FOR THE FILIPINOS

Senator Bacon Spoke on His Resolution.

PLEA FOR SELF-GOVERNMENT

The Declaration of Such a Policy, He Declared, Would Terminate the War.

WASHINGTON, Jan. 30.—For more than three hours today Bacon of Georgia occupied the attention of the senate with a discussion of the Philippine question. His argument, which had for its basis his own resolutions declaratory of the government's policy toward the Philippines, was listened to carefully by his fellow-senators and by a large gallery audience. He maintained that the United States owes as much to the Filipinos as it does to the Cubans, to whom, by resolution of congress, self-government has been promised, and he strongly urged that his resolutions, declaring it to be the intention of this government to confer the right of government upon the Filipinos, be adopted as a means not only of terminating the war, but of extending to the struggling people justice and freedom.

The Proceedings.

When the senate met, a bill providing that the cannon on the gunboat Nashville, from which the first shot was fired in the Spanish war, be condemned and presented to the city of Nashville, was passed.

Hoar (rep. Mass.) offered a resolution directing the committee on rules to consider whether some plan could not be adopted for the enlargement of the capitol and for providing for the transaction of public business other than legislative business elsewhere, so that there may be sufficient space provided for the convenient transaction of the business of the two houses of congress. After debate the resolution was agreed to.

A resolution offered yesterday by Pettigrew (sil. S. D.), calling upon the president for information as to whether the people of Samoa were consulted on the treaty recently made in relation to the islands, and whether any protests have been received from the Samoans against the treaty, was laid before the senate.

On motion of Davis (rep. Minn.), the resolution was referred to the committee on foreign relations by a vote of 29 to 23.

Pettigrew then asked unanimous consent to have printed as a public document a statement by Aguinaldo, giving a history of the revolt of the Filipinos against the Spaniards. He said it was a document of great interest to the senate and to the country, but on objection the question went over.

Bacon's Speech.

After the passage of a number of bills on the calendar, Bacon (dem. Ga.) addressed the senate on the Philippine question.

Mr. Bacon, after discussing some preliminary points, said in part:

"Under these resolutions, if adopted, the United States will do for the Philippines practically the same as it has undertaken to do for Cuba. The question presented may be concisely stated as follows:

"When the conditions are ripe, when peace has been restored and the authority of the United States is no longer resisted in the Philippines, shall the United States then accord a free government to the Filipinos, to be independently exercised by them, or will the United States thereafter retain possession, demand sovereignty of the Philippines, with the view to their permanent retention as a part of the territory of the United States?"

After discussing previous acquisitions of territory, Mr. Bacon said:

"In each of these vast acquisitions and in the uses made of them there was expansion, and great expansion. But it was not simply expansion of the territory subject to the jurisdiction of the United States. It was also an expansion, or rather an extension, of the same political system and political institutions which existed in the original states—the expansion or extension of the system of states inhabited by people of our own race, a people free and self-governing and with equal rights with the people in the original states, in the making of laws for the control of state and federal government.

"This in each instance was legitimate expansion. It was legitimate and harmonious growth. It was not revolutionary change. It subverted none of our institutions. It did no violence to our political principles. It destroyed none of our political ideals.

"What shall be said of an expansion which is simply an expansion of territory, which does not carry with it an extension of our political system, our political principles and our political ideals? What shall be said of an expansion by the acquisition of territory where it is not intended that there shall be statehood, and where it is impossible that there can ever be statehood? To hold them a subject colony makes necessarily a revolution in our system of government which should not be aided by any one who is loyal to the principles upon which that system is founded.

"The advocates of the permanent retention of the Philippines do not like to hear the term 'vassal.' Nevertheless, one who is a subject of a government in which he has no voice, who only has such liberty as the government may grant him, and which itself may be taken from him at the will of the government, is a vassal. And that is the only political relation the Filipino can ever bear to the United States. The advocates of permanent retention do not like the term 'imperialism.' Nevertheless, whenever a republic owns outlying provinces, to be held permanently as dependent colonies, never to be admitted as a part of the republic in the control and administration of the government of that republic, it is to that extent imperial. And if held permanently, that is the only relation which the Philippine islands can ever bear to the United States. In the nature of things there can be no imperial republic. Under such a government the form of a republic may be preserved, but under it the spirit of republicanism must die.

"I am not pleading the cause of the Filipino. I am pleading the cause of Americans that their government may not be converted from a republic composed of free states into an imperial government holding vassal and subject colonies, ruled and controlled necessarily by a standing army in their midst. If our free republic is to be converted into this imperial government, it is not those who are to be held and ruled as vassals in subject colonies who will be the principal sufferers.

"The first feature in which this revolution will definitely manifest itself to the injury of our people will be in the immediate growth of militarism. If it shall be finally determined to hold the Philippine islands, it is a safe prediction that in less than 18 months from this date the regular army of the United States will be 100,000. And the army of 100,000, which now seems to be monstrous, will in a short time be increased to 200,000.

"There can be no greater danger to republican government, there can be no greater menace to personal liberty and free institutions, than a great standing army in time of peace. It is the mailed hand of every tyrant. It is the voracious consumer of the hard tribute wrung from the industries of the land; it is the oppressor and the burden of the great mass of the people. I want no territory permanently annexed to the United States in which the conditions are such that it is a conceded fact beyond the possibility of successful dispute, that not only for a while, but for all time, the authority of the United States must and can be maintained only through the power of a great standing army, enforcing the submission and obedience of an unwilling people.

"Another certain consequence of this revolution in the principles and structure of our government will be the liability and probability of disastrous wars, of which we have not hitherto stood in danger. We will necessarily become complicated in the contentions and competitions and rivalries of the European governments, and from these complications there will be constant danger that wars will be thrust upon us which we cannot honorably decline. The Philippine islands will be our weak spot, and that will be the point of attack by our enemies, because it is the weak spot.

"Again, with our navy necessarily concentrated in the Pacific ocean, our long seacoast on the Atlantic and on the Gulf must depend upon its land defenses to repel the attacks of the enemy's ships. And if this distant imperial colonization scheme is to be permanently adhered to, our seacoast must remain in an undefended condition. If these hundreds of millions of dollars are to be expended on account of the Philippines, it will be impossible to provide the money to defray other necessary expenses of the government, and also necessary properly to fortify our vast stretch of seacoast.

"If our navy, small as it is, were in Atlantic waters, it could be depended upon in large measure to defend our coasts. But with our army and navy in the Philippines, and with our long seacoast comparatively undefended by fortifications, what plight we would be in if we should become involved in a war with a European power.

"Unless met by a superior power, there is no halt to the imperial tread, once it starts upon its conquering and its despoiling march. Until it meets with disaster, it can only be stayed by the command of the people, and then only when such command is given before, in the decay of free institutions, they lose their power to command. The thirst for empire is like the desire for human blood, which is stirred to an unquenchable and maddening thirst in the veins of every man who tastes it. It was a long step into the middle of the sea to take Hawaii. It was a much longer step across the midst of all the oceans to take the Philippines. From there across to the continent of Asia is a much shorter step. Thus from step to step the march of empire will go on, and a necessary, inevitable consequence will be a growing standing army, not of 100,000 or of 200,000, but of 400,000 or 500,000 men, and an annual expenditure drawn from the taxes paid by the people, the magnitude of which one would scarcely venture to suggest.

"While our people of the South are ready to meet war when it comes, and to do always their full duty in every war, they do not desire war and do not desire the governmental policies which will invite wars by entangling the United States in the disputes and contentions of monarchial Europe.

"To retain permanently the islands will annually cost the United States more than $100,000,000. The large increase in the standing army will alone annually cost that, and that will, by no means, be all of the expense.

"But it is said that all of these evils will be compensated for in the fact that the possession of the Philippines will open and secure for us the trade of the Orient. If there ever was a proposition absolutely without argument to sustain it, it is this one. If there could have over been any argument upon which it could rest, it has been entirely removed by the agreement which has been made by all of the European governments that the open door shall remain in China, and that we shall have equal privileges with all other nations for our commerce there. What more than this could we get if we owned every Pacific island and harbor on the Asiatic coast?

"The pretense that the Philippines are necessary to our trade is a delusion and a snare."

Other Business.

As Bacon was concluding, a lively colloquy occurred between him and several other senators. Spooner (rep. Wis.) inquired on what theory Bacon proposed a declaration by this congress that could in any way be binding on subsequent congresses.

Bacon responded that the same declaration that the 56th congress had made with reference to the Cubans ought to be made with reference to the Filipinos. Congress had the right to make such a declaration, even if it were not binding upon future congresses.

Teller (sil. Colo.), the author of the Cuban resolution, said he believed that the United States stood before the world committed to the self-government of the Filipinos—that is, such self-government as they were capable of. He maintained that the pacification of the islands must be the first object of the United Staets, however. He regretted that this pacification now must be by the sword.

The pension calendar was taken up. Among the bills passed was one granting to Anne Brumby, mother of Lieutenant Brumby, Admiral Dewey's flag lieutenant, $50 a month.

The following bills were passed: To pay $5000 to the widow of John Phillips, in view of his services as a dispatch-bearer in the Sioux war; to increase the limit of cost of the public building at Cheyenne, Wyo., to $325,000.

A resolution was adopted for the reading of Washington's farewell address, February 22, by Senator Foraker, of Ohio.

W. V. Sullivan, recently elected senator from Mississippi, was sworn in.

The senate at 5:15 P. M. adjourned.

IN THE HOUSE.

Only Business of Minor Importance Was Transacted.

WASHINGTON, Jan. 30.—The house was in session a little over one hour today, and only business of minor importance was transacted.

Eddy (rep. Minn.) rose to a question of privilege, calling the attention of the house to fraudulent representations made by alleged agents of the set of books known as "Messages and Papers of the Presidents of the United States." Richardson (dem. Tenn.), who compiled the volumes upon the order of congress, explained that congress had voted him a copy of the plates for the volumes for his labor, and he had made a contract with a publisher, from whom he received a small royalty. He was as much opposed to fraudulent representations as any one. Eddy disclaimed any intention of reflecting upon Richardson.

Resolutions were adopted calling upon the secretary of the navy and the secretary of war for information as to the amount of money expended and the amount for which the government is liable remaining unpaid, for equipments, transportation, supplies and naval operations in the Philippine islands from May 1, 1898, to November 1, 1899.

Under the call for committees, a bill to authorize the secretary of war to accept a site for a military post near Des Moines, Ia., was passed; also a bill to extend the time for the completion of the incline railway on West Mountain Hot Springs reservation, Arkansas.

At 1:19 P. M. the house adjourned.

The Hawaiian Bill.

WASHINGTON, Jan. 30.—The Hawaiian bill has been practically completed by the house committee on territories, and Chairman Knox, with a subcommittee, is preparing a draft of the revised bill with the intention of presenting it to the house this week. Several important changes have been made in the measure. The chief of these is the striking out of any and all property qualifications for electors to the senate. Another change eliminates the supervision given to the supreme court of Hawaii over the election in the senate and house, and makes each the judge of its own elections. The omission of the property qualifications for electors is in the interest of the natives.

Montana Land Grant.

WASHINGTON, Jan. 30.—From the senate committee on public lands Senator Carter reported favorably a bill granting 50,000 acres of land to Montana for the maintenance of an asylum for the blind.

For Men of Taste,
There's delight in Evans' Ale and Stout.

LAWMAKER AND GAMBLER

WHERE A MONTANA STATE SENATOR MADE HIS WINNINGS.

Explained That His Sudden Acquisition of Wealth Was Due to His Success at Faro.

WASHINGTON, Jan. 30.—When the senate committee on privileges and elections adjourned its hearing today of the charges made against Senator Clark, of Montana, in connection with his election to the United States senate, it was understood the defense would be prepared to proceed with its witnesses not later than Monday next. Mr. Campbell said he would have only one or two more witnesses, and, without stating how many men he would call, Mr. Faulkner said his witnesses would follow each other in rapid succession, and there would be no delays.

There was but one witness on the stand today, J. H. Geiger, who was, on a contest, given the seat of state senator in the Montana legislature from Flathead county at first occupied by Mr. Whiteside, who is one of the principal movers in the fight against Mr. Clark. Geiger voted for Clark, but he insisted he did so only because the republican caucus had declared for him. He confessed to taking $3600 in money home after the adjournment of the legislature. Of this sum he claimed to have won $1500 to $1800 playing faro, and to have found $1100 in $100 bills in his room. This latter amount he thought had been left for him to influence him to vote against bills 132 and 134, relating to corporations, but he did not know who had left it there. Geiger said he had received no money to vote for Mr. Clark, and, while he admitted having been approached with the view of bribery in other propositions, he refused to give the names of persons who had talked with him, saying that to do so would incriminate himself.

Geiger's Testimony.

Mr. Geiger said he had been the republican candidate for the senate from Flathead county. He was asked whether he had not said in his speech accepting the nomination that his vote could not be purchased for a democrat for the senate. He replied that it was his intention to convey the idea that he could not be "handled." He had said that if he sold out he hoped his constituents would take him out and hang him, "and I still feel that way," he said. He had not said that he would not vote for any democrat, but it had been his intention to prevent a deadlock. He had also said that there were other matters more important to come before the legislature than the election of some rich man for United States senator.

Upon being questioned concerning his financial condition when he was nominated, he said it was "just moderate. He had been in the hotel business, and had sold out; he could not remember just how much he received, but after much questioning said he thought the amount was about $25. He had also received $200 from his mother's estate, and had borrowed $300 for the campaign. After he was given his seat he had voted twice for Leonard for senator, and then for W. A. Clark. Mr. Geiger hesitated considerably over a question as to what money he had deposited in the First National bank at Kalispell during or since the sitting of the legislature, but admitted that in May last he had bought a draft for $2500, paying currency for it. He had afterwards, in August, opened an account at that bank, depositing $800 in currency in the name of "John H. Geiger, agent." Since that time he had made other deposits and had borrowed from the bank $2300. He had gotten the $2500 first deposited from several sources, including $500 or $600 for his service and mileage in the legislature.

"Some of it I got at poker and the faro bank," he said, and added: "I don't remember whether I won any at poker—my experience was about even; but at faro I did."

"Did you win $2000 at faro?"

"It was some short of $2000, but at Helena and Butte together I think I quit about $1500 or $1800 ahead."

"You were a state senator; did you not know it was a misdemeanor to play faro?"

"Well, I was about as conscientious in that matter as some other Montana officials."

Continuing this explanation, he said he had never made any great winning at one time, never more than $190, but that he had been uniformly lucky, and had played often. He had also gotten $100 in money for mining stock sold to Spokane men.

"How do you explain the fact that you had so much better luck at faro after you entered the legislature than before?" asked Senator Chandler of Mr. Geiger.

"Why, senator," was the reply, "I did not have. I lived in Montana 22 years, and, having fallen into the ways of the people soon after going there, I had frequently in the early days won more than I did after my election to the state senate. But Libby has no faro bank, and I had not played for some time."

In explanation where he got the $800 deposited in August, he said that while in Peoria, Ill., he had won $1000 in a day on a horse race. All told, Mr. Geiger said, he had in his possession $3600 when he reached Libby after going home from the legislature at Helena.

"When did you get the amount that you have not already accounted for?"

"I can't tell without uncovering my private affairs."

"Do you decline to tell?"

"I do."

This caused the members of the committee to put their heads together in consultation over the question as to whether the witness should be compelled to answer. At the conclusion of this conference Mr. Chandler told Mr. Campbell to proceed with his questions, and informed the witness that he must reply. The question as to where the money came from was repeated. The witness gazed at the ceiling for fully 5 minutes and at last said.

"Where did I get it? Why, in Helena."

"Where did you get it from??"

The witness again took a long time for replying: "Well, sir," he said at last, "I can't answer."

"Do you mean to say that you don't know?"

"I don't know. To be frank, there were other ways of getting money in Helena during the session of the legislature. I was approached at different times to vote for different bills."

"Did you make any money in that way?"

"I don't know; I never sold my vote, but I got money."

Senator Chandler asked: "Now, Mr. Geiger, the committee requires you to state from whom you got money. Go ahead and tell what you know."

Found Money in His Room.

To this the response came quickly. The witness said:

"I found a package in my room containing $1100, and I have since used the money. It was the time that corporation bill 132 was up. I took the money, put it in my pocket and used it, and from that time to the present have never said a word about it."

In reply to other questions he said that he had an idea who left the envelope in his room, but that he did not know. He had, he said, intended to vote for the bill anyway.

At this point, Mr. Faulkner, representing the Clark interest, obtained permission to ask a question.

"Will you state," he asked, "whether any part of that money was given you by any one connected with Mr. Clark, or by Mr. Clark himself, to influence your vote for him for United States senator?"

But, while he had permitted the question, Senator Chandler, as chairman of the committee, instructed the witness that he need not answer it at this juncture, and the examination proceeded on the original lines.

In reply to questions, the witness said he had been told that he could get $1000 or $1200 for his vote in opposition to the bill, but he declined to tell who had made the suggestion, on the ground that it would incriminate himself.

At this point the committee took a recess until 2:15 P. M.

When the committee reassembled, Mr. Campbell took up the line of inquiry where it had been left off.

"Who was it," he asked, "that made the proposition to you that you could receive $1500 for your vote against bill 132 or bill 134?"

"It was common talk all over town that money could be had for votes," replied Mr. Geiger, "but I can't explain further without incriminating myself."

Senator Chandler insisted upon an explanation as to how he could be incriminated, unless he had agreed to accept money for his vote, but the witness insisted that a further explanation would certainly be self-incriminating, and declined to answer. He would go no farther than to say that he had told the person approaching him "that he would see about it."

Asked concerning the purchases of property in Kalispell, Mr. Geiger at first said that he had not bought any, but his brother had.

"Whose money paid for it?" asked Mr. Campbell.

"I refuse to disclose my private affairs," he responded.

Senator Chandler urged response to the question, and, after meditating for some time, the witness said that $1500 of the money that he had originally deposited in the First National bank of Kalispell had been used to pay for that property. He also admitted the purchase of lots and the construction of buildings on them at Libby. Mr. Geiger said he had not had any conversations concerning the senatorial contest with Senator Clark prior to the latter's election to the senate. He had visited the senator's room once, the day of the election, but he said "neither W. A. Clark, Mr. Wellcome, C. W. Clark, nor any of them, so far as I can remember, ever approached me in regard to my vote, but before I was seated I was frequently asked how I would vote if I should get my seat, and uniformly replied that my actions would be controlled entirely by the action of the republican caucus. I voted for Mr. Clark when the decision of the caucus was in his favor." He had, he said, advised the republicans against voting for any democrat.

In reply to questions from Senator Hoar, Mr. Geiger said that before voting for Mr. Clark he had convinced himself that the charges of bribery against Mr. Clark were untrue. Further responding to Mr. Hoar, he emphasized his allegiance to the republican party, saying that he was a McKinley republican; that, while he would have preferred a gold man, he thought it best to accept the next best thing, which he considered Mr. Clark to be.

Mr. Faulkner asked only one question in cross-examination, and in reply to this question Mr. Geiger repeated that he had received no money or any promises of any from either Senator Clark, or any one else for him, for his vote for Mr. Clark for the United States senate.

ANTI-TRUST BILLS.

Measures Before Judiciary Committees of Both Houses.

NEW YORK, Jan. 30.—A special to the Herald from Washington says:

Republican leaders in both houses of congress are devoting considerable attention to the subject of trust legislation, and there is every reason to believe that a measure of some kind will be brought forward after the report of the industrial commission has been made.

The judiciary committees of both houses have before them general bills proposing to regulate trusts, and several resolutions proposing constitutional amendments to give congress power over corporations. The best lawyers seem to be of the opinion that nothing can be done without a constitutional amendment and it is probable that some form of amendment will be recommended. Chairman Ray, of the house judiciary committee, said he thought his committee would report some measure after the committee had studied the testimony taken by the industrial commission. Chairman Hoar, of the senate judiciary committee, declined to anticipate the probable action of his committee on this subject and said no definite conclusion had been reached.

Senator Aldrich, chairman of the committee on finance, says that if the trusts are destructive and demoralizing to public interest the republican party is as ready and anxious and equally as well qualified as the democrats to correct such abuses as may exist. Senator Cullom, chairman of the committee on interstate and foreign commerce, agrees with Mr. Aldrich, and so do Senators Lodge, Spooner and Elkins, three of the leading political workers in the senate.

Whether action is taken, aimed directly at great commercial combinations, or not, congress may amend the interstate commerce law so as to give the commission more power over railroad rates to make freight discriminations more difficult.

CAMPAIGN COMMITTEE.

Elected by Republicans of the Senate and House in Joint Caucus.

WASHINGTON, Jan. 30.—The republicans of the house and senate met in joint caucus in the hall of representatives tonight and selected the members of the congressional campaign committee. The delegation from each state seected its representatives. States where no agreement was reached were given three days in which to announce their selection. The committee will organize within 10 days. Representative Babcock, of Wisconsin, will be re-elected chairman. The list of committeemen selected today includes the following: California, Representative Metcalf; Missouri, Representative Pearce; Montana, Senator Carter; Nebraska, Representative Mercer; Texas, Representative Hawley; Washington, Representative Jones; Wyoming, Representative Mondell.

A Persian Loan.

ST. PETERSBURG, Jan. 30.—It is semi-officially announced that the government, at the request of the government of Persia, and in view of the good relations between the two governments, has authorized the Loan Bank of Persia to take up the loan of 22,500,000 rubles about to be issued in Persia under the designation of the 5 per cent Persian gold loan of 1900. The Loan bank, therefore, has contracted to take up the loan, which is repayable in 75 years, guaranteed by all the Persian customs receipts except the revenues in the custom-house at Fars and the custom-houses of the Persian gulf. In the event of a delay in the payments, the Loan bank will have the right to control the custom-houses. Russia guarantees the bonds of the Persian loan.

Boston Hotel Man Fails.

BOSTON, Jan. 30.—Joseph W. Smith, one of the proprietors of the Hotel Beleville, filed a voluntary petition in bankruptcy in the United States court. The hotel has just been built and furnished and the announcement will create much surprise. The firm's liabilities are scheduled at $131,951, while the assets are very small; about $7000. The secured claims are $74,795 and the unsecured claims $57,355. It is stated that differences between the partners led to the court proceedings.

Colonel Charles F. Williams Dead.

VALLEJO, Cal., Jan. 30.—Colonel Charles F. Williams, commander of the United States marine corps at Mare Island, died suddenly today of hemorrhage of the stomach.

Daily Treasury Statement.

WASHINGTON, Jan. 30.—Today's statement of the condition of the treasury shows:

Available cash balance............$290,653,887
Gold reserve 217,836,812

Boorish and Horrid.

Philadelphia Press.

A boorish young fellow from Fla.,
Made a dash through a crowded inn's ca.;
Said a lady from Me.,
As he trod on her tre.,
"I ne'er met a man who was ha."

PARLIAMENT IN SESSION

REASSEMBLING WAS NOT ACCOMPANIED BY DISORDER.

The Speech From the Throne—Estimates for Continuing the War and Strengthening Defenses.

LONDON, Jan. 30.—The seventh session of the 14th parliament of Queen Victoria opened at 2 P. M. after the customary formalities. The speaker, William Court Gulley, arrived at the house of commons at 1:53 P. M. There was a large attendance of members. The gentleman usher of the Black Rod, General Sir M. S. Biddulph, summoned the commons to the house of lords at 2:05 P. M., where the lord high chancellor, Earl Halsbury, read the queen's speech, which was as follows:

"My Lords and Gentlemen: The peace which had recently been broken in South Africa when last I addressed you has, unhappily, not been restored, but otherwise my relations with other states are friendly. In resisting the invasion of my South African colonies by the South African Republic and the Orange Free State, my people have responded with devotion and enthusiasm to the appeal which I have made to them, and the heroism of my soldiers in the field and my sailors and marines who were landed to co-operate with them has not fallen short of the noblest traditions of our military history.

"I am deeply grieved that so many valuable lives should have fallen as a sacrifice, but I have witnessed with pride and with the heartiest gratification the patriotic eargerness and spontaneous loyalty with which my subjects in all parts of my dominions have come forward to share in the common defense of their imperial interests. I am confident I shall not look to them in vain when I exhort them to sustain and renew their exertions until they have brought this struggle for the maintenance of the empire and assertion of its supremacy in South Africa to a victorious conclusion.

"A treaty has been concluded with the German emperor for the adjusiment of the rights claimed by the two countries in Samoa, Tonga and other islands in the Pacific. To a portion of these stipulations the government of the United States has also been a party.

"A bill will be introduced at an early date to give effect to the scheme of federation which has been adopted, after most careful consideration, by five of my Australian colonies. I have watched with cordial satisfaction the gradual development of my greater colonies into self-governing communities. I feel confident that the establishment of the great federation of Australia will prove advantageous not only to the colonies immediately concerned, but also to the empire at large.

"The brilliant courage and soldier-like qualities of the colonial forces engaged in South Africa have already earned high admiration, and patriotic offers of assistance, which it was not possible to accept, have come from many other colonies with populations of various races. I have received from the ruling chiefs of native states of India numerous offers to place their troops and the resources of their states at my disposal for service in South Africa. These proofs of their loyalty to myself and their devotion to the cause of my empire have afforded me much gratification.

"I regret that owing to insufficient rainfall in the autumn over a great part of Western and Central India the harvest and pasturage have failed to such an extent as to create a famine. Timely measures have been taken by my government and by the rulers of the native states affected to relieve the suffering and prevent starvation. I regret to add that the epidemic of plague continues, and that, although its severity has not increased since last year, there is at present no prospect of its diminution.

"Gentlemen of the House of Commons: The estimates for the public service of the year will be laid before you. The provision for military expenditure must be largely increased on account of the charge for military operations in South Africa. The experience of a great war must necessarily afford lessons of the greatest importance to the military administration of the country. You will not, I am convinced, shrink from any outlay that may be required to place our defensive preparations on a level with the responsibility which the possession of so great an empire has laid upon us. At a time when several other nations are perfecting their naval preparations at the cost of increasing efforts and sacrifices, the solicitude with which you have provided for the efficiency of our navy and our coast defenses will assuredly not be relaxed."

The rest of the speech recognizes that the time is not propitious for domestic reforms involving large expenditures, recommends amendments to the agricultural, educational, company, railway and accident laws, and concludes:

"It appears that service in South Africa may have the effect of disfranchising those taking part in it, and you will be asked to sanction a measure by which this injustice will be prevented.

"I commend your deliberations at this anxious time to the blessing and guidance of Almighty God."

The attendance of peers and of the public was not extraordinary. After the reading of the speech the house adjourned until 4 P. M., and the commons returned to their house, which adjourned its sitting until 4 o'clock.

There was a conspicuous absence of public excitement in connection with the reassembling of parliament. A small knot of people witnessed the arrival and departure of the yeomanry of the guard, the crowd around the entrance to the palace yard at no time exceeding 500, and the few who were hoping for some demonstration against the ministry were disappointed.

Debate in the Commons.

When the proceedings were recommenced in the house of commons, Mr. Balfour, first lord of the treasury and government leader, Sir Henry Campbell-Bannerman, liberal leader, and others were loudly cheered by their respective followers. James Lowther made his annual motion relative to the interference of people at elections. It was rejected by a vote of 337 to 101. The speaker read the queen's speech at 4:45 P. M. Subsequently Captain Ernest G. Pretyman, conservative member for the Woodbridge division of Suffolk, moved the address in reply to the speech. The entry of the secretary of state for the colonies, Joseph Chamberlain, was not cheered from any part of the house.

Captain Pretyman, in moving the address in reply, expressed the deepest sympathy, which he said was shared by both sides of the house, with the sufferers from the war and the sufferers in Natal. He further referred to the feeling of admiration for the gallantry of the troops which was felt by all parties, and remarked that additional common ground for pride was the gallantry and national spirit shown by both Great Britain and her colonies. The captain then appealed for the union of all parties in support of the government in its efforts safely to conclude the war. Herbert P. Pike Pease, liberal-unionist member for Darlington, seconded the address in reply to the speech from the throne.

The liberal leader in the house of commons, Sir Henry Campbell-Bannerman, then rose to reply, amidst cheers from the opposition benches. Sir Henry Campbell-Bannerman, commenting on the queen's speech, said he had seldom known so little to be said in such a large number of words. As, however, the war advanced, it became more difficult and more critical, and he was not surprised that the government had not proposed a formidable programme. Affairs in South Africa, political and military, would undoubtedly engage the present parliament to a great extent. The war was uppermost in all minds when the members separated in October, and it was believed there were troops enough in South Africa rapidly to clear the queen's domains. But their expectations had been sobered. Week after week had seen checks, disappointments and deplorable loss of life. In every instance the advance of the British troops had been stayed by large bodies of the enemy. But the country had again and again gone through greater perils with courage and composure, and would not now depart from its high traditions. The courage and fortitude of British soldiers was never more conspicuous, and they must associate with this the sons of the colonies, who had shown extraordinary aptitude in this kind of warfare. He appreciated the gallantry and devotion which led their countrymen to volunteer, but he wished to know the reasons which necessitated this unusual method of reinforcing the army. He and his friends had resolved to support a vigorous prosecution of the war, that the integrity of the queen's domains be speedily vindicated, and he imagined there would be no difficulty in obtaining the additional supplies necessary. "Here my agreement with the government ceases," said the liberal leader.

Sir Henry Campbell-Bannerman then proceeded with a bitter condemnation of the administration and the temper in which it had approached the whole problem, saying the narrowness of the government's provision for military requirements necessitated hostilities, and asserting that its policy made war probable.

Arthur J. Balfour, after a vain attempt to draw Sir Henry Campbell-Bannerman into an admission that he did not advocate pushing the war into Boer territory, reproached him with waiting until the country had become involved in military difficulties to bring a vote of censure of the colonial secretary, which might have been brought, Mr. Balfour declared, any time since 1895. In general defense of the colonial secretary and the government's policy, Mr. Balfour said that at one time the government believed that the war would be avoided, but had subsequently become convinced that the Boer government never from the first intended to give those franchise concessions, the withholding of which meant war.

Lord Edmond Fitzmaurice then moved the amendment to the address:

"And we humbly express our regret at the want of foresight and judgment displayed by her majesty's advisers, as shown alike in their conduct of African affairs since 1895 and in their preparations for the war now proceeding."

Lord Fitzmaurice attacked Mr. Chamberlain's policy, especially his failure to punish the raiders and the retention of Cecil Rhodes as a member of the privy council, together with the "irritating and reckless methods that plunged the country into war before any adequate preparations were possible."

The debate was then adjourned.

In the House of Lords.

On the resumption of business in the house of lords the galleries were thronged. There was an unusually large attendance of peers. The Duke of Somerset moved the address in reply to the queen's speech, and the Earl of Shaftesbury seconded the motion. The Duke of Somerset, in moving the address, said he looked forward confidently to a successful termination of the war. He urged the necessity for reform in the military administration, and said hitherto the army seemed to have existed for the benefit of the war office, and that in future the war office must exist for the benefit of the army.

The Earl of Shaftesbury conservatively emphasized the debt of gratitude which Great Britain owed to her colonies, and expressed satisfaction at the settlement of the Samoan question.

The liberal leader in the house of lords, the Earl of Kimberley, followed. He said he was glad to learn that Great Britain's relations with other states were friendly. He added that he believed the term could be justly applied to the relations with European governments and the United States, and he deprecated undue attention to the attacks of the foreign press. His lordship congratulated Lord Salisbury upon the conclusion of the agreement with Germany, but strongly disapproved of one of Mr. Chamberlain's speeches. In this connection, however, he paid a warm tribute to the conduct of the soldiers in the field and to the loyalty of the British colonies.

The Earl of Kimberley, continuing, said that although the moment was one of the deepest gravity, he would entirely abstain from criticising the conduct of the generals. It was the duty of the government to select men to conduct those operations, and it was their duty to support the government. It was, therefore, unwise to criticise the generals in these operations. He did not mean to imply that the generals were not doing their utmost to fulfill their arduous duties, but the government would be wise if it made every effort to prepare thoroughly for what might occur in the future. Continuing, Lord Kimberley said:

"We might meet a period of disaster, and although our relations with the other powers are friendly, it would be well to consider the possibilities of the future, and it would be well if the government prepare for all eventualities and all dangers, and be ready with the means to surmount them. The government does not seem to have been aware of the scale of preparations of the South African republics."

Lord Salisbury asserted that there was nothing in the stipulations of the conventions to limit and hinder the importation of arms and ammunition into the Transvaal through Lourenco Marques. Continuing, the premier said:

"Why were we to know about the importation of arms? I believe guns were introduced into the Transvaal in boilers and munitions of war in piano cases. We had a small secret service fund. If you want more information you must give more money. I consider the enormous amounts spent by other governments, especially the Transvaal, which I have heard on high diplomatic authority spent £800,000 in a single year, and the small sums spent by England make it impossible for us to have the omnipotence attributed to us by Lord Kimberley. I am glad he has not pressed an immediate inquiry into the action of the military authorities at a time when our generals in the field any many of those who could give the most valuable information are unable to appear. We should defer an inquiry to a more convenient season."

Later the premier admitted the deficiency of the existing system, remarking that the treasury had acquired a power which was not to the public benefit. He had not thought of looking into past history, of examining the amount of blame to be attached to this or that minister.

"It is not," he said, "quite the right way of dealing with the present crisis. We must join together and exercise all our powers in extricating ourselves from a situation full of humiliation and not free from danger. I will not say the danger may not have easily been exaggerated. Many a country has commenced a war with difficulties of the kind we experience. We have to look only at what the northern states of America went through at the beginning of the civil war to see how easy it would be to draw a mistaken inference from the reverses we have met at the outset. We have every ground to think that if we set ourselves heartily to work and exert all the undoubted instruments of the power we possess we shall bring the war to a satisfactory conclusion. We have work which appeals to us as subjects of the queen and as Englishmen, and it must throw in the shade all thoughts of party expediency.

"Our effort," the premier continued, "must be to retrieve ourselves from the present situation, which cannot be allowed to lax. This empire is a valuable and splendid but responsible possession. We must concentrate our forces. If we do not tame all the smaller passions into one great duty, we run the danger of convulsions which will tarnish the empire's luster and perhaps menace its integrity."

After Lord Salisbury had spoken, Lord Rosebery made a fiery speech, demanding of the government what it was going to do, and adding that the country would shrink from no sacrifice which the burning emergency might demand. Lord Rosebery spoke with great earnestness. He asked why the premier made it so difficult for the man in the street to support his policy. The past conduct of the government would come up for investigation some day, he hoped, adding:

"We have the right to know if, before the crisis, the intelligence department supplied the government with sufficient information. If not, dismiss the department. If the department possessed the information, their responsibility is heavy. I hope that when the time for the investigation arrives those who have served the queen will be covered with such glory that the eyes of the investigators will be dazzled.

"I was appalled at the nature and style of Lord Salisbury's speech. We have now 120,000 men in South Africa, yet we are, with difficulty, holding our own. The attitude of foreign nations is described as friendly. But that does not strike me as being so amicable as the word would imply. I deem it necessary to know what the government is going to do. Lord Salisbury said the cause of our casualties was the smallness of the secret fund and the British constitution. But what is the government's duty? Some form of compulsory service must be introduced to meet the growing exigencies of the empire, and I am sure the nation will not shrink from either that or any other sacrifice to preserve the empire's predominance. That we should not shrink from sending away vast masses of troops, situated as we are in the center of a universe by no means friendly to us, without having a hint from the government of the military measures it proposes taking to face the disasters we have met and the sacrifices we have made is one of the most extraordinary features of the British constitution. I agree with Lord Salisbury that the country can carry this thing through in spite of all the impediments of men and methods which have shackled it in the past, but I venture to say it will have to be inspired by a loftier tone and truer patriotism than that shown by the premier."

Lord Kimberley urged that the government ought to have been aware of the importing of arms into the Transvaal, and ought to have informed the Transvaal that unless it desisted it must result in Great Britain sending a large force to South Africa. He could not believe the government was so ignorant of the preparations of the Transvaal, and they could not divest themselves of the responsibility.

Baron Balfour, of Burleigh, said that the Jameson raid had closed the mouth of the government and prevented it from protesting against the arming of the Transvaal. "But," he added, "the government must have known armaments were accumulating to an extent unjustified by fears of another raid, and it was the duty of the government to communicate on the subject with the Boer government, but as the first step it ought to punish the raiders severely. The country had not reached a pass that if the government appealed to it, it would not have supported the government in any preparations it thought necessary." He would do nothing to prevent the government from carrying on the war to a successful conclusion.

The Marquis of Lansdowne, secretary of state for war, followed. He said he was prepared to make a statement at a future date. The government, he added, was not prepared and had excellent reasons for not pushing its arrangements further. The address in reply to the speech from the throne was then adopted.

Irish Nationalists Absent.

All sections of Irish nationalists were absent from the open session of parliament, owing to their attendance at a meeting in committee-room 16. Timothy Harrington presided. Those in attendance included Dillon, Healy, John Redmond and many of their followers. Harrington and Redmond urged that the time had come to restore unity in the ranks of the parliamentary representatives of Irish nationalism. Redmond described the prestige of Great Britain as practically shattered, and said there seemed to be no better time for promoting union upon a sound and enduring basis, coupled with a policy of unity in combat and entire independence of all English political parties. He then moved a resolution declaring at an end the division of the Irish nationalist representatives, and that henceforth they should act together as one united party. The resolution was carried unanimously.

The Times in an editorial says: "It is satisfactory to know that further provision will be made for increasing the efficiency of the navy, a duty enjoined by the undisguised hostility of foreign opinion. Obviously it will be practically out of the question to introduce any measures of drastic reform involving large expenditures."

The Times severely reproaches the opposition for "opening the floodgates of controversy," by the Fitzmaurice amendment, which it declares can do no good at the present juncture. It says:

"We hope it is not too late for the opposition to reconsider their decision. No national benefit of any kind could possibly balance the mischief to be done by such a display of divided counsels in the face of the country's enemies. There is much in the conduct of the government calling for criticism, but this is not the proper time."

Trust.

Philadelphia Record.

Hoax—I believe everything my wife tells me.

Joax—On general principles?

Hoax—Yes; I think every man should believe about half he hears, and I prefer to believe the better half.

Your Liver

Will be roused to its natural duties and your biliousness, headache and constipation be cured if you take

Hood's Pills

Sold by all druggists. 25 cents.

Tutt's Pills Cure All Liver Ills.

Twenty Years Proof.

Tutt's Liver Pills keep the bowels in natural motion and cleanse the system of all impurities An absolute cure for sick headache, dyspepsia, sour stomach, constipation and kindred diseases.

"Can't do without them"

R. P. Smith, Chilesburg, Va. writes I don't know how I could do without them. I have had Liver disease for over twenty years. Am now entirely cured.

Tutt's Liver Pills

Woodlark's Homoeopathic Croup and Cough Syrup

Is a safe, certain and prompt remedy. Price 25 cents at all druggists, or sent postpaid on receipt of 30 cents—stamps.

WOODARD, CLARKE & CO., Chemists, Portland, Or.