

protect State anti-cigarette laws—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of the Methodist Episcopal Church of Pleasant Dale, Nebr., in favor of the passage of the Broderick bill to raise the age of protection for girls to 18 years in the District of Columbia and the Territories—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of the Methodist Episcopal Church of Pleasant Dale, Nebr., asking for the passage of a bill to forbid the sale of intoxicating beverages in all Government buildings—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. STEPHENS of Texas: Six petitions of citizens of Abilene, Santo, Strawn, Putnam, Allamoore, and Vanhorn, Texas, in favor of the passage of the anti-scalping bill—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. SUTHERLAND: Papers to accompany House bill for the relief of William Campbell—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, petitions of the First Congregational Church of Indianola, Nebr., for the passage of bills to forbid the interstate transmission of gambling matter by telegraph and to raise the age of protection for girls—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of the First Congregational Church of Indianola, Nebr., praying for the enactment of legislation prohibiting the sale of intoxicating liquors in all Government buildings—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. VEHS�AGE: Three petitions of 18 citizens of New York City, in favor of the passage of the anti-scalping bill—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. WANGER: Petitions of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Carversville, Bucks County, Pa., praying for the enactment of legislation to forbid the transmission of lottery messages by telegraph and to protect State anti-cigarette laws—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Carversville, Pa., asking for the passage of a bill to forbid the sale of intoxicating beverages in all Government buildings—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

SENATE.

THURSDAY, April 14, 1898.

The Chaplain, Rev. W. H. MILBURN, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O Lord God, we come into Thy presence with a hymn of thanksgiving, while we celebrate the eighty-eighth birthday of our patriarch, the father of both ends of the Capitol, beloved and revered by all his colleagues, and throughout his native State and our whole country. We praise Thee for this noble life, a life of honorable devotion to the interests of the country through more than forty years, a life of patriotic and patriarchal devotion, simplicity, and nobleness.

We also bless Thee for the recovery to health of his beloved wife, and devoutly pray that they may be spared to us through yet other years to celebrate this natal day. God bless, comfort, cheer, and uphold them, keeping them as an example to us all.

We pray, O Lord, that Thou wilt likewise bless Thy servants, the President and Vice-President of the United States, the members of both Houses of Congress, our Army and Navy, and the whole land. Let the blessing of the Lord God rest upon us, and may Thy providence be our guide and our defense. We humbly ask, through Jesus Christ our Saviour. Amen.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the prayer of the Chaplain this morning be inserted in the RECORD.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Is there any objection? The Chair hears none, and the order will be made. The Secretary will read the Journal of yesterday's proceedings.

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

NAVAL HOSPITAL, MARE ISLAND.

The VICE-PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a letter from the Secretary of the Navy submitting an estimate of appropriation, \$100,000, for the naval hospital, Mare Island, Cal., recently destroyed by the earthquake of March 30, 1898; which, with the accompanying papers, was referred to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE.

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. W. J. BROWNING, its Chief Clerk, announced that the House had passed the following bills and joint resolutions; in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

A bill (H. R. 1004) for the relief of Theodore F. Swayze, ad-

ministrator de bonis non of the estate of John S. P. Wheeler, deceased;

A bill (H. R. 1287) for the relief of Dr. John R. Hall, of Louisville, Ky.;

A bill (H. R. 5070) for the relief of the widow of Lieut. John F. Stewart;

A bill (H. R. 9552) permitting the building of a dam across Rainy Lake River;

A joint resolution (H. Res. 116) authorizing the Secretary of War to make a survey of the West Fork River, West Virginia, and prepare estimates of the cost thereof;

A joint resolution (H. Res. 149) directing the Secretary of War to submit plans and estimates for the proposed improvement of Hillsboro Bay, Florida, from its confluence with Tampa Bay, through Hillsboro Bay and River, to the city of Tampa; and

A joint resolution (H. Res. 233) authorizing and directing the President of the United States to intervene to stop the war in Cuba, and for the purpose of establishing a stable and independent government of the people therein.

The message also announced that the House had passed a concurrent resolution directing the Secretary of War to prepare and submit more complete plans and estimates for the improvement of the Big Sandy and the Tug and Louisa forks of the same, in Kentucky and West Virginia, etc.; in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS.

The VICE-PRESIDENT presented a petition of the legislature of the State of Ohio, praying for the enactment of legislation to prevent the use of the national flag by private enterprises for advertising purposes; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

House joint resolution No. 42.

Joint resolution memorializing the Congress of the United States to enact laws to prevent the use of the flag by private enterprises for advertising purposes.

Whereas it is a fact notoriously patent to every patriotic observer that the flag of the Union is employed as a means of attracting attention to private enterprises by using it in connection with advertisements of various articles of merchandise, and for other purposes inconsistent with the spirit which prompted the adoption of our national emblem, and believing that such base uses have a tendency to destroy the respect and veneration in which the Stars and Stripes should be held by all loyal citizens: Therefore be it

Resolved by the general assembly of the State of Ohio, That the Congress of the United States be, and hereby is, memorialized to enact such laws as will effectually prevent the use of the flag for advertising private enterprises, or to further the selfish interests of any class of citizens as against the interests of the whole people; and be it further

Resolved, That the governor is hereby requested to forward to both branches of Congress certified copies of this resolution.

HARRY C. MASON,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.
THADDEUS E. CROMLEY,
President pro tempore of the Senate.

Adopted April 8, 1898.

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, OHIO,
Office of the Secretary of State.

I, Charles Kinney, secretary of state of the State of Ohio, do hereby certify that the foregoing is an exemplified copy, carefully compared by me with the original rolls now on file in this office, and in my official custody as secretary of state, as required by the laws of the State of Ohio, of an act passed by the general assembly of the State of Ohio on the 8th day of April, A. D. 1898.

In testimony whereof I have hereunto subscribed my name and affixed my official seal, at Columbus, this 11th day of April, A. D. 1898.

[SEAL.] CHARLES KINNEY,
Secretary of State.
Pursuant to the request of the general assembly of Ohio, I herewith transmit the accompanying resolution for the consideration of Congress.
ASA S. BUSHNELL,
Governor of Ohio.

Mr. LODGE presented a petition of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Dorchester, Mass., praying for the enactment of legislation to prohibit the interstate transmission of lottery messages and other gambling matter by telegraph; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also presented a petition of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Dorchester, Mass., praying for the enactment of legislation to prohibit the sale of intoxicating liquors in all Government buildings; which was referred to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

He also presented a petition of Tri-Mountain Lodge, No. 486, Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen, of Boston, Mass., praying for the passage of the so-called eight-hour bill, the prison-labor bill, the anti-injunction bill, and the bill for the relief of American seamen; which was referred to the Committee on Education and Labor.

He also presented petitions of the Woman's Christian Temperance unions of Dorchester and Fall River and of the congregations of St. Paul's Methodist Episcopal Church, the Quarry Street Methodist Episcopal Church, the First Christian Church, the Second Primitive Methodist Church, the Third Primitive Methodist Church, the Advent Christian Church, and the Preparative Meeting of Friends, all of Fall River, in the State of Massachusetts, praying for the enactment of legislation to protect State

anti-cigarette laws by providing that cigarettes imported in original packages on entering any State shall become subject to its laws; which were referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

Mr. GEAR presented a petition of the congregation of the Methodist Episcopal Church of Fairfax, Iowa, praying for the enactment of legislation to prohibit the sale of intoxicating liquors in all Government buildings; which was referred to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

He also presented a petition of the congregation of the Methodist Episcopal Church of Fairfax, Iowa, praying for the enactment of legislation to protect State anti-cigarette laws by providing that cigarettes imported in original packages on entering any State shall become subject to its laws; which was referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

He also presented resolutions adopted by Wisner Post, No. 127, Department of Iowa, Grand Army of the Republic, approving the action of the President in regard to the trouble with Spain and requesting the Senators and Representatives from that State to give him all the aid in their power; which were ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. MILLS presented a petition of sundry citizens of Village Mills, Tex., praying for the passage of the so-called anti-scalping ticket bill; which was ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. PENROSE. I present a telegram in the nature of a petition addressed to me in regard to the Cuban situation, which I ask to have read. It is only two lines long.

There being no objection, the petition was read, and ordered to lie on the table, as follows:

[Telegram.]

PHILADELPHIA, PA., April 14, 1898.

BOIES PENROSE, *Senate*:

House resolution dishwater; Davis resolution satisfactory; remember the Maine.

T. JAY TOMLINSON.

Mr. PENROSE presented a resolution adopted by the Northeast Representatives' Association, Junior Order United American Mechanics, of Philadelphia, Pa., favoring the recognition of the independence of Cuba, demanding from Spain such reparation as is proper to atone for the insult to our honor and murder of our fellow-citizens and the destruction of our property, and pledging their support to the President and Congress in any action they may take for the freedom of Cuba and the preservation of our national honor; which was ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. TURPIE presented resolutions adopted by the Board of Trade of Indianapolis, Ind., favoring the patriotic and conservative course of the Administration in dealing with the Cuban question and the affairs resulting from the destruction of the battle ship *Maine*; which were ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented a petition of sundry citizens of Millville, Ind., praying for the passage of the so-called anti-scalping ticket bill; which was ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. SMITH presented resolutions adopted by the board of directors of the Prudential Insurance Company of America, of Newark, N. J., favoring the attitude of the President in regard to the trouble with Spain and pledging their support in the event of war with that country; which were ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. MORRILL presented a petition of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Irasburg, Vt., and a petition of the congregation of the Center Methodist Episcopal Church of Underhill, Vt., praying for the enactment of legislation to prohibit the sale of intoxicating liquors in all Government buildings; which were referred to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

He also presented a petition of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Irasburg, Vt., and a petition of the Center Methodist Episcopal Church of Underhill, Vt., praying for the enactment of legislation to prohibit the interstate transmission of lottery messages and other gambling matter by telegraph; which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also presented a petition of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Irasburg, Vt., and a petition of the Center Methodist Episcopal Church of Underhill, Vt., praying for the enactment of legislation to protect State anti-cigarette laws by providing that cigarettes imported in original packages on entering any State shall become subject to its laws; which were referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

Mr. PETTIGREW presented a petition of the Young People's Society of Christian Endeavor of Clinton, Mich., and a petition of the Epworth League, the congregations of the Methodist Episcopal Church, the Baptist Church, and the Congregational Church, the Baptist Young People's Union, and the Anti-Saloon League, of Clinton, Mich., praying for the enactment of legislation to protect State anti-cigarette laws by providing that cigarettes imported in original packages on entering any State shall become subject to its laws; which were referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

Mr. BATE presented sundry petitions of citizens of Nashville,

Tenn., praying for the passage of the so-called anti-scalping ticket bill; which were ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. HOAR presented a petition of Taunton Lodge, No. 474, of Taunton, Mass., praying for the passage of the so-called anti-scalping ticket bill; which was ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. WARREN presented petitions of the Grand Lodge of Wyoming, Knights of Pythias, of Buffalo; of Rawlins Lodge, No. 4, Knights of Pythias, of Rawlins; of Lander Lodge, No. 10, Knights of Pythias, of Lander; of Cheyenne Lodge, No. 2, Knights of Pythias, of Cheyenne, and of Sweet Water Lodge, No. 6, Knights of Pythias, of Rock Springs, all in the State of Wyoming, praying for the enactment of legislation authorizing the Supreme Lodge of the Knights of Pythias to erect and maintain a sanitarium and bath house on the Government reservation at the city of Hot Springs, Ark.; which were ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented a petition of Cheyenne Division, No. 128, Order of Railway Conductors, of Cheyenne, Wyo., and a petition of Black Hills Lodge, No. 86, Brotherhood of Locomotive Firemen, of Laramie, Wyo., praying for the passage of the so-called anti-scalping ticket bill; which were ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented a petition of R. W. Baxter, jr., Lodge, No. 67, Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen, of Laramie, Wyo., praying for the enactment of legislation to substitute voluntary arbitration for railway strikes; which was referred to the Committee on Education and Labor.

Mr. FAIRBANKS presented a petition of the Grace Methodist Episcopal Church, of Hartford City, Ind., praying for the enactment of legislation to prohibit the sale of intoxicating liquors in all Government buildings; which was referred to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

He also presented a petition of the congregation of the Methodist Episcopal Church of Bedford, Ind., praying for the enactment of legislation to protect State anti-cigarette laws by providing that cigarettes imported in original packages on entering any State shall become subject to its laws; which was referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

He also presented a petition of the congregation of the Methodist Episcopal Church of Bedford, Ind., praying for the enactment of legislation to prohibit the interstate transmission of lottery messages and other gambling matter by telegraph; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. HAWLEY presented a petition of the congregation of the Second Baptist Church of Danbury, Conn., praying for the enactment of legislation to raise the age of protection for girls to 18 years in the District of Columbia and the Territories; which was ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented a petition of the congregation of the Second Baptist Church of Danbury, Conn., praying for the enactment of legislation to prohibit the sale of intoxicating liquors in all Government buildings; which was referred to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

He also presented a petition of the congregation of the Second Baptist Church of Danbury, Conn., praying for the enactment of legislation to prohibit the interstate transmission of lottery messages and other gambling matter by telegraph; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. CHANDLER presented a petition of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Hinsdale, N. H., praying for the enactment of legislation to prohibit the sale of intoxicating liquors in all Government buildings; which was referred to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

He also presented a petition of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Hinsdale, N. H., praying for the enactment of legislation to protect State anti-cigarette laws by providing that cigarettes imported in original packages on entering any State shall become subject to its laws; which was referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

He also presented a petition of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Hinsdale, N. H., praying for the enactment of legislation to prohibit the interstate transmission of lottery messages and other gambling matter by telegraph; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

WILKINSON CALL.

Mr. CHANDLER. The memorial of Wilkinson Call, for eighteen years a Senator from the State of Florida, and of some members of the Florida legislature, relating to the election of a Senator for the term commencing March 4, 1897, which was laid before the Senate by the Vice-President on the 7th of March, was referred to the Committee on Privileges and Elections, and it has not been printed. I move that the memorial be printed for the use of the Senate, together with a letter of Wilkinson Call to the people of Florida.

The motion was agreed to.

GOVERNMENT OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA.

Mr. McMILLAN. I present certain papers relating to the various forms of local government in the District of Columbia, which I move be printed as a document. I also move that 500 copies in addition to the usual number be printed and bound in paper for the use of the committee.

The motion was agreed to.

THE NAVIGATION LAWS.

Mr. HALE. I present a statement, in the nature of a memorial, from the National Civic Club, calling attention to the necessity of an amendment or repeal of the navigation laws in case of war. I ask that it be read.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. In the absence of objection, the Secretary will read the memorial.

The Secretary read as follows:

The National Civic Club of Brooklyn, N. Y., respectfully calls the attention of the Administration to one phase of the Cuban situation which has apparently been forgotten in the event of war with Spain. The United States may capture Cuba and annihilate the sea forces of the enemy, but that will not prevent Spain from harassing our coasting vessels for years to come. The moment war is declared every merchant vessel of Spain will be placed under the French flag and will remain secure from attack. Nothing but the repeal of the present navigation laws can place us upon an equal footing. This club therefore respectfully represents that Congress should not adjourn without repealing the laws that would prevent our ships from sailing under a foreign flag during the pending war.

THE NATIONAL CIVIC CLUB,
F. W. HINRICHS, President.

Mr. HALE. Mr. President, the memorial raises a very serious question, which should be carefully considered by a competent committee. Whether the remedy suggested is the true one the committee can judge upon and decide. That it would be mortifying and humiliating that every American merchant ship upon the ocean should be obliged to strike its flag and go under the flag of a foreign nation no one can dispute, but that grave danger would beset every ship of ours upon the sea in case of war no one can deny. It is one of the lamentable conditions which war brings. I ask that the memorial be referred to the Committee on Commerce, and I hope that committee will give it most careful and prudent consideration.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The memorial will be referred to the Committee on Commerce and printed as a document.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES.

Mr. CARTER, from the Committee on Military Affairs, to whom was referred the joint resolution (S. R. 70) authorizing the Secretary of War to exchange Springfield breech-loading rifles, caliber .45, of late model, now stored in any of the United States arsenals, for the Springfield breech-loading rifles, calibers .45 and .50, now in possession of the State of Illinois, submitted an adverse report thereon, which was agreed to; and the joint resolution was postponed indefinitely.

Mr. McLAURIN, from the Committee on Claims, to whom was referred the bill (S. 3187) for the relief of the widow and heirs of Samuel Kramer, reported it without amendment, and submitted a report thereon.

Mr. SHOUP, from the Committee on Military Affairs, to whom was referred the bill (S. 3323) to place Henry Biederbick, Julius R. Frederick, Francis Long, and Maurice Connell on the retired list of enlisted men of the Army, reported it with amendments, and submitted a report thereon.

AFFAIRS IN CUBA.

Mr. LODGE, from the Committee on Printing, reported the following resolution; which was considered by unanimous consent, and agreed to:

Ordered, That 2,000 additional copies of Senate Report No. 885, relating to affairs in Cuba, be printed for the use of the Senate.

STATISTICS OF LAKE COMMERCE.

Mr. LODGE, from the Committee on Printing, to whom was referred the following resolution of the House of Representatives, reported it without amendment; and it was considered by unanimous consent, and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That there shall be printed by the Public Printer 10,000 copies of House Document No. 277, Fifty-fifth Congress, second session, entitled Statistics of Lake Commerce; 4,000 copies for the use of the House, 2,000 copies for the Senate, and 4,000 copies for the use of the Treasury Department.

BEET-SUGAR INDUSTRY.

Mr. LODGE. From the Committee on Printing I report back with an amendment the joint resolution (S. R. 148) providing for the printing of House Document No. 396, for the use of the Department of Agriculture. I ask for its present consideration.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the joint resolution?

Mr. GEAR. I do not object, but I wish to suggest an amendment.

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

Mr. GEAR. I move to amend the joint resolution by providing that there shall be 40,000 additional copies printed for the use of the House and Senate. It is a very valuable document.

Mr. COCKRELL. I should like to ask the Senator who reported the joint resolution if the printing is asked for by the Secretary of Agriculture?

Mr. LODGE. It is. I have his letter here. If the Senator from Missouri desires to have it read, I will have it read.

Mr. COCKRELL. Let the letter be read.

Mr. LODGE. I send the letter from the Secretary of Agriculture to the desk and ask that it be read.

The Secretary read as follows:

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY,
Washington, D. C., April 11, 1893.

SIR: There is now being printed under an order of March 31 ultimo, as House Document 396, a special report on the beet-sugar industry in the United States. This order, I understand, carries only the usual number. I beg to call your attention to the urgent necessity which exists for a supply of this report adequate to meet the extraordinary demand therefor which its publication is sure to create. In fact, since the same was ordered printed I am in receipt daily of earnest applications for copies from parties to whom it is extremely desirable, in the interest of this great industry, that the information contained in this report be communicated.

The resumption by this Department of active efforts for the development of this industry in the United States has been universally commended, and I am extremely desirous that no suspension of these active efforts, such as would be entailed by my inability to supply this report to the proper parties, should occur. Under the embarrassing restrictions as to size of editions of certain publications under the law of January 12, 1895, my requisition upon the Public Printer for copies of this report could not carry over a thousand copies. I must, therefore, apply to your committee for authorization by joint resolution for the publication and assignment to this Department for distribution of not less than 20,000 copies, an edition which I believe to be amply justified by the extreme importance of the subject-matter.

I have addressed a communication similar to this to the chairman of the House Committee on Agriculture.

Very respectfully,

JAMES WILSON,
Secretary.

HON. REDFIELD PROCTOR,
Chairman Committee on Agriculture, United States Senate.

Mr. LODGE. There is an amendment reported from the committee.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Secretary will read the amendment.

The SECRETARY. In line 3 strike out "40,000" and insert in lieu thereof "60,000;" and after the words "United States," in line 6, insert "27,000 copies for the use of the House of Representatives, 13,000 copies for the use of the Senate, and 20,000 copies;" so as to make the joint resolution read:

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives, etc., That there be printed 60,000 copies of House Document No. 396, Fifty-fifth Congress, being a special report on the beet-sugar industry in the United States, 27,000 copies for the use of the House of Representatives, 13,000 copies for the use of the Senate, and 20,000 copies for the use of the Department of Agriculture.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Committee on Printing.

The amendment was agreed to.

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

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

The title was amended so as to read: "A joint resolution providing for the printing of House Document No. 396, relating to the beet-sugar industry in the United States."

BILLS INTRODUCED.

Mr. PRITCHARD introduced a bill (S. 4412) to correct the military record of Thomas O. Pritchard; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. CHANDLER introduced a bill (S. 4413) for the proper control and regulation of corporations engaged in the transportation of persons and property by railroads between the several States, and for establishing just and reasonable prices for such transportation; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

Mr. CULLOM introduced a bill (S. 4414) granting a pension to Georgia H. Berry; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. HOAR introduced a bill (S. 4415) to incorporate the Society of American Florists and Ornamental Horticulturists; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

AMENDMENT TO NAVAL APPROPRIATION BILL.

Mr. CHANDLER submitted an amendment relative to the purchase of a limited number of copies of General Orders and Circulars of the Navy Department, 1887-1897, inclusive, intended to be proposed by him to the naval appropriation bill; which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

BIG SANDY RIVER, IN KENTUCKY AND WEST VIRGINIA.

The VICE-PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following concurrent resolution of the House of Representatives; which was read:

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring). That the Secretary of War be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to prepare and submit more complete plans and estimates for the improvement of the Big Sandy, and the Tug and Louisa forks of same, in Kentucky and West Virginia, with probable cost of same if placed under the continuing-contract system.

Mr. LINDSAY. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the concurrent resolution.

The concurrent resolution was considered by unanimous consent, and agreed to.

HOUSE BILLS REFERRED.

The following bill and joint resolutions were severally read twice by their titles, and referred to the Committee on Commerce: A bill (H. R. 9552) permitting the building of a dam across Rainy Lake River;

A joint resolution (H. Res. 116) authorizing the Secretary of War to make a survey of the West Fork River, West Virginia, and prepare estimates of the cost thereof; and

A joint resolution (H. Res. 149) directing the Secretary of War to submit plans and estimates for the proposed improvement of Hillsboro Bay, Florida, from its confluence with Tampa Bay, through Hillsboro Bay and River to the city of Tampa.

The bill (H. R. 1004) for the relief of Theodore F. Swayze, administrator de bonis non of the estate of John S. P. Wheeler, deceased, was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Finance.

The bill (H. R. 1287) for the relief of Dr. John R. Hall, of Louisville, Ky., was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

The bill (H. R. 5070) for the relief of the widow of Lieut. John F. Stewart was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

PRESIDENTIAL APPROVALS.

A message from the President of the United States, by Mr. O. L. PRUDEN, one of his secretaries, announced that the President had, on the 13th instant, approved and signed the following acts:

An act (S. 73) granting a pension to William L. Grigsby, of Belvidere, in the county of Thayer, Nebr.;

An act (S. 178) granting a pension to Susan A. Paddock;

An act (S. 431) granting a pension to Ann M. Madden;

An act (S. 655) granting a pension to Harriet R. Matlack;

An act (S. 1181) to increase the pension of Anna E. Botsford, widow of Eli W. Botsford, late major of Sixteenth Regiment Ohio Volunteers;

An act (S. 1825) granting an increase of pension to Robert P. Wild;

An act (S. 2299) granting a pension to Caroline A. Slocum; and

An act (S. 3178) granting a pension to Olevia S. Washburn.

INTERVENTION IN CUBAN AFFAIRS.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The morning business appears to be closed.

Mr. DAVIS. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Senate joint resolution 149.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the joint resolution (S. R. 149) for the recognition of the independence of the people of Cuba, demanding that the Government of Spain relinquish its authority and government in the Island of Cuba, and to withdraw its land and naval forces from Cuba and Cuban waters, and directing the President of the United States to use the land and naval forces of the United States to carry these resolutions into effect.

Mr. HOAR. Mr. President—

Mr. WILSON. Mr. President, I rise to a question of order. We are exceedingly anxious to hear the honorable Senator from Massachusetts, and I should like to have order enforced in the rear of the Chamber. It is next to impossible to hear anything at this distance from the Chair.

Mr. TURNER. Mr. President—

Mr. HOAR. If the Senator from Washington will be kind enough to allow me to make a statement, I desire to take the floor upon the pending resolution and to speak to it. The discussion so far has been by unanimous consent, without anything before the Senate. I am told that in my absence last night the Senator from Washington [Mr. TURNER] rose and addressed the Chair, there then being nothing before the Senate, and being inquired of whether he would prefer to go on last night or to-day, he answered that he would prefer to go on to-day.

Under those circumstances, if the Senator from Washington wishes to go on now, I do not desire to interfere with him and will give way, with the understanding that I can be recognized when he is finished. If that is the desire of the Senator from Washington, I will yield to it.

Mr. GRAY. I was present last night at the adjournment. When we adjourned, the Senator from Washington had the floor, and by the universal custom of the Senate when the same order of business comes up again to-day, he still has the floor. I do not believe that it is within the power of the Senator from Massachusetts and the Senator from Washington to make an agreement as to the Senator who shall have the floor at the conclusion of the speech of the Senator from Washington.

Mr. HOAR. There was no order of business at all then before the Senate. But I wish to do exactly what the Senator from Washington desires. If he desires to go on, I do not desire to do so. If he desires not to go on, I desire to go on.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Senator from Washington can answer the Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. TURNER. It would be my disposition to yield in any mere question of precedence between the Senator from Massachusetts and myself to that Senator because of his eminence and his long and distinguished career in the Senate.

Mr. HOAR. I beg the Senator to understand that there is no such question involved. If the Senator desires to go on, I do not desire to go on.

Mr. TURNER. I desire to go on at the appropriate time.

Mr. HOAR. Very well, then; that is all.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Senator from Washington will proceed.

Mr. TURNER. Mr. President, I shall give my support to the resolutions reported by the Committee on Foreign Relations, but with the amendment, I hope, if the Senate shall see fit to vote it, offered by the minority of that committee, and I need no further justification for my action, nor does any Senator, than the magnificent state paper prepared by the committee and presented by it to the Senate along with its resolution. That paper meets in admirable temper and style every argument and suggestion and recommendation contained in the President's message of the 11th instant, looking to further irresolution and indecision, and overrules them all.

But there are certain phases of that message and of the remarkable series of incidents leading up to it, all of them connected with it and throwing light on it, which the committee as an official organ of this body could not, if it would, present to the country, and which other Senators who may address themselves to the resolutions under consideration may not feel disposed to present, to which I propose principally to address myself on this occasion.

I think it is important that some one should do so because the same malevolent influences which have hitherto and for so long paralyzed the arm of the Government, bringing to it a condition of impotence requiring Congressional action to relieve, and harassing the patriotic spirit of the people almost beyond the point of endurance, and which all had hoped was at last ended, is still alive and active and striving to minimize the action of Congress to a point which shall emasculate it of all force and effect and bring it at least in apparent accord with the lame, halting, and impotent course which has heretofore governed the action of the executive department of the Government. If that attempt shall succeed, then I for one desire, and so far as my poor abilities will permit, intend that the people of this country shall know and understand the entire situation.

Mr. President, the Executive in his message blazes out a course of procedure for Congress and urges its adoption which is in contravention of the Constitution of the United States, is an anomaly in international relations, and is shocking to the sense of right and justice of the great mass of the liberty-loving people of the United States. I say that that course of procedure is in contravention of the Constitution of the United States, because it involves the delegation by Congress on the Executive of the power of making war at his pleasure, and necessarily thereby the power of declaring war. That power is reposed by the Constitution exclusively in the Congress of the United States.

Section 8 of Article I of that instrument declares "that the Congress shall have power to declare war, grant letters of marque and reprisal, and make rules concerning captures on land and water." The power is nowhere else declared in that instrument nor is the right in Congress to shift that power on another department of the Government anywhere declared.

That the Executive makes this untenable suggestion, and that his policy with reference to the Cuban problem depends wholly and entirely for its efficacy upon that suggestion, is shown by the paragraph of his message which contains his recommendations to Congress. That paragraph is as follows:

In view of these facts and of these considerations, I ask the Congress to authorize and empower the President to take measures to secure a full and final termination of hostilities between the Government of Spain and the people of Cuba, and to secure in the island the establishment of a stable government, capable of maintaining order and observing its international obligations, insuring peace and tranquillity and the security of its citizens as well as our own, and to use the military and naval forces of the United States as may be necessary for these purposes.

Mr. President, how is it possible for the President to employ the naval and military forces of the United States for the purpose and in the manner indicated without making war, and how is it possible for Congress to delegate to the President the power to do so in his discretion without at the same time and by the same act delegating to him the power to make war at his discretion?

There are two reasons which influence my mind against the recommendations of the President, either of which would compel my vote against those recommendations. My oath of office compels me to support and sustain and defend the Constitution of the United States. Since that instrument devolves upon Congress exclusively the war power, I can not, without violating my oath of office, vote to devolve that power upon another department of the Government.

But, Mr. President, if the question were free from constitutional difficulties, I should still decline to give my own adherence to the Presidential recommendation. The Congress of the United States is the organized conscience of the people of this nation, and the only department of the Government capable of dealing with the awful question of peace and war. That department partakes alike of the weakness and the strength of the people of the nation.

If their weakness be a too ready and generous sympathy with suffering and distress, with struggling humanity aspiring for liberty, a too inflammable disposition under wrong and insult, under the cruel and wanton murder of sons and brothers, their strength, grand, glorious, and godlike, consists in the fact that their eyes are not blinded nor their consciences seared by sordid, selfish, cold calculation; that they refuse to measure tears and blood against dollars and cents; wrong, aggression, and murder against the rise and fall of stocks, or the imperiled interests of trade and commerce, or the jeopardizing of money invested in international securities.

Mr. President, I will not say that there are others moved by such considerations to brook national insults, to overlook international murder, to shut their eyes to the wrongs of humanity, to push down aspiring patriotism struggling for liberty, because to say all that might be said on that subject might savor of a want of courtesy to another department of this Government, and that courtesy, so sorely strained during the last few weeks, I would not be the first one to break. But I will say that the Congress of the United States, coming from the people, and representing the people, and standing for the people, both in their weakness and their strength, will never be moved by such considerations to adopt a course so cowardly, so contemptible, and so pusillanimous. Hence, Mr. President, I prefer to trust to the Congress of the United States to say when and where and how and under what provocation the people of the United States shall draw the sword in defense of imperiled honor, in reparation for cruel aggression, and in aid of a brave and aspiring and deserving people struggling for liberty and independence.

Mr. President, I presume that one may still, in these latter days and in a becoming spirit of humility, question the wisdom of the Executive and his advisers without being guilty of the crime of lese majeste. If so, I want to say, and I say it regretfully, as another reason for withholding the power which is sought by the Executive, that the developments of the last few weeks have shaken my confidence in the wisdom of those who have the Executive ear and upon whose advice the Executive appears to be disposed to act on all public questions.

Mr. President, it has been now about two months since the relations of this country with Spain became acute. At that time the position of this country in the eyes of the world was impregnable. The revelation of the horrors practiced upon the devoted people of Cuba by Spain was then fresh in the mind of the world, and that revelation was so shocking to humanity and vouched for by authority so incontestable that the voice of the world with one accord would have stood by the United States in any action which she might feel disposed to take to abate those horrors.

On top of that feeling came the destruction of the *Maine* and the gross, cruel, wanton murder of our brave sailors in the harbor of Havana. The people of the world stood aghast at that atrocious act, waiting for us to strike, and ready to applaud the blow. But instead of striking as a courageous man and a bold man would have done, instead of striking as a patriotic man must have done, a course of conduct was entered on by the Executive and his advisers which, but for my respect for the Executive office, I would say was marked by evasion and equivocation and subterfuge, having for its primary purpose the blinding of the American people and the muzzling of the American Congress, and having for its secondary purpose delay, a delay that in view of the known and moving and urging facts of that time was dishonorable to this nation, and that weakened it in the eyes of the world no less than it dishonored it.

We were told that we must wait for the result of the deliberations of the naval court of inquiry into the subject of the destruction of the *Maine*, and we were led to believe that the direction of

those inquiries was for the purpose of determining who was responsible for the destruction of the *Maine*. When that report finally came to hand it was found that it had been directed to the inquiry who was not responsible for the destruction of the *Maine*. In other words, it was simply a court of inquiry into the responsibility of the officers of the *Maine* for the destruction of that vessel.

Mr. President, who that has read that report and the testimony taken by that naval court of inquiry but now knows that its deliberations were delayed for an ulterior purpose by superior orders, and does not feel indignation at the subterfuge practiced thereby on the American people and the American Congress? And who, moreover, that has read that report and seen how close and compact the few facts were necessary to determine how and by what agency the *Maine* was destroyed but knows that any intelligent court in this land or any committee of any legislative body in this land could have found all of those facts within ten days after having entered upon the inquiry?

Well, the report of the court of inquiry, after every delay that red tape and official etiquette could demand had been exhausted, finally came to hand, and was sent to Congress with an impotent and colorless message which indicated that the Executive intellect had been unable to digest plain facts, because to suppose anything else would be an impeachment of the heart and the conscience of the President. Congress at the same time was given to understand that the President would speedily communicate to it other facts in his possession necessary to a full and complete understanding of our relations with Spain and our situation with respect to the Island of Cuba. The time for this other and further and fuller communication was informally fixed for the ensuing Wednesday. When Wednesday came the prospects of a speedy and brilliant diplomatic triumph, which should secure ample reparation for the past and ample guaranty for the future, and at the same time assure independence to struggling Cuba, were so bright and promising that a delay until the ensuing Monday was determined on by the Executive.

And then came the hegira to the White House by invitation and appointment. Senators and Members were buttonholed and cajoled and worked on by iridescent and evanescent promises and assurances of what the future should bring forth to induce them to acquiesce in the delay.

The appeals were so direct, the assurances so positive, and accompanied with a mysterious reserve that was so profound and awe-inspiring that no man, however heartless and tired, and disgusted and humiliated, wanted to take on himself the responsibility of forcing the Presidential hand. Time with slow but inexorable steps went on until the next Saturday, when the President found that he needed rest. On Sunday he was very weary.

By Monday he had a well-developed case of brain fog, which necessarily prevented the completion of his message. This last development was noted in the European capitals, as we saw by the dispatches, and was considered a most proper and justifiable exhibition of diplomatic finesse to hold in check an unruly Congress. And it was, because the courtesy of Congress to its disabled Executive again tided things over until Wednesday.

On Wednesday came the coup de théâtre. The message which we now have before us, and which, it transpires, had been communicated in substance to Spain long before, was to stir the blood of the Spaniard to the boiling point and make unsafe the lives of our consuls and citizens in the Island of Cuba, and hence it was necessary to further delay its delivery to Congress until the ensuing Monday, in order to bring back our imperiled citizens.

But coincidentally with this information came the further information from Rome that Archbishop Ireland had cabled the Holy Father that the President had consented to withhold action until the ensuing Monday, to enable the Holy Father to bring his powerful influence to bear in further aid of the President's diplomacy. Just how far the Holy Father was aiding the President we gather from the following dispatch from Rome in last Monday morning's paper:

The Rome correspondent of the Daily News, telegraphing Sunday, says: "The Pope telegraphed personally to the Queen Regent and Señor Sagasta to-day (Sunday), to convince them that it was Spain's interest to concede the armistice without delay and without conditions, in order to put President McKinley in such a position as to make it difficult for him to decide what course to take."

Now, Mr. President, while all this was going on, we have had from day to day, almost from hour to hour, assurances that diplomatic negotiations were proceeding prosperously, looking to the withdrawal of Spain from the Island of Cuba, to the complete independence of the Cuban people, and to the most complete reparation, however that might be made, for the loss of the *Maine* and the murder of our sailors. Nothing less would have justified an otherwise shameful procrastination or met for a moment the impatient demand of the people of this country that Congress and the President should take vigorous, determined, and patriotic action. It was with the utmost astonishment, then, that I heard read the portion of the President's message which describes the

extent of our diplomatic demands on Spain. The paragraph relating to that is as follows:

Realizing this, it appeared to be my duty, in a spirit of true friendliness no less to Spain than to the Cubans, who have so much to lose by the prolongation of the struggle, to seek to bring about an immediate termination of the war. To this end I submitted, on the 27th ultimo, as a result of much representation and correspondence, through the United States minister at Madrid, propositions to the Spanish Government looking to an armistice until October 1 for the negotiation of peace with the good offices of the President.

In addition, I asked the immediate revocation of the order of reconcentration, so as to permit the people to return to their farms and the needy to be relieved with provisions and supplies from the United States, cooperating with the Spanish authorities, so as to afford full relief.

Mr. President, without enlarging on the discrepancy between that which we were led to believe was the end and that which we now know to have been the end of the President's diplomacy, it is pertinent to inquire, Where has that diplomacy landed him?

What has he been able to accomplish with the aid of the Pope? The Pope answers the question in the telegram which I have before read. The President, in the language of the Holy Father, is now in "a position to make it difficult for him to decide what course to take."

According to his own statement, the only thing which the President has demanded of Spain throughout all this diplomatic negotiation, during which the impatient spirit of the people and the impatient demands of Congress were being subdued and put aside, was an armistice in the Island of Cuba and the privilege upon the part of the United States to feed the starving poor of Spain in that island.

Both of those demands of the President have now been granted by Spain and it is strictly in order to ask, "Mr. President, where are we at?" It is likewise in order to consider seriously whether we want any more diplomacy of the kind I have been describing. If so, we should grant the President's request for discretionary power, which means more diplomacy, and then adjourn and go home. With a State Department at this end of the diplomatic line somewhat weak in the use of diplomatic terms, even when aided by the Department of Justice, as we saw in a semi-official statement in the papers yesterday, with a diplomatic representative at the other end so anxious to preserve peace that he will not even obey instructions of his superiors for fear of offending Spain, as we likewise saw in a semi-official communication in the papers yesterday, and with the Pope to assist with his good offices, Spain, no doubt, in time and for a proper indemnity, will absolve us from responsibility for blocking the harbor at Havana with the shattered hull of the sunken *Maine*.

I can not conceive of any other result likely to be accomplished should our diplomacy progress backward as rapidly in the future as it has in the past. The trouble with it has been that it was without shape and form, and, like the world at the beginning, void. It asked nothing which we had a right to ask or which would materially benefit us in the receiving or which would seriously hurt Spain in the giving, and it was deplorably and disgracefully silent on the things which were bringing flame to the hearts and minds of the American people, and which alone Spain feared and could not satisfactorily adjust.

The little comedy that was played with us from Sunday to Sunday, with Spain in the rôle of the bullying and bloody villain, the six great powers as the respectable and prosperous but fearful citizens, the Holy Father as the mediator, and America as the hero, standing resolutely for wounded honor and outraged humanity, ended on last Sunday where it was designed that it should, with all parties but America in their everyday clothes, smiling, placid, and content, and with the latter, still strident of voice and heroic in attitude, but without ground to stand on, and, in the language of the Holy Father, "in a position to make it difficult to decide what course to take."

Mr. President, this is true if the American nation is bound by the results of our diplomacy; but, fortunately, we are not so bound. The foreign nations knew when they commenced their diplomatic juggle that they were dealing with an agent of limited authority and that the most they could hope to accomplish was to prejudice and embarrass our position in the sight of mankind.

The only power that has ever had the right to commit the country to any policy is now dealing with the subject, and it may brush away the cobwebs of diplomatic intrigue which bind and enthrall another department, and without dishonor and without the reproach of bad faith at last take that vigorous and decided action which the people of this country expect, and which is demanded alike by every sentiment of humanity and by every dictate of national honor. A declaration of war, pure and simple, would be most consonant with my idea of that action. But believing that a declaration of independence in favor of the Cuban Republic, and armed intervention in aid of that declaration, would amount to the same thing, I am prepared for one to accept that as a satisfactory solution of our duty to ourselves and to the world. Spain has made war on humanity by her cruelties and barbarities in the Island of Cuba. She has made specific war on us by her

cowardly and perfidious attack on our ship and our unsuspecting sailors. Since she has made war, I say let us give her war.

The sword that has been sheathed so long is still bright and flashing and keen, and the arm that wields it is stronger than ever before. When we draw that sword to defend our national honor, so seriously attacked; to avenge our honored dead, so cruelly slaughtered, we will keep it uplifted until we have won a reparation worthy our dignity as a nation and worthy the memory of those whose loss we so deeply deplore. We will keep it uplifted until we have driven the cowardly and brutal Spanish nation from this hemisphere at the muzzle of our guns, thereby honoring ourselves, honoring our dead, and giving to struggling Cuba, after four hundred years of living hell, and after a succession of heroic struggles which have moved the world to sympathy and admiration, peace and happiness under free and glorious republican institutions.

Mr. President, to pursue the course suggested by the President would be an anomaly in international relations. That course involves, first, a threat of armed intervention to force diplomatic concessions; and second, failing such concessions, possible intervention to expel Spain from the Island of Cuba. It does not involve the independence of Cuba, because that is only suggested in the President's message for the purpose of making an argument against its present recognition.

Such a thing, I believe, as is proposed was never heard of in the history of nations. Nations intervene to secure tranquillity, to preserve order, to stop outrage and murder, but never to themselves usurp sovereignty, nor ever to subvert sovereignty, except in the interest of some other nation or in the interest of a subject people struggling for independence. If we intervene in the affairs of Cuba for either one of the three causes first named, we will have accomplished our purpose when Spain has given proper guaranties of better future conduct.

To propose to expel her from the island after that, or before giving her opportunity to afford such guaranty, would be unheard of and would justly arouse the opposition and protest of other nations. Mr. President, armed intervention involves the use of force and is, in essence, war. It is only less than war by the acquiescence of the power against which it is employed. When writers speak of it as an international right, they speak of it in the same sense that they speak of the right to make war. That right belongs to any nation at any time and for any cause it may esteem sufficient. Both rights spring from the same source, and are held in check by the same sanction, namely, the reprobation of mankind if improvidently exercised. Hence, if we would avoid that reprobation in our intervention in Cuba, it must be either for the purpose of simply restoring order and tranquillity and stable government under the sovereignty of Spain, or it must be in aid of the struggling insurgents who have already so largely overturned the power of Spain.

The first purpose the President disclaims and the last one he refuses to permit Congress to proclaim or to himself proclaim, and therefore I say his course is an anomaly. But we have a perfect right to intervene in Cuba, in the sense that the right is spoken of, if the sovereignty of Spain has been superseded there by another and superior power, or if her aggressions against us have been such as to justify us in making war on her and in aiding another power to supplant her. There would be no anomaly about that.

If we do intervene there, the right to do so and the disposition to do so will be predicated, as everybody knows, on both the grounds I have stated. I am opposed, therefore, to further shuffling or evasion. I think we ought now to declare that which it is our purpose to effectuate. Any other self-respecting nation would do so, and for one I want my country to stand in the front rank of all the nations of the world in the matter of dignified and fearless self-respect.

To stop short now will be to commit this country to a war of conquest. The conclusion is inevitable. To drive Spain out of Cuba without recognizing the independence of the Cuban Republic will be to conquer that island by force of arms and to establish our own sovereignty over it. We may hold our conquest for a short time or a long time. We may treat with the insurgents and turn it over to them on such terms as will suit the "business interests," or we may, failing such terms, deliver the island back to Spain; but whatever we do eventually, we will in the first instance have waged a war of conquest. As such it will be justly regarded by all the people of the world, and as such it will be justly resented by all the people of the world.

The historical references in the message of the President for the purpose of showing that the condition of affairs in Cuba do not now justify recognition of independence are failures. Why stand on the message of Andrew Jackson concerning the independence of Texas, a message, moreover, which was ignored and overridden by the action of Congress, when we have before our eyes the generous and glorious example of France in our own revolutionary struggle?

That country did not wait until we had overcome all hostile

efforts to subdue our arms before recognizing our independence, but under the promptings of that liberty which was so soon to burst into flame in her own country, France gave us both the moral and the material support of her great national power. She did so in virtue of that principle of international law, then and now in force, that the question of independence is not so much one of fact as it is one of sympathy and interest, and one which every nation may properly judge for itself.

Mr. President, the view urged by the Executive in this matter is both anomalous and unnatural, and, in the results which may flow from it, is so little to be desired in comparison with almost any other possible action, that one is led to doubt whether the President, in his own mind, contemplates the necessity of ever putting it in force. I do not believe that he does, but think he is still relying on the force of our splendid diplomacy to answer the demands of an eager and expectant and insistent public opinion.

Why we should take the risk of financial obligations of large amount, now specifically saddled on Cuba, and which there is grave reason to believe will legally devolve on the successor of Spain in that island, no matter how short the sovereignty of that successor, is one of the puzzling things which the puzzling conditions of the last few weeks has brought forth. Why we should assume the additional and indisputable liability for all that may occur between the expulsion of the Spanish power and the setting up of some other power in the island of Cuba, a liability against which we can not hedge, and which may be onerous in the extreme, is one of the things concerning which we are left in the dark.

There is only one of two explanations possible of this remarkable position of the Executive. He either does not expect to ever act on the power which he invokes, or, if he acts, he expects to make the government which shall succeed that of the United States in the island assume and pay that which the United States might otherwise be compelled to pay, namely, the Spanish debt. This last alternative is so monstrous, not only in its injustice to Cuba, but in the sordid and dishonest intrigue at home which it would imply, that I do not hesitate to reject it. I am again brought back thereby to my original conclusion, namely, that the Executive does not ever expect to intervene, but is still relying on American diplomacy to fulfill the glowing declarations of the last Republican national platform and to meet the impatient demands of the people of the nation.

In view of the net results of that diplomacy, as we now, for the first time, see it in its entirety, another and most cogent reason is shown for withholding from the Executive the unconstitutional power which he seeks at our hands and for taking prompt and decisive action ourselves.

And lastly, Mr. President, I say that such action as that which the President invokes would be shocking to the sense of right and justice of the great mass of liberty-loving American citizens. I have received evidences of this in telegrams which I have been receiving from my constituents in my own State and in other telegrams which I have seen in the hands of other Senators from their States. I propose now to read three or four of the later telegrams which have come to me on this subject from my State. The first one is from the governor of the State:

OLYMPIA, WASH., April 13, 1898.

Hon. GEORGE TURNER,
United States Senate, Washington:

Public opinion here unanimous; favor the independence of Cuba. It is opposed to intervention without Cuban independence.

J. R. ROGERS, Governor.

Another telegram from the capital of my State reads:

OLYMPIA, WASH., April 13, 1898.

Senator TURNER, Washington, D. C.:

Our people urge recognition Cuban Republic. No recognition, no intervention. Stand by Democratic resolutions against bondholders' intervention.

THOS. MALONEY.	L. P. OUELLETTE.
ROBERT BRIDGES.	JAS. B. REAVIS.
WILL D. JENKINS..	F. J. BROWNE.
H. ALLING.	C. W. YOUNG.
C. G. HEIFNER.	C. F. BOWNE.
JOHN CRYDERMAN.	D. B. MORRISON.

Among the signers are one judge of the supreme court of the State and four of the State officials.

Another telegram received from my own home reads:

SPOKANE, WASH., April 12, 1898.

Hon. GEORGE TURNER:
People enraged at President's message. All demand recognition and war. Republicans wiring WILSON Maine disaster sufficient casus belli.

R. B. BLAKE.
F. H. GRAVES.

Those are two of the ablest lawyers in that city or in the State of Washington.

Another dispatch which I have received reads:

SPOKANE, WASH., April 12, 1898.

GEORGE TURNER, United States Senate, Washington:
Second Regiment Uniform Rank Knights of Pythias recently tendered their services in case of war. Please inform President McKinley our offer is suspended until it is known whether this Government intends to fight Spaniards or Cubans.

W. H. PLUMMER,
Colonel Second Regiment.

Colonel Plummer is a prominent member of the bar of Spokane and a member of the State senate.

His telegram was called out, no doubt, by the paragraph of the message of the President which I shall now proceed to read. It is short. Speaking about the policy of forcible intervention, which he had recommended to Congress, he says:

It—

The policy—

involves, however, hostile restraint upon both the parties to the contest as well to enforce a truce as to guide the eventual settlement.

Mr. President, since it is evident that the President has never broached the independence of the Cubans to Spain, but has listened with a willing ear to the soft and insinuating tales of an accommodation of the insurgents with the mother country on the basis of a large autonomy, and since the meaning is now made plain to us, of the assurances of his friends a few weeks ago, that the result of his negotiations would be to secure almost as good as Cuban independence, we now see the deplorable direction toward which his policy leads him, and, from his own declaration, the extent to which he is prepared to go.

He proposes to leave the flag of Spain flying over the Island of Cuba. That is bad enough. But worse still, he proposes to use the power of this Republic to compel the people of Cuba to submit to that bloody flag.

Mr. President, it seems to me both monstrous and shocking that such an idea could find lodgment in the mind of an American President. It is monstrous in view of the solemn pledge by all political parties in this country, and by none more strongly than by the Republican party, to promote by every possible means the freedom and independence of Cuba.

It is shocking in view of the heroic struggle made by that brave people for liberty, of their suffering and martyrdom and death, of the confidence with which they look to us, not for aid, but for sympathy, and in view of the active feelings of sympathy with which it is to be supposed we would, and with which we do in fact, look on such a people in such a struggle and for such a cause.

Mr. President, the power of this people may be put forth at some time to strike down aspiring liberty in a neighboring people and to impose on them a government which they repudiate and reject and will not have, but it will be when, and only when, our own liberty shall have been destroyed; when, and only when, a despotism shall have reared itself on the ruins of our now glorious Republic.

That day, thank God, will never come. That infamy, thank God, will never be perpetrated, to stain and tarnish the otherwise glorious record of a glorious people.

Mr. HOAR. Mr. President, the function of diplomacy in regard to this grave crisis in the history of this matter seems to have ended. The President tells us in his message that he has exhausted every effort to relieve the intolerable condition of affairs which is at our doors, and for the first time, by the consent of everybody, the matter rests with the American Congress for decision. It has seemed to me to be my duty, while the Government was engaged in diplomatic efforts, to abstain from public discussion. The Constitution having committed to the President from the beginning the conduct of our relations with foreign governments, I do not think that expressions of dissent or criticism are quite in accordance with the duty either of American citizens or American Senators while he is acting. The duty of action and determining the policy of this people now rests with us and our associates in the legislative functions of the Government.

I wish to make a few observations which I fear and believe will be somewhat dull in the ears of my listeners, quietly, rather in the manner of a court dealing with a great question of constitutional law involving in its results liberty and life and public welfare and public honor. It seems to me to be no time for impassioned rhetoric, for the clapping of hands, the stamping of feet, and shouting. I do not in saying that forget that the expressions of deep emotion which we have heard in this Chamber, which we read in the press, which we have heard all over the country, are neither to be condemned or to be slighted.

I am not one of those persons who find in them occasion either for sneers or for jesting. They are the utterances of good men, of American citizens, of the emotion which is felt and which all good men must feel when they witness great cruelty, great wrong, and when they are contemplating a great outrage to their flag. So, whether I differ or whether I agree with the conclusions, or some of them, to which these gentlemen have come, I have nothing but the profoundest respect for the motive which has brought them forth.

I, however, Mr. President, bred and born in a cold latitude, would rather approach this grave occasion in the spirit of that captain who led the company of the people of my own birthplace to the bridge in the morning of the Revolution, when he said, "I went into that battle with the same seriousness and the same sense of

responsibility to God with which I am accustomed to go to church." If in the providence of God this country is called upon to do a great act of international justice, let us do it in the spirit of justice, and not in the spirit of vengeance.

The other day one Senator cited us, as if he liked it, the utterance of the Scripture, an eye for an eye and a tooth for a tooth. The Saviour cited it only to disapprove it and to give us a new commandment and a better doctrine.

I am not one of those, either, if any there be, who would seek to divide and not to unite the people of this country. If we are to enter upon a course of action where we receive the sympathy of the civilized world, let us not begin by reviling each other.

Mr. President, I regret, speaking for myself, that any Senator feels it to be his duty to indulge in harsh criticism of the President of the United States. What the President of the United States does in diplomacy the people of the United States do. There is no other means of knowing the opinion, purpose, conduct, character of the American people under our Constitution, so far as that is expressed in our diplomatic and international action, than by studying and seeing what the accredited agent of the American people, the Executive, has done, just as there is no mode of determining what the American people do or mean to do or desire to do in legislation but by the legislative enactments passed through their constitutional agencies.

What the President of the United States did the United States did in the face of mankind, and what the President of the United States refrained from doing the American people refrained from doing in the face of all mankind. For one I approve him alike in what he has done and said and in what he has refrained from doing and saying. I like the President's holding back and striving with all his power for a peaceful solution of this business. I like his holding out for peace so long as there was a hope that peace could be had with honor.

Mr. President, do gentlemen, when they criticize this brave American soldier's love of peace—and every brave American soldier from the beginning of our history has been a lover of peace—reflect what war is and who it is that suffers by it? The persons who suffer by modern wars are not the men who provoke them or the men who are guilty of the causes to which they owe their origin. Every modern war is an additional burden on the poor man, the laboring man, the plain man, while the glory is reaped by a few officers and the profits by a few stock jobbers and contractors.

It is not even the guilty Spaniard who is primarily to suffer by the terrible punishment which we are expected to inflict upon Spain. It is not the Weylers or even the Sagastas or the Blancos. It is the poor peasant whose first-born is to be drafted into the military service, never to return or to return a wreck. It is the widow whose stay is to be taken from her, who is to get no share of the glory, but only the full of the suffering. This war, if it be to come upon us, is to add a new and terrible burden, even if it be confined within the limits to which we hope it may be confined, to the already overburdened and suffering peasantry of Europe. The results of a great war are due to the policy of the king and the noble and the tyrant, not the policy of the people.

Every child upon the Continent of Europe to-day was born with a mortgage of \$350 about his little neck and an armed soldier riding upon his back. So while I agree, as will be seen before I finish, that war may be necessary, and it may be necessary now, yet I can not myself agree with my honorable friend the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. MONEY] when he said so lightly that he thought it was a good plan to have a war once in a while, that it prevented the dry rot of prolonged peace. A nation is made up of human homes, and the glory of a nation and the value of its possessions are in its humble homes. I do not agree with the Senator who thinks that a home is made better by the loss of its boys or the crippling for life of its head.

I do not like what follows war. I do not like the piling up in this country of thousands upon thousands of millions more of our public debt. I have not read history like the Senator from Mississippi in a way to lead me to think that war is ever a purifying process. The seasons which follow great wars, either in this country or elsewhere, are times of debts and jobs and disordered currency and popular discontent. The periods that have followed the great wars are the worst periods in history. If we enter upon this war, we are to subject our ships to many disasters like that of the *Maine* and our soldiers to pestilence and yellow fever. The destruction in the soldier who survives of the capacity for the rest of his life for the works of peace is a not insignificant result even of the best and most necessary war, to say nothing of the increase of the debt and of the pension list.

On the other hand, I have no patience and I have no respect for those critics who find in the conduct and action of many of my associates and friends on this floor what they are pleased to term a spirit of jingoism. The spirit which has inspired, without an exception, the impassioned and zealous speeches to which we have listened is the spirit of an honorable indignation at a great wrong and an honorable resentment for a great insult, and I believe

these gentlemen who think as I do that the time has come when the armed forces of this nation are to be summoned to assert themselves have been guided certainly by quite as patriotic a spirit as I claim to be guided by myself, whether I agree with them in all their conclusions as to the detail of action or not.

But I was saying, Mr. President, that I like and thank President McKinley that he has as far as he could and as long as he could held back the impatience of the American people. President McKinley and those who love him and stand by him need not be at all disturbed lest his fame may suffer in the eyes of humanity and the eyes of posterity by the caution and wisdom with which he has proceeded. The great events in our civic history and the great names in our civic history are those which are connected with the sublime self-restraint with which the American people has contained itself in the presence of great wrongs and of great provocations. It is true, also, that these civic glories have more than once crowned the brows of great soldiers and warriors.

Have we forgotten that the same kind of speeches which the Senator from Washington permitted himself to utter, who seemed to think that he who represents half the State of Washington had a better right to speak for the American people than William McKinley, who represents forty-five States and 70,000,000 people—have we forgotten that the same kind of objugation and contumely was hurled at the head of George Washington at the time of Jay's treaty, when he held back the indignant people of the Republic from entering upon another war with England? The fame of Washington is represented and typified by the loftiest of monumental structures as it rises in its severe and stainless beauty over the streets of the capital. Where, Mr. President, are the graves of his critics?

Has my honorable friend from Washington forgotten John Adams's experience when the people were clamorous for a war with France, and Washington was summoned from his retirement to take the head of the armies again, and our ministers had been dismissed with insult and contempt by the French Directory, when he sent Oliver Ellsworth and Davie and Vans Murray to reopen the negotiation? That act cost John Adams the support of the Federal party and it cost John Adams his reelection. But it left him his fame and the love and honor of his countrymen.

Andrew Jackson, in the great desire of the Southern people and of the majority of the American people to acquire Texas, and in the midst of our great sympathy with that people, struggling then against the despotism of a people of Spanish blood, held this nation strictly in the narrow yet honorable path of international law. Now, everybody honors Andrew Jackson and the only thing that our friends have to say about it is to pervert the transaction and say that the General really did not do it.

Mr. President, I am old enough to remember some of the tempests of popular excitement in Congress and out. I think there are Senators here who remember the cry of "On to Richmond! On to Richmond! On to Richmond!" and the denunciation by honorable and zealous patriots of what they described as the cowardice and treachery of Abraham Lincoln. I think people like to remember Abraham Lincoln's counsels in those days, and those of us who sit on this side of the Chamber wish we could forget Bull Run.

You remember, Mr. President, the sublime patience with which we waited after the French invasion of Mexico until the time at last came, and Mr. Seward spake and the Frenchman got out. You remember, my colleague cited it yesterday, the impatience of some good men at our dealing with the Trent affair, and my colleague cited the lines of Mr. James Russell Lowell:

Et I turn mad dogs loose, John,
On your front-parlor stairs,
Would it jest meet your views, John,
To wait an' sue their heirs?

I wish to remind my honorable colleague, with whom I suppose I am so fortunate as to agree as to everything of substance relating to this political crisis, that we did not take the advice of Mr. James Russell Lowell on that occasion. We took the advice of Abraham Lincoln, and William H. Seward, and Charles Sumner, and John Andrew, and on the whole we came out about as well.

Mr. President, some of us remember President Grant's dealings with the same sort of conditions that we have had to deal with in the Island of Cuba in the last two years. I came first into public life just as that matter was going on. We did not throw law books at each other's heads in those days in the House of Representatives, but there was quite as much angry speech for the President as we have heard in either House of Congress within a few days. But the great fame of Ulysses Grant shines in the sky like a star, and the conduct of that affair is one of the brightest and strongest of his claims to the gratitude and affection of the American people.

I think it is perhaps because I am getting old and thin blooded and losing my pluck in these matters. But, somehow or other, I like, when I read the history of the Republic, to read the story of

these sublime self-restraints, for which those men who hate popular government think a great and free people are incapable.

Do you remember how we submitted year after year to the fitting out in England of the war ships which drove our commerce from the seas till at last one morning, Mr. Adams, having discovered that the rams were about to go out from Laird's shipyard, wrote a letter to Lord John Russell expostulating? Lord Russell replied that he had consulted Her Majesty's ministers and really they did not think they could do anything about it. Mr. Adams, when the time came, replied in a single sentence, which to my taste is the most sublime utterance in American literature: "It is superfluous to observe to your lordship that this is war." And the rams were stopped in an hour.

I also agree with the President of the United States in his refusal to recognize belligerency up to this time. I do not agree with my honorable friend from Ohio [Mr. FORAKER], who thought the result of that was that we policed our shores in the interest of Spain. That recognition of belligerency, in my opinion, would have simply given Spain the right to search our ships; would have released her from responsibility for actions like the destruction of the *Maine*, unless they could be traced affirmatively and clearly to her, and would have done the insurgents no sort of good whatever.

Mr. President, what has been the result, what is the result today, of the conduct of this matter by President McKinley so far? I have not time to go, as I should like, into a full discussion of this matter, but I wish to read one testimonial only. I do not often read newspapers in the Senate, and ordinarily we all agree that it is not a very good practice, but I wish to read the testimony of the ablest, most consistent, most thoroughgoing advocate of an instant and an extreme dealing with Spain in this emergency in regard to what has been the effect of the policy which the present Executive has pursued thus far.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Senator from Massachusetts will suspend a moment. The hour of 2 o'clock having arrived, the Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business, which is Senate bill 2680.

Mr. GALLINGER. I ask unanimous consent that the unfinished business be temporarily laid aside.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Is there any objection to the request? The Chair hears none, and unanimous consent is given. The Senator from Massachusetts will proceed.

Mr. HOAR. I read, Mr. President, from the New York Sun of April 5, and not much has happened to excite my honorable friend from Washington since then, with the exception which I shall speak of presently.

The delay thus far—

Says this organ of the cause of liberty in Cuba—

has served the cause of the right. It has given time for military and naval preparation for decisive action. It has consolidated public opinion and put the nation behind the President in his constitutional capacity of Commander in Chief of the land and sea forces of the United States. It has permitted the escape of some of the vapor that precedes deliberate and calm action in an affair of momentous importance. It has likewise enabled the President to exhaust, as it was his duty to employ and exhaust, the resources of diplomacy in order to bring about, if possible, an honorable and satisfactory settlement without resort to arms.

Now, I would like to ask these gentlemen who are so anxious to find treachery and cowardice and want of patriotism and want of honor in the President of the United States, the President of their own party, whether in the face of such a testimonial as that it is not just barely possible that President McKinley may have been right and that they may have been wrong.

There is another result which has come from this diplomatic action and this striving to keep in the paths of peace. We have, what we never have had in any international conflict before, largely the sympathy of all foreign nations and almost wholly the sympathy of that nation on earth which is alike the freest, the most powerful, and the most nearly allied to us by language, history, and blood.

I would like to have read as a part of my remarks an extract from the London Times. Mr. President, these gentlemen may, if they choose and if they are so disposed, undervalue in this great crisis the sympathy of the most powerful nation on the face of the earth. I think we may perhaps like to have it before we get through. The sympathy of that country on the other side prolonged what would have been a one or two years' war to a four years or five years' war within the memory of most of us. I will ask the Secretary to read what I have marked. Undoubtedly this paper expresses the sentiment of the entire people of Great Britain.

The Secretary read as follows:

We can not refuse our sympathy to the people of the United States in circumstances which would have made it difficult even for our own countrymen to preserve their boasted calm. We should have needed all our self-command to combine dignity with equity in such a trying position. It is bare justice to say that however inexcusable the language of some of the newspapers of the United States may have been, the attitude of President McKinley is equally dignified and fair.

In this matter, whatever disagreements we may have had from time to time with our trans-Atlantic kinsmen, our sympathies are on their side. We

share their grief at the loss under such cruel conditions of a noble vessel of war and a gallant crew. We admire the patience and the reserve of a democratic government in circumstances of provocation, in the presence of public excitement which it would only have been too easy to fan into a flame of war. The sentiments with which the majority of the people of the United Kingdom regard the people of the United States, and which we trust, in spite of passing gusts of temper, are reciprocated at heart on the other side of the Atlantic, are expressed in the cordial verses of the poet laureate, which we print in another column.

Mr. HOAR. Now, Mr. President, I affirm, and I challenge contradiction, that that sympathy and that expression of respect has been won for us largely, if not wholly, by the diplomatic bearing and conduct of the President of the United States in this emergency.

I also desire to express my full and hearty concurrence with the President of the United States when he advises against the recognition of the insurgent government, if it be a government, now. Consul-General Lee says he has never thought the insurgents had anything but the skeleton of a government. I will not repeat the citations from international law and from the utterances of our statesmen and department of foreign affairs throughout the whole of the other Spanish conflicts in the Spanish-American countries which I have had occasion long ago to cite.

I affirm that to recognize that people now can not be done without disowning our whole history, without declaring that England was right and that we were wrong in the great controversy as to her conduct in the time of the rebellion, where there were eleven States, with a constitution, with courts, confederated into a republic; and yet we claimed, and England yielded, that she had no right to recognize their independency. We can not recognize that independency, as I say, without flying in the face of our whole diplomatic history. Before this discussion is over it may be desirable to return to that particular point again.

Gentlemen cite the precedent of France in the time of our Revolution. France did not pretend or claim that that recognition of the independence of the United States was anything but an act of war. She was hardly at peace with England. Before she had been driven off the continent of North America by the genius of Chatham and the military prowess of James Wolfe, and she had sat, sulky and angry, biding her time during twelve years of hollow and treacherous truce, and when the time came France hastened to throw her weight into our scale.

It is not true, however, as I understood my honorable friend to imply the other day, as I read the history of the country, that we should not have won our independence without the assistance of France. Before the French alliance our Navy, which never has had its due share of the credit of the Revolutionary war, had driven the rate of marine insurance in the Mediterranean Sea on English vessels and cargo up to 28 per cent. England could have maintained the land war, France or no France, for a hundred years but for that; and it was that which induced the merchants of Liverpool and London to compel George III and Lord North to make peace.

Our Navy in the time of the Revolution, as I said, never has had its due credit. Why, Mr. President, the State of Massachusetts alone had at sea in the Revolutionary war more men in ships of war and in privateers than the whole of all the rest of the States of the Union put together had on land, in addition to furnishing largely more than her quota of the land forces.

Mr. President, we want to gain and we want to keep in this struggle into which we are about to enter the sympathy of the civilized world, and we can only keep it by maintaining the pathway marked out for us by the law of nations. If we depart in dealing with Spain from the accepted traditions and rules of international law, especially if we depart from those rules which we have affirmed over and over again during our own history, we can not blame them if they shall sympathize with Spain for departing from them also. If we put the issue on any doubtful ground, we make the cause of Spain the cause of every European Government that has got a colony in another continent or in an island adjacent to another continent. We do not need to be departing from the rules of international law. What we have in hand we shall know how to do lawfully and effectively.

Another thing. Senators talk about recognizing the insurgent republic. Is that insurgent republic the people of Cuba? The Senator from Ohio [Mr. FORAKER] and, I believe, the committee in their report both state the number of the people of Cuba who sympathize with the insurgent government. The committee states it as a third of the people of the island, and the Senator from Ohio stated it at 400,000. Now, although we may all sympathize, as we all do sympathize, with the gallantry of those insurgents, with the courage and leadership of Gomez, with the endurance and the devotion which is willing to give life and everything which makes life dear for the liberty of Cuba, by what right can you stand in the face of the nations of the earth and say that you will recognize as the lawful government of Cuba a community which the Senator from Ohio, in some sense the organ of the committee, and the chairman of the committee in his report tell us amounts to but a third of the inhabitants of that island?

Mr. STEWART. The Senator from Ohio [Mr. FORAKER] is not here, but I did not understand him to make that statement.

Mr. HOAR. I will look in his speech and find if he did not.

Mr. STEWART. I understood the Senator from Ohio to say that there were only 400,000 within the military lines.

Mr. HOAR. That is not what he said at all.

Mr. STEWART. I do not think the Senator from Ohio said that of those who sympathized with the insurgents there were but 400,000.

Mr. HOAR. Perhaps we had better find what the Senator from Ohio said. I had somewhere marked what he said about the 400,000.

Mr. HAWLEY. Here it is.

Mr. HOAR. The Senator from Ohio said:

They control absolutely more than one-half of that territory. More than 400,000—

That is it—

More than 400,000 of the population of the island recognize no government except only their civil government.

Now, what has become of the other 1,100,000?

Mr. STEWART. If the Senator will take the context, he will find the Senator from Ohio spoke of those in the walled cities.

Mr. HOAR. The Senator from Ohio said a great many other things with which I am not dealing now. I am dealing with the estimate which that Senator gave of the number of Cubans, the 1,500,000 people, who recognize that government themselves. Where are the other 1,100,000? The Senator said nothing about walled cities. He was speaking of the number of Cubans who recognize no government but the civil government of the insurgents.

Mr. DANIEL. Mr. President—

Mr. CHANDLER. Will the Senator from Massachusetts allow me to read from the testimony of General Lee?

Mr. GALLINGER. I will say to the Senator from Massachusetts that a very large part of the people sympathize with the Cuban cause even in that part of the island where the insurgents do not hold the territory.

Mr. TILLMAN. Over 200,000 of them are dead.

Mr. CHANDLER. Will the Senator from Massachusetts allow me to say one word? I wish to read from Gen. Fitzhugh Lee's testimony before the Committee on Foreign Relations, which will give the Senator the information he wants. Will the Senator allow me to do that?

Mr. HOAR. Certainly.

Mr. CHANDLER. General Lee was asked by Senator FORAKER:

What percentage of the population of the island is Cuban?

Consul-General LEE. About one million five or six hundred thousand people. About one-third of those are negroes. Take off 500,000 and that will leave 1,000,000, the Cubans being out of that 1,000,000, all except about 300,000.

Senator FORAKER. About 70 per cent?

Consul-General LEE. Yes; I think all but about 300,000.

Senator FORAKER. Are all the Cubans friendly to the insurgents?

Consul-General LEE. I never saw one who was not.

Senator FORAKER. They are all friendly to them?

Consul-General LEE. Yes.

Mr. HOAR. Mr. President, I know Cubans myself who are thoroughly friendly to the cause of the insurgents, but who do not desire their government to be established.

Mr. FRYE. Will the Senator from Massachusetts allow me to interrupt him?

Mr. HOAR. Certainly.

Mr. FRYE. The Senator from Massachusetts alludes to the Senator from Ohio as to a certain extent being the organ of the committee. He is in no sense the organ of the committee on the question of the recognition of the Cubans as a republic.

Mr. HOAR. I had somewhere marked the statement about the proportion of people in Cuba who favor the recognition of the insurgents' government made by the committee, which I shall ask leave to quote in the RECORD. It is this:

The insurgents hold the eastern portion of the island to the practical exclusion of Spain. This possession extends over one body of territory comprising fully one-half of the area of Cuba.

The extermination by Spain of the peaceful inhabitants of the western portion of the island has so affected the balance of the population between these moieties of Cuba that the insurgents comprise in the eastern half nearly one-third of the population of the island. That third of the population pays taxes to them, serves in their armies, and in every way supports and is loyal to them. This situation has existed ever since the first few months of the war.

Mr. President, I was about to say, however, that this does not seem to me to be practically so important as it seems to some gentlemen who have dealt with it, because the moment we are at war, the moment we choose to exercise armed force and constraint upon the people of Spain, we are then, by every rule of international or moral law, at liberty to ally ourselves with any instrumentality we choose to use. So, after all, it is a question of what is to happen twenty-four hours beforehand or twenty-four hours afterwards.

You have the opportunity to keep within the acknowledged prin-

ciples of international law, the precedents of your own history, and have unity in dealing with this matter, or, for the sake of casting an imputation upon the President of the United States largely, to adopt a different policy; and the moment this process of intervention begins and war follows, if it do follow, we shall then have the right by every rule of law to ally ourselves with any instrumentality. If the people of Ireland, if the people of Sussex, if the people of the Isle of Man, or of Guernsey were in rebellion against England, and we went to war with her, we should, of course, extend the hand to them as allies and cooperators.

Mr. President, there is another matter in which I do not agree with the honorable Senator from Ohio [Mr. FORAKER] or the honorable Senator from Kentucky [Mr. LINDSAY], and with great respect to both those Senators—and no man values more highly their ability or their patriotism—I am sorry they said it. I do not believe that the man who enters a house to put out a fire becomes legally responsible for every mortgage on the house, and I do not believe that a policeman who enters a disorderly house to subdue a riot or a fight, even if he has to take the proprietor into custody, becomes liable for every debt which the proprietor may have incurred. I do not think if we take Spain into custody, if we put her off the Island of Cuba neck and heels, that we are in the least responsible for any mortgages she may have undertaken to put on the island.

Mr. MASON. Will the Senator from Massachusetts allow me to make a suggestion?

Mr. HOAR. I will yield to the Senator.

Mr. MASON. I do not care to interrupt the Senator, but I thought the illustration which he has made as to one entering a burning house should in all fairness have been carried to its legitimate conclusion.

Mr. HOAR. I beg that the Senator will not interrupt me to do so.

Mr. MASON. I wish to ask the Senator, after a man who enters a burning house has extinguished the fire, if he sets up ownership and says he will decide who shall run the house thereafter, whether he does not then incur responsibility?

Mr. HOAR. Nobody proposes to set up ownership and to prescribe who shall run that house hereafter. I have not heard such a proposition, certainly not from my honorable friend from Illinois [Mr. MASON], and, as I said, I think the only effect of that utterance of those two eminent Senators to whom I have referred will be to give to some foreign government, or some foreign banker, or broker, or stock jobber a chance to make a claim against this Government. Mr. President, it is a pretty fine distinction between our liability if we go in there and turn Spain out without first recognizing the insurgent government, and our liability in case we go in there and turn Spain out and do first recognize the insurgent government.

I do not think the hairsplitting metaphysics of my honorable friend from Kentucky or the exuberant eloquence of my honorable friend from Ohio will ever make the publicists or the investors of mankind to see the distinction between those two cases. What they state will be held and will amount in the eyes of mankind to throwing the great authority of those two Senators on the side of a claim to be made hereafter if we do anything in Cuba by way of intervention; and an utterance of that kind in debate is another argument for the opinion of those who think such discussions should be in executive session and not in open session.

Mr. President, there is another thing. As I said, the insurgents have many titles to our sympathy, and they have it. I do not suppose there is a man within the sound of my voice whose heart has not been stirred by the noble and gallant story of this struggle for freedom. They are struggling for freedom. They are brave and unyielding. There is another thing I like in them, and I presume the Senator from Kentucky likes it also: It is well understood that the aspiration of Gomez is for a black republic in the West Indies. If he should get control of Cuba, and if Haiti and San Domingo join him, and perhaps Puerto Rico, he aspires to give an example to mankind where the men of the colored race may rule themselves as equals socially and politically, and in all other ways in freedom and in honor; and for one, I say, and I hope my friend from Kentucky will say, Amen. I bless him and I honor him for that aspiration.

But, Mr. President, the insurgents are not without fault in regard to the terrible condition of affairs which has grown up in Cuba. They began that system of warfare. Among their first acts, long before the reconcentrado orders, was the destruction of every cane field and of every farm where anything could be raised for which even the owners should pay a tax to the Spanish Government. I would not speak severely of them for it in their desperate struggle, but it was an introduction into the usages of war of a practice unknown to the present time. Mr. President, they have not abandoned that system in warfare.

I should like to have the Secretary read one testimony upon this subject, the testimony of a person for whose wisdom, honor, and integrity—if it were not ridiculous for anybody to impugn

it—I would pledge every title of my own to the respect and confidence of my countrymen. I speak of Clara Barton. I spoke of her years ago as the most illustrious citizen of Massachusetts. Whoever else may be in doubt, she has won all the laurels of this epoch—that noble, beautiful woman who leaves her comfortable and delightful home, where she enjoyed the society of kindred, the affection of friends, and the admiration of all her fellow-citizens, to go, with the Red Cross in her hand, wherever there is fever or sickness or suffering, penetrating the barbarism of Turkey when the missionaries failed to do so, and making her way into Cuba even past the cruel and bloody knives of the Spanish soldiery.

The American people have had, in every generation since the landing at Jamestown and at Plymouth, brave soldiers and sailors. There has never been a war from the beginning in which the American flag has suffered dishonor or the glory of the American name been tarnished. But in this field other nations also have been our competitors. Military character, courage in war, have been found in human annals from the beginning of time; but the mission of the Red Cross, with its message of peace and humanity, is wholly and altogether of American origin. It is ours almost exclusively. I think we may trust Clara Barton and may accept her evidence without hesitation. I ask the Secretary to read what is marked.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. FAULKNER in the chair). The Secretary will read as requested, if there be no objection.

The Secretary read as follows:

It is hardly possible, even with General Blanco's latest permission, for Spain to give all the protection she would even within her trochas. Although the Spanish soldier might be controlled and might not touch the reconcentrados who are attempting to cultivate the land, there is always the native guerrillas to be feared. There is where the danger lies; it is not so much from the Spanish soldier. The Spanish can generally control their soldiers. All the reconcentrados could cultivate much land still left to them inside of the trochas and inside of the forts, but as soon as they have got something raised, in comes the lawless guerrilla and takes it. Great destruction has also come from the insurgents. Their policy in regard to that is about as strange and as unnatural as was the cruel policy of Spain in driving the reconcentrados away from their farms.

Mr. HOAR. Mr. President, we have the testimony of this benevolent lady to this effect. But I do not wish to be misunderstood. The fact that both parties are in some degree to blame for these horrors does not in the least affect our right and our duty to stop them. They exist in an island over which Spain claims authority, and by her own logic she must admit either that she herself is guilty of them or that her subjects, as she calls them, are guilty of them, she being unable to prevent them. So that I conceive it makes no difference in the right or the duty of the American people to deal with this transaction, and I only cite this evidence of Miss Barton as showing the reason why we should hesitate just now at the recognition of the insurgent government.

What should we do, Mr. President? I think we should not begin by quarreling amongst ourselves and by slapping the President of the United States in the face. I think we should not begin by aiming to make party capital out of this transaction. I agree entirely with my honorable friend the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. DAVIS] in his admirable and powerful statement of international law as to the right of intervention. He has summed up the authorities on one side, and to some extent on both sides, and he has come to the conclusion—and I will ask leave to make an extract or two from it—that the writers on international law who declare that there is a lawful international right of intervention to stop horrors of this kind have the better reason on their side. In that opinion I entirely concur with him. The chairman says in his report:

The conflict of opinion and definition among the jurists upon the subject of intervention is very great. Some of them deny its existence as a right under any circumstances, excepting of self-defense against an imminent peril, while other writers of equal authority maintain the validity of its assertion as a right for causes which may be inconsistent with that great foundation principle of international law, the equal and inviolable sovereignty of states.

The extremes of these opinions are represented by Guizot and Arntz. The former declares that "no state has the right to intervene in the situation or internal government of another state, except only when the interest of its own safety renders such intervention indispensable."

Arntz maintains that the right of intervention exists:

1. "When the institutions of one state violate or threaten to violate the rights of another state, or when such violation is the necessary consequence of its institutions and the impossibility of an orderly coexistence of states results therefrom."

2. "When a government, acting entirely within the limits of its prerogatives of sovereignty, violates the rights of humanity, whether by measures contrary to the interests of other states or by excess of injustice and cruelty which deeply wounds public morals and civilization."

"The right of intervention is a legitimate one, because, however important may be the rights of sovereignty and independence, there is one thing of still greater importance, and that is the law of humanity and human society, which ought not to be outraged."

Between these extremities of opinion the differences among the publicists are exceedingly various and irreconcilable. Professor Hall, in his work on International Law (3d edition, page 288, note 1), in considering the opinions of modern international jurists who touch upon humanitarian intervention, says that "the treatment which the subject receives from them is merely fragmentary, notice being taken of some only of its grounds, which are usually approved or disapproved without very clear reference to a general principle."

Vattel (liv. 1, chapter iv, section 56) considers it permissible to succor a

people oppressed by its sovereign, but does not appear to sanction any of the analogous grounds of intervention. Wheaton (Elem., part II, chapter 1, section 93), Bluntschli (section 478), Mamiani (page 86), give the right of aiding an oppressed race.

Heffter (section 46), while denying the right of intervention to repress tyranny, holds that so soon as a civil war has broken out a foreign state may assist either party engaged in it. Calvo (section 166) and Fiore (1,446) think that states can intervene to put an end to slaughter.

Vattel says, Book II, Chapter IV, top page 157, "As to those monsters who, under the title of sovereigns, render themselves the scourges and horror of the human race, they are savage beasts, whom every brave man may justly exterminate from the face of the earth."

"All antiquity has praised Hercules for delivering the world from Antæus, a Bnsiris, and a Diomedes."

If these opinions state the correct rule, as we believe they do, the right of intervention by the United States in the present instance is indubitable. They are, however, controverted by other publicists of great eminence. It is possibly correct to say as to this conflict of opinion that this portion of international law is, though operative in certain cases, in that formative and progressive condition of development by which many benign principles, though formerly contested, have at last become firmly established.

I shall not undertake to detain the Senate by reciting the familiar, yet terrible, story which is told in the consular reports. If there be no objection, I will also include as a part of my remarks a few extracts from the reports of our different consuls which have been communicated to the Senate and printed. [See Appendix.]

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That order will be made, if there be no objection. The Chair hears none.

Mr. HOAR. I agree further with the President of the United States when he says in a sentence brief and compact, as becomes the head of a great nation making a great statement to the world, but which can not be misunderstood—

This long trial has proved that the object for which Spain has waged the war can not be attained.

Mr. President, that means, as I understand it, that in order to restore peace in that island, the continuance of the flag of Spain over the Island of Cuba is an object impossible of attainment. If that be true, then any intervention on our part conducted by the President, if it is to accomplish the object at which we aim, must directly, and as soon as may be, expel the authority of Spain from that island, and in that belief I have no doubt we are all agreed. It is in view of that fact that the President goes on to ask leave to use the forces of the Navy and Army to restore peace. It is a peace, in other words, which can only exist and be consistent with the expulsion of the Spanish flag from Cuba. So our intervention can only accomplish its end by compelling the entire withdrawal of Spain from the island. So far as Spain has made this necessary, she is responsible for it; so far as the insurgents have made it necessary, they are, or they were, Spanish subjects, whom she can not control, and Spain, so long as she is there, can not prevent it, and we who can prevent it must prevent it.

Mr. President, I find no difficulty where my honorable friend the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. LINDSAY] and my honorable friend the Senator from Washington [Mr. TURNER] find difficulty, and where my honorable friend the Senator from Ohio [Mr. FORAKER] finds a doubt, in authorizing the President to do a particular act of international force unless that be preceded by a declaration of war. Take a familiar case in our history, that of the Algerian captives, where so many of our merchantmen and sailors were taken by Algiers, during Mr. Madison's Administration I think it was.

Does anybody here doubt that Congress might have authorized President Madison to dispatch a naval force to Algiers and rescue those captives and compel their delivery up, and stop there? I imagine that proposition will not be controverted. It depends on the other side, then, whether they will take that as an act of war. If we authorize the President to put Spain out and restore peace to that island and Spain shall get out, there will be no war, and it is not necessary to declare war; or if he puts her out and she concludes that she can not help herself and does nothing further, there will be no further war, and it is not necessary to declare war.

Mr. President, the Executive of the United States has frequent occasion to do acts of this kind when Congress is not in session. How many instances of international force have been necessary in the ordinary protection of American citizenship abroad or on the high seas which the other party may take as an act of war if it chooses, but which the President has a constitutional right and duty to do whether or not war has been previously declared? Suppose Austria had gone a little further and Commodore Ingraham had resisted the attempt to retake Martin Koszta by force and the President of the United States had sustained him in it. Does anybody claim that is a declaration of war, or will any American claim that it is not within the lawful and constitutional power of the President to do it? Austria might have treated it as an act of war.

Take the very familiar power committed to the President, that of the recognition of the independence of a foreign government, which he does in time of peace, so far as this country is concerned, or he does when Congress is not in session. The other side may

take that as war or not, as they see fit. It is very often one of the most hostile of acts. So I find no difficulty there.

Mr. President, I am therefore prepared to support the resolutions of the House, if I have correctly interpreted them. I should like a little better the form which has been drawn up, I understand, by the honorable Senator from Colorado [Mr. TELLER]. It appeared in the papers, and I suppose I violate no propriety in saying that it appeared with his consent or his authority. I like that, which I think is a perfect expression of the limits and the extent to which it is necessary for us to go, and I think when we go that far all other things will be added to us and all other things will be added by the inevitable and inexorable logic of events that are desired by the friends of freedom in Cuba. I have spent this time because I thought it was due to a brave soldier, to an honorable American patriot, and to a great President that the angry attacks upon him which have been heard in this Chamber should not go without at least one voice being raised in his behalf.

I also agree with the President and with the committee in treating the outrage upon the *Maine* for our present and immediate purpose only as an instance and proof of Spain's incapacity to preserve order and civilization in the island. It will have its own consideration, and they misunderstand the American people who think that the consideration of any public transaction by the people of the United States leads to cowardice, dishonor, or weakness. It will have its own consideration, and unless the entire history of this country is to be forgotten the result of that consideration will be such as is creditable and honorable to American manhood and to American good faith.

I believe it was a meditated act of which Spanish officials were probably guilty. I do not overlook Consul-General Lee's suggestion as to the possibility of bringing a torpedo in the neighborhood of the ship in a boat by one or two or three men and the ship swinging against it. That is not the consul-general's opinion, but his suggestion, and I should like to put it in the language in which he gave it:

Consul General LEE. I never have been certain that the submarine mine was placed there prior to the entrance of the *Maine* into the harbor. It might have been done afterwards. The *Maine* was anchored to a buoy by some little chain. A vessel swinging around that way sometimes gets at various places all around the circle. When she would swing off that way, with the bow next to the buoy, and these boats plying about the harbor all the time, anybody could go pretty well in front of her on a dark night and drop one of these submarine mines of 500 pounds. They have fingers, as it were, and as the boat goes around it would touch the finger, which makes contact and explodes the mine. That might have been done after the *Maine* got in there.

Senator CULLOM. And not be discovered?

Consul-General LEE. Yes, sir; one or two men rowing quietly in a boat could drop it off the stern of the boat on a dark night, though Sigsbee had his patrols out—I do not know what they call them on men-of-war; sentinels. Still, it might not have been discovered. A boat would not have been noticed, because boats go there always.

Senator CULLOM. Day and night?

Consul-General LEE. Yes, sir; to a late hour of the night. The harbor is full of these little boats. A mine weighs about 500 pounds, and I suppose it would take two or three men—one man to row and probably three or four to handle the mine.

Senator CULLOM. Containing 500 pounds of gun cotton?

Senator LODGE. And the casing.

Senator CULLOM. And the casing, which weighs something more.

But the committee say with great force that such things are not found in private hands, especially in a community like that of Havana, and that it is almost impossible to escape the conclusion that no person could have had in his possession a mine or torpedo capable of working that destruction without the connivance of Spanish officials, or without gross negligence, which, under the circumstances, was equal to connivance. I further agree and believe and maintain that that being true, the Spanish Government is responsible for that loss and should be held responsible.

But everybody—the President, the consul-general, the Committee on Foreign Relations, if I am not mistaken—acquits Blanco. The chairman of the committee, the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. DAVIS], nods his head in assent. General Lee says he found Blanco in tears when he hastened himself to the scene of the occurrence. This is Blanco's dispatch:

[Inclosure in No. 777.]

HAVANA, February 13, 1898.

MR. CONSUL: It becomes my painful duty to express to you my profound sorrow for the misfortune which occurred yesterday on board the American ship *Maine*. I associate myself with all my heart to the grief of the nation and of the families who have lost some of their members; and upon so doing I do not only express my personal sentiments, but I speak in the name of all the inhabitants of Havana—witnesses of the catastrophe which has afflicted so many homes.

God guard you many years.

RAMON BLANCO.

THE CONSUL-GENERAL OF THE UNITED STATES.

Now, to acquit Blanco—do not let me be misunderstood—is to acquit Spain of direct purpose, intentional guilt, in that transaction, because he was the only medium through which the orders of the Government of Spain could have gone to any subordinate official. I do not mean that to acquit Blanco is to acquit Spain of neglect. I do not mean that to acquit Blanco is to acquit her

of having treacherous and wicked officials, and still less do I mean that to acquit Blanco is to acquit her of full responsibility; but what I say is that if we acquit Spain of having directly, with malice aforethought, of diabolical intent and purpose, set off that mine, then the setting off of it is not an affirmative act of war, but is one of those acts which warrant us in seeking reparation, if necessary, by warlike means and instrumentalities. It does not create a state of war unless we choose to make war for that cause in and of itself; and so the committee treat it.

If the *Maine* stood alone, we could, I hope and believe, under these circumstances secure an honorable reparation for her loss without war. Spain has opened the door. She has declared her willingness to submit, not her liability, not what reparation she shall make, but simply the fact how it happened under circumstances which imply that if it be ascertained that it happened from an external cause, she of course expects to make due reparation and to agree, as she says in advance, to accept the result.

Mr. President, I do not agree with those gentlemen, amiable, honest, zealous, and patriotic as they are, who find fault with our honorable committee and our President for not bringing in a declaration of war on the instant in consequence of the destruction of the *Maine*. It is said—although on this I do not place so much stress, but as gentlemen are reviewing the past and finding fault with some of us, we may, perhaps, allude to it—that there is no other country in the world that would allow the *Maine* incident to go three weeks without redress. That may be true, but there is no other country in the world which would allow itself to go unarmed and would maintain, with wealth and resources like ours, a policy for all these years which enables a fifth-rate, weak power, a relic of the Dark Ages, to be on an equality almost with the people of the United States for the first few weeks of a naval war.

I should think my honorable and amiable friend the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. CHANDLER], who does me the honor to listen to me, and, I am afraid from the expression on his countenance, has done me the honor to disagree with me a good deal, would be rather amused when he reads the utterances and the votes of some of his bellicose associates and remembers how he was baffled, disappointed, and blocked in his honorable and praiseworthy attempts, which are the glory and crown or among the various glories and crowns of his honorable and useful life, by the very men who are now so warlike.

I will not undertake to give names or to allude to persons, but I will undertake to say that if any Senator of the State of Massachusetts be charged with overcaution in hesitating to get this country into a naval war before she is ready, at least no Senator of Massachusetts ever failed to vote for the largest amount of money and the largest number of ships whenever the question of an honorable and decent Navy was at stake or whenever the question of proposed fortifications was up.

Mr. President, Spain ought to be as powerless in the grasp of the United States as a 3-year-old infant in the grasp of his father.

Mr. President, I expect to vote for the House resolutions, unless I should have an opportunity to vote for the resolution of the honorable Senator from Colorado. That leads to war. There is no doubt about it. It will lead to the most honorable single war in all history, unless we except wars entered upon by brave people in the assertion of their own liberty. It leads to war. It is a war in which there does not enter the slightest thought or desire of foreign conquest or of national gain or advantage.

I have not heard throughout this whole discussion in Senate or House an expression of a desire to subjugate and occupy Cuba for the purposes of our own country. There is nothing of that kind suggested. It is disclaimed by the President, disclaimed by the committee, disclaimed by everybody, so far as I am aware. It is entered into for the single and sole reason that three or four hundred thousand human beings, within 90 miles of our shores, have been subjected to the policy intended, or at any rate having the effect, deliberately to starve them to death—men, women, and children, old men, mothers, and infants.

If there have been any hasty or unwise utterances of impatience in such a cause as that, and I think there have been, they have been honest, brave, humane utterances. But when I enter upon this war, I want to enter upon it with a united American people—President and Senate and House, and Navy and Army, and Democrat and Republican, all joining hands and all marching one way. I want to enter upon it with the sanction of international law, with the sympathy of all humane and liberty-loving nations, with the approval of our own consciences, and with a certainty of the applauding judgment of history.

I confess I do not like to think of the genius of America angry, snarling, shouting, screaming, kicking, clawing with her nails. I like rather to think of her in her august and serene beauty, inspired by a sentiment even toward her enemies not of hate, but of love, perhaps a little pale in the cheek and a dangerous light in her eye, but with a smile on her lips, as sure, determined, unerring, invincible as was the Archangel Michael when he struck down and trampled upon the Demon of Darkness. [Applause in the galleries.]

APPENDIX.

Mr. Lee to Mr. Day.

No. 710.]

UNITED STATES CONSULATE-GENERAL,
Havana, November 23, 1897.

Fourth. The insurgents' leaders have given instructions to prevent grinding wherever it can be done, because by diminishing the export of sugar the Spanish Government revenues are decreased. It will be very difficult for the Spanish authorities to prevent cane burning, because one man at night can start a fire which will burn hundreds of acres, just as a single individual could ignite a prairie by throwing a match into the dry grass.

I have read letters stating that charitable persons in the United States will send clothing, food, and some money to these unfortunate people, and I have arranged with the Ward Line of steamers to provide free transportation from New York. I hope to secure the permission of the Spanish authorities here for such things to be entered free of duty. I am told, however, that they must come consigned to the bishop of Havana. The sufferings of the reconcentrado class have been terrible beyond description, but in Havana less than in other places on the island; yet Dr. Brunner, acting United States sanitary inspector here, informed me this morning that the death rate of the reconcentrados in this city was about 50 per cent that in other places of the island, and when it is remembered that there have been several hundred thousands of these noncombatants or pacificos, mainly women and children, who are concentrated under General Weyler's order, some idea can be formed of the mortality among them.

In this city matters are assuming better shape. Under charitable committees large numbers of them have been gathered together in houses, and are now fed and cared for by private subscriptions. I visited them yesterday and found their condition comparatively good, and there will be a daily improvement among them, though the lives of all can not be saved. I witnessed many terrible scenes and saw some die while I was present. I am told General Blanco will give \$100,000 to the relief fund.

I am, etc.,

FITZHUGH LEE, Consul-General.

[Inclosure with dispatch No. 712.]

SIR: The public rumor of the horrible state in which the reconcentrados of the municipal council of Havana were found in the fosos having reached us, we resolved to pay a visit there, and we will relate to you what we saw with our own eyes:

Four hundred and sixty women and children thrown on the ground, heaped pellmell as animals, some in a dying condition, others sick, and others dead, without the slightest cleanliness nor the least help, not even to give water to the thirsty, with neither religious nor social help, each one dying wherever chance laid them, and for this limited number of reconcentrados the deaths ranged between forty and fifty daily, giving relatively ten days of life for each person, with great joy to the authorities who seconded fatidically the politics of General Weyler to exterminate the Cuban people, for these unhappy creatures received food only after having been for eight days in the fosos, if during this time they could feed themselves with the bad food that the dying refused.

On this first visit we were present at the death of an old man who died through thirst. When we arrived he begged us, for God's sake, to give him a drink. We looked for it and gave it to him, and fifteen minutes afterwards he breathed his last, not having had even a drink of water for three days before. Among the many deaths we witnessed there was one scene impossible to forget. There is still alive the only living witness, a young girl of 18 years, whom we found seemingly lifeless on the ground; on her right-hand side was the body of a young mother, cold and rigid, but with her young child still alive clinging to her dead breast; on her left-hand side was also the corpse of a dead woman holding her son in a dead embrace; a little farther on a poor, dying woman, having in her arms a daughter of 14, crazy with pain, who after five or six days also died, in spite of the care she received.

In one corner a poor woman was dying, surrounded by her children, who contemplated her in silence, without a lament or shedding a tear, they themselves being real specters of hunger, emaciated in a horrible manner. This poor woman augments the catalogue already large of the victims of the reconcentration in the fosos.

The relation of the pictures of misery and horror which we have witnessed would be never ending were we to narrate them all.

It is difficult and almost impossible to express by writing the general aspect of the inmates of the fosos, because it is entirely beyond the line of what civilized humanity is accustomed to see; therefore no language can describe it.

The circumstances which the municipal authorities could reunite there are the following: Complete accumulation of bodies dead and alive, so that it was impossible to take one step without walking over them; the greatest want of cleanliness, want of light, air, and water; the food lacking in quality and quantity what was necessary to sustain life, thus sooner putting an end to these already broken-down systems; complete absence of medical assistance; and what is more terrible than all, no consolation whatever, religious or moral.

If any young girl came in any way nice looking, she was infallibly condemned to the most abominable of traffics.

At the sight of such horrible pictures the two gentlemen who went there resolved in spite of the ferocious Weyler, who was still Captain-General of the island, to omit nothing to remedy a deed so dishonorable to humanity, and so contrary to all Christianity. They did not fail to find persons animated with like sentiments, who, putting aside all fear of the present situation, organized a private committee with the exclusive end of aiding materially and morally the reconcentrados. This neither has been nor is at present an easy task. The great number of the poor and scarcity of means make us encounter constant conflicts. This conflict is more terrible with the official elements, and in a special manner with the mayor of the city and the civil authorities, who try by all means to annihilate this good work. The result of the collections are very insignificant if we bear in mind the thousands of people who suffer from the reconcentrados; but it serves for some consolation to see that in Havana some 159 children and 84 women are well cared for in the asylum erected in Cadiz street, No. 82, and 93 women and children are equally well located in a large saloon erected for them in the second story of the fosos, with good food and proper medical assistance, as also everything indispensable to civilized life.

According to the information which we have been able to acquire since August until the present day, 1,700 persons have entered the fosos proceeding from Jaruco, Campo Florido, Guanabo, and Tapaste, in the Province of Havana. Of these, only 243 are living now and are to be found in Cadiz street—82 in the saloon already mentioned and 61 in the Quinta del Rey and the Hospital Mercedes, the whole amounting to about 397, and of these a great many will die on account of the great sufferings and hunger they have gone through.

From all this we deduct that the number of deaths among the reconcentrados has amounted to 77 per cent.

Mr. Lee to Mr. Day.

No. 723.]

UNITED STATES CONSULATE-GENERAL,
Havana, December 7, 1897.

I am informed an order has been issued in some parts of the island suspending the distribution of rations to reconcentrados. * * * The condition of these people is simply terrible.

I inclose herewith an official copy of the comparative mortality in Havana for the six months ending November 30. It will be perceived that there has been a great increase in the death rate, and without adequate means in the future to prevent it the mortality will increase. I hear of much suffering in the Spanish hospitals for want of food and among the Spanish soldiers. * * * I hear also that the Spanish merchants in some parts of the island are placing their establishments in the names of foreigners in order to avoid their provisions being purchased on credit by the military administration, and that the Spanish army is suffering much from sickness and famine, and that a great deal of money is needed at once to relieve their condition. In some parts of the island, I am told, there is scarcely any food for soldiers or citizens, and that even cats are used for food purposes, selling at 30 cents apiece.

It is a fair inference, therefore, to draw from the existing conditions that it is not possible for the Governor-General of this island to relieve the present situation with the means at his disposal. * * *

Mr. Lee to Mr. Day.

No. 727.]

UNITED STATES CONSULATE-GENERAL,
Havana, December 14, 1897.

SIR: I have the honor to report that I have received information that in the province of Havana reports show that there have been 101,000 "reconcentrados," and that out of that 62,000 have died. Of the said 101,000, 32,000 were children. This excludes the city of Havana and seven other towns from which reports have not yet been made up. It is thought that the total number of reconcentrados in Havana province will amount to 150,000, nearly all women and children, and that the death rate among their whole number from starvation alone will be over 50 per cent.

For the above number of reconcentrados \$12,500, Spanish silver, was set aside out of the \$100,000 appropriated for the purpose of relieving all the reconcentrados on the island. Seventy-five thousand of the 150,000 may be still living, so if every dollar appropriated of the \$12,500 reaches them the distribution will average about 17 cents to a person, which, of course, will be rapidly exhausted, and as I can hear of no further succor being afforded, it is easy to perceive what little practical relief has taken place in the condition of those poor people.

Mr. Lee to Mr. Day.

No. 742.]

UNITED STATES CONSULATE-GENERAL,
Havana, January 3, 1898.

SIR: I have the honor to state, as a matter of public interest, that the "reconcentrado order" of General Weyler, formerly Governor-General of this island, transferred about 400,000 self-supporting people, principally women and children, into a multitude, to be sustained by the contributions of others or die of starvation or of fevers, resulting from a low physical condition and being massed in large bodies without change of clothing and without food.

Their houses were burned, their fields and plant beds destroyed, and their live stock driven away or killed.

I estimate that probably 200,000 of the rural population in the Provinces of Pinar del Rio, Havana, Matanzas, and Santa Clara have died of starvation or from resultant causes, and the deaths of whole families almost simultaneously or within a few days of each other, and of mothers praying for their children to be relieved of their horrible sufferings by death, are not the least of the many pitiable scenes which were ever present. In the Provinces of Puerto Principe and Santiago de Cuba, where the "reconcentrado order" could not be enforced, the great mass of the people are self-sustaining.

Mr. Lee to Mr. Day.

No. 746.]

UNITED STATES CONSULATE GENERAL,
Havana, January 13, 1898.

SIR: I have the honor to transmit herewith some statistics sent me about the mortality in the town of Santa Clara, the capital of Santa Clara Province, situated about 33 miles south of Sagua, which numbers some 14,000 inhabitants. It will be noticed that there were 5,489 deaths in that town in the seven years previous to 1897, which included 1,417 in one year, from an epidemic of yellow fever, while in 1897, owing to the concentration order, there were 6,981; the concentration order went into effect in February.

In that year, 1897, the month's death rate for January was 78, but in February, the first month of reconcentration, there were 114, and there has been a gradual increase since, as you will see, until in December, 1897, the number of deaths was 1,011. I refer to this as a specimen of the mortality on this island in consequence of the "reconcentrado order" of the late Captain and Governor General, Weyler.

I am, etc.,

FITZHUGH LEE, Consul-General.

[Inclosure in No. 746.]

STATISTICS OF DEATH RATE IN SANTA CLARA.

(A town of 14,000 inhabitants.)

1890.....	578	1896 (epidemic of yellow fever	
1891.....	720	among army and Cubans)....	1,417
1892.....	596		
1893.....	619		5,489
1894.....	687	1897 (no epidemic).....	6,981
1895.....	872		
(1,492 more than in seven previous years.)			

Concentration order in February, 1897—Monthly death rate.

January.....	78	August.....	645
February (concentration).....	114	September.....	630
March.....	333	October.....	884
April.....	524	November.....	1,037
May.....	539	December.....	1,011
June.....	531		
July.....	655	Total.....	6,981

Sample month, December, 1897.

	Number of deaths.	Number of patients.
Civil Hospital.....	143	170
Military Hospital.....	23	700
San Lazarus Hospital.....	2	10
Buried in poor carts.....	228
Buried by family.....	553
Prison.....	2
Total.....	951

Mr. Brice to Mr. Day.

No. 95.] CONSULATE OF THE UNITED STATES,
Matanzas, November 17, 1897.

Starvation.—No relief as yet afforded the starving thousands in this province. Several days ago an order from Captain Gin was given municipal authorities to issue rations and clothing, but no attention is paid the order.

Death rate in this city over 80 persons daily, and nearly all from want of food, medicines, and clothing. As I write this a dead negro woman lies in the street within 200 yards of this consulate, starved to death; died some time this morning, and will lie there, maybe, for days. The misery and destitution in this city and other towns in the interior are beyond description.

A general order has been issued allowing reconcentrados to return to the country, but the restrictions placed in order are such as to practically prohibit. If they went, what can they do without money, food, or shelter? Only those who can obtain employment on sugar plantations can live. Insurgents say no one will be allowed to grind in Province of Matanzas. The situation is indeed deplorable, and I am free to say no real help can be expected from Spanish Government, and the fate of the remaining reconcentrados is slow, lingering death from starvation.

Mr. Brice to Mr. Day.

No. 97.] CONSULATE OF THE UNITED STATES,
Matanzas, December 17, 1897.

Concentrados.—Relief offered these and other poor people by Spanish authorities is only in name. I have personally visited (on several occasions) head masters of distributing stations. Two thousand rations were given out, for a few days only, to 8,000 persons. * * * There are more than 12,000 starving people in this city to-day. One out of 4 (or 6) received the following ration: 2 ounces rice, 1½ ounces tassaio (jerked beef), and sometimes a small piece of bread, per diem. Imagine starving people being relieved by such rations! Even this ration of food has been discontinued since 11th instant. Death rate has diminished somewhat; now about 63 daily. There are less people to die.

The scenes of misery and distress daily observed are beyond belief. Here is one out of hundreds: In a family of seventeen living in an old limekiln, upper part of city limits, all were found dead except three, and they barely alive. * * * A few of the strongest of these people have been sent out to sugar plantations, which expect to grind. They get 30 cents per day and board themselves. General Blanco's order allowing reconcentrados, owners of plantations and farms, to return and cultivate crops, etc., is inoperative and of no avail. Several of our American citizens, owners of land, have repeatedly asked the civil governor of this province for permission to return to their homes, and in every case refused or restrictions imposed making it impossible to comply with.

I am, etc.,

A. C. BRICE, United States Consul.

Mr. Brice to Mr. Day.

No. 99.] CONSULATE OF THE UNITED STATES,
Matanzas, January 13, 1898.

SIR: I have the honor to report the following concerning destitute American citizens, Matanzas Province:

Up to Sunday, January 9, 1898, weekly rations of food have been regularly issued, also medicines for sick, and although there has been more or less hardships and suffering for want of clothing, shelter, etc. (which we were not allowed to supply), none of our people have suffered for food or medicine.

In behalf of these people I earnestly ask the Department that some prompt measures be taken to further relieve them. They are absolutely helpless—no work, shut up in cities and towns like rats in a trap to starve. We have fifteen or eighteen families (American reconcentrados) who own property in the country, and were they allowed to go to their homes, could make a good living. All these have begged and pleaded with authorities (under Blanco's order) to go, and in every case refused.

Since the 24th of May, 1897, to December 26, 1897, seven months, we have given food and medicines and relief to an average of 305 persons, American citizens, at a cost of \$8,175.48 Spanish gold. This amount received from Havana on account of Cuban relief fund to date. We require a little over \$800 (bills not rendered) to settle last two weeks' ration bills and three weeks' medicine.

I am, etc.,

A. C. BRICE, United States Consul.

Mr. Hyatt to Mr. Day.

No. 413.] CONSULATE OF THE UNITED STATES,
Santiago de Cuba, December 14, 1897.

As I write a man is dying on the street in front of my door, the third in a comparatively short time.

Very respectfully,

PULASKI F. HYATT,
United States Consul.

Mr. Hyatt to Mr. Day.

No. 415.] CONSULATE OF THE UNITED STATES,
Santiago de Cuba, December 21, 1897.

SIR: I respectfully report that sickness and the death rate on this island is appalling. Statistics make a grievous showing, but come far short of the truth.

The principal disease is known by various names. Calentura, baludol fever, la grippe, etc., is thought by physicians to be brought on by insufficient food. I know some that are attacked that have plenty. These, however, usually make a good recovery, while the others die or make very slow recovery.

The three Rivery brothers, American citizens and owners of coffee, cocoa, and orange groves, are about to return to their places. They are absolutely penniless, and say they would have surely starved but for the food issued from this consulate. I shall continue to supply them with food, and issue a month's rations of such food as rice, beans, codfish, crackers, etc., as their homes are over 30 miles away. I have made myself, personally (not my Government), responsible for the transportation of themselves, their families, and goods, as it seemed desirable to get them on their estates as soon as possible.

Dr. Henry S. Caminero, United States sanitary inspector, has just informed me that there are in this city over 12,000 persons sick in bed, not counting those in military hospitals. This is at least 35 per cent of the present population. Quinine, the only remedy of avail, is sold ten times higher than in the States.

Mr. Jova to Mr. Day.

No. 261.] CONSULATE OF THE UNITED STATES,
Sagua la Grande, November 11, 1897.

In the meantime the reconcentrados, the majority innocent beings, who have had, and even now have, no notion of the cause of this revolution, who had no more aspiration than to till their little farms, continue perishing. It is difficult, it may be said almost impossible, to be able to describe the extension and intensity of such tremendous suffering, of such iniquitous, unjust, and sinful imposition, to annihilate thousands of women and children. If this Godless combination should be accurately represented, it would seem an exaggeration induced by stirred fellow-feeling.

With sensibility in the heart moving among them, the unceasing crowd of famished beggars, one can scarcely do more than commiserate the undeserved misfortune. To express, to delineate the afflictions, the anguishes witnessed at every step, would require much to write, and no lavish of colors could approach the reality to fiction. No history in the world, ancient or modern, can be compared an instant to this frightful, dreadful suffering. Perhaps civilization has not seen the like of it.

I have, etc.,

JOHN F. JOVA, Vice-Consul.

Mr. Barker to Mr. Day.

No. 264.] CONSULATE OF THE UNITED STATES,
Sagua la Grande, November 25, 1897.

The guerrillas have already started their merciless warfare, having within the past week killed two "presentados" who had in good faith surrendered and gone to work on the American-owned estate "Victoria," repeating the act upon three insurgents who had surrendered to the local guerrillas of Sagua.

Mr. Barker to Mr. Day.

No. 265.] CONSULATE OF THE UNITED STATES,
Sagua la Grande, November 25, 1897.

SIR: With reference to the distress and deaths in this island, I beg to submit the following relative to this—Santa Clara—province.

As has been my custom for the past five months, I have just made the monthly trip of investigation in this consular district, embracing a large part of the territory of the province. Appended is the official mortality list of each of the judicial districts comprising the province known as "Cinco Villas" (five towns) from January 1 to November 15, 1897, inclusive, viz:

Santa Clara.....	27,900	Sancti Spiritus.....	5,482
Sagua.....	16,583	Trinidad.....	4,946
Cienfuegos.....	14,263		
Remedios.....	11,415	Total.....	80,589

Add to this 25 per cent for the number of which no record has been kept. * * * I deem a conservative estimate would make the grand total 100,736 deaths.

In truth, after talking with both military and judicial officers, I regard this rather under than above the actual deaths for the period stated. Undoubtedly one-half of the concentrated people have died; and to-day Spanish soldiers are companion victims to the surviving noncombatants.

The inclosed slip (inclosure No. 1), showing the number of deaths, official, in the small municipal district of San Juan de la Yeras, will give some idea of the rapid increase from month to month, as will also the clippings (inclosure No. 2), cut from the local papers, show that the authorities no longer conceal these facts, as was done under the retired Captain-General. This appalling death roll is mute yet convincing proof of the terrible destruction of life under the main policy pursued in attempting to subjugate the island. The heavens, it would appear, weep for despoiled, distressed Cuba, for during the present month the fall of rain has been almost phenomenal. I have to reiterate, the authorities, however great the desire to do so, are utterly helpless to ameliorate the dire distress that must continue to increase. * * *

Relative to furnishing protection to the mills to grind, how is it possible in view of the fact that the safeguard extended planters in making the previous crop enabled them to grind less than one-third of the usual yield, while the military force available to-day is not half in numbers as at that time?

With me the conviction is firmly rooted that within sixty days 90 per cent of the populace will reach a state of craving hunger, without outside aid, nor do I feel that I am speaking chimerically when I include the rank and file of the Spanish army.

The true status, as viewed at present, will bear out this opinion. The suffering among the troops, as well as the reconcentrados, simply beggars portrayal, while discontent ripens daily.

I am, etc.,

WALTER B. BARKER, Consul.

Mr. Barker to Mr. Day.

No. 270.] CONSULATE OF THE UNITED STATES,
Sagua la Grande, December 13, 1897.

All efforts so far to obtain relief by popular subscription have met with signal failure. The Cubans are too poverty stricken, while the Spaniards, who own the wealth, will contribute nothing.

In my recent trip I found that the Spanish soldiers are not only suffering for necessary food, but I was often appealed to by these pitiable creatures for medicine. One has only to look upon them to be assured of the needs complained of.

[Confidential.]

Mr. Barker to Mr. Day.

CONSULATE OF THE UNITED STATES,
Sagua la Grande, December 28, 1897.

How could the situation be otherwise, since the island is producing absolutely nothing, save some growing cane, and at the same time completely exhausted of all food? Relief alone can be obtained from the outer world in the way of charitable contributions.

This—Santa Clara—province is capable this season of producing perhaps two-thirds of whatever cane might be made in the entire island.

To grind this cane without interruption would be the means of saving the lives of thousands who, without this or outside aid within the next thirty to fifty days, must die of actual hunger. Over a month since the planters were officially advised of Spain's inability to provide protection in order to operate their mills. This leaves the sugar growers entirely in the hands of the Cubans in revolt as to whether they will be allowed to grind without hindrance or fear of total destruction of their property. I know that strict orders have been given to subordinate commanders under no circumstances must mills be permitted to grind, under penalty of violation of the order of destruction of property.

[Inclosure 1 in No. 273.—Telegram.]

Mr. Barker to Mr. Day.

SAGUA, December 8, 1897.

States that food, medicine, and clothing are required by more than 50,000 persons in his consular district, and that a reliable estimate of the number of starving in the Sagua province is 100,000. Advises the immediate need of relief by supplies through Consul-General Lee at Havana, or directly by the Munson Line. Says that some money will be needed, and that municipal authorities will aid in distributing supplies sent.

BARKER, Consul.

Mr. Barker to Judge Day.

No. 278.]

CONSULATE OF THE UNITED STATES,
Sagua la Grande, January 15, 1898.

SIR: I beg to submit the following: In this consular district a reign of terror and anarchy prevails which the authorities, be they so disposed, are utterly powerless to control or in any measure subdue.

Aside from the suffering and desperation caused by the unparalleled destitution, I regard the situation as rapidly assuming a critical stage; and to add that, as stated repeatedly heretofore, in no way have the authorities departed in fact from the policy pursued by the late (but not lamented) General Weyler.

Spanish troops as well as the guerrillas, under the cruel chiefs Carreras, Olavarrita, and Lazo, continue to despoil the country and drench it with the blood of noncombatants. Although the "bando" of the Captain-General provides that laborers may return to estates having a garrison, last week a number belonging on the "Sta. Ana," located within a league of Sagua, and owned by Mr. George Thorndike, of Newport, R. I., were driven off after returning, and refused permit as a protection by the military commander, Mayor Lomo, one of the trusted officers under the Weyler régime.

I am, etc.,

WALTER B. BARKER.

Mr. Barker to Mr. Day.

No. 284.]

CONSULATE OF THE UNITED STATES,
Sagua la Grande, January 27, 1898.

SIR: I beg to inform the Department that smallpox, referred to in my No. 279 of the 18th instant, has increased to an alarming extent.

The number of cases and mortality among the "reconcentrados" is unprecedented throughout this consular district.

I am, etc.,

WALTER B. BARKER, Consul.

Mr. Barker to Mr. Day.

No. 286.]

CONSULATE OF THE UNITED STATES,
Sagua la Grande, January 31, 1898.

Over two months since two of our citizens notified me they had discovered in possession of the local guerrillas 10 or 12 head of their horses, seized by said guerrillas. I addressed the military commander of Sagua, asking, upon proof of ownership, their stock to be restored. Nothing has been done; while these American citizens—both in affluence at the breaking out of the rebellion—are to-day dependent on charity.

One sugar mill is running, not without interruption, with chances of making one-fourth of a crop. Another—just started up—was attacked yesterday by a band of insurgents, killing 14 and wounding 5 of the guerrillas paid by the estate to protect the operatives. Seven laborers were killed, the insurgents leaving two of their dead.

An adjoining estate, the property of the British consul, was also attacked, the growing cane burned. This precludes further attempts to grind, as men can not be induced to work while the insurgents roam at will over the country.

I am, etc.,

WALTER B. BARKER, Consul.

Mr. Barker to Mr. Day.

No. 288.]

CONSULATE OF THE UNITED STATES,
Sagua la Grande, February 17, 1898.

SIR: I beg to submit the following: It is proper that I inform the Department that the ravage of smallpox has reached a point where the physicians, few in number, without proper means of treating, as well as no nurses, can not cope with it. I have cabled our dispatch agent in New York for an additional supply of virus.

I was informed by the mayor of this city only yesterday that he was just in receipt of a communication from the government of the province stating no funds to feed the starving were obtainable. In reply to my query why he did not send a number of them to the country, he stated that the military commander refused to grant this permission.

I am, etc.,

WALTER B. BARKER, Consul.

Mr. Barker to Mr. Day.

No. 294.]

CONSULATE OF THE UNITED STATES,
Sagua la Grande, March 12, 1898.

From the 15th of last month, through cash donations made to this consul-

ate direct, through personal appeal, I cared for 1,200 persons. By the 1st instant these contributions increased so as to enable the committee to increase the relief list to 2,000. This has been maintained until now; but as the *Fern*, with 35 tons, should arrive to-morrow, the Sagua relief can be continued.

Mr. Barker to Mr. Day.

No. 295.]

CONSULATE OF THE UNITED STATES,
Sagua la Grande, March 14, 1898.

SIR: The inclosed letter from Mr. Valle,* of Sancti Spiritus, whom I have every reason to believe will not misrepresent the case, together with the fact that in other places I find I have underestimated the number in my jurisdiction in need of relief. It is therefore that I beg to increase the amount required, as stated in my No. 294, of the 12th instant, from 80 to 100 tons per month.

I am, etc.,

WALTER B. BARKER, Consul.

[Telegram.]

Mr. Barker to Mr. Day.

SAGUA LA GRANDE, March 24, 1898.

DAY, Washington:

Closer investigation disclose larger number destitute than estimates sent. Fifty tons needful now. Distress far greater than my reports show.

BARKER, Consul.

Mr. Barker to Mr. Day.

No. 297.]

CONSULATE OF THE UNITED STATES,
Sagua la Grande, March 21, 1898. (Received March 30.)

SIR: I have the honor to say that since forwarding my No. 294 of the 12th instant, wherein I gave the Department approximately the amount of food required for my zone per month, I find many outlying—interior—villages, of which I had no account, neglected and in great want. To this very class, located in the interior towns, I have given special attention, but it has been impossible to care for all immediately. For instance, the relief committee to whom supplies were sent in Santa Clara, seat of government of the province, inform me to-day that in a small town near there are 300 persons in pressing need.

To-day I wired Mr. Louis Klopsch, of the Christian Herald and Central Cuban Relief Committee, who is now in Havana, that 20 tons additional required till last proximo, and to know if he could supply this. As yet no reply has been received. A very large proportion of these poor creatures being actually ill, other medicine than quinine is required, as also medicinal wines and nourishing food for them.

I beg to inclose herewith a list of towns to which I have and am sending supplies. There are perhaps six to eight more requiring relief.

Mr. Barker to Mr. Day.

No. 299.]

CONSULATE OF UNITED STATES,
Sagua la Grande, March 26, 1898.

SIR: I visited seat of government of this Province, Santa Clara, where I learned, not alone from trustworthy persons sent out by me for the purpose, but also the civil governor, that the number of persons in actual want exceeds any estimate I have sent the Department. The distress is simply heartrending. Whole families without clothing to hide nakedness, sleeping on the bare ground, without bedding of any kind, without food, save to such as we have been able to reach with provisions sent by our noble people; and the most distressing feature is that fully 50 per cent are ill, without medical attention or medicine.

GENERAL GOVERNMENT OF THE ISLAND OF CUBA,
Havana, February 16, 1898.

MR. CONSUL: It becomes my painful duty to express to you my profound sorrow for the misfortune which occurred yesterday on board the American ship *Maine*. I associate myself with all my heart to the grief of the nation and of the families who have lost some of their members; and upon so doing I do not only express my personal sentiments, but I speak in the name of all the inhabitants of Havana—witnesses of the catastrophe which has afflicted so many homes.

God guard you many years.

RAMON BLANCO.

THE CONSUL-GENERAL OF THE UNITED STATES.

Mr. TURPIE. Mr. President, I rise to speak in behalf of the immediate recognition of the independence of the Cuban Republic. I do not see how we can rightly intervene by arms or how we can declare war against Spain without making this recognition. If we go to war or intervene by arms, not recognizing the independence of the Cuban Republic, we miss one great element in the cause which will make our quarrel just. We shall lay ourselves open to a great variety of complicated questions and conditions. The open, free path is to make the recognition before we land upon the shores of that island at all.

The Cuban Republic, sir, is the great, overshadowing, outlying fact in this whole transaction. The war waged by the Cuban Republic, its army and navy—I am speaking advisedly—has made the Cuban question. Without its endurance and success thus far there would have been nothing here for our deliberation. The existence and the recognition of that republic are so related to the question as the soul to the body to make a living man. We can not be blind to it. We can not fail to see it. It is the first fact to be noticed and it is the first fact to be recognized—the existence of a republic upon the Island of Cuba.

It may be asked, Who are the government of the Republic of Cuba? I answer that question by one statement: The Government of Cuba is composed of men at the head of affairs with a constituency behind them who have maintained successful war for thirteen years against the Spanish Monarchy. That is the Government of the Republic of Cuba, and no colonial government in the history of the world has waged war for such a period without earning and receiving recognition as a nationality, and especially

*Letter referred to implores medicines and provisions.

recognition from the Government of the United States. I therefore prefer, greatly prefer, that we shall acknowledge and recognize the existence and authority of the Cuban Republic, so that when we have intervened by arms, if it become necessary, that shall be the government of the island, and it shall be left free in its career, unfettered in its course, as the United States were left by France at the time when she withdrew her forces at the close of our Revolutionary war.

I am especially in love, sir, with the idea of Cuban nationality, and I am attached to it for the reason of the capacity which nationality has to deal with debt, with foreign debt, with domestic debt. A sovereign nationality deals absolutely with debt. It may incur debt. It may assume a debt, part of a debt, portion of an indebtedness, or it may entirely obliterate it, and refuse to be liable for any part or portion of it. That is one of the functions of nationality. It is not a function of mere autonomy. It is not a function of a free and independent people like the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, like the Commonwealth of Indiana, the colony of New Zealand, or the Dominion of Canada. None of these have nationality, and they can not therefore deal thus with debt. Nobody can question the action of the sovereign in the disposition he makes of debt.

What, then, has been the practice—the universal practice—in disposing of debt, such as the one said to be now confronting us in this condition? The universal practice is this: Where a nation merely changes its form of government, there is no change in the status of the debt, notwithstanding that change may be effected by war, by revolution. We have, within the last one hundred years, recognized four or five different governments in France—first the old republic, then the first empire, then the kingdom, then the second republic, then the second empire, lastly the third republic. None of these changes, most of which were effected by war, affected the status of the French national debt.

So I might speak of the revolution in Brazil. That was a mere change in the form of government. The Republic of Brazil carries with it the debt of the former empire. So I might speak of the revolution in the Republic of Hawaii. That was where one form of government supplanted another utterly in the administration of government, but did not change the nationality, did not change the status of the debt; and the Republic of Hawaii is bound by the debt of the monarchy.

I might cite many other parallels—there have been many others. Such has been the universal practice. But where a part of an old-established government asserts its right to be independent, asserts and successfully asserts its right to be a national sovereignty, that part of the government so revolting has never bound itself to pay any debt of the mother country; it is not either morally or legally liable for the payment of any debt of the mother country, and can only become bound and liable for the payment of such debt by a treaty, by covenant, or by agreement.

Now, sir, we know what the status of the Republic of Cuba is with respect to the payment of the Spanish war debt incurred in an unsuccessful attempt to suppress revolution in that island. We know that that debt amounts to \$300,000,000, or very near that sum.

Not long ago there were various overtures made in the newspapers, not official, I grant you. They were scouts, spies, thrown out to sound public opinion as to whether the Cuban Republic would purchase Cuba; whether it would pay \$200,000,000; whether it would pay \$100,000,000; whether it would pay \$100,000,000 guaranteed by the United States; whether it would pay \$200,000,000 guaranteed by a wealthy syndicate. We know what the reply of the Cuban Republic was to those propositions. We know that Gomez stated, after consulting the civil authorities of his government, that the Cuban Republic would not be liable and would never recognize its liability to pay one dollar of the Spanish war debt. That is the position of the Cuban Republic. It will not agree to pay, it will not make any covenant to pay one dollar of the Spanish debt. If it had done so there would be no question now about its independence and recognition.

What has hindered the declaration of belligerency? The existence of the immense Spanish war debt. The mere recognition by this Government of Cuban belligerency would have been an acknowledgment of the fact that a government de facto was in that island; and upon that government de facto would have rested the function of either ignoring or paying the Spanish war debt, and because the government de facto was known to be opposed to assuming any portion of it, belligerency was as bitterly opposed then, and is to-day, as the absolute recognition of independence.

It is from this concealed disappearing battery of the Spanish war bonds that all the rumors have arisen with respect to the disparagement of the character and claims of the Cuban Republic.

Latterly they put into circulation a report that the Cuban Republic was hopelessly insolvent; that it had sold its bonds for sixpence, for nothing; that a large amount of its bonds were in the hands of speculators—all attempting to mislead Congress with respect to the pecuniary condition of the republic, and to ask the

American Congress why will you recognize a nation so hopelessly insolvent, as if insolvency were a crime, that freedom and liberty should not be preferred even where a people were insolvent. Now, we know that all this was false; we know that it was all unfounded; we know that there is not much more than \$100,000 of Cuban bonds in the hands of bona fide holders. They have lacked every element of credit. They have had no market. They have had no recognition; none of belligerency, none of independence. They have had no commerce. They have had no means of pledging or of binding to secure the payment of these bonds—none in the world.

The fact is the Cuban Republic is comparatively without debt; it is a government without debt. It has not had the credit to maintain and establish or to procure that national blessing, as it is sometimes called, of a national debt. It is free of debt; and it is without liability except what it may have incurred in the prosecution of the war for independence; and even those liabilities are very small.

The army of Cuba, sir, serves without pay. Not an officer or soldier of the republic receives any pay. The civil government of Cuba, President Maso and all of his assistants, serve without salary. They serve for the love of the country and its cause. Where has there been a higher, nobler service? Where is there a parallel to this unpaid service in the cause of liberty except in the case of George Washington, who served also without pay, without salary, and without remuneration as the Commander in Chief of the Army of the United States? It is because the Cuban Republic established upon the Island of Cuba, it is because the Cuban Republic recognized by the American people, would be free of debt, perfectly solvent, able to pay the Spanish war bonds—it is because of that, sir, that independence is deferred. It is because of that that belligerency is postponed. The very reason that it will be rich and wealthy and not in debt is the reason why through some diplomacy a covenant and agreement must be made to make it liable for the payment of the war debt.

Senators express themselves in the most patriotic terms as willing to go to war and shed the blood of the people of the United States, her gallant sailors and soldiers, for the purpose of extinguishing the divine right of kings to reign in the Island of Cuba or in any other free country on this continent. I say we ought to extinguish the divine right of the bondholders at the same time; and neither intervention nor war ought to be made except with the condition that no part of the Spanish war debt shall be entailed upon the Cuban people. The only way to make that condition possible and operative, the only way to make that covenant binding beyond all contradiction, is to recognize the independence of the Cuban Republic. That would be the end of the Spanish war debt except as to Spain.

How did the holders of these bonds procure them? They were a part of the war credit voted by the Spanish Cortes. The holders of these bonds had ample notice of their character. Every holder of these bonds made his bet against liberty and lost. I say, Let them lose the whole amount; let them look only to old Spain for any retrieval of such loss.

I ask with great regret, sir, what is the meaning in a recent state paper read to the Senate about the force of the Army and the Navy transferred by us to the Island of Cuba which shall establish a government free and independent, which shall observe its international obligations and which shall guide to a settlement?

I am not certain, sir, that my construction of this language is correct. It may be wholly wrong. If the words had been "international powers and function," if the words had been "international rights and powers," the phrase would be plain; but the words "international obligation," it seems to me, define precisely a Spanish war bond held by the citizen of a foreign country against Spain. International obligation may include that settlement which is spoken of. It may comprise under this construction the establishment of a government in Cuba which shall acknowledge in some way its liability for the payment of these bonds.

Now, I wish to make a recognition that shall make that liability impossible, that shall banish from the minds of all men everywhere the right or duty of the Cuban revolutionists to pay taxes for the payment of the bonds which were issued for their own conquest and subjugation. I do not think there is any other safe way of doing this. There is no other prudent way of effecting it. There is no other international course open to us that is so perfect in all its parts as the immediate recognition of the Cuban Republic.

Belligerency, it is said, is not even to be granted. Why? Because the Spanish war bonds would be discarded by such acknowledgment, because it would imply some power in the Cuban people to make a disposition of this debt. That is the real reason. The other reasons assigned are all unworthy and unfounded.

It is said that our recognition of belligerency or of independence would be contrary to tradition. We recognized seven republics in South America in the third year of the war, without navies on the sea, when they were confronting Spanish armies three times their number, without seaports except those in the possession of the

enemy, where it was difficult to find the capital, shifted from place to place by the exigencies of the campaign. Mr. Monroe insisted that his ministers should find the capital, if it were in the camp of Bolivar, and should make the recognition of independence. This is a part of our tradition. Would it be contradicted if we to-day recognized Cuban independence?

We recognized the independence of Texas as a sovereign nationality when it had no navy and never expected to have any, when it had only 800 men under arms, when it had only 30,000 population. We recognized the independence and nationality of the Republic of Texas. In very recent times we recognized, twenty-four hours after its declaration, the independence and nationality of the Republic of Hawaii, having a population of not 100,000 and an army not to exceed 1,200 men.

Here is a power, here is a government, here is a nationality—for I will call it such—a Cuban nationality, with 400,000 of population within the States of Oriente and Camaguey, absolutely under republican control, and with 300,000 other population in the debatable ground adhering to it, who have pledged their lives, their fortunes, and their sacred honor for the maintenance of the independence of the Cuban Republic.

I know it is said the Cuban Republic has no navy. That is a great mistake, sir. It has a very efficient navy. It has the same navy that Toussaint l'Ouverture had when he drove the French from Haiti—skiffs and canoes innumerable; a navy which goes by sea around the end of the trocha near the shore, which supplies its forces in the same manner with ammunition and provisions; a navy which acts as lighters to the blockade runners who occasionally make a landing in that island. It has a navy as much as any South American or West India republic that we now acknowledge had at the time of its first declaration of independence. The army and the navy of Cuba have supported the government, and they have earned recognition by deeds of valor equal to Spartan bravery and by endurance equal to Roman perseverance, and by prudence and caution which have never, in the history of the world, been excelled.

I wish this recognition, Mr. President, to be made now as a part of the resolutions reported by the committee, so as to put beyond all doubt that the Cuban Republic shall not only be free from Spanish usurpation, but it shall be free from Spanish debt and bondage. If we do not make this recognition now, I fear it never will be made. I know it is said the President can recognize at any time. So he can. Why did he not recognize yesterday? Why does he not recognize to-day? If he has the power to recognize now, when will he be prepared? When this war is fought, as I believe it will be, to a successful conclusion, it will come within the field of negotiation as to what status the Republic of Cuba shall have in that island.

That is manifestly predicted in the President's message as the time when military constraint will have to be put on both forces in order to make the pacification of the island. Who would have dared to put military constraint, at the close of the war of the Revolution, upon Washington, upon Lafayette, upon Steuben, upon De Kalb, upon those immortal adventurers who secured to this nation its life and its existence?

Where in the history of the world has there been an instance when a free de facto government in arms had been suppressed by a friend and ally for any cause, had been supplanted by a friend and ally for any other form of government?

What if France had said at the close of our Revolution, "The British have gone; they have evacuated the country; we are here; we do not like the Continental Congress; we do not like the Articles of Confederation; we do not like the system of government; we distrust your method of dealing with the loyalists; we are opposed to your legislation upon many subjects; we will stay here until we have established a government in the United States which shall secure peace and order and preserve all its international obligations?" What would have been the reply of Washington to that? What would have been the reply of Hancock, the president of the Congress, to that? They would have fought the Revolutionary war for seven years longer before they would have received such an intimation, before they would have assumed the liability of one penny of the debt of Great Britain incurred in the unsuccessful attempt to suppress the Revolution.

No, sir; the same influences which have heretofore prevented the declaration of belligerency, the same sinister influences which have heretofore prevented the recognition of Cuban independence, that same disappearing battery of the Spanish war bonds, that same last gun of the Spanish war debt will enter into our negotiations with respect to the settlement of affairs on that island; and they will insist that if a free republic is established in Cuba, it shall be established only on one condition—that the Spanish war debt be paid or secured; and they will insist that if any government be established by the United States on the island which shall not recognize the validity and legitimacy of the Spanish-Cuban bonds, we ourselves shall be liable to pay them.

These are possibilities. They are very grave possibilities, be-

cause of the \$300,000,000 of bonds, at least \$200,000,000 of them, perhaps more than that, perhaps \$250,000,000, are held by subjects of the most powerful countries in Europe. They are grave questions; they are grave responsibilities; they raise serious complications. How shall we be rid of them? There is only one way, pure, straight as the path of rectitude, unclouded, without question. It is to acknowledge now the independence of the Cuban Republic and let that government deal with it as it deems it proper to do.

Mr. President, even in the case of the defeat of the amendment of the minority, I am in favor of the resolutions of intervention reported by the majority of the committee. Any change in the present condition of Cuba must be for the better, if not for the best. Nothing can exceed in horror and iniquity the present tyranny of Spain on that island; nothing can exceed the patriotism, the endurance, the unselfish devotion of the Cuban Republic to the cause of liberty. The reward of the one and the punishment of the other rest in the single phrase: "The recognition of the independence of the Cuban Republic."

I would not reach out my left hand to Cuba Libre, bringing her in by the back door. I would stretch out both hands to the Cuban Republic, welcoming her at the front door as the latest born sister into the family of the nations of the world; and even if our armed intervention bring at present invisible, inaudible, and inexplicable conditions—for I do not understand the silence of the committee on that subject; I do not understand the greater silence of the President's message—I shall put my trust in going with the majority. I shall have confidence that God in His providence will overrule these gigantic evils for the good of liberty and the welfare of mankind. Even through the chapter of accidents which are to succeed present action I will trust that the Cuban Republic at present in existence shall continue to live as free from Spanish debt as it will be from the ruthless and blood-stained ruin of the Spanish throne.

Mr. PETTIGREW. I wish to offer an amendment, which I should like to have read, printed, and lie upon the table.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The amendment intended to be proposed by the Senator from South Dakota will be read.

The SECRETARY. It is proposed to strike out all after the resolving clause of the joint resolution and insert:

First. That the people of the Island of Cuba are, and of right ought to be, free and independent, and the Government of the United States hereby recognizes the Republic of Cuba as the true and lawful government of the island.
Second. That war be, and the same is hereby, declared to exist between the Kingdom of Spain and the United States of America, and that the President of the United States is hereby authorized to use the whole land and naval force of the United States to carry the same into effect.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The proposed amendment will be printed and lie upon the table.

Mr. GRAY. Mr. President, if it were not for the fact that I am a member of the committee which has reported the resolutions that are now before the Senate, I would at this solemn and fateful moment in the history of my country remain silent and content myself by my vote in vindicating the position which I think my country should occupy in asserting her cause before the civilized world. In the few moments that I shall occupy I shall not concern myself with any such—and I say it with all respect—inconceivable, in the presence of such a crisis, low and contemptible considerations as to who may or who may not hold the bonds of Spain or of the Cuban Republic.

I am not here, sir, to govern my public action in the face of the world in this grave crisis by mere suspicion as to what may or may not be the motives of others. I was not born with suspicion in my blood; but I was born, I hope, sir, with that in my blood that will make me always stand erect, until I am stricken down, for the honor of my country and the glory of her flag.

Mr. President, it is a hackneyed saying, I know, that partisan politics halt at the shore line; but, hackneyed as it is, it is pregnant with meaning. We are here to-day—and I attribute to no Senator upon this floor any feeling less patriotic than my own—we are here to-day as Americans all. Patriotism, and not partisanship, is the spring and motive, as it should be, of our action, whatever form it may take. I do not believe that anyone here will gain his own consent to maneuver for a partisan advantage at a time like this. I am here, sir, to support, not a Republican President, not to say that I range myself behind a partisan leader, but, in my humble way, to support an American President, the leader of 70,000,000 of people, inducted into his high office by their will and by the laws of his country.

Mr. DANIEL. Will my friend allow me to ask him if he considers these resolutions in line with the President's message?

Mr. GRAY. I will come to that and answer if my friend will indulge me for a moment.

Mr. President, I am here, in case we can not do what I think better, to support the resolutions which came from the committee of which I have the honor to be a member. I believe, however, sir, that the resolution that was introduced yesterday by the

Senator from Maine [Mr. FRYE] is wiser and a better expression of the feeling of the country. It was considered by the Committee on Foreign Relations and received the support in that committee, as was said yesterday—and I am not disclosing, certainly, at first hand the secrets of that committee or its proceedings—received the support of four—I do not remember, but five, certainly of four—members of that committee, and I believe, as I said, it better represents the feeling of this country and the attitude that the good people of the United States would assume if they had a fair expression of their own will and of their own desire in that regard.

Mr. DANIEL. Mr. President, my honorable friend is using language which is vital to this case and rather seems to imply that those who differ with him are not in so loyal and high an attitude toward the President as he is.

Mr. GRAY. I disclaim it if I have said anything which would give the Senator ground for such a statement.

Mr. DANIEL. The Senator puts an interpretation upon these resolutions—

Mr. GRAY. I have not discussed the resolutions. I have not come to them yet. I am going to speak of them.

Mr. DANIEL. I thought you said you would speak to these resolutions in support of the President of the United States.

Mr. GRAY. No, sir; I did not use that language.

Mr. DANIEL. What I wish to know is whether the Senator, when he recommends these resolutions to us, considers that they embody the views of the President of the United States?

Mr. GRAY. Mr. President, with all respect for my very good friend the Senator from Virginia I do think that he is a little previous in asking the question.

Mr. DANIEL. I beg pardon of the Senator.

Mr. GRAY. I know there is no intention on his part to unduly interrupt me, but I had not spoken to the resolutions, although I intended to discuss them in my own way as well as I could and very briefly. I will come to them in a moment.

Mr. President, I did say with some emphasis, because it came from my heart, that I was here, as I conceive my duty as an American Senator to be, to support in this grave crisis of our country's history an American President, chosen by the American people for the very purpose that he is now seeking to carry out and achieve.

Mr. President, there is no need that I should occupy the time of this Senate in making, or in attempting to make, a speech, if I were capable of it, that would merely have a tendency to excite the feelings of the American people or my colleagues here if they needed such excitement. We do not need to lash running horses. We all agree—of course I know we all agree—in the patriotic intent and purpose to support our country and stand loyally by it in this hour of trial, but I want to put, in these few brief hours before final action is taken, for myself and for others who may think that what I say is worthy of attention, the case of my country upon grounds so high, as I conceive them, that all the world must approve them.

Mr. President, why have we waited all these long years while suffering humanity has been crying out across the narrow strait that divides Cuba from the territory of the United States? Why, during all these months of patient waiting and anxious longing, have we been performing our international duty that we owe to a power with whom we are at peace? Why have we patrolled our coast and spent millions of the public money in order that international duty might be kept and performed to the letter? It is because the American people, as represented by the American Government, have a conscience. It is because no war or armed collision, with all its frightful sequences, would be tolerated by the civilization of America unless its conscience was satisfied that such collision and such war was righteous altogether. We have no dynastic wars; we have no wars of conquest or aggression; we have marked out in our diplomacy for a hundred years a new pathway, which has led the nations upward to a higher plane, and that is our glory and our pride. It is because the conscience of America is satisfied to-day that we stand here and feel that we are reflecting their will when we vote for any of the resolutions which are now before the Senate.

What has made the case that has thus affected so deeply the heart and conscience of the American people? Exceptional circumstances, circumstances that we had no hand in creating, and out of those circumstances duties have arisen that we can not evade or ignore. Time and propinquity are of the essence of the situation. Cuba is right at our door, and that colors and qualifies the duty we owe and the attitude we occupy toward her. If she were on the other side of the ocean, moored off the coast of Africa or Portugal, while our interest might be excited and our feelings stirred, our duty might be different. But there she is where God placed her. There, during all these three years, we have waited while the drama of blood has been enacted under our eyes, and we have stood as a people strong and conscientious, with a religious and holy hope that humanity at last would assert

itself there without our intervention and right those wrongs; and we have waited and waited until, in the language of the President, we can endure it no longer and the situation has become intolerable.

Time then enters into it. Time has elapsed sufficient to make our duty clear and plain. God knows that I, with others in this body and outside of it, would have had this occasion pass away, would have availed all necessity for unrolling the purple testament of bloody war and sought some peaceful solution, as I believe that the President of the United States has, conscientiously and in accordance with the best feelings and aspirations and desires of the American people, sought a peaceful solution of this difficulty. Mr. President, I applaud every effort that he has made to secure peace with honor to this peace-loving country. We are to-day stronger morally and materially for those efforts. And he would not have fairly met the high responsibility of his station had he failed to make them. The American people will not fail to do justice to their President.

But, as the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. HOAR] said, it is apparent from the President's message that the function of diplomacy is exhausted and the matter is submitted to the Congress of the United States.

Now, what are the grounds upon which we are to take the grave step which we are about to take? To recognize merely the struggling Republic of Cuba in its contest against the parent country? No. Suppose that contest had been waged in such fashion that the rules of civilized war had not been violated; we would not have been justified merely on that account in recognizing this republic as independent from the mother country—we would not have been performing our international duty if we had—but it is because in the course of that contest humanity has been outraged, the conscience of the American people has been stirred, and a state of things has been produced which no man with a human heart in his breast can look upon calmly and with quiet pulse.

Mr. President, the case has been made up. The President has recited the pitiful story in the message which he has sent us. It has been reinforced by the sober, calm, almost colorless statement of our own colleague, the Senator from Vermont [Mr. PROCTOR]. The consular reports make that statement a moderate one and under, rather than beyond, the truth. We have those reports on our desks. I do not want to read from them; we have it all with us; the world will have it all. I do not want to take up your time to tell you that in January of this year Consul-General Fitzhugh Lee, writing to the Government, says:

I have the honor to transmit herewith some statistics sent me about the mortality in the town of Santa Clara, the capital of Santa Clara Province, situated about 33 miles south of Sagua, which numbers some 14,000 inhabitants. It will be noticed that there were 5,439 deaths in that town in the seven years previous to 1897, which included 1,417 in one year, from an epidemic of yellow fever, while in 1897, owing to the concentration order, there were 6,981; the concentration order went into effect in February.

In that year, 1897, the month's death rate for January was 78, but in February, the first month of reconcentration, there were 114, and there has been a gradual increase since, as you will see, until in December, 1897, the number of deaths was 1,011.

Or that Mr. Brice, in a letter dated November 17 last, said:

Death rate in this city over 80 persons daily, and nearly all from want of food, medicines, and clothing. As I write this a dead negro woman lies in the street, within 200 yards of this consulate, starved to death; died some time this morning, and will lie there, maybe, for days. The misery and destitution in this city and other towns in the interior are beyond description.

Mr. BACON. What is the date of that letter?

Mr. GRAY. November 17, 1897. I take these reports at hazard. There are many other things more harrowing still, but I am not here to harrow your feelings, but to state the basis of our action. That is well stated in the preamble to the resolution reported from the Committee on Foreign Relations, which reads as follows:

Whereas the abhorrent conditions which have existed for more than three years in the Island of Cuba, so near our own borders, have shocked the moral sense of the people of the United States, have been a disgrace to Christian civilization, culminating, as they have, in the destruction of a United States battle ship, with 266 of its officers and crew, while on a friendly visit in the harbor of Havana, and can not longer be endured, as has been set forth by the President of the United States in his message to Congress of April 11, 1898, upon which the action of Congress was invited: Therefore,

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives, etc.

I want to call the attention of the Senate to the ground upon which this committee has placed the action which they invite in this body, not that the Republic of Cuba has sustained a gallant contest for these three years past—and I know that in every fiber of my being I sympathize with those gallant men—not on that account, but on account of the violated womanhood and childhood and motherhood and manhood that has been perpetrated right at our own doors. That is the morality of the situation.

I liken the action which is proposed to be taken in this country now, Mr. President, so far as its moral aspect is concerned as a member of the family of nations, to that of a man in a civilized community who is a law-abiding citizen, who has next door to him a villainous and cruel neighbor who every day chokes his wife and starves and maltreats his children, and because he is a

law-abiding citizen he bears it and bears it and bears it for days and weeks, until at last he can bear it no longer, and, law or no law, he enters the residence of his neighbor, takes him by the throat, and says, "Take your hand off of that woman and let these children go;" and all his neighbors applaud. That is what we propose to do, and all our neighbors of the family of nations will applaud our action in so doing. If they do not, God help them and the civilization they represent.

Mr. President, interference in the government of another country is nowhere countenanced by specific rule or canon of international law. It can not be. You could not formulate a rule of international law to say that under certain circumstances one nation may invade the territory of another if the purpose is so and so and so and so; but international law stands mute and holds that nation blameless that in the cause of humanity interferes to bring about a cessation of outrageous cruelty, to lift up the falling cause of humanity, and to let the oppressed go free. Every case must stand upon its own merits, and when the case of a civilized Christian country commends itself to the moral judgment of its citizens, then it is sanctioned, then it is justified, in the interference it proposes.

The writers on international law have not been entirely silent upon this subject. Professor Lawrence, of England, in a recent publication in 1895, called *Principles of International Law*, after stating the general rule that international law does not countenance or sanction the interference or invasion of one nation in the affairs or in the territory of another, states this principle thus:

At the same time, it—

That is, international law—

At the same time, it will not condemn such interventions if they are undertaken with a single eye to the object in view and without ulterior considerations of self-interest and ambition.

Have we not, Senators, in our conduct purged our action and our intent of every possible selfish consideration? Where, Mr. President, have you ever heard, either on the floor of the Senate or the House of Representatives, in public utterance or private deliverance, one suggestion that we should interfere for the sake of aggrandizing the territory of the United States or bringing about the annexation of Cuba as a star to be added to the galaxy of the States of this Union? Never, I will warrant. I never have.

Should the cruelty—

Now, mark you—

Should the cruelty be so long continued and so revolting that the best instincts of human nature are outraged by it, and should an opportunity arise for bringing it to an end and removing its cause without adding fuel to the flame of the contest, there is nothing in the law of nations which will condemn as a wrongdoer the state which steps forward and undertakes the necessary intervention. Each case must be judged on its own merits. There is a great difference between declaring a national act to be legal, and therefore part of the order under which states have consented to live, and allowing it to be morally blameless as an exception to ordinary rules. I have no right to enter my neighbor's garden without his consent; but if I saw a child of his robbed and ill-treated in it by a tramp, I should throw ceremony to the winds and rush to the rescue without waiting to ask for permission. In the same way, a state may, in a great emergency, set aside everyday restraints, and neither in its case nor in the corresponding case of the individual will blame be incurred.

Mr. President, upon that high ground I wish to place the cause of my country, now about to take this important step which may set the world aflame. I desire that statement to go before the forum of nations to justify the course we are about to pursue. Nothing here less high, less holy, less sacred, could impel the great American people thus to stand erect and demand that this cruelty, outrage, and oppression shall cease, and cease at once upon our demand, and if not upon our demand, then by force of American arms.

We have nothing here to do with the Monroe doctrine. It plays no part in this contest. The circumstances by which we are surrounded are exceptional. The case is out of any ordinary rule—the propinquity of Cuba, the tyranny they have endured, the outrages, and the character of them, as my friend the Senator from Alabama [Mr. MORGAN] says. No, Mr. President, it is because outraged nature can not longer stand what we have been compelled to endure. We can not forever keep our place and say we are not our brother's keeper. God himself will hold us to responsibility if we continue to plead thus.

Mr. President, there are some lines of a New England poet on another occasion, to express the deep feeling of a strong and righteous American welling up from an honest heart, that seem to me to apply to the situation that is forced upon our observation, where he exclaims:

Look on who will in apathy,
And stifle ye who can
The sympathies, the hopes, the fears,
That make man truly man.

I first drew in New England's air,
And from her hardy breast
Sucked in the tyrant-hating milk
That will not let me rest.

Mr. President, a word or two more as to the report of the minority of the committee in regard to the recognition of Cuba. I have already touched upon it. The Senator from Indiana [Mr. TURPIE] who has just taken his seat, in the eloquent address which he has made—and no one listens to him more gladly and delightedly than I always do—used an illustration which it seems to me ought to control the situation. He said suppose France at the end of our Revolutionary struggle, with her armed forces on our shores, had attempted to dictate to the United States as to what form of government they should have and how they should administer that which they already had. The answer, of course, could be only in one vein.

Is that to be the attitude of the United States on the Island of Cuba when this war shall happily come to end, that we are to stand mute in the presence of this republican government, and no matter what policy is pursued, no matter what form of government they set up, that we are to retire without influence, without voice, as to the future of the people of that island? Suppose, for instance—and I am making a violent assumption, because from what I know of the people who make that republic and are its leaders I have only admiration for them—that at the end of that struggle Gomez and his followers should seek to wreak vengeance as the result of the not unnatural resentment which he and his followers have against the 200,000 Spanish subjects who still remain upon that island. Are we to have no voice? Is our protest to be of no avail, and is the analogy put by the Senator from Indiana in the case of France and the United States at the end of the Revolutionary struggle to hold? No; it can not.

No, Mr. President, we are intervening not to recognize a revolutionary government, but we are interfering in the sacred cause of humanity; and if it comes, as surely it will—the independence of the people of that island—due respect and due influence and due weight and consideration will surely be given to the gallant men who have made this struggle and have erected the framework of government of which we hear so much; but we will hold their future in our hands, and I am not afraid of any bondholding attack upon the United States on the ground that we have for a single moment controlled the destinies of that island. We do not, in the language of the books, absorb her territory. We do not as we enter into this great drama declare that we wish to absorb the territory. We declare something entirely different. And if you are to take our conduct measured and characterized by our declarations, then we are absolved and free from the conditions upon which any power on earth could claim that we were responsible for the incomes which have been mortgaged to pay Spanish bonds.

Mr. LINDSAY. If it will not interrupt the Senator from Delaware, I should like to make an inquiry. Suppose when we take possession of the Island of Cuba and make the people of Cuba independent they form a government which, in our estimation, operates unjustly toward a portion of the people of that island who adhered to the Spanish Crown, are we to refuse to recognize the government; and if so, to what means are we to resort to cause a government to be erected that comes within our approval?

Mr. GRAY. We can not guard against every human eventuality, but we can take care that a government formed under our supervision and care and tutelage shall be such a government as will be just not only to this country, but to those for whom we have concern on the score of humanity in the territory over which that government extends. I do not believe that there is any thought now or that there ever has been any thought that we are forever, after this matter shall be accomplished, to exercise a protectorate or suzerainty over that island or any government which may be set up there under our auspices.

Mr. LINDSAY. Then, if the Senator will permit, I will ask another question. If we are to retain control until a government is formed which meets with our approval, will that government be the act of the people or the act of the United States?

Mr. GRAY. We are crossing a great many bridges before we get to them, but I believe that when that happy consummation of American arms shall come we shall say to all the world, and illustrate what we say by our acts, that no selfish consideration has actuated us; that we spoke the truth when we said we intervene in the cause of humanity, and that we have aided the people of that island in setting up a republican government, and we will retire and leave them to conduct better housekeeping than was ever conducted under Spanish rule or Spanish protectorate. Now, I leave the subject.

Mr. CAFFERY. Will the Senator permit me to ask him whether or not, after we intervene, the making of such a government as we approve of by the United States does not of itself constitute a protectorate?

Mr. GRAY. Oh, Mr. President, I am not here to answer metaphysical conundrums like that. I am here, sir, in the face of this—

Mr. CAFFERY. Will the Senator pardon me? Does the Senator decline to answer my question?

Mr. GRAY. I decline to answer it now, because it has nothing to do with my argument.

Mr. CAFFERY. I beg pardon of the Senator for interrupting him.

Mr. GRAY. I always listen to my friend with pleasure, but I am about to close.

Mr. CAFFERY. I am so opaque-minded that I do not see any metaphysics in the question.

Mr. GRAY. That may be.

Mr. BACON. Will the Senator from Delaware permit me to ask him a question, as a member of the Committee on Foreign Relations? I ask it because I desire the information. Do I understand the Senator to favor the first resolution reported by the committee?

Mr. GRAY. I favor those resolutions if I can not get what I consider better. I do not think they are the best possible outcome.

Mr. BACON. The Senator does not favor it?

Mr. GRAY. I favor the resolutions in one contingency—when the others are voted down. I am going to vote, if I have the opportunity, for another set.

Mr. BACON. That is a preliminary question which I wanted to ask the Senator. Probably he may not be in a position to reply to what I am about to ask, as he does not give his unqualified consent to the first resolution. I ask it in good faith, in order that I may get the opinion of the Senator, and through him the opinions of his colleagues upon the committee. I ask the Senator to state to the Senate what he means by the term in the resolution, the independence of the people of Cuba?

Mr. GRAY. I will reply to the Senator. The first resolution reads thus:

First. That the people of the Island of Cuba are, and of right ought to be, free and independent.

I agree that the people of the Island of Cuba of right ought to be free and independent. I wish to God that I could say that they are. I do not believe it.

Mr. BACON. The Senator, as I understand it, does not agree to that word "are?"

Mr. GRAY. I do not.

Mr. BACON. Then the inquiry which I wish to make must be addressed to some other Senator. I want to know, and I ask the other members of the committee to bear it in mind when they come to address the Senate, what is the meaning of that resolution when it says that the people are independent.

Mr. MORGAN. May I interrupt for a minute?

Mr. GRAY. Certainly.

Mr. MORGAN. I will ask the Senator from Georgia what is the meaning of the very identical language in the Declaration of Independence of the United States in 1776, when the world knows that historically we were not then independent?

Mr. BACON. I think the answer is a very plain one. We are speaking of another people. We are speaking of the conditions there existing. We say that we recognize that they are independent.

Mr. MORGAN. Historically—

Mr. BACON. One moment, if you please. I want to know what you mean when you say it. I am not saying it.

Mr. GRAY (to Mr. BACON). Ask him in your own time, if you please.

Mr. BACON. Let me finish the answer. I am not responsible for the interjection of the Senator from Alabama. It was he who asked the question. We, in the case of the Declaration of Independence in 1776, were speaking of ourselves, which is a vast difference.

Mr. GRAY. That is the true distinction. I agree with the Senator from Georgia entirely. In 1776 we declared before the world that we were free and independent.

Mr. MORGAN. Was that the truth?

Mr. GRAY. We are now called upon to state as a fact in regard to another people that which is notoriously not true.

Mr. MORGAN. Will the Senator allow me?

Mr. GRAY. I was about to close.

Mr. MORGAN. When we made the declaration in 1776 that the people of the United States are and of right ought to be free and independent, we certainly were not speaking of history. We were simply uttering a grand political decree which was the basis of our political union at that time, and that was the meaning of that decree at that time, and it is the meaning, as I understand it, of this resolution.

Mr. GRAY. The President of the United States in his late message, besides reciting the pitiful tale of sufferings and outrage in the Island of Cuba, has told us, and we are bound to take his official declaration as the basis of our action, and the rightful and competent basis of our action, that—

The long trial has proved that the object for which Spain has waged the war can not be attained. The fire of insurrection may flame or may smolder with varying seasons, but it has not been and it is plain that it can not be ex-

tinguished by present methods. The only hope of relief and repose from a condition which can no longer be endured is the enforced pacification of Cuba. In the name of humanity, in the name of civilization, in behalf of endangered American interests which give us the right and the duty to speak and to act, the war in Cuba must stop.

And so say the American people, unless I mishear their voice entirely. This war must stop in the interests spoken of by the President, and for that we intervene, and for that cause we will rally the manhood of America, which will go to the seacoast with an erect and defiant front, ready to die for the honor of their country and in the cause of outraged humanity which we attempt to succor. [Applause in the galleries.]

Mr. FAIRBANKS obtained the floor.

Mr. DANIEL. The Senator from Delaware did not answer the question.

Mr. DAVIS. Mr. President—

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Senator from Indiana has been recognized. Does he yield to the Senator from Minnesota?

Mr. FAIRBANKS. Certainly.

Mr. DAVIS. I have no intention or desire to speak upon the topics involved in this very momentous discussion, and I shall not do so, but I think the time has now come for me to make an appeal to the Senate, in the interest of the exigency of this cause and of those who are dying in the Island of Cuba while we are speaking, to fix a time for the close of a debate which with the exception of some features is a repetition of discussions we have heard here for the past three years. I now ask unanimous consent that when the Senate adjourn to-day it be until to-morrow at 11 o'clock, and that a vote be taken upon the joint resolutions of the House and the Senate at the hour of 5 o'clock to-morrow afternoon.

Mr. ALLEN. The Senator from Minnesota says he wants an early time fixed for a vote. Let us not debate it. Why not vote now?

Mr. DAVIS. I should be delighted if that could be done.

Mr. CARTER. I ask unanimous consent that we vote now.

Several SENATORS. Vote! Vote!

Mr. ALLEN. I am as well prepared to vote now as I ever will be.

Mr. DAVIS. I accept that suggestion, and ask unanimous consent that the vote be taken now.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Is there objection made to the request of the Senator from Minnesota?

Mr. WHITE. I wish to state that there are some Senators here who would like the privilege of saying a few words. I am one of those Senators, and I therefore object.

Mr. DAVIS. I renew the request just made.

Mr. ALLEN. I object to that. Let us proceed with a session to-night.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Objection is made to the request.

Mr. TELLER. I suggest to the chairman of the committee that perhaps there might be a limit to the length of speeches.

Mr. DANIEL. I object.

Mr. TELLER. It seems to me we might facilitate coming to a vote in that way.

Mr. DAVIS. I will ask that debate be limited to fifteen minutes to each speaker.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Minnesota?

Mr. CAFFERY. I object.

Mr. DAVIS. I renew the request in its original form.

Mr. DANIEL. I object.

Mr. PASCO. I suggest to the Senator from Minnesota to ask that the last two or three hours be consumed in limited speeches, and that there be no limit prior to that time. Perhaps that proposition will be acceptable.

Mr. DAVIS. Do I understand the Senator from Virginia to object to my entire request?

Mr. DANIEL. Yes, sir; I object.

Mr. DAVIS. Then I ask unanimous consent that the final vote upon the Senate joint resolution and the House joint resolution and all amendments be taken at 9 o'clock to-morrow night.

Mr. MORGAN. To-night.

Mr. DANIEL. I object.

Mr. ALLISON. I ask the Senator from Minnesota to embody in his request that four hours of the time shall be allowed for debate upon the suggested amendments and propositions, limited to fifteen minutes to each speaker.

Mr. DANIEL. I object.

Mr. DAVIS. Let that suggestion be incorporated in my request.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request that the vote be taken on the House joint resolution and the Senate joint resolution and the amendments to-morrow night at 9 o'clock, and that the last four hours of the debate be under the fifteen-minute rule?

Mr. DANIEL. I object.

Mr. HAWLEY. There is no use saying anything, objection having been made. I am perfectly willing to give a reasonable

time. I want to speak for ten minutes some time or other during the debate.

Mr. DANIEL. May I be allowed to say a word in explanation? I dislike to object to any request of my honorable friend the Senator from Minnesota, but I know there are ten or eleven gentlemen here who wish to express their opinions on a question that involves peace or war. I wish to have an opportunity to express my own views as one of the minority to oppose the very elaborate and able report which has been made by the accomplished chairman of the committee; and so desiring myself, I do not wish to be put in the attitude of excluding any other Senator from the exercise of the same rightful and solemn privilege on this occasion.

Mr. DAVIS. I now ask unanimous consent that the vote be taken upon the Senate joint resolution, the House joint resolution, and all pending resolutions before the Senate adjourns tomorrow.

Mr. CAFFERY. I object, Mr. President.

Mr. CHANDLER. I desire to ask the Senator from Minnesota whether if consent is not given to fix a time for voting, it is his intention to ask the Senate to remain in continuous session?

Mr. DAVIS. Undoubtedly it is.

Mr. CAFFERY. I desire to say that I have no disposition to prolong this debate. I consider it a question of the greatest moment to the people of the United States. The opponents of the Senate joint resolution, even the minority of the committee, have not had an opportunity to be heard. It is but a small matter to crave a few moments' deliberation in the discussion of this momentous question of peace or war. The Senator from Minnesota says that while we are deliberating the reconcentrados are starving.

Mr. MORGAN. A thousand a day.

Mr. CAFFERY. When the United States fulminates its fiat of war I should like to know of that Senator if it will save the life of the reconcentrados? I should like to know whether that will not shut out the hand of mercy that is now feeding them and create a condition of nonintercourse between the United States and the Island of Cuba? I can see no interest to be subserved, no legitimate end to be gained, by any hasty action in a matter that will involve this great Republic in war.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Chair desires to state that there is no request for unanimous consent before the Senate.

Mr. FRYE. Will the Senator from Louisiana allow me to answer his question?

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Senator from Indiana is recognized.

Mr. FRYE. I understood the Senator from Louisiana to ask whether or not there would be any relief to the reconcentrados if there was war.

Mr. CAFFERY. Yes; and the Senator may answer the question, if he please.

Mr. FRYE. I say if there was war the pathways to the island would be opened by our ships of war, and the ships of peace would enter at once into those pathways loaded with food for the starving people of Cuba. [Applause on the floor and in the galleries.]

Mr. FAIRBANKS. Mr. President, I shall detain the Senate but briefly in the consideration of the great question that is pending before us. I would, indeed, be quite content to leave it where it has been left by the splendid addresses of the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. HOAR] and the Senator from Delaware [Mr. GRAY]. I am slow to add any word at this moment lest it be discordant with the patriotic and splendid sentiments uttered by those distinguished Senators—sentiments clothed in classic diction and fervid with exalted patriotism.

Mr. President, I have come to the Senate as I would seek a sanctuary in the contemplation of this great issue. I, sir, have not been for either peace at any price or war at any cost. I have been steadfastly for peace if it could be maintained honorably, and for war if the national dignity and honor required it.

The problem which is presented to us is one of the greatest gravity, one which invokes our most deliberate, patriotic judgment. Many times during the last three-quarters of a century our relations with Spain have been the subject of deep concern and profound embarrassment. The proximity of the Island of Cuba to our shores, our intimate commercial relations with it, are such that we are instantly and sensibly affected in a greater or less degree by its misgovernment.

The island stands sentinel over the Gulf of Mexico, the entrance to the Mississippi River, and lies in the direct course of our commerce via the Isthmus of Panama. We have been and shall always continue to be concerned in the character of the government which maintains in it. No other nation can have an interest in the maintenance of peace and in the existence of stable and just government in it equal to ours. Turbulence and revolution there involve our peace, embarrass our commerce, and entail upon us heavy expense in the observance and enforcement of our neutrality laws.

During the last thirty years insurrections have occurred in the

island which the Spanish Government has been impotent to suppress, and devastating warfare has existed for many years. Each recurring insurrection apparently has been more determined and successful than the preceding one, and the Spanish authority has continued to diminish until it seems that the Crown is incapable of successfully reestablishing it in the island.

The war that has been waged has been in disregard of the universally recognized principles of modern warfare. The torch has laid waste the homes and property of innocent people not engaged in the struggle, and barbarities have been practiced which disgraced savagery. A fruitful island, susceptible of high development and the support of a prosperous nation, has been reduced in many places to a dreary waste; commerce has been destroyed, and the people driven from their homes to starvation and death. The world has witnessed a warfare without a counterpart in its brutalities and its destructiveness; and the moral sense of the civilized nations has been shocked and aroused as never before.

Our Government has neither coveted the island nor sought by force to control its administration. It has been our settled policy from an early period to permit no foreign interference with the Spanish authority over it. Our imperative demand has been that Cuba should fall under the sovereignty of no power other than Spain. We have repeatedly declared that we would not, without interference, see it pass to any other European power. This was clearly the policy embraced in the Monroe doctrine; and it was pointedly urged by Mr. Clay in 1825, in his note to Mr. Brown, when he said:

You will now add that we could not consent to the occupation of these islands (Cuba and Puerto Rico) by any other European power than Spanish under any contingency whatever.

This doctrine has never been modified; it has been repeatedly reiterated and reaffirmed. But for our opposition, England would undoubtedly have acquired the island when she desired to do so in 1823 and thereafter have established a government which would have relieved us from the disquiet that has prevailed, and the world would not have witnessed the horrors of Spanish rule at our very doors. Indeed, but for our attitude, other powers might have succeeded to the Spanish control and have established stable government in the Island of Cuba.

In view of our relations to the island and of our policy of opposition to foreign interference with Spanish control, we are morally bound to put an end to the wrongs, the outrages, the evils which flow from Spanish misrule.

We have repeatedly tendered to the Spanish cabinet our friendly offices to end the wars in Cuba and to restore peace. Our offers uniformly have been rejected. Many of the concessions we have demanded, however, have been granted to the insurgents. During the ten-years war slavery was abolished at our demand; autonomous government was proposed, in name, however, rather than in reality. The autonomy offered was in fact a sham, a delusion, for the grasp of Spain was in no essential degree relaxed.

This Government has at all times been scrupulously observant of her duties toward Spain, yet Spain has been either unwilling or unable to properly protect the rights of our citizens or to make adequate reparation for the wrongs committed against them. They have been imprisoned without cause and tardily released without just reparation for the indignities and wrongs committed. The story is an old one, is already familiar as a thrice-told tale. History is but repeating itself.

When the present Administration succeeded to power, war existed in Cuba. An insurrection had broken out some time previously, which the Spanish authority was unable to subdue. Many American citizens were imprisoned and our commerce with the island was seriously embarrassed. Our authorities were vigilant in the apprehension and suppression of filibustering expeditions which were being organized on our shores.

Weyler was Captain-General of the island, and in the name of war had entered upon a system of extermination, had violated every recognized code of civilized warfare, and was fast bringing the island and its people to destruction.

Although confronted with questions of grave and serious moment at home, the Administration speedily addressed itself to the Cuban problem which has vexed our diplomacy and disturbed our tranquillity for so many years.

For many months the Chief Executive, upon whom rests, under the Constitution, the conduct of our foreign affairs, has been attempting to solve the Cuban problem peacefully and honorably. He has proceeded to its consideration with a broad and sympathetic statesmanship, and with a determination to enforce all the just demands we could make upon the Spanish authority, and with a purpose of defending, in the fullest degree, the national honor. The task imposed has been a grave and difficult one, and he has discharged it in a manner to challenge the admiration of his contemporaries and, in my opinion, to win the approval of dispassionate history.

His policy was an open one known to the world; it was peace with honor above and beyond all else, and war with honor only

as the last dread emergency. If war was to come, it must come at such time as we would be able to meet it and in such manner as the whole world would approve. He truly comprehended the resources and patriotism of our people, and well knew that but one result would follow an appeal to the sword. He also knew that nothing so became the mighty power of a great people as its sparing use.

Much has been accomplished by the Executive. Spanish prisons which contained many American citizens have been opened, and no American is in prison on Spanish soil; the rule of Weyler was closed by his withdrawal at the demand of this Government. His orders whereby noncombatants were driven from their fields and homes into cities and villages to starve and die have been rescinded. But the relief has come too late. Upward of 200,000 inoffensive citizens who never struck a blow at Spanish authority have perished—a harvest of death which only Spain could reap.

Thousands of others have been brought to the verge of destruction and are incapable of either returning to their desolated homes or existing until their crops can be grown if they were able to return. Through the appeals of the Executive, the American people have contributed liberally of their abundance, and ships have been loaded with food for the reconcentrados, and thousands have been saved by this merciful interposition who otherwise would have been lost.

Mr. President, upon the hands of the Spanish people is the blood not only of our own brave sailors but of over 200,000 of Spain's subjects; not of our race, it is true, but of fellow-beings created in the image of our Maker. This stain can not be washed away; it "will rather the multitudinous seas incarnadine." Where in all history are there crimes so atrocious? The murders and atrocities in Cuba have been committed as near to our shores as Philadelphia is to New York. The continuance of the starvation of noncombatants as an adjunct of war within the shadow of our homes must result in our own debasement and demoralization. Spanish cruelty has no synonym in the human tongue.

But a few weeks ago the *Maine*, one of our war vessels, was sent to the harbor of Havana upon a mission of peace, for the protection of American interests, and not for war. Her going was but the resumption of old-time friendly relations. While the noble ship rested at peace in the harbor of Havana, while she was enjoying Spanish hospitality, she was destroyed, and most of her brave crew perished with her. When the blow came she was Spain's guest, which "was strong against the deed." The explosion aroused our countrymen and shook the earth. It was the master tragedy of the age.

The report of our naval board charged with the duty of ascertaining the cause of the explosion found that it was primarily due to an external agency, but did not attempt to fix the responsibility upon any person or persons. The report was promptly transmitted to the Spanish Government, which has made answer of disavowal. This is not enough. Our country has been touched as by no other sorrow. Our countrymen, whose judgments are always just, have seriously and patiently sought the awful truth, desiring to acquit, not convict; they have weighed all the evidence, and no doubt remains in their minds that the massacre of our sailors, wearing the Federal uniform, was the foul work of Spanish treachery.

The evidence is ample to convict Spain. No unprejudiced jury in all Christendom would fail to render a verdict of guilty if Spain were an individual resting under indictment in a court of criminal jurisdiction. Her conduct, both before and after the fact, leaves no possible shadow of doubt. Whether the electric current was sent upon its mission of death by Spanish decree or by a Spanish functionary in Havana, we will not stop to inquire.

It is not for us to do so. The burden rests upon Spain. It was by the direct order of her military authorities that the *Maine* was anchored above a powerful, deadly, submarine mine. Was this accidental? Splendid sport, indeed! How chivalric! What a token of friendship and esteem! What a graceful courtesy! But it is said by Spain that we have not shown that she released the fatal spark. Be it so. It is not necessary. The primary cause was her act; we will not look beyond it. The original offense was hers. Nor are we obliged to stop to inquire whether the Spanish officers were negligent or exceeded their authority. If such a duty rests upon anyone, it does not rest upon us.

The finger of suspicion pointed strongly to Spain from the beginning, and events have strengthened suspicion into a conviction. Her perfunctory disavowal and sympathy were but cruel mockery. What think you would have been Great Britain's reply were the tragedy transferred to her waters? The cable would have been too slow to bear abundant testimony of her profound sympathy and complete disavowal and her purpose to hunt to the death the fiendish perpetrators. Or what think you our sister Republic, France, or the German Empire, Russia, Italy, or Austria, or any other of the civilized governments with which we are at amity would have said or done?

They would each have avouched their sincere sympathy and

made disavowal of any privity with the act and expressed their determination to rest only when the authors of it were brought to justice, and we would have believed them and the world would have believed them. But it was left to Spain, which has not fairly emerged from the night of the Middle Ages; to Spain, which has led the world in the invention of instruments of torture; to Spain, which to-day feeds its youth upon lessons of blood and suffering, to make reply and pursue a course which is inconsistent with a sense of absolute innocence. Guilt would fence; innocence would frankly disavow and lead in the search for those who did the deed. Innocence would show the blow was struck at both and would rest only when the authors of it were brought to justice.

Those who know best the Spanish character and the present frenzy of the Spanish mind are most convinced of Spanish guilt. To them no doubt remains.

Sir, the ghosts of the *Maine* will not down; they beckon us on. Would that they could tell the secrets of their "prison-house." Then we would know how, sleeping, the Spanish "serpent stung" them.

For this grave act Spain must make due amends.

But if it be granted that the guilt of Spain for this crime can not be fixed by the fair analysis of fact and law, yet she will not be held blameless from a moral standpoint. If her rule is so lax, her impotence so great, that she can not give protection to the lives and property of her friendly neighbors, she is no longer fit to rule; her sovereignty becomes a menace and friendly powers are insecure.

Our own tranquillity, our own sense of security, our regard for our present and future comfort and for the lives of her hapless and helpless subjects, demand that we should interpose the mighty power of this Government to stop the carnival of crime and suffering and restore peace in the Island of Cuba until some suitable government may be formed which shall be a guaranty to us and to the other nations of the earth that it will at all times in the future be ready and willing and able to discharge its domestic and international obligations.

It is instinctive with us to desire to see people who are oppressed freed from the oppressor and secured in the God-given, inalienable privileges of life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. We desire and hope to see the independence of Cuba secured. Spain has, by every just consideration, by every standard of international duty, forever forfeited any right to further dominion over the Cuban people; and we hope to see established on the island a free and just government, endowed with functions for protecting the lives and property of the present and future generations who may dwell upon it.

But, Mr. President, I am not prepared at present to favor the recognition of the independence of the present so-called Republic of Cuba. We know but little about it. It is too nebulous, too mythical, to be invited into the family of nations by our potential act. The present so-called government, at most, is a military oligarchy with no habitat, with no well-defined governmental organism exercising the functions of a republic; and if we were to recognize its independence under the present pressure without adequate knowledge or information, it might lead to the establishment of a power upon the island which would prove vexatious and hurtful to us, and our second estate might be as bad or worse than our first, or at least we might continue to be seriously menaced and disturbed by it.

There are, doubtless, among the citizens of the island those capable of forming and establishing a government which will be stable and secure and which will be a guaranty that the Cuban question is settled for all time to come. It seems to me, therefore, that the first imperative duty resting upon us is to establish tranquillity in the island, relieve the suffering and distressed, and then enable the citizens of the island to deliberate and form a government upon such lines as their highest and best interests may require.

It may be that the present pretended republic is expressive of the highest and best thought of the island, and that its recognition will be found to be in the best interest of all concerned. If this be so, time will demonstrate it. We should not forget that the ultimate decision is in our hands; that justice will not miscarry; delay will not defeat her righteous demands.

The air is too full of rumors as to the character of the present so-called Cuban Republic and as to the bonds that have been floated in its name in this country and said to be in the hands of speculators, to justify us in any hasty act of recognition.

We have had introduced here by the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. HOAR] the weighty testimony of Clara Barton, a veritable angel of mercy, entirely disinterested, with no motive on God's earth except in the interest of humanity, and her testimony is against the recognition of the independence of the present so-called Cuban Republic. Who knows better than she? Do the distinguished Senators who advocate immediate recognition? For my part, I will accept the intelligent, disinterested testimony of Clara Barton.

Mr. President, we have been educated to the doctrine in this country that the majority shall rule. If it shall be demonstrated that the present so-called republic is fairly representative of the majority of the citizens of Cuba, I would gladly and quickly vote to recognize its authority. If it represents a majority, and we compel peace, it should have no difficulty in convincing us of the fact, and that it is entitled to rule, and to recognition.

Sir, no one will distrust our motives in taking this step. We do not intervene for revenge, for the acquisition of territory, for the extension of our authority and power. Our past history is ample proof of this. Spain has long overtaxed the generous forbearance of our people. We have suffered wrongs which would have justified a nation actuated by less exalted motives than we to have struck in revenge. Ample opportunity has heretofore occurred for the seizure of the island by force if we had been eager to extend our dominion. Mr. President, the world will acquit us of any base desire. The misgovernment of Cuba has become so flagrant, the barbarism, the wrongs, the outrages there have so offended the civilized world that we must intervene for and in the name of humanity. No higher motive can actuate any government.

Mr. President, I am aware, as was well said by the distinguished Senator from Delaware [Mr. GRAY] this afternoon, that intervention in the domestic affairs of another power is a matter of delicacy, and should be attempted only where the necessity is clear and where it is demanded by grave exigency. Such necessity exists here, surely, indisputably.

There are those who insist that before intervening we should recognize the independence of the republic which is said to have been organized and maintained in the island. It is urged, among other things, that recognition should occur in order that we may not become liable to the holders of certain Spanish bonds said to have been issued under a pledge of the revenues of Cuba for the payment of the accruing interest thereon. It is argued that intervention without recognition would impose upon us a liability which may be avoided by recognition. I must wholly dissent from the soundness of this proposition. There is not one precedent, so far as I am aware, which supports the contention.

Let us briefly see what the opposing position is. If I understand correctly, it is: That we shall first recognize the independence of the present Cuban Republic and then intervene with force to sustain it; while the opposite contention is that we shall intervene with force and then acknowledge the independence of the present republic, if, when in possession of adequate information, its recognition is proper; and if it is not a proper government to recognize, then that we shall recognize some republic which the patriots of Cuba may deliberately form. Such is the divergency of our views, though we are seeking to attain the same end.

Is there subtlety enough here to measure the difference in our obligations—our international liabilities under these two methods? Mr. President, I am free to confess that I am unable to see why our ultimate responsibility would not be the same in the one case as in the other. The final end is the same, though the processes are slightly different. It seems to me that the substance of our act must control, and not the mere form. Haste, sir, in this vital matter is not of the essence of the situation; correct conclusions, sound and stable results should be our sole and only aim.

But, Mr. President, no liability will rest upon us whichever method we pursue. Spain has, by her course, which it is unnecessary to review in this connection, forfeited her right to further dominion over Cuba or its revenues. If the revenues were ever pledged to the satisfaction of a series of Spanish bonds, such pledge was necessarily subject to the forfeiture of the island for the violation of those humane principles and precepts which are observed by the civilized nations of the earth.

Sir, the rights of humanity are superior to the rights of bondholders. We violate neither the law of nations nor incur the burdens which rest upon Spain by our act of recognition either before or after intervention. If our act is warranted by the considerations of humanity, no bondholder can be heard to complain.

When the bonds were taken under a specific pledge, they were taken upon the implied understanding that the pledgee would observe its international obligations according to the standard of civilized nations. The bondholder was presumed to know that a violation of those obligations would work a forfeiture of the estate and the dispossession of the sovereignty of the obligor. The bonds, sir, were taken subject to a condition, and that condition was the proper observance and practice of the rules of humanity, the faithful discharge of international duties. The condition, sir, has been broken.

We are at the beginning of a new epoch in our history. No graver emergency ever confronted us than the one which faces us at this hour. Peace is about to be abdicated for a policy which may lead to war. War, if it comes, will have been forced upon us by the misgovernment, the insolence, the cruelty of Spain. Spain has too long presumed upon our good nature. She has too long offended against the sense of justice of our people. Her des-

ultory, guerrilla-like, barbarous warfare upon her subjects in Cuba, upon American citizens and American commerce, has been in effect a war upon us.

The concessions she has made toward a modification of her iron and harsh rule have been made but to be broken. Her diplomacy has been characterized by subtlety, insincerity, and insult, until our countrymen have lost faith in her professions, confidence in her stability and fitness to rule. All sense of security and safety to our citizens and their commercial interests in Cuba is forever destroyed so long as Spanish sovereignty is maintained there. The highest dictates of national interest and humanity require that the war which is waged in Cuba should be stopped by force of arms, all other means of a pacific nature failing.

We need make no apology for the deliberation and delay in making this last appeal, for no self-respecting nation could afford to do less than exhaust to the fullest degree the resources of diplomacy before a resort to arms. If some delay has occurred while the powers concerned, have attempted to effect a peaceful and honorable conclusion, and war comes, we can have the consolation of the reflection that sorrow has been delayed in countless households throughout the land. Thousands of patriotic boys above and before whom stands the bow of promise have been ready to lay down their lives if diplomacy failed. If there has been seeming delay in calling them to arms their soon to be desolated homes will not complain.

We strike not in anger, not for mere revenge, not for the extension of our sovereignty, but in defense of our rights and in discharge of our duty divinely imposed.

Mr. President, I had profoundly hoped until recently that war could be averted. We have patiently witnessed the effort of the Chief Executive to attain an honorable and peaceful solution of the grave problem.

The conservative, patriotic people of the country have been profoundly impressed by his statesmanship, his tenacity of purpose, and the ability and force with which he has pressed the consideration of our just demands and rights upon the attention of the Spanish Government. We have had full faith and confidence in his courage and patriotic purpose and desired that he should exhaust every honorable means to avert war before it should be invited or declared.

We have desired, moreover, that he should be given opportunity to make that preparation which is necessary to meet so grave an emergency. With the foresight of true statesmanship—and I would that the Senator from Washington [Mr. TURNER] were in his seat, that he might hear what I say—he has negotiated for peace with one hand while preparing by day and by night for war with the other. When he took the oath of his high office, our country was not prepared to engage in war. Conscious of our isolation, and disarmed by long years of peace, we were ill fitted to engage in war with any power. Our seaport cities were inadequately protected.

Our marine force, while of high quality, was entirely insufficient in quantity. While this fact was generally recognized by those who had given intelligent consideration to the subject, it was unknown to many of our countrymen, who were insistent upon immediate measures which would instantly precipitate war. They were doubtless unadvised as to whether we had ample coast defenses to resist foreign attack, as to whether we had an ample fleet, or as to whether we had ammunition sufficient for one battle.

Mr. President, I confess I have come to the conclusion to which I have arrived after much deliberation—reluctantly and with profound regret. I have hoped and prayed that this great emergency might be honorably averted or avoided. My hesitancy did not grow out of any doubt as to the patriotism or the power of my country. It was due to no possible doubt as to the result of the issue, but to the fact that I have felt that even Spain, cruel and merciless as she has been, would not be wholly dead to our righteous and firm appeals.

Nearly one year ago I expressed myself in this Chamber in favor of extending our friendly offices to Spain in aid of a settlement of the war in Cuba, indulging the hope that pacific efforts would accomplish the desired end and also expressing the conviction that if all else failed, this Government should reach out its strong arm and command peace. Sir, all reasonable, peaceable means have been employed by the Chief Executive, earnestly, intelligently, and patriotically.

All efforts at amicable solution have failed, and all that remains is to invoke the mighty power of this Government in behalf of enduring peace and imperiled humanity. We shall now have the satisfaction of knowing that, come what may in the lottery of war, we have left undone nothing which could be done consistently with honor to secure a pacific settlement. The Spanish flag must be withdrawn and cease forever to contaminate the air of this hemisphere. To the high and holy cause of humanity and the vindication of our national honor we dedicate the lives and fortune of the Republic.

Mr. CULLOM. Mr. President, I desire to inquire of the chairman of the committee having charge of this measure whether it is desired that we shall remain in session longer to-night?

Mr. DAVIS. Has the Senator from Illinois taken the floor?

Mr. CULLOM. I have taken the floor.

Mr. DAVIS. I ask the Senator if it is his convenience—

Mr. ALLEN. If the Senator from Illinois will permit me to interrupt him, and the Senator from Minnesota will indulge me just a moment, I should like to register my protest against our adjourning here to-night or taking any adjournment or recess until we vote on this question. I will not detain the Senator from Illinois for more than a moment. If the Senator from Minnesota is correct in his statement made a moment ago, several deaths are taking place on the Island of Cuba while we are engaging in a little flamboyant oratory here in defense of the President of the United States, as though he were on trial for high crimes and misdemeanors. We are all for the President. We are all American citizens. We disagree with him as to the wording of these resolutions.

Now, what is there about this question to provoke lengthy discussion? It has been discussed for the last three years, ever since the war broke out. What is there about it either in a constitutional sense or as respects its policy which should require the delivering of grave orations on the subject of our relations with Spain and Cuba? What reason is there why we can not to-night continue this session until every gentleman shall have had an opportunity to express himself, if he desires, and then come to a vote on the question and determine what we shall do? Who is to be responsible for this adjournment? What occasion is there for an adjournment? Is the Republican party willing to take the responsibility for a useless adjournment under these circumstances?

Mr. President, this may provoke mirth upon the part of some, but we have reached that peculiar period in this session of Congress where the eyes of the entire world are turned upon us. It is more than an ordinary session of Congress. Are we to adjourn here to-night simply as a matter of convenience to give an opportunity to patch up broken lines upon this question? Why can we not in good faith go on and before we finally adjourn come to a vote on the question?

The Senator from Indiana [Mr. FAIRBANKS] says there is no difference between recognizing the existence of the present Republic of Cuba and intervening. If his position be true, why cavil about this question?

Mr. FAIRBANKS. If the Senator from Nebraska will permit me, I will state that he quite misapprehends what I said. I did not say there was no difference between intervention and the recognition of independence. I said there was no difference in the question of liability whether we recognize independence before intervening or after intervening.

Mr. ALLEN. From that statement I must dissent as to the question of liability.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Senator from Illinois [Mr. CULLOM] is entitled to the floor.

Mr. ALLEN. Under the suggestion of the Chair, I yield the floor to the Senator from Illinois.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Chair lays a joint resolution from the House of Representatives before the Senate.

The joint resolution (H. Res. 233) authorizing and directing the President of the United States to intervene to stop the war in Cuba, and for the purpose of establishing a stable and independent government of the people therein, was read the first time by its title.

Mr. DAVIS. Let the joint resolution be read.

Mr. ALLEN. I move to lay the joint resolution on the table.

Mr. DAVIS. I was about to make that motion myself. Meanwhile, let the joint resolution be read.

The joint resolution was read the second time at length, as follows:

Whereas the Government of Spain for three years past has been waging war on the Island of Cuba against a revolution by the inhabitants thereof, without making any substantial progress towards the suppression of said revolution, and has conducted the warfare in a manner contrary to the laws of nations, by methods inhuman and uncivilized, causing the death by starvation of more than 200,000 innocent noncombatants, the victims being for the most part helpless women and children, inflicting intolerable injury to the commercial interests of the United States, involving the destruction of the lives and property of many of our citizens, entailing the expenditure of millions of money in patrolling our coasts and policing the high seas in order to maintain our neutrality; and

Whereas this long series of losses, injuries, and burdens for which Spain is responsible has culminated in the destruction of the U. S. battleship *Maine* in the harbor of Havana and in the death of 260 of our seamen:

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the President is hereby authorized and directed to intervene at once to stop the war in Cuba, to the end and with the purpose of securing permanent peace and order there and establishing by the free action of the people thereof a stable and independent government of their own in the Island of Cuba. And the President is hereby authorized and empowered to use the land and naval forces of the United States to execute the purpose of this resolution.

Mr. DAVIS. I move that the joint resolution lie upon the table.

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

Mr. ALDRICH. That is a formal laying of the joint resolution upon the table, to be taken up for consideration?

Mr. DAVIS. In connection with the subject.

Mr. ALLEN. My suggestion was that it should permanently lie upon the table.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The joint resolution will lie on the table, to be taken up on motion.

Mr. ALLEN. Senators say to me in a subconversational tone that we can not do this; but I am not prepared to yield to any conclusion of that kind.

Mr. MORGAN. I will raise my tone, as I made the remark—

Mr. ALLEN. Very well; I hope the Senator will.

Mr. MORGAN. To high contralto, if necessary, and say that no motion to lay upon the table can so dispose of a measure that it can not be taken from the table.

Mr. CHANDLER. That is correct.

Mr. DAVIS. I understand that to be correct.

Mr. CULLOM. Of course I will go on with what I have to say if it is the desire of the Senate to remain in session longer, but I should prefer not to proceed to-night.

Mr. WELLINGTON. I move that the Senate adjourn.

Mr. CHANDLER and Mr. TELLER called for the yeas and nays; and they were ordered.

The Secretary proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. SPOONER. Will it not be agreeable to the Senator from Maryland to modify his motion so as to move to adjourn until 11 o'clock to-morrow morning?

Mr. WELLINGTON. That is agreeable to me—until 11 o'clock to-morrow.

Mr. BERRY. Out of order, by unanimous consent, I should like to ask—

Mr. CHANDLER. Is the question debatable?

Mr. BERRY. I should like to ask the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. DAVIS] what is his desire in the matter?

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The question is not debatable. The Secretary will call the roll.

Mr. TELLER. It is a debatable question whether we vote to adjourn until 11 o'clock—

Mr. CHANDLER. I ask for the reading of the rule.

Mr. ALLEN. Let the motion be stated.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Maryland that the Senate adjourn until to-morrow at 11 o'clock a. m.

Mr. TELLER. If the Senator wants to cut off debate—

Mr. CULLOM. That motion was withdrawn, I understood.

Mr. ALLISON. I hope the Senator from Minnesota having charge of the joint resolution will so adjust and arrange with other Senators that we may know whether we are to continue in session now until this matter is disposed of or are to remain here for some time longer and then adjourn. I should very much prefer myself, unless we are to dispose of the measure before adjournment, that we take an adjournment at some suitable hour to an early hour to-morrow, and I would even suggest an earlier hour than 11 o'clock, in order that if a final vote is not to be taken to-night we may have some understanding, if we can, when it is to be taken and then adjourn.

Mr. DAVIS. I suggest to the Senator from Maryland that he submit to an amendment to his motion to make the hour of meeting to-morrow 10 o'clock.

Mr. WELLINGTON. I have no objection to that hour. I merely want an adjournment now. I see no good to be accomplished by a session to-night, and, so far as I am concerned, I am willing to assume any responsibility in the matter of adjournment.

Mr. CHANDLER. Mr. President, the motion appears to be debatable.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The motion is not debatable.

Mr. CHANDLER. Senators have been debating it. Some seventeen or eighteen—

The VICE-PRESIDENT. If any Senator objects, the roll will immediately be called upon the motion of the Senator from Maryland.

Mr. ALLEN. I rise to a parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. CHANDLER. What is the motion?

The VICE-PRESIDENT. That the Senate now adjourn to 10 o'clock to-morrow morning.

Mr. CHANDLER. Then the Senator modified his motion. It was not so stated from the Chair.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Chair so stated the motion.

Mr. ALLEN. Is it a simple motion to adjourn?

Mr. BERRY. No; a motion to adjourn until 10 o'clock to-morrow.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Until 10 o'clock to-morrow.

Mr. ALLEN. I desire to raise the parliamentary question that a motion to adjourn to a specific time is debatable.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Chair will refer the Senator from Nebraska to the twenty-second rule.

Mr. ALLEN. *It is debatable under the rules of this body. The VICE-PRESIDENT. Under the rules of this body it is not debatable.

Mr. CHANDLER. I ask to have the rule read. The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Chair will read the rule:

- When a question is pending, no motion shall be received but—
- To adjourn.
- To adjourn to a day certain, or that when the Senate adjourn it shall be to a day certain.
- To take a recess.
- To proceed to the consideration of executive business.
- To lay on the table.
- To postpone indefinitely.
- To postpone to a day certain.
- To commit.
- To amend.

Which several motions shall have precedence as they stand arranged; and the motions relating to adjournment, to take a recess, to proceed to the consideration of executive business, to lay on the table, shall be decided without debate.

The Secretary will call the roll. The Secretary resumed the calling of the roll.

Mr. BERRY (when his name was called). I will withhold my vote until I hear from the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. DAVIS], in order to learn what he desires.

Mr. MALLOY (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the junior Senator from Vermont [Mr. PROCTOR]. If he were present, I should vote "yea."

Mr. NELSON (when his name was called). I am paired with the Senator from Missouri [Mr. VEST]. If he were present, I should vote "yea."

Mr. SPOONER (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. WALTHALL], who is detained from the Chamber by illness. I feel at liberty to vote, notwithstanding his absence. I vote "yea."

Mr. TURPIE (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the senior Senator from Vermont [Mr. MORRILL]. In his absence, I withhold my vote.

The roll call was concluded; and the Secretary recapitulated the vote.

Mr. PASCO (after having voted in the affirmative). I notice that the Senator from Washington [Mr. WILSON] has not voted. I am paired with him, and therefore withdraw my vote.

Mr. ALDRICH. He would vote "yea."

Mr. GALLINGER. I suggest to the Senator from Florida that I am paired with the Senator from Texas [Mr. MILLS] who is not present, and that we transfer our pairs. We vote on opposite sides.

Mr. PASCO. That is satisfactory to me, and I will allow my vote to stand.

The result was announced—yeas 30, nays 32; as follows:

YEAS—30.

Aldrich,	Cullom,	Gray,	Spooner,
Allison,	Daniel,	Hanna,	Tillman,
Bacon,	Davis,	Hawley,	Warren,
Berry,	Elkins,	Hoar,	Wellington,
Caffery,	Fairbanks,	McBride,	Wetmore,
Chilton,	Faulkner,	Pasco,	White.
Clark,	Gear,	Perkins,	
Clay,	Gorman,	Platt, Conn.	

NAYS—32.

Allen,	Gallinger,	McLaurin,	Quay,
Bate,	Hansbrough,	Mantle,	Roach,
Cannon,	Harris,	Martin,	Shoup,
Carter,	Heitfeld,	Mason,	Smith,
Chandler,	Kenney,	Money,	Teller,
Cockrell,	Lindsay,	Morgan,	Thurston,
Deboe,	Lodge,	Penrose,	Turley,
Foraker,	McEnery,	Pettus,	Turner.

NOT VOTING—27.

Baker,	Kyle,	Nelson,	Stewart,
Burrows,	McMillan,	Pettigrew,	Turpie,
Butler,	Mallory,	Platt, N. Y.	Vest,
Frye,	Mills,	Pritchard,	Walthall,
Hale,	Mitchell,	Proctor,	Wilson,
Jones, Ark.	Morrill,	Rawlins,	Wolcott.
Jones, Nev.	Murphy,	Sewell,	

So the Senate refused to adjourn.

Mr. CULLOM. Mr. President, I supposed in view of what transpired last evening that perhaps the Senate would extend the same courtesy to me. But it is immaterial. I shall proceed to say what I have to say in perfect good nature, without any feeling of disappointment whatever. I confess that I feel a good deal of hesitancy in addressing the Senate at all upon this occasion. If the suggestion of the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. ALLEN] that we should vote at once were acceded to, I would be delighted, and would be ready to cast my vote upon this question.

Mr. CULLOM thereupon proceeded to address the Senate. After having spoken for two minutes,

Mr. ALLISON. Will the Senator from Illinois yield to me?

Mr. CULLOM. Certainly.

Mr. ALLISON. I do not see the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations present. I hope that we can have unanimous

consent that we may adjourn until to-morrow at 10 o'clock. It is manifest, I think, that there will not be a quorum here to-night to go on in such a way as to reach a conclusion.

Mr. MASON. I can not hear the suggestion of the Senator from Iowa.

Mr. ALLISON. There will not be a quorum here to-night, I am afraid, to go on to the final conclusion of this measure, and if we are to occupy to-morrow, I should be very glad if we could have some adjustment or arrangement by which—

Mr. CHANDLER. Would the Senator be willing to have an agreement that we will vote on this question to-morrow before we adjourn?

Mr. ALLISON. Certainly.

Mr. CHANDLER. That will harmonize—

Mr. ALLISON. Why does the Senator ask me that question?

Mr. CHANDLER. That will harmonize all difficulties.

Mr. ALLISON. There are no difficulties that I know of.

Mr. WELLINGTON. I am not willing to agree to vote at any time.

Mr. ALLISON. The Senator put that question to me as though I was obstructing the measure. I am willing to go on to-night.

Mr. CHANDLER. If I may be allowed to make a statement, the Senator from Minnesota, the chairman of the committee, asked unanimous consent that we might agree to vote to-morrow before adjourning and said he should insist upon a continuous session if that agreement was not reached. That agreement was not reached. Now, the Senator from Iowa very properly asks unanimous consent that we agree to adjourn until 10 o'clock to-morrow; and through the Chair I prefer the request made by the Senator from Minnesota that we agree to vote on this subject to-morrow before we adjourn.

Mr. COCKRELL. I was just going to say that I hope the motion of the Senator from Iowa will receive unanimous consent. A night session would be very unpleasant, and it is manifest that we can not pass this measure to-night. If we could pass it to-night, I should be perfectly willing to stay. I do not believe we can, and I for one am perfectly willing now that by unanimous consent we shall agree to meet at 10 o'clock in the morning, and so far as I am concerned I will stay here until the debate is closed, if it is till Sunday morning.

Mr. DAVIS. Is any motion pending?

Mr. FORAKER. There has been a request for unanimous consent.

Mr. ALLISON. The Senator from New Hampshire asks unanimous consent that the matter may be concluded before adjournment to-morrow. I concur so far as I am concerned, but I also desire to couple with it a proposition that at least two hours, or I will say three hours, shall be devoted to ten minutes' debate upon the various amendments that have been offered before the vote is taken.

Mr. COCKRELL. I have no doubt that when the time comes we can readily arrange that in a fair and just way, as it should be arranged.

Mr. ALLISON. I ask that it be arranged now. I think that should be a part of the agreement.

Mr. CHANDLER. I withdraw my suggestion. The Senator from Minnesota is now here. I suggest to him that at 10 o'clock to-morrow morning when we meet he endeavor to make some arrangement on the basis suggested by the Senator from Missouri.

Mr. CARTER. Let the arrangement be made now.

Mr. CHANDLER. I have no objection.

Mr. DAVIS. I desire to give notice that I shall ask for a continuous session to-morrow until this matter is disposed of. I now move that the Senate adjourn until 10 o'clock to-morrow.

Mr. BACON. I can not hear what the Senator from Minnesota says.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Senator from Minnesota moves that the Senate adjourn until to-morrow morning at 10 o'clock.

Mr. COCKRELL. Giving notice that he will ask the Senate to sit it out to-morrow.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. That was the statement of the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. TELLER. Why not arrange it now?

Mr. DAVIS. I withdraw the motion for a moment at the request of the Senator from Montana [Mr. CARTER].

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The motion to adjourn is withdrawn.

Mr. CARTER. I suggest that the agreement indicated by the Senator from New Hampshire and the Senator from Iowa can be now made. There are some twenty-three Senators on the list who contemplate making addresses to the Senate on the pending resolution. At least one-half of that number stated that if any agreement could be made whereby a vote could be taken at a stated hour they would gladly forego the desire they have to be heard. This subject has been debated in the Senate for over three years. We have been insisting that action should be taken elsewhere. Action has been taken in all other departments of the Government, and the question is now before the Senate. We

seem to be the only obstruction in the way of final and definite action on the subject.

Before we adjourn to-night, in view of the definite expression given but a few minutes ago on the subject of adjournment without an arrangement, it seems to me but proper that an arrangement should be made now instead of being undertaken at 10 o'clock to-morrow morning.

Mr. COCKRELL. We can not do that. Why try what is absolutely impossible?

Mr. CARTER. Then I suggest that we fix the hour for the vote at 2 o'clock on Saturday afternoon.

Mr. COCKRELL. We will sit it out to-morrow. When we get through talking we shall vote. That is the only way we can settle it, in my judgment.

Mr. CARTER. That would mean the last of next week.

Mr. COCKRELL. No, it would not.

Mr. TELLER. Yes, it would, if all on the list talk.

Mr. COCKRELL. They will get tired of it.

Mr. CARTER. During the course of the discussion this afternoon, as in an experience meeting in church, one speech gave rise to a desire to make another speech, and each speech was but a repetition of the one that preceded it. It does seem to me that the country requires that we act rather than talk on this occasion. [Applause on the floor and in the galleries.]

The VICE-PRESIDENT rapped with his gavel.

Mr. CARTER. As a matter of fact this little demonstration in the galleries, contrary to the rules of the Senate, is but an expression in a small way of the feelings to-night of 70,000,000 people in this country. [Applause in the galleries.]

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Manifestations must not take place in the galleries. They are not a part of the Senate of the United States.

Mr. GRAY. I make the point of order that it is out of order to speak directly to the galleries.

Mr. PETTUS. Mr. President, the disorder that is now spoken of commenced in the Senate and not in the galleries.

Mr. CULLOM. Let me say a word.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Chair admonishes both Senators on the floor and the occupants of the galleries that manifestations of applause ought not to be indulged in.

Mr. CULLOM. I should like to have the Senate either adjourn or let me go on. [Laughter.]

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Chair will state that there is no motion before the Senate.

Mr. DAVIS. It seems perfectly plain that the agreement which the Senator from Montana so earnestly and properly desires can not be arrived at at present or to-night. I therefore renew my motion that the Senate adjourn until 10 o'clock to-morrow.

Mr. MORGAN. Will not the Senator from Minnesota allow me to say one word before that takes place?

Mr. TELLER and others. Vote!

Mr. TILLMAN. I make the point of order that the motion to adjourn is not debatable.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The point of order is sustained by the Chair.

Mr. TILLMAN. Let us vote.

Mr. MORGAN. I want to—

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Senator from Minnesota moves that the Senate adjourn until to-morrow morning at 10 o'clock.

Mr. MORGAN. On that question I call for the yeas and nays. The yeas and nays were ordered; and the Secretary proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. GALLINGER (when his name was called). I am paired with the senior Senator from Texas [Mr. MILLS]. I understand the Senator from Florida [Mr. PASCO] is paired with the Senator from Washington [Mr. WILSON]. I propose that we transfer our pairs, so that we can vote.

Mr. PASCO. Very well.

Mr. GALLINGER. I vote "nay."

Mr. MALLORY (when his name was called). I am paired with the Senator from Vermont [Mr. PROCTOR]. If he were present, I should vote "nay."

Mr. NELSON (when his name was called). I am paired with the Senator from Missouri [Mr. VEST].

The roll call having been concluded, the result was announced—yeas 33, nays 23; as follows:

YEAS—33.

Aldrich,	Cullom,	Hoar,	Spooner,
Allison,	Daniel,	Lindsay,	Tillman,
Bacon,	Davis,	Lodge,	Turley,
Bate,	Deboe,	McBride,	Warren,
Caffery,	Fairbanks,	Pasco,	Wellington,
Chilton,	Faulkner,	Perkins,	Wetmore.
Clark,	Gear,	Pettus,	
Clay,	Gorman,	Platt, Conn.	
Cockrell,	Gray,	Shoup,	

NAYS—23.

Allen,	Gallinger,	Martin,	Rawlins,
Berry,	Hansbrough,	Mason,	Smith,
Cannon,	Harris,	Money,	Teller,
Carter,	Heitfeld,	Morgan,	Thurston,
Chandler,	Kenney,	Penrose,	Turner.
Foraker,	Mantle,	Quay,	

NOT VOTING—33.

Baker,	Jones, Nev.	Murphy,	Turpie,
Burrows,	Kyle,	Nelson,	Vest,
Butler,	McEnery,	Pettigrew,	Walthall,
Elkins,	McLaurin,	Platt, N. Y.	White,
Frye,	McMillan,	Pritchard,	Wilson,
Hale,	Mallory,	Proctor,	Wolcott.
Hanna,	Mills,	Roach,	
Hawley,	Mitchell,	Seawell,	
Jones, Ark.	Morrill,	Stewart,	

So the motion was agreed to; and (at 6 o'clock and 10 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until to-morrow, Friday, April 15, 1898, at 10 o'clock a. m.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

THURSDAY, April 14, 1898.

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

CORRECTIONS.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. On pages 4195 and 4196 of the RECORD, in the roll call on Mr. DINSMORE'S motion to recommit the resolution reported from the Committee on Foreign Affairs, I am reported as not voting. I did vote "aye," and voted as loud as I could, but there was so much confusion I suppose the Clerk did not hear.

The SPEAKER. The correction will be made.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, I learn this morning for the first time that I was paired, and it so appears in the RECORD. I was absent yesterday on account of a nervous sick headache. I got information from the Foreign Affairs Committee that the matter would not be concluded yesterday, and so was not present. I see that I am paired, but it was by the kindness of some friend. Had I been present, I should have voted for the minority resolution, and, that being defeated, I should have voted for the majority resolution.

Mr. WHEELER of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I am incorrectly reported on page—

The SPEAKER. Before any further corrections are made, is there objection to the approval of the Journal?

Mr. BAILEY. I desire to suggest that as far as the recorded votes are concerned, they probably appear the same in the Journal and the RECORD, and if there is a mistake in the RECORD, it is also likely to be in the Journal.

The SPEAKER. The correction of the Journal is first in order.

Mr. BAILEY. But if the Journal was first approved and it should develop that the mistakes were the same in both—

The SPEAKER. Then, the gentleman should first address himself to the correction of the Journal.

Mr. WHEELER of Alabama. The Clerk informed me that a correction of the RECORD would be followed by a correction of the Journal.

The SPEAKER. The Journal must be first passed upon before corrections in the RECORD.

Mr. WHEELER of Alabama. Then, Mr. Speaker, I ask to have the Journal corrected. I am reported as not voting on the motion to recommit the resolution yesterday. I did vote "aye" very loudly and I stood in front of the Speaker's desk.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman is not recorded, but if he states that he voted, the Journal will be corrected.

Mr. CONNOLLY. Mr. Speaker, if I am recorded in the Journal as I am recorded in the RECORD, I desire to correct it. On the motion of Mr. DINSMORE to recommit the resolution reported from the Committee on Foreign Affairs, I am recorded as voting "no." I want to be recorded as I voted, "aye."

The SPEAKER. The gentleman is recorded as voting "no." If it is an error it will be corrected.

Mr. SHERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I am recorded on the first roll call yesterday, on agreeing to the substitute, as not voting. I was present and voted "no."

The SPEAKER. The gentleman is not recorded. Does the gentleman state that he voted "no"?

Mr. SHERMAN. I do.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk informs the Chair that the tally sheet shows that the gentleman voted "no." The RECORD is incorrect, the Journal is incorrect, and the corrections will be made.

Mr. STRODE of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I desire to correct the Journal. In the RECORD I am recorded as not having voted on the motion to recommit. I was present and voted "no."

The SPEAKER. The gentleman is not so recorded, and the change will be made.