

years must have pressed still more heavily upon his power of endurance, he took upon himself, at the request of those near him, the labor and duty of organizing and uniting those inside of his own political household in favor of the policy of bimetalism—a policy which he always declared involved neither change nor innovation, but was as to our law restoration, as to silver itself restitution, and a safe return to the ancient, long-tried, and well-established usage and practice of our fathers. With what success he prosecuted and completed his portion of this great design the official record of the late national convention specially discloses, and we all are witnesses.

It must have seemed even to his ardent zeal in the beginning a work of mountainous difficulty and of much uncertainty in the event. It involved a correspondence under his direction and supervision with persons residing in every State and Territory and Congressional district of the United States. It required a daily comparison of part with part, a summary of very numerous details, sudden and constant resort to the best method of answer and reply, information wide and accurate, with ceaseless vigilance and circumspection to the close. Such were for many months his labors, worthy of the man and of the cause.

Those versed in modern mechanism and invention have furnished us with a phrase now become quite familiar—"applied science." Called upon to designate in the briefest terms the controlling, guiding principle of a career so greatly prolonged, so highly distinguished, we might justly name it "applied common sense" in its broadest significance and in the most active development.

Action was a necessity of his being. He was as prone to take the initiative, and to keep it, as the sparks to fly upward. Some one, now many years ago, in Washington, spoke to him once about accepting a position upon the Federal bench. "No," he said, "I desire no such position. I do not wish to be tied up like a log in a raft with nothing to do but to float or to drift at the end of a line. My boat must be in the moving current. I must feel the gale; should it come, I must ride out the storm, if I have nothing left but the rudder in my hand."

This readiness to participate actively in affairs was not exercised without care or caution. He was neither rash, reckless, nor indifferent to consequences. His vision, his view of men and events, was clear. He was subject to no delusions. He sometimes failed, as men must who will act while others wait, but he was of valiant heart, strenuous will, and of that fertility in resource which either eluded or defied disaster. Failure, with him, was no finality—rather a cause and occasion for further endeavor.

His life was so crowded with action that it is not known that he had the leisure, even if he had the inclination, to have left behind him a single line of personal history or reminiscence. Moreover, he was a man of strong attachments; in friendship, earnest and sincere. How he loved Memphis, the city of his home and residence! He delighted to speak of its thrift and progress, of its harbor and landings, of its public buildings and other improvements, all of which had felt the fostering hand of his care and solicitude. How inseparably his name is connected with the magnificent transit-way of commerce and travel which, hard by, spans the broad current of the Father of Waters. Often he spoke of his State, always in the language of the warmest affection—his native State, whose great and generous constituencies had so long and so bounteously given him their support and confidence.

The faculty of almost instant adaptation of himself to circumstances of whatever exigency, his manner of molding men to his side and way, his steady advance against insurmountable obstacles, his survival of the rudest shocks of adverse fortune were as manifest throughout his whole course as they are indescribable.

Witness his departure to Mexico at the conclusion of the great civil war, his adventurous sojourn within the domain of that Republic, his voyage to England, for he crossed the ocean not in quest of ease, but of fresh fields of new enterprise; his return to Tennessee and to this city, the reentry upon the business of his profession, his continuous and very successful practice in the courts, the canvass for his first election to the Senate, his successive re-elections to that position—these are testimonials written at large to the genius, character, and conduct of one destined to so conspicuous a career.

Last scene of all—his death at the capital—at his place and post of duty, the obsequies in the Senate Chamber, the funeral cortège thence bearing his remains to their final resting place, a whole city in mourning to receive them, a State—the whole sisterhood of States—in sorrowing sympathy with you for a loss so irreparable, commemorating with you, my hearers, also to-day the demise of a great statesman whose course, with all its vicissitudes, has been in the end so grandly crowned with years, with honors, and with the just fame which follows a life so useful and beneficent.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The ceremonies having been concluded, by virtue of the last of the series of resolutions heretofore adopted the Senate stands adjourned.

The Senate accordingly (at 4 o'clock and 20 minutes p. m.) adjourned until Monday, March 28, 1898, at 12 o'clock meridian.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

THURSDAY, March 24, 1898.

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

The Journal of yesterday's proceedings was read and approved. Mr. BOUTELLE of Maine. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill making appropriations for the naval establishment for the next fiscal year.

STATISTICS OF LAKE COMMERCE.

Mr. PERKINS. I ask the gentleman to yield to me to make a report.

Mr. BOUTELLE of Maine. I yield to the gentleman to make a report.

Mr. PERKINS. The Committee on Printing makes the following report, and asks its immediate consideration.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Iowa submits a report from the Committee on Printing, for immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

Concurrent resolution No. 23.

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 of which shall be for the use of the Treasury Department.

Mr. PERKINS. There is an amendment to the resolution.

The Clerk read as follows:

Strike out all after the word "Commerce," in line 5, and add: "4,000 copies for the use of the House, 2,000 copies for the use of the Senate, and 4,000 copies for the use of the Treasury Department."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. BAILEY. I would like to know, if the amendment is agreed to, how the resolution would read?

Mr. PERKINS. It makes another division of the number of copies.

Mr. BAILEY. Well, but you strike out a few words. I understood the Clerk to read—

The SPEAKER. A change of number.

Mr. BAILEY. I understand; but I thought the Clerk read strike out the two words, "vital statistics."

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The amendment was again reported.

Mr. BAILEY. Now, what I asked was that the Clerk report the resolution as it would read when amended.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk has so reported the resolution.

Mr. PERKINS. I can tell the gentleman.

Mr. BAILEY. It is utterly impossible to know how it would read by what the Clerk has read.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the resolution as it would read when amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

So as to read: "4,000 copies for the use of the House"—

Mr. BAILEY. I want the whole resolution.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Texas wants to hear the resolution read as it would read after it is amended.

The Clerk read 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 use of the Senate, and 4,000 copies for the use of the Treasury Department.

Mr. BAILEY. Now, Mr. Speaker, I have not seen this document. I presume that it relates to interstate commerce on the lakes.

Mr. PERKINS. It relates to the statistics of lake commerce. The request is from the Treasury Department. The resolution was introduced by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BURTON]; and if the gentleman from Texas needs any further information, I have no doubt the gentleman from Ohio would be glad to give it.

Mr. BAILEY. I will not detain the House by asking that; but I am not perfectly sure that such a document should be printed.

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

The amendment recommended by the committee was agreed to.

The concurrent resolution as amended was agreed to.

BRIDGE ACROSS ST. FRANCIS RIVER, ARKANSAS.

Mr. McCULLOCH. Mr. Speaker, I desire to ask consideration for the bill (H. R. 5030) to authorize the construction of a bridge across the St. Francis River, in the State of Arkansas, and ask to concur in the Senate amendments.

Mr. BOUTELLE of Maine. Mr. Speaker, is this a request for unanimous consent?

The SPEAKER. It is.

Mr. BOUTELLE of Maine. I will have to refuse the gentleman. Several gentlemen on this side have made similar requests

and I have refused, and justice requires that I should treat all alike.

Mr. McCULLOCH. It is a little bridge bill, with Senate amendments, that can be disposed of in a minute.

Mr. BOUTELLE of Maine. I have been asked by three or four different gentlemen, and have stated that I would be unable to yield; and it will be utterly unfair and unjust for me to do so now. I must ask for the regular order.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Maine that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. McCULLOCH. Mr. Speaker, I ask that this bill be retained on the Speaker's table.

The SPEAKER. It will lie on the table.

The motion to go into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union was then agreed to.

NAVAL APPROPRIATION BILL.

The House accordingly resolved itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, Mr. SHERMAN in the chair.

The CHAIRMAN. The House is in Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 9378) making appropriations for the naval service for the fiscal year 1898-99, and the gentleman from Maine asks unanimous consent to dispense with the first reading of the bill. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. BOUTELLE of Maine. Mr. Chairman, it is the very earnest desire of the Committee on Naval Affairs that this important bill may be acted upon by the House and sent to the Senate as speedily as possible. This bill is reported under somewhat extraordinary circumstances, and I therefore have no hesitation in calling attention to the fact that it has the most liberal provisions for the strengthening and maintenance of the naval establishment that has ever been reported to the House.

The reasons for this are too obvious to require mention from me. The committee to whom the House intrusted the preparation of this bill have not failed to be impressed with the circumstances that surround legislation at this session, and it has been their earnest desire to meet fully and speedily what they believe to be the expectations of the House and of the country in providing this great arm of our military service with all that it could reasonably require to meet every exigency of the public service and every demand for the maintenance of the public honor.

Necessarily, the bill has been somewhat delayed beyond the usual time, by the increased demands from day to day to meet the exigencies that were not foreseen at the beginning of this session, but we have reported our bill after the fullest consideration, after the most ample investigation, and we are confident today that the House will sustain the action of the committee in having provided, so far as in their knowledge it was possible, for every demand that could legitimately arise for the strengthening of this branch of the public service during the current fiscal year.

I may be pardoned, Mr. Chairman, for alluding to the fact that in these exciting and somewhat sensational times there have been directed toward the committee of which I have the honor to be the chairman various unjust and untruthful criticisms. I desire to say here to-day, in the only body to which either myself or the committee are responsible, the House of Representatives, which put this task of preparing a bill upon us, and to which we are by law and by right responsible for the report of our stewardship, that any and every intimation, from whatever source it may have proceeded, that this committee has for one instant lacked in a desire to meet the fullest requirements of the executive department in meeting every exigency that has come or may come upon us, is absolutely without foundation.

I have participated in a more or less active way in the preparation of fourteen annual appropriation bills for the naval establishment, and I can truthfully say that upon all of the other bills preceding this, in the aggregate, there has not been expended a tithe of the thought and care and labor that has been given to this bill. The members of my committee have attended its sessions day after day when their physical condition required that they should have been at their homes.

We have been laboring in season and out of season to meet the extraordinary requirements that have come upon us, and the result is before you. We do not claim that this bill is perfect, but we do not know of a feature that it contains which in our judgment ought not to receive the approval of the House of Representatives and of the country. We have been, it is true, far more liberal with the requirements and estimates of the executive department than would ordinarily be the case.

Every member of experience knows how estimates are drawn, and what the usual course of legislation is in regard to the increased demands for expenditure, but we have recognized that we were preparing legislation under extraordinary conditions of public affairs; and this bill, which is now upon the desk of members, has not only responded to every legitimate requirement of

the executive department, but in many of its features has gone beyond it, as in the judgment of the committee was demanded by the exigencies of the situation.

I presume, Mr. Chairman, that most of the members have read the bill, as well as the report of the committee, and I shall be exceedingly brief in the reference I make thereto. This bill carries an appropriation aggregating \$35,683,058.68. The amount appropriated in the bill for the last fiscal year was \$31,918,626.55. The estimate submitted by the Department for the coming fiscal year was \$33,128,234.19. The appropriations carried in this bill exceed the appropriations for the last fiscal year by \$3,764,432.13, and are \$2,554,824.49 over the estimates submitted by the Department.

This increase extends all along the line. In the first place, we may properly mention the fact that we have again increased the enlisted force of the Navy. In the Annual Report of the Secretary of the Navy, citing the report of the Chief of the Bureau of Navigation, who requested an increase of 1,500 in the enlisted force, the report of the Secretary stated that an increase of 1,000 would, in his judgment, meet the requirements of the service.

Since that time circumstances have changed. The demands upon the enlisted force have increased; and your committee, acting upon their own responsibility and their recognition of the situation confronting us, have increased the enlisted force of the Navy by 2,000, adding 1,750 men and 250 apprentice boys.

Mr. CANNON. What is the total increase?

Mr. BOUTELLE of Maine. I will state again that we have increased the total enlisted force of the Navy by 2,000. We have done this in view of the fact that for the first time in years it has been deemed essential to put into commission all of the vessels of our Navy; and, as is known by all, we have been purchasing additional tonnage abroad. So that the committee felt that it was not only their duty to meet the suggestion of the Secretary for a thousand more men, but to make additional provision for 1,000 beyond that to meet exigencies that have since arisen.

In regard to the officers of the Navy, while it was not originally, in December last when we took charge of this bill, the intention or the expectation to make provision for additional officers upon the appropriation bill, but rather to refer such propositions and consider them under the head of a general reorganization of the naval force, the representations that have been made to the committee recently of the absolute necessity for an increase in the corps of paymasters and an increase in the corps of surgeons were so effective upon the judgment of our committee that in response to the direct personal and official request of the Secretary and of the chiefs of those departments we have authorized an increase of 15 paymasters and 25 acting assistant surgeons of the Navy.

Mr. McMILLIN. Will the gentleman allow a question?

Mr. BOUTELLE of Maine. With great pleasure.

Mr. McMILLIN. The gentleman has said that this bill contemplates an increase of the force of the Navy. I wish to ask from what source that increase is to be taken—from the Naval Militia?

Mr. BOUTELLE of Maine. No, sir; the force to which I refer is the enlisted force of the Navy—the petty officers, seamen, landsmen, marines, and boys.

Mr. McMILLIN. Then this additional force is not taken from the Naval Militia?

Mr. BOUTELLE of Maine. The Naval Militia to which the gentleman refers are not available for that purpose.

Mr. McMILLIN. Why not?

Mr. BOUTELLE of Maine. Because they are enlisted under State laws for specific service, and are not necessarily available for service on board men-of-war; they are not necessarily seamen, and not necessarily expert in the duties of seamanship. They are organized under State laws with certain aid from the Navy Department for certain specific purposes, among which I may state is the protection of the harbors and coast lines within their limit. But they are not available directly, as I understand, for service as seamen, landsmen, and marines on board our ships of war. The men whom we have authorized to be enlisted are men who are to become a permanent part of the enlisted force of the Navy.

Mr. Chairman, I had queried in my own mind whether I would make reference to another fact in this immediate connection. The suggestions of my colleagues on the committee have decided me that I should do so; and I do it more especially because the subject to which I am about to allude has been made the text of some very scandalous and mischievous criticisms, not only upon myself, for which I care little, but upon the legislation which is now presented to this House.

In a leading New York paper of yesterday I read a statement, the exact language of which I will quote, so that there can be no mistake. I want to say to my colleagues in the House that no criticism purely personal to myself could induce me to refer to a matter of this kind, for after fourteen years of public service, in the light of day, among my associates in this House, I do not feel called upon to rise on any occasion to vindicate my integrity or my patriotism.

I received yesterday through the mail a clipping from the New York Sun, a leading and influential paper, which is marked conspicuously with black pencil, "Shame," with three lines under it—"Shame to the M. C. from Maine." And then there is a big, black hand with a finger pointing to a certain paragraph, which is marked.

The editorial thus marked is largely devoted to eulogy—eulogy of good men, great men, patriotic men who have been laboring for their country in these days of trial. And then it goes on to refer to matters in this bill in this way:

So far as naval preparation is concerned, the report of the Maine inquiry board finds it as complete as Congress has permitted—

That leaves the brunt of the criticism on Congress. But the article goes on and becomes a little more concrete and individual—

for here we are compelled to note with equal indignation and disgust that the engine rooms of this fleet are less than half supplied with engineers, many ships having but a quarter of their complement and a number of them less than a quarter. Let Congressman BOUTELLE of Maine answer it. The responsibility is his alone. And no one has charged him with being a knave. That a fool can do the more harm of the two is an old story.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I am inclined to agree with the suggestion of some of my committee colleagues sitting near me that perhaps a few words from me in regard to that extraordinary slander are desirable for the enlightenment of the House. I am inclined to think that without some statement from me members of this House and others who should read such a declaration might be led to reflect not only upon myself, but upon the committee for failing to remedy a condition of things which the article sets forth; so I will briefly inform the House of the facts in regard to this matter.

As I stated to you some time ago, it was not the original intention of the committee to deal with increases or reorganizations in the force of naval officers in this appropriation bill. We can only do so by the indulgence of the House and by an elastic interpretation of the rules. We intended to deal with all of these matters in a comprehensive consideration of the various plans of reorganization of the various corps.

A little over a week ago, when my committee had assembled for the express purpose of closing up this bill, I found the Chief of Engineers waiting for me and for the committee, with a letter from the Secretary of the Navy, which, with the permission of the House, I shall put into the RECORD, commending especially to me and to the committee his representation of the absolute need of more engineer officers to run the engines of our ships. The letter was as follows:

NAVY DEPARTMENT, Washington, March 12, 1898.

SIR: The Engineer in Chief, Commodore Melville, has presented me the accompanying statement, showing the absolute necessity of more engineer officers, especially in case of any emergency. The matter was fully treated in his annual report, and also urged upon the attention of Congress in the Annual Report of the Secretary of the Navy.

As the Engineer in Chief says, the number of engineer officers now attached to various vessels in commission is barely enough to admit of the performance of their duty in time of peace, and wholly inadequate in time of war, when increased vigilance and constant presence of officers on duty in charge of the machinery will become imperative.

Will you permit me to commend his suggestions to your favorable consideration and ask you to give him an opportunity to lay the matter before you?

Very respectfully,

JOHN D. LONG, Secretary.

Hon. C. A. BOUTELLE,

Chairman Committee on Naval Affairs, House of Representatives.

Of course we gave the Chief of Engineers a full and courteous hearing. He stated his case, and he proffered to us a paragraph to be incorporated in the appropriation bill. The paragraph that he thus presented, with the indorsement of the Department, embraced a practical reorganization of the Engineer Corps—the active Corps of Engineers. It provided just how many of such a rank and just how many of such a rank that corps should be composed of, practically reorganizing it. This is the paragraph proposed:

Proposed amendment to the bill making appropriation for the naval service for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1899.

Provided, That the active list of the Engineer Corps of the Navy shall be composed of 15 chief engineers with the relative rank of captain, 20 chief engineers with the relative rank of commander, 50 chief engineers with the relative rank of lieutenant-commander, 90 passed assistant engineers with the relative rank of lieutenant, 80 passed assistant engineers with the relative rank of lieutenant (junior grade), 50 assistant engineers with the relative rank of ensign: And provided further, That former engineer officers of the Navy who have resigned or been honorably discharged from the Navy with creditable records since January 1, 1882, and who are not above 45 years of age, may be placed on the active list of the Engineer Corps of the Navy in such place and under such regulations as the Secretary of the Navy may approve: And provided further, That naval cadets of the engineer division now at sea, and naval cadets of the engineer division of the first class now at the Naval Academy, may, upon the approval of the Secretary of the Navy, become at once eligible for commissions as assistant engineers in the Navy: And provided further, That vacancies in the lowest grade of the Engineer Corps of the Navy as above constituted, that may exist after the above provisions have been complied with, may be filled by graduates of recognized technological schools of the United States, subject to such restrictions and examinations as may be prescribed by the Secretary of the Navy.

I asked him what the effect would be in regard to increase, and I understood him to state that they wanted, and that this para-

graph would provide, 110 additional assistant engineers. My committee gave him a cordial hearing, and after some conversation, as chairman of the committee I suggested that inasmuch as the Secretary of the Navy had recommended certain other increases in the official corps as essential, we would notify him to attend our meeting the next day, and to bring with him the Chief of the Engineering Bureau and the chiefs of the other bureaus, when we would arrange for legislation that would meet all the requirements for additional officers in the service.

The next morning the Secretary came in response to our invitation, accompanied by the chiefs of the Bureaus of Navigation, Steam Engineering, Medicine and Surgery, and Supplies and Accounts. These gentlemen and the committee discussed the situation. We considered the paragraph of the Secretary's annual report in which he had stated that we needed more line officers, more engineer officers, more surgeons, and more paymasters. The immediate and exigent requirement in the Engineering Bureau was stated to be so serious that we had two vessels at League Island that could not be moved to New York for lack of engineers to run the machinery. And in the course of that conversation it was suggested that in the proposed reorganization, known as the personnel bill, which is intended to compose the long-standing disputes between two of the corps of the Navy, the line and the engineers, there was a paragraph providing that 100 first-class machinists should be enlisted and appointed as warrant officers, to receive liberal pay, and those 100 men should be employed in handling engines, and thereby relieve that number of junior engineer officers.

The Secretary favored it as an excellent provision that, as was understood, would set 100 engineers free, supply their places with 100 of the most skillful machinists that \$1,200 a year and warrants in the Navy could bring, and to make up the additional ten more that the Chief of Engineers said was demanded it was proposed that we should immediately commission the two classes of naval cadets who are now serving their two years at sea; that as to the present class in the Academy we should abolish the two years' sea service and immediately commission that class on their graduation from the Academy this summer, which would give eighty-two cadets to be made ensigns and assistant engineers; and in addition to that, that we could permit former engineers of the Navy who are now in private life, who have gone out of the service with honorable records, to be restored to the Navy to provide for all the requirements of the engineer service.

We then considered the question of the additional assistant surgeons and of the additional assistant paymasters, and the Secretary of the Navy was requested by me, speaking for my committee, to put into proper form these suggestions, which had received the tacit approval of the committee, and send them to us in such language as the Department thought would, when inserted in the appropriation bill, prove effective in putting into force its recommendation and wishes on the subjects named.

The next day I received the following letter:

NAVY DEPARTMENT, Washington, March 14, 1898.

SIR: I have the honor to inclose herewith the draft of an amendment to the pending bill making appropriations for the naval service for the ensuing year, in which draft is embodied the matters orally agreed upon during my interview with the committee this morning, with the exception of that which relates to the reinstatement of officers late of the Engineer Corps who have honorably resigned or who have been honorably discharged in pursuance of law.

On further consideration, and after conference with the Engineer in Chief, it is hoped that with the additional engineers we shall get by shortening the course at the Naval Academy to four years, it will not be necessary to ask for a general law for reinstatement of such officers, but to leave the matter open for special legislation in individual cases as the committee may elect.

Permit me also to urge the great importance of taking up and passing the personnel bill, which is the work of a board representing the line and Engineer Corps, and which, for the first time in a long period, have, with some concessions on each side, agreed upon that measure, insuring a reorganization of the Navy and securing its efficiency and harmony. It seems to me that the time is very propitious for this enactment, when all parties are inspired by patriotic spirit, and that if the opportunity is now lost the result may be a renewal for years to come of the friction and antagonism which have for so long stood in the way of efficient harmony in the naval service.

Very respectfully,

JOHN D. LONG,
Secretary.

Hon. CHARLES A. BOUTELLE,

Chairman Committee on Naval Affairs, House of Representatives.

The draft of the provisions for insertion in the bill was as follows:

That from and after the passage of this act the students at the Naval Academy shall have the title of midshipmen, and on successfully completing the course at that institution each shall be commissioned in the lowest grade of the line, Engineer or Marine Corps, the two years' course at sea being hereby abolished.

That upon the passage of this act all the naval cadets of the line and engineer divisions who have completed the four years' course at the Naval Academy and are performing duty at sea shall be commissioned in the lowest grade of the line, Engineer or Marine Corps, and the members of each class shall take rank among themselves according to their graduating multiples as was determined at the end of the four years' course at the Naval Academy.

That upon the passage of this act the Secretary of the Navy shall appoint a board for the examination of men for the position of warrant machinists, 100 of whom are hereby authorized. The said examination shall be open, first, to all machinists by trade of good record in the naval service, and if a sufficient number of machinists from the Navy are not found duly qualified,

then any machinist of good character in civil life shall be eligible for such examination and appointment to fill the remaining vacancies.

All subsequent vacancies in the list of warrant machinists shall be filled by competitive examination before a board ordered by the Secretary of the Navy, and open to all machinists by trade, who are in the Navy, and machinists of good character in civil life authorized by the Secretary of the Navy to appear before said board, and where candidates from civil life and from the naval service possess equal qualifications the preference shall be given to those from the naval service.

That the pay of warrant machinists shall be \$1,200 per annum for the first three years after date of appointment, and \$1,400 per annum thereafter, and they shall be retired under the provisions of existing law for warrant officers. Warrant machinists shall receive at first an acting appointment, which may be made permanent under regulations established by the Navy Department for other warrant officers. They shall take rank with other warrant officers according to date of appointment, and shall wear such uniform as may be prescribed by the Navy Department.

Mr. Chairman, I immediately laid this proposition before the committee. I was in favor of it then. I have been in favor of it ever since. I am in favor of every provision of it now, and without attempting to speak for the committee specifically in regard to this particular suggestion that I am about to make, I have the right to say here, personally, that while I was ready and am ready to provide any men, whether lieutenants or ensigns, engineers or machinists, doctors or paymasters, or any others who are needed to insure the efficiency of the naval service, I firmly believe, based on some experience on the water, or some experience in the Navy, and a considerable experience in naval legislation, that no addition of 100 men could be made to the force of our fleets to-day that would be more valuable to this country and to the service than the appointment of 100 of the first-class machinists of this country in positions of responsibility and rank which have never before been accorded in the Navy to our mechanics; in positions which recognize the dignity of skilled labor, the importance of mechanical proficiency, by awarding not only a high rate of pay for mechanical service, but an official status on board the ships of our Navy that would be honorable alike to themselves and their craft.

Now, what came of that? I do not propose to enter into any discussion of motives, but we all know the strong feeling that is excited in regard to public measures that affect the positions and interests of individuals. And perhaps it is enough for me to say that a desire on the part of a great many people to secure the immediate enactment of a measure affecting the rank and interests of two of the corps of officers in the Navy in some way seemed to become operative in antagonism to these propositions, which were originally formulated in my committee room at a conference of the Secretary of the Navy, the Chief of the Bureau of Navigation and Detail, who is the Adjutant-General of the Navy, the Chief of the Bureau of Steam Engineering, the Surgeon-General, and the Paymaster-General, and subsequently forwarded to me as chairman from the Department in writing, with the request of the Secretary for its passage. Now, why is it not in the bill?

The New York Sun says that Mr. BOUTELLE is responsible for some alleged failure to provide for the engineer force of the Navy. My answer to that is that the absence of that legislation from the printed copy of our bill is due to the personal and official request of the Department, and I am not going to bear responsibility which does not belong to me.

The Assistant Secretary of the Navy came to the Capitol to request, first, that the committee should incorporate an entire code of legislation, reorganizing two of the branches of the Navy, into this appropriation bill, a legislative measure that by no stretch of parliamentary courtesy could be permissible upon it; and as the committee decided that we could not put that into the bill properly, and as everybody knew that it would be subject to a point of order, the committee were requested to eliminate these provisions from the bill, lest their enactment might affect in some way future possible action upon the matter of reorganization.

Naturally I insisted upon something more than a verbal withdrawal of these requests, and I received it, and I have it here to-day. I said to the Secretary that our committee would be guided by the wishes of the Department, because we were trying in every possible way to fortify and sustain them, but that with that legislation drawn up in specific form lying on my desk, with the official request of the Secretary of the Navy for us to incorporate it in the appropriation bill, I could not fail to present and press it, unless I had equally specific authority from the Department for its omission. On the 18th of March, 1898, I received the following letters:

NAVY DEPARTMENT, Washington, March 18, 1898.

MY DEAR SIR: I inclose herewith a letter from the Assistant Secretary, stating the result arrived at after his interview with you and with Speaker REED with reference to the personnel bill.

The arrangement is satisfactory to me, as it insures either the personnel bill in its entirety, which I believe to be a consummation vitally important to the service, or, at least, the provisions for warrant machinists and for the commissioning of naval cadets immediately upon the conclusion of the four years' course, so that in either event the additional force necessary by the increase of the Navy for the running of engines will be insured.

Please accept my acknowledgments for the consideration which you and the committee have given to the Assistant Secretary, and believe me,

Very respectfully,

JOHN D. LONG, Secretary.

Hon. C. A. BOUTELLE,
Chairman Committee on Naval Affairs, House of Representatives.

NAVY DEPARTMENT, Washington, March 18, 1898.

SIR: I have been all day before the House Committee on Naval Affairs and in communication with the Speaker, and after much consultation have made them a proposition on which they acted, I stating distinctly that it had to be made on my own authority, and that you might repudiate it. I believe, however, that it is exactly in the line of the views you expressed to me this morning. It is this:

The committee have left out of the appropriation bill the provision for the hundred machinists and for the commissioning of the cadets, it being the understanding that immediately after the appropriation bill has gone to the House they shall take up the personnel bill and report either that bill or else these provisions that they have struck out of the appropriation bill, or whatever combination the committee decide, the Speaker saying that he believes without question that the Committee on Rules will provide for the immediate consideration of this bill, so that it will go through the House, in all probability, very close to the appropriation bill. I have the honor, sir, to recommend that you approve what I have done, and so notify Mr. BOUTELLE, stating to him at the same time that the paymasters and surgeons asked for by the Department should be provided for in the appropriation bill.

Very respectfully,

THEODORE ROOSEVELT,
Assistant Secretary.

The Honorable the SECRETARY OF THE NAVY.

What the Secretary there refers to is the fact that we were urged to give some assurance that we would take up some other bill and pass it in such a way as to render the proposed amendments to the appropriation bill unnecessary. Of course, Mr. Chairman, nobody could give such a promise, pledge, or assurance as that. The only assurance that could be given, and it was given by courtesy and not by right, was that the subcommittee charged with this entirely distinct matter of legislation would bring it up as early as possible and press its consideration. If the bill referred to should not be passed, then no provision will have been made for this pressing want represented to me by the Chief of Engineers a week ago, and we will have to trust to some other legislation to secure it.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I think everybody here understands what I have stated. Such is the situation to-day; and the responsibility for the fact that the naval appropriation bill does not contain specific legislation providing for every alleged need of the Engineer Bureau and of every other bureau rests upon other shoulders than mine. I favored the legislation, and was reluctant to have it omitted from this bill. That is all I have to say upon the subject.

Now, Mr. Chairman, in other respects the committee have sought to meet every requirement, as I have stated before. We probably, at the outset of this session, would not have provided for so large an increase of the Navy as we have in this bill; but confronted as we are with the fact that the United States Government in a crisis has been subjected to the humiliation of raking over the shipyards of Europe to find vessels with which to protect our coast, we have taken the lesson to heart and felt that it was incumbent upon us to go forward with some reasonable degree of activity in making provision for producing our Navy through the labor and skill and impulse of our own citizens, which, if we had done for the last fifteen years in a greater degree, would have saved us the humiliation of hoisting our flag on foreign-built vessels to-day, and have given us the satisfaction of having our flag float over vessels that had been built in our own country, under our own flag, by our own skilled labor.

Mr. SIMPSON of Kansas. If the gentleman will permit me, I desire to ask him a question. I notice that this bill provides for the building of three battle ships.

Mr. BOUTELLE of Maine. It does. I had just referred to that in an incidental way.

Mr. SIMPSON of Kansas. Will the gentleman tell us how long it takes to build a battle ship?

Mr. BOUTELLE of Maine. One of the reasons, and one of the principal reasons, why we made this provision for three battle ships was the fact that it takes so long to build them.

Mr. SIMPSON of Kansas. About how long?

Mr. BOUTELLE of Maine. About three years.

Mr. SIMPSON of Kansas. There is a considerable interest felt in the matter by various gentlemen, who have expressed a wish to know how long it took to build one of these vessels.

Mr. BOUTELLE of Maine. That is a well-known fact.

Mr. SIMPSON of Kansas. About three years?

Mr. BOUTELLE of Maine. About three years, considerably less if under forced conditions working day and night.

Mr. LEWIS of Washington. With an added force of men.

Mr. BOUTELLE of Maine. With an added force of men. That is the reason we want to begin three, because it takes so long to build them.

Mr. SIMPSON of Kansas. It might be possible to build one of them in two years?

Mr. BOUTELLE of Maine. I do not know whether we could build a first-class battle ship in two years. I suppose the gentleman is skirmishing around, basing an idea of some incompatibility of this provision with immediate prospects of war. I will say to the gentleman—

Mr. SIMPSON of Kansas. Oh, no, Mr. Chairman; I have been merely seeking information as to the length of time it takes to build these battle ships.

Mr. BOUTELLE of Maine. All right; it is about three years, or two years and a half if in a hurry. We have provided for building three first-class battle ships. I believe we certainly have not overestimated the demand of the House in that regard. One of the most important factors in naval warfare to-day has become what is known as the torpedo-boat destroyer. She is larger than the torpedo boat, and can take the sea and eat up the small torpedo boats.

In the modern way of conducting naval warfare the small torpedo boat could, if it is not obstructed, destroy the battle ship, but the torpedo-boat destroyer can guard the battle ship to a great extent against them. I will say, briefly, not as an expert in naval warfare, but simply referring to that phase in the development of the torpedo boat, that the torpedo boat is quite effective, and in that regard has changed the methods of warfare to a considerable extent. Men-of-war no longer go into harbors and lie there to be blown up by torpedoes in time of war. They keep the sea. They are safer from attack of torpedo boats, and these small crafts labor with great disadvantage in great sea way.

But with the assistance of the torpedo-boat destroyer, he can keep off the torpedo boats and dispose of them or he can keep in motion at sea outside. With the search light and the rapid-fire battery and the added protection of the torpedo-boat destroyer, we made another stride forward in naval warfare. And so we recommend the construction of six torpedo-boat destroyers and six torpedo boats.

You will have noticed by the newspaper reports—and occasionally a true statement gets into the newspapers, although I would not want you to take it from that authority without looking at the headlines and seeing whether it was printed in yellow—that the Government has been purchasing a few of these torpedo boats abroad, because we believed we were somewhat short. We can build in this country the best torpedo boats in the world, and we ask you to authorize the building of six small boats and six of the large boats.

Mr. CANNON. These boats can be constructed in six to twelve months, can they not?

Mr. BOUTELLE of Maine. These boats can be constructed in from six to seven months, I believe.

Mr. BROMWELL. Will the gentleman allow me a question?

Mr. BOUTELLE of Maine. Certainly.

Mr. BROMWELL. We have all been interested in the description of the various classes of vessels by the gentleman from Maine, but there has been considerable discussion as to the value of the double-turret monitor as compared with the battle ship. I would be glad to hear the gentleman's views on that subject.

Mr. BOUTELLE of Maine. That is entering upon a wide sea of discussion. I do not like to weary the House, and I will be as brief as I can. The House will acquit me of any attempt to speak ex cathedra upon any question. That is a controverted question. There are some of the best men of the Navy who insist that the monitor is a more desirable vessel than the battle ship; they are men of intelligence and experience, and I have great respect for them. I do not know that they are not right, but my impression, my judgment, or the conclusion at which I have arrived is that they are not justified in all of their assumption.

Mr. FOOTE. Will the gentleman permit me?

Mr. BOUTELLE of Maine. I am just answering the question put by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BROMWELL].

Mr. FOOTE. I simply wanted to ask the gentleman to go a little into detail as to the relative cost of the two types of vessels.

Mr. BOUTELLE of Maine. I will do so, and give my reasons. That the Ericsson monitor is a most formidable craft, no one can deny. The prime elements of her power are, first, the ability to build a tremendously fortified turret upon a floating platform, which can be made very thick, to resist the impact of shot.

The second prime quality is its very low free board, that presents so small a mark for the enemy's guns; we all recognize that. In making the report from the Committee on Naval Affairs that recommended the first of the seagoing battle ships, I called attention to the controversy between these two types of ships and recommended the battle ships of to-day, which were originated in that bill of 1890.

I recommended them on the ground that there was no essential or typical conflict between the two classes of ships; that the first-class seagoing battle ship recognized every point of excellence in the monitor; that we preserve the revolving turret, the nearly all-around fire, and made it all around as nearly as we could, and that we only sacrificed one principle, and that was the low free board—that is, the low side of the ship—and we sacrificed that solely to enable our ships to go to sea and successfully use the batteries outside the headlands of our ports.

Now, I think every gentleman will recognize at once the distinction. We will take New York Harbor, with a fleet of first-class double-turreted monitors with the same armament that we put on battle ships. In that harbor they would be magnificent powers of defense, but, in my judgment—and in this I reluctantly differ with

not a great number, but a number of excellent seamen, whose enthusiasm I think may carry them away—the monitors can not steam out of New York Harbor in any ordinary sea way and successfully attack a fleet of vessels that have equally heavy guns and equally thick turrets and have the advantage of great speed and the ability to man their guns so high above the water that they are not obstructed by the sea.

Many years ago it was my fortune to be an officer aboard a gun-boat in the Navy that had the duty of convoying a monitor from Hampton Roads to Pensacola, and my memory is very vivid as to that voyage. It was the *Tecumseh*, that ill-fated vessel that went down by a torpedo explosion in the gates of Mobile Bay, carrying all on board with her.

You all remember that marvelously tragic and pathetic incident when Captain Craven, the magnificent commander of that ship, with a chivalry that recalls that of Bayard in the past, when the explosion occurred and the men were rushing to the few apertures of escape, the captain and the pilot who was with him in the turret reached side by side that avenue of delivery, Captain Craven stepped back and said, "After you, Pilot;" and the pilot was saved and the gallant captain went down.

The vessel to which I was attached towed this monitor into port. And I remember distinctly how upon the very smoothest day, when the water was so glassy you could read a newspaper held over it, the ordinary swell—6, or 8, or 10 inches—when it would meet this inert mass of iron which moved steadily along through the sea, would roll upon the deck, roll forward till it touched the turret, and then break over it. I can not conceive, Mr. Chairman, that the monitors can prove very effective vessels in a sea way, for fighting purposes.

At any rate that is the belief of naval experts. And the fact that there is something in this opinion ought to be shown, it seems to me, by our experience. In improving upon our experience since we built the *Indiana*, the *Massachusetts*, and the *Oregon*, you will notice, if you visit our fleet, that the later ship, the *Iowa*, has been lifted still higher, and that forward her turret is on an elevation considerably above that of the afterdeck—all of which means that it has been found desirable to lift these vessels enough out of the water to enable them to train their guns and fight them even when there is a moderate sea.

Another thing should be considered in that regard. It is true that this method of construction exposes a larger surface of the broadside to the fire of an enemy; but if gentlemen will take the trouble to look over diagrams (which are easily accessible) of the naval ships of the world, and will take the skeleton sketches which have been made of them, which show where the belts of armor are, where the vital portions are, and leave in white those portions which are simply structural and not vital to the ship, it will be found that in eliminating all of that superstructure which enables the ship to be buoyant, to resist the water and keep it out—when you eliminate all of that superstructure which is not essential to the safety or formidability of the ship, you have a line of vital ship above water very little more than the exposure of the ordinary monitor.

My colleague on the committee [Mr. HILBORN] reminds me, in connection with what I said before, that of course we are bound to yield more or less, and more rather than less, to the consensus of judgment of those who have given most thought to the subject; and it is a fact that to-day the nations of the world are devoting themselves to the building of what we term to-day "battle ships." And when we consider that we are building these ships on our own soil, that every ounce of metal that goes into them comes out of American mines, that every rivet is made by the strong right arm of an American citizen, that even the armor plate has been forged in our own workshops, I think gentlemen will be proud, as I am proud, that I am ready to say without any hesitation, basing my statement not upon the flamboyant egotism of Americans or the exuberant patriotism of our own officers, but upon the calm, cold-blooded verdict rendered by the most expert naval architects in England itself, that to-day the first-class battle ship of the United States is the first-class battle ship of the world. [Applause.]

Of course a chance shot might disable a battle ship; but in all that goes to the constitution of impregnability and formidability British authorities to-day—and I could cite you their testimony if I wished to take the time—concede that a comparison of the three battle ships, the *Illinois*, the *Alabama*, and the *Wisconsin*, with the finest ships that England has under construction shows an immeasurable advantage for the American ship.

We have developed ourselves also in speed. The *Columbia* is "the gem of the ocean." She carries the world's record to-day for a war ship crossing the Atlantic. When we had the great naval review a few years ago in New York Harbor, and England sent some splendid specimens of her handicraft here with her admiral on board the *Blenheim*, the last and finest manifestation of European architectural skill, the admiral of the British navy came on board the *New York*, and as I was reminded only a few nights ago by the commander of our fleet on that occasion, that

splendid and gallant officer, Admiral Gherardi, said the British admiral told him freely, "You have a far finer ship than ours." And that has been accomplished in a dozen years.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Is the *Columbia* a battle ship?

Mr. BOUTELLE of Maine. No; the *Columbia* is the very reverse of a battle ship; it is simply a commerce destroyer, built for the express purpose of developing speed—to see just how fast we could make a war ship go.

Mr. FOOTE. The gentleman has not spoken of the cost of the monitors.

Mr. BOUTELLE of Maine. Oh, the cost of the monitor is considerably less than the cost of a battle ship.

Mr. FOOTE. About how much?

Mr. BOUTELLE of Maine. I can not give you a comparison offhand, because we have never built a monitor approaching the size of the battle ships. I do not know how you can make a comparison, because the monitor does not represent what the battle ship does. We have never built any monitor that comprehended any such expenditure as we put upon a battle ship.

Mr. FOOTE. This bill provides for no monitor?

Mr. BOUTELLE of Maine. For no new monitor, because the consensus of judgment is that the battle ships are the vessels required.

I will state to the gentleman one fact. I am not speaking now as an expert; I am not a great naval commander; I had a little personal experience in the Navy for a few years, but that does not count. Let me state the fact that the naval contests of the world in my judgment have been decided by what is known as the line-of-battle ships. All governments have had large ships and small ships, but the great naval battles of the world have been fought by the heavy line-of-battle ships, and in my judgment they always will be.

Mr. FOOTE. Does the chairman of the committee believe that the torpedo boat and the torpedo-boat destroyer provided by this bill are sufficient in number?

Mr. BOUTELLE of Maine. That is a question purely for the House.

Mr. FOOTE. I was asking the chairman of the committee in his official capacity.

Mr. BOUTELLE of Maine. The gentleman understands perfectly that we do not suppose that three battle ships will be all that this country needs, but it was a question with us as to how much we should provide for in this bill and ask the House to appropriate for at this time; and I will say that until within the last two or three weeks we should have felt a great deal of apprehension of failure in undertaking to get the House to do as much as we do in this bill.

Mr. FOOTE. I suppose we should all have a good deal of apprehension, if we had not more than we used to build.

Mr. BOUTELLE of Maine. I meant apprehension as to the result of our effort in the House. I will state to the gentleman from New York that we are not recommending that Congress shall not provide for any more, but we are asking them to provide so much.

Mr. DRIGGS. I should like to ask the gentleman if it is not true that the monitors are practically only fitted for harbor defense and not for the outer line of defense or, in other words, open-sea defense?

Mr. BOUTELLE of Maine. I agree to that entirely.

Mr. DRIGGS. I thought that was so.

Mr. FITZGERALD. I should like to ask the gentleman if there would be any objection on the part of the committee to the incorporation of an amendment to this bill providing that one of these battle ships be named the *George Washington*?

Mr. BOUTELLE of Maine. That will come up under the five-minute rule. That is a proposed amendment. The gentleman knows very well that we do not consider amendments at this time.

Mr. FITZGERALD. I was asking the gentleman whether he would be willing to consent to such an amendment at the proper time.

Mr. BOUTELLE of Maine. *George Washington* himself would not be in order at this stage of the bill. [Laughter and applause.]

Mr. WALKER of Massachusetts. That is good for home consumption in the gentleman's district just the same.

Mr. FITZGERALD. It is not a case for home consumption. I think it is a very proper thing that one of these battle ships be called the *George Washington*.

Mr. FOOTE. I should like to ask the gentleman one more question, for information.

Mr. BOUTELLE of Maine. Certainly.

Mr. FOOTE. What are the recommendations from the Department in regard to the battle ships and torpedo boats and torpedo-boat destroyers?

Mr. BOUTELLE of Maine. I suppose the House knows perfectly well that when the Secretary's report was made, he suggested one battle ship; but if the gentleman from New York had

received as many communications from the Department since then as I have, he would be aware that the Department is looking at things through a very different kind of binoculars from what they did at that time.

Mr. FOOTE. That is the kind of glasses I want to find out about—the kind through which they are looking now.

Mr. BOUTELLE of Maine. Well, the gentleman knows what the change has been in the situation.

Mr. FOOTE. Is there any reason why the information should not be given to the House?

Mr. BOUTELLE of Maine. I thought I gave it.

Mr. FOOTE. No; I asked how many battle ships the Department now recommend. You told me how many they recommended a few weeks ago.

Mr. BOUTELLE of Maine. The Department has made no specific recommendation since then, but it has done something that I felt, and my colleagues felt, and this House will feel obliged to take cognizance of. It has sent men over to Europe to buy from European shipbuilders ships that we ought to build in this country.

Mr. FOOTE. We are sadly aware of that, but I wanted to know whether they had made any recommendation to the committee.

Mr. BOUTELLE of Maine. I do not remember that there has been any specific recommendation. I suppose that the Secretary of the Navy took it for granted that the committee of the House of Representatives would adjust itself to the situation as it developed; and we have attempted to do so.

Mr. FITZGERALD. I should like to ask the chairman of the Naval Committee what prevented the Naval Committee from making these recommendations last year or in the last Congress?

Mr. BOUTELLE of Maine. If you will resolve yourself into a Committee of the Whole on the last Congress and make the inquiry, you may be able to find out. We are legislating for this Congress. [Applause.]

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Chairman, I should like to observe that the gentleman has made a criticism on a committee of this House of which he has been chairman for a great many years, on account of its inaction, and that is not a proper answer.

Mr. BOUTELLE of Maine. Would the gentleman like about a minute and a half more?

Mr. FITZGERALD. I do not care to interrupt the gentleman at this time, but I call the attention of the House to his own answer.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Maine [Mr. BOUTELLE] has expired.

Mr. MEYER of Louisiana. I ask unanimous consent that the time of the gentleman from Maine be extended without limit.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Louisiana asks unanimous consent that the time of the gentleman from Maine be extended without limit. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. BOUTELLE of Maine. I am humiliated to find that I have occupied the attention of the committee for this length of time, when I only intended to speak a very few minutes.

Mr. Chairman, I perhaps ought to make a reference to two other features of this bill. One of them is the matter of dry docks. The Secretary of the Navy in his annual report made certain specific recommendations of the very great importance of additional dry-dock facilities. In my own judgment there was some exaggeration in the statement that found utterance in the press last year as to the failure of Congress in the past to do its duty, because if the great docks that we had authorized had been properly constructed certain difficulties that did arise would not have occurred.

But it is too late to go back now and hunt for last year's birds' nests. The Secretary of the Navy has earnestly recommended the authorization of additional docks. That those docks will be required in the future is more obvious now than it was six months ago. There are a great many more people in this country to-day who are reconciled to the idea that we must maintain a reasonably strong Navy than there were a year ago or perhaps six months ago.

The Committee on Naval Affairs have taken under consideration all of these recommendations, and after a long period of hearings by the subcommittee, of which the gentleman from California [Mr. HILBORN] is the chairman, they have recommended to the full committee and the full committee indorsed the provisions which are now in this bill for the erection of a dry dock at Portsmouth, N. H., where there is no dock now; for the erection of a new dock at Boston, where there is only an inferior and undersized stone dock; for the erection of an additional dock at League Island, Pa., our only fresh-water yard, unless Mare Island is called a fresh-water yard—the only fresh-water yard on the Atlantic coast.

Mr. BUTLER. The only fresh-water yard on any coast.

Mr. BOUTELLE of Maine. My friend from Mare Island will not admit that the water is brackish there, where they have not a dock large enough to take in our largest battle ship. Mare Island is 900 miles from Port Orchard, where we built a dry dock some years

ago; and for the construction of a steel floating dock at Algiers, La., opposite New Orleans, there being no facility of the kind now anywhere along the Gulf coast.

Members will find the recommendations of the Department in the annual report, and the committee have deemed it wise to make to the House these recommendations for additions in that regard.

Mr. BROMWELL. Are all of these proposed docks of sufficient capacity to dock our largest war vessels?

Mr. BOUTELLE of Maine. I will say to my friend from Ohio that we have been somewhat disappointed in the construction of some of these docks in the past, and that we labored to get the wording of this bill in such shape that it will prevent the possibility of building a dock anywhere hereafter that shall not be calculated to meet the requirements of our largest vessel. The wording in the bill is:

Said dry docks to be not less than 700 feet in length, and of other dimensions sufficient to meet the present and probable future requirements of the largest vessels of the Navy and auxiliary fleet.

Mr. BENNETT. Will the gentleman allow me to ask him a question?

Mr. LEWIS of Washington. Will the gentleman permit me to suggest—

Mr. BOUTELLE of Maine. I will answer one gentleman at a time. I yield to the gentleman from New York [Mr. BENNETT].

Mr. BENNETT. Was the recommendation of the committee appointed by the Navy Department a short time ago to report to Congress on the selection of location of dry docks—was that taken into consideration by the Committee on Naval Affairs?

Mr. BOUTELLE of Maine. I understand it was exhaustively considered by the subcommittee and the full committee.

Mr. BENNETT. Were any of those places selected by the Naval Committee?

Mr. BOUTELLE of Maine. Why, yes; nearly all of them. The only one, I think, was League Island—

Mr. BENNETT. What was the recommendation of the board?

Mr. BOUTELLE of Maine. In regard to League Island?

Mr. BENNETT. Yes.

Mr. BOUTELLE of Maine. They made no recommendation.

Mr. BENNETT. They made no recommendation for the Pacific coast?

Mr. BOUTELLE of Maine. But the gentleman must understand we were not necessarily governed by that report. It was purely advisory.

Mr. BENNETT. I was simply asking for information, to see whether that report had had any weight with the Committee on Naval Affairs or not.

Mr. BOUTELLE of Maine. My understanding is, I will say, that every one of these docks except one has been authorized in this bill according to the recommendations of the Bunce board.

Mr. LEWIS of Washington. I will suggest to the gentleman from Maine, the chairman of the committee, the gentleman from Ohio asked whether these docks will accommodate the large war vessels we have.

I desire to remind the honorable gentleman that the dry dock at Port Orchard, within my district, is able to accommodate the largest vessels we have in the Navy. It has lately accommodated the *Oregon* with perfect ease and complete facility. I take the liberty to make the suggestion lest it may have escaped the honorable gentleman at the time the question was asked.

Mr. BOUTELLE of Maine. I am simply speaking of the additional docks.

Mr. LEWIS of Washington. I thought it might have escaped the gentleman's attention.

Mr. BOUTELLE of Maine. The dock at Port Orchard is a large and admirable dock, and further provision is made for it in this bill.

Mr. JOHNSON of Indiana. And it is in the gentleman's district.

Mr. BOUTELLE of Maine. And an additional recommendation is the fact that it is located in the gentleman's district. [Laughter.]

Mr. LEWIS of Washington. I have no doubt that that dock has derived much benefit from the fact that it is in my district. [Laughter.]

Mr. BOUTELLE of Maine. Now, there is one other topic I wish to refer to. That is the matter of armor. We have debated that—

Mr. ROBBINS. Before you leave the question of dry docks, I desire to ask you a question.

Mr. BOUTELLE of Maine. This whole matter will be discussed under the five-minute rule on these items.

Mr. ROBBINS. I know.

Mr. BOUTELLE of Maine. I am only making a preliminary statement.

Mr. ROBBINS. What I wanted to know is the necessity for the dock at Portsmouth, so near the dock at Boston?

Mr. BOUTELLE of Maine. Great Britain has a dozen docks in one yard. The reason that place is provided is because we have a very extensive plant of over a million dollars invested in machinery and facilities for complete repair of ships that has been invested during the last fifty years, and that a dry dock is an essential part of a navy-yard; and also, I presume, more or less based on the fact that experts in strategy have held for many years that the seat of a foreign war on the ocean would be likely to locate itself somewhere off the New England coast, or between Gardners Bay and Halifax; and also that there is a great depth of water there.

You must remember that the United States coast is of a very peculiar conformation. I do not know how many gentlemen of this House may have had themselves brought into a recognition of the fact that from New York Harbor, from the Jersey beach, Long Branch, and all the way along the coast of the United States to Galveston Harbor there is such a uniform conformation of the shore that a man would have to be very expert when landed in the night to be able to tell where he was. From Bascom down to near Galveston it is a shoal sandy beach all along our coast, and our harbors as we go south suffer in depth of water.

The deepest water is off the coast of the Northern States where the coast is rock bound and the openings to the harbors deeper. In my district, which runs down toward the Bay of Fundy, we have a rise and fall of tide, in some places, of 30 feet, which furnishes harbors that can give any depth required. Portsmouth has more depth of water, and Portland, Me., gives an unrivaled harbor as to depth. As you go south, the depth of water decreases.

I want to say just one word about the matter of armor. As you know, this subject was discussed very thoroughly. A great indisposition was shown on the part of Congress to pay more than \$300 a ton. Various propositions were submitted, and finally Congress decided that no armor should be provided at a cost greater than \$300 a ton. Under the operation of that limitation it has proved impossible to obtain armor for the three ships now under construction.

I will remind gentlemen that the armor for the *Kentucky* and *Kearsarge*, presumably launched to-day, had already been provided; but these other vessels had no other provision made for their armor except that the builders had themselves supplied that diagonal armor which had to be built in the ship, and are taking chances as to what they will get paid for it. The consensus of judgment in the Department and many with whom I have been able to confer has been that we must raise the limit of cost of this material. I do not want to get into any argument about it, because the facts are plain and clear.

Mr. McMILLIN. Will the gentleman permit me to ask him a question there?

Mr. BOUTELLE of Maine. Certainly.

Mr. McMILLIN. Can the gentleman furnish to the House or to the Committee of the Whole any information as to the actual cost of the production of that armor? We have had a great deal of controversy over it.

Mr. BOUTELLE of Maine. I will state to the gentleman, in answer to that, that there was an exhaustive inquiry made by the Secretary of the Navy in the last Administration, Secretary Herbert, by order of Congress. He went into the matter with all possible effort to obtain the best information, and, in my judgment, exhausted the sources of information. The result of his investigation of the matter was to recommend to Congress that \$400 a ton would be a fair price. That is the most authoritative information we have ever received.

Of course, there was discussion, there were suggestions that somebody was ready to make this armor for \$250 a ton, but when the test was applied, it proved that no bids were made along that line. The parties who were expected to do that, made an informal proposition that, if the Government would make a contract for twenty years to come, and would agree to buy 6,000 tons of armor a year for twenty consecutive years, they would supply it at a less price, I think \$240 a ton.

Mr. BROMWELL. Will the gentleman allow me?

Mr. BOUTELLE of Maine. Certainly.

Mr. BROMWELL. I was one of those who voted for cutting down the price of armor in the last Congress. I voted against the payment of \$400 or \$500 a ton for the armor and in favor of limiting it to \$300, I think it was.

I wish to ask the gentleman from Maine whether or not the company which was represented on that occasion as being willing to furnish this armor did not make that offer, through the gentleman who represented them on the floor, without any qualification as to any subsequent contract; whether or not it was not stated that they were willing to furnish such armor as was needed for the supplying of these vessels at \$300 a ton, or less, without any qualification?

Mr. BOUTELLE of Maine. I will say to the gentleman from

Ohio that that will lead to or excite discussion, and I do not want to bring up any of these old matters. I do not want to be discourteous to my friend, but he knows that at times, under the strain and the representation of certain phases of party matters, gentlemen will take certain positions and may afterwards revise their judgment. I think, for the interest of the House and of the service, it is better for us not to enter upon those questions. I do not want to taunt anybody for not fulfilling their promises.

Mr. BROMWELL. It was not for that purpose that I interrupted the gentleman.

Mr. BOUTELLE of Maine. I know that.

Mr. BROMWELL (continuing). It is to put those of us right before the House who voted for reducing the price of the armor.

Mr. BOUTELLE of Maine. I have no doubt whatever in my own mind that the vote of the House limiting the price of armor to \$300 was very largely influenced by the statement made here that there was a responsible company that would be glad to furnish it at a less price. But it turned out afterwards that there were certain conditions, as I thought there were at the time, to that offer that made it impossible for the Government to accept it.

Perhaps, for the purposes of this discussion, it will be all that is necessary to state that the Secretary of the Navy was authorized to advertise for proposals for armor not to exceed \$300 a ton, and the official report made to this House was that he had received no bid whatever that the Department was authorized to entertain under the law.

Then he went on to state that the Carnegie Company had written them that they did not care to compete, that the Bethlehem Company said they did not care to furnish armor at that price, and that the other company had written an informal proposition that if they could have a contract for twenty years and the Government would buy 6,000 tons of armor a year from them for twenty years, they would build a plant and have it ready within eighteen months, and furnish the armor for \$340 a ton. The Secretary of the Navy reported to Congress that that was not a proposition that he had any authority under the law to consider.

Now, we have gone on in that way through two Congresses, and we have got no armor to-day. The fact remains, whatever else may be said, that we never paid any more for our armor than have other governments of the world, and it is to me an astonishing thing that we have been able to build up a plant and get it as cheap as England, France, and Germany. I was reminded by my friend from Ohio that the statement has been made in the newspapers that recent contracts have been made by the American manufacturers to furnish armor to Russia for \$525 a ton.

In that connection, I do not want to impress any of my views on the House, but if we are going to build three more battle ships, we are going to complete those on hand, and if we are going to complete them we are going to buy the armor in this country. We are not going abroad to buy it, because we have to pay more for it abroad than we pay here.

I want to inject right here, not in the spirit of "I told you so," but merely to remind gentlemen that we sometimes strain at a gnat and swallow a camel; that while we have for two years prohibited the Department from making contracts with American citizens for the product of American labor, because we thought we could not get it cheap enough, we the other day appropriated \$50,000,000, with which the President of the United States has gone abroad and bought ships, paying for them at a rate which would make the price of armor plate much higher than we were paying for it, and gave a bonus of \$108,000 on the ship besides that. I do not believe we can afford to do that.

Mr. GROW. Will the gentleman from Maine yield to me just a minute or two on that point?

Mr. BOUTELLE of Maine. If the gentleman wants to ask a question, I will.

Mr. GROW. I want to say a word just upon that point.

Mr. BOUTELLE of Maine. The gentleman can do that when we come to the debate under the five-minute rule. Now, Mr. Chairman, I want it to be distinctly understood that the armor for the three ships provided for in this bill is to be purchased at a price not exceeding a certain sum, computed accurately on the specifications, not to exceed \$400 a ton.

Mr. JOHNSON of Indiana. Will the gentleman state for what ships that armor is to be purchased?

Mr. BOUTELLE of Maine. The *Illinois*, the *Alabama*, and the *Wisconsin*, one in California, one at Cramps, and one at Newport.

Mr. JOHNSON of Indiana. We have three war ships now being built for which there is no armor?

Mr. BOUTELLE of Maine. For which there is no provision for armor for the reason stated.

Mr. CANNON. But provision is made in the bill for the armor?

Mr. BOUTELLE of Maine. We do not appropriate for the whole amount because we can not expend it all in a year; but we have appropriated for the amount estimated by the Department

as necessary for the coming year for the ships under construction. Mr. CANNON. The gentleman says, "for the ships under construction."

Mr. BOUTELLE of Maine. Yes, we make no provision for armor plate for the three to be authorized, because there will be no need of armor plate for the coming year; but there is incorporated an amount based upon the estimates of the Department for money to buy that portion of the armor for these three ships that will be completed during the coming year.

Mr. SIMPSON of Kansas. I see that these three ships are to cost three millions exclusive of the armor, and I presume the armament.

Mr. BOUTELLE of Maine. The armament.

Mr. SIMPSON of Kansas. Is it within the gentleman's information as to what the ship will cost when completed?

Mr. BOUTELLE of Maine. We have not the full estimate, but they would cost about two millions and something additional. I want to say to the gentleman from Kansas that they are to cost very much less than they would have cost two years ago. When the first battle ships were built, or authorized, they were authorized at a cost of four millions. We have reduced that since to three millions, and the battle ships now under construction will cost about \$2,640,000.

Mr. SIMPSON of Kansas. I have seen an estimate that the *Maine* cost five millions.

Mr. BOUTELLE of Maine. It cost about \$4,600,000 when she was built.

Mr. BROMWELL. What is the state of completion of the three battle ships for which we are providing in this bill? Are they so near completion that the armor plate will be needed for them before next July, when this appropriation becomes available?

Mr. BOUTELLE of Maine. No, it will not be needed before that time. But I will say to the gentleman—I am glad he reminded me of it—that in another feature of this bill, in recognition of the exigency now upon us, we have asked the House to pass a provision at the close of the bill that whenever the President in his judgment may deem that any public exigency demands it, each and every provision of the bill may be made immediately available.

We have made more liberal appropriation for the first year on these ships authorized than we ever did before. There is naturally a tendency not to make the bill over and above large, but we have been more liberal because we did not want to run the risk of delaying the work, because we thought under the phases of the situation there might be a disposition to force work more rapidly than usual. We have provided for building the torpedo boats and very liberally for the battle ships.

Mr. Chairman, I do not know that I care to say anything more at this time. I thank the Committee of the Whole very much for its kind consideration.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I should like—although there is some embarrassment in making the suggestion to limit debate immediately after having occupied the time of the House so extensively myself—yet I think everybody will recognize it is of very great importance to get this bill through to the Senate and the President as rapidly as possible, especially in view of the fact that more or less of the generous provision which was made in the \$50,000,000 bill, so far as it affects the Navy, can only be available under provisions of law contained in this bill.

I repeat, it is important to get the bill to the Senate as rapidly as possible, and I would like to reach some agreement as to the time for general debate. If the committee will only charitably consider that I, in a certain sense, have been occupying time which would naturally belong to the fifteen members of the committee, I should be very glad to have their charity in that regard.

Mr. MEYER of Louisiana rose.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Maine [Mr. BOUTELLE] make any request?

Mr. BOUTELLE of Maine. I should like to ask my colleague on the committee [Mr. MEYER of Louisiana] what his judgment is as to the amount of time which will be necessary for general debate. Of course the bill must afterwards be debated by paragraphs.

Mr. MEYER of Louisiana. It seems to me that the most judicious course would be to permit the general debate to run along during to-day without limit, and at the expiration of that time we could agree on some limitation. There are a number of gentlemen on this side who desire to speak on the bill.

Mr. BOUTELLE of Maine. I am willing to be governed by the wish of the House. My judgment is—and I think I can not err on this point—that the will of this House will be to fix a limit to this debate. We can afford to talk on almost any other subject with greater or less limit, but we ought to put this bill through with all the rapidity consistent with a reasonable discussion of its merits.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Maine make any motion or request?

Mr. BOUTELLE of Maine. My judgment, when the consideration of the bill began, was that four hours' debate, two on each side, would be ample—I mean from the beginning, including my own remarks. I did not intend to occupy so much time myself.

Mr. CANNON. I should like to occupy ten minutes; but I think I can get that time under the five-minute rule.

Mr. BOUTELLE of Maine. In reply to the inquiry of the Chair, I suggest that general debate be closed at 4 o'clock. [Cries of "No!" "No!"]

Mr. RICHARDSON. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Texas, who has been unavoidably called away, requested me to make a statement to the House. He informed me that quite a number of gentlemen had spoken to him asking him to secure time for them to speak in the general debate on this bill. There is no disposition on this side to occupy unusual time in debate, but it is impossible to accommodate gentlemen who desire to speak on this side in so short a time as has been suggested by the gentleman from Maine. We would be very glad indeed if there could be a limit fixed which would be satisfactory, giving us four hours on this side. If gentlemen on the other side do not wish to occupy four hours, they need not take it. The gentleman from Maine has suggested two hours on his side, and allowing us four hours, that would be only six hours for general debate, which I submit to the gentleman is not extravagant.

As the gentleman from Maine will remember, under the five-minute rule we are held to a very rigid account in conducting any discussion. I am not complaining of it; but that being so, it becomes the more important that we should have a little more time in the general debate.

Mr. BOUTELLE of Maine. Does not the gentleman believe that the time I have suggested would more than cover all the time that would be occupied in discussing the merits of the bill?

Mr. RICHARDSON. If the gentleman will pardon me, I do not think so.

Mr. BOUTELLE of Maine. I do. I have received hardly a request for time from anyone who wishes to speak as to the merits of the bill.

Mr. McMILLIN. I approve the course of the gentleman from Maine in occupying the time that he did. I would have been glad if he had occupied more, because he understands this measure. But he will readily admit that there is no more important bill than this before the House, and none more likely to come before it at this session. Our situation is such that there ought to be discussion of a matter so important as the naval defense of the country.

Mr. BOUTELLE of Maine. I say to the gentleman with absolute candor that I shall be glad to consent to the occupation of all the time that can be legitimately occupied in discussing the merits of the bill. But I have had no intimation that would lead me to believe that more than the time I have indicated would be so used. Members desiring the floor want to talk, as a rule, on other subjects. I may be wrong about that. But the matter is in the control of the Committee of the Whole or the House. But it seems to me this bill ought to be put through on its merits as speedily as possible.

Mr. McMILLIN. Yet the gentleman has realized in his own remarks how impossible it is for a member to discuss fully the merits of the bill in even one hour.

Mr. BOUTELLE of Maine. I hoped I had made some contribution to a lucid understanding of it.

Mr. McMILLIN. I am sure the gentleman has.

The CHAIRMAN. The request of the gentleman from Maine is that all general debate close at 4 o'clock.

Mr. RICHARDSON. We hope he will not insist on that.

Mr. BOUTELLE of Maine. Will 5 o'clock be satisfactory?

Mr. RICHARDSON. I will say to the gentleman that gentlemen on this side who have made requests for time want to occupy four hours. Now, that is reasonable.

Mr. BOUTELLE of Maine. Well, we are proposing to give you until 5 o'clock. Do you mean four hours on that side?

Mr. RICHARDSON. That is what we want.

Mr. BOUTELLE of Maine. I shall have to test the judgment of the House on that. That would be eight hours.

Mr. RICHARDSON. But the gentleman says he only wants two hours on that side.

Mr. BOUTELLE of Maine. I never said anything of the kind.

Mr. RICHARDSON. I do not want to misrepresent the gentleman, but he said four hours, one-half on that side.

Mr. BOUTELLE of Maine. I said I thought that would be enough time in which to discuss the merits of the bill, but if gentlemen on the other side are going to indulge in four hours of oratory on all imaginable subjects, we have orators here. [Laughter.] "If there be lords in the southland, there be chiefs in the north." I ask that general debate may close at 5 o'clock.

Mr. LOW. I hope the gentleman will extend that beyond that time. There are a great many gentlemen on this side who would like to speak.

Mr. BOUTELLE of Maine. It is all in the hands of the House. The CHAIRMAN. The request of the gentleman from Maine is that by unanimous consent general debate upon this bill close at 5 o'clock to-day. Is there objection?

Several members objected.

Mr. BOUTELLE of Maine. I move that the committee rise and fix a time for closing debate on this bill.

The question being taken, on a division there were—ayes 84, noes 71.

Mr. FITZGERALD and Mr. RICHARDSON demanded tellers.

Mr. BOUTELLE of Maine. I hope no gentlemen will insist on filibustering.

Tellers were ordered; and the Chairman appointed Mr. BOUTELLE of Maine and Mr. RICHARDSON.

The committee again divided; and the tellers reported—ayes 93, noes 88.

The committee accordingly rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. SHERMAN, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that committee had had under consideration the naval appropriation bill (H. R. 9378), and had come to no resolution thereon.

Mr. BOUTELLE of Maine. Mr. Speaker, I move that when the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole for the further consideration of the naval appropriation bill all general debate be closed at 5 o'clock to-day.

Mr. RICHARDSON. I move to amend by inserting 4 o'clock to-morrow afternoon.

Mr. BOUTELLE of Maine. I move the previous question on that.

Mr. RICHARDSON. It is too late, after my motion.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman's motion should be that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, and pending that, that general debate be limited. The gentleman from Maine moves that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the naval appropriation bill, and pending that, moves that all general debate be limited to 5 o'clock, and on that he demands the previous question.

Mr. RICHARDSON. I moved an amendment before the gentleman from Maine moved the previous question.

Mr. BOUTELLE of Maine. I had the floor to move the previous question.

The SPEAKER. One moment. The gentleman from Tennessee was not recognized to move the amendment.

Mr. RICHARDSON. But the gentleman from Maine had not made the motion for the previous question.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman states that he intended to make the motion for the previous question.

Mr. RICHARDSON. I did not hear that.

Mr. OGDEN. He had not made it.

Mr. BOUTELLE of Maine. The gentleman from Tennessee is too good a parliamentarian to make a suggestion of that kind—

Mr. RICHARDSON. The gentleman from Tennessee recognizes that the gentleman from Maine could make the motion, but he did not make it.

Mr. BOUTELLE of Maine. It was my privilege and my duty as chairman of the committee in charge of the bill to make the motion.

Mr. RICHARDSON. But the gentleman did not make it.

Mr. BOUTELLE of Maine. I never had left the floor at all. The gentleman knows that he can not inject motions into another gentleman's time.

Mr. RICHARDSON. I know the gentleman had not sat down—

Mr. McMILLIN. Mr. Speaker, I desire to make this suggestion: It will not be denied that the gentleman from Maine had a right, in connection with his motion to limit debate, to call for the previous question upon that motion; but not having done so and another gentleman rising and moving to amend his motion, that second motion has to go in.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Maine states that he rose for the purpose of making that motion.

Mr. McMILLIN. But he did not do it.

Mr. OGDEN. He did not do it.

The SPEAKER. But he did do it before any other gentleman was recognized.

Mr. McMILLIN. But there was a lapse of time, so that any gentleman might presume that he did not intend to make the motion.

The SPEAKER. But the gentleman removed that doubt by saying that he did intend to do so.

Mr. RICHARDSON. We made no point of order on the form of the motion—

The SPEAKER. The Chair desires to say that the matter is entirely within the control of the House, and if the House desires it can vote down the previous question, in which case the matter will then be open for amendment.

Mr. RICHARDSON. Yes; but if the Chair will indulge me for a moment, the gentleman from Maine did not even make his motion in order; but I make no point on that. He did not move to resolve the House into the Committee of the Whole.

Mr. PAYNE. Oh, yes, he did.

Mr. RICHARDSON. No, he did not, and the Speaker corrected him.

The SPEAKER. The Chair corrected him without objection on the part of any member.

Mr. RICHARDSON. I do not object to it, but the Chair put the motion into order and made the gentleman's motion in order. Now, I do not think the Chair is safe in assuming that the gentleman intended to make his motion for the previous question. I have not heard the gentleman make the statement that he intended to move it.

Mr. BOUTELLE of Maine. What did the gentleman from Tennessee think I intended when I took the floor? [Laughter.]

Mr. RICHARDSON. I do not know, if I may be pardoned. If the Chair will allow me to answer that question, which is a reasonable one—

The SPEAKER. Will the House please be in order.

Mr. BOUTELLE of Maine. I call for the regular order.

The SPEAKER. If the House will be in order, the Chair will endeavor to facilitate what the gentleman from Tennessee desires; but he must have silence in the House in order to do it. It is impossible to administer the law or the business of the House unless we can have order so that we can hear what is going on. Will gentlemen have the kindness to take their seats—all gentlemen.

Mr. RICHARDSON. Now, Mr. Speaker—

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Tennessee desires to ask the gentleman from Maine a question.

Mr. RICHARDSON. I wanted to answer his question as to what I supposed he intended to do. That I am not able to answer, but I am able to say, Mr. Speaker, that the gentleman did not move the previous question before I made my motion to amend. Now, if he says—

Mr. BOUTELLE of Maine. I say most decidedly that I made the motion.

Mr. RICHARDSON. If he says he intended to make the motion, we always accept that, when a gentleman makes that statement.

The SPEAKER. The Chair understands the gentleman from Maine to say that.

Mr. RICHARDSON. I can not go back of the statement of the gentleman from Maine, if he says he intended to.

Mr. BOUTELLE of Maine. If I were you—

The SPEAKER. The Chair understands that the gentleman from Maine stated that he intended to move the previous question, and had the floor for that purpose.

Mr. BOUTELLE of Maine. I never left it, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Is the statement of the Chair correct?

Mr. BOUTELLE of Maine. The statement of the Chair is absolutely correct.

Mr. OGDEN. Has the gentleman from Maine the floor still?

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Maine for the previous question.

Mr. OGDEN. I have taken my seat at the request of the Chair, and all other gentlemen have done so except the gentleman from Maine, and he seems to hold the floor even against the Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Maine took the floor to answer a question of the gentleman from Tennessee. The question now before the House is the previous question, asked for by the gentleman from Maine.

The question was taken; and the Speaker announced that the ayes seemed to have it.

Mr. RICHARDSON. Division!

The House divided; and there were—ayes 91, noes 92.

Mr. BOUTELLE of Maine. The yeas and nays, Mr. Speaker.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

The SPEAKER (interrupting the call). The Chair desires the attention of the House. At the request of gentlemen from both sides of this question the Chair will submit a proposition for an agreement, which is that debate shall continue until 6 o'clock this evening, and from 12 to 1 to-morrow, and then the bill proceed under the five-minute rule. The gentlemen on the other side to receive three hours of what remains.

Mr. MAHON. I will not object if the House will agree, as to-morrow is Friday, private bill day, to give us next Tuesday.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, that will be considered in the agreement.

Mr. RICHARDSON. What day?

Mr. MAHON. Tuesday.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. BOUTELLE of Maine. What is that as to Tuesday?

Mr. RICHARDSON. For the consideration of the Private Calendar.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. RAY of New York. I desire to understand whether that carries over the Friday night session.

The SPEAKER. The Chair understands it will carry over the Friday night session. [After a pause.] The Chair hears no objection; and if there be no objection, the Clerk will not further proceed with the call of the roll.

There was no objection.

Mr. BOUTELLE of Maine. The time to be divided by the Chair according to the understanding.

The SPEAKER. The roll call will be vacated, and the question will be put on the motion that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the naval appropriation bill.

The question was taken; and the motion was agreed to.

The House accordingly resolved itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, Mr. SHERMAN in the chair.

The CHAIRMAN. The House is in Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H. R. 9378) making appropriations for the naval service for the fiscal year 1898-99.

Mr. MEYER of Louisiana. Mr. Chairman, the introduction and consideration of the annual naval appropriation bill at this time is, I can not but feel, invested with unusual, I might say with extraordinary importance.

Only a few days ago the two Houses of Congress, departing from the customary precedents of legislation, passed after a brief debate, without cavil or a single negative vote, a measure appropriating \$50,000,000 "for the national defense, and for each and every purpose connected therewith, to be expended at the discretion of the President, and to remain available until January 1, 1899."

The President had sent no message to Congress asking for this large appropriation, but it was well understood by us all that he desired it and deemed this step to be absolutely necessary. Had twice this sum been estimated to be proper, it would have been voted without hesitation, regardless of party lines. Fifty millions being the sum indicated by the special representatives of the Executive, it was freely given.

This was no mere personal tribute. Had Mr. Bryan been the President instead of Mr. McKinley, it is safe to assert that our opponents would have acted as did those who are opposed to the domestic policy of the Administration.

Mr. Chairman, from every section of our wide country has since then come the approval by the masses of the action of the people's representatives. From millions of our countrymen came shouts of applause, whose echoes sent warning to our enemies that our nation is united to a man in defending the honor and glory and integrity of the Republic.

LOUISIANA'S GREETING.

From my own State of Louisiana comes the greeting of its sovereign people, in convention assembled, which I am proud to submit to this honorable House, and which represents so truly the universal sentiment all over this broad land:

Resolution No. 102, by Mr. Castleman.

Resolved, That the people of Louisiana, in convention assembled, hereby indorse and commend the action of our members of the House of Representatives in voting \$50,000,000 to be placed at the disposal of the President to sustain the national honor and enable the proper authorities to place our coast defenses in such condition that they may successfully resist any attack that may be made upon them by any foreign power.

Resolved further, That the secretary be required to forward to each of our members in the House of Representatives a copy of this resolution.

A true and correct copy.

[SEAL.]

Attest:

E. B. KRUTTSCHNITT, President.

ROBT. S. LANDRY, Secretary.

[Applause.]

Mr. Chairman, why, may I ask, do we behold this extraordinary concord of public men of both parties and of the people of every section of the Union? It is due to the fact that we stand confronted with a grave public exigency and a great peril, which to most men was an entire surprise. We are at peace nominally with all countries, but are liable at any moment to be involved in a war with Spain.

WAR NOT DEPENDENT ON ONE SIDE ONLY.

It is true that by the Federal Constitution the power of declaring war is confided exclusively to Congress, and Congress is in session and is likely to continue in session for some months to come. But war is not dependent on one side alone, and very often it is not preceded by formal declaration of war on either side. It comes "like a thief in the night," often without note of warning; yet we have had many people in this country who have argued and acted upon the assumption that a foreign war was out of the

question—an utterly impossible contingency. They have scouted the idea that any military or naval preparation for a possible war was necessary.

Looking to the eastward they beheld 3,000 miles of salt water lying between us and the armed camps of Europe. Invasion was impossible, and therefore they inferred that no foreign fleet would ever bombard our cities, or ravage our coasts, or harass our commerce. All we had to do was to cultivate the gentle arts of peace at home and be good. Foreign nations would respect our weakness and our inability to deliver a return blow. They would be merciful. History would be reversed the laws of human nature and human passion be suspended.

Even the fate of China, caught suddenly some years ago, and without preparation, lying prostrate, after a very short war, before an athlete nation having less than one-tenth of her numbers, carried with it no lesson, no moral, no warning to this class of men. Mr. Chairman, the theater of war, if such must come, will be not on the land but on the sea.

SUFFICIENCY OF OUR ARMY.

So far as our Army is concerned, I freely concede that it requires no addition to place us in a position of defense. It is large enough for peace purposes and can easily and quickly be expanded in event of war. We have a large body of the best officers, trained at West Point, and at the State military schools, and in the war between the States. Our citizen soldiery would make a large force. With a good supply of skillful officers, it requires but a short time to make a good soldier of an American citizen. He is apt, quick, and intelligent. We could soon have a large and effective force.

We have no invasion to fear on the southward; our relations with Mexico are most cordial and sympathetic, with an annually increasing intercourse of trade and commerce binding us together. In fact, we have taken the Republics of the western world under protection and friendship, and have come to the belief that our chiefest honor, not to speak of advantage, lies in an emphatic and honest assertion of the Monroe doctrine, to the author of which, a Virginian, one of the South American States has reared a monument. [Applause.]

With the Dominion of Canada we have, unfortunately, far more friction, but we have with her a very large and growing trade, and there is little prospect of conflict. I see, therefore, no reason for the increase of the Army unless war should become flagrant, and I do see many strong reasons to the contrary. The defense of our cities by proper fortifications is a necessary step that requires no increase of the Army beyond what has already been done, and ought to have been completed long ago.

CAN NOT IMPROVISE A NAVY.

But, Mr. Chairman, you can not improvise a Navy, even with fifty or one hundred millions placed at the discretion of the President. You may have an ample supply of officers, yet even these require experience in the handling of ships and in habits of command. Nor can you make a sailor as quickly as you can a soldier. Still less can you improvise a man-of-war's crew, with a thorough knowledge of all they have to do and possessing the discipline and training needed to make them efficient in sea service and in battle.

But, sir, even if you had a good supply of officers and men, an ample supply of guns in service and in reserve, and other articles needed for equipping or refitting your battle ships and cruisers, there would still remain the necessity for an immediate force of ships, not of commerce but of war ships. A battle ship or an armored cruiser is not built in a day any more than Rome was—not even in the old days of wooden ships could a war fleet be improvised or built expeditiously. The nation that was caught by a war unprepared was bound to suffer, and did suffer severely.

And now, with the development of naval construction, the building of a war vessel, with her complicated machinery, is a gigantic and tedious undertaking. In every country, even with skilled mechanics, the best dock yards, and ample material, it takes a year to build a battle ship. Our battle ships, both of the first and second class, have occupied over two years in construction, sometimes three. So that if war should come upon us suddenly, and we should be overmatched by our enemy in naval force, we would have to suffer all the evils of being driven from the sea for one or two years at least, and the consequent injury to our commerce and to exposed points on the coast, while in our dock yards we would be trying to catch up and remedy the disparity of naval force.

There would still remain the serious problem of making a union or concentration of the new and the old fleet in one force capable of regaining our lost control of the sea.

Our situation is not at all like that of Great Britain and France, each of which has one or two great naval stations, where naval construction and repair on a large scale can be conducted and a fleet built. We have no such stations, as we all know. They remain to be built up and developed in the future.

In view of these facts, which are known not only to the naval

expert, but to every intelligent man, it is obvious that to wait for a war and to await naval preparation until war actually arrives, in the hope that a disparity in naval force can be speedily corrected, is an idea unworthy of rational and patriotic men. It is the very acme of human folly.

What has been said in respect to war vessels applies with nearly equal force to the dock yards and dry docks, which are absolutely needed for the cleaning and repair of our war vessels. These dry docks do not, perhaps, demand the same length of time for their construction as battle ships, but they do require many months and careful skill in order to fit them for the uses of the Navy.

The truth of this fact is found in the report of the Secretary of the Navy.

DOCKING THE INDIANA AT HALIFAX, NOVA SCOTIA.

In August last it became necessary to dock the battle ship *Indiana*. It was found that we had no dry dock on the Atlantic or Gulf coast adequate for this purpose, and thus we presented the humiliating spectacle before the world of having to send our grand battle ship on a voyage to a dock yard of a foreign government with which but a few brief months before we were on the brink of a hostile collision, and this for the simple cleaning and repairs for which we should have been prepared in our own yards on the instant.

Mr. ELLIOTT. I would like to correct the statement just made as to the fact that we have no dry dock on the Atlantic coast in which one of the first-class battle ships can be placed, by the statement that the battle ship *Indiana*, on the only occasion that she has been docked in this country, was safely put into the dock at Port Royal, thoroughly cleaned, and was safely taken out without the slightest difficulty whatsoever, and there is no sound reason that can be given why that battle ship should have been sent out of this country to be docked in August last.

Mr. MEYER of Louisiana. Mr. Chairman, I do not propose to enter into a discussion as to the merits of the Port Royal dock. I have always been its friend; but the fact exists and has been demonstrated that at the period named it was inadequate and incapable of docking the *Indiana*, and this only accentuates the need for the additional docks provided in the bill.

I feel assured, Mr. Chairman, that the Secretary of the Navy would never have sent the *Indiana* to a foreign port to be docked without actual necessity. He is a prudent, thoughtful, and able official, and acted in the matter with great reluctance and only from the stress of the situation.

NAVAL PREPARATION AND CONSTRUCTION URGED.

But, Mr. Chairman, on all these questions I take no new position. I merely stand where I have stood ever since I have been in Congress, and especially as a member of the Naval Committee have I urged in season and out of season prompt naval preparation and construction, which shall bear some proportion, at least, to our extended coast and commerce, our vast wealth and resources, our population and our dignity as a Republic, and the great interests, present and prospective, which we may be called on to defend.

I presented these views at more length than I shall to-day in speaking to this House on the naval appropriation bill in February, 1895. On that occasion I gave some brief view of our naval history, and of the achievements of the Navy, and of the progress made in the construction of the new Navy under Secretaries Chandler, Whitney, Tracy, and Herbert.

But, sir, I strongly urged going on with the good work that had been begun. I pointed the danger of foreign complications in the future, and that while we had the wealth and resources which enabled us to become a leading naval power, if we desired, we were then only the seventh of all the nations in naval strength. I made a partial comparison of the additions Great Britain, France, Germany, Italy, and Russia were then making to their armament. All these facts had been stated time and time again by the heads of the Navy Department, but they failed to lead Congress to realize the obvious duty of putting the country in a proper state of defense.

I repeat what I said then, and the years that have elapsed only accentuate the force of my statement, that there is a great misapprehension in the public mind touching the actual and relative strength of the Navy.

OUR "NEW NAVY."

So much has been said in the press and on the stump about the "new Navy" that the public have grossly overestimated its fighting capacity. True, I may assert that the ships we have are of the best, and our personnel active, keen, and equal to the highest traditions of their predecessors.

It is indeed a powerful Navy, compared with the best fleet of wooden ships that the United States or any other nation ever possessed, but it is far inferior to the present navies of France, Germany, and Russia. It is a very small Navy compared with that of Great

Britain. It is inferior to that of Italy, a country nearly bankrupt, with about one-third of our population, and still more inferior in wealth and the interests she may be called on to defend.

The able report of the Secretary of the Navy, Mr. Long, gives us the present strength of our Navy. There are only four battle ships of the first class and two of the second class. One of these, the *Maine*, now lies at the bottom of Habana Harbor, the victim probably of an assassin's foul act, whose instigators, whoever they may be, evidently took no thought from the words of the English statesman, that "assassination has never changed the history of the world." [Applause.]

The loss of one or many American battle ships can not, shall not obstruct the march of events nor stay the progress of a people aspiring to be free from the thralldom and cruelty of a nation once powerful, once great, but now reduced by her own misconduct to a struggle for her own political existence.

So, then, we have only 5 battle ships left. We have 5 more of the first class now being built, and these, the Secretary tells us, will not be ready for service before the latter part of 1899, say eighteen to twenty months from now. Even the torpedo boats—an essential part of our system of coast defense—will not be ready for a considerable time to come.

NAVAL CONSTRUCTION ABROAD.

In the same report the Secretary tells us of the progress of naval construction abroad.

England leads with appropriations for the year 1897-98 amounting to \$26,500,000. Including new work, she will complete or have under construction during the year 15 battle ships—equal to three times our existing force, in addition to the great number she had heretofore—12 first-class cruisers, 9 second-class cruisers, 10 third-class cruisers, 56 torpedo-boat destroyers, and other boats, a total of 117 vessels under construction.

France is building 17 vessels, at a cost of some \$16,000,000. Japan, a nation newly born, with a very small territory and not half our population, comes next, with a construction of 4 large first-class battle ships, 4 armored cruisers, 6 protected cruisers, 9 torpedo-boat destroyers, and 13 torpedo boats. This construction of Japan is going on with the greatest rapidity. She will soon become the first in naval strength on the Pacific Ocean, and greatly superior to the United States in that quarter.

Germany, Russia, and Italy are building war ships readily. Spain has increased her naval power during the year by the purchase of 1 and the completion of 2 first-class armored cruisers, 1 protected cruiser, 2 gunboats, and 6 torpedo-boat destroyers. She is also building 4 armored cruisers, 4 protected cruisers, 4 gunboats, 4 torpedo ships, and 3 battle ships, to be fitted with new boilers and guns in France.

The facts stated by the Secretary of the Navy in this report are highly suggestive. It is well to bear in mind that these programmes of naval construction are carried on far more rapidly in Europe than in this country.

This is particularly true in respect to Great Britain, which is building war vessels not only for her own navy, but in her private shipyards for other countries.

I believe it is true that a first-class battle ship, which in this country can not be built in less than two years or more, can be completed and equipped in a single year in Great Britain. It is said that we can build in this country war ships equal to those of any other country in the world.

Doubtless this is true, but there remains an important question worthy of study by our naval experts and by all persons responsible for the conduct of public affairs, and that is, Can we build these war vessels in case of emergency as rapidly as European countries—for example, Great Britain—and if not, how can this deficiency be best and most promptly supplied?

I may add here that the prompt and convenient docking and repair of our war vessels is fully as important as the rapidity of their construction and of their necessary armament.

Mr. Chairman, since the date of the Secretary's last report we have seen a number of newspaper publications, which go to show that in the last few weeks very considerable additions have been made by Russia, Germany, and other nations to their programmes of naval construction.

In some of these cases, as I understand, the money invested is not doled out from year to year in an annual appropriation bill, but is given in a lump sum, or in a mode resembling the contract system which obtains in our important river and harbor work, with the results of increased expedition and greatly increased economy.

I have felt that a full comparison of the fighting strength of our Navy as compared with other countries, and what each country is doing in the way of naval construction, is so important, in order that we may see exactly where we stand, what our danger is, and what our duty is to the people whose honor and security we have

in charge, that I have sought and obtained from our Naval Intelligence Bureau—

A COMPARATIVE SUMMARY OF THE PRINCIPAL FLEETS OF THE WORLD, BUILT AND BUILDING.

I beg leave to insert this valuable statement here, and to bespeak for it the most careful consideration.

Comparative summary of the principal fleets of the world built and building.

Classes of vessels.	British Empire.		France.		Russia.		Italy.		Germany.		United States.		Japan.		Spain.		Chile.	
	a.	b.	a.	b.	a.	b.	a.	b.	a.	b.	a.	b.	a.	b.	a.	b.	a.	b.
Fit for line of battle.....	A..	29	9	12	5	10	6	6	2	4	3	4	5	2	3	1
	B..	12	...	4	...	4	7	...	1
	C..	11	...	5	3	...	1
	D..	5	...	13	...	6	...	7	...	8	...	6
	F..	18	4	12	6	10	2	3	4	1	2	...	4	4	5	4	1	...
	G..	17	4	2	2	1
	H..	46	3	16	2	3	6	11	...	8	3	1	3	1
Commerce protection and scouting.....	I..	11	...	6	1
	J..	21	10	14	3	1	...	1	3	1
	K..	23	3	...	1	1	8	...	3
	L..	1	...	13	1	20	6	3	3
Coast defense.....	E..	11	...	12	...	21	11	...	13
	N..	49	...	14	...	13
	M..	39	6	13	2	8	...	15	2	8	6	...	11
Torpedo attack and defense.....	O..	90	6	...	8	114	...	1	9	1	1	11	3	4	...
	P..	51	...	43	...	67	...	104	13	65	...	7	8	2	110	...	6	...
	Q..	30	...	145	28	6	...	4	...	53	...	4	...	422	13	26	...	1
	R..	104	...	50	...	99	...	69	...	16	...	1	...	4	...	7	...	12
Summary:		75	13	46	11	30	10	20	6	22	4	13	5	7	7	8	4	4
Line.....		119	17	51	8	23	2	17	1	18	7	27	...	15	4	12	6	4
Cruisers.....		60	...	26	...	24	13	6
Coast defense.....		308	12	257	38	181	14	192	16	151	1	8	15	29	22	60	3	27
Torpedo flotilla.....		70	6	102	...	35	...	37	...	18	...	24	...	17	...	96	...	10
Unclassified vessels.....																		

- A. First-class battle ships.
- B. Second-class battle ships.
- C. Third-class battle ships.
- D. Seagoing coast-defense ironclads.
- E. Nonseagoing coast-defense ironclads.
- F. Armored cruisers.
- G. First-class protected cruisers, 6,000 tons and over.
- H. Second-class protected cruisers, 3,000 tons to 5,999 tons.
- I. Second-class unprotected cruisers, 3,000 tons to 5,999 tons.
- J. Third-class protected cruisers under 3,000 tons.
- K. Third-class partially protected cruisers under 3,000 tons.
- L. Third-class unprotected cruisers under 3,000 tons, not including old and slow ships.
- M. Torpedo gunboats.
- N. Gun vessels, third class, mounting heavy guns for coast defense.
- O. Torpedo-boat destroyers.
- P. Torpedo boats, first class.
- Q. Torpedo boats, second class.
- R. Torpedo boats, third class.

The unclassified vessels comprise all armed vessels not included in the above-mentioned classes, and consist of gunboats, special-service vessels, old and slow cruisers, small gun vessels, and armed dispatch vessels.

Under each nation column a contains the number of vessels completed; column b the number of vessels building, and shows the present activity in naval construction. Column a may be taken as the present naval strength of each nation; columns a and b combined, as the strength in 1900.

A table showing the number of naval dry docks in each country will be found in Appendix K, Senate Document 107, Fifty-fifth Congress, second session.

RICHARDSON CLOVER,
Chief Intelligence Officer.

FEBRUARY 24, 1898.

It is not necessary for me to comment upon this table. It tells the story of our lack of naval preparation and backwardness as compared with the other great powers of the world far more eloquently than any words of mine could. It may be said that we have been only a few years at work reconstructing our Navy on the lines of modern science and development; but, sir, this work was begun at least fifteen or sixteen years ago, under the Administration of President Arthur, and I do not think the public can be convinced that much greater progress could not have been accomplished.

- Mr. GAINES. Will the gentleman allow me a question?
- Mr. MEYER of Louisiana. Certainly.
- Mr. GAINES. How many ships does this new bill propose?
- Mr. MEYER of Louisiana. Three battle ships and 12 torpedo boats.
- Mr. GAINES. Not taking into consideration those now in course of construction?
- Mr. MEYER of Louisiana. No, sir.
- Germany is ahead of us. She began after we did. She has only half our population, far inferior wealth and resources, a small coast line, and, until the North German Canal was lately built, no direct and easy communication with the sea.
- Her armies have for centuries been prominent in history, but practically she has not till this generation possessed a navy. With a bound she goes to the front. She has a colonial system, and is able to defend it.
- Holding these views as to our duty and the public necessities, I

welcome even the exceedingly modest and reasonable addition of 3 battle ships and 6 torpedo boats and 6 torpedo destroyers proposed by the bill.

ALGIERS DRY DOCK.

With equal satisfaction do I hail the step which proposes to give our war ships adequate docking and repair facilities upon the Atlantic, the Pacific, and the Gulf coasts.

I have steadily favored and urged this general policy. I have especially urged the reasons which recommend and make necessary a dock at Algiers, a part of New Orleans and opposite its main environs. In February, 1897, I discussed this subject in the debate upon the naval appropriation bill. I treated the question from no sectional standpoint, for I favored suitable docks at Puget Sound, New York, Portsmouth, Norfolk, and the New England coast; but it became my duty to present with special emphasis the great importance of going on with the dock at New Orleans, which had been recommended by two separate and successive naval commissions as combining in the highest degree the requisites for a dock upon the Gulf coast.

Unfortunately, nothing was effected at that session, and this year, as I have already stated, we found ourselves without a single dry dock on the coast of either the Gulf or the Atlantic capable of accommodating the battle ship *Indiana*, so that she was obliged to be sent to the port of Halifax, Nova Scotia, a long voyage to a foreign shipyard.

THE COUNTRY AROUSED.

This incident aroused the country. The Secretary of the Navy very properly appointed a special board last August to examine the matter, and upon the reception of its report he strongly presented the subject in his annual report. It is a valuable feature of this document that it gives the comparison of the docking facilities of the principal maritime powers. It presents a melancholy exhibit for this country, but it is well to know the whole truth, so as to be able to provide for the emergency.

DRY-DOCK PROVISIONS IN NAVAL APPROPRIATION BILL.

The bill of the committee has provided for five dry docks, to be constructed at Portsmouth, N. H., Boston (Mass.), League Island, Pa., Mare Island, Cal., and Algiers (New Orleans), La., and makes an adequate appropriation for beginning the work. It is possible, indeed, that one or two other places might have been provided for, but it can not be doubted that the points chosen will result in the public good.

This is unquestionably true in regard to the selection of New Orleans, for a dock on the Gulf coast is indispensable in the opinion of naval officers, and naval experts say emphatically that New Orleans is the true point to locate it.

At one time a timber or concrete dry dock was favored for this place, but the naval board recommended in lieu of this "a double-sided steel floating dock of the type known as the combined floating and graving self-docking dock, to be capable of lifting a war vessel of the largest size and deepest draft of water."

Mr. DRIGGS. I desire to ask the gentleman a question, if he will yield.

Mr. MEYER of Louisiana. Certainly.

Mr. DRIGGS. I want to ask if these steel floating docks have been tested until they have been found satisfactory?

Mr. MEYER of Louisiana. For many years docks of this character have been in use in this and other countries. I am informed that the floating dock passed through the same development of material—wood, iron, and steel—as ships, and has kept pace with their development.

A floating steel dock of 17,500 tons is now in operation in Hamburg. In England this development has been especially rapid, and many of them are in successful operation.

Mr. HILBORN. Will the gentleman allow me?

Mr. MEYER of Louisiana. With pleasure.

Mr. HILBORN. I will say that the floating dock has been thoroughly tested and approved. It is a modification of an American invention. It has been adopted and improved by the English, and England on her foreign stations, notably at the Bermudas, uses a floating dock. And Spain has now in the harbor of Habana a floating dock that has a battle ship on it to-day.

Mr. MEYER of Louisiana. I thank my friend.

Mr. KING. Does not the gentleman from California know that the floating dock to which he refers, in the harbor of Habana, has been sunk and disabled? It was sunk when I was there.

Mr. HILBORN. Oh, no; the gentleman has been misinformed, because to-day it has a battle ship on it.

Mr. KING. I was there and know that it was sunk.

Mr. HILBORN. You saw it at a time when it was crippled; but to-day it is floating a battle ship.

Mr. DRIGGS. I should like to ask the gentleman from Louisiana another question, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. MEYER of Louisiana. Certainly.

Mr. DRIGGS. I desire to ask him in relation to the number of dry docks. Last summer, as I remember it, there was a commission appointed and each denomination of docks was considered,

and they provided for a certain number of docks. Does this bill provide for a less or a greater number?

Mr. MEYER of Louisiana. The bill provides for a smaller number of docks than the commission recommends. Their report sets forth six docks at various points as "urgently necessary" and five as additional "to place the docking facilities of the country on an adequate footing."

Mr. HILBORN. And one of them a floating steel dock.

Mr. DRIGGS. Thank you.

Mr. MEYER of Louisiana. The reasons assigned by the board for preferring the steel floating dock are:

1. Changes in water level from high and low river do not affect its operation.

2. It is located in fresh water, and expense of maintenance will be small.

3. Great depth of water within mooring distance of wharf.

4. Rapidity with which a floating dock can be constructed to meet the urgent need for a dock on the Gulf of Mexico (ten months being the time estimated for its construction).

The necessity for pushing work of this character is manifest. At the date of the Secretary's report there was no dock on the Atlantic coast capable of accommodating a great battle ship. A few days ago a New York journal which pays close attention to such matters stated that unless the two docks on the Atlantic which are large enough to serve the *Iowa* and *Massachusetts* will soon be ready, it might become necessary to send these ships to Halifax for cleaning.

I trust there will be no opposition to this policy. The entire expenditure, either in construction or maintenance, will not equal the cost of one battle ship with her armament, and it will render our naval establishment efficient both in war and peace. It is a measure of economy at all times.

UNCERTAINTY OF OUR FOREIGN RELATIONS.

In urging as I do and have done the duty of making adequate naval preparations I have not felt it necessary to discuss the Cuban question or the issues now existing or that may arise between this country and Spain.

I trust that peace may be preserved. I value its inestimable blessings. But it is enough for my argument to point out the uncertainty and insecurity of our foreign relations. The lightning's flash of the cables encompassing the world, the speed of steam propellers, and all the agencies of our nineteenth-century progress and wonderful inventions bring the nations of the earth in close and hourly contact with us, and much as we may endeavor to observe the wise advice of the great father of our country, "to extend our commercial relations with foreign nations, but to have with them as little political connection as possible," modern conditions may prevent us. A country great as we have grown to be must take its part and share in the activities and humanities of the civilized world. It is inevitable; no mere theories can avert it. [Applause.]

The fifty-million appropriation unanimously voted by Congress was not only a declaration of our purpose to stand by the country in time of war; it was also a confession by Congress that we are lacking, sadly lacking, in preparation for war, and that whatever money, freely voted, would do to atone for our past neglect and want of foresight would be cheerfully, promptly given.

How much better it would have been if three or four, or better still, six years ago we had put ourselves in a condition of military and naval preparation which we would be only too happy to have to-day.

Such an act, such a wise policy, would have been the surest agency for peace that we could possibly have employed.

A weak and unprotected coast and commerce are always an invitation to aggression by foreign powers.

One of our earlier Presidents—John Adams—observed in one of his messages to Congress—

A mercantile marine and a military marine must grow up together; one can not long exist without the other.

If we are to have an extended commerce, rich and thriving cities on the seaboard, with vast wealth, as we have, or a foreign policy that takes care of our interests, as we ought to have, we must be prepared to defend what we have got, and to enforce our just demands.

Acting on this line, we can not only hold our place among the nations of the earth, but we can preserve "peace with honor." [Applause.]

SEA POWER ESSENTIAL TO NATIONAL GREATNESS.

Mr. Chairman, I trust it is needless for me to enlarge upon the value and importance of sea power. No nation can be complete or great without it. It was sea power that gave preeminence to Athens, Carthage, and Rome in ancient days. The lack of it, as compared with England, enfeebled France in her long struggle with Great Britain from 1792 to 1814, and not even the genius of Napoleon was able to surmount the difficulties growing out of the immense superiority of England on the sea.

The victory of Trafalgar over the fleets of France and Spain

balanced that of Austerlitz, and left England free to exert her arms, money, and vast resources with the certainty that her own soil and industries would be secure against interruption or devastation. Our success over Mexico from 1846 to 1848 was mainly dependent upon our command of the sea to transport armies and their supplies. Even in the hour of peace we find a continual demand for the services of our small Navy.

Mr. Chairman, I have consumed more time than I desired to do, and yet have hardly glanced at the important question before us.

I beg to conclude with a quotation from a letter of John Adams, written in the year 1802. It contains words of wisdom, and if penned with special reference to present conditions it could not be more true and appropriate than it is after the lapse of near a century. It is reinforced by every page of modern history:

The counsel which Themistocles gave to Athens, Pompey to Rome, Cromwell to England, De Witt to Holland, and Colbert to France I have always given and shall continue to give to my countrymen—that as the great questions of commerce and power between nations and empires must be decided by a military marine, and war and peace are determined at sea, all reasonable encouragement should be given to the Navy.

The trident of Neptune is the scepter of the world.

[Prolonged applause.]

Mr. BOÛTELLE of Maine. Mr. Chairman, I now yield to my colleague the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. DAYTON] thirty minutes, or so much of it as he may desire.

Mr. DAYTON. Mr. Chairman, inasmuch as this bill now presented for the consideration of the House increases appropriations something more than \$3,000,000 over the bill of last year, it is well for the House to clearly understand the provisions that make up that increase. Generally stated, three items constitute it.

First, the increase of the force of 2,000 men and boys, made necessary by the manning and putting into actual service of the ships; second, the increase in the number of vessels that shall hereafter constitute our Navy and provided by this bill, viz, the 3 battle ships, 6 torpedo-boat destroyers, and 6 torpedo boats. In addition to this, the bill has provided for the rebuilding of a gun-boat to take the place of the one substantially disabled upon the lakes. The third principal item which has helped to make up this increase is the provision of the bill for the five dry docks that it has been deemed necessary to build at Portsmouth, Boston, League Island, Algiers, and Mare Island.

Mr. Chairman, every thoughtful citizen of the Republic will agree with the Secretary of the Navy that this country is to be congratulated upon the fact that we do not need either the vast military or naval armament required by the other great powers. Our forefathers, chastened by the deadly and protracted struggle of the Revolution, builded better than they knew, and when by the Monroe doctrine they established the principle as one of fixed national policy that we would not allow ourselves to become entangled in the meshes and network of European politics, but that our interests and our action should center alone in the Western Hemisphere, we made way for the dismissal of armies and gave full sweep to the tide of development and national progress that has come to us beyond the wildest dream of one hundred years ago.

Separated as we are by vast seas, we can rest in security and tranquility, notwithstanding the "armed peace" of Europe, with its Franco-Russian alliance, its triple alliance between Germany, Austria, and Italy facing each other, while England, with her characteristic energy, maintains singly and alone a naval armament equal to and able to cope with that of either of the alliances in case it shall become necessary.

We need no navy to protect foreign colonies or to enforce our rule in distant empires. We are not interested in the questions of the East, nor will we be affected if China in the future shall seek to revenge her recent humiliation at the hands of Japan.

But, Mr. Chairman, while we may rejoice in our favorable location and conditions, this sense of security should not cause us wholly to overlook the wise truth proclaimed by the great German chancellor, the man of "blood and iron," Count Bismarck, that the best means of securing and maintaining peace is being prepared, in a measure at least, for war. We must not forget that while oceans intervene between us and other great nations, those oceans are now underlaid with strands of cabled steel, by which communication can be had in a few minutes, and that we are, therefore, necessarily in much closer touch with foreign powers than in years gone by.

We must not forget, either, that the obligation is upon us, not alone from considerations of national pride and the maintenance of the American spirit of self-respect, but also from that of the proper protection of our citizens abroad, to not wholly ignore our naval armament. I am fully persuaded of one thing, and that is, constituting, as we do, a body of 70,000,000 brave, self-reliant, and intelligent people, wholly wedded to the principle of self-government and having proved beyond peradventure that such government can be, and by us is, made as strong, stable, and enduring as any other on earth, we need have little fear of hostile invasion.

Exercising the intelligent freeman's right to agree and disagree

upon questions of internal policy, but always ready, when danger from outside threatens, to bury on the instant all differences, to respond with one voice, to follow one flag, to know but one tie—that of American brotherhood—I say, under such conditions as these we need have little fear of being assailed at our own firesides. Too many self-constituted "minutemen" and sentries will spring up to allow that.

I submit, therefore, Mr. Chairman, that any future danger must be met almost altogether by naval forces and naval defenses, and that it is therefore wise policy for us to be liberal to our naval establishment and respond promptly and effectively to its needs and requirements. I submit further, Mr. Chairman, that it is also wise for us as an original proposition, wholly independent of present emergency necessities, to establish a fixed policy of increasing our Navy to a point where we will not be ashamed of it, or, in case of necessity, be compelled to scamper over the globe to buy vessels to meet it.

Mr. Chairman, that being true, I hope—especially after having devoted these long weeks to consideration of the subject—that no one will be misled by the recommendation made by the Secretary of the Navy that we should build but one coast-line, first-class battle ship. The committee must understand that that recommendation was made under other than present circumstances; and I here state, personally, that the Secretary of the Navy is in entire accord with the committee in the recommendation that there shall be three instead of one. I have made this statement after a personal interview with him in regard to the matter. I have made it, too, in order that the three (it seems to me) important features in this bill may not be assailed here upon the question of economy, which is sprung so often in this House.

Mr. Chairman, the other subject, that of dry docks, has been considered long and thoroughly by the Committee on Naval Affairs. Its consideration has been based not only upon the recommendations of the Department, not only upon the report of the board appointed to ascertain and determine how many of these dry docks should be built, but it has been based upon the independent examination made by the committee itself from other and outside sources.

A very strange thing has occurred in this House in the sessions that have gone by. It is to my mind a remarkable thing that heretofore we have been retarded in building dry docks by the fact that points of order have been made against this provision as being new and independent work, and therefore outside of the provisions of the regular appropriation bill.

I sincerely hope and believe that when this measure comes to be considered upon its several provisions there will not be a man in this House who will attempt to raise this point of order and place himself in the strange position of saying that we are authorized to build new battle ships, to build new navy-yards, to build new tool houses and machine shops, to purchase the machinery necessary to build ships, but we are not authorized to erect, as it were, the scaffold upon which they are to be built, repaired, and cleaned. It seems to me that the day for that kind of economy has passed and that the time has come when we must not only furnish our Navy with the navy-yards, tools, and material necessary to repair our vessels, but must also furnish them with the docks to dock them.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I insist that the necessity for this increase in our Navy has been made thoroughly apparent, not only by the incidents and facts which have been transpiring within the last few years, but that the necessity is emphasized by a comparison of the Navy of this great nation of ours, the proudest, the noblest, the most civilized nation of the world, with the navies of the powers. This comparison emphasizes the fact I am insisting upon, that it is wise for us to pass, it is good policy for us to pass, and we shall not be true to the American spirit unless we do pass, almost, I might say, without question, the reasonable, prudent increase authorized by this bill.

I have also a statement—slightly different, I think, from that filed by my colleague from Louisiana [Mr. MEYER]—in regard to the naval equipment of the world. Gentlemen will understand that naval vessels are divided into different classes according to the different uses to which they are to be put. First, as to battle ships and other vessels that are capable for the line of battle.

While England has 75 already built and 13 building of these that can go out into the broad sea to furnish the line of battle; while France has 46 built and 11 building; while Russia has 30 built and 10 building; while Italy has 20 built and 6 building; while Germany has 22 built and 4 building, the United States has 18 built and 5 building. Of the commerce protecting and scouting vessels that are designed to protect commerce, England has 119 built and 17 building; France, 51 built and 8 building; Russia, 23 built and 2 building; Italy, 17 built and 1 building; Germany, 18 built and 7 building; the United States, 27 built and no others building.

Take it all the way through. Take the coast-defense vessels: England has 60; we have 13; France has 26; Russia, 34; Spain, 13; Germany, 13. Of the torpedo boats, England has 308 built and 12 building; France has 257 built and 36 building; Russia, 161 built

and 14 building; Italy, 192 built and 16 building; Germany, 151 built and 1 building; Spain, 60 built and 3 building; Japan, 29 built and 22 building, and we have 8 built and 15 building.

The total navy of England includes, of all these different kinds of vessels, 632 built and 48 building; France, 482 built and 57 building; Russia, 303 built and 26 building; Italy, 266 built and 13 building; Spain, 189 built and 13 building; Japan, 74 built and 13 building; United States, 85 built and 20 building. I insist that when it is stated publicly—and I get this information from reliable sources—that in this coming year England proposes to spend \$127,000,000 in the increase of her Navy, Russia will spend for ships alone \$83,333,000, Germany will spend \$95,000,000, while France will build one battle ship, 8 cruisers, 8 destroyers, and 6 torpedo boats, and Japan will build 3 battle ships, 5 first-class cruisers, 6 second-class cruisers, 3 torpedo vessels, 8 destroyers, and 12 torpedo boats, every self-respecting American citizen must desire that we shall not be so far behind even Japan as we are in this work. [Applause.]

Other important information is contained in this statement. I have not time to read, but will incorporate it in the RECORD, by the leave of the House, for the consideration of the committee, as a part of my remarks.

Mr. Chairman, a few more words, and I am done. I have always deeply deplored the custom so much indulged here, under the license of general debate, of discussing questions foreign to the bill under consideration. I would not for one moment express myself as I am about to do if I did not believe that not only the argument in behalf of the increase of our Navy but also other extraordinary and exceptional reasons justify me.

It is needless for me to call attention to the fact that we now have one less battle ship than when we last discussed in this House a naval appropriation bill. This bill provides for a new *Maine*, but the American heart has not ceased to thrill with horror because the original *Maine* lies a wreck in Habana Harbor with 266 of her brave men buried beneath her. We can not, no matter how hard we may try, believe otherwise than that it would have been impossible for this condition of things to be a stern reality confronting us in any other harbor in the world.

We talk as we will about an accident, and yet the time when and the place where it occurred brings the full realization that there is one nation, or at least one individual, who would destroy us if possible; and while I am in entire accord and sympathy with the wise and patient, yet prompt and patriotic, course pursued by the President in this matter; while I rejoice that nothing has been done in anger and haste, but a full investigation has been ordered by a board selected from the best, bravest, and most sensible body of naval officers to be found on earth, one member of which board I am proud to count as a constituent of mine, nevertheless, while our hearts may be full of sadness and indignation over this *Maine* tragedy, let us not for one moment forget that it is but an incident in a greater and more horrible tragedy transpiring daily before our eyes, and which, I insist, this great, enlightened, Christian nation must stop. [Applause.]

Two hundred and sixty-six brave men are dead to-day as a result of the *Maine* tragedy. Over 200,000 are dead in Cuba and 255,000 more, largely helpless women and children, are being held in imprisonment and starved to death there to-day. We do not know as yet that the Spanish authorities blew up the *Maine* and destroyed the lives of our seamen, but we do know that Spanish authority is responsible for this wholesale deadly murder in the first degree going on within a hundred miles of our shores. [Applause.]

And do not forget, Mr. Chairman, that the only cause for this—the only crime that these pitiful dead and dying have been guilty of—is that, inspired by our example, they have longed and sought for free self-government. And do not forget also, Mr. Chairman, that when this House, almost by unanimous vote, followed by the Senate, declared in favor of belligerent rights for this distracted isle, had Mr. Cleveland acted promptly, at least 100,000 lives would have been saved, Cuba would have been free, and in all human probability the *Maine* would not be to-day a dismantled wreck, but would be peacefully cleaving the sea, manned by men now dead, and flying the proud American flag. [Applause.]

Do not spare in our remembrance, too, Mr. Chairman, that other fact that when the question of belligerent rights was discussed in the Senate, by far the strongest, most earnest, and affecting words in behalf of such recognition came from the lips of the noble, venerated statesman who stands to-day at the head of President McKinley's Cabinet.

Let us look at this question fairly and squarely. Under the Monroe doctrine, if Eastern powers should seek to settle the affairs of Cuba, we would regard it either as humiliation or an affront. The obligation is upon us. In this case we are our brother's keeper, and the blood of dead thousands cry aloud to us out of Cuba's ground.

I do not want war if it can be avoided. I want peace, but with honor and with a sense that I can look my wife and boy at home in the face and feel I have some heart and humanity left in me.

I do not want them to think that I can stand by and see other wives and children starved and strangled without a word of protest. With food and raiment in one hand and with its strong power backed by the righteous will of 70,000,000 of freemen, this Administration must intervene, stop this horror, and give Cuba her freedom.

This intervention may be done, I hope, peacefully. If so, God be praised; but if not, and it can only be done by war, let it come. Humanity, mercy, charity, and all the attributes of God Himself will be with us, and Cuba will be free. [Applause.]

Comparative summary of the principal fleets of the world, built and building

Classes of vessels.	British Empire.		France.		Russia.		Italy.		Germany.		United States.		Japan.		Spain.		Chill.		
	a.	b.	a.	b.	a.	b.	a.	b.	a.	b.	a.	b.	a.	b.	a.	b.	a.	b.	
Fit for the line of battle—	(A) 29	9	12	5	10	6	6	2	4	3	4	5	2	3	1	—	—	—	—
	(B) 12	—	4	—	—	—	—	—	7	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	
	(C) 11	—	5	—	—	—	—	—	3	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	
	(D) 5	—	13	—	—	—	—	—	8	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	
	(E) 18	4	12	6	10	3	4	—	1	2	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	
	(F) 17	4	2	—	—	—	—	—	1	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	
	(G) 46	3	16	—	—	—	—	—	3	6	11	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	
Commerce protection and scouting—	(H) 11	—	6	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	
	(I) 21	10	14	3	1	—	—	—	7	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	
	(J) 23	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	1	2	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	
	(K) 1	—	13	1	20	—	—	—	6	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	
	(L) 11	—	12	—	21	—	—	—	11	13	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	
Coast defense—	(M) 49	—	14	—	13	—	—	—	2	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	
	(N) 33	6	13	2	8	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	
	(O) 90	6	—	—	14	—	—	—	1	9	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	
Torpedo attack and defense—	(P) 51	—	43	—	67	—	—	—	104	13	65	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	
	(Q) 30	—	145	28	6	—	—	—	4	—	53	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	
	(R) 104	—	56	—	99	—	—	—	69	—	1	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	
Summary:																			
Line	75	13	46	11	30	10	20	6	22	4	13	5	7	7	8	4	4	4	2
Cruisers	119	17	51	8	23	2	17	1	18	7	27	—	15	4	12	6	4	2	—
Coast defense	60	—	26	—	34	—	—	—	13	—	—	—	6	—	—	—	—	—	—
Torpedo flotilla	308	12	257	38	131	14	102	16	151	1	8	15	29	22	60	3	27	—	—
Unclassified vessels	70	6	102	—	35	—	37	—	18	—	24	—	17	—	90	—	10	—	—
Total	632	48	482	57	303	26	266	23	222	12	85	20	74	33	189	13	45	2	—

- A. First-class battle ships.
- B. Second class battle ships.
- C. Third-class battle ships.
- D. Seagoing coast-defense ironclads.
- E. Nonseagoing coast-defense ironclads.
- F. Armored cruisers.
- G. First-class protected cruisers, 6,000 tons and over.
- H. Second-class protected cruisers, 3,000 tons to 5,999 tons.
- I. Second-class unprotected cruisers, 3,000 tons to 5,999 tons.
- J. Third-class protected cruisers under 3,000 tons.
- K. Third-class partially protected cruisers under 3,000 tons.
- L. Third-class unprotected cruisers under 3,000 tons, not including old and slow ships.
- M. Torpedo gunboats.
- N. Gun vessels, third class, mounting heavy guns for coast defense.
- O. Torpedo-boat destroyers.
- P. Torpedo boats, first class.
- Q. Torpedo boats, second class.
- R. Torpedo boats, third class.

The unclassified vessels comprise all armed vessels not included in the above-mentioned classes, and consist of gunboats, special-service vessels, old and slow cruisers, small-gun vessels, and armed dispatch vessels. Under each nation column a contains the number of vessels completed; column b the number of vessels building, and shows the present activity in naval construction. Columns a may be taken as the present naval strength of each nation; columns a and b combined as the strength in 1900.

Proposed naval expenditures, 1898.

England proposes to spend	\$127,750,000
Russia will spend for ships alone	83,333,400
Germany will spend	95,000,000
France will build—	
Battle ship	1
Cruisers	8
Destroyers	8
Torpedo boats	6
Japan will build—	
Battle ships	3
First-class cruisers	5
Second-class cruisers	6
Torpedo vessels	3
Destroyers	8
Torpedo boats	12

Now, Mr. Chairman, I yield the remainder of my time to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. ARNOLD].

Mr. ARNOLD. Mr. Chairman, we stand to-day on the verge of an armed conflict, and it were well that our actions be justified by the facts and approved by honorable men everywhere. It is clear that the *Maine* was in a supposedly friendly harbor, and was anchored in a particular spot by direction of the Spanish authorities. Our naval court of inquiry, composed of men of unsullied honor and sterling integrity, it is believed, found that the vessel was blown up by some external force—a mine or torpedo.

As to what particular persons were the active agents we may not be informed directly, but we do know that the only party interested, and the only party which hates the United States and

which was in a position to accomplish the cowardly and infamous act, was Spain. It may not have been officially directed, but the responsibility still exists. Without such direction there is such negligence as would make the party, in criminal law, guilty of manslaughter in a similar occurrence as between citizens of a State. To my mind there is moral and legal responsibility resting upon Spain. Assuming all this to be true—and I believe it to be true—what should be our demands in way of reparation? In this connection, I desire to refer to the suggestion of some un-American citizens, that the controversy be settled by arbitration.

I submit, Mr. Chairman, this can not be done with honor. We have not only lost the *Maine*, which in money can be estimated, but there were ushered into eternity without a moment's warning 266 American sailors, whose lives were dear to them and dear to us, and this can not be estimated or measured. Shall we make merchandise of the lives of our people? Can money purchase human life? Is gold dearer to us than the blood of patriots? No, no! And there can not be and must not be any arbitration. [Applause.] Our honor is at stake and our flag insulted. If I insult any gentleman in this House, should there be arbitration to decide and inform that gentleman whether or not he has been insulted? Again, any agreement to arbitrate is an infamous reflection on the honor and integrity of the gentlemen who composed our court of inquiry.

You may then say that my views would necessarily lead to war. In connection with other facts which I will refer to, relative to Cuba, I unhesitatingly say, yes, war, with all that it implies, unless full damages be immediately paid and the complete independence of Cuba be at once obtained. War is the incarnation of an awful tragedy, but a greater tragedy was enacted when 266 brave American sailors went down to their death through the infamy and treachery of Spain or of some of her subjects. We all love peace, and it is dear to us, but may it never again be said of this great nation that we will purchase peace at the price of honor. [Applause.]

As to our recognition of belligerent rights or the independence of Cuba, I confidently assert we have both a moral and legal right so to do. International law materially differs from constitutional or statute law. First, it is not universal, and is not binding in law or conscience upon any except those nations which have so agreed. In fact, so-called international law is not law in its true sense, but is in the nature of a contract or compact or agreement by common consent. These principles, or rather agreements, are very broad and general in character, and no positive or inflexible rule of action is prescribed.

The result or effect is that each particular case must be determined by the circumstances, surroundings, and facts of that case. But as to our interference in Cuba we have authority and precedents. Grotius says:

The same justice which binds the individual as an individual must bind him as a state member. The law of nature which penetrates the individual conscience must guide the national conduct. Justice is approved of and injustice condemned by the consent of all good men in every relation of life.

D'Aubigne says:

There is a God in history. There is a moral power abroad whose dictates neither statesman nor nation can afford to despise.

Maine on International Law says:

This (Roman) *jus gentium* is identical with natural law, and this is, in truth, the highest law by which individuals and nations can be governed: highest in the absolute perfection of the rules which it contains; highest in the cogency of the commands which it utters, and highest in the absolute obligation of the duties which it enforces.

Let us now refer to precedents: In 1849 the United States early and promptly—being the first so to do—recognized the independence of far-off Hungary. In 1825 England recognized the independence of the revolted South American colonies of Spain, "because of sympathies, united with English commercial interests." The United States had several years earlier—in 1822—recognized the independence of these same South American republics. In 1802 England instructed its representative in Paris as follows:

You will state most distinctly His Majesty's determination never to forego his right of interfering in the affairs of the Continent on every occasion in which the interests of his own dominions may appear to him to require it. This right His Majesty possesses in common with every other independent power. It rests upon general principles.

It was in this same spirit and on the same principle that the British ministry defended the bombardment of Copenhagen and the seizure of the neutral Danish fleet.

Another precedent, interesting and pertinent at this time, was the prompt recognition by Spain, in June, 1861, of the independence of the Confederate States in our own land. But it is unnecessary to multiply authority and precedents. The millions spent by our country in preventing filibustering expeditions to Cuba, the loss of tens of millions in commerce, the illegal and revolting imprisonment by Spain of American residents in Cuba, these and many other good reasons demand immediate action, which has been too long, much too long, delayed. The question will never be settled until it is settled right.

But throwing aside all precedents and all injuries, and not even considering the *Maine* disaster, there is a law greater and higher and nobler than any and all international law, the law of common humanity, which not only justifies but demands immediate action at our hands. More than 400,000 innocent and peaceful men, women, and children deliberately starved to death within the last two years, and hundreds, if not thousands, now dying by starvation daily, almost within sight of our shores.

Intensely and sadly interesting as is Senator PROCTOR's and Senator GALLINGER's portrayal of the sad scene, and though we have had full knowledge of the awful crime, no hand has been lifted to save. I have confidence in our present Chief Magistrate. I hope and believe he will measure up not only to his full duty but his opportunities. Washington, because of his labors in the cause of liberty, will live through all time. Lincoln, in the courage, gentleness, and firmness of his great heart, through the emancipation proclamation, will be honored through all the countless ages yet to come.

And to our present Chief Magistrate there has come an opportunity seldom vouchsafed to man to build for himself, in the cause of humanity and freedom, a monument which all the assaults of all time can not destroy, and leave to posterity a glorious name, which will be revered by all men and which will be an inspiration to all in future ages who shall battle for their liberties. [Applause.]

The blood of these murdered people is on the hands of our nation to-day. The whole question has resolved itself into one of annihilation or independence. It has been well demonstrated that Spain can not conquer; so she has been pursuing the policy of annihilation by starvation. Simple and common humanity should now move us to duty too long delayed. Let us do right, though war result, as it probably will. The history of the world, from the slavery of the Israelites under Pharaoh down to this hour, shows that charters of liberty are always written in the blood of heroes.

There can be no peace for Cuba, and we as a nation will ever be annoyed and troubled, until absolute independence is an accomplished fact. Independence is no new thing to the world at large or to ourselves as a nation. Autonomy for Cuba by Spain is a delusion, a snare, and a failure. Many centuries ago autonomy was a fascinating word to Hellenic ears, but it only paved the way to Hellenic subjection, and Greece perished.

In this emergency Providence points the way, duty bids us move on in the pathway of progressive civilization, humanity demands that we march resolutely forward, and justice insists that we punish deceit, perfidy, treachery, cruelty, tyranny, and savagery, which are the predominant traits of Spanish character. I put this statement against that made by General Blanco in Habana a few days ago:

The present generation will never see another banner than that of Spain at the entrance to the Gulf of Mexico. That banner, representing civilization, progress, liberty, humanity, and religion, will be eternal.

How matchless the irony; how infamous the falsehood!

In the splendid progress and civilization of the last four centuries by the great nations of the world, Spain has not taken one single step forward, and she to-day belongs to the age of barbarism. She deserves no place and should not have a place on the map of the world. Compared with her treatment of Cubans, the Turkish massacres of the Armenians were humane.

It has been said that our intervention may cause foreign complications. This should not deter us from our plain duty; but there is no such danger; any foreign interference would be met by the two great English-speaking people of the world. I would not favor "entangling alliances," but I would not refuse the active kindness of platonic, if not maternal, friendship. In this connection I am reminded of the statement of a prominent Spaniard, a few days ago, that if we became involved with Spain, there was great danger of a revolt against our Government by the late Confederate States. What gross ignorance; what an infamous slander. 'Tis true the South suffered much at the hands of the North during our late strife. Very many of her best and bravest went down to their death; beautiful homes were ruined and desolate; sorrow and despair seemed their only heritage. But, withal, honor, courage, and determination were still theirs, and with these, as part and parcel of ideal manhood, a new South has sprung up, and joining hands with their brethren of the North we are all moving onward and upward to attain to the highest possibilities of this our nation—one God, one flag, one country, one destiny.

And if that flag is ever assailed I know that no hand will be quicker than that of the South to strike down the assailant, and none will more earnestly and quickly respond to defend the honor and glory of this United States.

I will not detain the House longer, except to urge the duty of the hour. That duty is independence and intervention. In the name of the Christ, let us be humane; in the name of humanity, let us be just; in the name of justice, let us do right; and being right, let us dare maintain it. [Loud applause.]

Mr. MEYER of Louisiana. I now yield to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. TATE].

Mr. TATE. Mr. Chairman, it is not my purpose to discuss in detail the items of this bill, but, sir, I desire briefly to review and contrast the extravagant appropriations for the past thirty years with the appropriations in the earlier days of this Republic, when its affairs were administered in the interest of all the people, and when economy was in reality practiced; when every dollar collected in taxes from the people was used to meet some legitimate purpose, and when the people of this country were contented, prosperous, and happy.

Beginning with the Administration of President Washington, we find that the net ordinary expenditures of his entire Administration were only \$20,024,062.59, and in 1790, with a population of 3,927,214 people, the net ordinary expenditures of this Government amounted to only 95 cents per capita.

During President Adams's Administration, from 1797 to 1800, the people were only taxed, for the entire four years, \$21,379,357.62 to pay the net ordinary expenses of the Government, or an average of a little over five millions each year.

President Jefferson, from 1801 to 1804, only spent \$17,174,432.96, or a little over four millions each year, and during his second Administration, from 1805 to 1808, only \$23,926,355.72 or an average of \$5,981,588.93 each year.

The ordinary expenses during President Madison's Administration, from 1809 to 1812, were \$36,147,857.98, being an average of \$9,036,964.49 for each year.

From 1813 to 1816, during President Madison's second Administration, the expenditures of the Government rose to \$108,537,086.88, or an average of \$27,134,271.47 each year, and were, during President Monroe's Administration, from 1817 to 1820, only \$58,698,087.71, or an average of \$14,674,521.92 each year.

From 1821 to 1824, during President Monroe's second Administration, the expenditures of the Government were \$45,665,421.88, or \$11,416,355.47 each year, and the net ordinary expenses from 1825 to 1828, during President John Quincy Adams's Administration, were \$50,501,913.31, or an average of \$12,625,478.32 each year.

Then followed President Jackson's Administration, from 1829 to 1832, with an ordinary expenditure of \$56,251,200.30, or an average of \$14,062,800.07 each year.

From 1833 to 1836, during President Jackson's second Administration, the ordinary expenditures of the Government were \$89,532,286.68, or an average expenditure of \$22,383,071.67 each year; and during President Van Buren's Administration, from 1837 to 1840, the ordinary expenditures of the Government were \$121,729,801.16, or an average of \$30,432,450.29 each year.

The ordinary expenses during President Tyler's Administration, from 1841 to 1844, amounted to \$82,464,753.49, or an average of \$20,626,188.37 each year, and President Polk, from 1845 to 1849, expended \$147,342,853.34, or an average expenditure of \$36,835,713.33 each year.

The net ordinary expenses of President Taylor's Administration, from 1849 to 1852, amounted to \$161,604,204.92, or an average expenditure of \$40,401,051.23 each year.

The ordinary expenditures of President Pierce's Administration, from 1853 to 1856, were \$219,134,410.13, or an average of \$54,783,602.53; and during the Administration of President Buchanan, from 1857 to 1860, were \$264,784,285.65, or an average of \$66,196,071.41 each year.

This, sir, brings us to the beginning of the war, during which time, from 1861 to 1864, under President Lincoln's Administration, the ordinary expenditures of the Government were \$2,024,284,207.29, or an average of \$506,071,051.82 each year.

The ordinary expenditures under President Johnson, from 1865 to 1869, amounted to \$2,036,522,443.69, or an average of \$509,130,610.92 each year, and the ordinary expenditures under President Grant's Administration, from 1869 to 1872, amounted to \$665,703,545.87, or an average of \$166,425,886.46 each year, and during his second Administration, from 1873 to 1876, amounted to \$710,995,283.53, or an average each year of \$177,748,820.88.

The ordinary expenditures under President Hayes's Administration, from 1877 to 1880, amounted to \$609,383,412.21, or an average of \$152,345,853.05 for each year, and during President Arthur's Administration, from 1881 to 1884, the ordinary expenditures were \$759,843,002.55, being an average expenditure of \$189,960,750.63 each year.

The ordinary expenditures from 1885 to the beginning of the present fiscal year were as follows:

Year.	Amount.	Year.	Amount.
1885.....	\$208,840,678.64	1892.....	\$321,645,214.35
1886.....	191,902,922.53	1893.....	356,213,562.31
1887.....	220,190,602.72	1894.....	339,683,874.19
1888.....	214,938,951.20	1895.....	325,217,268.08
1889.....	240,965,131.31	1896.....	302,780,385.98
1890.....	291,637,202.55	1897.....	365,774,159.57
1891.....	317,825,549.37	1898.....	432,421,605.98

The estimates furnished by the Departments at the beginning of this session of Congress for the next fiscal year, ending June 30, 1899, are \$462,647,885.85.

Mr. Chairman, this is a brief review of the net ordinary expenditures of this country from the Administration of President Washington to this date. The entire expenditures of this Government from 1790 to 1850, for sixty years, only amounted to \$1,466,767,553.42, and when we consider, sir, that we are now expending more money in three years than we did in the sixty years referred to above we can get some idea of the enormous taxes that are now being collected annually from the people of this country.

But our friends will say, no doubt, to justify these expenditures, that we have increased in population and wealth, and that our expenses are necessarily more. I grant you, sir, that the expenses of the Government would necessarily be more than when this was a weaker or poorer country, but no better test can be made of this question than to take the amount of taxes per capita paid by the people of this country.

If our population has kept pace with our wealth, and it has, certainly our expenditures should not, with the exclusion of the expenses of this country during the late war, increase faster than our population.

Sir, in 1800, with a population of 5,308,483 people, the net ordinary expenditures of the Government were \$7,411,369.97, being \$1.10 per capita.

In 1810, with a population of 7,239,881 people, the expenditure per capita for each year, from 1800 to 1810, was \$2.50 per capita; and from 1810 to 1820, when we had a population of 9,633,822 people, we had an average expenditure of \$1.50 per capita per year.

From 1820 to 1830, when we had a population of 12,866,620 people, the expenditures per capita were only \$1.80, and from 1830 to 1840, with a population of 17,069,453 people, we had an expenditure of only \$1.70 per capita; and from 1840 to 1850, with a population of 23,191,879 people, we had an average expenditure of \$2.80 per capita.

During the year 1860 the per capita expenditures of this Government were only \$1.92, but on account of the increased expenses of the war, the average per capita in 1870 increased to \$4.26, but in 1880 decreased to \$3.39; increasing again in 1890 to \$5.73 per capita.

In 1891 the expenditures were \$6.58 per capita; in 1892, \$6.36 per capita; in 1893, \$6.88 per capita; in 1894, \$6.48 per capita; in 1895, \$6.21 per capita; in 1896, \$6.10 per capita, in 1897, \$6.27 per capita, and for 1898, counting our population at 70,000,000, we spent \$6.18 per capita. And the estimates for the year ending June, 1899, is \$6.60 per capita.

It will therefore be seen, Mr. Chairman, that the gradual increase of expenditures since the war can not be justified from the standpoint that the population of the country is increasing, nor can it be defended from any other standpoint.

The argument in favor of high-tariff taxation is always put upon the ground of meeting the expenses of the Government. You seldom hear upon this floor, sir, any proposition urging a reduction of expenditures, but year by year all the power of the Government is used in taxing the people to meet these expenditures.

Why not, sir, instead of increasing the taxes reduce the appropriations? In the ordinary business affairs of life when our expenses exceed our income we cut down our expenses or bankruptcy must follow, but this has not been the rule of the Government. While the expenditures have been piled mountain high, taxation must be in proportion, and the people have been taxed and taxed, as we are told, to meet the expenses of the Government, until the power to tax has almost been exhausted.

When we consider that the appropriations during thirty years of peace have almost equaled those necessary to carry on war, no man can justify or defend them. The extravagance that has been practiced in almost every department of this Government for the past thirty years is appalling.

We hear a great deal in these Halls at every session of Congress in reference to cutting down appropriations, but, sir, we have but one lamp with which to light our feet, and that is the lamp of past experience. We can only judge the future by the past, and what has there been in the conduct of the Republican party, which has continued to increase annually the burdens of taxation by extravagant appropriations, to lead us to hope or believe that a reduction in the enormous expenditures of public money is to be made?

Instead of reductions, the figures show that year after year of peace our appropriations have increased in every department of the Government until the taxing power of the Government is at the highest limit and the capacity of the people to pay taxes almost exhausted, and the time has come when a halt must be called.

It seems, sir, that in the National, State, county, and municipal government, and all over this country, extravagance in the expenditure of public money is complained of. Those who advocate extravagant expenditures seem to forget that every dollar

squandered is collected from the people and represents the labor and privation of our citizens, and that every dollar unnecessarily collected suggests an unnecessary expenditure. Money collected from the people in time of peace beyond the amount absolutely necessary to support the economical administration of the Government is robbery. [Applause.]

Sir, there is in my judgment no justification for the enormous increase for the past thirty years in the expenditures of this Government, but there is every reason for a reduction. Such enormous increases justify alarm. We should resist this ever-growing extravagance that has grown up in our country; we should shut down this flood gate of extravagant and unnecessary appropriations or there will be demoralization in the near future. We can not raise our voice too soon, for with this unheard-of increase in the expenditure of the people's money for the past thirty years it is not possible that there can be that purity in public affairs which should exist.

If we are to have honesty and integrity in the administration and conduct of the affairs of this Government we must have economy in our expenditures. We were taught this lesson in the purer and better days of this Republic, and such has been the teachings of history. Extravagant appropriations always breed corruption, which means death to the Government, while economy and integrity in the administration of public affairs is the very foundation on which our Government must rest.

The expenditures of this Government must either be extravagant or economical; there is no middle ground. If economical, integrity and honor will direct and control the affairs of the Government; if extravagant, the people will groan under excessive taxes. We can not have purity in our Government unless we have economy. The standard of public honor will decrease year after year as the unnecessary, base, and extravagant expenditures increase.

Speaking for the people I have the honor to represent and the Democratic party to which I belong, I assert that in times like these, with want and hardship pressing upon the people, that I favor the lowest possible appropriations necessary for the support and economical administration of the Government. If the integrity and purity of this Government are to be preserved, it must be honestly and economically administered.

Mr. Chairman, the necessities—the absolute necessities—of a large portion of our people cry out for economy.

We have heard a great deal at this session of Congress about keeping down appropriations, and I do hope that this will be done. It seems to me, sir, that we have reached the limit, and it is time to call a halt.

If we listen to the heads of Departments who make recommendations, and who are always ready to furnish some excuse why appropriations should be increased, we will never make a reduction.

Sir, upon the slightest pretense or the smallest appropriation for any purpose we are met in the next Congress with a new division or bureau, with a chief and a full set of officials, and a recommendation for additional appropriations to carry it on.

This has gone on until to-day we have an army of officeholders and employees for this Government, a large number of whom are unnecessary and a dead expense.

In this connection it would be of interest to know the great increase in the number of officeholders in this country, and for the purpose of giving this House and the country some idea of how great this increase of the officeholding class has been I will briefly review the same from 1820 to the present time.

It is difficult to find any authentic data on this subject, but from the best I can gather I find that we had 8,694 officeholders in the service of the Government in 1820.

In 1830 we had	12,785
In 1840 we had	17,740
In 1850 we had	31,149
In 1860 we had	38,625
In 1870 we had	69,700
In 1880 we had	103,140
In 1890 we had	183,488

If you will take the census from 1820 to 1860, you will find, by comparing the same with the above statement, that about one person out of every thousand in the United States held a Government job up to 1860, but since that time the Republican party has so increased the number of officeholders of this Government that four persons in every thousand hold a Government office.

This demonstrates one of two propositions: That the average officeholder at this time possesses only one-fourth of the capacity of those who held offices from 1820 to 1860, or that we have a great many more officers than we need, and a trip through the Departments will convince any member of this House, from the number of heels he will find on top of desks, that the latter proposition is true at least, and, in my opinion, both.

Why should we have four people out every thousand drawing

a Government salary now when we only had one out of every thousand before 1860? There can be no valid reason offered for it.

The greatest increase, however, in the office-holding class is found in the number of employees of the Government here in Washington. I find that the several Departments had, in 1820, 332 employees here in Washington, and in 1853 there were 722, showing an increase from 1820 to 1853, a period of thirty-three years, of 390. I find that for the thirty-two years from 1853 to 1885 the number of employees increased from 722 to 12,717, being an increase of 11,995.

In 1889 we had 16,234 people employed in the Departments here in Washington. In 1891 this number had increased to 23,144, and the number increased from 1891 to 1896 until we had, in the latter year, 27,576. The increase from 1885 to 1896 was at the rate of 1,363 employees each year, or 113 each month, and when we consider that we have more people holding Government jobs here in Washington than we have soldiers in the Army of the United States, we can more fully appreciate why this office-holding class is referred to so often as "an army of officeholders."

In this connection I desire to say, sir, that while I favor and have at all times voted for and advocated economy in the expenditure of public money in times of peace, yet, if necessary for the defense of the nation, I stand ready to vote for any necessary appropriation that is needed for national defense, and should the present crisis result in war with Spain there will be no braver or more loyal defenders of our flag than the men of the South who wore the gray, and their descendants. [Applause.]

Sir, the history of the United States shows conclusively that the Democratic party has had a uniform policy of economically administering the affairs of the Government, and in opposing the unnecessary increase in public offices; while the Republican party has had a uniform policy of extravagant appropriations, reckless expenditures, and an unnecessary increase in the number of public offices. The position of the Democratic party, since its foundation, upon these two questions to which I have referred, and which I so fully indorse, is expressed in its last platform at Chicago, in the following language:

We denounce the profligate waste of money wrung from the people by oppressive taxation, and the lavish appropriations of recent Republican Congresses, which have kept taxes high, while the labor that pays them is unemployed and the products of the people's toil are depressed in price, till they no longer repay the cost of production. We demand a return to that simplicity and economy which befits a Democratic government, and a reduction in the number of useless offices, the salaries of which drain the substance of the people.

[Applause.]

The people of this country will soon be called upon to select between the party now in power, that has built up trusts and monopolies from one end of this country to the other, and which advocates the single gold standard and high tariff taxation, and the old Democratic party that brought our people the boon of self-government, that has always favored low taxes and economy, and that has been the uncompromising enemy of monopolies and privileged classes, the friend of the honest laboring man, and the advocate of both gold and silver, the money of the Constitution.

Sir, with a national existence that dates back to the very birth of this Republic, and during all the storms through which this country has passed, the banner of the Democratic party has been continuously borne by the legions of patriotic American citizens as the proud emblem of the very corner stone and foundation of this Republic. Upon its record and history and our principles and admitted economy in public affairs, together with our platform adopted at Chicago, we shall go before the people of this Union.

That we shall elect a majority of the members of this House in the fall election, I believe. That we shall elect the next President of the United States, I am confident. We will witness then, indeed, a united people, enjoying all the blessings of constitutional government, administered in the interests and devoted to the honor and welfare of our whole country. [Loud applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. MEYER of Louisiana. I yield to the gentleman from New York [Mr. DRIGGS].

Mr. DRIGGS Mr. Chairman, Boswell, in his immortal Life of Johnson, records the eminent doctor's views upon controversy as follows:

Why, sir, when you wish a man to have that belief which you think is of infinite advantage, you wish well to him; but your primary consideration is your own quiet. * * * No, sir; every man will dispute with great good humor upon a subject in which he is not interested. I will dispute very calmly upon the probability of another man's son being hanged, but if a man zealously enforces the probability that my own son will be hanged, I shall certainly not be in good humor with him.

I can conceive of no terser language with which to preface my remarks than the above, for respecting most highly and veneration greatly the reasoning faculties and abilities of the members of this House, I trust with the small arguments in my power that I may be able to somewhat prove that increase of the Navy and national defense would be to your "infinite advantage;" and I also believe it is possible to most conclusively show that your primary

consideration for your "own quiet," mutual advantage, progressive greatness, and expansion and extension of commerce absolutely demand that the Navy be considerably augmented and strengthened; therefore I wish well to you.

We do not care about the broils and quarrels of other nations, but if they attempt to quarrel with us, we should be prepared to creditably defend ourselves. My first proposition is: If the commerce of a nation is to be maintained, legislators must grant defense appropriations commensurate with its growth and development, or not only will that commerce fade away and disappear, but the nation itself will decline and eventually fall.

From the earliest ages to the present time history supplies proof upon proof of the absolute truth of this proposition, but in the limited time I have for the discussion of this entire subject it is impossible to cite many of them.

The Phoenicians were the greatest navigators and merchants of antiquity, and for nearly five hundred years their seamanship and commercial activity made them almost absolute masters of the Mediterranean. Finally, however, the merchants and aristocracy, grown richer and richer, refused to spend sufficient money for war ships for the protection of their merchant marine, and this wonderful nation then fell an easy prey to Alexander the Great.

You all remember how Demosthenes plead with the Athenians, in the speeches known as the Philippics, to provide more ships, appropriate more money, or else become conquered by Philip. No heed was paid to the advice, Greece was conquered, and the commercial party was the cause of the subjugation. Hannibal tells us that Rome became mistress of the world because the Carthaginians refused to increase and strengthen their naval force.

The Egyptians, too, during their five thousand years of existence, were repeatedly conquered by maritime powers.

It is only from the deepest vaults of history's storehouse that we are able to portray the greatness and grandeur of ancient Rome, and knowing that her decline and fall are directly attributable to the refusal of her merchants, traders, and pleasure seekers to allow moneys to be appropriated for an increase of her army and navy, we can not but think that here is a terrible example of what may follow insufficient protection to commerce.

During mediæval history one of the most powerful trade confederations that ever existed was the Hanseatic League. This league was a union of many cities banded together for the extension of commerce and the protection of their fleets from piratical attacks. Their great fleets of merchantmen, convoyed by powerful sloops and ships of war, were indeed remarkable evidences of the enterprise of the promoters of the league.

After an existence of four hundred years, through avarice, greed, and foolish sense of safety, the directors failed to provide a sufficient number of war ships for the protection of the fleets, and the league fell, destroyed by the freebooters and pirates of the sea.

Assuming that the epoch of modern history begins with the year 1485, we are able to show the rise and fall of three great powers, the rise being directly attributable to power on the sea, and the fall attributable to failure to strengthen that power when required.

Who has not read the story of the rise and fall of the Dutch Republic? Who has not admired the enterprise, pluck, and push of the Dutch?

Shortly after its birth the republic became the most powerful maritime power in the world. Time and again its fleets, under command of the famous admirals, De Ruyter and Van Tromp, coped successfully with not only the fleets of England, but also with the combined fleets of France and England, and also Spain and France. What was the result? Colony after colony fell into her possession; home and over-sea trade increased so rapidly that in less than one hundred years after its inception the republic is said to have had over 10,000 ships (merchant) engaged in over-sea traffic (by this I mean exports and imports collectively), over 400,000 people made their livelihood through shipping, and her trade amounted to over \$150,000,000 annually.

Notwithstanding oft-recurring wars, the nation was enormously prosperous, and as Mahan truly says, it "only shows how the harvest of the sea can lift up to wealth and power a country intrinsically weak and without resources." For about one hundred years this condition of affairs continued, and then her people became involved in party strife, one party favoring the maintenance of the navy and the other the strengthening of the army, while each, in a very half-hearted manner, favored small appropriations for the other. The result was the introduction to the world of political contention over the question of national defense and protection. Sectional and political jealousy grew apace, and the consequence thereof can easily be seen. Neither the navy nor army was strengthened in time of peace.

The commercial aristocracy, feeling satisfied behind their counters and money bags, laughed at the idea of any more wars and used their influence to procure large sums of public moneys for

measures other than the common defense, or, as De Witt, one of the greatest statesmen that ever lived, and a Dutchman, says:

Never in time of peace and from fear of rupture will they take resolutions strong enough to lead them to pecuniary sacrifice beforehand. The character of the Dutch is such that unless danger stares them in the face they are indisposed to lay out money for their own defense. I have to do with a people who, liberal to profusion where they ought to economize, are often sparing to avarice where they ought to spend.

Mr. Chairman, we must not forget that these Dutch burghers were as brave and courageous as any people that ever lived. The world knows how they loved their country, for there is not another instance in history equal to the opening of the dikes so that their beloved soil might be kept from falling into the possession of their enemies. Notwithstanding all this, they refused to appropriate moneys for increased naval defense, and Holland lost her enviable position among the nations of the world, grass grew in the streets of Amsterdam, and the glory and greatness of the Dutch Republic disappeared.

Ah, gentlemen, heed well the story of the Dutch Republic ere you take final action upon this naval appropriation bill.

If time permitted, I could cite the fading of Spain and Portugal as the other evidence of what may follow lack of naval appropriation.

On the other hand, what magnificent and permanent success has remained with England and France, who have always lived up to this truism: Adequate naval protection is essential if commercial greatness is to be enduring.

Alfred the Great was probably the first English Sovereign to recognize the importance of maintaining a navy. From his reign to the time of Cromwell it developed slowly and spasmodically, and then began systematic growth and a definite policy was adopted. An eminent author, speaking of this period, this dawn of the era of England's commercial greatness, says:

Under Cromwell the English navy sprang rapidly into a new life and vigor. * * * England's rights or reparations for her wrongs were demanded by her fleets throughout the world. * * * Nor were equally strong peaceful measures for the growth of English trade and shipping forgotten.

Cromwell's celebrated navigation act naturally boomed her commerce. This act provided—

That all imports into England or her colonies must be conveyed exclusively in vessels belonging to England herself or to the country in which the products carried were grown or manufactured.

The master mind of the stern old statesman saw how necessary it was to link navy and commerce together into an unbreakable chain, with each link absolutely dependent on the other for collective strength. Almost without interruption from the date of the navigation act, England has been "mistress of the seas," and her commercial power has grown and increased until her exports and imports are so much greater than those of any other nation that she is also the mistress of the commercial world.

Every historian of note records that the great success of England must be attributed to her naval policy. Practically whatever her people and merchants have asked in the line of war ships her Houses of Parliament have granted. A German historian, speaking of this characteristic, says:

The English navy simply keeps pace with the absolute requirements of the people, from whom it originally sprang, and thus the maritime power of the country becomes identified with them step by step in their national growth.

The absolute truth of this declaration is shown by the following table, recording as it does the naval strength of the nation at various periods:

Date.	Ships of all classes.	Men.	Tons.
1578.....	24	6,700	10,506
1608.....	42	8,346	17,055
1658.....	157	21,910	57,000
1702.....	272	40,000	159,020
1760.....	412	70,000	321,134
1793.....	498	45,000	433,236
1800.....	767	135,000	688,744
1808.....	869	143,800	892,800
1814.....	901	146,000	966,000
1850.....	585	48,000	570,000
1890.....	373	65,000	680,000

While the above table seems remarkable, the following showing is even more so:

Date.	Tons.	Date.	Tons.
1825.....	202,870	1870.....	5,690,789
1835.....	605,200	1880.....	6,574,313
1845.....	1,312,020	1890.....	7,978,538
1855.....	4,082,900	1895.....	8,988,450
1860.....	4,658,687		

Note carefully this enormous development.

Commerce.

Date.	Imports.	Exports.	Total.
1799.....	£24,066,700	£35,908,850	£59,975,550
1840.....	60,540,000	102,705,000	163,245,000
1854.....	152,389,053	115,821,022	268,210,145
1866.....	295,290,274	238,905,682	534,195,956
1870.....	305,257,493	244,080,577	549,338,070
1894.....	429,433,000	237,358,000	666,791,000

Do these last two tables not show what marvelous results may follow when commerce is taken from the realm of insufficient naval protection and placed under the dominion of strong fleets and liberal laws. Merchant marine increased forty-four fold and commerce eleven fold.

FRANCE.

Richelieu, in 1638, realizing that France could never become truly great unless her sea power developed, endeavored to build a navy, but met with little success, and it was not until the reign of Louis XIV that a definite policy of naval aggrandizement was inaugurated, and then through the ability of Colbert, one of the greatest ministers France has ever had, great life and vigor was given to the development of the fleet.

Colbert's policy was not one of war, for in his memoirs we are repeatedly told that his sole object was "the commercial prosperity and development" of his country, and this was impossible without merchant marine and a sufficient force of war ships to protect that marine and the trade treaties with foreign countries. When Colbert first took office France had only 30 war ships of small size. Twenty-two years later the fleet had increased to 107 ships of the line, not including many smaller vessels. These twenty-two years have frequently been called the "Golden Age" of France. Commerce and the merchant marine grew apace.

In the latter part of the reign of Louis XIV all this changed and the navy rapidly dwindled away, for Louis, to quote from Mahan, "could not or would not see that men-of-war were of little use and life if the peaceful shipping and the industries by which they were supported perished." After the death of Louis XIV the naval power of France dwindled away, and with its disappearance the colonies she had so gloriously developed were lost to her forever.

Finally in 1793 the people arose as one man and demanded the restoration of the navy. The Government, realizing that "the voice of the people is as the voice of God," answered the cry, and from that time France has ever been the second naval power of the world, and her greatness is now established on so firm a foundation that in all probability her power will never again be shaken.

Prior to 1793 French naval development was independent of the desires of the people and depended almost wholly on the commercial and war projects of ambitious monarchs. After 1793 the wishes of the people governed the development; for, with the bitter lesson of 1634-1793 ever before them, the warm-hearted, France-loving Frenchmen would rise in their might against any faction or party that dared attempt a decrease in its naval force.

Prosperous France, our former ally and present friend! Long may she retain her power and strength!

From these historical pictures I have endeavored to prove my first proposition, and, Mr. Chairman, let us not forget that we members of Congress are a sort of a council, an advisory board, not only for the interests of our constituency but for the far greater welfare, growth, and development of our country; and does it not behoove us to consider well the lessons taught by history, remembering the fate of the Dutch Republic, and be careful that the trust reposed in us is well administered? We know of the greatness of England and France, and as we also know that that greatness has come from sea power, let us develop the Navy and build up our coast defenses for the continued success of our commerce and national strength.

UNITED STATES.

Mahan says:

Naval strategy has for its end to found, support, and increase, as well in peace as in war, the sea power of a country.

The founders and early developers of our Union thoroughly appreciated this and from the very beginning adopted a liberal naval policy. What was the result? Our growth and increase in strength were more than phenomenal; they were wonderful. In commerce we took almost at once a place side by side with the richest and oldest nations of the earth and bade fair to leave them all far behind.

Of course the French Revolution and the Napoleonic wars had a great deal to do with our rapid progress, but if our statesmen had not passed liberal laws for the development of our merchant marine and granted generous appropriations for the Navy, we would not have had the means of carrying exports and imports or the war ships for the protection of our fleets of merchantmen.

In 1821 it was said by an eminent English author that—

The United States, though without Eastern possessions, have obtained a high position in trade from their commercial activity and naval superiority.

Down to 1840 two-thirds of the foreign vessels trading to America were of American build. Our ships were not only the pride of the nation but were the envy of the world, for no nation was able to compete with us in this our chosen industry. From 1840 to 1858 our clipper ships were the queens of the seas, and the American flag was known in every port around the globe. Grant-ham, the English author of the Navigation Papers, written in 1870, says:

It will be recollected that previous to the development of steamships the preponderance of shipping was falling rapidly into the hands of American shipowners. Thirty years ago one of the great objects of interest at the docks in Liverpool was the American sailing packets, and it was considered that a stranger had missed one of the lions of the port who had not visited these celebrated ships.

The same prestige was felt everywhere, on the Atlantic and Pacific oceans, in India, China, and in all the best trades American ships were most in demand.

Ah, those were indeed the halcyon days of American shipping; and, Mr. Chairman, there is not an American to-day who does not look back with pride at the time when the American flag was supreme upon the seas, and there is not one of us who would not hail with satisfaction the dawn of a new era restoring American vessels to the proud pinnacle of greatness held by them in 1845. Ah, Mr. Chairman, the Democratic party may have committed many errors, but it was the Republican party that drove our shipping from the seas.

In 1845 the tonnage of our merchant marine was 2,417,072; 1855, 5,212,001; 1860, 5,853,868; 1880, 4,068,034; 1885, 4,265,934.

Number of United States ships on the Navy list and commissioned.

Year.	Num-ber.	Commis-sioned for serv-ice.	Year.	Num-ber.	Commis-sioned for serv-ice.
1835.....	52	1850.....	77	51
1836.....	51	1851.....	74	44
1837.....	53	1852.....	75	50
1838.....	53	1853.....	75	59
1839.....	54	1854.....	73	50
1840.....	63	1855.....	78	46
1841.....	63	1856.....	76	41
1842.....	63	47	1857.....	73	34
1843.....	67	49	1858.....	81	42
1844.....	71	54	1859.....	86	41
1845.....	75	44	1860.....	90	55
1846.....	77	43	1862.....	886	ALL
1847.....	81	52	1870.....	85	49
1848.....	92	66	1880.....	88	25
1849.....	78	47	1897.....	*88	47

* NOTE.—The number 88 includes all ships built and building down to fourth class and gunboats, but not torpedo boats, tugs, sailing ships, or receiving ships.

From this table it is seen that the numerical strength of the Navy has not materially increased since 1847; that is, for the past fifty years. The strength of the individual ships is, of course, much increased; but so has the strength of individual ships in other navies. Our relative strength has decreased. At the close of our war with the South we were the second naval power of the world. To-day we are about the fourth; and at the rate at which Germany and Japan are increasing, we may soon be the sixth.

From 1790 to 1860—seventy years—our merchant-marine tonnage increased during fifty-eight years, and only decreased twelve years. From 1865 to 1887—twenty-two years—it increased only during eleven years. From 1888 to 1897 it has decreased only twice.

Percentage of exports and imports carried in American vessels.

Year.	Per cent.
1825.....	82.3
1845.....	81.7
1850.....	72.5
1860.....	68.5
1880.....	17.4
1896.....	12
1897.....	11

I believe, Mr. Chairman, that where one nation is absolutely dependent upon another for the carrying of its oversea commerce, that nation runs the greatest risk of not only loss of commercial prestige but disaster. I believe that increased naval power will build up and tremendously increase our commerce, for as the magnet draws the needle, so a liberal naval policy draws commerce and merchant marine. When our naval appropriations have been great and our fleets most powerful, you can see from the above tables that we carried our exports and imports in our own ships; and right here I would like to give a table showing the strength of our Navy during most of our history.

We have identically the same number of ships (47) to-day that we had in 1842, and remember that the 47 commissioned ships of 1842 were proportionately as powerful as those of 1897. In 1842 our exports were \$99,877,995 and our imports \$96,075,071, while in 1897 our exports were \$1,050,993,556 and our imports \$764,730,412. Population—1842, 18,000,000; 1897, 73,000,000. Now that we are so rich and powerful, should we not be far more powerful upon the seas than we were in 1842? You say economy is your watchword;

but are you not willing to appropriate a larger percentage of your gross revenue for the Navy and national defense than you have in recent years? You could not be accused of extravagance if you did, for such a charge would malign, would cast reflection upon every statesman from 1794 to 1860, for the following table shows what percentage of the revenues have been alone spent on the Navy:

	Per cent.
1794 to 1820, inclusive, average per annum	14½
1821 to 1840, inclusive	15½
1841 to 1860, inclusive	18½
1861 to 1867, war period	
1868 to 1883, inclusive	2½
1884 to 1897, inclusive	3½
1794 to 1860, inclusive (average)	16½
1868 to 1897, inclusive (average)	3½
Greatest per cent, 1860	31
Lowest per cent, 1879	1½

I know that this is not the age of sentiment, but of practical consideration. Times may be different, but the statesmen of to-day are certainly not more far-seeing or ubiquitous than those of 1794 to 1860. Think of the great men who graced House and Senate and brought lasting honor to American institutions during that period. Think of the great Presidents, and yet they were willing to appropriate an average of 16½ per cent for naval development, while those of the last thirty years have only appropriated an average of 3½ per cent. Is this wisdom, or is it folly? I am inclined to think the latter, for we are not willing to accept that wise precept left us by our fathers, "In time of peace prepare for war." Our fathers believed, too, that "a peaceful, gain-loving nation is not far-sighted, and far-sightedness is needed for adequate military preparation." They knew it, because preparation for war would have prevented the war of 1812.

Read what Presidents Jackson and Polk had to say about the Navy, and you will then see that the ideas held by them are those of the nations of the earth to-day, excepting the United States:

[Messages and Papers of the Presidents, 1817-1833, Richardson, volume 2, page 526.]

ANDREW JACKSON'S SECOND ANNUAL MESSAGE.

Our position in relation to the most powerful nations of the earth and the present condition of Europe admonish us to cherish this arm [the Navy] of our national defense with peculiar care. Separated by wide seas from all those governments whose power we might have reason to dread, we have nothing to apprehend from attempts at conquest. It is chiefly attacks upon our commerce and harassing inroads upon our coast against which we have to guard.

A naval force adequate to the protection of our commerce always afloat, with an accumulation of the means to give it a rapid extension in case of need, furnishes the power by which all such aggressions may be prevented or repelled. With the aid of Congress, in a few years the Government will be prepared in case of emergency to put afloat a powerful navy of new ships almost as soon as old ones could be repaired.

[Messages and Papers of the Presidents, 1841-1849, Richardson, volume 4, pages 412, 413, 414.]

JAMES K. POLK'S FIRST ANNUAL MESSAGE.

I refer you to the report of the Secretary of the Navy for the present condition of the branch of the national defense and for grave suggestions having for their object the increase of its efficiency and a greater economy in its management.

It is believed that at all our foreign stations the honor of our flag has been maintained. I am happy to add that the display of maritime force which was required by the events of the summer has been made wholly within the usual appropriations for the service of the year, so that no additional appropriations are required.

The commerce of the United States, and with it the navigation interests, have steadily and rapidly increased since the organization of our Government, until, it is believed, we are now second to but one power in the world, and at no distant day we shall probably be inferior to none. Exposed as they must be, it has been a wise policy to afford to these important interests protection with our ships of war distributed in the great highways of trade throughout the world. For more than thirty years appropriations have been made and annually expended for the gradual increase of our naval forces. In peace our Navy performs the important duty of protecting our commerce, and in the event of war will be, as it has been, a most efficient means of defense.

The successful use of steam navigation on the ocean has been followed by the introduction of war steamers in great and increasing numbers into the navies of the principal maritime powers of the world. A due regard to our own safety and to an efficient protection to our large and increasing commerce demands a corresponding increase on our part. No country has greater facilities for the construction of vessels of this description than ours or can promise itself greater advantages for their employment. They are admirably adapted to the protection of our commerce, to the rapid transmission of intelligence, and to the coast defense.

Whatever may have been our policy in the earlier stages of the Government, when the nation was in its infancy, our shipping interests and commerce comparatively small, our resources limited, our population sparse and scarcely extending beyond the limits of the original thirteen States, that policy must be essentially different now that we have grown from three to more than twenty millions of people; that our commerce, carried in our own ships, is found in every sea, and that our territorial boundaries and settlements have been so greatly expanded. Neither our commerce nor our long line of coast on the ocean and on the lakes can be successfully defended against foreign aggression by means of fortification alone.

They are essential at important commercial and military points, but our chief reliance for this object must be on a well-organized, efficient Navy. The benefits resulting from such a Navy are not confined to the Atlantic States. The productions of the interior which seek a market abroad are directly dependent on the safety and freedom of our commerce. The occupation of the Balize below New Orleans by a hostile force would embarrass

if not stagnate the whole export trade of the Mississippi and affect the value of the agricultural products of the entire valley of that mighty river and its tributaries

It has never been our policy to maintain large standing armies in time of peace. They are contrary to the genius of our free institutions, would impose heavy burdens on the people, and be dangerous to public liberty. Our reliance for protection and defense on the land must be mainly on our citizen soldiers, who will be ever ready, as they ever have been ready in times past, to rush with alacrity at the call of their country to her defense. This description of force, however, can not defend our coast, harbors, and inland seas, nor protect our commerce on the ocean or the lakes. These must be protected by our Navy.

Considering an increased naval force, and especially of steam vessels, corresponding with our growth and importance as a nation, and proportioned to the increased and increasing naval power of other nations, of vast importance as regards our safety, and the great and growing interests to be protected by it, I recommend the subject to the favorable consideration of Congress.

EFFECT OF NAVAL WAR UPON AGRICULTURAL INTERESTS.

In case of war any of the great naval powers would have no difficulty in blockading every one of our great seaports, from Maine to Texas and from California to Washington. This is so generally admitted that it required no extended argument for proof. Therefore does not sea power and increase of the Navy become as important and essential to the rural or farm districts as to the districts along the coast?

You may say destroy the seaport cities and the manufacturers and farmers will rebuild them; but I say destroy your seaports and the manufacturers and farmers will suffer equally with we of the coast. This may seem a bold proposition, but figures will prove its accuracy, and I repeat that my contention is that development of the Navy is of as great importance to the farmer and manufacturer as it is to the residents of the coast. Assuming, for argument, that we were at war with either England, France, Germany, or Italy—I do not consider Spain, for we are far more powerful than she—ere thirty days passed all our great ports of export would be so thoroughly blockaded that commerce would be literally paralyzed.

It may be that I am assuming too much; that you are not willing to admit the idea of a blockade. Very good. I will show, then, what would certainly keep commerce from entering even the seaports. Many of the great railroads have their termini in and near the city of New York. The tracks, warehouses, and elevators of these roads could easily be destroyed by an invading fleet. Take, if you please, the West Shore, New York Central, Pennsylvania, Delaware, Lackawanna and Western, Erie, and Jersey Central railroads. The tracks of the first skirt the Hudson River from Haverstraw to Albany; those of the second from New York to Albany; the third extending from the Hudson River to Newark, where the bridge over the Passaic River could be demolished; the fourth and fifth, from the Hudson River to the Bergen tunnel, a distance not exceeding 3 miles, and the sixth from Jersey City to Elizabeth, including the long bridge over Newark Bay.

On the east we have the New York, New Haven and Hartford Railroad, whose tracks for seventy-odd miles skirt Long Island Sound.

Not only would every foot of these tracks be destroyed, but the road beds would be almost irretrievably ruined. While New York is only one illustration, similar conditions exist in and about Portland, Boston, Philadelphia, Baltimore, Norfolk, and practically every other city on the Atlantic and Pacific coasts. Therefore the surplus agricultural products and manufactures of the Southern, Middle, and Western States would have absolutely no outlet.

By referring to the tables in appendix you will see the results that would ensue.

Though not desiring to burden you with a full argument based on these six tables, I do desire to go into detail of the year 1890. The agricultural exports for that year amounted to \$629,820,808, this amount being 73.69 per cent of our total exports. The total value, raised throughout the entire United States, of the ten main crops, wheat, corn, cotton, etc., was \$2,460,107,454. Thus the amount exported was a trifle under 25 per cent of the entire crop.

Number of workers and value of farms, etc.

Workers	6,297,580
Value produced	\$2,460,107,454
Wages	\$1,385,467,000
Value of farms	\$13,279,252,649
Value of farm implements, machinery, and live stock	\$2,703,015,040
	\$15,982,267,689

Now, 25 per cent having been shown to be the amount of total production exported, what relation does it bear to the above table? Why, simply that your production must of necessity be reduced that amount, and this would mean loss of employment to 1,574,395 workers and (figuring five persons in all dependent on one worker for maintenance) loss of support to 7,871,975 dependents, and this does not include workers engaged in manufacturing or transportation, and for these I would add, say, 1,000,000, and together forming a total of 8,871,975, or about 8½ per cent of our total population.

Loss in wages to agricultural workers would amount to \$346,-866,900 and depreciation of farm values amounting to \$3,995,566,-921. These last two estimates do not include manufacturers and transporters' wages and valuation, and none of the above figures include the wholesale and retail dealers in other occupations and more or less dependent on the classes mentioned, for I know of no way to compute the above, but I think it reasonable to allow one dependent for each of those in the occupations figured upon, and this would give a total of 17,743,950 dependents not living anywhere near the coast who would be directly interested, affected, and thrown out of employment by any blockade that lasted for three months or longer. The depreciation of property would amount to \$8,000,000,000.

The following table gives all the coast cities, and allows for places apt to be injured or destroyed by an invading fleet of war ships. The population is estimated January 1, 1898, and the assessed estimated values from the various tax rolls and without allowing anything for contents of buildings. These figures having been compiled by the Brooklyn Daily Eagle, I believe them to be accurate.

Population and value of real estate of the coast cities of the United States.

Coast cities.	Population.	Real estate.
Portland	42,000	\$26,182,085
Boston	550,000	803,890,550
Providence	154,000	135,805,490
New Haven	112,000	59,000,000
Bridgeport	65,000	51,640,636
Hartford	72,000	39,398,785
Greater New York	3,389,753	2,377,277,820
Jersey City	200,000	82,415,220
Hoboken	57,000	35,978,429
Newark	250,000	137,000,000
Yonkers	40,000	30,711,000
Newburg	25,000	9,173,430
Albany	100,000	58,768,650
Troy	64,000	42,411,511
Philadelphia	1,340,000	840,498,650
Baltimore	625,270	280,646,932
Washington, D. C.	277,117	181,256,284
Richmond, Va.	100,000	144,094,166
Savannah, Ga.	65,000	24,433,678
New Orleans, La.	275,000	102,025,922
Add on, say	1,000,000	500,000,000
Pacific Coast	8,303,130	5,962,577,218
	500,000	300,000,000
	8,803,130	6,262,577,218

So, from point of population as well as valuation, the inland communities would be more seriously affected than the coast communities. I believe that 80 per cent of our agricultural and manufacturing people would be affected, but I have only attempted to show the number of people who would be absolutely deprived of all revenue and who would become dependent on their various communities for maintenance and support. I believe, though, that there is a far greater question involved in this discussion. I believe there should be no question of locality where national progress is to be considered.

If the interior requests appropriations for river development, increased postal facilities, public buildings, or agricultural investigation, we of the coast should listen to their appeal and grant what they ask. On the other hand, when we ask for increased coast fortifications and more battle ships, cruisers, and torpedo boats, the interior should heed our request. It seems to me that we would thus be fair and just to each other and above all else we would be doing unto each other as we would that they should do unto us.

We believe "that in union there is strength," but the only way to establish this strength is for the States to absolutely rely upon each other through the medium of Congress for their development along national lines.

I believe that we should prepare so as to preclude the possibility of war, but if war should come, let us show the world that we are "as great in war as we are in peace." Let us be more than slow to anger, but ever ready to defend and protect the honor of the flag, our "Old Glory."

COMPARISON OF NAVAL DEVELOPMENT ABROAD WITH THAT OF THE UNITED STATES.

The expenditures for increasing the strength of the Navy, as well as the amount expended to maintain the naval forces in an efficient condition, are greater in England than in any of the other countries.

The work laid out for the year just passed (1897) is here given in extracts from the report of the first lord of the admiralty:

Briefly summarized, the leading proposals as set forth in the first lord's statement explanatory of the navy estimates for 1896-1897 are as follows:

Net estimates for the year	£21,823,000
Expenditure on new construction	£7,885,000
Number of officers and men	93,750

Three docks, instead of one, to be built at Gibraltar. These are to be, respectively, 700, 600, and 500 feet in length. The entrances are to be 95 feet broad and 33 feet deep on the sills.

List of chief gunners, chief boatswains, and chief carpenters to be increased.

Pay of warrant officers to be increased.

The *Britannia* to be abolished in favor of a college on shore, with a sloop as tender to it.

An increase of £250,000 in the vote for guns and ammunition.

Increase of the amount proposed in the naval-works bill (to be spread over a series of years) from £3,500,000 to £14,000,000. The chancellor of the exchequer to devote his surplus to this object.

An increase in "personnel" to the extent of 4,900 officers and men, to include 500 royal marines. Total strength of navy, 100,050 men.

Surveys to be made for new docks at the Cape and Mauritius.

Keyham Naval Barracks to be extended.

A new naval hospital, of 600 beds, to be built at Chatham.

THE NEW CONSTRUCTIONS.

The new vessels to be constructed are [in 1897]:

Battle ships (improved <i>Renowns</i>)	5
First-class cruisers	4
Second-class cruisers	3
Third-class cruisers	6
Torpedo-boat destroyers	23
Total	46

The five battle ships to be 300 feet long and 74 feet beam, with a displacement in each case of 12,900 tons and a draft of about 25 feet 6 inches. Two will be built by contract and three in the royal dockyards, one at Portsmouth, one at Chatham, and one at Devonport. They will all have tubular boilers.

The four first-class cruisers will be of the *Diadem* class; length on water line, 455 feet; beam, 69 feet; displacement, 11,000 tons; speed, 22 knots. One will be built in a royal yard; the rest by contract.

The three second-class cruisers will be of the *Talbot* class; length, 350 feet; beam, 53 feet 6 inches; displacement, 5,600 tons; speed, 19.5 knots. All these are to be built by contract.

The six third-class cruisers will be of the *Pelorus* class; length, 300 feet; beam, 36 feet 6 inches; displacement, 2,135 tons; speed, 20 knots. One of these is to be built at a royal dockyard; the remaining five are to be given out to contractors, and, indeed, tenders have already been invited.

Tenders for eight of the destroyers have already been given out, four of them to the Palmer Company, of Yarrow-on-Tyne. They are to be 30-knot craft.

It is interesting, in connection with the present estimates, to compare the expenditure and the number of officers and men voted for each of the past eight years, beginning with the financial year 1889-90, the year of the naval-defense act:

Year.	Total net estimates.	Officers and men.	Increase for the year.
1889-90	£13,685,600	65,405
1890-91	13,786,600	68,800	3,395
1891-92	14,215,100	71,000	2,200
1892-93	14,240,200	74,100	3,100
1893-94	14,240,100	76,700	2,600
1894-95	17,366,100	83,400	6,700
1895-96	18,701,000	88,850	5,450
1896-97	21,822,000	93,750	4,900

THE INCREASE IN PERSONNEL.

There is an increase of 4,900 officers and men provided for in the estimates. They are composed as follows:

Commissioned officers	61
Subordinate officers	30
Warrant officers	8
Seaman-class men	1,800
Artisans	342
Engine-room ratings	2,028
Miscellaneous ratings	131
Royal marines	500

THE INCREASE OF NAVAL ARMAMENTS.

The increase in the amount to be voted for naval armaments compared with last year is £850,000, chiefly composed as follows:

Guns	£369,000
Projectiles and ammunition	348,780
Torpedoes and gun cotton	36,200
Small arms	90,370
Inspections	5,000

During the present financial year—that is, for 1897-98—it is proposed to commence the building of—

Battle ships	4
Third-class cruisers	3
Sloops	2
Twin-screw gunboats	4
Torpedo-boat destroyers	2

Total of new constructions to be undertaken during the year..... 15

With these vessels, England will have under construction during 1898 this exceedingly large list:

Battle ships	14
First-class cruisers	8
Second-class cruisers	9
Third-class cruisers	10
Sloops	2
Twin-screw gunboats	4
Torpedo-boat destroyers	52
Light-draft steamers for special service	8
Royal yacht	1

Thus the total number of vessels of all classes under construction during the year will be 103. Their aggregate displacement tonnage will be about 380,000 tons, and the aggregate indicated

horsepower about 800,000 horsepower. It is anticipated that during the next financial year 66 of these vessels will be completed for service, including 50 torpedo-boat destroyers.

Seven battle ships and eight cruisers have been rearmed with quick-firing guns during the year 1896-97.

The work in the royal dockyards continues to be carried on with zeal and energy. At the naval yards abroad, and especially at Malta, the work has been very heavy, owing to the increase in number and size of the vessels in commission and to the large number of ships recommissioned abroad.

The magnitude of this addition to the English navy may be better understood when it is known that it exceeds in number our entire seagoing ships, even counting in the ships building.

THE NAVY LEAGUE AND THE NAVY ESTIMATES.

The Navy League have issued a memorandum on the navy estimates. They point out that in six weeks' time it will be too late to influence the policy or to strengthen the resolve of the Cabinet, and proceed to make a number of statements, which may be summarized as follows: Great Britain is not only friendless, but the great powers and the United States of America seem to have found a point of agreement in the evolution of a common hatred to this country. With eighty years' start in the race for empire, Britain has peacefully secured those things which other powers would gladly fight to obtain.

The memorandum takes each power separately and shows why, in the opinion of the Navy League, it is hostile to Great Britain. The memorandum goes on to say that the British fleet has lost the standard of strength in battle ships established by Nelson and confirmed by the committee of admirals in 1889. In 1899 we shall be, relatively to France and Russia, in a worse position than we were in 1889, when the naval defense act was passed, while the actual number of battle ships now available is eighteen below the standard of strength considered necessary in 1889, since which date no revised standard has been put forward. Furthermore, English battle ships of 14,000 tons must be compared with French ships of only 11,000 tons, because of the greater distance to be traveled by British men-of-war, and the consequent need of more coal capacity.

To keep the French alone in port we require at least 60 battle ships. We have 52 built and building. In 1794 Great Britain had 145 ships of the line against 77 French, while the year before Trafalgar we had 175 ships of the line against 50 French. To-day 10 of our 52 battle ships are still armed with obsolete muzzle-loading guns. Our deficiency in cruisers is also very marked. Our officers and seamen are insufficient to man the fleet we already possess, and the deficiency of 700 lieutenants and 300 engineers only makes worse the fact that there is no reserve to repair the waste of war. Two years' training are required to make an able seaman; five years a lieutenant. The average age of the men actively responsible for the control, mobilization, and command of our fleets is 53. Nelson died at 47.

Turning now to the strength of the English navy, we see that it comprises:

Armored vessels (52 of these are first-class battle ships)	65
Cruisers	232
Torpedo boats	258

During the maneuvers of the year 1896 there were 105 vessels and 20,500 men took part in the drill, or, in other words, there were more than double the number of men and as many ships as the United States has at its command engaged in this summer drill.

During the last year the strength of the navy was further increased by the addition of 6,300 officers and men, divided as follows:

Officers	121
Seamen	2,400
Engine-room artificers	265
Stokers	2,000
Marines	1,000
Artisans	514
Total added	6,300

Making total force 100,050 officers and men.

This was further increased by the addition of—

Medical officers	34
Pay officers	30
Chaplains and naval instructors	10

Besides the great amount to be spent by England on her navy afloat, she is looking into the future and preparing fortified bases of supply and refit.

At Gibraltar three large docks and means of repair are being built.

At Dover is being constructed a harbor for supplies and rendezvous. Here the works to be executed are most extensive—13,370 feet of breakwater, inclosing 610 acres at low water, and anchorage in over 5 fathoms for 20 first-class battle ships, together with a large number of torpedo boats.

At Hongkong she is also to increase her naval facilities, and the same at Bermuda, and at Kingston, Jamaica.

NAVAL EXPENDITURE ON SEAGOING FORCES.

Sir Courtenay Boyle supplies some interesting particulars in regard to the aggregate naval expenditure on the seagoing forces of various countries. The total for the United Kingdom during 1895-96 was £21,264,377. In addition to this, India and many of

the self-governing colonies expended considerable sums. The expenditure of France on its seagoing force was considerably larger than that of any other European State. The aggregate for 1896 was £10,877,279. The Russian Empire comes next, with an expenditure of £6,440,666. Germany follows, with a total of £4,372,068. Italy nearly equals Germany, with an aggregate of £4,129,984.

The expenditure of Spain was £937,742; Austria-Hungary, £1,122,389; Netherlands, £1,313,169, and Portugal, £649,944. The aggregate naval expenditure on the seagoing force of the United States amounted to £6,180,132. Japan ran the United States very close, with an expenditure of £5,945,919. The expenditure of Brazil was £1,053,486 and that of the Argentine Republic £823,435. This sum is stated to be not sufficiently authenticated, and in regard to Chile the expenditure can not be given.

NAVAL EXPENDITURE AND MERCANTILE MARINE.

The Parliamentary return moved for by Sir John Colomb, M. P., and published a few days ago will be found in this issue (Shipping World, Volume XVII, No. 234, November 24, 1897) in a condensed form. It will satisfy all those who seem to think that the money spent on the Royal navy should bear some relationship to our shipping and over-sea commerce. We may state the—

Maritime trade of the Kingdom at	£822,158,000
That of India at	116,451,005
Self-governing colonies	194,195,168
Other colonies	175,000,000
Value of 10,000,000 tons of shipping	100,000,000
Securities carried yearly, say	250,000,000
Interest in freight carried for foreigners	350,000,000
Making a total of	2,007,804,263

Yes, those stupendous figures will justify a fleet more powerful than the combined navy of the world against us. But surely that is a wild way even for jingoism to reach conclusions. If the other nations of the world had no fighting ships, we should require none. It is our duty to keep a steady eye upon the fleets of all the powers, and take care to maintain a swinging superiority over any probable combination against us. Because Japan spends half her revenue in a single year on fighting ships, we are not called upon to do so. From a revenue of £101,974,000 in 1896 we spent £21,264,377 on the navy. Twenty per cent is a large proportion; it is enough. But in this consideration we must be governed, not by the volume of our over-sea commerce, but by what other powers are doing.

JAPAN'S NAVAL AND MILITARY EXPANSION AND FINANCE.

TOKIO, January 10, 1898.

An examination of the budget for 1897-98, just submitted by the Government to the Diet, enables us to form, for the first time, a clear idea of Japan's scheme of military and naval expansion and of the financial expedients devised by her statesmen to meet the greatly increased outlays involved in carrying out the programme. The dates of the inception and completion of this programme are April 1, 1896, and March 31, 1903, respectively.

At the conclusion of the war with China Japan found herself in possession of a fighting fleet of 43 serviceable vessels, independent of 26 torpedo boats, their aggregate displacement being 78,774 tons. Of these, 10, with an aggregate displacement of 15,055 tons, had been captured from China, namely, an armor-clad turret ship (the *Chenyuen*), of 7,325 tons; 2 steel cruisers, 6 steel gunboats, and 1 wooden gunboat. Prior to the capture of the *Chenyuen* (now called the *Chinyen*) Japan did not possess a line-of-battle ship. Her fleet consisted entirely of comparatively small vessels, namely, 4 cruisers of over 4,000 tons each, 4 of over 3,000 tons, 4 of over 2,000, 6 of over 1,500, and the rest gunboats, sloops, etc. She had already determined, however, to acquire two first-class battle ships, and orders had been placed in England for the *Fujiyama* (12,649 tons) and the *Yashima* (12,517 tons). Further, there were on the stocks two steel cruisers (2,700 and 2,800 tons) and a steel dispatch vessel (1,800 tons).

It may be said, therefore, that her fleet consisted, or would very soon consist, of 48 ships, having an aggregate displacement of 111,240 tons, and 26 torpedo boats. In the scheme of expansion mapped out by the Government after the war it was decided to make an addition of about a hundred per cent to the strength of the fleet. No official declaration was published as to the exact nature of the ships to be added, but it is tolerably certain that the following list is approximately correct:

4 line-of-battle ships of 15,140 tons each	Tons.
4 first-class cruisers of 7,500 tons each	60,560
3 second-class cruisers of 4,850 tons each	30,000
2 third-class cruisers of 3,200 tons each	14,550
8 torpedo gunboats of 1,200 tons each	6,400
1 torpedo depot ship of 6,750 tons	3,800
	6,750

Thus the number of ships to be added was 17 and their displacement 121,860 tons. The programme further included 11 torpedo-boat destroyers and 89 torpedo boats. Hence the Japanese navy would consist in 1906 of 65 ships, with an aggregate displacement of 233,100 tons, 11 torpedo catchers, and 115 torpedo boats. The cost of carrying out this scheme was estimated at 213,250,000 yen, approximately. Of course the whole was not to be spent on ships, it was divided thus:

[The value of the yen is about 97 cents.]

Shipbuilding	Yen.	126,047,975
Armament	66,927,498	
Admiralty, torpedo corps, and naval institute buildings	20,274,525	

Ten years was the time fixed for consummating the scheme, and the expenditures in the various fiscal years were put, in round numbers, thus (the Japanese fiscal year being from April 1 to March 31):

1896-97	Yen.	22,000,000	1901-2	Yen.	15,800,000
1897-98	60,000,000	1902-3	5,150,000		
1898-99	48,000,000	1903-4	2,400,000		
1899-1900	33,800,000	1904-5	530,000		
1900-1	20,800,000	1905-6	72,000		

To meet the outlay of two hundred and ninety-five millions, required to place the army and navy on their new footing, Japan's

chief available asset was the Chinese indemnity—a sum of 345,000,000 yen, in round numbers (omitting interest on deferred installments, since China had the option of avoiding payments of interest by prompt discharge of her whole indebtedness). Plainly, the indemnity, assuming its due receipt, would amply cover the proposed expenditure. But when Japan came to cast up her accounts at the close of the war, she found that a sum of 80,000,000 yen was required to strike a balance. This deficit might have been met by a further issue of the domestic war loan, but the Government preferred to employ the indemnity for the purpose.

Thus reduced, the indemnity would furnish only 265,000,000 yen for purposes of military and naval expansion. Moreover, the indemnity was not yet an asset in hand. A portion of it had been paid, but the remainder could not be counted on with absolute certainty. And there was another point to be considered. Side by side with the above expenditures for nonproductive purposes, the Government desired to adopt measures for promoting the nation's prosperity; as, for example, the establishment of an iron foundry; the expansion of the telephone service; the improvement of State railways; contributions to the capital of industrial and agricultural banks, etc.

The sums required for these objects aggregated 70,500,000 yen, and adding to this 30,000,000 yen (the difference between the remaining portion of the indemnity, namely, 265,000,000 yen, and the outlay on account of military and naval expansion, namely, 295,000,000 yen), it resulted that 100,500,000 yen had to be obtained from some independent source. The Government resolved, therefore, to issue a public-undertakings loan of 135,000,000 yen, spread over seven years, the installments to be 8,250,000 yen in 1896-97, 59,250,000 yen in 1897-98, 41,000,000 yen in 1898-99, 10,250,000 yen in 1898-1900, and so on.

It will be seen from the above that Japan's severest financial strain is to be experienced in the interval between April 1, 1897, and March 31, 1899. Her expenditure on account of military and naval expansion in the fiscal year 1897-98 will aggregate 79,000,000 yen, approximately, and she will have to float a loan of 59,250,000 yen; and her corresponding expenditure during the year 1898-99 will be 61,000,000 yen, when the loan to be floated will be 41,000,000 yen.

The figures here set down are close approximations only. Perplexing details are avoided. As a matter of fact, if China adheres to the programme of payments mapped out in the Shimomoseki treaty and does not avail herself of the option of discharging her indebtedness at an early date, she will have paid by May 8, 1902, not 345,000,000 yen, but 377,000,000. In that case the assets available for Japan's armaments and so forth will be 32,000,000 yen greater than the estimate shown above, and the total funds accruing from the indemnity and the domestic loan will exceed by some 67,000,000 yen the expenditure to be defrayed out of them.

Turning now to the question of a permanent addition to the national revenue for the purpose of supporting the increased expenditure (21,500,000 yen) on account of expanded armaments, we find that four measures have been adopted—namely, the imposition of two new taxes and the increase of two already existing. The new taxes are a registration tax and a trade tax. Without entering into details, it will be sufficient to say that the former is a small impost upon the public registration of all transactions, whether personal, financial, industrial, or commercial; the latter a charge on money-making occupations of every kind. Each tax was originally expected to yield an annual income of about 6,000,000 yen, which estimate experience has thus far shown to be fairly accurate. The two taxes to be increased were the tax on sake (an alcoholic beverage made from rice) and the tax on tobacco. There can be no doubt that in both these taxes the Japanese Government possesses elastic sources of revenue.

THE NAVAL EXPANSION OF JAPAN AND RUSSIA.

Mr. Charles Cramp, of the well-known shipbuilding firm of Philadelphia, has recently been visiting the shipyards of Europe, and he has been surprised at the amount of work which is being done for the Japanese. He comes to the conclusion that unless Russia and the United States awaken to their position in the Pacific, Japan will be able to defy either of them in three years, and both together in less than ten years.

He states that the development of the Japanese navy since the war is not to be described as progress; it is a cyclone, Japan being second only to England in naval activity, being ahead of France, much in advance of Germany, and vastly in the lead of Russia and the United States. Moreover, her ships are all of the best and highest types of naval architecture. During the course of his travels he observed the following ships under construction for the Japanese:

1. Three 14,800-ton battle ships, which are well advanced, at Armstrong's, Thompson's, and the Thames Iron Works, respectively.
2. One battle ship of about 10,000 tons, commencing at Armstrong's.
3. Four first-class armored cruisers of 9,600 tons displacement and 20 knots speed: Two at Armstrong's, one at the Vulcan Works, Stettin, and one at the Forges et Chantiers, France.
4. Two 5,000-ton protected cruisers of about 23 knots speed—one at San Francisco and one at Philadelphia.
5. One protected cruiser of 4,900 tons and about 23 knots, at Armstrong's.
6. Four 30-knot torpedo-boat destroyers, at Yarrow's.
7. Four more of similar type, at Thompson's.
8. Eight 90-ton torpedo boats at the Schichau Works, Elbing.
9. Four more of similar type at the Normand Works, France.

10. Three 3,000-ton protected cruisers of 20 knots, three torpedo gunboats, and a dispatch vessel, at the Imperial dockyard, Yokosuka, Japan.

11. A fifth armored cruiser of the type already described (9,600 tons and 20 knots) to be built at Yokosuka.

And he has no hesitation in saying that the vessels Japan is building in shipyards of England, France, and Germany are superior to any vessels those nations are building for themselves, class for class. Discussing the question against whom the naval power of Japan is destined to be turned, he evidently thinks it will be Russia, for there are many points on which differences may arise between that power and Japan.

The Russian navy estimates for next year have been prepared, and they show a total of £8,250,000 as compared with £5,500,000 five years ago, but of that amount a considerable part is to be spent on naval harbors, barracks, arsenals, and workshops. For instance, £1,750,000 is to be spent on the extension of Vladivostok Harbor, and on ice-breaking steamers to test practically the experiment of keeping it open throughout the winter, and other considerable sums are to be spent on other harbors and on dredgers.

About four and one-half millions are to be spent on shipbuilding, or about £700,000 more than in the previous year. Some of the ships are of large size, but neither in speed nor in equipment do they seem to have been kept so nearly up to date as those being built for Japan. As regards the number of ships, Mr. Cramp comes to the conclusion that in the race for naval supremacy in the Pacific Japan is gaining, while Russia and the United States are losing ground.

It is quite evident that after the next struggle which takes place Japan will be in a stronger position to retain the stakes and the spoils of victory than she was on the conclusion of the war with China, and, therefore, that it is probable when the next treaty comes to be signed at Shimomoseki, the representatives of Japan will not be found so pliant as they were on the occasion of the last, when they had to resign some of their original claims on account of the intervention of European diplomacy. The Japanese show plainly that they have more faith in ships and guns than in diplomacy.

THE GERMAN NAVY BILL.

A special edition of the Imperial Gazette gives an account of the navy bill which will be laid before the Imperial Diet on Tuesday, and accompanies its statement with an explanation and defense of the naval policy of the Government. It turns out that the Government will ask the Reichstag, in addition to voting the estimates for the coming financial year, to express its approval of a programme determining the strength to which it is intended to bring the German navy during the seven financial years 1898-1905.

The present declaration of the Government describes the programme of 1873 as inadequate, and at the same time it demonstrates that even that programme has remained unfulfilled in consequence of the neglect of the Reichstag to supply new ships in place of those which had been superannuated or transferred into inferior classes. Thus the programme of 1873 declared that 14 battle ships were necessary, and at present only 7 are available. Two of the remaining battle ships in existence are in need of repairs which will take a year and a half to execute, and 3 are still on the stocks.

But the Government has now come to the conclusion that, in view of the increased naval strength of other nations and also of the extended interests of the German Empire, it is necessary to make provision for 17 battle ships, furnishing 2 squadrons of 8 ships, together with a flagship for the admiral in command.

What the Imperial Diet is asked to do is summarized in the following statement:

The strength in ships of the German navy, exclusive of torpedo boats, training ships, special-service vessels, and gunboats, is to be fixed as follows: There should be ready for service 17 line-of-battle ships, 8 armored ironclads for coast defense, 9 large and 26 small cruisers. Two battle ships and 3 large and 4 small cruisers are to be provided as a reserve force.

A fleet of this strength is regarded by the German Government as adequate for the duties which may devolve upon it, but at the same time the number of ships proposed is considered to be indispensable. At present, if the ships which will be available for service or which will be in construction on April 1, 1898, be included, the German navy consists of 12 battle ships, 8 ironclads for coast defense, 10 large cruisers, and 23 small cruisers. It follows that, in order to realize the Government plans, 7 battle ships and 2 large and 7 small cruisers must be built before the close of the financial year 1904-05.

The scheme of the Government, of course, takes into account the necessity for always being able promptly to substitute new ships for superannuated ones. The period of efficiency for battle ships and ironclads for coast defense is reckoned at twenty-five years, for large cruisers at twenty years, and for small cruisers at fifteen years. The Imperial Diet will be asked to undertake that the votes for renewals shall invariably find a place in the estimates at the proper time.

The personnel asked for under the bill is as follows:

- (1) One and one-half times the full complement for ships in foreign waters.
- (2) Full complements for the ships belonging to the active home fleet, one-half of the torpedo boats, all training ships, and special service vessels.
- (3) Two-thirds of full complement of engine personnel and one-half of full complements of other personnel for the reserve ships of the home fleet and the second half of the torpedo boats.
- (4) The necessary complements for land service.
- (5) A margin of 5 per cent additional on the whole. The bill sails very close to the wind in its endeavor to meet the objections of the opposition, since it modifies its provisions with regard to these standards by adding that, although the above principles will be authoritative, yet the yearly strength of these different categories of the naval personnel will continue to be determined by the annual estimates.

In preparing the bill the Government has been guided by the following considerations: The naval interests of the German Empire require the presence abroad of 3 large cruisers, 2 in East Asia and 1 for Central and South America; of 10 small cruisers, 3 in East Asia, 3 for Central and South America, 2 for East Africa, and 2 for the South Seas; of 4 gunboats, 2 for East Asia and 2 for West Africa, and of 1 stationary vessel for Constantinople. But in the present year there were available for the purposes enumerated only 2 large and 8 small cruisers, 2 gunboats, and 1 station ship; and in order to provide even this force for foreign service the home fleet had to be deprived of 3 of its best cruisers.

The Government, however, does not withhold from the Imperial Diet and the country an approximate estimate of the amounts of money which will be required for fresh constructions and renewals, as well as a tabular statement of the probable amounts of the yearly estimates for the navy up to the financial year 1904-5. The total expenditure contemplated for the seven years for new constructions, including artillery and torpedo armament, is estimated at 162,000,000 marks. The cost of renewals for the same period will amount to 211,000,000 marks.

The installments not yet voted for ships now in course of construction amount to 63,500,000 marks. When the cost of 3 gunboats and 7 torpedo-boat divisions, together amounting to 45,000,000 marks, as well as the additional expenditure for maintenance and for increase in the personnel, is taken into account, it is estimated that the average annual increase in the ordinary expenditure will be 4,000,000 marks in the coming seven years, as contrasted with 3,000,000 marks average yearly increase during the last seven years.

An important undertaking is given by the Government with regard to the sums to be demanded for fresh constructions. The Imperial Gazette states that at the end of seven years the item of "fresh constructions for the increase of the fleet" will disappear, and all that will subsequently be wanted will be new ships to take the place of superannuated vessels in order to maintain the standard strength of the navy.

Should the bill be carried by the support of the Clericals, that party will assuredly fix upon this declaration and endeavor to bind the Government to it. On the other hand, the improbability that Germany at the end of seven years will be prepared to renounce all idea of attempting anything more than the maintenance of her fleet in the strength which it will then possess may deter many who might otherwise have been inclined to support the bill from accepting it as a final settlement.

The Government, however, endeavors to win over those whom such consideration may cause to hesitate by pointing out that for tactical reasons the standard of 17 battle ships of the line is not only a necessary minimum, but also in a sense an imperative maximum. What is required is the formation of a fighting line, consisting of two tactical units in the form of 2 squadrons of 8 ships each, together with a flagship for the admiral in command.

Of course the necessary attendant cruisers will be required, as well as the indispensable reserves. But the deputies are asked to believe that with the dominating idea of "tactical units" in its mind the Government would never on any account dream of asking them or their successors in a future Reichstag to provide more than the number of ships contemplated in the bill.

As regards cruisers, the official statement points out that, while in England two of these vessels are reckoned necessary for every battle ship and in France the complement of cruisers varies between one and two per battle ship, the German admiralty is going to be content with 6 large and 16 small cruisers to 17 battle ships of the line and 8 ironclads for coast defense.

The following statement is submitted by the Government, the first amount under each heading representing in millions of marks the naval estimates for the current financial year, the succeeding seven amounts representing the contemplated estimates for each financial year from 1898 to 1905:

	1897-98.	1898-99.	1899-1900.	1900-1.	1901-2.	1902-3.	1903-4.	1904-5.
Constructions, including artillery and torpedo armament.....	49.1	51.4	55.5	64.6	64.3	62.4	58.5	53.6
Other nonrecurrent expenditure.....	9.0	7.7	8.7	8.7	8.7	8.7	8.7	8.7
Recurrent expenditure.....	59.4	62.6	67.4	71.4	75.4	79.4	83.4	87.4
Total naval estimates.....	117.5	121.7	131.6	144.7	148.4	150.5	150.6	149.7

Total amount demanded for the septennate, 997,200,000 marks. [A mark equals 24 cents.]

The official statement concludes as follows:

"While safeguarding the rights of the Imperial Diet and abstaining from a resort to fresh sources of revenue, the Government does not aim at a boundless naval plan, but has in view as its sole object the creation within a definite period of a national navy the strength and efficiency of which are estimated within such limits as to render it adequate for the effective maintenance of the interests of the Empire on the seas."

GERMANY'S ACTIVE NAVAL FORCE—EIGHTY-TWO WAR VESSELS TO BE HELD IN READINESS FOR SERVICE.

BERLIN, March 2, 1898.

The budget committee of the Reichstag to-day adopted, in accordance with the Government proposals, section 1, paragraph 1, of the naval bill, fixing the number of ships to be held in readiness for service as follows: A flagship, 18 battle ships, 12 large cruisers, 30 small cruisers, 8 coast-defense iron-

clads, and 13 gunboats, besides torpedo boats, school ships, and small gunboats.

FRANCE.

Budget of the navy.

According to Mr. Kerjégu, reporter of the budget, the propositions of the budget committee are to the effect of opening for the navy department credits amounting to 285,534,427 francs, being an increase over the credits for 1897 of 20,261,404 francs.

This considerable increase of expense is to be applied almost exclusively to those branches whose mission it is to create the fleet and develop its efficiency and strength.

The appropriation for new constructions for 1897 was 85,067,543 francs; for 1898 it will be 102,186,294 francs. The credits necessary for maintenance and repairs for 1897 were 26,205,942 francs; for 1898 they will be 30,570,959 francs. Finally, the sum to be devoted to the organization of points of refitting for the fleet in Corsica and Africa are not inferior to the amount for last year, and for the navy alone they will amount to 1,489,000 francs. [A franc equals 19 cents.]

Nine years are necessary for the programme of shipbuilding now in course of execution, and the credits up to 1905 on this head will be 721,815,000 francs, being an annual average of about 90,000,000 francs, but in 1901 the annual sum will become 120,000,000. The average eight years' outlay will not, however, be more than 2,000,000 francs above that of the six previous years. Refitting of ships in 1898, 1899, and 1900 will cost 20,381,000 francs. A million will be expended at Bizerta for making it a naval station, and considerable works will also be undertaken next year in Corsica, Algeria, and Dakar, making altogether 1,489,000 francs. In 1898 the amount allotted for shipbuilding will be 102,000,000 francs, and for repairs 30,000,000 francs.

The northern squadron will be kept up to its full strength for eight months instead of six, and the Mediterranean reserve division will be kept complete by having ships corresponding to every class in the active squadron. The armament and trial trips of several ships in advance of the estimated date will entail supplementary outlay. M. de Kerjégu maintains that the number of ships is too small, that some are too slow, or of too small a range, and that they are of such different types that scarcely any two are alike.

The cost, moreover, is too great and the period of construction too long. In spite of the reduction shown in the cost of the battle ships *Charles Martel*, *Charlemagne*, and *Gaulois*, the cost is 20 or 25 per cent greater than in England. France, moreover, lacks cruisers. While England has 195 and is building 42, France has 46 and is building 16. The speed, moreover, ought to be increased.

RUSSIA.

The budget of 1897-98 amounts to 68,053,420 rubles (\$52,538,784) for ordinary expenses, plus 6,000,000 rubles (\$4,632,000) incidental expenses for new constructions, plus 15,500,000 rubles (\$11,966,000) for Vladivostok, and contains the following principal items:

	Rubles.
New ships and armament.....	27,304,603
Maintenance.....	11,244,371
Barracks, etc.....	4,014,513
Arsenals.....	4,487,556
Depots on land.....	7,421,595
The arsenal Alexander III, at Libau.....	3,705,420
Vladivostok.....	3,000,000
Total.....	61,178,148

[1 ruble = \$0.772.]

New military port.—Russia is undertaking the construction of a large military port, to be called "Ekaterinograd," on the coast of Lapland, between the White Sea and the Norwegian border. Work has already been commenced on a railway connecting it with St. Petersburg. This port is of great importance to the political world, since it indicates that Russia is no longer satisfied with seeing her squadron imprisoned in the ice of the Baltic, for the new port will be free from ice, owing to the influence of the Gulf Stream.

Russia is also building two ice-breaking ships, the invention of Admiral Makaroff. These are to open a canal for the purpose of allowing her ships to pass from Kronstadt to the White Sea by winter.

The Baltic and Black Sea Canal.—The great canal, the total length of which will be nearly 1,000 miles, and which is to connect the Baltic with the Black Sea, is to be commenced next spring, the surveys for it being in an advanced state. The new waterway is to be 217 feet wide at the ordinary water level, and 117 feet at the bottom. Its depth being 28½ feet, the largest war vessels will be able to pass through it. The canal commences at Riga, and it will follow the course of the river Düna as far as Dünaburg. Here the great excavations will begin which will connect the canal with

Lepel, on the Beresina. That river will be utilized as far as its junction with the Dnieper, when the latter will be followed to its mouth, near Cherson.

Of the whole length of the canal, 875 miles will be canalized rivers, leaving only 125 miles for the excavator. The canal will have eighteen ports—at Riga, Jakobstadt, Dünaburg, Lepel, Borissov, Robruisk, Kieff, Pergaslav, Kuneff, Cherkassy, Krementshug, Verchnedieprovsk, Yekaterinoslav, Alexandrovsk, Nikopol, Berislavi, Aleshki, and Cherson. The enlargement of the two terminal ports of Riga and Cherson, on the Baltic and Black Seas, respectively, is at the present time being actively proceeded with.

The canal is to be substantially constructed so as to allow vessels to proceed at a uniform speed of 6 knots. At that speed it will take one hundred and forty-four hours to make the whole journey. The canal is to be lighted by electricity, to avoid stoppages at night. Its total cost is estimated at £20,000,000, and the work of construction will probably take four years.

CHINA.

Three arsenals are about to be constructed: The first at Kianchan in the north, the second at Namkivan, and the third at Mirsbay, near Hongkong. Plans are also being prepared for 2 battle ships of 12,000 tons each, 2 protected cruisers, 2 gunboats, and 6 torpedo-boat catchers, contracts for which will be given out shortly.

SPAIN.

Under construction, 3 battle ships, 4 armored cruisers, 4 protected cruisers, 4 gunboats, 4 torpedo boats.

In 1880 Germany was not a strong naval power. During that year, however, reconstruction of the war fleet was favorably considered and liberal appropriations were made. Note the consequence: Enormous increase of commerce, tremendous expansion of range of commercial activity, and above all the strengthening of love and pride in the hearts of the Germans for the Fatherland. Germany's example can well be followed by us.

The New York Journal of Commerce, commenting upon our phenomenal foreign commerce of 1897, published the following table:

The years next (to 1897) in order of magnitude were 1891, 1892, 1896, and 1890, as will be seen from the subjoined table. The exports were \$94,000,000 above the highest previous record, which was in 1896, and \$129,000,000 above the next highest year, 1891. The imports were \$61,000,000 more than in 1896, but were much below those of 1895, 1892, 1891, and 1890, and compared with ten years ago they show an increase of only \$17,000,000.

For the four years succeeding 1893 the imports have averaged only 75 per cent of the amount of the exports, while for the three normal years 1887, 1888, and 1889 the imports and exports, within a fraction, evenly offset each other. For the four later years combined the exports exceeded the imports by \$853,000,000. In this reckoning no account is taken of the gold movement; nor yet of the imports or exports of silver, which, since 1893, have added about \$35,000,000 net per year to the value of the exports. We append a statement of the imports and exports of merchandise for each of the last eleven calendar years:

Calendar year.	Exports.	Imports.	Total trade.
1897.....	\$1,099,000,000	\$742,000,000	\$1,841,000,000
1896.....	1,005,000,000	681,000,000	1,686,000,000
1895.....	824,000,000	801,000,000	1,625,000,000
1894.....	825,000,000	676,000,000	1,501,000,000
1893.....	876,000,000	778,000,000	1,652,000,000
1892.....	938,000,000	841,000,000	1,779,000,000
1891.....	970,000,000	828,000,000	1,798,000,000
1890.....	857,000,000	825,000,000	1,680,000,000
1889.....	827,000,000	770,000,000	1,597,000,000
1888.....	692,000,000	725,000,000	1,417,000,000
1887.....	715,000,000	709,000,000	1,424,000,000

Comparing the above figures for the calendar year 1897 with those of fiscal years (ending June 30), the periods for which compilations are usually made, it is found that—

"The imports of last year were exceeded by the imports of the fiscal years 1889 to 1893, 1896, and 1897. The domestic exports and the total of domestic and foreign exports last year were never before equaled in either a fiscal or a calendar year. The domestic exports, \$1,099,000,000, have been most nearly approached in the fiscal years 1897 and 1892.

"The domestic exports exceeded \$900,000,000 in no fiscal year except 1892 and 1897, when they exceeded a billion dollars. They were between eight and nine hundred million dollars in 1880, 1881, 1883, 1890 to 1894, and 1896 and 1897. The excess of exports of merchandise over imports, \$356,000,000, is far beyond any fiscal year, the excesses being over two hundred millions only in the years 1878, 1879, 1881, 1892, 1894, and 1897. The total volume of foreign trade, \$1,841,760,374, was exceeded by sixteen millions in 1892. The aggregate has exceeded \$1,700,000,000 in only two other years, 1891 and 1893."

Considering the bad times throughout the world during the past ten years, I can only think that history is repeating itself as far as our commerce and naval development are concerned.

About the year 1895 we began the reconstruction of our Navy, appropriating as follows:

Total amounts authorized for increase of the Navy since 1885, including armor, armament, rebuilding old monitors, etc.

Year.	Amount.	Year.	Amount.
1885.....	\$1,895,000	1892.....	9,400,000
1886.....	3,500,000	1893.....	7,125,000
1887.....	10,048,362	1894.....	9,955,000
1888.....	5,760,000	1895.....	13,304,000
1889.....	6,605,000	1896.....	11,500,000
1890.....	8,120,000		
1891.....	4,400,000	Total.....	*91,612,362

* This figure represents the total expenditure during the twelve years for rebuilding the Navy.

Comparing our commerce of last year (1897) with 1887 we find that our exports have increased \$284,000,000, while our imports have increased only \$33,000,000, thus showing that our exporters are satisfied that Congress intends at last to provide a naval force of sufficient strength to protect their rights.

I desire to refer to the report of the Secretary of the Navy for our present condition:

NAVY DEPARTMENT, Washington, D. C., November 15, 1897.

To the President:

The present effective fighting force of the Navy consists of 4 battle ships of the first class, 2 battle ships of the second class, 2 armored cruisers, 16 cruisers, 15 gunboats, 6 double-turreted monitors, 1 ram, 1 dynamite gunboat, 1 dispatch boat, 1 transport steamer, and 5 torpedo boats. There are under construction 5 battle ships of the first class, 16 torpedo boats, and 1 submarine boat.

There are 64 other naval vessels, including those used as training, receiving, and naval-reserve ships, tugs, disused single-turreted monitors, and some unserviceable craft.

There is, further, the auxiliary fleet. This consists, first, of more than 20 subsidized steamers which comply with the requirements of the postal act of March 3, 1891, with regard to their adaptability to naval service, and to an armament of main and secondary batteries; second, of a very much greater number of large merchant-marine steamers, which can be availed of at any time of need.

These auxiliaries, ranging from 2,000 to 12,000 tons, will, if occasion require, form a powerful fleet of ocean cruisers, capable of swift and formidable attack upon an enemy's commerce. Their great coal capacity will also enable them to remain a long time at sea in search of the whereabouts of hostile vessels.

The country is to be congratulated upon the results obtained in the rebuilding of the Navy. While its ships are not as many—and it is not necessary they should be—as those of some other great powers, they are, class for class, in power, speed, workmanship, and offensive and defensive qualities, the equal of vessels built anywhere else in the world.

Since the last annual report of the Secretary of the Navy was submitted the following vessels have been conditionally or finally accepted, and are now a part of the effective force of the Navy:

Name of vessel.	Type.	Speed required by contract.	Speed obtained on trial.	Date of preliminary acceptance.	Date of final acceptance.	Date of commission.	By whom built.
		Knots.	Knots.				
Oregon.....	Seagoing battle ship.....	15	16.78	June 26, 1896	Dec. 31, 1896	July 15, 1896	Union Iron Works.
Brooklyn.....	Armored cruiser.....	20	21.91	Sept. 28, 1896	May 6, 1896	Dec. 1, 1896	Wm. Cramp & Sons.
Wilmington.....	Gunboat.....	13	15.08	May 17, 1897	Sept. 25, 1897	May 13, 1897	Newport News Co.
Helena.....	do.....	13	15.50	May 24, 1897	Oct. 8, 1897	July 8, 1897	Do.
Annapolis.....	do.....	12	13.17	May 19, 1897	Sept. 21, 1897	July 20, 1897	Lewis Nixon.
Iowa.....	Seagoing battle ship.....	16	17.09	June 22, 1897	June 16, 1897	Wm. Cramp & Sons.
Nashville.....	Gunboat.....	14	16.30	June 25, 1897	Aug. 19, 1897	Newport News Co.
Vicksburg.....	do.....	12	12.71	July 8, 1897	Oct. 23, 1897	Bath Iron Works.
Newport.....	do.....	12	12.29	do.....	Oct. 5, 1897	Do.
Wheeling.....	do.....	12	12.88	Aug. 6, 1897	Aug. 10, 1897	Union Iron Works.
Marietta.....	do.....	12	13.02	do.....	Sept. 1, 1897	Do.
Porter.....	Torpedo boat.....	27½	28.63	Feb. 12, 1897	Aug. 12, 1897	Feb. 20, 1897	Herreshoff Manufacturing Co.
Foote.....	do.....	24½	24.53	July 23, 1897	Aug. 7, 1897	Columbian Iron Works.

The coast-defense monitor *Puritan* was completed at the navy-yard, New York, and placed in commission December 10, 1896.

Table showing the condition of work on vessels now under construction, where building, percentage of completion November 15, 1897, and probable date of completion.

Name of vessel.	Type.	Where and by whom building.	Estimated percentage of completion Nov. 15.	Estimated date of completion.
Kearsarge	First-class battle ship	Newport News S. and D. D. Co., Newport News, Va.	48	Aug., 1899.
Kentucky	do	do	47	Do.
Illinois*	do	do	30	Sept., 1899.
Alabama*	do	Wm. Cramp & Sons, Philadelphia, Pa.	31	Do.
Wisconsin*	do	Union Iron Works, San Francisco, Cal.	24	Sept., 1899.
Princeton	Gunboat	J. H. Dialogue & Son, Camden, N. J.	94	Feb., 1898.
Rodgers	Torpedo boat	Columbian Iron Works, Baltimore, Md.	85	May, 1898.
Winslow	do	do	96	Dec., 1897.
Rowan	do	Moran Bros. Co., Seattle, Wash.	88	Feb., 1898.
Dahlgren	do	Bath Iron Works, Bath, Me.	12	Aug., 1898.
T. A. M. Craven	do	do	12	Do.
Farragut	do	Union Iron Works, San Francisco, Cal.	14	July, 1898.
Davis	do	Wolf & Zwicker Iron Works, Portland, Oreg.	65	Mar., 1898.
Fox	do	do	54	Apr., 1898.
Morris	do	Herreshoff Manufacturing Co., Bristol, R. I.	Begun.	July, 1898.
Talbot	do	do	56	Mar., 1898.
Gwin	do	do	56	Do.
Mackenzie	do	The Chas. Hillman S. & E. B. Co., Philadelphia, Pa.	68	Feb., 1898.
McKee	do	Columbian Iron Works, Baltimore, Md.	30	Apr., 1898.
Stringham	do	Harlan & Holingsworth Co., Wilmington, Del.	Begun.	Jan., 1899.
Goldsborough	do	Wolf & Zwicker Iron Works, Portland, Oreg.	Begun.	Do.
Bailey	do	Gas Engine and Power Co., and Chas. L. Seabury Co., Consolidated, Morris Heights, New York City.	Begun.	Do.
Plunger	Submarine torpedo boat	Columbian Iron Works, Baltimore, Md.	65	May, 1899.

*The probable date of final completion of the *Illinois*, *Alabama*, and *Wisconsin* is based on the supposition that armor will be provided in due season.

The vessels under construction should be completed during the coming year, except the 5 battle ships, which will probably not be ready for service before the latter part of 1899. Of the latter, the *Kearsarge* and *Kentucky* are nearly half completed. About three-quarters of their armor has been delivered, a part of which has been secured in place on the ships. The other 3, the *Alabama*, *Illinois*, and *Wisconsin*, were begun subsequent to the last annual report. With the exception of a small amount of diagonal casemate armor, which the ship contractors have agreed to furnish at the price fixed by law, it will be necessary to preliminarily accept them without armor, in accordance with the terms of the contract for their construction.

The *Illustrated American* of January 8, 1898, says:

How like to China in some things we are after all! Germany seizes one of China's seaports, and China hardly makes a protest-sound.

She keeps silent because she can not resist, and it seems more dignified to acquiesce with seeming immobility than to set up a ridiculously feeble squeak, like a trapped mouse.

Yet China is the most multitudinous nation on earth. She has riches and resources untold. Her men with training might make very fair soldiers.

Without feeling the expense she could have fortified every port and bought a fleet equal to the entire naval strength of Germany, and infinitely more formidable, because so close to the base of supplies and repair.

But China has no military patriotism. Her Government is too sleepy to comprehend the danger or too senile to meet it.

We have plenty of patriotism, but do we make a much better showing materially?

Japan's great navy could wipe our Pacific squadron from the seas and shell San Francisco before our North Atlantic squadron could double Cape Horn.

A concentration of the superior German navy could overwhelm our Atlantic fleet by sheer force of numbers, while German transports could land at any one of a dozen of our smaller Atlantic ports a disciplined army of enormous size.

A military coalition of European powers against us could exact its own terms in a single fortnight from nearly all our seacoast cities, if not from the nation itself.

We are the best fighters in the world, but what have we to fight with? We have illimitable resource for a prolonged war; but modern wars are generally finished in a few weeks.

We have a gallant little fleet, but we have not a dry dock on the Atlantic coast large enough to repair a battle ship.

In the old days of wooden navies a victorious ship could mend her timbers and masts and be ready to fight again in twenty-four hours; but the modern battle ship is so complicated and delicate that, even if triumphant in a duel, her wounds would drive her home for long repairs.

We have a few coast defenses, but they are ridiculously inadequate.

The statesman mind of Tilden urged on the country the complete fortification of our coasts, but none heeded him.

If any European power, capable of engaging our little fleet, should at the same time throw even 100,000 trained soldiers upon our shores, could we successfully face such an army in a fortnight?

It is a crime against the continuance of peace for Congress to keep us so defenseless. We have trusted to the mutual jealousies of the foreign powers for the prevention of any attack upon us. We have trusted to our luck.

But can we expect to escape forever? Like England, are we not hated more deeply each year? Dislike or hate is the price that power or promise of continued greatness must pay among nations as among individuals.

Nothing under the canopy but a powerful navy, adequate coast defenses, and a modern army able to be mobilized and to act together in one week can be safely banked on to discourage a foreign attack.

SIGNS OF THE TIMES.

It is a fundamental truth warranted by history that the control of the seas, and especially along the great lines drawn by national interest or national commerce, is the chief among the merely national elements in the power and prosperity of nations. It is so because the sea is the world's great medium of circulation.

Mr. Chairman, we have seen the great naval preparations being made by all the nations of the Old World, including Japan, and

does it not seem as though they were looking ahead to the signs of the times? What are they?

China apparently to be partitioned.

Nicaragua Canal surely to be built.

Increasing jealousy among all nations of each other.

Territorial extension and expansion.

Have we not firmly declared for the maintenance of the Monroe doctrine?

Have we not declared that we will protect our trade treaties against all assaults?

Have we not affirmed that we propose, when it is built, to build the Nicaragua Canal?

Above all else, is not every nation upon earth, excepting Russia, jealous of us, envious of our great commercial success? Every nation must expect rivals in the race for commercial supremacy. When that nation, however, wins the laurel of greatest success, rivalry ceases, and jealousy and envy take its place, and sooner or later, upon some pretext or other, that nation will be drawn into a quarrel with some one or several of its vanquished competitors. This is our condition to-day.

I have frequently heard it said on the floor of this House that we have no colonies. Literally speaking, true, but figuratively speaking, false, for the creations of American brains and the kindness of mother earth have made the markets of the world your colonies of commerce. Take the reports of our consuls and you will see that the American electric light, motor, telephone, telegraph, sewing machine, locomotive, printing press, harvesting machines, armor plate, breadstuffs, and scores of other articles are slowly but surely capturing the foreign markets.

With this great success has now come the jealousy and envy of which I spoke. In our national infancy and youth we cared naught about the enmity of any power because we were prepared to resist all attacks; but now in our manhood are we prepared, and can we acquit ourselves with honor if foreign complications arise, if we do not keep pace with the naval developments of other powers? I think not. Take, if you please, the present complications in China. The honor of opening China to the world belongs to the United States. What are we going to do if our favorable trade treaties with that nation are interfered with and our rapidly growing commerce is destroyed?

Simply enter a more or less vigorous diplomatic protest, for what else can we do? We have not sufficient naval strength to compel heed to our protest, and our armed hand is not heavy enough to cause the least worryment to the powers involved in the Chinese problem. Oh, would that we had a powerful fleet, so that we might say, with the division of China, we have nothing to do, but we do propose to protect to the extent of our entire resources our trade rights and commercial treaties with that nation. This is what would have been done prior to 1860. Will we prepare so that it may be done now?

NICARAGUA CANAL.

Ere Father Time swings his scythe through many more years all writers and statesmen believe the Nicaragua Canal will be built, and then, through our treaty with Nicaragua, what becomes our duty?

The Dickinson-Ayrton treaty, ratified June 20, 1868, says:

The United States hereby agree to extend their protection to all such routes of communication as aforesaid, and to guarantee the neutrality and innocent use of the same.

It also makes provision for United States protection for persons and property along the route if for any reason Nicaragua does not furnish that protection. This brings us to the Monroe doctrine.

England owns and has strongly fortified Jamaica, and between Jamaica and Haiti is the best and shortest channel leading to and from the Nicaragua Canal; so, with Haiti in the possession of any continental power and Jamaica in possession of England, a major part of the commerce to and from the canal would have to pass almost under the guns of these powers.

What a magnificent base of supplies for any continental fleet, merchant or war, Haiti would be. I might add another source of trouble with a foreign power might easily arise through the continued growth and development of trade jealousy on the part of her people toward us. So it seems to me that we should prepare for war upon the sea in proportion to the preparation being made by most of the continental powers.

We may never have war with any power, but this is not the millennium. The era of eternal peace has not arrived, would to heaven it had, for no one can possibly abhor the awful horrors of war more than I do; no one detests jingoism more than I.

We have, however, said most emphatically to the world that some of the doctrines of our fathers we propose to defend at all times. We must live up to that declaration or else lose our place forever as one of the great powers. We have, indeed, set a high standard of patriotism for the conduction of affairs on the Western Hemisphere. If we believe in the Monroe doctrine, we must be ready and thoroughly prepared to defend it against any nation or coalition of nations attempting to destroy any of its tenets.

Mr. Chairman, I believe that the saying, "The pen is mightier than the sword," has long since been weighed in the balance and found wanting, for the pen of diplomacy, of statecraft, aye, of government itself, becomes woefully weak unless fortified and supported by the strong sword arm of a united, patriotic, and country-loving people who hold dear the truths established by their ancestors. You say the Monroe doctrine is an ideal, and if we live up to its ideas, its teachings, we will have occasional friction with some foreign power. True, it is an ideal, and also true that it may cause friction. What if it does?

I contend, sir, that a nation must be ever ready to defend, ever ready to fight for a principle grown sacred by years of open acknowledgment. We have openly declared that the truths of this doctrine are just, wise, and honorable. The peace-at-any-price people say, "Away with the Monroe doctrine!" while patriots reply, "We will relegate to the realm of everlasting contempt non-believers in the doctrine established by Monroe, believed in by Lincoln, strengthened by Grant, and rejuvenated by Cleveland." [Applause.]

Ah, Mr. Chairman, this is not jingoism; this is the true patriotism, and patriotism has ever been esteemed honorable, ever considered essential to the strength and welfare of a nation. The greatest nations of the world's history, ancient and modern, have been those that held patriotism in the highest regard.

When an English naval officer plants the English flag upon newly-discovered territory and amid the roar of heavy guns declares it to be English soil, the breeze takes up the "boom" of the cannon and wafts it to far-distant England. Soon comes back the echo with "We will defend the newly acquired territory to the extent of our resources. God save the Queen!"

Only a few days ago in our own land we had a magnificent display of patriotism. How did our people receive the action of this House on Tuesday, March 8? Ah, when the electrical messenger told the people of Maine what had been done here, they sent him forward on his journey with "Say to the people of the Vineyard State, 'My country; 'tis of thee, sweet land of liberty, and the Washingtonians replied, "Thy name I love," while the American people, taking up the words, sang in a mighty, united chorus:

My country, 'tis of thee,
Sweet land of liberty,
Thy name I love!

Patriotism is indeed a noble passion. May it never weaken in the hearts of the American people. [Applause.]

Through illiberal laws and lack of naval protection the American merchant marine has almost faded away; but increase the Navy, provide adequate protection, and despite these unjust laws American ingenuity will find a way to make the American flag once again supreme upon the seas. [Applause.]

APPENDIX A.

TABLE I.—Exports—Per cent of exports.

Year ending June 30—	Domestic merchandise other than manufactures.					
	Agriculture.		Mining.		Forest.	
	Values.	Per cent.	Values.	Per cent.	Values.	Per cent.
1860	\$253,560,972	81.13	\$999,465	.31	\$10,200,959	3.23
1870	361,188,483	79.35	5,023,111	1.10	14,897,963	3.27
1875	490,908,570	78.85	6,468,181	1.15	19,165,907	3.43
1878	456,113,515	76.67	7,122,989	1.20	18,078,668	3.04
1877	459,794,148	72.63	8,770,769	1.39	19,943,290	3.14
1878	536,192,873	77.07	6,732,119	.97	17,750,396	2.55
1879	546,476,706	78.12	6,405,813	.92	16,336,943	2.34
1880	685,961,091	83.25	5,863,232	.71	17,321,268	2.11
1881	730,294,943	82.63	7,401,282	.84	19,486,051	2.20
1882	552,219,819	75.31	8,175,692	1.11	25,580,264	3.50
1883	619,269,449	77.00	10,446,719	1.30	28,636,199	3.56
1884	536,815,318	73.98	15,022,255	2.07	26,222,959	3.62
1885	530,172,966	72.96	15,797,885	2.18	22,014,839	3.03
1886	484,954,595	72.82	13,654,286	2.05	20,961,708	3.15
1887	523,073,798	74.41	11,758,662	1.67	21,126,273	3.01
1888	500,840,086	73.23	17,996,895	2.63	23,991,092	3.51
1889	532,141,490	72.87	19,947,518	2.73	26,997,127	3.70
1890	629,829,808	74.51	22,297,755	2.64	29,473,084	3.49
1891	642,751,344	73.69	22,054,970	2.53	28,715,713	3.29
1892	799,328,232	78.69	20,032,885	2.04	27,967,423	2.75
1893	615,382,986	74.05	20,020,026	2.41	28,127,113	3.38

Year ending June 30—	Domestic manufactures.		Value total exports of domestic merchandise.
	Values.	Per cent.	
1860	\$40,345,892	12.73	\$316,242,423
1870	68,279,784	15	455,208,941
1875	92,678,814	18.57	559,237,638
1878	101,637,548	17.08	594,917,715
1877	133,933,549	21.16	632,980,854
1878	123,807,193	17.79	695,749,990
1879	117,015,729	16.72	699,538,742
1880	102,856,015	12.43	823,946,353
1881	114,233,219	12.92	883,925,947
1882	134,794,346	18.38	733,239,732
1883	134,228,083	16.69	804,223,632
1884	136,372,887	18.81	724,964,852
1885	147,187,527	20.25	728,682,946
1886	136,541,978	20.50	665,964,529
1887	136,735,105	19.45	703,022,923
1888	130,300,087	19.05	683,862,104
1889	138,675,507	18.99	730,282,609
1890	151,102,376	17.87	845,293,833
1891	168,627,315	19.57	872,270,283
1892	158,510,937	19.61	1,015,732,011
1893	158,023,118	19.02	831,030,785

TABLE II.—Exports of main cereals.

Fiscal year.	Corn.		
	Bushels.	Aggregate value.	Average value per bushel.
1875-76	49,493,572	\$33,265,280	\$0.672
1876-77	70,860,983	41,621,275	.587
1877-78	85,461,098	48,033,358	.562
1878-79	86,296,252	40,655,120	.471
1879-80	98,169,877	53,298,247	.543
1880-81	91,908,175	50,702,069	.551
1881-82	43,184,015	28,845,830	.667
1882-83	40,536,825	27,756,082	.683
1883-84	45,247,490	27,648,044	.611
1884-85	51,824,416	28,003,863	.540
1885-86	63,655,433	31,730,922	.498
1886-87	40,307,252	19,347,361	.479
1887-88	24,278,417	13,355,950	.550
1888-89	69,592,929	32,382,277	.474
1889-90	101,973,717	42,658,015	.418
1890-91	30,768,213	17,652,687	.574
1891-92	75,451,849	41,590,460	.551
1892-93	46,037,274	24,587,511	.534
1893-94	65,324,841	30,211,154	.462
1894-95	27,691,137	14,650,767	.529
1895-96	99,992,835	37,836,862	.378

Fiscal year.	Wheat.		
	Bushels.	Aggregate value.	Average value per bushel.
1875-76	55,073,122	\$68,382,899	\$1.241
1876-77	40,325,611	47,135,562	1.169
1877-78	72,044,961	96,872,016	1.333
1878-79	122,353,936	130,701,079	1.068
1879-80	153,252,795	190,546,305	1.243
1880-81	150,565,477	167,088,485	1.113
1881-82	96,271,802	112,929,718	1.185

TABLE II.—Exports of main cereals.—Continued.

Fiscal year.	Wheat.		
	Bushels.	Aggregate value.	Average value per bushel.
1882-83	106,385,828	119,879,341	\$1.126
1883-84	70,349,012	75,026,678	1.066
1884-85	84,653,714	72,933,097	.862
1885-86	57,759,209	50,202,715	.87
1886-87	101,971,949	90,716,481	.89
1887-88	65,789,261	56,241,168	.853
1888-89	46,414,129	41,652,701	.897
1889-90	54,387,767	45,275,906	.832
1890-91	55,131,948	51,420,272	.932
1891-92	157,280,351	161,369,182	1.026
1892-93	117,121,109	93,534,970	.798
1893-94	88,415,230	59,407,041	.672
1894-95	76,102,704	43,805,663	.575
1895-96	60,650,080	39,709,888	.655

Fiscal year.	Oats.		
	Bushels.	Aggregate value.	Average value per bushel.
1877-78	3,715,479	\$1,177,926	\$0.344
1878-79	5,452,136	1,618,644	.296
1879-80	796,366	308,129	.402
1880-81	402,904	186,899	.463
1881-82	625,690	298,349	.476
1882-83	461,496	233,843	.506
1883-84	1,780,376	710,694	.399
1884-85	4,191,682	1,559,649	.379
1885-86	5,672,694	1,944,772	.343
1886-87	440,283	179,634	.408
1887-88	332,564	143,284	.434
1888-89	624,226	245,562	.393
1889-90	13,692,776	4,510,055	.329
1890-91	953,010	405,708	.426
1891-92	9,435,078	3,842,559	.407
1892-93	2,380,643	951,920	.39
1893-94	5,750,266	2,027,935	.352
1894-95	569,977	200,793	.304
1895-96	13,012,590	3,497,611	.268

TABLE III.—Total production of the United States of the main cereals.

Year.	Indian corn.	Wheat.	Oats.
	Bushels.	Bushels.	Bushels.
1850	592,071,104	100,485,940	146,584,179
1860	838,792,742	173,104,924	172,643,185
1870	760,944,549	287,745,626	282,107,157
1880	1,754,861,535	459,479,533	407,858,900
1885	1,936,176,000	357,112,000	629,409,000
1886	1,665,441,000	457,218,000	624,194,000
1887	1,456,161,000	456,329,000	659,618,000
1888	1,987,790,000	415,868,000	701,735,000
1889	2,112,892,000	490,560,000	751,515,000
1890	1,489,970,000	399,262,000	523,621,000
1891	2,060,154,000	611,780,000	738,394,000
1892	1,628,464,000	515,949,000	661,035,000
1893	1,619,496,131	396,131,725	638,854,850
1894	1,212,770,052	490,267,416	662,086,928
1895	2,151,139,000	467,109,000	824,444,000
1896	2,283,875,000	427,684,000	707,346,000

TABLE IV.—The cotton supply of the United States for sixty-nine years.

Year.	Bales.	Year.	Bales.	Year.	Bales.	Year.	Bales.
1829	870,415	1846	2,100,537	1866	2,193,987	1883	6,992,234
1830	976,845	1847	1,778,651	1867	2,019,774	1884	5,714,052
1831	1,038,848	1848	2,347,634	1868	2,593,963	1885	5,669,021
1832	987,487	1849	2,728,596	1869	2,439,639	1886	6,550,215
1833	1,070,438	1850	2,096,706	1870	3,154,946	1887	6,513,624
1834	1,205,324	1851	2,355,257	1871	4,352,317	1888	7,017,707
1835	1,254,328	1852	3,015,029	1872	2,974,351	1889	6,935,082
1836	1,360,752	1853	3,262,882	1873	3,930,508	1890	7,313,726
1837	1,422,630	1854	2,930,027	1874	4,170,388	1891	8,655,518
1838	1,801,497	1855	2,847,339	1875	3,832,991	1892	9,038,707
1839	1,360,532	1856	3,627,845	1876	4,669,288	1893	6,717,142
1840	2,177,835	1857	2,939,519	1877	4,485,423	1894	7,527,211
1841	1,634,945	1858	3,113,062	1878	4,811,265	1895	9,892,766
1842	1,683,574	1859	3,851,481	1879	5,073,531	1896	7,162,473
1843	2,378,875	1860	4,669,770	1880	5,757,397	1897	8,714,011
1844	2,030,460	1861	3,656,006	1881	6,589,329		
1845	2,394,503	1862-1865	(*)	1882	5,435,845		

* No record.

TABLE V.—Per cent of total production exported.

Year.	Cot-	Wheat	Corn.	Min-
	ton			eral oil.
1867	68.32	8.32	1.85	46.58
1868	66.90	11.90	1.63	52.34
1869	57.01	13.27	.91	60.01
1870	65.98	20.72	.24	61.37
1871	72.39	22.30	.98	69.62
1872	67.44	16.88	3.60	54.60
1873	65.47	20.80	3.67	57.85
1874	70.03	32.54	3.86	51.23
1875	70.69	23.60	3.53	46.50
1876	70.75	25.58	3.86	68.69
1877	68.97	19.73	5.66	64.54
1878	71.23	25.29	6.49	54.02
1879	67.74	35.82	6.33	50.42
1880	65.73	40.18	6.43	31.41
1881	68.47	37.38	5.46	44.29
1882	67.23	31.82	3.71	39.21
1883	67.20	29.33	2.58	54.13
1884	67.56	26.49	2.99	53.55
1885	68.96	25.86	2.95	61.11
1886	64.68	26.48	3.35	50.21
1887	68.71	33.66	2.48	50.67
1888	65.83	26.23	1.74	49.37
1889	69.33	21.31	3.57	46.09
1890	68.15	22.31	4.85	36.06
1891	67.36	26.60	2.15	29.73
1892	65.13	36.88	3.72	37.35
1893	65.99	37.20	2.89	45.10
1894	71.20	41.47	4.11	53.26
1895	69.83	31.46	2.36	50.76
1896	65.00	27.07	4.70	43.34
1897		33.93	7.83	

TABLE VI.—Total value of the ten main crops and exports of the United States, from 1870 to 1895.

Year.	Ten main crops.	Exports.	Approximate per cent exported.
1870	\$1,671,161,288	\$361,188,483	20
1875	1,735,474,964	430,306,570	24
1880	2,107,111,989	685,961,091	32
1885	1,908,312,018	530,172,966	28
1890	2,490,107,454	629,820,808	25
1895	2,086,512,122	615,382,986	29

APPENDIX B.

Table showing foregoing data of all countries, in condensed form. [New York World Almanac.]

Class of vessels.	Great Britain.	France.	Germany.	Italy.	Austria-Hungary.	Russia.	Spain.	Denmark.	Netherlands.	Turkey.	Portugal.	Sweden and Norway.	United States.*
Battle ships, first class	29	15	6	8		14	1			1			9
Guns of same	H. G. 114	57	36	38		124	17			10			136
	S. B. 1,257	615	164	315		332	18			10			297
Battle ships, second and third class	24	9	10	2	10	4	2		3	8	1		2
Guns of same	H. G. 254	76	93	27	80	41	29		20	75	3		18
	S. B. 575	216	162	112	204	79	22		37	105	6		27
Seagoing coast-defense	6	12	8	7	3	7		26	7	6	2		8
Guns of same	H. G. 24	22	24	32	12	20		78	32	40	6		30
	S. B. 82	202	116	58	66	84		21	91	63	45		54
Nonseagoing coast-defense	11	12	11		4	21	2		17	3			18
Guns of same	H. G. 38	18	11		4	83	3		18	6			24
	S. B. 91	86	22		12	156	6		100	8			6
Armored cruisers	18	13	7	8	2	14	8						2
Guns of same	H. G. 184	78	14	30	10	137	14						38
	S. B. 679	259	256	313	100	287	194						36
Protected and partially protected cruisers	123	47	13	23	8	3	12	5	10	6	4	2	16
Guns of same	H. G. 525	46	54	52	12	26	98	34	96	44		2	169
	S. B. 2,372	1,085	231	496	40	53	161	45	160	32	48	20	232
Unprotected cruisers	3	14	6		2	20	4		2	2	3		4
Guns of same	H. G. 38	180	48		21	59	20	8	10	29	22		18
	S. B. 34	189	45		2	224	25	6	4	16	6		16
Gunboats, first class	42	16	2			12	11		9	36			21
Guns of same	H. G. 79	18	2			16	11		9	34			107
	S. B. 38	49				52	6	46	84				123

H. G. Heavy guns or primary battery. S. B. Secondary batteries or light guns.

* This column is inserted for purposes of comparison.

Table showing foregoing data of all countries, in condensed form—Continued.

Class of vessels.	Great Britain.	France.	Germany.	Italy.	Austria-Hungary.	Russia.	Spain.	Denmark.	Netherlands.	Turkey.	Portugal.	Sweden and Norway.	United States.*
Gunboats, second and third class.....	20	33	1	2	8	2	13	-----	15	12	2	-----	-----
Torpedo-boat destroyers.....	103	17	18	18	11	39	17	-----	6	6	3	6	3
Torpedo boats:													
First class.....	51	46	104	117	36	88	11	6	20	12	12	-----	18
Second class.....	32	149	54	4	5	6	28	5	12	20	9	37	1
Third class.....	107	54	13	70	35	97	9	13	31	4	27	20	2
Hulks and stationary vessels.....	139	86	12	3	9	2	6	6	16	3	-----	7	29
Subsidized vessels.....	28	12	10	16	-----	36	14	-----	-----	54	-----	-----	4
Obsolete vessels.....	32	30	5	7	5	3	59	2	23	12	23	37	11
Dispatch, training, transports, repair, tugs, and miscellaneous vessels.....	219	105	47	55	21	98	25	61	24	86	44	38	68
Officers.....	2,243	2,220	967	795	617	1,260	1,009	146	540	392	367	176	+982
Seamen.....	58,916	49,300	17,820	20,406	11,900	36,000	16,300	1,109	8,320	20,600	4,096	6,780	+12,600
Marines:													
Officers.....	746	1,640	228	83	76	382	400	40	43	84	18	123	-----
Soldiers.....	17,842	27,800	2,500	440	720	2,890	6,920	264	1,700	1,200	608	1,200	-----
Total active list.....	79,947	80,920	21,513	21,724	13,313	40,532	24,629	1,559	10,603	22,276	5,089	8,279	13,583
Naval reserves.....	83,000	84,350	37,009	19,600	2,000	45,000	25,000	4,000	10,000	36,000	4,000	12,500	2,800

*This column is inserted for purposes of comparison.

† Includes Marine Corps.

This table gives to us nine battle ships; this includes those under construction.

Mr. MEYER of Louisiana. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. Fox].

Mr. FOX. Mr. Chairman, in considering a great appropriation bill in Committee of the Whole on the state of the Union I trust it is not improper to submit some remarks on the condition of the masses who have to pay this and all other appropriations. On January 20, page 807 of the RECORD, the chairman of the Ways and Means Committee said:

I think it is a serious mistake for the Representatives of the South who desire to improve their economic conditions to forget that there can be no progress except as it is based on an improvement in the standard of living and an improvement in the earnings of the masses.

He also said:

The laws which bind the people of this country tend to the gradual increase of the earnings of the masses upon which prosperity depends.

There is no greater economic truth, there is no more profound political wisdom, than the statement that all prosperity must be based on the uplifting of the masses, who produce all the wealth of the country. This is the very essence of genuine Democracy as taught by Jefferson. Democratic policies and the principles enunciated in the Chicago platform, the greatest platform, embodying more political wisdom than any other platform ever promulgated, are all based on the doctrine enunciated by the gentleman from Maine.

I deny, however, that Southern Representatives forget this great principle. I assert that they as much as any other Representatives on this floor strictly adhere to it. The distinguished chairman of the Committee on Appropriations the other day said:

I have never yet seen the Constitution stand in the way of any Representative when it was his interest to get something for his people.

I say this is not true of Southern Representatives. They have at all times stood here on this floor and pleaded for a strict observance of the Constitution as the only guarantee of the rights of the masses; and it was a Southern Representative, the distinguished and honored leader of the minority here, who was pleading for the Constitution when the gentleman from Illinois ridiculed it and made the statement which I have quoted.

I deny that the laws of this country as they exist to-day tend to the gradual increase of the earnings of the masses. I charge the fact to be that under the leadership of the gentleman from Maine laws have been enacted that utterly ignore the great principle referred to; and instead of tending to bring about a gradual increase of the earnings of the masses, tend to the impoverishment of the masses and the enrichment of the few. If there should be a gradual increase of the earnings of the masses, there is bound to be a decrease in the accumulation of wealth by the few, and we would soon have the ideal state of things advocated by Thomas Jefferson when he said:

Let us found a government where there shall be no extremely rich men and no abjectly poor ones; let us found a government upon the intelligence of the people and the equitable distribution of property.

Instead of this, the concentration of wealth in the hands of a few has been progressing within the past thirty years, until \$3,000,000,000 of property have been taken by taxation from the consumers of the country and given to the capitalists, and to-day 1 per cent

of the families of the country hold more wealth than the remaining 99 per cent.

It is said that within sixteenth months, from October 6, 1896, to January 29, 1898, the deposits in the New York banks have increased from \$372,000,000 to \$722,000,000, and the holdings of legal-tender money from \$109,000,000 to \$216,000,000, and that they now hold more than one-eighth of all the money in the country outside of the United States Treasury. Accepting the doctrine of the gentleman from Maine, that prosperity depends upon the gradual increase of the earnings of the masses, on what does he predicate his assertion that there is general prosperity in the country when all the wealth of the country and all the earnings of the masses are being rapidly accumulated in the coffers of a few bankers as the deposits of great corporations and a few men of wealth, especially when everybody knows that these vast sums of money, so great that the common mind can have no comprehension of their magnitude, are themselves the earnings of the masses, of which they have been robbed by the most iniquitous system of taxation that ever disgraced a civilized nation, and that the moneyed power has become so great, its influence in controlling elections and shaping legislation so irresistible, that there is not a law on the statute books to-day relating to the currency of the country or to taxation that is not shaped with direct reference to the policy of making the rich richer and the poor poorer?

The fact is that the Republican party, notwithstanding the conservative and patriotic mass of the people have done everything to avoid it, has raised the issue of capital against labor, money against blood, luxury against toil, greed against patriotism, robbery against honor. [Applause.] Sentiments have been expressed here and policies advocated by gentlemen distinguished for their high personal character which show a depravity in political conscience and a want of regard for the rights of property and of individuals that is alarming.

On the 31st of January, in discussing the Teller resolution providing for the payment of United States bonds at the option of the Government in silver, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DALZELL], referring to the honor of the nation, the highest evidence of which and the noblest manifestations of which, as he seems to think, are the payment of the bonds in gold when demanded, said:

It is more sacred than the traditions and heroisms of our history; more sacred than the memories of our heroes; more sacred than the graves of our dead.

And the RECORD shows that there was loud applause on the Republican side.

This is a clear, frank, and distinct statement of the attitude of the Republican party. The bondholders, instead of the negroes, are now the wards of the nation, and their right to demand gold is "more sacred than the memories of our heroes; more sacred than the graves of our dead," although it is confessed that under the contract they can be paid in silver, although it requires all the earnings of the masses to pay them, although no employee of the Government is paid in gold, and although no citizen can collect a private debt in gold unless the contract provides that it shall be paid in gold.

From the statements of representatives of capital on this floor one would think there was no patriotism or sense of national honor except with the bondholders. Suppose in case of war volunteers should be called for, to spill money into the Treasury instead of to spill blood on the battlefield, how many dollars would

be obtained? Suppose instead of conscripting men there should be a confiscation of money, where would be the patriotism of the bondholders?

The shedding of blood in defense of the country is patriotism, the lending of money at a high rate of interest and the exacting in payment of two dollars for one is greater patriotism. The trouble is the blood shedders never have any money to lend and the money lenders never shed any blood, and the shedders of blood have to pay the interest. And in the issue raised of money against blood, money has much the best of it. [Applause.]

And now a word about my own section and the agricultural classes whom I have the honor to represent. And in speaking of them and their industrial condition I shall not be intimidated by the agents and representatives of corporations on this floor who cry out "calamity howlers" when anyone undertakes to show the true condition of the masses, whose prosperity is based on "an improvement of their standard of living and an increase of earnings."

I once heard a fable illustrating the point. A wolf had fastened its fangs in the throat of a lamb, and when the lamb began to struggle and bleat, the wolf said: "Lie still, you infernal calamity howler! I am not going to do anything but suck your blood." Another thing: I wish to express the hope that I will not subject my State to be insulted as it was the other day by the gentleman from Madisonville, Ohio [Mr. SHATTUC], who, because I told some unpalatable truths about the corporations which he represents controlling elections, took a cowardly advantage of his seat on this floor to utter a base slander against the people of Mississippi, notwithstanding he had enjoyed their generous hospitality, which had been extended to him on the idea that he was a gentleman, and then he threatened that railroad companies would be revenged on me because I had told the truth.

The gentleman also tried to excite the prejudices of railroad employees against me by pretending that I said that they had no comprehension of political principles, when the gentleman knows, if he has any comprehension of English grammar or of the English language, that I said nothing of the kind.

But I want to call the attention of the House, and of the country especially, to the cotton producers of the South, who constitute a large per cent of the masses whose prosperity, as the gentleman from Maine says, depends on a gradual increase of their earnings.

The gentleman from Maine, in the speech to which I have already referred, made the distinct admission that as 70 per cent of the cotton production of the world is in the United States, the production of cotton and of cotton goods can not be protected or benefited by a protective tariff. He also said substantially that the manufacture of cotton goods in New England was being ruined by competition from Southern mills, because in the South factory hands work eleven hours a day, while in New England they are allowed to work only ten hours a day.

Everybody who has the slightest knowledge of the facts knows that this is not true, and that the great advantages that the manufacturer in the South has over the New England manufacturer are due to other causes which have already been stated on this floor. But what I wish to call attention to is the astounding and alarming threat of the gentleman from Maine, since he has discovered that his pet theory of a protective tariff is a failure, to protect New England manufacturers against Southern competition by an amendment to the Constitution of the United States so as to prevent Southern factory hands from working longer than New England factory hands; and the gentleman from Maine professes to base his advocacy of this measure on a love for humanity and a desire to elevate the standard of living among the laborers of the South.

Let me say to the gentleman that if it is a sincere sympathy with human toil that is moving him, all over the great agricultural regions of the South and West men, women, and children on the farms are working fifteen hours a day for a bare existence. Many of these people have few of the comforts of life and none of its luxuries. The gentleman from Maine talks about the low price of cotton being caused by overproduction. Thousands of these people card, spin, and weave every yard of cloth they wear because they have no money with which to buy manufactured goods, for the reason that 5 cents per pound for cotton does not pay the cost of production. And the fall of the price of cotton to 5 cents is not caused by the fact that more cotton is produced than can be consumed.

The truth is that many people are unable to buy the cotton goods they really need because cotton has fallen to 5 cents. It is valuable to the country that the gentleman from Maine has distinctly admitted that so far as the cotton industry is concerned a protective tariff is an unjust tax without any benefit. An equally important admission the gentleman has made is that the ruin of cotton manufacturers in New England is caused in a great measure by the rapid decline in the price of cotton. He has at last learned, and I hope from his candid statement the country

will learn, that after all the prosperity of all industries depends largely upon the prosperity of the farmers. This being true, it is important to inquire what has caused the want of prosperity among this class of our people.

Why is there not a gradual increase in the earnings of the agricultural classes, who form 80 per cent of the masses? In the first place, a protective tariff brings no benefit to them, but compels them to pay an enormous tax, not only to defray the expenses of the Government, but to build up other industries. The farmer with a family whose home is not worth over \$2,000 pays as much tax to the General Government as Rockefeller, who is reputed to be worth over \$100,000,000—a man who is worth more than the value of all the farms, including lands, fences, and buildings, in either of the States of Maine, New Hampshire, Vermont, Connecticut, Delaware, South Carolina, Florida, Alabama, Mississippi, Louisiana, Arkansas, Washington, or Oregon.

The revenues of the Government are raised, not by a tax on what you have, but on what you do not have and what you are obliged to buy. There can never be prosperity in this country until this monstrous system of taxation is abolished and the revenues of the Government are raised by a tax on property and not on toil. There is not a civilized nation on earth, except the United States, that has not an income tax.

There never was a political economist of any repute, from Adam Smith to this time, who has not advocated an income tax; and we want to warn the capitalists of the country that if they do not cease their anarchistic policy of robbing the toilers of the country of their earnings, and come forward like honest men and pay their share of the taxes, they may precipitate a conflict that will make them wish they had never been born.

In the next place, I wish to call attention to the fact that it is now the fixed policy of the Republican party "to fix more firmly," to use the language of Secretary Gage, the gold standard. That is to say, that gold shall be the only money of the country, and all other kinds and forms of currency must be based on and redeemed in gold.

The absurdity of this proposition is emphasized by the fact that all the gold in the country would not more than pay the expenses of the Government for one year, that the Government does not collect one single cent of its revenues in gold, and if its policy to pay all its obligations in gold when demanded is to be continued, there is no possible way to obtain it except to buy it by the issuance of bonds, and thus perpetuate the power of bondholders to control the administration of Government and dictate its financial policy.

There is absolutely no gold whatever in circulation in the country. "Currency" literally means to run around. The only running around that gold ever does is to run into the coffers of the banks. We want a currency that will call at the hovel of the workingman as well as at the palace of the rich. We want a currency that will call on the laborer who works in the field, factory, and mine as well as on the banker and bondholder. In this connection I wish to call your attention to some remarkable utterances of a remarkable man.

Secretary Gage, instead of going through the country learning the wants of the masses and catching his inspiration from them, so as to devise a financial policy that would "increase their earnings and improve their standard of living," has been junketing over the country, being banqueted by bankers and imbibing their financial views as well as their wines.

On the 18th of March, at a banquet given by the Chamber of Commerce at Cleveland, Mr. Gage said:

A change in the money, whether that change be to one of higher or lower commercial value than that previously in use, would cause a universal derangement in prices and a perfect dislocation in the relation of things to each other.

The next day, at a banquet given in his honor by the Chamber of Commerce at Pittsburg, he said:

Whatever disturbs general faiths and confidences unsettles commerce and disturbs industry. Unhappily, the disturbing influences are numerous, and by their interposition from time to time suffering and ruin results. Wars and fears of wars, crop failures, widespread industrial revolts, shocks arising from the betrayal of great fiduciary duties, these are some of the adverse influences. But none of these, nor several of them associated, are as harmful as the doubts and fears which arise from the apprehension of a radical change in the money standard, to which all commodities and all credits stand finally related.

If the distinguished Secretary and his coconspirators had remembered these great truths in 1873 and been guided by them, there would to-day be unexampled prosperity among all classes in this country. There was then a change in the money from a lower to a higher commercial value, and it did cause a universal derangement in prices and a perfect dislocation in the relations of things to each other.

The radical change from the double standard of both gold and silver to the single gold standard, and the consequent fall of prices,

which has continued up to this day to such an extent that in spite of the tariff it has brought about the ruin of even the New England cotton industry, has, to use the language of Mr. Gage, been more harmful and caused more suffering and ruin than wars, crop failures, widespread industrial revolt, and betrayal of great fiduciary duties. And yet the Secretary invokes these great principles to fix more firmly the gold standard upon the country.

Having brought about the concentration of all the wealth of the country in the coffers of a few by a disregard and violation of these principles, he proposes now by invoking them to perpetuate the ruin he has wrought and fix more firmly the gold standard upon the country. He proclaims now, as financial wisdom, what he heretofore denounced as financial heresy. We want to return to the money of the Constitution, the free coinage of gold and silver at the ratio of 16 to 1 and legal-tender notes issued by the Government. We want a financial system that will foster, not the accumulation of wealth in the hands of a few, but the general distribution of wealth among the masses, so that, in the language of the gentleman from Maine, the prosperity of the masses may be promoted by an improvement in the standard of living and an improvement in their earnings.

Gentlemen, you can not satisfy the country by calling attention to the prosperity of a favored few. The good of the country will not be promoted except by a general prosperity of all. It is vicious legislation to promote the prosperity of certain classes at the expense of other classes. It is no function of government to help one class of people to make a living or to get rich by taxing the masses. I want to deny that there is prejudice among the masses in this country against capital.

Capital and combinations of capital are absolutely necessary to carry on the great industries of this country, and the people are perfectly willing to encourage capital in these industries and are perfectly willing for capital to realize a legitimate profit. But we want to warn you that you must keep your hands off the United States Treasury, which is filled by the sweat and toil of the laboring classes alone of the country. We want to warn you that this Government must be administered by the people and for the people.

The masses all over this country are not anarchists, are not repudiators, and ask for nothing but equality of opportunity, so that every man may reap the rewards of his own toil. This is their inalienable right, to which they are entitled by every law of God, morality, and justice. This right they are determined must be respected; and if the time ever comes, which may God forbid, that there must be an irrepressible conflict between capital and labor, it will not be precipitated by the toiling masses, who, now as ever, are willing to shed their lifeblood and spend their little fortunes in the service of their country, which they love so well. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. MEYER of Louisiana. I yield to the gentleman from New York [Mr. Low].

Mr. LOW. Mr. Chairman, one of the most gratifying scenes I have ever witnessed in any assemblage was the grand exhibition on the floor of this Chamber when this House, without one dissenting voice, passed the \$50,000,000 appropriation bill for the purpose of upholding the honor and integrity of our country.

Mr. Chairman, scientists have said that reason returns to the human mind just before the spirit leaves the body. When peace seemed ready to leave our land (after a long period of tranquillity) reason returned to Congress, and, to atone for Congresses' shortcomings, eagerly voted to pass this emergency appropriation. The passage of that \$50,000,000 appropriation bill was a monumental evidence, true and significant, that Congresses, by neglecting our Navy, had forgotten their lessons in the history of the United States.

Think of it. A country like ours, with its inexhaustible iron and coal mines, its shores on the Atlantic and the Pacific dotted with matchless shipbuilding plants, with the best labor in the world at their command, is obliged, when a war cloud appears, to enter foreign markets, seeking war ships to strengthen its Navy. Who will dare say that there has not been an unpardonable neglect somewhere?

The feeble condition of the nation's combative forces and its attributive causes will amply justify the tenor of my proposed remarks on the present appropriation bill.

Of all the yearly appropriation bills that come up before Congress, the naval bill should stand preeminently the most important, because American policy, in matters where foreign governments are concerned, demands a constant augmentation of an arm of our country's offense and defense, without which this great nation and its institutions would sooner or later become subservient to more powerful ones.

In discussing any naval bill it is interesting, likewise instructive, to examine the map of the world, note the geographical positions of the different countries that are prominent factors among the nations of the earth, then consider the fact that each maritime

nation of the Old World maintains a naval fleet commensurate with its foreign interests. It is well to remember that nations, like individuals, vary in their customs, habits, and dispositions. Some are grasping and selfish, ready to take every advantage of time and opportunity for self-aggrandizement and power, to the detriment of the less vigilant or weaker nation. It can not be disputed that our country, being separated from the powerful nations of the Old World by vast oceans, has had a comparative immunity from foreign foes.

But the development of sciences in every field of human interest, together with new inventions, which have followed one another with wonderful rapidity, have revolutionized, among other things, the slow methods of communication and transportation by land or sea. Touch the electric button at London, Paris, Berlin, or St. Petersburg, and orders can be flashed under the sea for the rapid concentration of fleets in any given waters.

Ocean highways to-day have their steam fliers emulating the lightning express trains of our trunk lines; hence, the great distances between this country and the old nations of the world have been annihilated, and the immunity we once enjoyed is inverted, and we would be unable to-day to enforce any positive policy like the Monroe doctrine, not from the lack of patriotism, but from a continued lack of a reasonable interest in the development of our Navy.

Now, let us see what attention other nations have given to their navies while we have been moving along at a snail's pace.

Forest timber, that was always scarce in many of the old countries for shipbuilding, has been supplanted by iron, which is illimitable in the Old World. And since the adoption of iron and steel in shipbuilding foreign maritime nations have multiplied their naval fleets with astonishing rapidity, strengthening their respective national interests and policies in the same ratio, far outstripping our country in this direction, and leaving our Navy at about the fifth class. I ask if this is just to constituents who elected us to represent them in the National Legislature? With the march of time, population has increased throughout all nations, impelling a constant expansion of trade and commerce.

New lands have opened up with promising fields for trade and traffic, and others are being discovered every day, which stimulates the greed of nations for preferred rights and privileges. Treaty rights and international law are too often ignored, while the gains of a selfish nation are being prosecuted against the vested rights of a weaker one, as the frequent changes in the boundary lines of some countries bear evidence. Too much study can not be given to these conditions while measuring up the required strength of our Navy.

Until we commenced to build our modern battle ships our Navy was one of the weakest of maritime nations. Public interest took the matter up, which gave an impetus to rehabilitating the Navy and increasing it toward a standard commensurate with the demands of our great commercial interests. The result is that we can boast of having some of the most modern battle ships afloat—American in material, American in design, and American in mechanism.

The bosoms of American citizens swell with pardonable pride when reference is made to our modern war ships. But with all the growth of this marine arm of our country's service, our Navy is still numerically weak, particularly in armored cruisers, torpedo destroyers, and torpedo boats. The torpedo destroyer is a vessel that can go to sea in any kind of weather and steam 20 or 25 knots an hour without washing a man overboard, in the manner in which the young ensign, Mr. Breckinridge, lost his life from the deck of the torpedo boat *Cushing* off the harbor of Habana a short time ago.

Torpedo boats like the *Cushing* are not calculated to go outside of headlands except in a smooth sea. In the first place, they have very little free board and in their construction everything is sacrificed for speed; and with this end in view all the materials, such as frames, deck beams, and plating, are of the lightest kind consistent with safety in smooth water, where their trial trips are made and where they get a rating of 25 or 30 knots an hour. But take any of them outside in an ordinary sea, and I do not hesitate to say not one of them could make over 10 miles an hour, and then they would be like a half-tide rock, the sea breaking over them constantly.

The effective sphere of torpedo boats is at the mouth of our rivers, harbors, and bays. A torpedo destroyer or catcher is nothing more than a seagoing torpedo boat three or four times the tonnage of the ordinary torpedo boat, with this advantage: They are constructed with heavier material, greater free board, and carry a light battery, and if too much weight and material are not sacrificed for speed, they can go to sea in any kind of weather and steam well up to their maximum rate.

At this time I want to call the attention of the House to my estimate of the naval requirements during the first session of the Fifty-fourth Congress. I was absolutely confident that our Navy

was totally inefficient in torpedo boats and in torpedo-boat destroyers, and to strengthen the Navy in this direction I introduced a bill empowering the Secretary of the Navy to contract for and build fifty torpedo boats and five torpedo-boat destroyers.

Before introducing that bill, and to be assured that I was correct in my views, I consulted many of our most experienced naval officers, who heartily sustained my views; but neither the Naval Committee nor the House seemed to think it necessary to make the expenditure.

To assure you that I knew what I was talking about, and was familiar with the weak points of our Navy, I have only to state that this Government is searching the markets of the world to-day for torpedo boats and torpedo-boat destroyers.

Thus far we have been able to purchase but one, a small 17-ton boat, which is about to be shipped on board of one of the Atlantic steamers for New York. Up to the present time our agents abroad have been unable to purchase a single torpedo-boat destroyer, and the result is that our Navy is without a single one to-day. Had my bill passed during the session it was introduced, we could have had the torpedo boats and the torpedo-boat destroyers in commission to-day. This matter I will leave to the House for digestion.

Now, one word about the usefulness of a torpedo boat. Its mission is to protect our bays, rivers, and harbors, and along our coasts, where it can run into some little bay, inlet, or small harbor, ready to run out at nighttime and discharge her projectile at an enemy and get away. A torpedo-boat destroyer accompanies the fleet and watches the approach of small torpedo boats, drives them back, and, if necessary, sends a torpedo after them—a sort of watchdog for the fleet. They are indispensable in time of war.

Mr. Chairman, it is true that the expenses of this Government have exceeded its income for several years. It is a well-known fact that the appropriations for several years past have gone beyond the lines of mercantile economy. But it makes no difference whether this nation has been prosperous or not, whether the Government's expenses have exceeded its income or not, the fact remains that we have the same interests to protect, the same lines of seacoast defense to guard, the same commercial interests to watch, and the same position in the family of nations to maintain. These functions can not be performed with a feeble navy. Besides, the numerical strength and the caliber of guns are potent factors in preserving peace and solving diplomatic questions.

The American people are peaceful—slow to wrath. The pastime of contest has no charm for them. But when the honor of their country or its institutions are threatened, the American becomes aroused and his patriotism breaks all peace bands, and every man becomes a combatant, ready not only to protect this great Republic of ours, but to punish its assailants. But he must have something to fight with. Are we not as a people inclined to be boastful? Stump declamation, telling the masses what a great country we have and what a noble people we are and what we can do, does not protect our interests, let alone win a victory.

Permit me to read an extract from Assistant Secretary Roosevelt's address before the Naval War College at Newport last June:

Tame submission to foreign aggression of any kind is a mean and unworthy thing; but it is even meaner and more unworthy to bluster first, and then either submit or else refuse to make those preparations which can alone obviate the necessity for submission. I believe with all my heart in the Monroe doctrine, and I believe also that the great mass of the American people are loyal to it; but it is worse than idle to announce our adherence to this doctrine and yet to decline to take measures to show that ours is not mere lip loyalty. * * * If we possess an immense navy, small is the chance indeed that we shall ever be dragged into a war to uphold the Monroe doctrine. If we do not possess such a navy, war may be forced on us at any time.

If I remember correctly, the gentleman from Arkansas said in case of foreign trouble the loyal citizens of his Commonwealth would flock to our shores in defense of our institutions. No one doubts his statement; but that does not add a single ship to our Navy. Can we, unarmed, meet a foreign foe? Can we cope with a foreign nation without ship for ship, gun for gun? Whose duty is it, if not the duty of Congress, to watch the barometer of events and note when it indicates disturbances or foretells future possibilities?

It gave us a warning in the Chilean controversy a few years ago. Our Navy at that time was not powerful enough to guarantee success at the start. The Venezuelan boundary dispute was another warning, and the present strained relations with Spain over Cuban affairs is still another. We are not without warnings. Why, no later than last December two German training ships entered the harbor of Port au Prince and demanded the payment of \$30,000 in gold from the Haitian Government; also an apology to the German Emperor for some alleged indignity to the German chargé d'affaires.

On a failure to comply with these terms inside of four hours, bombardment of the city would immediately take place. That

was a condition of affairs which certainly circumscribed the possibility of an ultimate infringement upon the Monroe doctrine.

It seems to me after such warnings that it would be a crime against this great Republic if Congress failed to make every provision to protect American interests by rapidly increasing our war ships to a maximum that will make our fleets a menace to all nations that should attempt to impinge our American policy. The people demand this protection and are bitterly complaining from the want of foresight on the part of its past and present national legislators.

This country has not seen the end of war, nor of foreign disputes or international controversies. International peace conferences may resolve and resolve, and they may sing their panegyric hymns of peace, yet, Mr. Chairman, the lion and lamb are not fraternizing, neither are swords being beaten into plowshares nor spears into pruning hooks, for just so long as there is a powerful nation on the one side, and a weak one on the other, disputes will arise, and the stronger will take advantage of the weaker. Such is the history of nations from the beginning of the world to the present day.

Why is it, Mr. Chairman, that this Republic, which was founded by intelligent, brave, heroic, and fighting stock (which qualities have been inherited by their descendants, who have, North and South, East and West, always demonstrated the courage of their convictions) is without a powerful navy, ready at a moment's notice to meet any emergency to sustain the American policy? Is it because Congresses forgot their responsibilities and wandered from the domain of American vigilance, the watchward of our fathers, and left the old ship of state swinging to her anchor without a watchman or lookout?

Is it not a fact that there has been too much politics in legislation—too many selfish interests centered in Congressional districts? I believe in politics, likewise in partisanship; but, above all, I believe in country first. The better American, the nobler partisan. It is true that every member of this House represents some district; but when a member takes his seat in the National Legislature, he represents, as a member of that great body, every foot of space within the boundary lines of the United States, and every act of his affects in some degree the common weal of the nation.

How often, under the cloak of public improvements, have vast sums of public moneys been wasted in useless improvements to perpetuate political careers?

Citizens who have followed the trend of national legislation will tell you that the public moneys which have been wasted in deepening unnavigable creeks and rivers would have gone far toward building and keeping up our Navy to its proper strength, power, and effectiveness.

While Congress should be more conservative in its appropriations, it can not, in the interests of the people of the United States, economize in appropriations for the maintenance of its Navy—the sheet anchor of our country. It watches over our institutions and resolutely defends every American policy enunciated and established since the Declaration of Independence. [Applause.]

No matter what political strifes we have, or whether the affairs of our Government are administered by a Republican or a Democratic Administration, the Navy never swerves from its line of duty, which is as fixed and true to this Republic as the needle is to the Pole.

The Navy makes no invidious distinctions between parties or sections. Its functions are absolutely American. Keep up our Navy, to the end that it may be equal to and ready for any emergency.

This means peace—peace with honor. [Applause.]

In closing, I will say that no matter what mistakes may have been made in the past, our duty is with the present; and permit me to say that no assemblage clothed with initiative power ever had within its reach a better opportunity to win the encomium of the people and illuminate the pages of history than the present Congress by inaugurating a new departure in its naval legislation on lines so liberal, patriotic, and American that all succeeding Congresses shall follow our precedent as the only safeguard to protect American policy. [Applause.]

Supplementing my remarks, I would suggest the establishment of a board of American admiralty, to consist of five naval officers of long and practical experience, whose duty it shall be to make recommendations to Congress, from time to time, through the Secretary of the Navy, for the perfection of our Navy and keeping it up to a proper standard, as recent developments have already demonstrated its total inadequacy in certain respects.

The Navy of the United States should be a modern one, thoroughly up to date in every particular, and Congress should have at all times in making appropriations the benefit of the views of the most enlightened naval authorities.

Had such a board been in existence during the past ten years

we would not be in foreign markets to-day buying war ships, and the keel of every torpedo boat, torpedo-boat destroyer, and war ship of our Navy would bear the imprint of an American hammer. [Applause.]

Comparative summary of the principal fleets of the world, built and building

Classes of vessels.	British Empire.		France.		Russia.		Italy.		Germany.		United States.		Japan.		Spain.		Chile.	
	a.	b.	a.	b.	a.	b.	a.	b.	a.	b.	a.	b.	a.	b.	a.	b.	a.	b.
Fit for the line of battle...	A.	29	9	12	5	10	6	6	2	4	3	4	5	2	3	1
	B.	12	4	4	7	...	1
	C.	11	5	3	...	1
	D.	5	13	6	8	...	6
	F.	18	4	12	6	10	4	...	1	...	4	4	5	4	1
	G.	17	4	2	2	1
	H.	46	3	16	2	2	3	6	11	...	8	3	1	3	1
	I.	11	...	6	1	6
Commerce protection and scouting	J.	21	10	14	3	1	8	1	7	...	3	1	
	K.	23	3	
	L.	1	13	1	20	6	...	3	...	3	...	5	...	1	
	M.	11	12	21	11	13	2	
Coast defense	N.	49	14	13	6	6	11	
	O.	33	6	13	2	8	15	2	9	1	11	3	4	
Torpedo attack and defense	P.	90	6	8	114	1	9	1	9	1	3	...	8	6	4	
	Q.	51	43	67	104	13	65	...	7	8	2	110	...	6	
	R.	30	145	28	6	4	53	...	1	8	22	13	26	...	1	
	Summary:	75	13	46	11	30	10	20	6	22	4	13	5	7	7	8	4	4
Line	119	17	51	8	23	2	17	1	18	7	27	15	4	12	6	4	2	
Cruisers	60	...	26	...	34	13	6	13		
Coast defense	308	12	257	38	181	14	182	16	151	1	8	15	29	22	63	3	27	
Torpedo flotilla	70	6	102	...	35	...	37	...	18	...	24	...	17	...	96	...	10	
Unclassified vessels	

- A. First-class battle ships.
- B. Second-class battle ships.
- C. Third-class battle ships.
- D. Seagoing coast-defense ironclads.
- F. Armored cruisers.
- G. First-class protected cruisers, 6,000 tons and over.
- H. Second-class protected cruisers, 3,000 tons to 5,999 tons.
- I. Second-class unprotected cruisers, 3,000 tons to 5,999 tons.
- J. Third-class protected cruisers under 3,000 tons.
- K. Third-class partially protected cruisers under 3,000 tons.
- L. Third-class unprotected cruisers under 3,000 tons, not including old and slow ships.
- M. Torpedo gunboats.
- E. Nonseagoing coast-defense ironclads.
- N. Gun vessels, third class, mounting heavy guns for coast defense.
- O. Torpedo-boat destroyers.
- P. Torpedo boats, first class.
- Q. Torpedo boats, second class.
- R. Torpedo boats, third class.

The unclassified vessels comprise all armed vessels not included in the above-mentioned classes, and consist of gunboats, special-service vessels, old and slow cruisers, small gun vessels, and armed dispatch vessels. Under each nation column a contains the number of vessels completed; column b the number of vessels building, and shows the present activity in naval construction. Column a may be taken as the present naval strength of each nation; columns a and b combined as the strength in 1900.

FEBRUARY, 1898.

Mr. MEYER of Louisiana. Mr. Chairman, I now yield to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. SKINNER].

Mr. SKINNER. Mr. Chairman, the provision for our Navy in this crisis of our history is of international importance and of universal interest, as it carries with it, as it should, extraordinary provisions and authority.

Standing as we do on an isthmus connecting the dead and unborn—the fathers of our liberty who have gone before us and the sons that are to come after us, in joy or sorrow—we should in this serious crisis pause and dedicate our hearts to our country, to humanity, and to liberty, and our minds to sacred, sober contemplations on our duty to ourselves, to the human family, and to that Being who stood by our fathers in the great day of their fiery trial and by whom we will be held accountable for the manner in which we shall direct and deliver the responsible trust which in His inscrutable wisdom has been imposed upon us.

Mr. Chairman, the brow of civilization at this hour of the world's history seems to be wrinkled with the frowns of war. Not an instant of time within four centuries can be recalled when the rumors of war so simultaneously and universally reverberated.

No great war in actual progress, but preparations for war everywhere. Japan has voted in preparation for war her yens, Russia her rubles, England her pounds sterling, the United States her dollars, and Spain has hawked her depreciated credit on every market to obtain the means and sinews of war.

There is war in Cuba, and we should have made this declaration of truth to the world long ago and had the powers of the earth to know and feel with absolute certainty that this country by inspiration, inheritance, and obligation is the ally, guardian, and protector of suffering humanity and liberty, certainly on this continent. There is preparation for war between this country and Spain. All Europe is growling at each other over a division of

the Chinese spoils. Japan is rushing her military forces to her Pacific coast, England is fighting Mahdi in Central Africa and her rebelling tribes in North India. In South America Argentina is preparing for a conflict with Chile, and in Crete the conditions of Moslems and Christians are anything but quiet.

The spirit of apprehension and preparation covers and encircles the globe. And if these great powers, by design or complication, shall be drawn into active hostile engagements, with the modern improved destructive implements of warfare, no man can foretell the end, the result, or the consequences.

War is our business, but to whom is given To die or triumph? That determine, Heaven.

The face of the whole civilized world may be changed.

All our accumulated and inherited wealth of letters, learning, history, science, ingenuity, genius, invention, discovery, progress, civilization, and light here and to the eternal shores may be lost or relegated to a dark age for centuries. Who can foresee, who can foretell? Or the very preparation and appearance of war may solve the great problems of the age, by emancipating nations and men from dependence upon and servitude to the sordid metals and making them more reliant upon their own credit and resources, relegating this relic of barbarism to the realm of commodities, and establishing an equitable basis of distribution for all human national and international transactions, and ushering in the twentieth century with the United States of the World formulated upon that sound and solemn and sacred compact which will be approved on earth and ratified in heaven?

"Nation shall lift no sword against nation. Neither shall they learn war any more."

When learning and art, and especially religion, shall weave ties that shall make war fratricide.

Mr. Chairman, under these conditions it may be statesmanship, consummate diplomacy, and wise patriotism and prophetic caution to prepare for the seeming conflict, with the reserved, patriotic, and Christian hope that the very preparation may avert war and command peace. Prepare wisely, abundantly, with deliberation for defense, yea for aggression, when involving suffering humanity on this continent or kindling the torches of liberty in Cuba, until her shores shall be a continuous circle of light, creating that beautiful circlet in the South Atlantic, that shall increase in size as it broadens, until it bears in the music of its waves this joyous news to every shore of civilization.

War, grim-visaged and destructive, is a relic of barbarism, and should be avoided, if possible, in the interest of Christian peace and civilization and their benign blessings. The brave, honorable Americans and the valuable sinews that we would have to employ and sacrifice in destructive war we need to husband and employ in fighting the battles of peace, whose victories are as renowned as those of war.

We need employ them to bring more comforts to American homes, in enlightening the minds, Christianizing the hearts, and bettering the condition of American masses. We need employ them in still further developing and enriching our already marvelously great country, in extending our commerce on land and sea, in constructing our great inland waterways, in building the Nicaragua Canal, connecting us with the Orient, and other great projects made possible by American genius and enterprise. Desirable as all of these may be and are, yet, if need be, we would make one and all of them a willing sacrifice upon the altar of starving humanity and liberty.

Mr. Chairman, it would seem in this day of light and Christian reason that all international differences could and should be arbitrated. If our quarrel, so just, as we know and feel it to be, was with any other nation in the world, we might indulge the hope for a peaceful settlement, giving adequate actual indemnity for the Maine, immediate and substantial relief to the starving Cubans and independence to Cuba upon just and honorable terms. But a history of the rise and fall of Spain, with her invariable record of cruelty, of persecution, of bigotry, of tyranny, of hostility to every sentiment of human freedom, common justice, and enlightenment, forbids us to indulge in the hope of this happy solution. The slavery to which Spain doomed its subjects in the Western Hemisphere was not more cruel than its oppression of the people of Holland or its tyranny over its own people at home.

After all, it may be Divine design and retributive justice that has brought this proud, tyrannical, long-sinners nation to judgment, to confront the Republic of liberty, equality, justice, and civilization, where the wage, the issue, is the triumph of justice, truth, liberty, humanity.

With the God of these attributes and the Father of nations to direct our councils in peace and our armies and navies in war, we should not, we do not, fear the result.

Mr. Chairman, I am a great believer in retributive justice and providential intervention where the welfare of the human family is involved.

I was born in a land cursed with a system of slavery, which was antagonistic to the spirit and letter of our Constitution and

institutions; and when we refused to surrender it peacefully, in my early youth I witnessed it wiped away by an issue of fire and blood, and I have lived, although a personal sufferer, to thank God and to regard the result as a blessing in disguise, making our country stronger, richer, and more hopeful and happier.

I read that in the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries oppressions fell upon and tyranny reigned over the people of Europe, and the oppressed fled from tyranny. They were providentially guided to a home and refuge then beyond the sunset. Their first work was to dedicate this country to God and liberty. They felled the forest and builded the country. The earth responded to their labors and the population multiplied.

But with the development of the country was also developed the sturdy spirit of independence, and when oppression came the spirit of '76 created the formal Declaration of Independence, to my mind and heart on the brightest day that ever beamed upon the moral world. This declaration and its emblem cheered the half-clad and half-fed heroes at Valley Forge, waved over the redoubts on Bunker Hill, floated from the masthead of the *Bon Homme Richard*, kissed the breezes of victory on the waters of Erie and Champlain, and waved in triumph over the army of Wellington on the immortal field of Chippewa, and Cornwallis at Yorktown, tearing liberty's ensign from the British lion.

We read in sacred history that when heavy oppression fell upon the children of Israel, when they were compelled "to make brick without straw," that a leader was raised up for them. They were given a pillar of cloud by day and a pillar of fire by night. The sea was caused to open and they pass as upon dry land, and the waters to recede and destroy their pursuing oppressors. They were given a law of government from amid the lightnings of Sinai. When they were hungry the heavens issued bread, and when thirsty the rocks issued water. The same Providence, in his own time and way, cares for the starving Cubans. He has given this country to them as their promised land, and these people as their guardians, defenders, and protectors; and this has been brought about in a way that we would not shrink from the obligation and responsibility, if we could, and we could not, with respect, if we would.

Mr. Chairman, in this solemn, serious, and anxious moment the American in the White House should, as he does, command our unqualified sympathy, confidence, and approval. Divided as we may be politically, racially, or sectionally, at the water's edge we are one, and our unity is represented by that emblem; and our President and Commander-in-Chief—his policy shall be our policy, his settlement or action shall be ours also.

He has carried with him to prayer, to church, to private and official relation in life the secrets and responsibilities of the crisis. He has demeaned himself with Christian patience, fortitude, and consummate statesmanship, so as to receive the approval of his people and the respect and admiration of the civilized world. We can trust him to develop his own policy; that policy we are sure will be a humane, liberty-loving, broad American policy, such as all Christendom will applaud and approve.

Mr. MEYER of Louisiana. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. FITZGERALD].

[Mr. FITZGERALD addressed the committee. See Appendix.]

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE.

The committee informally rose; and Mr. BOUTELLE of Maine having taken the chair as Speaker pro tempore, a message from the Senate, by Mr. PLATT, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment bills of the following titles:

H. R. 5865. An act to authorize the Monroe Railway and Construction Company to construct a bridge across Red River at or near Grand Ecore, La.; and

H. R. 1803. An act for the relief of Joseph P. Patton.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed the following resolutions:

Resolved, That the Senate has heard with profound sorrow of the death of the Hon. ISHAM G. HARRIS, late a Senator from the State of Tennessee.

Resolved, That as a mark of respect to the memory of the deceased, the business of the Senate be now suspended, to enable his associates to pay proper tribute of regard to his high character and distinguished public services.

Resolved, That the Secretary communicate these resolutions to the House of Representatives.

Resolved, That as an additional mark of respect, the Senate, at the conclusion of these ceremonies, do adjourn.

NAVAL APPROPRIATION BILL.

The committee resumed its session.

Mr. MEYER of Louisiana. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. KITCHIN].

[Mr. KITCHIN addressed the committee. See Appendix.]

Mr. DOCKERY. Mr. Chairman, I shall support the bill now pending to maintain and increase the American Navy. The necessity for additional war ships is so obvious that argument becomes unnecessary. The barbarous character of the warfare waged by

Spain in Cuba is no longer in dispute. The awful desolation and destruction of human life carried on there under Spanish rule are now no longer matters of contention. For months the American correspondents in Cuba have recited in our press the harrowing details of slaughter, rapine, starvation, and extermination inaugurated by Weyler, and so appalling is the story that the American people have been loath to believe it. But the statements of Senator PROCTOR, Senator GALLINGER, Senator THURSTON, and other eye-witnesses recently returned from the island fully vindicate the honor and veracity of the American press correspondents.

Indeed, Mr. Chairman, language seems impotent to depict, much less to exaggerate, the cruelties perpetrated by Spain in her efforts to exterminate the Cuban population. The wholesale carnival of blood visited by the early Spanish Conquistadores upon the unresisting aborigines of the West Indies, Mexico, and Peru at the beginning of her sovereignty over America, the atrocities of the Duke of Alva in the Netherlands, the massacre of the Armenians by the Turks, and the scalping of helpless women and children by the Apaches do not surpass the recent crimes of Spain in Cuba. It is estimated that more than 400,000 Cubans have already perished by Spanish cruelty. I declared months ago that the United States should not longer hesitate to intervene in behalf of Cuba's freedom.

Every hour of delay only intensifies the sufferings and miseries of the hapless Cubans. The dictates of humanity and of civilization peremptorily forbid further delay. It can not be that this great country will much longer tolerate on the American continent Spanish atrocities like those of the Dark Ages. The time for action, for intervention, for interference, for swift and sudden cessation, has come. Sir, I believe the President will respond to the unanimous desire of the American people and go, with Congress and the nation, to the end, without halting or looking back. I am convinced that he desires to start aright. Surely he must be nearly ready for the march. It now seems that war is inevitable. Mr. Chairman, if it is necessary, let it come, and let it drive the cruel, treacherous Spaniard from the Western World. Whether the outcome of present conditions be war or peace, we should build up and strengthen the American Navy. [Applause.]

Mr. MEYER of Louisiana. I now yield thirty minutes to the gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. OSBORNE].

Mr. OSBORNE. Mr. Chairman, as a general proposition, I am opposed to discussing subjects not directly connected with the legislation we have under consideration; but the fact that misleading statements have been made upon this floor during the discussion of monetary legislation, statements which, in my opinion, ought not to be permitted to go to the country unanswered, and the further fact that they, under our rules, can be answered in no other manner, must be my excuse for craving the indulgence of the House at this time.

I listened, Mr. Chairman, to the speeches made by gentlemen on that side of the Chamber during the debate on the Teller resolution. I have more recently listened to the speech upon the financial question made by the distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. ALEXANDER], and I now want to say that in my hearing since I served as a member of this body there has not been an argument advanced offering a legitimate defense of the single gold standard. We have heard our great reform leader maliciously traduced; we have heard our cause abused; we have listened to unjustifiable predictions of dreadful impending calamities that will befall us after silver is remonetized; but I have not heard a single argument based on defensible premises; not an argument backed up by historical deductions or logical reasoning.

Right in this connection, Mr. Chairman, I want to remark that any cause which must be upheld by ridiculous untruths or by mystifying half-truths can but prove a menace to the liberties of the people, and on general principles, without further argument, merits the stamp of their righteous condemnation. We have been told repeatedly that the conservative people of this country do not want to experiment with any new financial system during these critical times, a statement which naturally conveys the idea that bimetalism is something new, is an experiment. We deny this allegation.

Bimetalism has been thoroughly tried and has never failed to keep this body politic sound in wind and limb. It was in use away back in our colonial days. It was established as the American financial system in 1792, shortly after the declaration of our independence as a nation. It remained in continuous use and served us faithfully until stolen from us by the dastardly conspiracy of 1873. It was while silver and gold were recognized as our money of ultimate redemption, money endowed with full debt-paying capacity, that we laid the foundation for and erected here the grandest nation on earth.

We during that period created wealth which was justly distributed amounting to enough to buy the countries of Russia, Turkey, Egypt, Norway, Sweden, Denmark, South Africa, Australia, and all of South America, with their lands, palaces, factories, mines, ships, flocks, jewels, crowns, money, all of their wealth of every

description, wealth that had been accumulating for centuries, while our country was comparatively new. We then, Mr. Chairman, were a bold, a fearless, a proud leader of nations, not as to-day a stumbling follower, not an humble supplicant for permission to legislate for ourselves.

We coined and issued all of our own money, and every dollar of that money was worth a hundred cents. It was all sound, all honest, and yet we did not find it necessary to keep a reserve fund of \$100,000,000 in the Treasury as a guaranty that our debts would be paid. The honor, the integrity, the enterprise, and patriotism of the American people were a sufficient guaranty that we would meet all just demands, as they ought to be now. We had in those days neither 50-cent silver dollars nor 200-cent gold dollars. Our dollars were all at a parity; each was at a parity with the other, and, above all, the products of toil were at a parity with them. We not only had honest dollars, but we had honest pounds of cotton, honest bushels of wheat, and honest days labor. We had neither idle men nor idle money; they were both employed earning fair compensation.

We are told, however, that the nation has more wealth to-day than it had in 1873. True; but who to-day owns the wealth of this nation? Under your system of confiscation a large portion of the earnings of the masses has been misappropriated by the few. Four per cent of our people have been permitted under this system to absorb more than 80 per cent of the nation's entire wealth. In the States of New York and Massachusetts, where the greatest wealth is concentrated, we find existing the greatest proportion of poverty. In these States, around which an insurmountable wall of protective tariff has been erected, one-third of the support of families falls upon helpless women and children, who ought to be at home by the fireside. They have been driven into the factory and sweat shops because husbands, fathers, and brothers can not earn enough to provide food and raiment for those dependent upon them.

Never was humanity so cold and hungry, never were so many out of employment, as at the present time. The concentration of wealth, Mr. Chairman, in the hands of a few individuals does not mean universal prosperity. Prosperity depends not upon the accumulation of wealth, but upon its just distribution, and such prosperity as has been forced upon a few favored individuals by vicious legislation means distress and poverty among the actual producers of that prosperity. So we say the history of events warrants us in making the assertion that it is not the experiment we are advocating; we are merely warning you against the continuance of your experiment, which has brought so much suffering to humanity. We demand, not an experimental financial system, but that old-fashioned, that tried and true, that constitutional financial system which was recommended by Jefferson, approved by Washington, and subsequently indorsed by Jackson, Lincoln, and Blaine, true patriots, who to-day, if they were among us, would, in all probability, be termed anarchists and repudiators.

The distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. ALEXANDER] asks if there has ever been an international agreement, or if there is any hope of an international agreement. In answer to the gentleman we say there has never been an international agreement; there is not the slightest hope of an international agreement; there has never been the remotest necessity for an international agreement, and we do not care whether there ever is an international agreement. We have managed to get along very nicely without an international agreement.

Before the resumption of specie payment, when we had neither gold nor silver in circulation, we had no trouble in settling our trade balances with foreign countries and in retaining their confidence. During that time our growth in wealth, in population, and in commercial importance was without a parallel in history. Just think of it. This great nation, with its industrious and enterprising people, a nation whose productive capacity of all the world needs is only limited by what the world demands of us, a nation which Gladstone tells us has the foundation for the greatest continuous empire ever established by man, a nation which we were told by General Grant could support 500,000,000 of people, and yet to-day, with but 70,000,000 of people, 10,000,000 of them are suffering for the actual necessities of life.

A nation whose internal commerce even now during these critical times exceeds the foreign commerce of all the world, a nation whose commerce is one-third of the commerce of the entire world, a nation whose internal commerce is 96 per cent of our entire commerce, leaving but 4 per cent of our trade with foreign countries—and yet for the sake of this 4 per cent, this mere bagatelle, the greater portion of which will come to us anyway, they tell us that we must wait until England and other foreign countries will permit us to legislate for ourselves.

We contend, Mr. Chairman, that it is not necessary to ask the consent of England. We contend that it is extremely unwise to ask the advice of foreigners who are not in sympathy with our American institutions upon matters pertaining to the welfare of the American people. England, a creditor nation, will never give

her consent. She has always favored scarce and dear money, and when I say this I do not refer to industrial England, I refer to bondholding England.

If the industrial masses of England could to-day vote on this question, they, by an overwhelming majority, would vote in favor of the double standard, the double measure of values. But bondholding England, the few who own the dollars, want those dollars scarce; they want dear dollars, realizing that dear dollars mean the ruination of American producers. Why, away back more than one hundred years ago, this same class of money sharks paralyzed the commerce of our American colonies by commanding that no more paper bills be issued, and then destroyed the legal-tender function of those in existence.

They again at one time by counterfeiting our colonial currency endeavored to so weaken confidence in it as to produce a disastrous contraction. But in 1783 it was generally presumed throughout the world that our independence, both financial and political, was established for all time to come through the valorous deeds of an American ancestry. We since that time have been boasting of our independence, of the freedom we enjoy under this republican form of government, of our fortunate escape from British bondage, little dreaming that in an unguarded moment our old enemy, taking advantage of our inexperience in crafty legislation, had, through her Benedict Arnolds on this side of the Atlantic, again drawn us within her relentless grasp by destroying one-half of our debt-paying money.

The British bondholder did not dare to openly advocate an enlargement of our debts or a system of confiscation which would cut in half the prices of our farm products, realizing that such a bold maneuver would in all probability arouse again the spirit of 1776, but by a little legislative legerdemain she, through her pliant tools on this side, accomplished the identical object by depriving us of one-half of the money which we are obliged to pay our debts with. We repeat England, a creditor nation, has always favored dear money, and ours, a debtor nation, should, for self-preservation if for no other reason, oppose her selfish policy.

We are the most deeply interested in maintaining an honest dollar, because in the development of this new country—and our development has but begun—an enormous debt has been created, payable in honest dollars. And what is an honest dollar? Our definition of an honest dollar is a dollar that costs no more to buy, a dollar that measures no more of the products of toil, than the dollar originally borrowed. We are willing to pay in this kind of dollars. We are willing to pay in honest dollars. We are willing to pay in 100-cent dollars; but we protest against paying in dishonest dollars, in dollars made dishonest by unconstitutional laws, and in taking this position we are not advocating repudiation, as is charged. We are merely condemning confiscation.

If we are an independent people, as we boast, let us stop paying unjust tribute to those who would destroy our independence. Let us wipe from our statute books those unconstitutional laws which are obstructing our development as a nation, laws which are despoiling our producing masses to enrich the idle classes, laws which are throttling the very existence of American manhood. Let us follow the advice given by that illustrious American, James G. Blaine, who said:

I consider gold and silver the money of the Constitution—indeed, the money of the American people anterior to the Constitution. The responsibility of restoring silver to its ancient and honorable place devolves on the Congress of the United States. If we act here with firmness, the influence of our example will be potential with other countries.

And what further did Mr. Blaine say? Did he advise us to beg England for permission to legislate for ourselves? Did he advise us to send Wolcott commissions abroad to prostitute the dignity of American manhood for the amusement of foreign scoffers? No. That illustrious American, James G. Blaine, further advised that we "make Europe recognize American silver by first remonetizing it ourselves."

Gentlemen insist that the idea of remonetizing silver is but the flitting dream of a few deluded cranks who want silver to advance in value because the Western mine owners will thereby be benefited. And then, with almost the same breath, they proceed to tell us that value can not be legislated into money. There was scarcely a leader on the other side of the Chamber who, during the debate on the Teller resolution, did not insist that we can not legislate value into money, that the bullion value of the silver in a dollar is 50 cents, that this is the intrinsic value of the silver, and that we can not legislate any more value into it. Now, if we can not legislate value into money, the remonetization of silver will not cause silver to advance in value, and all this talk about the fabulous fortunes which are to accrue to the imaginary silver miners' trust is without foundation.

We know, however, Mr. Chairman, that we can legislate value into money. We know that money has no value except by legislation; that the remonetization of silver will cause it to advance to \$1.29 per ounce; that as soon as it is remonetized one ounce of silver will be worth one-sixteenth of an ounce of gold. We judge

the future by what the history of the past has clearly demonstrated. We want it to advance, not because it will benefit the mine owners, but because it will benefit 99 per cent of the American people.

To be sure, the mine owners, in common with others, will be benefited, but this is a matter of minor importance. Fifty per cent added to the value of our silver output will increase the mine-owners' income but about \$35,000,000 a year, while 50 per cent added to the value of our wheat and cotton crops will increase the farmers' income on these two products alone not less than \$200,000,000 a year.

If the gold worshippers are jealous of our Western mine owners, they can go out West and compete with them.

The privilege of prospecting and mining in the Western country is not monopolized by a close corporation as is the case with some of the leading industries in the East. But do you know, sirs, that in the State of Colorado, our greatest silver-producing State, and our greatest gold-producing State, too, by the way—I say do you know that in the State of Colorado the value of her farm products is double and the value of her factory products is more than quadruple the value of her entire silver output? While if silver had never been demonetized the mine owners would have realized during the last thirty-five years something like \$270,000,000 more than they have realized, during the same time the cotton planters would have realized not less than \$2,000,000,000 more and the wheat grower not less than \$3,500,000,000 more than they have realized.

Without itemizing the greatly increased profits which would have accrued on other products of the farm, I feel justified in stating, after a careful study of the most reliable statistics to be obtained on this subject, that the loss sustained on farm products alone during the last thirty-five years, while the price of the dollar has been steadily appreciating and the price of all commodities steadily depreciating, reaches the enormous sum of \$35,000,000,000. One billion dollars a year has been lost by this system of contraction. One billion dollars a year means about \$3,000,000 a day. That is more than it cost on both sides to conduct the late civil war. Just think of it! A greater continuous drain on the American farmer, day after day, year after year, decade after decade, than that occasioned during the five years of that dreadful civil war.

Why, this loss is more than double your entire tariff-revenue receipts, your internal-revenue receipts, and your miscellaneous Treasury receipts combined. Yet we are told that other questions are more important, that we must leave this British financial legislation upon our statute books until haughty England and a few poor deluded American anglo-maniacs kindly condescend to let free Americans legislate for themselves.

The cause of this almost incomprehensible loss is finally attributed by our friends on the other side to overproduction of commodities. And yet statistics prove that from 1853 to 1873 the world's annual increase in the production of all commodities was 2.8 per cent, and yet prices advanced during that period 20 per cent. From 1873 to 1893, the succeeding period of twenty years after the demonetization of silver, the world's annual increase in the production of all commodities was but 1.6 per cent, and yet prices fell during the latter period 32 per cent, and are now, as we all know to our sorrow, with but one or two abnormal exceptions, lower than ever before since the discovery of this continent.

No, Mr. Chairman, it is not overproduction of commodities; it is underproduction of money which prevents a proper distribution, and hence a normal consumption of the commodities we are producing. There can be no overproduction of breadstuffs or wearing apparel while the masses are cold and hungry. In 1873 the American people were consuming about 6 bushels of wheat per capita, and they were paying \$1.30 a bushel for wheat. In 1895, they were consuming but a little more than 3 bushels of wheat per capita, and yet wheat had fallen to 67 cents a bushel. Now, it is fair to presume that our people needed as much bread in 1895 as they did in 1873, but they could not earn the money to buy the bread they actually needed, notwithstanding the fact that wheat had fallen almost 50 per cent in value.

Your falling prices have curtailed the field for employment. The farmer and the laboring man can not earn the money with which to buy of the country merchant. The country merchant can not buy of the jobber, the jobber can not place his orders with the manufacturer. The factory closes, and then goes up the cry, "Vote for a higher tariff in order that our factories and mills may once more be opened. It is more necessary to open our factories and our mills than it is to open our mints." You heard that in the last campaign, and, strange as it may seem, a great many farmers, producers, and laboring men are still voting that old ticket; still voting for a higher tariff; still permitting themselves to be drawn deeper and deeper into the meshes of this relentless money power by that siren cry.

They seem to forget that it is not more taxation and less money they need, but less taxation and more money. Why, my friends, if overproduction is the cause of falling prices, what remedy are

you going to offer? How will you stop prices from falling if overproduction is the cause? Will you stop producing? Will you close your factories and stop cultivating the farm, and thus re-enforce the great army of American tramps by thousands and thousands of new recruits taken from the ranks of honest toil?

No, Mr. Chairman, neither the perpetuation of the present vicious system of taxation, which has added steadily to the tax on consumption until the industrial masses, owning but one-tenth of this nation's property, are obliged to pay nine-tenths of the nation's taxes, nor your bankers' monetary system can blow up from this vast expanse of distress and impoverishment that great tidal wave of prosperity for which you are so anxiously longing. I will tell you what it is doing. It is arousing a vast tidal wave of public indignation which will in the not far distant future sweep you and your trust-breeding laws out of existence. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. DRIGGS. I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman have five minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. The time is in the control of the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. MEYER].

Mr. MEYER of Louisiana. Inasmuch as the two gentlemen who were to have the remainder of the time on this side are absent, I of course have no objection to granting the gentleman's request.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Wyoming is extended five minutes.

Mr. OSBORNE. I read again from the speech of the distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. ALEXANDER]:

Free-silver men have been active and persistent, going up and down the land enforcing their views, printing pages of speeches in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and mailing them free of cost throughout the country. Their campaign has been continuous. Defeat did not stop them, and delayed hopes do not discourage them.

Now, if we must apologize to the gentleman for being active, I want to say to him that we still have confidence in the patriotism of the American people. We believe the American people want to do right. We believe the American people will do right when they ascertain in which direction the finger of justice beckons them. The strength of our cause is the justice of our cause, and we have but to educate the people upon this great economic question in order to have them behind us in our fight.

We are active, we are persistent, and we have met nothing to discourage us in the work. In the preliminary skirmish of 1896 our dauntless leader polled six and one-half million votes. He polled more votes than had ever before in the history of this nation been cast for the Presidential candidate of any political party, and that splendid result was achieved notwithstanding the fact that the wealth of two continents was poured in here to deprive American citizens of their constitutional right to cast a free and untrammelled ballot. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

To be sure, we met with a temporary defeat in that contest, but that defeat only served—let me sound the warning—it only served to more thoroughly amalgamate the conscientious reform forces of all the reform political parties. Let me say to the gentleman further that we are to-day more closely united than ever, and we have registered a vow never to cease our efforts in this good work until the wrongs of the common people are righted. [Applause on the Democratic side.] We won a victory in that campaign, for we, in the city of Chicago, after one of the fiercest struggles ever recorded in the history of American politics, rescued the standard of Democracy from the hands of the traitorous leaders who had so basely prostituted the sacred trust reposed in them, and to-day, thank God, consecrated anew to the principles so fearlessly upheld by Jefferson, Democracy still lives to bless mankind. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

We made the issue in that contest, and that was a victory. We inscribed upon our banner a platform recommending the enlargement of our primary money, protesting against placing the burden of taxation upon the shoulders of those least able to bear it—a platform in spirit reiterating the words of warning uttered by Daniel Webster:

The liberties of the people can not long endure in a country where the tendency is to concentrate wealth in the hands of the few.

Now, Mr. Chairman, in conclusion, as that was our platform in 1896, it is still our platform, and will continue to be our platform until there is once more restored to this country a government for and by those governed.

We not only have our platform framed ready for you to criticize, but the American people have already nominated a candidate for the Presidency upon that platform, one who when elected will fulfill its every pledge. Continue to heap your abuse upon him, if you will, but that abuse only tends to magnify his unsullied Americanism. He stands before the American people possessing the statesmanship of a Jefferson, the courage of a Jackson, the eloquence of a Webster, yet with all the gentleness and honesty

of an Abraham Lincoln. [Applause on the Democratic side.] The day is coming, it is not far distant, my friends, when all true Americans of every political creed, of every class, and of every section will unite in thanking God that there has been raised from the common people a William J. Bryan to bless the common people. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. MEYER of Louisiana. I yield to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DE GRAFFENREID].

[Mr. DE GRAFFENREID addressed the committee. See Appendix.]

Mr. MEYER of Louisiana. Mr. Chairman, I had promised the remainder of the time apportioned to this side to two gentlemen who are not present. I therefore yield the remainder of the time that I have.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. MEYER] yields the balance of his time.

And then, on motion of Mr. BOUTELLE of Maine, the committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the Chair, Mr. SHERMAN, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that committee had had under consideration the naval appropriation bill (H. R. 9378) and had come to no resolution thereon.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED.

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

H. R. 8618. An act for the relief of the sufferers by the destruction of the U. S. S. *Maine* in the harbor of Habana, Cuba.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE.

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows: To Mr. BRUMM, until Monday evening, on account of important business.

To Mr. HICKS, for ten days, on account of important business.

And then, on motion of Mr. BOUTELLE of Maine (at 5 o'clock and 54 minutes p. m.), the House adjourned.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, the following executive and other communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

A letter from the assistant clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting a copy of the findings filed by the court in the case of the Presbyterian Church of Murfreesboro, Tenn., against The United States—to the Committee on War Claims, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the assistant clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting a copy of the findings filed by the court in the case of W. W. Jackson against The United States—to the Committee on War Claims, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a copy of a communication from the Interstate Commerce Commission submitting certain items disallowed by the accounting officers of the Treasury—to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting draft of a joint resolution for printing the Statistical Abstract of the United States—to the Committee on Printing, and ordered to be printed.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

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

Mr. GROSVENOR, from the Committee on Mines and Mining, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 7442) to amend section 2323 of the Revised Statutes of the United States, relating to tunnel rights, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 809); which said bill and report were referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. HOOKER, from the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, to which was referred the joint resolution of the House (H. Res. 175) for a survey of the harbor at Sheboygan, Wis., reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 810); which said joint resolution and report were referred to the House Calendar.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the joint resolution of the House (H. Res. 174) for the improvement of the harbor at Port Washington, Wis., reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 811); which said joint resolution and report were referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. RICHARDSON, from the Committee on the District of Columbia, to which was referred House bill 7613, reported in lieu thereof a bill (H. R. 9428) to authorize the Washington and Get-

tysburg Railway Company, of Maryland, to extend its line of road into and within the District of Columbia, accompanied by a report (No. 818); which said bill and report were referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. BERRY, from the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, to which was referred the concurrent resolution of the House (House Con. Res. No. 25) for the improvement of the Big Sandy River in Kentucky, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 821); which said concurrent resolution and report were referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. MUDD, from the Committee on the District of Columbia, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 771) to incorporate the National Florence Crittenton Mission, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 823); which said bill and report were referred to the House Calendar.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 3472) to incorporate The Masonic Temple Association of the District of Columbia, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 824); which said bill and report were referred to the House Calendar.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII, private bills and resolutions of the following titles were severally reported from committees, delivered to the Clerk, and referred to the Committee of the Whole House, as follows:

Mr. NORTON of Ohio, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 7523) granting an increase of pension to Mary Speier, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 812); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. DRIGGS, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 1825) to increase the pension of David Parker, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 813); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 8834) granting a pension to John B. Hays, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 814); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. STURTEVANT, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 6988) for the relief of Emory T. Hipple, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 815); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. BRUMM, from the Committee on Claims, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 3754) for the relief of The William Cramp & Sons Ship and Engine Building Company, of Philadelphia, Pa., reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 816); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. KERR, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 2299) granting a pension to Caroline A. Slocum, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 819); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. CURTIS of Kansas, from the Committee on Indian Affairs, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 9282) transmitting and referring the claim of the Turtle Mountain Band of Chippewa Indians to the Court of Claims under the provisions of the Bowman Act, an act approved March 3, 1883, and for other purposes, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 820); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. NORTON of Ohio, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 2669) granting a pension to Henry H. Tucker, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 822); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

PUBLIC BILLS, RESOLUTIONS, AND MEMORIALS INTRODUCED.

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

From the COMMITTEE ON THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA: A bill (H. R. 9428) to authorize the Washington and Gettysburg Railway Company, of Maryland, to extend its line of road into and within the District of Columbia—to the House Calendar.

By Mr. JENKINS: A bill (H. R. 9429) to authorize the acquisition of certain real estate for the purpose of a site for a hospital for the treatment of contagious diseases—to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. EVANS: A bill (H. R. 9430) to amend the internal-revenue laws relating to distilled spirits, and for other purposes—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SPARKMAN: A bill (H. R. 9475) to furnish the Supreme Court reports and the reports of various courts of appeals of the United States to certain courts—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SAMUEL W. SMITH: A joint resolution (H. Res. 194) for the creation of a joint commission—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS INTRODUCED.

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

By Mr. BOUTELL of Illinois: A bill (H. R. 9431) granting a pension to Byron F. Davis—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9432) to correct the record of Stephen W. Coakley—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9433) for the relief of Emma P. Drake—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CAMPBELL: A bill (H. R. 9434) granting a pension to Alice Bozeman—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9435) to remove the charge of desertion from the military record of Lewis Rankin—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9436) granting a pension to William H. McKenry—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9437) granting a pension to Henderson M. Fisher—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9438) to increase the pension of William R. Wiggins—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9439) for the relief of David Bolling—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9440) to increase the pension of William Ewin—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9441) to increase the pension of George W. Rhodes—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9442) to increase the pension of John M. Stevens—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9443) granting a pension to James C. Finn—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9444) granting a pension to C. D. Ellis—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9445) granting a pension to William Newby—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9446) granting a pension to Sallie Gray—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9447) granting a pension to Augustus Voigt—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9448) to remove the charge of desertion from the record of Jeremiah McDaniel—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. COX (by request): A bill (H. R. 9449) for the relief of the estate of Mrs. E. M. Booker, deceased, late of Columbia, Tenn.—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. DE GRAFFENREID: A bill (H. R. 9450) to remove the charge of desertion from the record of James Morris—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. MARSHALL: A bill (H. R. 9451) granting a pension to Josiah B. Deeter—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9452) for the relief of B. Frank Yazel—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. MIERS of Indiana: A bill (H. R. 9453) granting an increase of pension to John W. Case, of Carlisle, Ind.—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. ODELL: A bill (H. R. 9454) for the relief of Jeronemus S. Underhill—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9455) granting an increase of pension to Richard Atkinson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. OGDEN: A bill (H. R. 9456) for the relief of the estate of Edward Eley, deceased, late of Natchitoches Parish, La.—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. PUGH: A bill (H. R. 9457) for the relief of Samuel Berry—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. ROBBINS: A bill (H. R. 9458) granting increase of pension to Daniel W. Dougherty, of Saltsbury, Pa.—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. STARK: A bill (H. R. 9459) granting an increase of pension to Alonzo Lewis, of Stockham, county of Hamilton, Nebr.—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SULLOWAY: A bill (H. R. 9460) granting a pension to Levi Caldwell—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9461) granting an increase of pension to Ellen C. Abbott—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9462) granting a pension to Phronie A. Woodman—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9463) granting a pension to Elisabeth S. Spaulding—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. TAYLOR of Alabama: A bill (H. R. 9464) for the relief of Franklin W. King—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9465) for the relief of Elisha B. Lott—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. ELLIS: A bill (H. R. 9466) to pension John H. Boyd—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. KERR: A bill (H. R. 9467) to pension William F. Davison—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. KNOX: A bill (H. R. 9468) granting a pension to Emma A. Andrews, widow of Daniel W. Andrews—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CALLAHAN: A bill (H. R. 9469) for the relief of J. A. Courtney—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9470) granting an increase of pension to Ahi. S. Loudermilk—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HARMER: A bill (H. R. 9471) for the relief of Joseph B. Hughes, late private Company D, Eighty-first Regiment New York Volunteer Infantry, and late private Company B, One hundred and nineteenth Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. PACKER of Pennsylvania: A bill (H. R. 9472) for the relief of Samuel Finch—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. STALLINGS: A bill (H. R. 9473) granting an increase of pension to James R. Cook—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. SKINNER: A bill (H. R. 9474) for the relief of R. T. Priddy, executor of John D. Priddy, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

PETITIONS, ETC.

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

By Mr. ACHESON: Resolutions of Elizabeth Lodge, No. 444, of Elizabeth, Pa.; Hancock Lodge, No. 231, and Our Lodge, No. 407, Knights of Pythias, of Coal Center, Pa., in support of House bill No. 6468, granting land at Hot Springs, Ark., for the purpose of erecting and maintaining a sanitarium thereon—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, petition of Washington Lodge, No. 33, Amalgamated Association of Iron and Steel Workers, of Pennsylvania, favoring the passage of the anti-injunction bill and the bill for the relief of American seamen—to the Committee on Labor.

By Mr. ADAMS: Resolution of the Philadelphia (Pa.) Board of Trade, in favor of House bill No. 8066, for an appropriation for a national exposition of American products and manufactures in Philadelphia, Pa.—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of Local Union No. 1, Steel and Copper Plate Printers' Union, of Philadelphia, Pa., protesting against any change in the manner of printing Government securities at the Bureau of Engraving and Printing—to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. BARHAM: Petitions of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Dows Prairie, Cal., and the Society of Christian Endeavor of Albion, Cal., for the passage of a bill to protect State anti-cigarette laws—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petitions of the Woman's Christian Temperance unions of Colusa and Nimshe, Cal., for the bill forbidding the interstate transmission of lottery messages by telegraph, etc.—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petitions of the Woman's Christian Temperance unions of Quincy and Napa, Cal.; the Young People's Society of Christian Endeavor and citizens of Albion, Cal., and American citizens of Redding, Cal., and vicinity, to forbid the sale of intoxicating beverages in Government buildings—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. BELFORD: Petition of the Chamber of Commerce of Cincinnati, Ohio, for an appropriation for the maintenance of the levee system of the Mississippi River—to the Committee on Levees and Improvements of the Mississippi River.

By Mr. BELL: Petitions of R. L. Chambers, C. L. Johnson, N. S. Gandy, and other citizens of Colorado Springs, Colo., in opposition to the so-called anti-scalping bill or any similar measure—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petitions of the Woman's Christian Temperance unions of Grand Junction and Durango and Board of Education of Aspen, Colo., favoring a bill providing that cigarettes imported in original packages on entering any State shall become subject to its laws—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petitions of the Woman's Christian Temperance unions of Durango and Mancos and Asbury Methodist Episcopal Church, of Denver, Colo., praying for the enactment of legislation raising the age of protection for girls to 18 years in the District of Columbia and the Territories and to forbid interstate gambling by telegraph, etc.—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petitions of Woman's Christian Temperance unions and certain churches and societies in the State of Colorado, favoring the passage of a bill to prohibit the sale of intoxicating liquors in all Government buildings—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. BOUTELLE of Maine: Petition of Martha F. Peavey, of Bangor, Me., for a pension—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, petition of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Greenville, Me., to forbid the transmission of lottery messages and other gambling matter by telegraph—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BRODERICK: Petition of the Reform Bureau and a meeting of citizens of Washington, D. C., favoring the bill which forbids the sale of alcoholic liquors in Government buildings—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BROMWELL: Petitions of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Hartwell, Ohio, for the passage of bills to protect State anti-cigarette laws, to raise the age of protection for girls to 18 years, and to forbid interstate transmission of lottery messages by telegraph, etc.—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Hartwell, Ohio, to forbid the sale of intoxicating liquors in Government buildings—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. BRUCKER: Resolution of the Bay County Ministerial Association of the State of Michigan, in favor of the passage of the so-called anti-scalping ticket bill—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. BURLEIGH: Petition of the Methodist Episcopal Church of Sturgeon Bay and Young People's Society of Christian Endeavor of St. Albans, Me., favoring 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—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of the Young People's Society of Christian Endeavor of St. Albans, Me., to prohibit the sale of intoxicating liquors in all Government buildings—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. BUTLER: Resolutions of Hall of Improvement Lodge, No. 197, of Clifton Heights, Pa., and Larkin Lodge, No. 78, of Chester, Pa., Knights of Pythias, in favor of House bill No. 6468, granting land at Hot Springs, Ark., for the purpose of erecting and maintaining a sanitarium thereon—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, petitions of the Woman's Christian Temperance unions of Jennersville and Blue Rock, Methodist Episcopal Church of Springfield, and churches of Honeybrook, Pa., favoring legislation providing that cigarettes imported in original packages on entering any State shall become subject to its laws, and to forbid the interstate transmission of lottery messages and other gambling matter by telegraph—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union, Springfield Methodist Episcopal Church, and others, 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. CAMPBELL: Petition of members of the fire department and others, of Xenia, Ill., protesting against the passage of Senate bill No. 2736, in relation to the regulation of insurance—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, resolution of Rhoads Post, No. 586, Grand Army of the Republic, Department of Illinois, in favor of House bill No. 6553, in relation to the free transmission of certain classes of matter through the mails—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. CAPRON: Petitions of the Woman's Christian Temperance unions of Kingston, Hope Valley, and Usquepaugh, and Christian Endeavor Society of Hope Valley, R. I., 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—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petitions of Woman's Christian Temperance unions of Usquepaugh and Hope Valley, and Christian Endeavor Society of Hope Valley, R. I., to forbid the transmission of lottery messages by telegraph—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petitions of certain churches and societies of Phenix, Hope Valley, and Usquepaugh, R. I., for the passage of a bill prohibiting the sale of intoxicating liquors in the Capitol building and grounds—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, petitions of certain churches and societies of Kingston, Hope Valley, and Usquepaugh, R. I., asking for the passage of the bill to raise the age of protection for girls—to the Committee on the Territories.

By Mr. CASTLE: Petitions of the Woman's Christian Temper-

ance unions of Pylema and Turlock, and Christian Endeavor Society of Ceres, Cal., favoring the enactment of legislation to protect State anti-cigarette laws and to forbid the interstate transmission of lottery messages by telegraph—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petitions of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Turlock, and Young People's Society of Christian Endeavor of Ceres, Cal., favoring the passage of a bill to prohibit the sale of liquors in the Capitol and all Government building, and for other purposes—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. CLARKE of New Hampshire: Petitions of the Epworth League of North Grantham, First Baptist Church of Newport, and Woman's Christian Temperance Union of East Washington, all in the State of New Hampshire, for the passage of bills to protect State anti-cigarette laws, to forbid the transmission of lottery messages by telegraph, and to raise the age of protection for girls to 18 years—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of Epworth League of North Grantham, First Baptist Church of Newport, and Woman's Christian Temperance Union of East Washington, N. H., for the passage of a bill prohibiting the sale of intoxicating liquors in the Capitol building and grounds—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. COUSINS (by request): Petition of the Congregational Church of Fairfax, Iowa, to prohibit the sale of intoxicating beverages in all Government buildings—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, petition of the Congregational Church of Fairfax, Iowa, praying for the enactment of legislation to protect State anti-cigarette laws, to forbid interstate transmission of lottery messages, and to raise the age of protection for girls to 18 years—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CRUMP: Resolution of Bay Division, No. 306, Order of Railway Conductors, of West Bay City, Mich., in favor of the passage of the anti-scalping ticket bill—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petitions of various labor organizations in the State of Michigan, in opposition to the so-called anti-scalping bill or any similar measure—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petitions of a public meeting at North Branch, Mich., and 150 citizens of Sanilac Center, Mich., in favor of the passage of a bill to prohibit the sale of intoxicating liquors in all Government buildings—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. DALZELL: Resolutions of Maddoc Lodge, No. 229; of South Side Lodge, No. 158, Knights of Pythias, of Pittsburg, Pa., in support of House bill No. 6468, granting land at Hot Springs, Ark., for the purpose of erecting and maintaining a sanitarium thereon—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, resolutions of the Christian Endeavor Society of Mount Washington Presbyterian Church, of Pittsburg, Pa., asking for the passage of a bill to forbid the sale of intoxicating beverages in all Government buildings—to the Committee on Alcoholic Liquor Traffic.

By Mr. DAVEY: Resolution of the constitutional convention of Louisiana, asking for an appropriation to complete the monument erected on the plains of Chalmette, in the parish of St. Bernard, to celebrate the battle of New Orleans—to the Committee on the Library.

By Mr. DINGLEY: Petitions of Sabina Lodge of Good Templars, Popham Beach, Me., and Monthly Meeting of Friends, of Durham, Me., for the passage of the 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 District of Columbia.

Also, petitions of Sabina Lodge of Good Templars, Popham Beach, and Monthly Meeting of Friends, of Durham, Me., praying for the enactment of legislation prohibiting the sale of intoxicating liquors in all Government buildings—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, petitions of Sabina Lodge of Good Templars, of Popham Beach, and Monthly Meeting of Friends, of Durham, Me., for the passage of a bill to forbid the interstate transmission of lottery messages and other gambling matter by telegraph—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. ELLIS: Petition of the Reform Bureau and citizens of Washington, D. C., praying for the enactment of legislation prohibiting the sale of intoxicating liquors in all Government buildings—to the Committee on Alcoholic Liquor Traffic.

By Mr. ERMENTROUT: Petition of Charles Stoughton, for the building of the Harlem Kills Canal as a war measure—to the Committee on Railways and Canals.

Also, memorial of the American Paper and Pulp Association, favoring increased foreign transportation and the Nicaraguan Canal—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, resolution of the National Grange, Patrons of Husbandry, favoring postal savings banks—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

Also, memorial of the Pennsylvania Division of the Travelers' Protective Association, favoring the passage of the anti-scalping bill—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. FOOTE: Petitions of citizens of Elizabethtown, N. Y., urging the passage of the Lodge immigration bill—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, petitions of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Franklin, N. Y., favoring the enactment of legislation to protect State anti-cigarette laws, to raise the age of protection for girls to 18 years, and to forbid the interstate transmission of lottery messages by telegraph—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Franklin, N. Y., for the passage of a bill forbidding the sale of liquor in all Government buildings—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. GILLET of Massachusetts: Petitions of the Methodist Episcopal Church of Athol, Mass., asking for the passage of bills to protect State anti-cigarette laws and to forbid the transmission of lottery messages by telegraph, etc.—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of the Second Advent Church of Athol, Mass., praying for the enactment of legislation prohibiting the sale of intoxicating liquors in the Capitol building—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, petition of the Second Advent Church of Athol, Mass., for the passage of a bill forbidding the interstate transmission of lottery and other gambling matter by telegraph—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GRIFFIN: Petition of 41 citizens of La Crosse, Wis., in favor of the anti-scalping bill—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. HANDY: Petition of the Woman's Christian Temperance unions of Bridgeville and Townsend, Del., praying for the enactment of legislation prohibiting the sale of intoxicating liquors in all Government buildings—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, petitions of Woman's Christian Temperance unions of Bridgeville and Townsend, Del., and Methodist Episcopal Church of Camden, Del., favoring the passage of bills to protect State anti-cigarette laws, to forbid interstate transmission of lottery messages, and to raise the age of protection for girls to 18 years—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HENDERSON: Petition of Honey Creek Monthly Meeting of Friends, of New Providence, Iowa, in favor of bills to raise the age of protection for girls and to forbid the interstate transmission of lottery messages by telegraph, etc.—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of the Honey Creek Monthly Meeting of Friends, of New Providence, Iowa, praying for the enactment of legislation raising 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 Honey Creek Monthly Meeting of Friends, of New Providence, Iowa, against the sale of intoxicants in Government buildings—to the Committee on Alcoholic Liquor Traffic.

By Mr. HENRY of Connecticut: Petition of Volunteer Council, No. 38, Order of United American Mechanics, and others, of Rockyhill, Conn., urging the enactment of legislation which will more effectually restrict immigration and prevent the admission of illiterate, pauper, and criminal classes to the United States—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. HOOKER: Petitions of the First Methodist Episcopal Church and Universalist Church of Friendship, N. Y., in favor 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, and 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 Young People's Union of the Universalist Church of Sherman, N. Y., 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. HOWELL: Petitions of the Woman's Christian Temperance unions of South River, Millstone, and East Millstone, N. J.; First Baptist Church, First Presbyterian Church, and Methodist Church of Lambertville, N. J., to raise the age of protection for girls, to forbid the interstate transmission of lottery messages by telegraph, and in favor of a bill to protect State anti-cigarette laws—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petitions of the Woman's Christian Temperance unions of Millstone, East Millstone, Lambertville, and South River; First Baptist Church, First Presbyterian Church, and Methodist Church of Lambertville, N. J., to prohibit the sale of intoxicating liquors in all Government buildings—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, petition of the Atlantic Highlands Baptist Church, of Monmouth County, N. J., for the passage of a bill to protect anti-cigarette laws—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JETT: Six petitions of John I. Foulkes and others, J. F. Upham and others, Pettibone, Sawtell & Co., Vogers, Porter & Myer, J. C. Hollanday and others, Marshall Field & Co., and other firms, of Chicago, Ill., in favor of the anti-scalping bill—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. JOHNSON of North Dakota: Petition of the Methodist Episcopal Church, Christian Endeavor, and Woman's Christian Temperance Union, of Absaraka, N. Dak., Methodist Episcopal Church of Reynolds, and Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Fessenden, N. Dak., for the passage of bills to forbid interstate gambling by telegraph, and to protect State anti-cigarette laws by providing that cigarettes imported in original packages on entering any State shall become subject to its laws—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of the Methodist Episcopal Church, Christian Endeavor, and Woman's Christian Temperance Union, of Absaraka, Cooperstown, and Fessenden, and Methodist Episcopal Church of Reynolds, all in the State of North Dakota, against the sale of intoxicants in Government buildings—to the Committee on Alcoholic Liquor Traffic.

Also, petition of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union, Christian Endeavor, and Methodist Episcopal Church, of Absaraka; Methodist Episcopal Church and Epworth League, of Reynolds; Woman's Christian Temperance unions of Fessenden and Cooperstown, all in the State of North Dakota, praying for the enactment of legislation raising the age of protection for girls to 18 years in the District of Columbia and the Territories—to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. KERR: Petitions of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union, Congregational Church, and public schools, of New London, Ohio, asking for the passage of bills to forbid the interstate transmission of lottery messages and other gambling matter by telegraph, and to protect anti-cigarette laws and raise the age of consent to 18 years—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petitions of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union and Congregational Church, of New London, Ohio, to prohibit the sale of intoxicating liquors in all Government buildings—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. KETCHAM: Petitions of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Wassaic, N. Y., and Schultsville Christian Church, of Clinton Corners, N. Y., for the passage of bills to raise the age of protection for girls, and to forbid interstate transmission of lottery messages by telegraph—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Wassaic, N. Y., and Schultsville Christian Church, of Clinton Corners, N. Y., praying for the passage of a bill prohibiting the sale of intoxicating liquors in the Capitol and all Government buildings—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. KNOX: Paper to accompany House bill granting a pension to Emma A. Andrews, widow of Daniel W. Andrews—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LOUDENSLAGER: Petitions of the Woman's Christian Temperance unions of Roadstown, and Freesburg, and Presbyterian Church of Greenwich, N. Y., for the passage of bills to protect State anti-cigarette laws, to forbid the transmission of lottery messages by telegraph, and to raise the age of protection for girls to 18 years—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petitions of the Woman's Christian Temperance unions of Roadstown and Freesburg, and Presbyterian Church of Greenwich, N. Y., for the passage of a bill prohibiting the sale of intoxicating liquors in the Capitol building and grounds—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. LOVERING: Petition of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Bridgewater, Mass., asking for the passage of a bill to raise the age of protection for girls to 18 years in the District of Columbia and to protect State anti-cigarette laws—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Bridgewater, Mass., favoring the passage of a bill to prohibit the sale of liquors in the Capitol and all Government buildings, and for other purposes—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. McCORMICK: Papers to accompany House bill No. 9872, granting a pension to Matilda E. Outhel—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MEEKISON: Petition of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union and churches at Ridgeville Corners, Ohio, 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—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Ridgeville Corners, Henry County, Ohio, to forbid the transmission of lottery messages by telegraph—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MIERS of Indiana: Paper to accompany House bill for the relief of John W. Case—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. ODELL: Petition of Fred W. Northrop and 72 citizens of Sing Sing, N. Y., for the passage of a bill to prevent the admission of illiterate, pauper, and criminal classes to the United States—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. PARKER of New Jersey: Petition of Erwin T. Bussman and 61 citizens of Newark, N. J., protesting against the passage of a bill to restrict immigration—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, petitions of Bethel Presbyterian Church and Woman's Christian Temperance Union, of East Orange, and De Groot Methodist Episcopal Church, of Newark, N. J., favoring legislation providing that cigarettes imported in original packages on entering any State shall become subject to its laws—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of East Orange, N. J., praying that the age of protection for girls be raised to 18 years in the District of Columbia and the Territories, and to forbid interstate transmission of lottery messages by telegraph—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petitions of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union, Bethel Presbyterian Church, of East Orange, and De Groot Methodist Episcopal Church, of Newark, N. J., urging the passage of a bill to prohibit the sale of liquors in Government buildings—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, petition of the Eighth Avenue Methodist Episcopal Church, of Newark, N. J., praying for the enactment of a Sunday-rest law for the District of Columbia—to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. PRINCE: Petition of the United Presbyterian Church and Young People's Christian Union of Aledo, Ill., for the passage of a bill which forbids the sale of alcoholic liquors in Government buildings—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. RAY of New York: Petition of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Kendall, Wis., favoring 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—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of the Reform Bureau and citizens of Washington, D. C., favoring the passage of a bill to limit absolute divorce to cases of adultery in the District of Columbia and the Territories—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROBBINS: Resolution of Charity Lodge, No. 488, Knights of Pythias, in favor of House bill No. 6468, granting land at Hot Springs, Ark., for the purpose of erecting and maintaining a sanitarium thereon—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. SAUERHERING: Petition of F. M. Pulser and 28 citizens of Kilbourn, Wis., in favor of legislation abolishing ticket brokerage—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. SHAFROTH: Petitions of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Denver, Colo., for the passage of bills forbidding the interstate transmission of lottery and other gambling matter by telegraph, to protect State anti-cigarette laws, and to raise the age of protection to 18 years—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Denver, Colo., urging the passage of a bill to prohibit the sale of liquors in Government buildings—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. SHERMAN: Petitions of Department Grand Army of the Republic of Virginia, Department Grand Army of the Republic of Alabama, Paper Trade Association of Boston, Mass., Master Builders' Association of Boston, Mass., and Holland Patent (N. Y.) Grange, No. 636, Patrons of Husbandry, in favor of House bill No. 7130 and Senate bill No. 1575, relating to ticket brokerage—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. SHOWALTER: Petitions of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Rochester, Pa., favoring legislation providing that cigarettes imported in original packages on entering any State shall become subject to its laws, to forbid interstate transmission of lottery messages by telegraph, and to raise the age of protection for girls to 18 years—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of the Methodist Episcopal Church of Bruin, Pa., for the passage of bills to prohibit the interstate and mail circulation of newspaper descriptions of prize fights—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of the Methodist Episcopal Church of Bruin, Pa., 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. SIMPSON of Kansas: Petition of the Southwest Kansas Conference of the Methodist Episcopal Church, in favor of bills to raise the age of protection for girls and to forbid the interstate transmission of lottery messages by telegraph, etc.—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of the Southwest Kansas Conference of the Meth-

odist Episcopal Church, 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. SOUTHARD: Petition of the Walding, Kinnan & Marvin Company and other firms of Toledo, Ohio, urging bankruptcy legislation—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SPRAGUE: Resolutions of the Boston Paper Trade Association, New England Metal Association, New England Confectioners' Club, and Bay State Division of the Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers, all of Boston, Mass., urging the early passage of the anti-scalping bill—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, resolution of the Paint and Oil Club, of Boston, Mass., in favor of reciprocity with Canada and Newfoundland—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. STARK: Petitions of the Woman's Christian Temperance unions of Cedar Bluffs, Fairmont, Hebron, and Valparaiso, United Brethren Church and Methodist Episcopal Church of Seward, and First Presbyterian Church of Fairmont, all in the State of Nebraska, for the passage of bills to prohibit the interstate transmission of gambling matter by telegraph and to protect State anti-cigarette laws—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petitions of certain churches and Woman's Christian Temperance unions of the State of Nebraska, asking for the passage of a bill to raise the age of protection for girls to 18 years in the District of Columbia and to forbid the sale of alcoholic liquors in Government buildings—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. STEWART of New Jersey: Petition of Hackensack Valley Council, No. 182, Junior Order United American Mechanics, of Hackensack and vicinity, State of New Jersey, in favor of legislation to more effectually restrict immigration and prevent the admission of illiterate, pauper, and criminal classes to the United States—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, petition of Washington Camp, No. 4, Patriotic Order Sons of America, of Trenton, N. J., for the passage of the Lodge immigration bill—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, petition of the First Reformed Church of Little Falls, N. J., to prohibit the sale of intoxicating liquors in all Government buildings—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, petition of the First Reformed Church of Little Falls, N. J., 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, and 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.

By Mr. STEELE: Petition of the board of governors, Indianapolis Board of Trade, in favor of the passage of the so-called anti-scalping bill—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. SNOVER: Petition of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Algonac, Mich., to raise the age of protection for girls, to forbid the interstate transmission of lottery messages by telegraph, and in favor of a bill to protect State anti-cigarette laws—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Algonac, Mich., 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.

Also, petitions of citizens of Jeddo and Carsonville, Mich., favoring the anti-scalping bill—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. CHARLES W. STONE: Petition of H. M. Clark and 19 citizens of Pennsylvania, in opposition to the so-called anti-scalping bill or any similar measure—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of citizens of Sheffield, Warren County, Pa., in favor of the passage of a bill to prohibit the sale of liquors in Government buildings—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. STROWD of North Carolina (by request): Petitions of citizens of Henderson, N. C., in favor of the passage of the so-called anti-scalpers bill—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. UPDEGRAFF: Petition of J. H. Ellsworth, C. E. Hunting, and 39 other citizens of McGregor, Iowa, favoring the passage of the anti-scalping bill—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. VINCENT: Papers to accompany House bill No. 7191, granting an increase of pension to Frederick E. Vance—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WADSWORTH: Petition of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of North Bergen, N. Y., asking for the passage

of a bill to raise the age of protection for girls to 18 years in the District of Columbia and to forbid the transmission of lottery messages by telegraph—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of North Bergen, N. Y., 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. WEYMOUTH: Petition of the Young Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Billrica, Mass., for the passage of the anti-cigarette law—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Billrica, Mass., urging the passage of a bill to prohibit the sale of liquors in Government buildings—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

FRIDAY, March 25, 1898.

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

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

NAVAL APPROPRIATION BILL.

Mr. BOUTELLE of Maine. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the naval appropriation bill.

The motion was agreed to.

The House accordingly resolved itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, Mr. SHERMAN in the chair.

The CHAIRMAN. The House is in Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the naval appropriation bill.

Mr. BOUTELLE of Maine. Mr. Chairman, I yield the remainder of the time to my colleague from Illinois [Mr. Foss] to close general debate.

Mr. FOSS. Mr. Chairman, "to provide for the common defense" has always been the tie which has bound individuals, families, and communities together in the earliest beginnings of every nation. When a nation becomes great and prosperous it should be a matter of no less concern to provide for its defense in a manner that shall be commensurate with its growth and position.

Our foes must either be domestic or foreign. To overcome the former we have a small standing Army and the National Guard of the several States; but we rely for our main defense upon the patriotism of our people.

To defend ourselves from foreign foes we must depend primarily upon the strength of our fortifications and the prowess of our Navy. The maintenance of our Navy is, therefore, a matter of national concern.

I represent a district in the middle West, about midway between the Alleghany Mountains on the east and the Rocky Mountains on the west, over which no cannon shot from any man-of-war upon the seaboard has found its way, yet the people of my district are fully as much interested in building up the American Navy as their more exposed brethren along the Atlantic and Pacific coasts. What is true of the Seventh Congressional district of Illinois is undoubtedly true of all the districts of this country. Indeed, it was but a few days ago that the Representatives upon this floor, irrespective of party or locality, voicing the unanimous sentiment of the people, voted \$50,000,000 for the national defense, which is now being used for the buying of ships and the putting of this country in a position where if war becomes necessary it will be able to successfully maintain its honor. [Applause.]

Never in our history has the American Navy been nearer to the hearts of the people than at this hour. In silence and in sorrow the American people for many days have been looking toward Havana, where sleep their "unreturning brave;" but to-day, in silence, more portentous, their eyes are fixed upon the American Navy, the defender of the living and the guardian of the honor of the dead.

If an emergency be upon us, the American Navy is ready to meet it. In every great crisis in the history of this country the American sailor has never failed to gloriously perform his duty. I desire to recall for a brief moment the splendid past of the American Navy, and then sketch the growth and development of our new Navy of to-day, and lastly to state some of the reasons why I believe we should continue the policy of strengthening our Navy in the future.

I am not here to snatch one laurel from the wreath which adorns the brow of the American soldier, but only seek to pay a tribute of deserved respect to the American sailor. The sailor on the sea has always supplemented the efforts of the soldier on

the land, and the great results which have been achieved have been due to the combined strength of both.

The brilliant achievements of the American sailor in the war of our national independence, when our Navy at first consisted of only a small fleet of eight vessels, in command of Commodore Essex Hopkins, early inspired a feeling of pride in our Navy. The names of Biddle and Barry and Nichols and Whipple and of others I might mention recall the daring and bravery of that period.

What schoolboy has not read with admiration the story of John Paul Jones, as with the *Ranger* he ransacked the coasts of England and Scotland, or pictured him upon the deck of the *Bon Homme Richard*, when, amid the storm and smoke of battle, the English captain of the *Serapis* inquired: "The *Richard*, ahoy! Have you struck your colors?" And the doughty Jones replied: "No; I have not yet begun to fight." That battle established the prowess of the American Navy upon the sea.

Who, sir, has not read with satisfaction of our naval achievements in the war with the Barbary powers,

How Truxtun fought, how Somers fell,
How gallant Preble's daring host
Triumphed along the Moorish coast,
Forced the proud infidel to treat,
And brought the Crescent to their feet.

The next great conflict was the war of 1812, which gave us the freedom of the seas. Search history through, and where will you find as gallant a band of sea captains as those who walked the decks of the American ships during that struggle?

There were Decatur and Bainbridge and Lawrence, whose dying words, "Don't give up the ship," emblazoned on a canvas, became the oriflame of victory to Perry and his fleet upon Lake Erie. There was Porter, who so gallantly defended the *Essex* in the fight with the *Phoebe* and the *Cherub*, where our Farragut, then a boy, is said to have first engaged in naval warfare. There was Hull, by whose skillful seamanship the old *Constitution*, which the English contemptuously called "a bundle of pine boards under a bit of bunting," outsailed the English fleet, and later overcame the *Guerrière*. There was MacDonough, whose brilliant victory on Lake Champlain made him one of the commanding figures of all naval history.

Says a recent historian:

The Republic of the United States owed a great deal to the excellent make and armament of its ships, but it owed still more to the men who were in them.

Then, again, in our war with Mexico, the Navy played an important part, for it was under the fire of its guns that our Army was landed at Vera Cruz, and through the combined efforts of both sailor and soldier that the war terminated to the glory of our country.

Now I come to speak of the Navy of 1861, which Lincoln called "Uncle Sam's webfoot." When Fort Sumter was fired upon, we had 90 vessels, of which 42 were in commission and of these 31 were scattered upon the seas. We had 7,600 seamen in the service, and about 1,400 officers.

Yet during the war our Navy grew to 671 vessels and 52,000 seamen, and 7,500 additional officers were enrolled. The American Navy contributed in no small degree to the grand results of that war. I will not say that they would have been otherwise without it. I leave that to Him who overrules the destinies of peoples and of nations, but that the war would have been ended as soon as it was in all human probability without the aid and assistance of the American sailor no candid student of history will affirm.

The blockading of the Eastern and Southern ports; Dupont's terrible circle of fire off Port Royal; the silencing of the *Merrimac* by the *Monitor*, called "the cheese box of Ericsson;" the opening of the Mississippi by Foote and Porter; the capture of New Orleans; the terrible fight in Mobile Bay, where Farragut, wrapped in the shrouds of the *Hartford*, directed the "grand, wild storm of battle;" the daring of Cushing, and the sinking of the *Alabama* by the *Kearsarge* tell their own story of the achievements of the American Navy in the late war.

No historian can ever write a complete history of that great contest and leave out the daring of the American sailor any more than he could write it and leave out the bravery of the American soldier. The one cooperated with the other, and both together, inspired by the same devotion to a common cause, preserved the Union of the North and the South, which time is fast cementing into a peace, a perpetual peace, in the everlasting bonds of American brotherhood.

A union of lakes and a union of lands,
A union that time can not sever,
A union of hearts and a union of hands,
And the flag of our Union forever.

After the war our Navy was put upon a peace footing, and decaying time reduced it still further, until in 1881, there were but few pieces left. The most powerful navy in the world, in the short