisdom and our own moderation, for we are now strong enough to work our will among the nations of the earth.

The proud boast—

No pent-up Utica contracts your powers,
The whole, the boundless continent is yours—

pales into pitiable insignificance beside what we can say and can make good if we conclude to go into the business of imperial aggrandizement. The entire Western Hemisphere and all the islands of the adjacent seas are ours, if we desire to possess them. No human power can stay our arms. Had we been animated by the spirit of universal conquest, the scream of our eagles would long since have resounded amid the Andes and the Cordilleras.

When Robert Lord Clive was impeached for plundering the East Indians of a princely fortune, while admitting that he had appropriated vast sums to his own uses, he exclaimed in a fine burst of indignation: "By God, at this moment I am astonished at my own moderation!"

All land grabbers, big and little, have heretofore been astonished at our moderation, but it has been our strength, our glory, our salvation.

And are we now to reverse the policy of a century—that policy which has made us the wonder of the world?

We are invited to take the first step in that primrose path of dalliance which leads to the eternal bonfire. And where will we stop?

Hawaii is first, then south to Cape Horn, northward to the Pole, westward until the starry banner of the Republic will float in gory triumph over the most ancient capitals of the Orient, eastward to an unceasing and ruinous conflict with all Europe.

No reason can be urged for annexing the Sandwich Islands which will not apply with equal force to the annexation of something else and everything else.

"The Pearl of the Pacific" is the beginning of the end. Then "the Gem of the Antilles," for if we need an island in the Pacific, why not one also in the Atlantic?

Indeed that preeminent twister of the British lion's caudal appendage, Senator HENRY CABOT LODGE, of Nahant [laughter], is not to be satisfied with the one Island of Cuba in the West Indies, so he has introduced a bill to purchase the islands of St. Thomas, St. Croix, and St. John; and many here are talking of annexing Puerto Rico, the Philippines, the Canaries, and the Caroline islands.

The jingo bacillus is indefatigable in its work. Every day or two some prophetic jingo, in the endeavor to excel all his tribe, proposes to annex the five seething, bubbling, eruptive Central American Republics. Jingoism appears to be more contagious than the measles, the smallpox, or the black plague, and let us fervently pray that it will not also prove more fatal. [Applause.]

That eminent publicist, orator, and author, Henry Wattersson, has capped the climax of jingoism by proposing to annex Ireland. Somebody else asked "Marse Henry" why we should squander time and money annexing Ireland when we have already annexed the vast majority of the Irish?

One of my Missouri friends—a preacher in my church at that—

Mr. WALKER of Massachusetts. What church is that?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. The Christian Church, vulgarly called the Campbellite.

Mr. JOHNSON of Indiana. The fact that you are in communication with a preacher shows that antiannexionists are not outside the pale of salvation.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri (continuing). . . Wrote me last week to immortalize myself by proposing in this House to partition Spain, giving the largest slices to France and Portugal, with a piece around Gibraltar to England big enough to keep the British lion from roaring. You jingoes here are mere babes and sucklings beside my reverend brother from Missouri. You need to be fed on strong meat in huge chunks for a long time to bring you up to his exalted standard.

This whole annexation scheme reminds me of a game of cards, about which I know nothing [laughter], but of which I have heard a great deal, called draw poker—which has been solemnly adjudicated by a Nevada court to be a scientific performance and not a game of chance as popularly considered [laughter]—in which one of the most prominent features is "raising" your opponents until you "raise" them clear out of the game. Every jingo appears to be determined to "raise" all others in this bad and desperate game.

If we annex Hawaii and you, Mr. Speaker, should preside here twenty years hence, it may be that you will have a polyglot House and it will be your painful duty to recognize "the gentleman from Patagonia," "the gentleman from Cuba," "the gentleman from Santo Domingo," "the gentleman from Corea," "the gentleman from Hongkong," "the gentleman from Fiji," "the gentleman from Greenland," or, with fear and trembling, "the gentleman from the Cannibal Islands," who will gaze upon you with watering mouth and gleaming teeth. [Great laughter and applause.]

In that stupendous day there will be a new officer within these historic walls, whose title will be "interpreter to the Speaker," for your ears will be assailed by speech in as many discordant voices as were heard at the confusion of tongues on the plain of Shinar at the foot of the unfinished Tower of Babel. [Applause.]

THE ENGLISH ALLIANCE.

Jingoism is more rapid in its progress than quick consumption. So virulent is it that many are now advocating an alliance with England—certainly the most preposterous idea that was ever hatched in the brain of man. Are we to give no heed to the lessons of history? Are we to scout the wisdom of the fathers? Are we to take leave of our senses because we are engaged in a struggle with a third-rate power, which, if vigorously pressed, will be gloriously concluded in time to celebrate our triumph on the 4th of next July? Who is to be the gainer by such an arrangement? Certainly not America. Mr. Joseph Chamberlain's gush about what an inspiring spectacle it would be to see our soldiers and British troops fighting together under the Star-Spangled Banner and the Union Jack may be wisdom from his standpoint, but from ours it is sheer nonsense—unmitigated bosh. After thrashing Spain, we have no enemies to fight, but England has a superabundance of them. Like the poor, they are always with her, because John Bull's longing eyes are always fixed on somebody else's possessions.

An alliance with England! Have gentlemen considered what a partnership with that quarrelsome nation means? It means that our armies would soon be fighting against the French in Africa, against the Russians in Afghanistan, against the Germans in China, against the Japanese in Korea, against the Italians in the Mediterranean, against the Austrians on the Danube, and against the Turks in the Golden Horn. The best blood of America would enrich foreign soil from the Punjab to St. Petersburg and from the Cape of Good Hope to the Land of the Midnight Sun. That is jingoism run mad. Is not that a ravishing picture? What mothers and fathers are willing to so sacrifice their sons? Who is going to pay the piper for such a wild dance? How can we be made happier, more prosperous, or more puissant by such an amazing performance? Time and time again we have expressed our sympathy with downtrodden Ireland by speeches, by resolutions, by public meetings, by large contributions of cash, by every other method known among men short of sending an army for her liberation. In fact, the armed enemies of Great Britain have found a great deal of substantial aid in this country. Now, as part and parcel of this fantastic, grotesque, and suicidal jingo scheme, we are to join hands with the merciless oppressors of the Irish race. God forbid that we should be such howling idiots! The proper policy for us to pursue is to do what we have always done—attend strictly to our own business and let the Old World take care of itself, fight its own battles, and settle its own bills.

IN THE FACE OF OUR OWN RESOLUTIONS.

Let it not be forgotten that we went into this Spanish war on a solemn resolution, passed by both Houses of Congress and signed by the President, that we are not waging it for purposes of imperial aggrandizement or territorial expansion, but solely for love of humanity. It is not putting it too strong to say that that resolution raised us immeasurably in the eyes of all civilized nations, placed us on an unequalled pinnacle of glory, and made us many valuable friends in Europe.

Now, within six weeks of the passage of that lofty resolution, we are beginning to do precisely the reverse, putting ourselves in position to be charged with acting with Punic faith and dragging our country down from the high pedestal on which we placed her, thereby reducing her to the low and common level of the land-grabbers of the Old World.

OTHER REASONS AGAINST.

Some of the other inevitable evils of annexation are an increase in our standing Army; an increase in our Navy; a vast increase in our taxes. Unless the American people have made up their minds deliberately to do those three things, we have no right to saddle such a load upon their backs—a load which will go on augmenting year by year so long as the world shall stand. Most assuredly I refuse to be a party to such an outrage upon those who, in the last analysis, must foot the bills.

HOW SHALL WE GOVERN THEM?

That a great many people who are in favor of annexation have been scared at the idea of creating a State out of these islands

is shown by the fact that the annexationists evolved a scheme to make them a county or counties of California.

This latter proposition was a little better than making a State of them, for while as a part of California they would not have two United States Senators and three Presidential electors of their own, still the hateful fact remains that by holding the balance of power in California politics they might control the two Senators and nine electors from that State, which they would generally do, as California is a close State.

But as California objected strenuously to that, we are now assured that it is not intended to make either a State or a California county out of them.

If this be true, if this is not a trick with which to rope in the unwary, why is it not so stated in this resolution? True, it might have no binding effect upon our successors here, but an agreement so solemnly entered into would have a moral effect for all time, and would go far toward removing opposition, not that we would be convinced of the wisdom of annexation upon any terms, but because we would be choosing the lesser of two evils.

Even that would not solve the problem of "What will we do with them?" For if we annex them we must govern them some way. If not as a State, or a county of California, then what? Do we propose to resolve this day that we will hold the people of these islands in perpetual tutelage as a Territory, by which term we have hitherto meant a State in embryo?

A perpetual chrysalis existence as a Territory is repugnant to the genius of our institutions and out of harmony with our entire history. Home rule has been our policy from the beginning, and the chief boast of the younger Harrison's Administration was that it relieved the people of six Territories from the reproach and annoyances of Territorial leading strings and conferred upon them the glory and dignity of statehood.

Again, I submit that these people are not fit to vote in Territorial elections if they are unfit to vote in State elections, which they clearly are, even according to the standard of President Dole's little oligarchy; otherwise he would not have so revised the voting lists as to confine the suffrage to 2,800 persons out of a total population of 109,000 souls—that is to say, about one-seventh as many people are allowed to vote now as were permitted to vote under the monarchy.

If, however, these people are fit for neither a State nor a county nor a Territory, what form of government shall we give them? Crown colonies like the English? Or shall we send American proconsuls to plunder these unfortunate people as the Roman proconsuls plundered the ancient world or set up a system of satrapies to be controlled by the central Government here in Washington—a system utterly un-American in its character and contradictory of our entire theory of government?

Ah! Mr. Speaker, there comes to my mind this moment the sage remark of Abraham Lincoln, which I commend to the American Congress: "If we could first know where we are and whither we are tending, we would the better know what to do and how to do it."

BECAUSE IT IS GIVEN TO US.

We hear a vast deal of ecstatic talk about these leprous islands "falling into our laps," as if that were a reason for annexation. Are we such Simple Simons as to accept everything offered us? Because a hog with the cholera, or a sheep with the rot, or a horse with the glanders, or a dog with the rabies is given to us, by the same token we should annex him to our animal possessions and infect the whole lot with a loathsome and incurable disease.

We are to take them because, forsooth, they are given to us! That is the main argument for annexation, but even that is not the truth. Far from it. By these very resolutions we pay four millions for a starter. How many millions will finally go the same road Omniscience alone can tell. We are paying down cash on Mr. Dole's counter for these volcanic rocks nearly one-third as much as Thomas Jefferson paid for "the Louisiana Purchase."

No; it is not given to us. And if it were, I would still say with the ancient poet, "Timeo Danaos et dona ferentes"—Beware of the Greeks bearing gifts.

FOR WHOSE BENEFIT?

For whose benefit and behoof are we to do this preposterous thing? Not for ourselves or our children, surely; for Hawaii has a tropical climate, beneath whose burning, blistering sun no Anglo-American can work out doors.

Why not learn something from the great historic and scientific fact—for fact it is, though it may be amazing—that Teutonic civilization and representative government are coextensive with the wheat belt? They are exotics in the Tropics, and will wither and perish there.

WHO IS ITS FATHER?

Who is back of this annexation scheme? Who has worked up a sentiment in its favor? Who has maintained a lobby here to labor for its success? Who has enlisted a portion of the public

press, and caused it to question the patriotism and cast insinuations against the integrity of the men who have the courage, the wisdom, and the patriotism to fight this colossal job?

I was long since taught that it is a sound practice when trying to fix responsibility for a crime to search for the person or persons who would reap the greatest profit from its commission.

Applying that rule of common sense to this case, to what conclusion are we irresistibly led? To this: That the sugar kings of the Sandwich Islands are the chief promoters of the scheme, because they are easily the chief beneficiaries. Even the holders of Hawaiian bonds are not in it with them, because all the bonds ever issued by the Dole Government are not equal to the profits which the sugar kings will make out of annexation in each and every year henceforth and forever so long as they shall live, because annexation will make raw Hawaiian sugar come in free, and the sugar kings will pocket the tariff on the same, which amounts under the blessed Dingley bill to millions of dollars annually, and will grow as the Hawaiian sugar output increases, and is really a gift from us, which already exceeds \$65,000,000.

But it will be answered that reciprocity already lets Hawaiian sugar in free, and therefore the kings have and can have no interest in annexation. Do not believe that for one moment, Mr. Speaker. The reciprocity treaty is a tiptop thing for the kings, but it is only temporary in its nature, and annexation would be a permanent blessing to them. I do not know much about stocks; I have had no experience with the ticker; but, mark my prediction, the moment annexation is an assured fact sugar stocks will soar skyward—a direction in which their owners will never go. To this low estate have we fallen at last that the sugar kings of the Sandwich Islands force us from the safe, wise, honorable policy of one hundred and nine years into a new, dubious, and untried policy which endangers our prosperity and is a menace to our very existence.

I would not be understood as asserting that members in advocating annexation are consciously influenced by the sugar kings or are in any manner corrupted by them. I am perfectly willing to admit that their motives are absolutely pure. Nevertheless, I believe that the sentiment in favor of annexation now, in the day of William McKinley, under the impulse of which members are rushing upon ills they know not of, is largely the work of the sugar kings, just as the sentiment favorable to annexation in the days of William L. Marcy was distinctively the creation of the propagandists of African slavery. As annexation was resisted and defeated by lovers of human freedom then, so it ought to be resisted and defeated by lovers of human freedom now.

REESTABLISHMENT OF HUMAN SLAVERY.

To the Republicans who are shouting for annexation I commend the fine Shakespearean dictum, "Consistency, thou art a jewel."

The Republican party claims now—since emancipation has become popular and since the vote of our "Brother in Black" controls the elections in several close States—that it waged for four years a costly and bloody war to extirpate African slavery from this country. In 1861 the claim was that that awful war was for the preservation of the Union. Indeed, Abraham Lincoln, the greatest of all Republicans dead or alive, so stated in his famous and wonderful letter to Horace Greeley. So believing, hundreds of thousands of brave, patriotic Democrats helped put down the rebellion, which could not have been put down without them. Now, however, generally, but especially about election time, the seductive tale is whispered in the credulous ears of Afro-Americans that the civil war was fought solely to free them, and that nobody did any fighting in the Federal armies save and except Republicans; all of which is a fable.

But if the civil war was carried on to free the negroes, as is now claimed, how can Republicans justify themselves either in the forum of conscience or at the bar of public opinion for annexing the Sandwich Islands, thereby again grafting slavery onto the Republic? No man who has any reputation for veracity will jeopardize it by denying that coolie slavery does exist in the Sandwich Islands to-day as thoroughly as African slavery ever did exist in South Carolina or in Massachusetts up to the time when it was found to be unprofitable on that stern and rockbound coast. [Applause.] Furthermore, men of intelligence know that Chinese slavery is more brutal and more immoral than was African slavery in its worst estate, even in Massachusetts. It is a matter of common knowledge that Chinese men are sold into slavery, and that Chinese women are sold into and especially prepared by cruel surgical operations and physical mutilations for a species of slavery ten times worse than death itself.

PROTEST OF ORGANIZED LABOR.

Perhaps it may quicken the consciences, open the eyes, and dampen the ardor of certain jingoes here to know that organized labor is against this annexation scheme. This element, which justly looks to its own interests, and which is more and more every year finding ways to make its influence felt, opposes this Hawaiian job under the impulse of self-preservation, which has

been wisely defined as "the first law of nature." The labor organizations of California, being nearest the scene, being at the point of earliest contact, and being the first who would suffer from competition with coolie slave labor, were very properly the first to sound the alarm. They were soon reenforced by an earnest protest from the American Federation of Labor, which demonstrates that workmen throughout the land sympathize with their imperiled brethren on the Pacific Slope.

The Federation places its strong resolution against annexation on the ground that it "would be tantamount to the admission of a slave State, the representatives of which would necessarily work and vote for the enslavement of labor in general."

Members with jingo tendencies will be serving their country, and perhaps themselves, by giving heed to this note of warning, thereby escaping the wrath to come.

AGAINST THE WILL OF THE HAWAIIAN PEOPLE.

The corner stone of this Republic is the proposition enunciated by Thomas Jefferson, the chief priest, apostle, and prophet of constitutional liberty—"Governments derive their just powers from the consent of the governed."

If that proposition is not true, then the American Revolution was a monstrous crime; Washington, Warren, Montgomery, Greene, Marion, and all that band of heroes were turbulent traitors to King George III; John Hancock, Old John Adams, Patrick Henry, Richard Henry Lee, and their Congressional compeers pestilent disturbers of the peace; and all the blood shed in our two wars with Great Britain was wanton and wicked waste. If that proposition is not true, William McKinley is this day exercising functions usurped from Victoria Guelph, and this body is composed of mouthy brawlers doing unlawfully those things which the English House of Commons has the sole right to do.

If that proposition is not true, you, Mr. Speaker, are not Speaker de jure, but only Speaker de facto, interfering pro tanto with the prerogatives of the speaker of the English House of Commons, Mr. Gully, who is the grandson of a professional pugilist. [Laughter and applause.]

This annexation scheme is in flagrant violation of that basic principle of our Republic, for many thousand Hawaiians—more than the entire male adult population—have solemnly protested against the sale and delivery of their country to us by a little gang of adventurers who, claiming to be the whole thing, are offering to us a property of which they have robbed the rightful owners. And now America, which has been solemnly declared by the Supreme Court to be a Christian land, is to be made the receiver of these stolen Hawaiian goods.

If an ordinary citizen receives stolen goods, he commits a penitentiary offense. Wherein, I beg leave to inquire, is the difference of principle in stealing ordinary property and in stealing an island or a group of islands, or in receiving them after they are stolen? The only justification lies in the thievish theory that if the theft is big enough, it ceases to be a crime and takes on the character and complexion of a virtue, and the perpetrators thereof, instead of being consigned to the striped uniforms, cramped quarters, meager diet, and hard labor of felons, are to be hailed as statesmen and rewarded with the plaudits of a grateful people—a theory which, I regret to say, is growing in this country.

But the jingoes tell us that this protest of the Hawaiians is all bogus, gotten up by designing knaves, and that the Hawaiians are falling over each other in their eagerness for annexation. If this is true, why not submit this annexation scheme to a popular vote in Hawaii, as was done in the case of Texas, and which was provided for in the treaty once negotiated with Santo Domingo, but which happily was never ratified, or have a plebiscite, as Napoleon III was in the habit of doing whenever he felt like it or wished to cure himself of ennui produced by wearing his uncle's heavy crown, which was too large for him? That would be fair and would remove one difficulty. Certainly Mr. Sanford B. Dole could guarantee that every vote in favor of annexation would be counted at least once.

Does he or do his sponsors here shrink from the test of Hawaiian manhood suffrage on that proposition?

If a fair election on that proposition can not be had, what assurance have we that fair elections can be had hereafter, if we annex these islands? If the Hawaiians are not fit to vote on a proposition of vital interest to themselves, who will have the effrontery to say that they are fit to vote for all coming time on propositions of vital interest to us and to our posterity?

If governments do derive their just powers from the consent of the governed, how does it happen that the Hawaiians are to have no voice in a performance which transforms their country from an independent nation into a mere outpost of this Republic?

Let him answer who can.

This submission to a vote of the Hawaiian male adults of a proposition decisive of their destiny ought to be insisted on by Congress as a condition precedent to even considering annexation.

This is the American method of procedure—a method bottomed on the eternal principles of wisdom, justice, and liberty.

We should demand a free ballot and a fair count for the Hawaiians, whose patrimony has been appropriated by President Dole and his partners in the oligarchy.

The annexation shouters claim that the Hawaiian names appended to the remonstrance are largely fictitious, and chiefly secured as signers under false pretenses. We deny it. Issue is squarely joined on an important matter of fact. It can be settled by a vote of the Hawaiian males over 21 years of age. Who can deny that that is a fair test?

All the machinery of elections is in the hands of the little coterie of oligarchists. They are able, resolute, ambitious men. They can be relied upon to see to it that every annexation voter votes and that his vote is counted. They can also be relied on to see to it that not an unlawful vote is cast against the scheme of annexation, for their fortunes depend upon annexation. Can anything be more clearly just? Is President Dole afraid of the verdict of his own people? I pause for a reply.

None of his friends answer, so I will answer myself. He can not be induced to submit this scheme to a popular manhood suffrage vote, for the very good reason that he knows that he and his friends hold office through usurpation and that the vast majority of the Hawaiian people are bitterly opposed to him and all his works. He the friend of liberty, is he? How does it happen, then, that while under the monarchy 14,000 persons were permitted to vote, only 2,800 are given the elective franchise under the oligarchy?

Let it be remembered also that a large percentage of these 2,800 voters have been colonized in Hawaii by Dole & Co. since they have been conducting the Government. What a misleading misnomer is it to dignify this little handful of close-corporation oligarchists with the name of a republic! What a burlesque upon truth, what a travesty upon justice, what an affront to intelligence to assert that Dole and his gang have any claims upon us or upon any other friends of representative government and human freedom!

Oh, yes, but we are told that all male citizens of the Sandwich Islands can vote who will swear that they will support the present Republic and the present constitution of Hawaii. Now, at first blush that seems perfectly fair; but it is a delusion and a snare, as will readily appear from this fact: The constitution, which the Hawaiian people never had any hand in adopting, provides for this very scheme of annexation, which the Hawaiian people detest. That condition for voting is a very skillful contrivance. It exhausted human ingenuity to invent it and is worthy of Machiavelli himself. In order to vote at all a citizen of the Sandwich Islands must solemnly swear to support a constitution which deprives his country of its nationality. What man who has any reputation to lose will risk it by arising in his place here and declaring that he indorses such a swindle on a feeble people? Under it only about 2,800 persons vote, and that is about the number in favor of annexation.

SHALL HAWAIIANS CONTROL OUR FUTURE?

I put this question to every man in the Republic of whatever politics: Are you willing that the destinies of your children and your children's children shall be determined in some crisis of your country's fate by the votes of two mongrel Senators from Hawaii or 3 electoral votes from that leprous island? Two votes or less in the Senate and 3 votes or less in the electoral college have ere this determined matters of great pith and moment. Old John Adams beat Jefferson only 3 votes in 1796.

Write it on the tablets of your memory that the resolution declaring the war of 1812 passed the Senate by only 1 majority.

Let it never be forgotten that the greatest crime ever committed on this continent, the rape of the Presidency, was accomplished by only 1 majority in the electoral college, even after the infamous 8 to 7 commission had stolen bodily the electoral votes of Louisiana, South Carolina, and Florida.

HAWAIIAN LOBBYISTS.

The propaganda which has been carried on openly in this city for the last five or six years by the agents of the Hawaiian sugar kings in favor of annexation is a disgrace to this Government and has lowered us in the eyes of ourselves and the rest of the world. It has no parallel in all history. Minister Hatch has lobbied for it. Ex-Minister Thurston has lobbied for it, and has written and sent a book in favor of it broadcast over the land, which book the Senate Committee on Foreign Affairs made a part of its report. Other lesser personages have lobbied for it. These not succeeding, at last appeared President Sanford B. Dole, in all his bewhiskered glory.

What other government on earth would permit the agents of a foreign government to come into its very capital and openly interfere with its affairs? Suppose, when the arbitration treaty with England was pending in the Senate, Queen Victoria had come to Washington to lobby for its ratification. Such a howl would have gone up as would have startled the man in the moon, and it would have been a howl of righteous indignation. If Sanford B. Dole was not here to influence public opinion and the

action of Congress, what was he here for? Will we be told that he was seeking health? Is it credible that a man from the Tropics would risk his life in this climate in midwinter for pleasure? Did he want to see the country? If so, why not come at a more convenient season? And why make his visit in January, at the precise time that his precious treaty of annexation was being debated in the secret sessions of the Senate and was a few votes short of the necessary two-thirds majority?

Have we not always been extremely jealous of foreign officials interfering with our affairs—yes, always, till now, and even now make an exception only in favor of the Hawaiian plotters?

Did not Washington drive the impudent, meddling Genet, minister of the French Republic, out of the country at the risk of a war with France when we were a feeble folk?

Did not Mr. Secretary of State Daniel Webster's dark brow grow darker when he thought of the brave Kossuth haranguing our people on our affairs?

Did not our Government demand the recall of Minister Sackville-West for his imprudent letter touching a Presidential election? And did not his Government, recognizing the justice of the demand, instantly recall him?

Was not the foolish and insulting letter of Minister Dupuy de Lôme about President McKinley and our people one of the things that irritated our people into demanding this war?

Why have not Thurston, Hatch, Dole, and all the rest been sent about their business and given plainly to understand that we need no instruction from them as to our duty or our interests?

Surely this is an amazing performance.

MANIFEST DESTINY.

We hear much of "manifest destiny." That is a charming phrase. It tickles the ears of men; it panders to human vanity; it feeds the lurid flames of our ambition; it whets the sword of conquest; it is an anodyne for the troubled conscience, but it lureth to destruction. At the last it biteth like a serpent and stingeth like an adder. It is, however, no new doctrine. It is as old as the hills, "rock-ribbed and ancient as the sun." Years and years ago, stripped of all disguises and adornments, it was formulated by that eminent annexationist, Rob Roy, in this plain, blunt language:

The good old rule, the simple plan,
That they should take who have the power,
And they should keep who can.

Moses placed his veto on this convenient theory of "manifest destiny" when with inspired pen on tables of stone he wrote this stern command: "Thou shalt not covet thy neighbor's lands." Even in this presence, I beg leave to suggest that the decalogue is a moral code, not for the temporary and exclusive use of the disgruntled children of Israel, foot-sore and weary with wandering in the wilderness, but is applicable to all persons in all countries and at all times, for the principles of right and wrong are eternal and do not change with latitude and longitude or with the lapsing years or with the various tongues of men.

"Manifest destiny" has been the specious plea of every robber and freebooter since the world began and will continue to be until the elements shall melt with fervent heat.

It was "manifest destiny" which led Lot to overreach his uncle Abraham in selecting the rich lands of the valley, and you remember the weird story of Sodom and Gomorrah.

The "manifest destiny" of Jacob enabled him to appropriate the birthright of his luckless brother Esau.

"Manifest destiny" led Philip's invincible son across the sea, across the Granicus, even to farthest Ind, to build up an immense empire, which crumbled to pieces at his death.

"Manifest destiny" sent the Roman emperors to the burning sands of Africa, to the impenetrable forests of Gaul, to the inhospitable mountains of Asia, to the bottomless bogs of England, and at last put up the imperial crown for sale at auction to the highest bidder.

"Manifest destiny" caused Bajazet to desolate the fairest portions of Asia, and he ended by being hauled around in an iron cage as a ravening wild beast, which he was.

"Manifest destiny" impelled Mad Charles of Sweden to put all northern Europe to the sword until he met his Nemesis in Peter the Great at Pultowa.

"Manifest destiny" was Napoleon's gauzy justification for all the bones bleaching from Toulon to Mount St. Jean. He was always prating about his star; but it disappeared forever in the sunken road of Ohain, and he wandered from the stricken field "the immense somnambulist of a shattered dream."

"Manifest destiny" makes England the great bully of the world, oppressing the weak, toadying to the strong, laying up wrath against that day of wrath, that dies iræ, which is as sure to come for her as that a just God reigns on high.

Oh, yes! "Manifest destiny" is a seductive thing. It is the beautiful, the irresistible, the wicked Circe beckoning us on to our undoing. The entire pathway of man since the day when

Adam was driven from Eden with flaming swords is black with the wrecks of nations who harkened to the siren song of "Manifest destiny," and the epitaph upon whose tombstones is: "They were, but they are not."

Hitherto we have been the favorites of heaven; but let us not tempt fate too far or destiny will grow weary of partnership with us and dissolve it as she did with Napoleon at Waterloo.

Hawaii is a blind for our eyes, a snare for our feet, a bait for our cupidity, the will-o'-the-wisp which will lead us into the Slough of Despond, the bewitching, scheming, treacherous Delilah destined to shear our Samson of his leonine locks and to deliver him bound hand and foot into the power of the Philistines.

Hawaii is the fly which will make our whole pot of ointment stink in the nostrils of the civilized world.

Let us put away this supreme temptation from before our faces, and generations yet unborn will bless us for this act of wisdom, self-abnegation, and patriotism.

Nature has set bounds to this magnificent Republic beyond which she should not go—the Atlantic on the east, the Gulf of Mexico and the Rio Grande on the south, the Pacific on the west, and in the fullness of time, without the expenditure of a dollar or the spilling of one drop of blood or the shedding of a single tear, the frozen ocean on the north.

Within those wide, extended limits we will live and grow and flourish, the happiest, the richest, the most puissant, the most intelligent, the securest people on the whole face of the earth.

But depart from the plan of justice, of wisdom, and of moderation, go chasing the ignis fatuus of "manifest destiny" over land and over sea, and some day Macaulay's artistic New Zealander, after finishing his picture of the ruins of St. Paul's, will sit on a broken arch of "the Long Bridge" and sketch the ruins of this Capitol. Before you consummate this monstrous folly I say to you, in the language of Galgacus to the ancient Britons, "Think of your forefathers; think of your posterity!" [Prolonged applause.]

Mr. HITT. I yield twenty minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. WALKER].

Mr. WALKER of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I hope I shall be able to relieve the House from any effects which may have been produced by the lamentations of its Jeremiah. [Laughter.] In the discussion and decision of this question there is not the first element or purpose of territorial expansion. We enter upon the discussion and decision of this question of accepting Hawaii in precisely the same manner and upon the same principles that we would enter upon the discussion of the question of building a ship of our Navy. It is within as narrow limits as that question. It is clearly a question of our national defense, our national duty, our national existence, in the position in which the great Former of the destiny of nations has placed us.

I have struggled against this decision. I have been opposed to the annexation of Hawaii until I heard the shot of the guns of Dewey at Manila; and then I wakened to the importance of this question to the great destiny, as I believe, of this nation. No man has a moral right in his power and strength in any community to shut himself up within his own selfish interest and advantage and there live, seeking what he may for himself and forgetting those about him. He has not this right either in a State or in a nation, nor has any nation such a right. It has no right to cut itself off from all the moral obligations that rest upon it to secure righteousness and maintain peace in the great community of nations.

Are there any obligations resting upon the great empire of Great Britain to secure justice? Do we look upon her to discharge any of the duties that become her in her place of power among the nations? And are we to be absolved from every obligation that rests upon England? Was that the idea of our fathers? Have we received nothing in blessing from Almighty God? Shall we return nothing to our fellow-nations in our interest in them as our fellows? I do not make any claim that it is our duty to right the wrongs of every people and of every nation under all circumstances, but I do say that it is the duty of this nation to take its proper place among the nations of the world, and that we stand verily guilty before God if we do not do our full duty in maintaining peace in the world. We are seeking Hawaii for peace.

The roots of all moral courage rest in physical courage. The power of moral courage, in the last analysis, rests in the physical courage of the man or the nation, and the certainty that moral courage will find exercise in physical courage and in physical action when duty calls. In order that we may have practical courage, physical courage, and moral courage we must have the means of legitimately exercising our physical power, else we are as weak as China when attacked by Japan. Where was this nation in practical physical power when Chile threatened us but a short time since? If Chile had pursued her purpose to the end she would have won as against us, for a time. Where should we have been in this contest with the weak power of Spain ten years ago? Spain would have won if the contest had been commenced then.

Mr. Speaker, I have become convinced that this nation, to maintain her self-respect and the respect of the nations and in the interest of peace, must have a navy as powerful as any nation in the world, ship for ship, man for man, fort for fort. [Applause.] We must have Hawaii as a part of our naval outfit. We must have the Nicaragua Canal as a part of our naval as well as mercantile outfit. [Applause.] Those are three things that this nation owes to itself and owes it to every other nation of the world to have. It is a duty that we can not shirk. Any man who belittles his own power and shirks his own duty shrinks and shrivels and does injury to his town as long as he exists on this earth. Every nation that forgets its high place, every nation that fails to do its duty, must shrink and shrivel in the life of each one of its citizens all the days of its existence.

I was struck in a manner that I have never been struck before by any event in our history, more than when the guns were fired on Fort Sumter, by the electrical effect upon this nation when we heard the guns of Dewey at Manila. [Applause.] This nation towers to a height more than double that she ever had attained before. And I say here that we must come up to our opportunities, that we must be in the possession of the physical power to make our moral decisions effective, or we must see civilization hindered if not retrograded.

What are the other nations of the earth doing? Where is the nation standing for liberty among the nations, with the power and disposition to enforce it, except England? I ask here and now, are we to enter into alliance with England? No! Are we to have an alliance with England? Yes. What kind of an alliance? None whatever in form, but an alliance of good fellowship, of duty done, seeing our duty eye to eye for humanity. I believe that this Government, uniting with Japan and Great Britain, should enter into a treaty to-morrow, if possible, that the ports of all three nations, under all circumstances, should be open to each one and all of the three nations. How long? Not a day beyond the time when either nation shall give notice that the agreement is terminated.

The most lasting alliance that can be made, and the only one that can be lasting, is an alliance which will last during the free consent of the parties to it. The moment you make an alliance for all time each party begins to think when and where and how it shall be terminated; but when you make an alliance that can be terminated at any moment, each party is studying to maintain and perpetuate it. What shall we add to that? Following the example of the three American commissioners, who alone settled the trouble of our southern neighbor Venezuela, we will agree that when any difficulty arises between any two of the three nations that the two nations that are at a misunderstanding shall each appoint—what? A court of arbitration? No, for a court of arbitration will breed war. What then? Each of the countries at odds shall appoint three commissioners of its own citizens, and agree that for two years they will take no further action.

Then each commissioner of each country is in duty bound and under bonds to find grounds of agreement, not of dissent. But if you have a court of arbitration, the commissioners of each nation become counsel for their respective nation, and are studying for grounds of disagreement, and not of agreement. This is all the alliance we want with any nation. The time has come, and in the interest of peace, when this country must and will have the power of enforcing the just and righteous decision of a righteous people. The righteous are in the majority always in this country. They always have been in every exigency in the past, and will be in the future; and not only in this country, but in every other nation that speaks the language of the Anglo-Saxon race.

Now, what will become of our friend Russia, that has always stood by us? Because of our power and because of our friendship to the mother country we will see that neither she nor any other country does injustice to our friend Russia, or any other nation that is friendly or even unfriendly to us. The time of our swaddling clothes has gone. The pitcher is broken at the well, and never can be restored. We can not shut our eyes to the fact that we have attained to-day, as I said before, to a stature such as none of us dreamed we should ever reach in our day or even in that of our immediate children. We can not shirk its responsibilities. We can not return again to the place of a physical pigmy or a moral dwarf. [Applause.]

Mr. DINSMORE. I promised to yield some time to the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. SMITH], and if he is present, I should be glad to have him occupy his time. He does not seem to be present, Mr. Speaker.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE.

A message from the Senate, by Mr. PLATT, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had agreed to the 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. 10100) to provide ways and means to meet war expenditures.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed with amendments the bill (H. R. 4936) for the allowance of certain

claims for stores and supplies reported by the Court of Claims under the provisions of the act approved March 3, 1883, and commonly known as the Bowman Act, and for other purposes, asked a conference with the House of Representatives on the bill and amendments, and had appointed Mr. TELLER, Mr. PASCO, and Mr. STEWART as the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed the bill (S. 4710) to amend an act entitled "An act providing for the construction of a bridge across the Yalobusha River, between Leflore and Carroll counties, in the State of Mississippi," approved April 29, 1898; in which the concurrence of the House was requested.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED.

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

- H. R. 1271. An act granting a pension to Clara A. Short;
- H. R. 2669. An act granting an increase of pension to Henry H. Tucker;
- H. R. 7007. An act to increase the pension of Samuel B. Davis;
- H. R. 4672. An act granting an increase of pension to Alfred D. Johnson;
- H. R. 8871. An act for a survey for a channel leading from Ship Island Harbor, Mississippi, to the railroad pier at Gulf Port, Miss., and to Biloxi, Miss., and for a survey of Ship Island Pass;
- H. R. 8680. An act granting an increase of pension to William Tompkins; and
- H. R. 8226. An act to make certain grants of land to the Territory of New Mexico, and for other purposes.

SENATE BILLS REFERRED.

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

- S. 1572. An act granting a pension to Albert Hammer—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.
- S. 2002. An act granting an increase of pension to Bryon R. Pierce—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.
- S. 2015. An act granting a pension to Lillian M. Yost—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.
- S. 2729. An act granting a pension to Lydia E. Bowers—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.
- S. 2616. An act to pension Harriette F. Hovey—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.
- S. 2494. An act granting a pension to Mary A. Colhoun—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.
- S. 571. An act granting a pension to Mrs. Susan Mellsop—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.
- S. 4550. An act granting an increase of pension to Col. John F. McMahon—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.
- S. 4483. An act granting an increase of pension to John H. Crandall—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.
- S. 1698. An act granting a pension to Alden B. Thompson—to the Committee on Pensions.
- S. 4710. An act to amend an act entitled "An act providing for the construction of a bridge across the Yalobusha River, between Leflore and Carroll counties, in the State of Mississippi," approved April 29, 1898—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.
- S. 3330. An act granting an increase of pension to H. B. Armstrong—to the Committee on Pensions.
- S. 4394. An act granting an increase of pension to Alexander Keen—to the Committee on Pensions.
- S. 1921. An act granting a pension to John Bailey—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.
- S. 1580. An act granting an increase of pension to Cutler D. Sanborn—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.
- S. 717. An act granting an increase of pension to Eva W. Brannan, widow of the late Maj. Gen. John Milton Brannan, United States Army—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.
- S. 4575. An act granting an increase of pension to John McVicar—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.
- S. 3911. An act pensioning H. C. Bedell, Company A, One hundred and ninety-first New York Volunteers—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.
- S. 1774. An act granting a pension to Mrs. Henretta Cummins—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.
- S. 4147. An act granting an increase of pension to R. W. Haywood—to the Committee on Pensions.
- S. 369. An act granting a pension to James Ballard—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.
- S. 1797. An act granting an increase of pension to John A. Hughes—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.
- S. 4233. An act granting a pension to Solomon Kline—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.
- S. 601. An act granting a pension to S. W. Taylor—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

S. 2107. An act granting an increase of pension to Theodore S. Cross—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

S. 4701. An act granting an increase of pension to Charles W. Tilton—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

S. 3532. An act granting a pension to J. K. Hager—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

S. 3534. An act granting a pension to Annie E. Joseph—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

S. 3285. An act to increase the pension of Mary F. Hopkins—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

S. R. 165. Joint resolution to amend the joint resolution permitting Anson Mills, colonel of the Third Regiment United States Cavalry, to accept and exercise the functions of boundary commissioner on the part of the United States, approved December 12, 1893—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

S. 1699. An act to remove the charge of desertion from the military record of George F. Harter—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

S. 2919. An act granting a pension to Olivia Worden, widow of the late John L. Worden, United States Navy—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

S. 412. An act to amend an act entitled "An act for the relief and civilization of the Chippewa Indians in the State of Minnesota," approved January 14, 1889—to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

S. 1036. An act granting the use of certain lands to the city of St. Augustine, Fla., for a public park, and for other purposes—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE.

By unanimous consent leave of absence was granted to Mr. REEVES for four days, on account of important business.

And then, on motion of Mr. HITT (at 4 o'clock and 43 minutes p. m.), the House adjourned.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATION.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, a letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a copy of a communication from the Acting Director of the Mint submitting estimates of deficiencies in certain appropriations, was taken from the Speaker's table, referred to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII, bills and resolutions of the following titles were severally reported from committees, delivered to the Clerk, and referred to the several Calendars therein named, as follows:

Mr. CLARK of Iowa, from the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 460) to extend the uses of the mail service, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1544); which said bill and report were referred to the House Calendar.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 4304) regulating the postage on letters written by the blind, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1545); which said bill and report were referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. SHAFROTH, from the Committee on the Public Lands, to which was referred House bill 10331, reported in lieu thereof a bill (H. R. 10666) authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to permit the use of the buildings of the Fort Supply Military Reservation by Oklahoma Territory for an insane asylum, accompanied by a report (No. 1546); which said bill and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS, RESOLUTIONS, AND MEMORIALS INTRODUCED.

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, bills, resolutions, and memorials of the following titles were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. COCHRAN of Missouri: A bill (H. R. 10665) granting pensions to teamsters engaged in the military service of the United States during the Mexican war—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. SHAFROTH (from the Committee on the Public Lands): A bill (H. R. 10666) authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to permit the use of the buildings on the Fort Supply Military Reservation by Oklahoma Territory for an insane asylum (in lieu of H. R. 10331)—to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

By Mr. RICHARDSON: A bill (H. R. 10667) to change name of

Capital Railway Company—to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. CHICKERING: A bill (H. R. 10668) for sharing with the several States the expense of State canals providing free transportation to interstate and foreign commerce—to the Committee on Railways and Canals.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10669) to amend certain acts regulating navigation—to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS INTRODUCED.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. EDDY: A bill (H. R. 10670) to pension Maria J. Blaisdell—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SULLOWAY: A bill (H. R. 10671) granting a pension to Lucia A. Hynes—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, the following petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

By Mr. COWHERD: Petition of various labor organizations of Kansas City, Mo., in opposition to the so-called anti-scalping bill or any similar measure—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also (by request), petition of business firms of Kansas City, Mo., in favor of the anti-scalping bill—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. ERMENROUT: Protest of Wetherill & Bro., of Philadelphia, Pa., against the adoption of the Chilton amendment to the war-revenue bill—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of W. H. Snyder, supreme recorder of the Fraternal Mystic Circle, Philadelphia, Pa., in opposition to the clause in the war-revenue bill imposing a tax on fraternal benefit societies—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, protests of the National Remedy Company, of New York City, against the retroactive clause in the war-revenue bill—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, protest of Lazell, Dalley & Co., of New York, against the clause in House bill No. 10100 requiring wholesalers and retailers to stamp existing stock of proprietary medicines, perfumery, etc.—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FENTON: Petition of John McNaughton, to accompany House bill No. 8788, for his relief—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, petition of Ellen Owens, to accompany House bill No. 6401, for her relief—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, petition of Thomas McCall and papers, to accompany House bill No. 6031, for relief—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. TODD: Petition of the Michigan Stove Company, of Detroit, Mich., protesting against certain provisions in House bill No. 10100, known as the war-revenue bill—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of the State Millers' Association of Michigan, in favor of the pure-food bill—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WARD: Papers to accompany House bill for the relief of William A. Wheeler—to the Committee on War Claims.

SENATE.

MONDAY, June 13, 1898.

Prayer by Rev. J. B. STITT, D. D., of the city of Washington.

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

OFFICIAL RECORDS OF UNION AND CONFEDERATE ARMIES.

The VICE-PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following concurrent resolution of the House of Representatives; which was read, and referred to the Committee on Printing:

*Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That the Secretary of War is hereby authorized and directed to furnish one complete set of the Official Records of the Union and Confederate Armies to each Senator, Representative, and Delegate of the Fifty-fifth Congress not already entitled by law to receive the same; and he is further authorized to use for this purpose such incomplete sets as remain unsold or uncalled for by the beneficiaries designated to receive them under the authority contained in the several acts of Congress providing for the distribution and sale of this publication: *Provided*, That the Secretary of War may call upon the Public Printer to print and bind such parts of said work as will enable him to complete the sets herein provided for.*

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE.

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. H. L. OVERSTREET, one of its clerks, announced that the House had agreed to the reports of the committees of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the following bills:

A bill (H. R. 378) granting a pension to Lowell H. Hopkinson;

A bill (H. R. 1801) granting an increase of pension to Catherine Clifford;

A bill (H. R. 4488) granting an increase of pension to Peter Castle; and

A bill (H. R. 5006) to increase the pension of Edward Starr.

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

A bill (H. R. 3141) increasing the pension of Price W. Hawley;

A bill (H. R. 5149) to amend the charter of the Capital Railway Company;

A bill (H. R. 5522) to authorize the establishment of a life-saving station at or near Charlevoix, Mich.;

A bill (H. R. 9554) granting certain lands to the city of Santa Barbara, Cal.; and

A bill (H. R. 10220) to organize a hospital corps of the Navy of the United States; to define its duties and to regulate its pay.

The message further announced that the House insists upon its amendment to the bill (S. 104) to increase the pension of Lucretia C. Waring disagreed to by the Senate, agrees to the conference asked for by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and had appointed Mr. LOUDENSLAGER, Mr. WEYMOUTH, and Mr. SIMS managers at the conference on the part of the House.

The message also announced that the House insists upon its amendments to the bill (S. 3596) to ratify the agreement between the Daves Commission and the Seminole Nation of Indians disagreed to by the Senate, agrees to the conference asked for by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and had appointed Mr. LACEY, Mr. SNOVER, and Mr. ZENOR managers at the conference on the part of the House.

The message further announced that the House had disagreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 8581) for the protection of the people of the Indian Territory, and for other purposes, agrees to the conference asked for by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and had appointed Mr. SHERMAN, Mr. CURTIS of Kansas, and Mr. LITTLE managers at the conference on the part of the House.

The message also announced that the House had disagreed to the amendments of the Senate to the following bills, agrees to the conferences asked for by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and had appointed Mr. BARCOCK, Mr. CURTIS of Iowa, and Mr. RICHARDSON managers at the respective conferences on the part of the House:

A bill (H. R. 6148) to amend the charter of the Eckington and Soldiers' Home Railway Company of the District of Columbia, Maryland and Washington Railway Company, and for other purposes; and

A bill (H. R. 8541) to define the rights of purchasers of the Belt Railway, and for other purposes.

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

A bill (H. R. 10350) to enable volunteer soldiers during the war with Spain to vote at Congressional elections; and

A bill (H. R. 10606) to amend section 10 of an act approved April 22, 1898, entitled "An act to provide for temporarily increasing the military establishment of the United States in time of war, and for other purposes."

The message also announced that the House had passed a concurrent resolution to print 32,000 copies of an act entitled "An act to provide ways and means to meet war expenditures, and for other purposes," in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message further announced that the House had passed a concurrent resolution authorizing and directing the enrolling clerk of the House to enroll the act (H. R. 10100) to provide ways and means to meet war expenditures, and for other purposes, in accordance with the text of said act as submitted to both Houses in connection with the report of the managers of the two Houses on the disagreeing votes; in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED.

The message also announced that the Speaker of the House had signed the following enrolled bills; and they were thereupon signed by the Vice-President:

A bill (H. R. 1271) granting a pension to Clara A. Short;

A bill (H. R. 2669) granting an increase of pension to Henry H. Tucker;

A bill (H. R. 4672) granting an increase of pension to Alfred D. Johnson;

A bill (H. R. 7007) to increase the pension of Samuel B. Davis;

A bill (H. R. 8226) to make certain grants of land to the Territory of New Mexico, and for other purposes;

A bill (H. R. 8680) granting an increase of pension to William Tompkins; and

A bill (H. R. 8871) for a survey for a channel leading from Ship Island Harbor, Mississippi, to the railroad pier at Gulfport, Miss., and to Biloxi, Miss., and for a survey of Ship Island Pass.