IMPERIALISM AND EXPANSION.

(Continued from page six.)

Massachusetts [Mr. Lodge] said the other day, that the American people are almost ready to declare that they ever to submit a writ. They were preceding to execute law without any authority whatever, and the American tyranny was appealed to to prevent any effort from being committed.

The supreme court discharged him. They held that as to a state or territory, for which there was no invasion or rebellion and as to a person not a prisoner of war and not in the military or naval service of the United States, neither a military commission with the power to try and convict and execute him, and as the same government was being safeguarded Milligan in the State of Indiana, every equally everywhere, in the limits of our dominion and wherever the jurisdiction of our government extends, under the Constitution and the principles of the common law and the law of nations, the same principles which were applicable to Milligan are limits him to equity to punish him for his offenses in the Philippine Islands if we retain them. But there is some language in this opinion which I desire to read.

Mr. Platt of Connecticut—May I interrupt the senator from Utah?

Mr. Rawlins—Certainly, with pleasure.

Mr. Platt of Connecticut—Where under the Constitution is it provided that a person who is charged with crime before a court martial is not entitled to a trial by jury? I suppose the reason why the framers of the Constitution did not do it was because the Constitution never that Congress may make laws for the government of the army and navy and that it may make all needful rules and regulations for the government of territory.

Mr. Rawlins—I had plenty of time, I should like to read this opinion by the Supreme court, delivered by Chief Justice Chase, before the Milligan case, quoted in 4 Wallace. It shows why we can not do the one thing as to a person not in the military or naval service in a district or state where there is no invasion and no rebellion and why we can do it under a different set of circumstances as to a person who is a prisoner of war or who is in the military or navy service and therefore subject to military discipline and military law.

Mr. Platt of Connecticut—But court martial in time of war try persons who are not in the military service; try citizens of the United States, the same as soldiers, who have not enlisted, who have not signed the articles of war and by them without a jury trial be executed and duly beaten, as I understand the Constitution of the United States. Congress may make rules for the regulation of the army and navy for their government. The same power is given that Congress may make rules for the government of territory.

Mr. Rawlins—I may not oppose my own feeble authority against that of the distinguished senator from Connecticut, but I will call attention to the fact that the supreme court of the United States, in passing the authority of the Supreme court of the United States. I read what they said upon the subject, quoting from the syllabus.

Mr. Platt of Connecticut—The senator from Utah will do me the favor to read it.

Mr. Rawlins—Will the senator from Connecticut permit me to complete my sentence? The court says:

Military commissions organized during the late civil war in a state not invaded and not engaged in rebellion, in which the Federal courts are open and in the proper and unobstructed exercise of their jurisdiction, have no jurisdiction to try, convict, or sentence for any criminal offense a citizen who is neither a resident of the rebellious state, nor a prisoner of war, nor a person in the military or naval service. An act of Congress can not impart such authority.

The language is free from ambiguity.

Mr. Platt of Connecticut—The senator will kindly allow me to ask him that Justice Davis puts the right to try a citizen of the United States by court martial upon the ground upon the character of the Constitution to which I have referred.

Mr. Rawlins—Of course, I am aware of that proposition. I quote this language from the opinion:

Time has proven the discernment of our ancestors; for even these provisions

That is, the safeguards of the Constitution—

were found inadequate in times of great national excitement, when the passions of men were aroused to such a fearful degree that the tyranny of one man or a few was habitually submitted to as a necessity. Knowing this, our fathers, when they established a government for the people, limited its powers so that one person or a few could not overthrow it. They were willing that the country should have the benefit of the wisdom of the few, but they resolved that the many should not be sacrificed by their ignorance or prejudice. They were unwilling that a free government, intended for a people who had a right to demand protection from their own agents, should be turned into a despotism, wielding unlimited power through military tribunals. They therefore commanded that no one should be deprived of life, liberty, or property, but by the judgment of his peers or the law of the land. These great principles are universal in their application, and in all the vicissitudes of government they are the only safeguards of the citizen against oppression. Knowing this, Congress has never conferred upon military commissions the power to try citizens in states where the courts are open and their process unobstructed. Congress could have conferred such power in the states lately in rebellion, but it has not done so. It has always recognized the inherent impolicy and danger of such a course. Congress has, however, seen fit to authorize military commissions to try citizens in states where martial law existed, and where the courts were closed, or their process obstructed. This was done during the late war in the states which were involved in rebellion, and in the territories bordering on the theater of military operations, and which were exposed to invasion by the enemy. Congress thought the public safety required it. Whether it was or not is a question for its decision, and not for the decision of the court. But no usage, however long continued, can confer upon military commissions a jurisdiction over citizens in states where the courts are unobstructed and the laws are in force, because the Constitution forbids it.

Mr. President, I will do all I can to shorten the debate, but I do not want to be misunderstood. I am not opposed to the ratification of the treaty. I am opposed to the assertion of the principle that the Constitution does not follow the flag, that the Constitution is not in force in the Philippine Islands if we retain them. But there is some language in this opinion which I desire to read.

Mr. Platt of Connecticut—May I interrupt the senator from Utah?

Mr. Rawlins—Certainly, with pleasure.

Mr. Platt of Connecticut—Where under the Constitution is it provided that a person who is charged with crime before a court martial is not entitled to a trial by jury? I suppose the reason why the framers of the Constitution did not do it was because the Constitution never that Congress may make laws for the government of the army and navy and that it may make all needful rules and regulations for the government of territory.

Mr. Rawlins—I had plenty of time, I should like to read this opinion by the Supreme court, delivered by Chief Justice Chase, before the Milligan case, quoted in 4 Wallace. It shows why we can not do the one thing as to a person not in the military or naval service in a district or state where there is no invasion and no rebellion and why we can do it under a different set of circumstances as to a person who is a prisoner of war or who is in the military or navy service and therefore subject to military discipline and military law.

Mr. Platt of Connecticut—But court martial in time of war try persons who are not in the military service; try citizens of the United States, the same as soldiers, who have not enlisted, who have not signed the articles of war and by them without a jury trial be executed and duly beaten, as I understand the Constitution of the United States. Congress may make rules for the regulation of the army and navy for their government. The same power is given that Congress may make rules for the government of territory.

Mr. Rawlins—I may not oppose my own feeble authority against that of the distinguished senator from Connecticut, but I will call attention to the fact that the supreme court of the United States, in passing the authority of the Supreme court of the United States. I read what they said upon the subject, quoting from the syllabus.

Mr. Platt of Connecticut—The senator from Utah will do me the favor to read it.

Mr. Rawlins—Will the senator from Connecticut permit me to complete my sentence? The court says:

Military commissions organized during the late civil war in a state not invaded and not engaged in rebellion, in which the Federal courts are open and in the proper and unobstructed exercise of their jurisdiction, have no jurisdiction to try, convict, or sentence for any criminal offense a citizen who is neither a resident of the rebellious state, nor a prisoner of war, nor a person in the military or naval service. An act of Congress can not impart such authority.

The language is free from ambiguity.

Mr. Platt of Connecticut—The senator will kindly allow me to ask him that Justice Davis puts the right to try a citizen of the United States by court martial upon the ground upon the character of the Constitution to which I have referred.

Mr. Rawlins—Of course, I am aware of that proposition. I quote this language from the opinion:

Time has proven the discernment of our ancestors; for even these provisions

That is, the safeguards of the Constitution—

were found inadequate in times of great national excitement, when the passions of men were aroused to such a fearful degree that the tyranny of one man or a few was habitually submitted to as a necessity. Knowing this, our fathers, when they established a government for the people, limited its powers so that one person or a few could not overthrow it. They were willing that the country should have the benefit of the wisdom of the few, but they resolved that the many should not be sacrificed by their ignorance or prejudice. They were unwilling that a free government, intended for a people who had a right to demand protection from their own agents, should be turned into a despotism, wielding unlimited power through military tribunals. They therefore commanded that no one should be deprived of life, liberty, or property, but by the judgment of his peers or the law of the land. These great principles are universal in their application, and in all the vicissitudes of government they are the only safeguards of the citizen against oppression. Knowing this, Congress has never conferred upon military commissions the power to try citizens in states where the courts are open and their process unobstructed. This was done during the late war in the states which were involved in rebellion, and in the territories bordering on the theater of military operations, and which were exposed to invasion by the enemy. Congress thought the public safety required it. Whether it was or not is a question for its decision, and not for the decision of the court. But no usage, however long continued, can confer upon military commissions a jurisdiction over citizens in states where the courts are unobstructed and the laws are in force, because the Constitution forbids it.

Mr. President, it will be an evil day for this country when the Constitution is solemnly announced become untrue. That is sufficient answer, to me, to the remarks of the junior senator from Massachusetts [Mr. Lodge] and reiterated by the senator from New York [Mr. Platt] that whenever the Constitution stands in the way of accomplishing any temporary expedient or any measure that may be thought proper in the frenzy of a temporary majority, the Constitution is to be bowed to one side or changed or changed without doing through the medium and difficult formalities prescribed in that instrument for its amendment.

The cases to which I have alluded are monuments of the fact that arbitrary power incensed by whomsoever and whenever it has manifested itself has been opposed in England time and time again by every sovereign who claimed to be clothed with any monarchical authority with respect to the liberties and properties of its subjects. Time and time again I have seen it shielded within the limits of the United States, in the same case they tried to coerce him from such agitation and punish him for one and the same offense, contrary to the provisions that for the same public offense no man shall twice be put in jeopardy, etc. The Reynolds case, the Milligan case, the Moon case, the Mills [illegible] case, and the multitude of cases which have gone to the Supreme court, followed by those examined by the courts of our Constitution, and which have been reversed by that tribunal for the very reason, plainly that there is a disposition to break down the barriers to the exercise of arbitrary power.

Mr. President, it would be useless for me to undertake by further reference to authorities to establish the proposition which I started out to maintain first, that the Constitution propria vigore necessarily applies to the Territories of the United States within the same jurisdiction, and is there a vital and living force, never to be overridden by any edict of any executive, by any command of any military leader, or by the concurrent action of all the departments of this government. I think it is clear that an act of Congress which does not call for its validity upon the Constitution can not give the Constitution any force anywhere which it would not otherwise possess.

But let me apply these principles briefly to the situation which now immediately confronts us in the light of some things which are put forth here by distinguished senators. One of these is that we will so adjust and make unequal our revenue and tariff laws as that the wages and hence the products of the inhabitants of the Philippines are overpaid. This not be permitted to come into competition with the like products of the American farmer.

If by that, we can pass similar legislation in order to prevent the competition shown in Oklahoma from coming in competition with the wheat grown in Kansas or other states of the American Union. Is it possible that there is within anywhere in this government power to make such discrimination that the inhabitants of the territories and citizens owing allegiance to this government and entitled to the reciprocal benefits of its laws and just taxation shall not be prevented by such injurious discrimination between a particular citizen of Oklahoma and one of the citizens of Kansas or to any other State? Or may we prevent the competition of different products of New Mexico and Arizona with the similar products of Colorado and Utah? If so, why is it to override the interpretation of the Constitution that was made by John Marshall and which has prevailed without question from that moment to this. Therefore by virtue of the power to prevent the barriers of the Constitution, that the two principles of taxation of our citizens owing allegiance, wherever they may be, whether upon the continent or on behalf of the Philippine Islies from the seat of government.

Mr. President, another contention is made in regard to the rights of inhabitants of those distant islands. It is that we are not a proclamation for any crime of which they have been duly convicted, even in accordance with the safeguards and provisions of the Constitution, may desire to throw the jurisdiction coming from their homes to the States or visiting the capital of the country to which they owe allegiance, it is impossible to do that. Mr. President, is it not also possible for us to say to the inhabitants of the Philippine Islands that they shall not come from their homes to come into the Territory of New Mexico or Utah or Arizona? Is there anything to prevent us from doing that? Is there anything to prevent us from saying that they shall not come from their homes to come into the Territory of Utah? Is there anything to prevent us from saying that they shall not come from their homes to come into the Territory of Arizona? Is there anything to prevent us from saying that they shall not come from their homes to come into the Territory of New Mexico? Is there anything to prevent us from saying that they shall not come from their homes to come into the Territory of Colorado? Is there anything to prevent us from saying that they shall not come from their homes to come into the Territory of Nevada? Is there anything to prevent us from saying that they shall not come from their homes to come into the Territory of Wyoming? Is there anything to prevent us from saying that they shall not come from their homes to come into the Territory of Idaho? Is there anything to prevent us from saying that they shall not come from their homes to come into the Territory of Montana? Is there anything to prevent us from saying that they shall not come from their homes to come into the Territory of Washington? Is there anything to prevent us from saying that they shall not come from their homes to come into the Territory of Oregon? Is there anything to prevent us from saying that they shall not come from their homes to come into the Territory of California? Is there anything to prevent us from saying that they shall not come from their homes to come into the Territory of Nebraska? Is there anything to prevent us from saying that they shall not come from their homes to come into the Territory of Kansas? Is there anything to prevent us from saying that they shall not come from their homes to come into the Territory of Oklahoma? Is there anything to prevent us from saying that they shall not come from their homes to come into the Territory of Indian Territory? Is there anything to prevent us from saying that they shall not come from their homes to come into the Territory of Texas? Is there anything to prevent us from saying that they shall not come from their homes to come into the Territory of Louisiana? Is there anything to prevent us from saying that they shall not come from their homes to come into the Territory of Arkansas? Is there anything to prevent us from saying that they shall not come from their homes to come into the Territory of Missouri? Is there anything to prevent us from saying that they shall not come from their homes to come into the Territory of Iowa? Is there anything to prevent us from saying that they shall not come from their homes to come into the Territory of Minnesota? Is there anything to prevent us from saying that they shall not come from their homes to come into the Territory of Wisconsin? Is there anything to prevent us from saying that they shall not come from their homes to come into the Territory of Illinois? Is there anything to prevent us from saying that they shall not come from their homes to come into the Territory of Michigan? Is there anything to prevent us from saying that they shall not come from their homes to come into the Territory of Indiana? Is there anything to prevent us from saying that they shall not come from their homes to come into the Territory of Ohio? Is there anything to prevent us from saying that they shall not come from their homes to come into the Territory of Kentucky? Is there anything to prevent us from saying that they shall not come from their homes to come into the Territory of Tennessee? Is there anything to prevent us from saying that they shall not come from their homes to come into the Territory of Mississippi? Is there anything to prevent us from saying that they shall not come from their homes to come into the Territory of Alabama? Is there anything to prevent us from saying that they shall not come from their homes to come into the Territory of Georgia? Is there anything to prevent us from saying that they shall not come from their homes to come into the Territory of Florida? Is there anything to prevent us from saying that they shall not come from their homes to come into the Territory of South Carolina? Is there anything to prevent us from saying that they shall not come from their homes to come into the Territory of North Carolina? Is there anything to prevent us from saying that they shall not come from their homes to come into the Territory of Virginia? Is there anything to prevent us from saying that they shall not come from their homes to come into the Territory of West Virginia? Is there anything to prevent us from saying that they shall not come from their homes to come into the Territory of Pennsylvania? Is there anything to prevent us from saying that they shall not come from their homes to come into the Territory of New York? Is there anything to prevent us from saying that they shall not come from their homes to come into the Territory of Vermont? Is there anything to prevent us from saying that they shall not come from their homes to come into the Territory of New Hampshire? Is there anything to prevent us from saying that they shall not come from their homes to come into the Territory of Maine? Is there anything to prevent us from saying that they shall not come from their homes to come into the Territory of Rhode Island? Is there anything to prevent us from saying that they shall not come from their homes to come into the Territory of Connecticut? Is there anything to prevent us from saying that they shall not come from their homes to come into the Territory of Massachusetts? Is there anything to prevent us from saying that they shall not come from their homes to come into the Territory of Delaware? Is there anything to prevent us from saying that they shall not come from their homes to come into the Territory of Maryland? Is there anything to prevent us from saying that they shall not come from their homes to come into the Territory of New Jersey? Is there anything to prevent us from saying that they shall not come from their homes to come into the Territory of Connecticut? Is there anything to prevent us from saying that they shall not come from their homes to come into the Territory of Rhode Island? Is there anything to prevent us from saying that they shall not come from their homes to come into the Territory of Massachusetts