THE MORNING POST.

Vol. VII. RALEIGH, N. C., FRIDAY, FEBRUARY 15, 1901 No. 72

ARGUMENT ON IMPEACHMENT

House Heard Eight Speeches Yesterday and Will Probably Vote Today

ELOQUENT ARGUMENT

Judge Allen Opened Up for Majority and Mr. Stubbs for Minority—The Minority Report Filed

The Craig resolution for impeachment of Chief Justice Furches and Judge Douglas of the Supreme Court occupied the attention of the House yesterday. Eight speeches—four for and four against the proposed action—were delivered, and at 6:35 p. m. yesterday the House adjourned until 10 o'clock this morning, when argument will be resumed.

Two sessions of the House were held yesterday—one lasting from 10 a. m. until 2 p. m., and the other from 4 p. m. until 6:30 p. m.

A decision will probably be reached today. A number of gentlemen have signified their intention of speaking, Mr. Bonitz of New Hanover will begin the discussion this morning in favor of the majority report. Mr. Craig will also speak on the same side. Mr. Patterson of Robeson and Mr. Yarborough of Franklin will speak against impeachment.

Great public interest is attending the impeachment proceedings. The hall of the House was thronged all day yesterday. The speeches were on a high order. Mr. Allen of Wayne, the chairman of the Judiciary Committee, led off for the majority report in favor of impeachment. Mr. Stubbs of Martin opened for the minority. He was followed by Mr. Graham for the majority. In the afternoon Mr. Seawell of Moore spoke for impeachment, as did Mr. Green of Wilkes. Mr. Baldwin and Mr. Hood and Mr. Connor of Wilson spoke in opposition to the Craig resolution.

Applause greeted all the speakers when they concluded. Members joined in the applause. When Mr. Green of Wilkes concluded a gentleman near the front gave a shout that penetrated the hall. The Speaker rapped for order.

The Minority Report

Before the House assembled at 10 o'clock a number of ladies were in the galleries to obtain desirable seats. By 11 o'clock every seat was occupied and many were turned away.

Exactly at 11 a. m. the Craig resolution providing for impeachment was announced as the special order by Speaker Settle, who directed the clerk to read the majority report, signed by Judge Allen, chairman of the Judiciary Committee, who recommended that the resolution pass.

The minority report, which was signed by the three Republican members of the Judiciary Committee, Mr. Benbow of Yadkin, Mr. Blythe of Henderson, and Mr. Ebbs of Madison, was presented as follows:

To the Honorable the General Assembly of the State of North Carolina:

We, whose names are hereto subscribed, the minority of the Judiciary Committee of the House of Representatives, respectfully report:

That we have considered the evidence submitted under the resolution of enquiry in regard to the conduct of former Chief Justice D. M. Furches and Associate Justice R. M. Douglas, of the Supreme Court of North Carolina, and have carefully considered the law in regard thereto. Without entering into a detailed statement we are of the opinion that nothing appears in the evidence or the law relating thereto which justifies any resolution either of impeachment or censure.

We, therefore, respectfully recommend that the House take no further action in regard thereto.

"I. W. EBBS,
"O. V. F. BLYTHE,
"F. B. BENBOW."

Speaker Gattis announced that the question before the House was the minority report. This brought Chairman Allen, of the Judiciary Committee, to his feet, who maintained that the Craig resolution was the question before the house.

Mr. Connor, of Wilson, succeeded Mr. Allen on the floor and he sent forward a resolution of disapproval of the action of the judges, which he offered as a substitute. The resolution which is a joint one is as follows:

Resolved by the House of Representatives, the Senate concurring:

That in issuing a mandamus to the State Auditor and State Treasurer in the case of Theophilus White vs. H. W. Ayer, State Auditor, and W. H. Worth, State Treasurer, lately before it pending in the Supreme Court, a majority thereof concurring, assumed authority and power not conferred by the Constitution and laws of the State, but in derogation of the same.

Mr. Allen, of Wayne, who was determined to gain the advantage in the order of precedence, then offered the following amendments to the substitute, which read much more interment:

That said judges, David M. Furches, Chief Justice and now Associate Justice of the Supreme Court, and Robert M. Douglas, an Associate Justice of the Supreme Court, be impeached of high crimes and misdemeanors in office.

Judge Allen Speaks

There was perfect quietude in the house for more than a minute, when Judge Allen, of Wayne, arose in advocacy of the majority report. He said:

"It has been nearly two weeks since the distinguished member of this body introduced a resolution for the impeachment of these two judges. It was a resolution no lawyer would introduce save from a sense of duty. It is a duty from which the Judiciary Committee of the House shrank. When we began to consider the resolution it was not with a desire to impeach, but to find out the truth. The resolution was referred to a subcommittee. The first decision of the committee was that it would not reach a conclusion until it examined the law and facts. After examining the witnesses there was no difference among any of the members as to the law or the fact. The action of the sub-committee was unanimous in this respect. The full committee took up the report with a spirit of fairness and justice both to these judges and the State of North Carolina. The committee had three meetings, during which no impassioned speeches were delivered. The committee has considered this matter with a determination to do what the law compelled and what their oaths required.

"The facts agreed upon by that committee were the same. Every member was unanimous as to the facts. Only one Democratic member disagreed as to the law in the case. There has been no politics in this case. The first intimation of politics being in the case came from the leader of the Republican party in this State at Washington City. The Republicans have stood alike on this question."

Judge Allen review the entire case, beginning with the action of the Legislature with reference to Shell Fish Commissioner White and his salary.

"There are two provisions of the Constitution which no person, be he judge or not, should violate," Judge Allen declared. "One provision is that no process shall issue against the State, and the other is that money shall not be taken out of the Treasury save when appropriated by law.

"The committee found four violations of law by the court and two infractions of the Constitution itself.

"There is a great deal of loose talk of impeachment. There are a great many people who do not understand this impeachment. Why was this authority of impeachment given to Legislature? It is because it is the most representative body of the people. Some people talk like impeachment is some criminal action. As I understand it impeachment is a court of inquiry. It is an inquest of office. There is no punishment. I hear people say it is a political trial. So it is. But it is not a partisan political matter. It is an inquiry into their political duty as officers of the great State of North Carolina. When we know the facts and know the law, we can not escape the conclusion that our oath requires of us. Knowing the facts in this case we cannot escape the duty of impeaching these judges of high crimes and misdemeanors.

The question of intent does not enter into this matter. It is whether these judges are fit to hold office. Have they wilfully violated their oath of office. If they have taken money out of the public treasury without authority of law then they are not fit to hold office.

Judge Allen characterized the action of the judges in issuing the mandamus as "shuffling on the bench."

"Was that not humiliating to the State? When the court dallied about issuing the writ and went to the clerk to find out what he was going to do was that not humiliating to the dignity of the State. After the judges were polled they finally got them to issue the writ.

This case in the culmination of the decisions in some twenty cases beginning with the Day case. The decisions of the courts in all these cases has been in defiance of this branch of the government, and with the purpose of destroying it.

"If the Supreme Court has gone ahead for two years and attempted to break down and destroy this branch of the government shall we longer permit the guilty judges to remain in office? I do not want to do this duty imposed upon me. I shrink from it. The constitution says the Judiciary shall not encroach upon the Legislature, neither shall the Legislature encroach upon the Judiciary. And I read in the constitution how money shall be raised and how it shall be paid. It says the Legislature shall do so. When I found out that the court paid money out of the public treasury in direct violation of the constitution, I had to rely on my oath, which requires me to support the constitution. This is a matter that concerns us all, and comes home to us all today. We can't escape the duty imposed on us. We are not responsible for this resolution being here. We are responsible to our consciences and our oaths. I can't refuse to vote for this resolution because of sympathy, nor because it is an old man involved. If he violated the constitution he must assume that responsibility.

"I desire to present this resolution to the House. I am willing to leave it to the majority. I have attempted no discussion of law, but have only tried to make a plain statement of the case. There is no difference among us as to the law. These judges have violated two statutes of North Carolina which the Legislature had a right to enact. They have violated two provisions of the constitution. As to this there is no difference of opinion. The only question is what shall we do with them?

"There is no man in the House who has a higher regard for the gentleman from Wilson than myself. But I cannot follow him here. Before I would vote for his resolution I would vote to let the whole matter alone. I can't put myself in the position of saying these judges have violated the Constitution and then let them off.

"If we are going to let any one off, we should let some of the smaller fellows off. There is no excuse for such action on the part of the highest judicial officers in the State. They of all men should not plead ignorance. Don't let it be said that the highest officer in the State escaped with the plea that they did not know the law."

Mr. Stubbs's Able Speech

Mr. Stubbs of Martin, began the argument in favor of the minority. He delivered a magnificent speech, eloquent, able and effective. The popular young Representative from Martin was heartily congratulated upon his effort, which made a profound impression. He said:

I am opposed to the passage of this resolution, and I think it right that I should give you my reasons therefor. As suggested by the gentleman from Wayne we should approach this matter dispassionately, with fairness and justice and honestly. When we do that we are answerable nowhere save at the bar of our own consciences.

This is a great question. We are upon the eve of passing upon one of the greatest questions ever presented to the Legislature.

It seems strange, doubtless, that I should be demurring from questions of fact and law, which this committee has reported favorably. I demur honestly so far as their conclusions of fact and law are concerned.

To justify these proceedings we must find that these judges not only committed an error of judgment, but we must go further and say their action was wilful, corrupt and malicious. The resolution of impeachment says nothing of the decision in the White case, referring only to the mandamus issued by the court. This is a tacit admission that the decision in the White case is the law of the land. And it is the law and was so held for years by some of the greatest judges in the State. The judges are not on trial for their decision in this case. The Legislature is holding them responsible for saying an officer of the State can't be deprived of his salary while in office.

We have there the spectacle of a gentleman holding an office under the highest legislative and judicial authority and the Legislature saying he shall have no pay for it. The mandamus simply gave a remedy to a citizen and officer of the State, who otherwise was remedyless. White's claim was not a claim against the State as contemplated in the constitution for the constitution says that claims against the State can only be brought before the Supreme Court by petition. White's claim was brought in the Superior Court and a mandamus ordered by Judge Starbuck.

The Supreme Court concurred in its opinion that Judge Starbuck had jurisdiction in the case.

The Legislature of 1899 passed the act for the purpose of circumventing the laws of the State. This was an open secret and known of all men. No lawyer disputes the proposition that every section of an act can be construed on the principle of in para materia. The only difference between what the Legislatures of 1895 and 1897 did and the action of the Legislature of '99 was that the fusionists were bolder. They openly attempted to take the offices held by Wood and other Democrats. We were more astute. We clothed the purpose of the act of '99 with different verbage and legal phraseology. We were trying to take from a man his office and rights, which had been given him for four years. In Cotten vs. Ellis it is held that a man can't be starved out of his office. You can't make a man perform the duties of his office and take the compensation away from him.

I believe the court could have said White was entitled to $2,800 dollars. We talk about subverting the rights of a coordinate branch of the State government when we have passed an act intended to subvert the principles of our highest court. In the fact of the law we attempted to violate the existiug law when we wrote chapter 21, of the laws of '99. We have a law in North Carolina prescribing an impossible method for the payment of an officer.

It is claimed that the Supreme Court waited until the members of the session of 1899 were out of office before they ordered the issuance of this order. And yet you know that they knew that the election of 1900 would send back a Democratic legislature that was equally powerful to impeach. We ought to be anxious in the investigation of so grave a matter to put the fairest construction possible on the motives of otherwise good and conscientious men. Why they say they shuffled on the bench, when the evidence shows that the court was divided in opinion, and why should we not rather conclude that in not acting hastily, they were honestly seeking the line of duty. We should be more charitable. Judge Montgomery sided with the court in the decision of the White case and he only dissented as to the manner of payment.

If the opinions of this court in the last two years were efforts to thwart the will of the Legislature, then the court has been guilty of that offense for the last fifty years. In the case of Burton against Furman no money had been set apart to pay him and the decision was based upon that fact. In the case of White there were two judgments setting out the amounts due him and his right to the same.

Judge Starbuck not only ordered the issuance of the writ, but he went further than the Supreme Court. Who lost by the corruption charged? Why the State saved $2,400 by this decision. It's not the amount, but the principle involved, says Judge Allen. There is the law in the 65th North Carolina Reports sustaining the decisions of Judge Starbuck and the Supreme Court. If these judges have followed the decisions of the Supreme Court of North Carolina we should go no further in these proceedings. I have given these decisions careful investigation and I am satisfied the judges have not gone outside the law as thus laid down. I have studied this question and I am satisfied. I conceived it my duty to go through the matter for myself, and I am satisfied the judges acted within law. If

(Continue don sixth page.)

UNDER FIFTH RIB

Political Operation Performed in the Senate

SOME GOT IT IN NECK

Dangerous Blows Passed and Then Dressed—Hot Debate Over Indicted Registrars in Senate—Proceedings

Yesterday's session of the Senate chiefly consisted of three hours of argument—and the debate was a "warm number."

The rucus grew out of the passage, on its second and third readings, of the House bill authorizing the Governor to employ additional counsel to defend State election officers now or hereafter indicted in the Federal court—the object of the bill being to secure a proper and effective defense in the United States courts of the Democratic registrars of Forsyth, Mecklenburg, Montgomery and other counties who have been indicted at the instance of United States District Attorney Holton and the fusion politicians.

* * *

Senator Henderson, who had charge of the bill, announced that one hour would be allowed for debate, and that at the expiration of that time he would call the previous question—the Republicans to have one-half of the allotted time.

But it was soon discovered that nearly all the Republican Senators were "loaded" for the occasion, and the time was extended several times during the course of the discussion, until about three hours had been consumed.

The bill was then put upon its second and third readings and passed, all of the eleven Republicans and Populist Senators voting against and all the Democrats (except three absentees) voting for it.

* * *

The debate was opened by Senator Candler (Rep.), of Jackson county, in opposition to the measure. He made a regular campaign stump speech and declared that the "frauds" committed by the Democrats, in the name of White Supremacy, last year were more general and extensive than ever before—a campaign in which human lives were taken and the bodies of negroes given to the dogs and hogs to devour, in which white men were driven from their State and hundreds of negroes run into the swamps to die or to extricate themselves as best they could without being allowed to return to their homes—all this for the sake of office.

He characterized the present election law as a disgrace to the State. How well the Democratic "workers" and heelers had carried out the orders of their bosses and the Democratic leaders was well known.

But the leaders were the ones most to be blamed, he declared, and he hoped the day would come when the doors of the Albany penitentiary would open to receive them in the embrace of that prison.

In the name of the white mountaineers of Western North Carolina he would proclaim that none of those men, whose hands were dripping with blood, would ever again be trusted with government of the people of this State.

Senator Marshall (Rep.), of Surry, was the next speaker. He said he was opposed to the bill "world without end." It is the greatest piece of class legislation that was ever offered to be placed on the statute books of this State.

He did not mean to reflect on Senators on the other side personally, and what he said was said from his standpoint and not theirs. The men who have been indicted have been charged with a great crime. He didn't know whether they were guilty or not, but the law should take its course. The people of Western North Carolina were opposed to frauds in elections, and it was the duty of this legislature to condemn and not encourage such practices by the passage of bills like this.

Senator Henderson: Do you think the violators of State laws should be tried in the United States courts?

Senator Glenn: Do you not know that the United States protects its officers and employes, and that the United States District Attorneys are charged to defend them when they are charged with crime—even the revenue doodlers who shoot down citizens of the State in the alleged discharge of their duties?

These questions Mr. Marshall answered in a non-committal way, and then closed his remarks.

* * *

Senator Morrison (Dem.) of Richmond, opened for the defense of the bill, and made a fine, argumentative speech.

This bill, he said, is not designed to protect election rioters at Wilmington or elsewhere. It is intended simply to afford proper legal defense and protection to citizens of North Carolina who were sworn officers of the State and who, because of the faithful discharge of their duties as laid down by the law of their State, have been made the victims of political prosecution and presentation in the United States courts, and not for violating or breaking any law, State or Federal. There was no Federal law for them to violate, for the election in which they figured as election officers related purely and solely to our own domestic affairs, and no United States officeholder or officeseeker was in any way affected by its result.

Election officers of a sovereign State have been dragged up before the Federal court authorities simply because they performed their sworn duties to their State. The only precedent for such an outrage in the annals of the judicial history of this country was furnished by the radical judge in Kentucky who interfered with the affairs of that State during the strife there some time ago.

In North Carolina one of the two United States judges (Purnell) has charged the grand juries of this court that the Federal authorities had nothing to do with the August State election of last year. But the other (Boyd) has been making magnificent stump speeches to his grand juries regarding their alleged duties in the same matter.

This State has the right to regulate its own affairs as the people see fit, and it is our duty to see that our election and other officers are properly defended and protected when attacked by outsiders. The United States laws provide for the protection of their election and other officials just as we are now seeking to protect ours.

Here we appoint a citizen as registrar or judge of election and swear him to support our State laws on the subject. He enforces and executes them—and no more. Then the late chairman of the Republican party, as district attorney, attacks him and he and the Federal authorities indict our man in the United States courts for an alleged crime.

Will any man essay to claim that the State shall not protect that man, shall not defend its servant? Why, an individual who pursued such a course would be worse than an ingrate.

I believe the course the Republican party is pursuing in this matter will damn it forever in the estimation of good citizens.

All these indictments have been brought against men in the western section of the State—a section where the Republicans polled a larger vote and elected more candidates for office than usual, sending two Congressmen to Washington.

The authorities at Washington should be made to understand that these agents of theirs are not attacking merely individuals, but that they are assaulting the rights and interfering with the domestic affairs of a sovereign State—a State that is determined to look after the protection and defense of its public servants. All the rights of the States were not wiped out and done away with forever by the Civil War and its results.

Shall we sit supinely by and see all of our rights and privileges as States taken from us? Shall Federal Judge Boyd govern North Carolina? A great principle is at stake here.

Talk about "election riots." If there were any, what did they amount to in comparison to the hellish deeds of rape, arson, theft, robbery and murder that ran in eastern North Carolina under the Fusion regime?

We have no apology to make to anybody for anything we did to correct that awful and intolerable condition of affairs—when the white womanhood of the State and the virtue and honor of our wives and mothers and daughters were imperilled, and insulted and often outranged!

More than that, we are going to keep alive the principles on which we won the battle of 1898 and 1900.

In blistering language Mr. Morrison scored the Republicans who foisted negro rule upon the white people of his county and section, and then protected and shielded the negroes who, taking liberty for license, had insulted and outraged the pure womanhood of the State—and then had pals upon he juries that tried them to see that they went unwhipt of justice.

But, thank heaven, we have wiped all that out—and we are responsible and answerable to no one but ourselves, our own State and our God! This bill has nothing to do with it, however. It relates to election officers only, and not to any individual who participated in a "riot" of any kind.

The real murderers of those of whom the Senator from Graham (Mr. Candler) spoke are Butler and Pritchard and the rest of the crowd that brought about the conditions that forced and made absolutely necessary the results that followed.

And this State will never, never return to negro rule—not until the white men are all dead!

I wish I could properly portray to the Senators from the west the awful conditions that existed in my county and section. It was so revolting and unbearable that nearly all the white Republicans and Populists of that section joined hands with the Democrats to overthrow negro domination and the political rule of rascality. So the Democrats were not the only ones interested in the elections of 1898 and August, 1900. In my county the majority of white Republicans put on the red shirts and worked with us. The same thing was true all over Eastern North Carolina.

No Federal question is involved here, no Federal law has been broken. The indictment of these men is a piece of political persecution solely, and we mean to defend and protect them to the extent of our last dollar and the last drop of our blood, if necessary!

Mr. Morrison made Senator Dula admit that he would not support the bill ... it was intended to defend the Governor of North Carolina, even in the Federal courts, in such case.

He drew from Senator Pinnix the admission, on the other hand, that he thought it would be all right for the Attorney General of North Carolina to defend the indicted men in Federal courts, but that he objected to spending any money from the treasury to employ additional counsel.

This showed those two Republicans Senators to be very wide apart in the position taken by each—a fact which caused a Senator to suggest that the opposition ought to have gotten together closer than that before attacking the bill.

Senator Pinnix also made this admission, when asked if he thought the disgraceful and intloreable conditions which obtained under fusion rule in Eastern North Carolina (which he had said he did not appear) would ever have been corrected by the fusionists:

"I will be fair. I think they probably would not have been corrected."

All these admissions, wrung from their adversaries, were regarded as important points by the Democratic Senators.

* * *

Senator Crisp (Rep.) next took the floor and declared that in his opinion the Democrats were about to pass a law to defend violators of Federal election laws.

He grew angry when interrupted with questions by Democrats and said he didn't want the thread of his argument broken in that way. As to white supremacy, he couldn't see anything in it except Democratic supremacy and Democratic office-holding. Democrats are here on this floor representing the largest negro counties, and thereby white supremacy is established! The Republicans here represent only white counties.

The villainous Democratic machine was made for the purpose of grinding out Democratic majorities, but we don't carry elections in Western North Carolina that way—we don't use shot guns and Winchester rifles for that purpose. We don't hew down human timber at the polls like the big corporations were yesterday said to hew down the timber lands of others in the eastern pine forests.

Alluding to Senator Morton's speech last week on the House Apportionment bill, Mr. Crisp sarcastically said it had now been discovered that the "niggers" had not been driven out of Wilmington permanently; they had only been given a leave of absence, and now they have returned—accommodating souls—in order to make up enough population to base a claim for an additional member of the legislature from New Hanover county!

And more of the same kind.

* * *

Senator Woodard (Dem.), of Wilson, followed, and declared the minority would not be allowed to place the majority—in a false position.

This bill is designed rolely and only to protect innocent men from unjust prosecutions in the Federal court—instigated by party rage and hate.

We propose to do only that which the United States and other States do for their public servants, and not leave these indicted men to be thrown into jails and prison for upholding the law of their State, laws which they were sworn to support—men called upon to support the sacred rights of our citizens and even the virtue and honor of the white womanhood of the State.

Senator Woodard made a fine speech, but it is impracticable to report it in full.

* * *

Senator Pinnix (Rep.) of Yadkin, who may be termed to be the leader of the Rep-Pop, fusionists in the Senate, if they have a "leader," next addressed the Senate.

I don't blame the men who did the dirty work, said he, so much as I do the party leaders who put them forward and commissioned them to do it.

And I can hardly blame the leaders now for protecting them as best they can. You are in duty bound to do that much for them.

But I do object to making the State pay the bills. Yes, the United States defends its officials when indicted, but a salaried district attorney does the defending and it doesn't cost the government anything more than usual. He is not authorized to go out and employ extra counsel to do it.

Now the Attorney General should do the defending of these State election officials—and if he needs help Democratic lawyers enough for the purpose ought to voluntarily help him, and not tax the people to pay the lawyers who do so.

Your bill does not fix any limit to the amount to be paid—it may run up into the thousands and thousands of dollars. No man can now say how much it will cost.

As to the "nigger" I don't care if he is eliminated. He don't figure in the politics of my section much. I only object to the manner in which you dispose of him.

Your Governor the other day promised fair elections and a fair election law, and here you are a month later trying to pass a bill to encourage violations of election laws.

As to the Senator from Richmond (Mr. Morrison), he's a mind-reader, he is! He can and does tell you all about what I think—and I don't think—about a "strong central government" and the whole world being run and governed from Washington. He doesn't know one thing that I think about such matters.

If this bill is a sample of what is to follow, it's a poor augury for the future.

Asked by Mr. Morrison if he endorsed what the Democrats did in turning out negroes employed in the legislative halls and the employment of white men in their places, Mr. Pinnix replied that he did.

Mr. Morrison: Would the Republicans have done that?

Mr. Pinnix: I am afraid not. I'll be candid and fair. As to George White, you know more about him than I do.

* * *

Senator Aycock spoke next, and made a stirring speech. He repudiated and disproved some of the statements of the other side and scored several good points. We wish we had the space to report the speech more fully.

Senator Michael (Rep.) followed in a

(Continued on page 6.)

AS TO ECONOMY

Different Views Prevail in the Senate

ALL SEEM ALARMED

But Representatives of Various Interests Cannot Keep Their Hands Out of Treasury—The Arguments

Washington, Feb. 14.—When the Senate convened today it was decided to take a recess from 5:30 to 8 o'clock this evening, the reading of the District of Columbia Code bill to be the only order of the night session.

An amendment proposed by Mr. Shoup of Idaho to the Sundry Civil bill, looking to the establishment of a Soldiers' Home in Idaho, induced Mr. Hale of Maine to call attention to the fact that the Committee on Appropriations was being beseiged constantly for more and more soldiers' homes, although it is nearly forty years since the close of the civil war. The general belief was that in forty of fifty years the demand for these homes ought to be on the decrease, and he thought it would be necessary to give some account to the country of the proposed increase.

Mr. Pettigrew declared that the United States was manufacturing material for soldiers' homes every day. General MacArthur's report for December showed that there were 10,000 more sick in the Philippines then could be cared for properly.

Mr. Hale acceded to this statement, and added that every man in the Philippines would be on the pension list in five years. "This kind of war," he said, "is the most cruel and destructive in its ravages. All the soldiers now in the Philippines will want pensions and we will give them to them." He ... not believe, however, that there were enough soldiers in the Philippines to account for any increase in the number of soldiers' homes.

Mr. Seawell, of New Jersey, challenged Mr. Pettigrew's statement that there were 10,000 sick and disabled soldiers in the Philippines who could not be given proper care. He declared it was not true.

Mr. Teller, of Colorado, supported Mr. Pettigrew's statement and the latter declared his belief that the number of sick and disabled soldiers in the Philippines would aggregate 40,000 a year for years to come, or so long as the war might last.

The debate was cut off by a demand for the regular order.

Consideration of the Agricultural Appropriation bill was then resumed, the pending question being the amendment of Mr. Teller striking out the provision for the mapping of the agricultural soils of the United States.

Mr. Hale, of Maine, went bevond Mr. Teller's amendment and made a point of order against the committee amendment providing for a general mapping of the soils of the United States. "Is there," said he, "to be no stop to the schemes for depleting the treasury? This will cost $100,000,000. It never will stop until every county in every State has been visited and mapped. In the interest of some moderation in these new schemes I make this point of order."

Mr. Tillman, of South Carolina, made a vigorous appeal in support of the committee amendment, urging that it was in the interest of the farmers of the country. He declared that Congress every year was spending hundreds of millions that were stolen, and yet objection was made to a simple and inexpensive proposition in behalf of the farmers of the country.

Mr. Proctor in charge of the bill, explained that the amendment called for expenditure of only $91,000.

Mr. Pettus of Alabama, directed the Senate's attention to two word pictures, one of a proposition to spend $225,000,000 for the benefit of ship owners and ship builders of the country, and the other of a project to spend less than $100,000 for the benefit of more than half the population of the United States.

Mr. Hale reiterated his assertion as to the ultimate cost of the proposed project. He urged that there was no demand from the farmers of the country for such an examination of the soils. They knew their farms and their adaptability to crops. He urged that the pending proposition was evolved from the mind of some agricultural expert and did not have the approval of the hard-headed farmers of the country.

"There is nothing so thankless," Mr. Hale said, "as to object when schemes and interests are organized to loot the treasury. The tremendous expenditures constantly before our eyes are so demoralizing to our minds that we are incapable of understanding and appreciating them. When the people once realize the situation—and it is too early yet, probably those who are responsible for these expenditures will call upon the rocks and mountains to hide them from the wrath of the people. When we get to the end of this Congress and figure up the appropriations they will be found to be larger—yea, very much larger—

(Continued on page 2.)