

SENATE.

THURSDAY, August 14, 1890.

The Senate met at 10 o'clock a. m.

Prayer by the Chaplain, Rev. J. G. BUTLER, D. D.

The Journal of yesterday's proceedings was read and approved.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore* laid before the Senate a communication from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting, as requested by the attorney for Daniel J. Snow, a copy of the opinion of the First Comptroller relative to the claim of Daniel J. Snow for the payment of a sum of money due him from the United States as proceeds of sales of certain lands; which, with the accompanying papers, was referred to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS.

Mr. EDMUNDS. I present the petition of Edgar H. Horton, of Clarendon, Vt., as a friend and neighbor, in behalf of Hannah J. Morgan, praying for the passage of an act granting her a pension. I move that the petition be referred to the Committee on Pensions.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. QUAY presented a petition of George G. Meade Post, No. 1, Grand Army of the Republic, of Philadelphia, Pa., praying for the removal of the remains of the late Ulysses S. Grant from Riverside Park, New York, to Arlington, Virginia; which was ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented a communication from a committee representing the African Methodist Episcopal Church of the New England States, New York, Pennsylvania, New Jersey, and Delaware, advocating the passage of the bill (H. R. 11045) to amend and supplement the election laws of the United States, and to provide for the more efficient enforcement of such laws, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. QUAY. I present a resolution of certain river transportation companies centering at Cincinnati, Ohio, favoring the passage of the river and harbor bill. As the resolution is very brief, I ask that it may be read and referred to the Committee on Commerce.

There being no objection, the resolution was read and referred to the Committee on Commerce, as follows:

CINCINNATI, OHIO, August 8, 1890.

DEAR SIR: At a very large and enthusiastic meeting held here this day by all the river transportation companies centering at this city the subjoined resolution was unanimously adopted by the following companies, namely:

The Cincinnati, Portsmouth, Big Sandy and Pomeroy Packet Company.
The Pittsburgh, Wheeling and Cincinnati Packet Company.
The Kanawha River Packet Company.
The Tacoma Packet Company.
The Cincinnati and Louisville United States Mail Line.
The Cincinnati and Dayton Packet Company.
The Memphis and Cincinnati Packet Company.
The Cincinnati and New Orleans Packet Company.

The material welfare and interests of the entire Ohio Valley urgently demand the immediate passage of the river and harbor bill now before the honorable Senate of the United States, and also earnestly urge the adding to said bill an amendment transferring the snag and dredge boat services of the Ohio River and its tributaries from the Treasury Department to the War Department, to facilitate the continuous use of both services at all times.

JOHN S. PATTERSON,
PARIS C. BROWN,
J. D. HEGLER,

Committee.

Hon. MATTHEW S. QUAY,

United States Senator, United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

Mr. CAMERON presented resolutions adopted by the Flour and Grain Exchange of Pittsburgh, Pa., favoring an appropriation to complete the public building at that place; which were referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES.

Mr. VEST, from the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. 571) extending the limit of cost for public building at Hoboken, N. J., to meet requirements of site, reported it without amendment.

Mr. JONES, of Nevada, from the Committee on Contingent Expenses, to whom was referred an amendment intended to be proposed to the deficiency appropriation bill, reported it favorably, and moved its reference to the Committee on Appropriations; which was agreed to.

Mr. MITCHELL, from the Committee on Post-Offices and Post-Roads, reported an amendment to the deficiency appropriation bill; which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

PRINTING OF A DOCUMENT.

Mr. MANDERSON. The Committee on Printing were instructed by a resolution of the Senate to report as to the necessity and propriety of printing for the use of the Senate as a miscellaneous document a paper prepared by Adolph Hepner, esq., of St. Louis, Mo., on the subject of extraterritorial criminal jurisdiction and its effect on American citizens. The committee has made the investigation required by that resolution and reports recommending the adoption of in order that the usual number of the documents be printed and 1,000

additional copies for the use of the Senate, to be placed in the document-room. I ask that that order be made.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The Senator from Nebraska, from the Committee on Printing, reports a resolution, which will be read.

The resolution was considered by unanimous consent, and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the paper prepared by Adolph Hepner, of St. Louis, Mo., on the subject of extraterritorial criminal jurisdiction and its effect on American citizens be printed, and that 1,000 additional copies be printed for the use of the Senate and placed in the document-room.

R. ALLEN McCORMICK.

Mr. SAWYER. I am instructed by the Committee on Pensions, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. 7885) granting a pension to R. Allen McCormick, with the amendment of the Senate thereto, disagreed to by the House of Representatives, reducing the pension from \$50 to \$45 per month, to report it back with the recommendation that the Senate recede from its amendment made to the bill.

The report was agreed to.

NEW YORK AND PENNSYLVANIA BOUNDARY.

Mr. EVARTS. I am instructed by the Committee on the Judiciary to report without amendment the bill (H. R. 7058) to ratify and confirm an agreement entered into by commissioners on the part of the States of New York and Pennsylvania in relation to the boundary line between said States, with a written report, and I ask that the bill be put upon its passage at once. It is giving the consent of Congress to an agreement that has been made between the State of New York and the State of Pennsylvania and concluded by the authorities of those two governments, but requiring the assent of the Government of the United States.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The Senator from New York asks unanimous consent that the bill may be now considered. The bill will be read for information subject to objection.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to read the preamble and bill and was interrupted by—

Mr. BLAIR. Is it necessary to read this account of William Penn and his ancestors?

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. It is.

Mr. BLAIR. All right.

Mr. BUTLER. It is interesting historical information.

Mr. EVARTS. It is a part of the bill.

Mr. BLAIR. I was going to ask, in behalf of the tariff discussion, that the reading be dispensed with.

Mr. PLUMB. Can it not be printed in book form at the expense of the Government just as usefully?

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. It is a bill that is being read for information at the request of the Senator from New York, who desires to ask unanimous consent that it may be put on its passage. Is there objection?

Mr. BLAIR and others. No objection.

Mr. EVARTS. What is being read is a part of the bill, and it is necessary that it should pass; and it will occupy the Senate as little time now as on any other occasion.

Mr. BLAIR. I suggest that it be passed without reading.

Mr. EVARTS. It can not be passed without reading.

The reading of the bill was concluded; and, there being no objection, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to its consideration.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

The preamble was agreed to.

BILLS INTRODUCED.

Mr. JONES, of Nevada, introduced a bill (S. 4327) granting a pension to Mrs. Louisa Kearney; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. TELLER introduced a bill (S. 4328) to increase the pension of Charles H. Hinman; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

AMENDMENTS TO DEFICIENCY APPROPRIATION BILL.

Mr. FAULKNER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the deficiency appropriation bill; which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

Mr. PLATT submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the general deficiency appropriation bill; which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

RELIEF TO OKLAHOMA.

Mr. PLUMB. I introduced yesterday a joint resolution (S. R. 120) appropriating money to the Territory of Oklahoma to relieve destitution therein, which I gave notice I should ask the Senate to consider this morning. I now ask unanimous consent that the joint resolution be laid before the Senate for final action.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The joint resolution will be read for information.

The Chief Clerk read the joint resolution, as follows:

Resolved, etc., That the unexpended balance of an appropriation made by public resolution No. 15, approved April 25, 1890, for the relief of persons in the dis-

trict overflowed by the Mississippi River and its tributaries, be, and the same is hereby, reappropriated to the Territory of Oklahoma, to be expended under the direction of the governor thereof for the relief of the citizens of that Territory who have been rendered destitute by the unexampled drought of the present season. The governor of Oklahoma shall make full and detailed report of his expenditure of the foregoing sum to the President, to be by him transmitted to Congress at its next session.

By unanimous consent, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the joint resolution.

The joint resolution was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE.

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. McPHERSON, its Clerk, announced that the House had passed the bill (H. R. 10060) for the erection of a bridge across the Missouri River between the city of St. Charles, Mo., and the county of St. Louis, Missouri; in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

THE REVENUE BILL.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. If there be no further moving business, that order is closed.

Mr. ALDRICH. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of House bill 9416.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The Calendar under Rule VIII being in order, the Senator from Rhode Island moves that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the bill (H. R. 9416) to reduce the revenue and equalize duties on imports, and for other purposes.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, resumed the consideration of the bill.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The pending amendment, offered by the Senator from Missouri [Mr. VEST], will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. In paragraph 137, on page 29, line 6, after the word "pay," it is proposed to strike out "two and two-tenths cents" and insert "one cent;" so as to read:

And on and after July 1, 1891, all iron or steel sheets or plates, or taggers iron, coated with tin or lead or with a mixture of which these metals or either of them is a component part, by the dipping or any other process, and commercially known as tin-plates, tinned-plates, and taggers tin, shall pay 1 cent per pound.

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. President, the purpose of the pending bill is to reduce the revenue and equalize duties on imports, and thus, while regulating trade with foreign nations and providing enough but no more than the necessary amount of revenue to meet the reasonable demands of the Government, to afford more equal and adequate protection to American industries and American labor.

In the consideration of this measure we are proceeding under grants of power contained in those clauses of the Constitution which provide that the Congress shall have power, among other things, first, "to lay and collect taxes, duties, imposts, and excises, to pay the debts and provide for the common defense and general welfare of the United States" and, secondly, "to regulate commerce with foreign nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian tribes."

In view of one of the vital causes leading up to the Revolution—that of the contest for industrial freedom—and which stands prominent, historically, side by side with that other controlling influence, political liberty, in connection with the great events of those eventful years into which were crowded the Revolutionary war and the establishment of our Government, and the influence it exerted on the formation of the Constitution and on the consequent interpretation placed on that instrument by the fathers without a single exception for over a quarter of a century, it seems marvelous and to many wholly incomprehensible that there should at the present day be found any considerable number of prominent, intelligent statesmen in this country, much less a great party of intelligent voters, who should advocate the doctrine of free trade, or, what is its equivalent, a tariff for revenue only, and thus announce and express their disbelief, not alone in the policy were the power undisputed, but also in the constitutional power of Congress to impose import duties upon foreign products imported into this country, as a means of protection to home industries and home labor, as contradistinguished from that policy which gives merely incidental protection by the levying of only such customs duties as may be necessary for the purposes of revenue only, and in such manner as to wholly ignore every consideration of protection to either industrial enterprises or manual labor.

But yet such is the fact, and it was upon this great issue joined between the two great political parties that the Presidential contest of 1888 was "fought to a finish" and won by the Republican party. The pledges made to the people in that contest by the Republican party, not only in its national platform, but on every stump throughout the length and breadth of the land, are in the consideration of the pending bill in process of faithful redemption. Already one branch of the national Congress, whose constitutional duty it is to speak first on all questions involving the raising of revenue, has spoken.

That action having been under careful review and revision by the proper organ of the Senate—the Committee on Finance—has been submitted by that committee for the consideration of the Senate with certain amendments, not one of which, however, it is believed controverts

the grand central idea which is fundamental, pivotal, and controlling in the House bill, that of protection to American industries and American labor, but all of which relate rather to matters of arrangement and detail, and in some instances to the rates that should, all interests being considered, be applied in certain cases arising from differences in judgment among those all of whom agree as to the general policy to be enforced. That there should be differences of opinion among leaders of the same great political party in reference to what is a proper application of a great principle, that of a just and adequate protection to our various industries in so complicated a matter as the levying of imposts upon a great variety of articles of foreign importation, is not surprising.

Indeed, it is most astonishing that all should finally be able, as will the representatives of the Republican party of the two Houses of Congress be able, as it is to be hoped and believed, at no distant day, in the redemption of their solemn pledges to the people, to meet on common ground and submit to the Executive a bill which, while it will reduce the annual revenues of the Government from \$25,000,000 to \$35,000,000, perhaps much more, will, in the rearrangement of its various schedules, be more in accordance with equal and exact justice to all interests—those of the producer and consumer—than is the existing law. The great difficulties involved in arriving at correct legislation on this subject are truly indicated by the President in his annual message, wherein, after recommending a revision of our tariff law, both in its administrative features and in the schedules, he said:

The preparation of a new schedule of customs duties is a matter of great delicacy because of its direct effect upon the business of the country, and of great difficulty by reason of the wide divergence of opinion as to the objects that may properly be promoted by such legislation. Some disturbance of business may perhaps result from the consideration of this subject by Congress, but this temporary ill effect will be reduced to the minimum by prompt action and by the assurance which the country already enjoys that any necessary changes will be so made as not to impair the just and reasonable protection of our home industries.

The inequalities of the law should be adjusted, but the protective principle should be maintained and fairly applied to the products of our farms as well as of our shops. These duties necessarily have relation to other things besides the public revenues. We can not limit their effects by fixing our eyes on the public Treasury alone. They have a direct relation to home production, to work, to wages, and to the commercial independence of our country, and the wise and patriotic legislator should enlarge the field of his vision to include all of these.

The necessary reduction in our public revenues can, I am sure, be made without making the smaller burden more onerous than the larger by reason of the disabilities and the limitations which the process of reduction puts upon both capital and labor. The free-list can very safely be extended by placing thereon articles that do not offer injurious competition to such domestic products as our home labor can supply.

THE POWER AND DUTY UNDER THE CONSTITUTION TO PROTECT AMERICAN INDUSTRIES AND AMERICAN LABOR THROUGH TARIFF LEGISLATION.

But before proceeding to the consideration of any of the provisions of the pending bill it may not be inappropriate, in view of the contention of the Democratic party, to refer to some questions, both elementary and fundamental, and consider them in connection with our constitutional power and duty as well as bearing upon the questions of customs taxation. It is of vast importance that we should inquire as to who is right and who wrong in the interpretation placed upon the terms of the Constitution in so far as they relate to the powers of Congress in regulating commerce with foreign nations and in the power to lay and collect taxes, duties, imposts, and excises.

It is upon the correct interpretation of these clauses that the position of the one or the other of the two great political parties of this country must find an immutable and impregnable foundation, while to that of the other it will prove as insecure and as perishable as a foundation of melting snows.

It is insisted by our Democratic brethren that under these clauses there is only a grant of power to Congress to levy such customs taxes upon foreign imports as may be necessary for the purposes of revenue, and that there is no power given, either direct or implied, to impose duties upon foreign importations as a means and for the purpose of encouraging the establishment of a diversity of home industries and of affording protection to these, and to thus stimulate and advance the interests of American production and American labor; while upon the contrary the Republican party hold to the very reverse of this; that is, they believe that clearly embraced within, if not, indeed, the primary purpose and power involved in, the constitutional clauses referred to, as distinct and substantive items in the enumerated powers of the instrument, are the right and, indeed, the duty upon the part of Congress to encourage, by the imposition of duties, prohibitions, and restrictions on foreign imports, the American productions of farm, and mine, and shop, as also the interests of American labor.

To arrive at a correct interpretation of these constitutional provisions they should be read and studied, not alone in the light of the words and phrases themselves, considered in connection with other portions of the instrument, but in the broad and more comprehensive light of the causes which led the colonies first to legislative protest and resistance against what they deemed the unjust aggressions of the mother country, and then to open rebellion, the war of the Revolution, the creation of the Confederacy, and finally the establishment of the national Union, with the Constitution as its fundamental charter, and the interpretation placed on that instrument through more than a

quarter of a century subsequent to its establishment by the very statesmen who participated in its formation.

Viewed in the light of the history of those historic times, can there be any doubt as to the correctness of the interpretation of those clauses of the Constitution now placed upon them by the adherents of the policy of protection; and, moreover, is not such a construction one vital to the present and continued welfare and prosperity of the Republic? A glance at the history of the colonies reveals the important fact that it was the infringement by England on the industrial independence of the people of the American colonies, quite as much as interference with their political rights, which led first to colonial legislative protest, then to revolution, and then to independence.

Nosooner had the people of the North American provinces commenced the manufacturing of cloth in this country, which was initiated about the year 1710, than England protested long and loud and a resolution was unanimously adopted by the English House of Commons declaring that the erection of manufactories in the colonies had a tendency to lessen their dependence on Great Britain. Mr. Henry C. Carey, in his work (*The Slave Trade, Domestic and Foreign*, page 95), after referring to this fact, says:

Soon afterward complaints were made to Parliament that the colonists were establishing manufactories for themselves, and the House of Commons ordered the board of trade to report on the subject, which was done at great length. In 1732 the exportation of hats from province to province was prohibited, and the number of apprentices to be taken by hatters was limited. In 1750 the erection of any mill or other engine for splitting or rolling iron was prohibited; but pig-iron was allowed to be imported into England duty free, that it might be there manufactured and sent back again. At a later period Lord Chatham declared that he would not permit the colonists to make even a hobnail for themselves; and his views were then and subsequently carried into effect by the absolute prohibition, in 1765, of the export of artisans; in 1781, of woolen machinery; in 1782, of cotton machinery and artificers in cotton; in 1785, of iron and steel making machinery and workmen in those departments of trade; and, in 1799, by the prohibition of the export of colliers, lest other countries should acquire the art of mining coal.

So studiously and yet so remorselessly did these industrial encroachments proceed that Thomas Jefferson, over two years before he penned the Declaration that rendered his name immortal, wrote as follows:

That to heighten still the idea of parliamentary justice, and to show with what moderation they are likely to exercise power where themselves are to feel no part of its weight, we take leave to mention to His Majesty certain other acts of the British Parliament by which we were prohibited from manufacturing for our own use the articles we raise on our own lands with our own labor. By an act passed in the fifth year of the reign of his late Majesty, King George II, an American subject is forbidden to make a hat for himself of the fur which he has taken, perhaps, on his own soil—an instance of despotism to which no parallel can be produced in the most arbitrary ages of British history.

By one other act, passed in the twenty-third year of the same reign, the iron which we make we are forbidden to manufacture; and, heavy as that article is and necessary in every branch of husbandry, besides commission and insurance, we are to pay freight for it to Great Britain, and freight for it back again, for the purpose of supporting, not men, but machines, in the island of Great Britain.

Does any one believe that if Thomas Jefferson were alive to-day, entertaining, as he did, such views in reference to the right and duty of a separate people, whether colonial or independent, to resist the industrial encroachments of a foreign country and to encourage and protect by appropriate legislation the industries and labor of the people of his own country, he would indorse the views of those who to-day hold in effect that, so far from protecting these against foreign importations, we should remove every restriction to foreign trade, swing open the gates of our ports to the ships of the world, and offer a free market to the cheap machine and pauper-produced products and servile labor of all the nations of the earth? But further as to the trade and encroachments of England against her own colonial people and the causes leading up to the Revolution and which shed light on the clauses of the Constitution under interpretation, these are clearly indicated in the various acts of protest and resolutions of the Colonial Congress during the years 1774-1776, both inclusive. These will be found collated in the first volume of Elliot's *Debates on the Federal Constitution*, in a preliminary paper entitled "Gradual approaches to independence," and are as follows:

On the 19th of September, 1774, it was unanimously resolved that the Congress request the merchants and others in the several colonies not to send to Great Britain any orders for goods, and to direct the execution of all orders already sent to be delayed or suspended until the sense of the Congress on the means to be taken for the preservation of the liberties of America should be made public.

On the 27th of September the Congress unanimously resolved that, from and after the 1st day of December, 1774, there should be no importation into British America, from Great Britain or Ireland, of any goods, wares, or merchandise exported therefrom; and that they should not be used or purchased if imported after that date. On the 30th of September it was further resolved that, from and after the 10th of September, 1775, the exportation of all merchandise and every commodity whatsoever to Great Britain, Ireland, and the West Indies ought to cease, unless the grievances of America should be redressed before that time.

On the 6th of October (1774) it was resolved to exclude from importation, after the 1st of December following, molasses, coffee, or pimento from the British plantations or from Dominica, wines from Madeira and the Western Islands, and foreign indigo.

On the 20th day of October, 1774, the non-importation, non-consumption, and non-exportation agreement was adopted and signed by the Congress. This agreement contained a clause to discontinue the slave trade and a provision not to import East India tea from any part of the world. In the article respecting non-exportation, the sending of rice to Europe was excepted. In general, the association expressed a determination to suppress luxury, encourage frugality, and promote domestic manufactures. The agreement was dated the 24th of October.

On the 17th of May, 1775, it was unanimously resolved that all exportations to

Quebec, Nova Scotia, the Island of St. John's, Newfoundland, Georgia (except the parish of St. John's), and to East and West Florida, immediately cease, and that no provisions of any kind, or other necessities, be furnished to the British fisheries on the American coast until it be otherwise determined by the Congress.

At the same time (July 31, 1775) it was made the duty of a committee in the recess of Congress to inquire into the cheapest and easiest methods of making salt in the country, and to make inquiry after virgin lead and leaden ore, etc.

On the 1st of August Congress adjourned to the 5th of September, 1775, having first passed a resolution declaring the non-exportation and non-importation association to comprise the islands of Jersey, Guernsey, Sark, Alderney, and Man, and every European island and settlement within the British dominions, as well as all the West India Islands, British and foreign, to whatever state, power, or prince belonging, or by whomsoever governed; and also Somers's Islands, Bahama Islands, Berbice, and Surinam, on the Main, and every island and settlement within the latitude of the southern line of Georgia and the equator.

On the 21st of March, 1776, Congress recommended to the several provincial assemblies to exert their utmost endeavors to promote the culture of hemp, flax, and cotton, and the growth of wool in the United Colonies; to take the earliest measures for erecting and establishing in each colony a society for the improvement of agriculture, arts, manufactures, and commerce; and forthwith to consider of the ways and means of introducing and improving the manufactures of duck, sail-cloth and steel.

But while the one great purpose of the people of the colonies was to establish industrial independence—the other being political independence—it is a most remarkable historical fact that the fruits of the victory in this respect achieved by the success of the Revolution were not only not preserved by the Articles of Confederation, but, on the contrary, were actually frittered away and in so far as the confederation of the States was concerned forever lost by the failure to confer on Congress the power to regulate trade and commerce with foreign nations. This right by the Articles of Confederation was reserved to the States respectively, but unfortunately denied to the Congress. It was a fatal mistake, one resulting from that fearful fallacy of according to the several States of the Confederacy powers which alone should have been conferred on the General Government. The economist Young, in discussing this subject in his work on *National Economy*, says:

Although the States were politically independent, it was impossible to counter-vail the policy of other nations. Each State having, under the Confederation, the right to regulate its own trade, it imposed upon foreign productions, as well as those of its sister States, such duties as its own interests seemed to dictate. The States attempted by their separate navigation laws to secure their trade to their own vessels; and the selfish policy of some States counteracted the efforts of others. As the Congress had no power to lay duties or regulate trade and as the States could not agree upon a uniform rate of duties, foreign nations passed such laws as they judged most likely to destroy our commerce and extend their own.

Especially was this the policy of Great Britain. Our trade with her West India colonies was prohibited; and, by the enforcement of her navigation acts, our navigation was nearly destroyed. Foreign vessels and goods being freely admitted into the States, while ours were burdened with heavy duties in foreign ports, both the prices of goods imported and the prices of our exports were subject to the will of foreigners; and the money of our citizens was rapidly passing into the pockets of British manufacturers and merchants. In describing the state of the country at that time, a distinguished American statesman thus remarks:

"In the comparative condition of the United States and Great Britain, not a hatter, a boot or shoe maker, a saddler, or a brass founder could carry on his business, except in the coarsest and most ordinary productions of their various trades, under the pressure of this foreign competition. Thus was presented the extraordinary and calamitous spectacle of a successful revolution wholly failing of its ultimate object. The people of America had gone to war, not for names, but for things. It was not merely to change a Government administered by kings, princes, and ministers for a Government administered by presidents, and secretaries, and members of Congress; it was to redress their own grievances, to improve their own condition, to throw off the burden which the colonial system laid on their industry. To attain these objects, they endured incredible hardships and bore and suffered almost beyond the measure of humanity. And when the independence was attained, they found it was a piece of parchment. The arm which had struck for it in the field was palsied in the workshop; the industry which had been burdened in the colonies was crushed in the free States; and, at the close of the Revolution, the mechanics and manufacturers of the country found themselves, in the bitterness of their hearts, independent—and ruined."

And what was the lamentable result that followed this failure upon the part of the colonists to securely garner in the formation of their new Government the fruits of their successful revolution in respect of industrial freedom and industrial protection, and in the right to compel protection to home industries and home labor? For six years following the declaration of peace, the States not acting in concert in levying imposts on foreign importations and Congress being powerless in the premises, our ports were virtually free to the importation of all foreign countries; and England, smarting under defeat and seeing an opportunity to recover from her rebellious but victorious children some of the millions expended in her vain efforts to compel submission through the instrumentality of war, flooded this country with every conceivable form of foreign product.

During the first two years succeeding the close of the war (1784 and 1785), the importations from England alone were of the value of over \$30,000,000, while our exports during the same time were less than \$9,000,000, and the result was that every American industry was prostrated. The country was drained of its specie to pay for foreign importations. The circulating medium of the country was thus necessarily contracted; the price of labor and of farms and farm products, the inevitable result of excessive importations and currency contraction, was depressed, and financial ruin and universal discontent and bankruptcy reigned supreme throughout the confederated States from one end of the land to the other. Free trade in all its disastrous consequences ran riot and reigned supreme, and its blighting influences filled the land with desolation.

Hildreth, in his History of the United States, in speaking of this era, says:

The fisheries, formerly a chief resource of New England, broken up by the war, had not yet been re-established. The farmers no longer found that market for their produce which the French, American, and British armies had furnished. The large importation of foreign goods, subject to little or no duty and sold at peace prices, was proving ruinous to all those domestic manufactures and mechanical employments which the non-consumption agreements and the war had created and fostered. Immediately after the peace the country had been flooded with imported goods and debts had been unwarily contracted for which there was no means to pay. * * * The excessive importation of foreign goods had drained the country of specie.

Belknap, in his History of New Hampshire, in speaking of this epoch and of the disastrous effects of unrestricted free trade, says:

Silver and gold which had circulated largely in the latter years of the war were returning by the usual course of trade to those countries whence large quantities of necessary and unnecessary commodities had been imported. Had any general system of imposts been adopted some part of this money might have been retained and some part of the public debt discharged; but the power of Congress did not extend to this object and the States were not united in the expediency of delegating new and sufficient powers to that body. The partial imposts laid by some of the States were ineffectual as long as others found their interests in omitting them.

Massachusetts, Rhode Island, South Carolina, and other States of the Confederation were driven into the passage of acts making cattle and other species of property a legal tender for the payment of private debts, while in some of these States open revolt assumed material shape as well as formidable proportions, and the spirit of anarchy was abroad in the land. In New Hampshire the members of the Legislature were met and held prisoners by armed mobs who demanded that certain legislative action be taken in the interest of the people before they were released. Shay's rebellion in Massachusetts drenched the historical fields of that great State with blood. Belknap, in his History of New Hampshire, after speaking of the troubles in New Hampshire just referred to, speaks of the laws passed by the Legislature of the State of Massachusetts in these words:

Similar difficulties at the same time existed in the neighboring State, Massachusetts, to remedy which among other palliatives a law was passed called a "tender act," by which it was provided that executions issued for private demands might be satisfied by cattle and other enumerated articles at an appraisal by impartial men under oath.

Similar laws were passed in South Carolina and other States. Ramsay, in his History of South Carolina, (volume 2, page 428), among other things, says:

Laws were passed in which property of every kind was made a legal tender in the payment of private debts, although payable according to contract in gold or silver. Other laws installed the debt so that of sums already due only a third, and afterwards only a fifth, was annually recoverable in the courts of law.

Mathew Carey, in discussing the history of these times and the effect upon the prosperity of the country of this system of unrestricted free trade, says, on page 45, in *The New Olive Branch*:

The ports of this country, I repeat, were open to the commerce of the whole world, while with an impost so light as not even to meet the wants of the Treasury, the consequences followed which have never failed to follow such a state of things. Our markets were glutted. Prices fell. Competition on the part of our manufacturers was at an end. They were beggared and bankrupted. The merchants whose importations had ruined them were involved in the calamity and the farmers who had felicitated themselves on the grand advantage of "buying foreign merchandise cheap" sunk likewise into the vortex of general destruction.

So, Mr. President, it will be seen that in the opinion of nearly every historian of these troublous times the period of free trade under the Confederation—the six years following the declaration of peace, the period between the date when the Revolution succeeded and the Constitution was adopted—the one great cause assigned for the financial and industrial disasters that overtook the people of the new Government, was the lack of power upon the part of the Confederate Congress to regulate trade and commerce with foreign nations, and by reason of which this country was flooded with foreign importations, thus crushing out the life-blood from American enterprise, American industries, and American labor, and bringing paralysis on the arm, and energies, and heart of the whole country.

And then it was, moved irresistibly on to remedy the great evil which overwhelmed them as they were compelled originally to resist the trade aggressions, as also the political tyrannies of the English king, the people of the several States of the Confederation in constitutional convention assembled made the famous declaration that—

We, the people of the United States, in order to form a more perfect Union, establish justice, insure domestic tranquillity, provide for the common defense, promote the general welfare, and secure the blessings of liberty to ourselves and our posterity, do ordain and establish this Constitution for the United States of America—

And, educated by the bitter experience of the past, the men who framed that immortal instrument and the Legislatures of the States, respectively, that breathed into it the breath of national life, were determined that the Congress of the new nation, unlike that of the Confederation, should not be left powerless or the people who lived under it remediless against the disastrous and withering consequences of British free trade; and hence it was provided in that great fundamental charter that the Congress should have power not only "to lay and collect taxes, duties, imposts, and excises, to pay the debts and provide for the common defense and general welfare of the United States," but

should also have power "to regulate commerce with foreign nations," as well as among the several States.

And will it now be said, in view of the historical facts to which attention has been directed, that all that is meant by these provisions of the Constitution is that Congress shall have power simply to lay and collect duties and imposts solely with a view of raising revenue to meet the wants of the Government? Can it in view of what has been said be successfully contended that there is in these provisions no power in the American Congress to so levy customs duties as to restrict foreign importations and thus afford encouragement and protection to the industries and labor of this country? How did the statesmen of that day and of subsequent years regard the new Constitution considered in relation to the subject of the principle of protection? Daniel Webster, in his speech at Buffalo, in June, 1833, among other things, said:

The protection of American labor against the injurious competition of foreign labor so far as respects general handicraft production is known historically to have been one end designed to be obtained by establishing the Constitution.

But still further, and I quote from Mr. Daniel H. Mason's valuable *Tariff History of the United States*, page 67, as I have made other quotations from that valuable work, as follows:

Mr. Webster gave forth his views with more emphasis, directness, and detail in his speech at the Albany mass meeting, August 27, 1844. He then said:

"The terms [regulation of commerce] were well understood in our colonial history, and if we go back to the history of the Constitution and of the convention which adopted it we shall find that everywhere, when masses of men were assembled and the wants of the people were brought forth into prominence, the idea was held up that domestic industry could not prosper, manufactures and the mechanic arts could not advance, the condition of the common country could not be carried up to any considerable elevation, unless there should be one government to lay one rate of duty upon imports throughout the Union, from New Hampshire to Georgia, regard to be had in laying this duty to the protection of American labor and industry. I defy the man in any degree conversant with history, in any degree acquainted with the annals of this country from 1787 to the adoption of the Constitution in 1789, to say that this was not a leading, I may almost say, the leading motive, South as well as North, for the formation of the new government. Without that provision in the Constitution it never could have been adopted."

Mr. Mason further quotes from Mr. Rufus Choate on this subject, who, in his great speech in the Senate of the United States, delivered March 14, 1842, among other things, said:

A whole people, a whole generation of our fathers, had in view as one grand end and purpose of their new government the acquisition of the means of restraining, by governmental action, the importation of foreign manufactures, for the encouragement of manufactures and of labor at home, and desired and meant to do this by clothing the new government with this specific power of regulating commerce.

But not the least conclusive argument in favor of the construction now claimed for the provisions of the Constitution under consideration is the fact that one of the first great measures adopted by the Congress after the adoption of the Constitution was a tariff act based upon the purpose and founded on the lines of protection to American industry and American labor. It was in the discussion of that bill in the national House of Representatives in 1789 that Representative Fisher Ames used these significant words:

I conceive, sir, that the present Constitution was dictated by commercial necessity more than by any other cause. The want of an official government to secure the manufacturing interest and to advance our commerce was long seen by men of judgment and pointed out by patriots solicitous to promote our general welfare.

Scarcely had the present Government been inaugurated until the new Congress was flooded with petitions from all sections of the country praying the enactment of tariff laws based upon the theory of protection. From among others these petitions came from the tradesmen, mechanics, and others of the town of Baltimore; from the mechanics, shipwrights, and laborers of the city of Charleston, in South Carolina; from the manufacturers and laboring classes of the city of New York, and from those of Boston, Providence, and other New England cities.

These petitions felicitated Congress and the country on the fact that by the change from the Confederation to the Union a happy effect had been realized and a new era had dawned wherein the interests of the manufacturer, the laborer, the producer as well as the consumer in this country were no longer imperiled by being subject, in so far as protection against excessive importations and restrictive foreign trade laws were concerned, to the will of the Legislatures of the States, respectively, but that all these sacred interests were now committed to the protecting care and guardianship of one sovereign legislature, the Congress of the United States, possessed of the sole and exclusive power to levy duties on imports.

It was in response to these resolutions and the universal wish of the leading statesmen of the country that James Madison in the very morning of the new Union made the subject of tariff legislation on the lines of protection the first and main topic of consideration in the American Congress; and among other things, while advocating this measure in 1789, Mr. Madison said:

The States that are most advanced in population and ripe for manufactures ought to have their particular interests attended to in some measure. While these States retained the power of making regulations of trade, they had the power to protect and cherish such institutions. By adopting the present Constitution they have thrown the exercise of this power into other hands; they must have done this with an expectation that those interests would not be neglected here. (See *Gale & Seaton's Debates*, O. S., volume 1, page 116.)

A study of the history of those times will show conclusively that all

the great statesmen of that day, from Washington down, favored and approved the construction that Congress had the clear and undeniable power under the Constitution and moreover that it was a solemn duty on the part of Congress to enact such tariff legislation as would give reasonable and adequate protection to the American manufacturer, artisan, laborer, and farmer. This view is strengthened by a reference to the great speech of Rufus Choate delivered in this body March 14, 1842, and from which I beg to quote as follows: He said:

And who in that assembly of men—many of whom sat in the convention which framed the Constitution, all of whom had partaken in the discussions which preceded its adoption—breathed a doubt on the competence of Congress to receive such petitions as these, and to grant their prayer? "I conceive" (said the most eloquent of the eloquent, Mr. Ames) "I conceive, sir, that the present Constitution was dictated by commercial necessity more than any other cause. The want of an efficient government to secure the manufacturing interest and to advance our commerce was long seen by men of judgment and pointed out by patriots solicitous to promote our general welfare." But I have more to say before I have done on the proceedings of that Congress, and leave them for the present. In the mean while I submit to you that the proof is complete that the people who adopted the Constitution, universally and without a doubt, believed that it embodied this power. It was for that they received it with wide acclaim, with tears of exultation, with ceremonies of auspicious significance, befitting the dawn of our age of peace and industrial glory. Even those who feared its imperial character and its other powers, who thought they saw the States attracted to its center and absorbed by its rays, did not fear this power.

And now, sir, I wonder if, after all, the people were deluded into this belief? I wonder if that heroic and energetic generation of our fathers which had studied the controversies and had gone through the tasks of the Revolution, which had framed the Confederation, proved its weakness, proved its defects; which had been trained by a long and dreary experience of the insufficiency of a nominal independence to build up a diffused and massive and national prosperity, if the trade laws of foreign government, the combinations of foreign capitalists, the necessities of foreign existence, are allowed to take from the native laborer his meal of meat, and from his children their school, and depress his standard of comfortable life; which had been trained by experience, by the discussions of its ablest minds, in an age of extraordinary mental activity, and yet of great morality, sobriety, and subordination, peculiarly favorable to the task, trained thus to the work of constructing a new government—I wonder if such a generation were deceived after all.

I wonder if it was not living water, that which they supposed they saw gushing from the rock and sparkling and swelling at their feet, but only a delusive imitation, struck out by the wand of an accursed enchantment. No, sir; no man who believes that the people of this country were fit to govern themselves—fit to frame a constitution, fit to judge on it, fit to administer it—no such man can say that the belief, the popular belief in 1789, of the existence of this power, under the circumstances, is not absolutely conclusive proof of its existence.

And then, in addition to this, how do you deal with the fact that all the framers of the Constitution themselves, as well as every public man alive in 1789, and the entire intelligence of the country, supposed they had inserted this power in it?

Did not those who made it know what they had done? Considering their eminent general character, their civil discretion, their preparation of much study, and yet more experience of arduous public affairs for the task; their thorough acquaintance with the existing systems, State and national, and with the public mind and opinions of the day; the long, patient, and solitary labor which they bestowed on it; the immediate necessity imposed on them of explaining and defending it to the country—in view of this, if you find them unanimously concurring in it, ascribing this power to the instrument, is it not the transcendentalism of unbelief to doubt? Do we really think we are likely to understand their own work now better than they did the day they finished it?

Well, sir, we have satisfactory evidence that the members of the convention went, all of them, to their graves in the belief that the Constitution contained this power. Mr. Madison's opinion I have read. We have it on unquestionable authority that Mr. Gallatin has repeatedly said that upon his entrance into political life in 1789 he found it to be the universal opinion of those who framed the Constitution and those who resisted its adoption—the opinion of all the statesmen of the day—that Congress possessed the power to protect domestic industry by means of commercial regulations.

And when more than half a century had passed away Daniel Webster, in referring to these petitions in his great speech at Albany, August 27, 1844, and to the construction placed upon them by the statesmen of that day and the credit, moreover, accorded them in view of the changed powers of Congress in virtue of the clause in the new Constitution, used these memorable words, plainly indicating his views as to the powers and duties of Congress in reference to this important subject. He said:

Now, I ask you again, how were these petitions for protection treated? Did Congress deny its power? Did it say that it could not possibly give them this protection unless it should happen to be incidental? Did it say we have only a revenue power in regard to this matter? That is, we have the clear and undoubted power to take so much money out of your pockets and apply it to our own purposes, but God forbid that, in doing so, we should do you any good at the same time. Were these petitioners told that they must take care of themselves; that these were days of free trade and everybody must have a right to trade on equal terms with everybody else? Far, far from it.

In regard to the subject of these petitions, we all know that the very first Congress secured to the navigation of the United States that which has been, from that time to this, the great foundation, not only of preference, but of monopoly, the whole coasting trade of the Union; and the shipwrights of America enjoy that monopoly to the present day, and I hope they will enjoy it forever. Look at the coasting trade of the United States, so vast in its extent. It is entirely confined to American shipping. * * * But how did Congress treat these petitions from the cities of New York and Baltimore to extend protection to the mechanic arts? It granted them. It yielded it. And, except a formal act for taking the oaths, the very first act passed by Congress was to secure the coasting trade and protect the mechanic arts by discriminating duties, and thus carry out the clear and, according to historical testimony, the most manifest object of the Constitution.

But hear what that great Democrat Andrew Jackson had to say on this important subject. In his second annual message to Congress (December 7, 1830) he said:

The power to impose duties on imports originally belonged to the several States. The right to adjust those duties with a view to the encouragement of domestic branches of industry is so completely identical with that power that

it is difficult to suppose the existence of the one without the other. The States have delegated their whole authority over imports to the General Government, without limitation or restriction, saving the very inconsiderable reservation relating to their inspection laws.

This authority having thus entirely passed from the States, the right to exercise it for the purpose of protection does not exist in them, and consequently, if it be not possessed by the General Government, it must be extinct. Our political system would thus present the anomaly of a people stripped of the right to foster their own industry and to counteract the most selfish and destructive policy which might be adopted by foreign nations. This surely can not be the case; this indispensable power, thus surrendered by the States, must be within the scope of the authority on the subject expressly delegated to Congress.

In this conclusion I am confirmed as well by the opinions of Presidents Washington, Jefferson, Madison, and Monroe, who have each repeatedly recommended the exercise of this right under the Constitution, as by the uniform practice of Congress, the continued acquiescence of the States, and the general understanding of the people.

But further evidence on this point is superfluous, as it is all one way.

And yet in the light emanating from all the public declarations, not only of the founders of the Government, but also of the expounders of the Constitution, including those of every statesman of this country worthy of the name during the first quarter of a century of the existence of our Government, we find the distinguished and erudite junior Senator from Indiana [Mr. TURPIE], in his scholarly speech of a few days since, characterizing the honorable Finance Committee's recapitulation of the pending measure as a gilded cenotaph, marking the sepulchral abode of all the respect, traditional regard, and reverence which, according to the distinguished Senator, had in the first century of the Republic been paid to the law of the people.

The distinguished Senator is mistaken. The cenotaph to which he so eloquently points does not mark the burial-place of the principles of the founders and builders of the Republic on this great question. These, thank God, still live and will continue to survive, commanding the respect, traditional regard, and reverence accorded them, and the fundamental law from which they are evolved by the statesmen of earlier days; but, if they ever do perish and die, on the monument which shall shadow their tomb shall be inscribed, "Strangled and entombed by the free-trade, tariff-for-revenue-only tinkers of modern Democracy!"

Notwithstanding this wealth of evidence contributed by the founders of our Government, and to which I have attracted attention, notwithstanding this "great cloud of witnesses" from among the illustrious men who framed the Constitution and gave to its various clauses interpretation in the primal days of the Republic—all vindicating and securely establishing the very policy sought to be enforced and perpetuated by the pending bill—our distinguished and eloquent colleague, the senior Senator from Indiana [Mr. VOORHEES], the peerless spokesman of his party, the impetuous champion of free trade from the sycamore-lined shores of the Wabash, in his eloquent speech a few days since proclaimed in his usual, inimitable, captivating, and magnetic manner that "the bill under consideration is the result of a system of progressive evil, the offspring of a long-continued evolution in unjust taxation," a bill "springing from a parent stock whose life-germ is vicious, whose sap and vitality are imbued with a venom fatal to liberty and equality, the bold culmination, the climax of a series of oppressive enactments, * * * a financial monster" equipped with "claws with which to tear the fruits of labor from the farmer" and with "teeth with which to rend and crush his substance"—a measure, according to the distinguished Senator, whose authors are described as unlike "the romantic robbers of brilliant fiction," who are depicted "sometimes in the colors of chivalry and as sparing the needy and distressed while they politely preyed upon the opulent and the richly endowed," but who are, in the language of the senior Senator from Indiana, described as "the robber barons of this country, who do not belong to so refined a type as predacious chevaliers."

Truly, Mr. President, if simple denunciation and invective, as distinguished from argument, clothed in well rounded periods of finished rhetoric, is the standard by which the pending bill is to be judged, then indeed all will agree, without a dissenting voice, that the McKinley bill, as it passed the House and as modified by the Senate committee, must, before the irresistible avalanche of invective which literally saturated the speech of the Senator from Indiana, go down more speedily and to still lower depths than ever went poor McGinty, and I believe it is confidently and vigorously avowed that he went "to the bottom of the sea." Indeed, in the absence of material for argument or just criticism, so vehement in his terms of denunciation of the measure did that distinguished Senator become that as he proceeded the generous impulses of his nature, asserting their normal functions, called a sudden halt, and he involuntarily injected into his speech an apology to the Senate and the country for the use of terms in his characterization of this bill which he himself declared might "seem of unwonted severity."

EFFECT OF A TARIFF FOR REVENUE ONLY, OR, IN OTHER WORDS, FREE TRADE.

Mr. President, let the doctrine of free trade or a tariff for revenue only, which is the same thing, as insisted on by the Democratic party, be enforced as our American policy and the result will be that only those foreign products which can not be produced in this country will be taxed, while all others will be permitted to come in by the ship-load free; and while for a short time the cost of some of these articles, both domestic and foreign, might and undoubtedly would be reduced to the consumer, very soon the tables would be turned, American pro-

ducers would be driven to the wall, factories, mills, and machine-shops would be closed, the fires of furnaces would die out, hundreds of thousands of laborers would be thrown out of employment, the agriculturist, the wool-grower, the cattle, hog, sheep, and horse raiser, the dairyman, the manufacturer of butter, cheese, and kindred products would all be compelled to compete with the unrestricted and unrestrained importation of these articles from foreign countries, for all of which the United States would become the dumping ground—the free and open market.

And then what would be the result further? Simply this: The excessive importations having crushed out American production and having wiped out American industries would at once control the markets in this country, and immediately prices on the necessities of life would advance all along the line to the consumer, and, as a result, the great masses—the mechanics, laborers, and artisans—would be menaced and smitten with a two-sided, double-edged sword, one that would cut down unmercifully and relentlessly the rates of wages, if not indeed in many instances cause an entire deprivation of employment, while the other would carve on the rate-board of the consumer a marked increase in the price of every one of the necessities of life. And not only so, another lamentable fact, and one which must not be lost sight of, would result from such a state of things, and that is the money thus paid out by the American consumer in such a state of affairs for the necessities of life would, instead of going to increase and aid in paying the wages of these same consumers, instead of going to our manufacturers and farmers, to the producers of this country, go to fill the exchequer of foreign importers and to swell the coffers of the producers of England, Canada, and other foreign countries.

The statement made and insisted on by Mr. Cleveland, and taken up and repeated from every Democratic stump and by every Democratic journal in the land during the past four or five years, to the effect that the tariff is a tax the amount of which is added to the price which the consumer must inevitably pay for the article thus taxed, is misleading in the highest degree and only occurs under the existing tariff law in a very few instances, and in a carefully prepared and properly adjusted revenue act should not occur in any instance after a sufficient time has elapsed under its operation to bring into full growth and development in this country the industry protected by the tariff referred to.

It is only when a customs duty is levied on an article of foreign production which we do not and can not produce here either at all or only in such limited quantities as to fall far short of the demand that it is absolutely true that the tariff is a tax on the consumer. In other words, when a tariff duty is imposed on articles which we can and do produce in this country in competition with the foreign product, then, while it is possible and indeed very probable a temporary advance in prices may follow, the inevitable effect is, by building up and largely developing the particular industry, to reduce the price of that particular article to the consumer, and in such instances it is not infrequently the case that the price of the article is thus reduced much below the total amount of the duty.

This is clearly illustrated, as frequently instanced, in the case of the duty on salt. Salt in this country is worth to-day 50 cents a barrel of 280 pounds; the barrel in which it is packed is worth 20 cents, so that 280 pounds of salt is worth just 30 cents, and that is the price it costs the consumer, and yet the tariff on that amount of salt is 32 cents, or 2 cents more than the whole cost of the salt to the consumer. But it is also true in a great variety of cases, especially of woollen fabrics of the cheaper rates, and illustrated by the fact that these are as cheap here as in England. I agree the duty should be so adjusted that the amount of the duty, after an article has been sufficiently stimulated by the process of protection, would not be added to the price which the consumer must pay for the article, and in the case of a properly adjusted protective tariff this will always be the case.

But under the system advocated by the Democratic party with a tariff for revenue only, then in every instance the amount of the tariff is added to the price of the article which the consumer must pay; and the reason why this is so will be seen at a glance by a careful comparison of the principles upon which the two systems proceed—that is, a tariff for protection and one for revenue only.

In the former case it is the aim to admit free of duty all those foreign products which are necessities of life and which we can not produce in this country, and to levy duties only on those articles of foreign importation which we can and do produce here, and which come into competition with the imported article, and hence the effect is to stimulate competition, build up industries, maintain for a time until the industry is firmly established and then eventually reduce prices, and consequently in such cases the tariff is not a tax, is not added to the price of the article, but tends in the end, by stimulating competition, to reduce that price.

But in the other case, in imposing a tariff for revenue only, it is universally the aim of the legislator to obtain the greatest possible amount of revenue from the least possible amount or rate of tax, and therefore in imposing the tax for revenue only a free-trade legislator inevitably seeks to impose his tariff on those articles only which we can not and do not produce in this country, and hence in every such instance it is true, as claimed by the late President Cleveland and his party,

that the amount of the tariff becomes a tax, purely and simply, and is in such cases inevitably added to the price of the article which the consumer must pay.

When, therefore, it is insisted that the tariff is a tax and is paid by the consumer, the answer is that this is only the case, or at least most generally the case, when the tariff is a Democratic tariff, that is, one for revenue only, and not a Republican tariff, or one primarily not only for revenue, but which fosters and encourages American production, and the result of which is not to increase the price of the commodity to the consumer to the amount of such tariff, or to any amount, but which prevents a destruction of industries by a ruinous competition from abroad, and which in fact, by stimulating competition at home, reduces it far below in many instances, and in fact in most instances, that which it would be but for the tariff.

REDUCTION OF REVENUE.

It is, Mr. President, important that the people should be advised as to what reduction in the revenue is to be brought about by the passage of this bill. Any revision of the tariff at this time which does not involve a very large reduction in the annual revenues collected, whether by customs or internal tax, or both, would not meet the demands of the people, and would be regarded by them as an abandonment of party pledges. Let us inquire, therefore, what reductions are proposed and likely to follow the passage of this bill. These depend of course in a measure on the precise manner in which the differences of the two Houses may be ultimately adjusted in a conference between the two Houses, as the bill as it passed the House is somewhat different in this respect from the same bill as proposed to be amended by the Senate Committee on Finance, although this difference after all is not very great in so far as it relates to the probable reduction of the revenue, as under each proposition there will necessarily follow a very large reduction in the annual revenues.

Listening to some of the speeches made on the other side of the Chamber, one not properly informed, not conversant with the bill and its provisions as they really are, would naturally conclude the effect of the passage of this bill would be to largely increase taxation, advance customs rates all along the line, swell the annual revenue, and oppress the people. If such were, in my judgment, to be the effect of the pending bill it never could receive my vote. Such, indeed, is not the pending measure. And in this connection it may be properly stated that never, perhaps, in the history of legislation has there been such studied, deliberate, persistent attempt to misrepresent any proposed legislation—its nature, character, and probable effect, such determined, yet poorly concealed, efforts to deceive and hoodwink the masses of the people as there has been in reference to the pending bill. The bill is precisely what it purports to be, a bill to reduce the revenue and equalize duties on imports, the effect of which will be, if enacted into law, most unquestionably, to reduce the revenue to the extent of very many millions of dollars and to equalize the duties on imports, so as to operate more equally and fairly in reference to all the industries of the country.

THE FREE-LIST.

The House bill, as it passed that body, transferred to the free-list some forty-seven articles dutiable under existing law. This list has been but slightly modified by the Senate committee; some four or five new articles have been added. The question as to what effect this will have on the reduction of revenue is, of course, a matter of certain ascertainment when considered in connection with the amount of duties paid on these same articles the last fiscal year.

The value of the importations for the fiscal year 1889 of these articles transferred to the free-list by the action of the House of Representatives was \$107,921,735.34 and the revenues collected thereon amounted to \$60,736,896.12, while modified in this respect, as proposed by the Senate committee, it covers articles the importation of which for the same period was \$108,919,907.15 and on which duties were collected to the amount of \$60,599,343.69. So it will be seen that in any event, no matter which list should finally be adopted, or even should there be a compromise as between the two, by taking a fair average there will by the proposed bill be a reduction of the customs revenue alone by the one act of transferring articles heretofore dutiable to the free-list of considerably over \$60,000,000.

This much is certain. The average as between the amounts proposed by the two Houses being \$60,668,119.90—and a great portion of this has been collected heretofore from articles of general use in this country, and which can not be produced in this country either at all or only in very limited quantities—to what extent the annual customs revenues may be further changed in amount by the proposed changes in the rates of duties on dutiable articles, many of which have been reduced and some increased, can not be so definitely arrived at except calculation is made on the assumption that the value of importations of these articles in reference to which duties are charged should continue the same in the future as in the past. Estimating on this basis, the total reduction would under the bill as it passed the House amount to \$26,128,649.90, and under the bill as proposed to be amended by the Senate committee, \$20,318,283.40.

The average total reduction as between the proposition of the two Houses is \$23,223,465.50. These statements and estimates relate, of

course, only to revenues arising from duties on foreign imports, and have no relation whatever to the proposed reduction upon the part of the House of \$10,000,000 more in the revenues by changes in the internal-revenue taxes. In other words, the total value of dutiable goods imported into the United States for the fiscal year 1889, and which by the present bill are still retained on the dutiable list, was \$390,437,117.07, upon which duties were paid to the amount of \$161,408,846.49, while the estimated duties under the proposed legislation, assuming that the quantity and value of importations will be neither reduced nor increased by the proposed change of rates, is, under the bill as it passed the House, \$206,344,977.77, and, as proposed to be modified by the Senate committee, \$201,689,907.08.

It is but fair to state, however, that it is believed by the advocates of this revision, and indeed such is the intention, that one effect of the change of duties will, in respect of certain articles, especially where the duty is largely increased, for instance the articles of wool and woollen goods as notable examples, be to largely reduce both the quantity and the total value of the importation of such articles, and thus, while the revenue will doubtless be largely reduced, a more adequate protection will at the same time be afforded to the producers of these articles in this country.

But while this will be the effect in most cases where the rates of duty are increased, just the reverse will generally be the effect in cases where the rates of duty are lowered, as in such cases it is generally the case that there is such a large increase in both the number of articles and total value of articles imported as to materially increase the total amount of annual revenues collected therefrom, although the rates of duties, ad valorem or specific, may be much less. This is almost invariably the case unless indeed the rate of duty is so largely reduced as to be merely nominal.

But, notwithstanding the fact that the duties on some of the schedules have been advanced in the bill under consideration for the purpose of more adequately protecting certain American industries which have been sorely pressed and in some instances their very existence threatened by being compelled to compete with like articles the product of European pauper labor, it is a fact nevertheless, clearly susceptible of demonstration, that the present bill, both as it passed the House of Representatives and under the modifications proposed by the Senate committee, largely reduces the average per cent. of duty rates when considered in connection with our total annual importations.

This last year, that is, the fiscal year ending June 30, 1889, excluding gold and silver, they amounted in value to \$745,131,652, including those articles admitted free of duty as well as those that were dutiable. The total amount of duties collected was \$222,145,742, or but a slight fraction less than 30 per cent. average rate on our total importations; whereas under the present bill as reported to the Senate, in the event there should be no change in the amount and value of importations, the duties would be but \$201,689,907.08, or an average of but 27.15 per cent.

While, therefore, the rates on certain schedules are slightly advanced, there is on an average, by the increase of the free-list to the extent of \$108,919,900.15 in value of importation and the reduction in rates on certain dutiable articles, a marked decrease in the general average of duties on our importations, amounting in all to within a small fraction of 3 per cent. on our total importations of the fiscal year ending June 30, 1889, \$745,131,653. Our total importations, however, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1890, were \$789,335,855, or \$44,204,203 in excess of those of our importations for the year ending June 30, 1889; consequently the average ad valorem rates of duty under the pending bill, if applied to this latter amount, are but 25.75 per cent. In this statement as to the probable reduction of revenue no account, of course, is taken of the proposed reduction of internal-revenue taxes, which by the bill as it passed the House is, as stated, \$10,327,878.06.

FREE RAW MATERIALS.

Our Democratic friends have had much to say in the past, and the contention is still kept up, in favor of the proposition that raw materials should be admitted free. There is something in this, but in the demand thus made unqualifiedly two considerations seem to be entirely overlooked and lost sight of. First, a careful distinction is not noted or indeed attempted as to just what articles may properly be classed under the head of raw materials, and, secondly, the fact seems to be entirely overlooked that already under existing law, enacted in 1883, we have an extensive free-list, while the present bill proposes to increase that free-list to the extent of over \$100,000,000 more, under which (I now refer to the existing law) hundreds of millions of dollars' worth of raw materials are annually being imported into this country and here manufactured.

In fact, more than one-third of all the importations of merchandise into this country are now admitted free. Of the \$745,131,652 in value imported during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1889, but \$498,358,852 was subject to duty, while \$246,873,800 worth came in free, and by the pending bill, as I have stated, \$108,919,907 more are to be added to the free-list, giving us a free-list, should the pending bill become a law, of not less, based on present importations, than \$355,793,707. True, under the bill as it passed the House, some seventeen articles are transferred from the present free list to the dutiable list, which will

yield a revenue, in the event the importations of these articles equal in quantity and value those of last year, of \$2,456,030.14, while forty-seven articles now on the dutiable list, and on which duties last year were collected to the amount of \$60,736,896, will by this bill be transferred to the free-list.

And of the \$246,873,800 worth of articles which came in free the past year more than \$125,000,000, or over one-half of the whole amount, were articles that can in every proper sense be termed raw materials. They were articles such as are described in the reports of the Bureau of Statistics as "articles in a crude condition which enter into the various processes of domestic industry." Should this bill, therefore, become a law, either in the shape it passed the House or as modified by the Senate Finance Committee, the free-list will be increased to nearly, if not quite, 50 per cent. of the total importations into this country and nearly, if not quite, one-half of which will consist of what may be properly termed "raw materials."

So, Mr. President, when we come to define properly what are "raw materials" and then take into consideration the fact so universally overlooked that over \$125,000,000 worth of raw materials are now admitted free of duty, and the other fact that this list is to be so very largely increased by the proposed legislation, it would seem that there is not much room left for just complaint or criticism on this score.

As already suggested one great difference between the two Houses in a matter affecting a reduction of the revenue relates to the proposed repeal of internal-revenue taxes. By the bill as it passed the House a total reduction of \$10,327,878.06 is proposed, as follows:

First, repealing the tax on dealers in leaf-tobacco.....	\$48,570.88
Second, by repealing the tax on retail dealers in leaf-tobacco	270.84
Third, by repealing the tax on dealers in tobacco.....	1,280,015.93
Fourth, by repealing the tax on manufacturers of tobacco	5,128.25
Fifth, by repealing the tax on manufacturers of cigars.....	120,195.53
Sixth, by repealing the tax on peddlers of tobacco.....	12,701.88
Seventh, by reducing the revenue from smoking and manufactured tobacco from 8 to 4 cents per pound.....	8,538,449.97
And, eighth, by reducing the tax on snuff from 8 to 4 cents per pound.....	322,544.78
Making a total of	10,327,878.06

THE FARMER.

The effort, Mr. President, in the past few years upon the part of the advocates of free trade or a tariff for revenue only to impress the farmers of this country with the belief that their interests do not lie in the direction of a protective tariff and that by such a policy they are being robbed and their interest sacrificed to those of the Eastern manufacturers have been both persistent and able, if not to say prodigious, but never was a more untenable position assumed by any party or set of men. It is a contention which flies directly in the face of the whole history of this country from its earliest period to the present time, and is an insult to the names and memories of those illustrious men under whose inspiration and counsels our Government was brought into existence.

All concede that any discussion of this question that omits, as a most important and influential factor, entitled to the highest consideration, the farming class is out of place. By the last census there were in this country 7,670,493 persons engaged in agriculture, just about double the whole number engaged in manufactures, mechanics, and mining. There were engaged in the last-named three occupations, all told, only 3,836,112. In all employments the number engaged was 17,392,099. This was about the number who earned wages. The balance—33,000,000—earned no wages. Of these, 3,837,112 persons were engaged in trade and transportation; 4,074,238, in professional and personal services, and 7,670,493, in agriculture, or only 25,555 persons less than one-half the whole number engaged in all the professions and occupations known to man.

Any attempt, therefore, to ignore the interests of the farmers in any proposed legislation is simply to repudiate and set aside nearly one-half of all those who in the aggregate seek employment in the various industries and professions of the United States, while any attempts at deception must come under the head of political crimes, the just penalty of which should be, if it is not, political ostracism and political death. There are doubtless to-day in this country over nine million persons engaged in the business of agriculture. The farmer, therefore, being the great central column of the industrial structure, the keystone of the great industrial arch, is, more than any other class—yes, more than all other classes combined—entitled to protection. If the farmer fails, every other person, whether manufacturer, artisan, laborer, or professional man, must fail also.

Many things which ordinarily may be regarded as necessities of life, but which, after all, are more luxuries than necessities, may in an emergency be dispensed with, but the products of the farm—bread, potatoes, eatables—can not be dispensed with. These are necessities, and men, and women, and children, too, must have them or die. This being so, agriculture, more than any other industry known to man, should be,

and under our protective policy is, protected, if not more, at least to the same extent and with the same care as any other industry in which the citizens of this country engage. The farmer must have a market for his surplus products; otherwise, while he may not die for lack of bread, he may freeze to death for lack of clothing, shelter, and the other absolute necessities and comforts of life.

Man can not live on bread alone, and it is only by means realized from the sale of his surplus products that the farmer and his family may be properly clothed, otherwise provided for, and live.

What special consideration, therefore, does the present bill give to the interests of the farmer aside from those general benefits that must necessarily flow to all classes, the farmer included, from the application of a general policy that shields us from the industrial tax of foreign nations, and thus promotes the general welfare of all our people?

It is presumed that the farmers themselves, as represented in the national organization known as the National Grange, understand their wants and wishes in reference to tariff legislation, and it is a further fact, perhaps not generally known, but I believe true and worthy of note, that this organization, through its legislative committee, submitted early in the present session to the proper committees of Congress, the Ways and Means Committee of the House of Representatives and the Finance Committee of the Senate, the schedules of rates which they desired incorporated into tariff legislation.

And it is further worthy of note that these requests have been respected almost literally; in fact, in but one or two instances have any less rates of duty been imposed on farm products than requested, while in numerous instances even much greater protection than asked for has been given both by the action of the House and by that of the Senate Committee on Finance. Some slight departures may be noted in the amendments proposed by the Senate Committee on Finance, but on the whole there has been substantial favorable response, indeed, liberal beyond the asking, to the suggestions thus made, and as a result it will on careful examination be found that of the seventeen articles transferred from the free to the dutiable list by the pending bill eight-ninths of them relate to agricultural products, thus adding material protection to the farmer which under existing law is not accorded him.

These include a great variety of articles, among them camel's hair, heretofore largely imported free and used in this country in direct competition with American wool; fruits, apples (green, ripe, and dried), eggs, vegetables, flax, hemp, broom-corn, plants, trees, shrubs, straw, macaroni, vermicelli, and various other farm products, all of which can be produced and are produced largely in this country, and which under existing law suffer from competition with free foreign importation of these articles. I happen to have in my hand a copy of the report made by the national legislative committee of the National Grange, the Patrons of Husbandry, to this national farmers' association, which I beg to incorporate in my remarks, and which shows specifically precisely what tariff legislation was demanded. This committee is composed of Hon. J. H. Brigham, of Delta, Ohio, worthy master of the National Grange; L. Rhone, esq., of Centre Hall, Pa.; and John Trimble, esq., of Washington, D. C. It is as follows:

NATIONAL GRANGE, THE PATRONS OF HUSBANDRY.

[Legislative committee: J. H. Brigham, Delta, Ohio; L. Rhone, Centre Hall, Pa.; John Trimble, Washington, D. C. Office of the legislative committee, 514 F street.]

WASHINGTON, D. C., March 24, 1890.

The committee appointed at the last session of the National Grange to present to Congress the various measures considered by that body as requiring legislative action have endeavored faithfully to perform the duty assigned them. Each member of Congress has been furnished with a copy of all resolutions and reports adopted by the National Grange relating to legislative matters. We have also appeared before committees and urged immediate legislation for the relief of the farmers. Of the Ways and Means Committee we asked in some cases a duty and in others an increase of duty upon agricultural imports brought into this country to be sold in competition with the productions of the American farmer. In other cases we asked a reduction of duty upon some of the commodities farmers are compelled to buy.

The following is substantially what was asked and what will probably be reported. No change was asked upon products not imported in considerable amounts:

AGRICULTURAL PRODUCTS AND PROVISIONS.

Animals—live.

Horses and mules.....	\$30.00
Valued at \$150 and over.....	30 per cent.
Cattle, more than 1 year old.....	\$10.00
Cattle, less than 1 year old.....	\$2.00
Hogs.....	50 cents.
Sheep.....	\$1.50
All other live animals.....	20 per cent.

Breadstuffs.

Barley.....	30 cents per bushel.
Barley, malt.....	40 cents per bushel.
Barley, pearled, patent, or hulled.....	1 cent per pound.
Buckwheat.....	10 cents per bushel.
Corn.....	10 cents per bushel.
Cornmeal.....	10 cents per bushel.
Macaroni.....	2 cents per pound.
Oats.....	10 cents per bushel.
Oatmeal.....	1 cent per pound.
Rice.....	11 cents per pound.
Rye.....	10 cents per bushel.
Rye flour.....	1 cent per pound.
Wheat.....	20 cents per bushel.
Wheat flour.....	20 per cent. ad valorem.

Dairy products.

Butter and substitutes.....	6 cents per pound.
Cheese.....	6 cents per pound.
Milk.....	5 cents per gallon.
Milk, preserved or condensed.....	3 cents per pound.

Farm and field products.

Beans.....	40 cents per bushel.
Beans, peas, and mushrooms, prepared.....	40 per cent.
Broom-corn.....	\$8 per ton.
Cabbages, each.....	3 cents.
Cider.....	5 cents per gallon.
Eggs.....	5 cents per dozen.
Eggs, yolks of.....	25 per cent.
Hay.....	\$4 per ton.
Hides.....	15 per cent.
Honey.....	20 cents per gallon.
Hops.....	12 cents per pound.
Onions.....	25 per cent.
Pease.....	40 cents per bushel.
Split pease.....	20 cents per bushel.
Potatoes.....	20 cents per bushel.
Flaxseed.....	30 cents per bushel.
Garden seed.....	20 per cent.
Vegetables, prepared.....	45 per cent.
Vegetables, natural state.....	25 per cent.
Straw.....	\$2 per ton.
Tensels.....	30 per cent.
Tobacco, for wrappers.....	\$2 per pound.

Fruits and nuts.

Apples, green.....	25 cents per bushel.
Apples, dried.....	2 cents per pound.
Dates, grapes, plums, prunes.....	1 cent per pound.
Figs.....	2 cents per pound.
Oranges, according to size of package.....	25 cents to \$1 per box or case.
Raisins.....	2 cents per pound.
Fruit preserves.....	20 per cent.
Almonds, not shelled.....	5 cents per pound.
Almonds, shelled.....	7½ cents per pound.
Filberts and walnuts.....	2 cents per pound.
Peanuts, unshelled.....	1 cent per pound.
Peanuts, shelled.....	1½ cents per pound.
Nuts, not enumerated.....	1½ cents per pound.

Meat products.

Beef and ham.....	5 cents per pound.
Bacon, mutton, and pork.....	2 cents per pound.
Meats of all kinds, prepared and preserved.....	25 per cent.
Lard.....	2 cents per pound.
Poultry, live.....	3 cents per pound.
Tallow.....	1 cent per pound.
Vinegar.....	7½ cents per gallon.

There will be some opposition to the increase of duty asked upon farm products, particularly upon hides, and we said to the committee, "If you will make leather and manufactures of leather free, we will ask no duty upon hides. If leather and its manufactures are protected, we want equal protection upon hides."

The duty upon sugar will be reduced 40 or 50 per cent., or it will be made free and a bounty paid to American producers. Farmers should at once inform their Representatives as to their wishes upon this point, as there is quite a division among members of Congress on the subject. Jute will be made free, and the duty will be removed or reduced upon cotton-bagging. Sisal and manila will probably be put on the free-list, and binder-twine will be free or the duty will be reduced. Some changes will be made in the wool schedule which will prevent fraud at the ports of entry. The committee also went before the House Committee on Agriculture and urged the passage of pure-food bills, the bills to prevent gambling in farm produce, the formation of trusts, and urged legislation to protect the innocent purchaser of patented articles. We have also urged the Department of Labor to assist us in securing a reduction of the tare on cotton.

The above is a synopsis of what the legislative committee has done, and represents anxious and arduous labor upon our part. We now submit this brief report for your examination and consideration. We trust that our action will meet with your approval and that you will at once write your Congressmen and Senators endorsing what we have asked and urging speedy action. We hope all will help us.

There is no political question involved in what we ask for farmers in regard to tariff legislation; it simply means that we want the same policy pursued towards us that is adopted for others. We can consistently ask this and still remain free to support any policy in future campaigns which best accords with our opinions. It will be well also for you to draught petitions asking for these measures, procure signatures, and forward to your member of Congress. In conclusion, we desire to thank all those who have in good faith responded to our calls for assistance, and hope that we may continue to co-operate for the protection and promotion of the interests of the farmers.

J. H. BRIGHAM,
LEONARD RHONE,
JOHN TRIMBLE,
Legislative Committee.

On a careful examination of Schedule G of the pending bill (agricultural products and productions), commencing with section 244 of the House bill, section 232 in the bill as reported from the Senate committee, it will be found, on a comparison of these suggestions of the legislative committee of the National Grange, that their requests have been more than met. In not a solitary instance has the duty on any agricultural article named been reduced by the bill as it passed the House, but on a number the duties were largely increased. For instance, the committee of the Patrons of Husbandry asked a duty of 50 cents on hogs. The House bill and the Senate committee each gave protection to the amount of \$1.50. The committee asked 40 cents per bushel on barley malt; the House gave them 45, the Senate committee 40 cents.

The farmers' committee asked but 1 cent per pound on barley, pearl, patent, and hulled. Both the House and the Senate proposed to protect them on this article to the extent of 2 cents per pound, just double what was asked. On buckwheat the committee representing the Grange asked a protection of 10 cents per bushel. Both the House and the

Senate committee give 15 cents per bushel. The same on corn or maize; the committee asked 10 cents per bushel protection; 15 cents is accorded by both House and Senate committees. On corn-meal the committee representing the farmers asked protection to the extent of 10 cents per bushel. The bill gives them just double that amount, 20 cents per bushel.

On oats the committee prayed for 10 cents per bushel protection; the bill gives them 15 cents. On rice, cleaned, the committee ask 1½ cents per pound; the House gives them 2 cents per pound, the Senate committee recommends 1½. On wheat the farmers' committee asked protection to the extent of 20 cents per bushel; both the House and Senate Committee on Finance propose to give them 25 cents per bushel. On wheat flour the committee requests 20 per cent. ad valorem; the proposed legislation gives them 25 per cent. ad valorem.

DAIRY PRODUCTS.

On dairy products—butter, cheese, milk (fresh, preserved, and condensed)—the rates of protection suggested by the committee representing the National Grange have been accorded both by the House of Representatives and the Senate committee.

FARM AND FIELD PRODUCTS.

Not a single reduction was made in the rates of duty requested by the committee of the National Grange in any of the farm and field products except, I believe, on the single article of cabbages; while on many the rates were materially increased over those suggested. For instance, on potatoes the claim was 20 cents per bushel protection; it is proposed to give 25 cents. On hops all that was demanded by the committee of the National Grange was 12 cents per pound, while 15 cents per pound is accorded by both House and Senate committee. On onions the committee demanded 25 cents per bushel; it is proposed by the pending bill to give 40 cents per bushel.

On split peas 20 cents per bushel was asked; 50 cents is granted. On garden seeds 20 per cent. ad valorem was asked, while 50 per cent. ad valorem is proposed by the pending bill. The only article on which the Senate Finance Committee propose a reduction is on cabbages. The committee representing the farmers requested a protection of 3 cents per head; the House granted it, while the Senate committee propose 1 cent per head.

FRUITS AND NUTS

While no reduction below that recommended by the farmers' committee is proposed by either on any article coming under this head, a material increase is proposed on many. For instance, the committee suggest, modestly, 2 cents per pound on figs; the bill proposes to give 2½ cents per pound. On oranges a large increase is made over that claimed by the committee. The committee claim on the largest packages but \$1; the bill gives them on these \$1.50. On raisins the committee claim 2 cents per pound; the bill gives them 2½. On filberts and walnuts the committee ask 2 cents per pound, whereas the bill gives on filberts and walnuts, not shelled, 3 cents per pound; shelled, 6 cents per pound.

MEAT PRODUCTS.

On meat products the suggestions of the Grange committee have been adopted by both the House and the Senate.

In discussing the question as to the consideration given to the farmer in this bill Mr. McKINLEY, in his report in the House (H. Report No. 1466, first session, Fifty-first Congress), says:

We advance the rates upon the products of the soil which either do supply or can be brought to supply the home consumption. Horses, cattle, hogs, sheep, bacon, barley, beans, peas, beef, mutton, pork, buckwheat, butter, cheese, eggs, hay, hops, milk, poultry, flaxseed, vegetables, potatoes, flax, hemp, hides, wool, tobacco, and many other products are advanced with a view to save this entire market to the American farmer.

As indicating the general line of policy pursued in changing rates in this schedule, your committee can only, in the scope of this report, note a few articles illustrative of all.

HORSES, CATTLE, AND SHEEP.

In the last ten years not less than \$60,000,000 worth of horses, cattle, and sheep, ordinary marketable stock, has been imported. A portion of these have paid 20 per cent. ad valorem on a fraudulent undervaluation. A very large portion have come in free, professedly for breeding purposes, actually for the common markets. The duty has been changed to a specific rate and advanced to a point where it will protect the market, while the paragraph in the free-list on animals for breeding purposes is so framed as to only admit animals which are pure bred and properly registered.

WOOL.

But let us inquire what the pending bill proposes in the interest of the farmers of this country engaged in the business of raising sheep, and in turning out annually millions of dollars' worth of wool and mutton. This bill proposes to undo the great wrong done to the American farmer, in the matter of duties on wool, by the act of March 3, 1883, and to virtually re-enact the wholesome provisions, or what will be their equivalent in effect, and correcting certain irregularities relating to combing and carpet wools of the former much more beneficial act of March 2, 1867, under which this industry revived and flourished for some sixteen years. That such legislation will revive the waning sheep industry of this country and increase the price of wool to the American farmer, all familiar with the subject will readily agree. Nor will the effect of this be to increase the price of the manufactured article of woollen goods, but by stimulating and building up a great diversity of manufacturing interests will have precisely the opposite

effect, as the history of protective tariffs will prove since the commencement of our Government.

But concede for a moment that a high protective tariff did not have the effect of increasing the price of a pound of wool, that would not by any means be the end of the argument in favor of a protective tariff as applied to the one article of wool. There are other considerations of immense importance that must not be lost sight of, and which it is quite certain the great mass of intelligent sheep-raisers in this country do not fail to understand or fully appreciate. It is not merely the price of wool that is involved in the problem, irrespective of the questions as to the amount and kind of wool and the amount and kind of mutton produced by the American farmer.

Who will deny that, under the operation of the protective tariff, not only the number but the breeds of sheep and their capacity to produce per head, not only a greater number of pounds of wool, but a better grade and quantity, have been vastly increased, to say nothing of the increase not only in quantity, but also in the quality of American mutton?

Thirty years ago the average weight to each fleece of the then wool product of the United States was less than 2½ pounds, while to-day, under the fostering care and energizing influence of a protective tariff, the average weight of fleeces is about 6 pounds. Thirty years ago the number of sheep in the United States was but 22,471,375, while to-day, notwithstanding the terrible and almost fatal set-back to the sheep and wool industry of this country by the reduction made in the tariff on wool by the act of March 3, 1883, and through which there was in the past five years a reduction of nearly 7,000,000 head, the number is now 42,599,079.

An historical object lesson on this subject that ought to be not only convincing but absolutely controlling in the mind of every true American who has the interest of the agriculturists of the United States at heart, is found in the effect on the wool industry in the change of the tariff on wool by the act of 1883. Although prior to that reduction the number of sheep in the United States had, under the fostering influence of protection afforded by the act of 1867 (March 2, 1867), although that act unjustly discriminated against combing and carpet wools, increased from about 24,000,000 head in 1867 to 49,237,291 head in 1883. The number of head in the five years succeeding the reduction of tariff rates of 1883, instead of increasing in like ratio, did not even maintain itself, but was reduced to the enormous extent of about 7,000,000 head, or to an extent equal to nearly 14 per cent., or nearly one-sixth of the whole number; whereas, under the ratio of increase that had taken place under the act of 1867, the number should have increased in that time to about 60,000,000 head.

The number of pounds of wool produced in the United States in 1867 was only 70,000,000, whereas in 1883 it was considerably over 300,000,000, or an increase in pounds of about 350 per cent.; and yet, by reason of the baneful influence of the reduction of 1883, the annual product now is considerably less than 250,000,000, not more, perhaps, than 245,000,000 at most, possibly not over 240,000,000 pounds. And in making this comparison of the different effects produced on the wool industry of this country by the higher-rate tariff of 1867 and the lower rates of 1883 it must not be forgotten that a most powerful influence operated just prior to the passage of the act of March 2, 1867, which tended strongly to neutralize for a considerable time the beneficial effects of that act.

This was the dumping on the markets of this country of not only an abnormal amount of importations of foreign wool, but also of immense quantities of cast-off Army supplies as a result of the closing of the war, consisting of nearly two and a quarter million of men's large coats, over one-quarter of a million of uniform coats, over half a million of sack-coats, nearly half a million trousers, over eight hundred thousand blankets, half a million shirts, besides great quantities of other clothing and cloths of various kinds.

What a terrible blow at an American industry in which are engaged to a greater or less extent 10 per cent. of all the qualified voters of the United States, or more than 1,250,000 of the 11,369,461 voters in the United States in 1888; an industry in which in 1880 were invested over \$119,000,000 in sheep alone, to say nothing of the capital invested in addition in sheep lands, barns, sheds, and other things necessary in carrying on the sheep industry, estimated at over \$408,000,000 more, making an aggregate investment of over \$527,000,000; an industry which furnishes the tables of rich and poor alike with a cheap and nutritious meat in the 10,000,000 mutton sheep annually slaughtered for that purpose, of the farm value of over \$30,000,000; an industry in which are engaged, or were in 1880, 1,020,728 flockmasters, owners of as many flocks, and giving employment at good wages, as herdsmen and shearers alone, to over 100,000 men, to say nothing of the 320,000,000 pounds of wool produced in this country in a single year before the evil influences of the act of 1883 began to operate, of the value of over \$91,000,000, produced from the backs of 50,626,626 sheep—the number we had in this country in 1884—of the estimated value of nearly \$120,000,000; an industry, moreover, whose importance and magnitude can not be properly estimated unless note is also made of the fact that we have in this country, or had before the mischievous act of 1883 was enacted, 2,659 domestic woollen manufactories with an invested capital

of nearly \$160,000,000, employing 161,557 persons, paying them annually as wages the sum of \$47,389,000, in working up wool and other materials used of the value of \$164,371,551—these were the figures in 1880; they are much greater now—and turning out a product of the value of \$267,252,913.

But mark the further disastrous consequences of the reduction of the tariff on wool by the act of 1883. The imports of wool into this country in 1882 amounted to 67,861,744 pounds only, but under the encouragement given to importers by the act of 1883, the importations in 1887 had increased to 114,038,030 pounds, and the following year (1888) to 126,487,724 pounds, and during the past year (1889) the amount of our importations, not all, of course, in raw wool, but including raw wool and wool in woolen goods, about the amount of 378,000,000 pounds, or what is the equivalent of the fleeces from the backs of over 70,000,000 head of foreign sheep.

This total of importations is made up of the following items: First, worsted and woolen goods as per the appraised value at the custom-house—the real value, doubtless, being much more—of \$52,560,000, being equivalent to 156,000,000 pounds of wool, to which must be added wool importations as follows: carpet wools, equal to unwashed wool, 150,000,000 pounds; imported clothing wools, equal to unwashed, 35,000,000 pounds; combing wools, 12,000,000 pounds; waste, equal to unwashed, 25,000,000 pounds; total, including that imported in woolen goods, 378,000,000 pounds.

The wool industry of the United States, Mr. President, is menaced by the vastness as well as the marvelous annual increase in the production of wool in Australasia and in the South American countries. The estimate of the wool clip in Australasia alone for the present year is 578,000,000 pounds—it was 458,451,760 pounds in 1888 and 478,000,000 pounds in 1889—and the increase in number of sheep the present year is placed at 20 per cent., which would shear an additional 100,000,000 pounds of wool. The number of sheep in Australia more than doubled in the past ten years. In 1878 the number was 49,773,584; in 1888, 96,487,811. And thus it is while we, for lack of adequate protection, have in six years reduced the number of our sheep 7,000,000 head and the amount of our annual product over 50,000,000 pounds, Australasia alone will in a single year increase the amount of her clothing-wool product alone more than one-third of the whole annual product of the United States.

But right at our very door, on our own hemisphere, we find the valley of the Plate in South America producing 375,000,000 pounds of clothing wool alone, not including some 200,000,000 pounds of mixed grades of carpet wools and clothing wools from other sections; the United Kingdom, 133,000,000 pounds; the Continent, 450,000,000 pounds—all fleece washed; the countries of North America outside of the United States, 95,000,000 pounds; the Cape of Good Hope country, 93,000,000 pounds; which, with 184,000,000 pounds of all other sorts, makes a grand annual world's product of clothing wools outside of the United States of 1,788,000,000 pounds, to which must be added other Asiatic and African wools, South American carpet wools, and the carpet wools of the Balkan Peninsula of Europe, the whole estimated by Justice, Bateman & Co., of Philadelphia, at 500,000,000 pounds, and we have a grand annual aggregate, not including the product of the United States, of 2,298,000,000 pounds, and if to this we add 250,000,000 pounds as the product of the United States, we find the world's annual product, as well as the world's annual consumption of wool at the present time, is about 2,548,000,000 pounds.

In 1880, ten years ago, the world's product was 2,033,000,000 pounds, showing an increase in ten years in the annual production of wool of the world of about 25 per cent., whereas in the United States there has been in that period an increase in the annual product of only about 5 per cent. This disproportion, however, the past few years, is plainly attributable to the reduced rates of the tariff of 1883. A comparison of the increase of ratio in the production of wool between the United States and the European, Asiatic, and African countries, especially the free-trade countries during a period anterior to the act of 1883, and including the two decades prior to that date, will show a most marvelous increase in the ratio of production of the United States over that of all other countries, excepting, perhaps, Australasia, the increase in the United States from 1860 to 1884 being from 60,000,000 pounds to 320,000,000 pounds, while Australasia increased its wool product from 50,000,000 pounds in 1860 to 450,000,000 pounds in 1884 and to 478,000,000 pounds in 1889. And although Europe gradually increased its product from 50,000,000 pounds to 70,000,000 pounds, since then it has fallen off over 25 per cent. by reason of coming into competition with the wools of Australia and the Argentine Republic.

Notwithstanding these indisputable facts, we find a Democratic House of Representatives in 1888, under the lead, or recommendation rather, of a Democratic President, passing through that House a tariff measure in which wool is placed on the free-list, and a tariff tax, as our Democratic friends would term it, is continued on sugar; that is to say, they solemnly propose to impose a tax on one of the necessities of life, an article of universal consumption, an article that can not be produced in this country, or at least is not at present, to the extent of over 10 per cent. of the demand, and to place on the free-list wool, an article which, under the protection afforded by the act of 1867, was

produced to an amount considerably more than 80 per cent. of our total consumption, and which could undoubtedly by proper protection be stimulated so as to increase the number of our sheep, and by an improvement in the grades of wools, to over 100,000,000 head and our wool product to over 500,000,000 pounds.

This bill came to the Senate, and as a substitute a bill was presented to the Senate by the Finance Committee and passed through this body on the 31st day of January, A. D. 1889, in which the tariff on wool was restored to a range of duty nearly equal to that imposed by the act of March 3, 1867. So amended and passed, the bill was returned to the Democratic House and there permitted to die. The issue thus made and others of kindred nature, all involving the question as to whether there should be a tariff for revenue only or one having in view protection to the industries and wage-workers of this country, were presented to the people in the national campaign of 1888 and decided adversely to the Democratic party and adversely to the Democratic theory of free trade or a tariff for revenue only. And now one purpose of the present bill is to correct the mistake and repair the damage done to the wool industries of this country by the act of 1883.

The House bill aimed to meet the question squarely, and it does, as it is believed, under a proper construction, respond in a fairly substantial manner to the demands of the people. But owing to a recent judicial decision and certain statements that have appeared in Eastern journals as to the probable construction to be placed on certain provisions of the bill, it may be well for the Committee on Finance before the wool schedule is reached to make diligent inquiry as to the exact meaning of the House bill, which is also substantially the pending bill on this subject. That bill, it will be observed, divides dutiable wools into three classes: clothing, combing, and carpet wools.

The first class is made dutiable at 11 cents per pound, the second class, at 12 cents per pound, while on all wools of the third class the value of which shall be 13 cents or less per pound an ad valorem duty of 32 per cent. is proposed, which is equivalent to a specific rate of 3 cents per pound, while on wools of the third class the value whereof shall exceed 13 cents per pound 50 per cent. ad valorem is imposed. Doubtless it was the intention of the committee in consenting to these classifications and rates that all wools having any admixture of merino wool, whether immediate or remote, should pay a specific duty of 11 cents per pound, and, further, that no wool, whether imported from South America, Smyrna, or any other country, which had any admixture whatever of merino, although imported as carpet wools, should come in simply as third class, either at 32 or 50 per cent. ad valorem, but that all such wools and hair should be included in the first class and should be dutiable at 11 cents per pound.

If such is the construction to be placed on the bill, then well and good. If, however, it is to be held under these provisions, as reported, and as the bill now stands, that wools and hair of class 3, that is to say, Donskoi, native South American, Cordova, Valparaiso, native Smyrna, Russian camels' hair, including all such wools of like character as have heretofore been usually imported into the United States from Turkey, Greece, Egypt, Syria, and elsewhere, can come in under the proposed ad valorem duty of 32 per cent. when the price is 13 cents or less per pound, or at 50 per cent. ad valorem when it is over 13 cents in price, regardless of the question as to how much admixture of merino wool it may contain, then, as a measure of protection to the wool-growers of the United States, the provisions are comparative failures, in so far as they relate to this particular branch of the subject. And if, still further, what is known as "sorts" and "matchings," which constitute a fine clothing wool, obtained from the spine and ribs of sheep in many foreign countries, usually called carpet sheep, but which have been crossed in breeding with merino sheep, some having one-eighth and some more of merino blood, can come in as third class at the ad valorem duty, then the proposed legislation might be termed a total failure.

There is, it is apprehended, much reason to fear such a construction may be placed on these provisions, not only by the Department, but also by the courts, and the uncertainty and doubt with which this matter is thus left, with the chances, as is generally the case when left open to construction, largely in favor of the importer, are but another illustration of the objectionable character of ad valorem duties as compared with specific duties, and especially when applied to an article of so many different grades and admixtures as that of wool. The phraseology used in these provisions in describing the different kinds of wool is, in so far as the question now being considered is concerned, identical with that of the existing law upon this subject.

In a case recently determined before the district court of the United States for the eastern district of Pennsylvania, held at Philadelphia, in a case involving the query as to what duties should, under the existing law, be imposed on wool claimed to be carpet wool imported from Smyrna, it was held by that court that the wool, "commercially known" as carpet wool, coming from a country classified in the law as a coarse or carpet-wool country, is to be deemed carpet wool, notwithstanding as a matter of fact it may be quarter-blood merino, or even though "sorts" or "matchings" can be taken from the fleeces equal to or better in grade and quality than the quarter-blood merino of this country.

Should such a construction obtain, it is plain to be seen that millions of pounds of as good clothing wool as is produced in this country will be imported as third-class or carpet wool at ad valorem duties of 32 and 50 per cent, depending on the price of the article, equivalent to a specific duty of perhaps from 3 to 5 cents per pound, and thus brought into direct competition with the merino and other clothing wools of this country. I should hope to see such an amendment to the pending bill as would forbid beyond question any such construction, either by departmental officials or the judicial courts.

Again, it has already been suggested by articles appearing in eastern journals, evidently in the interest of the woolen manufacturers, that the provisions in this bill relating to sorting, dividing of fleeces, and other like changes from the ordinary condition, being section 383 of the bill as it passed the House, and section 365 as reported from the Finance Committee, do not apply to wools on which an ad valorem duty is placed by the pending bill. This section of the bill as it passed the House—and no change has been proposed—is as follows:

365. The duty upon wool of the sheep or hair of the camel, goat, alpaca, and other like animals which shall be imported in any other than ordinary condition, or which shall be changed in its character or condition for the purpose of evading the duty, or which shall be reduced in value by the admixture of dirt or any other foreign substance, or which has been sorted or increased in value by the rejection of any part of the original fleece, shall be twice the duty to which it would be otherwise subject: *Provided*, That skirted wools as now imported are hereby excepted. Wools on which a duty is assessed amounting to three times or more than that which would be assessed if said wool was imported unwashed, such duty shall not be doubled on account of its being sorted. If any bale or package of wool or hair specified in this act imported as of any specified class, or claimed by the importer to be dutiable as of any specified class, shall contain any wool or hair subject to a higher rate of duty than the class so specified the whole bale or package shall be subject to the highest rate of duty chargeable on wool of the class subject to such higher rate of duty, and if any bale or package be claimed by the importer to be shoddy, mungo, flocks, wool, hair, or other material of any class specified in this act, and such bale contain any admixture of any one or more of said materials or of any other material, the whole bale or package shall be subject to duty at the highest rate imposed upon any article in said bale or package.

In an article published in the Boston American Wool Reporter in its issue of May 29, 1890, this section of the bill is referred to in the following language:

It is the opinion of the Treasury Department that the adoption of an ad valorem duty on carpet-wool would operate to exempt it entirely from the clause [of the McKinley bill] imposing double and triple duties, where the wool is changed from its original condition. Governor DINGLEY, of Maine (a member of the Committee on Ways and Means), concurs with the Treasury officials in the opinion that the ad valorem duties on carpet-wools supersede any provisions of the "sorting" clause. If there is any doubt about this in the present language of the bill, it is promised that it shall be made clear by the Senate.

It does not appear from this editorial by whom this promise has been made to the effect that if there is any doubt about this construction it shall be so amended as to leave no doubt on the subject. I can not but believe that the writer of this article in the Boston American Wool Reporter reckoned without his host, as I fancy no member of the Senate Committee on Finance would insist for one moment either that such is the proper construction of the bill or that the bill should be so amended that such would be the inevitable construction. Upon the contrary I can not but believe that in view of this doubt, to say the least of it, raised by this influential journal, the committee would feel not only warranted, but in justice to all interests compelled to insert a clause which would render any such construction absolutely impossible. In referring to this article in the Boston American Wool Reporter, Hon. William Lawrence, of Ohio, than who no man west of the Alleghany Mountains is more thoroughly versed in all matters pertaining to this general subject, in a letter of date June 4 last, published in the Cleveland Leader, says:

This means that the fine portions of carpet-wool fleeces may be "sorted" out and imported at about 3 cents duty, and be used for the manufacture of clothing, supplanting American wool, and ruin our wool industry. How the wool-growers of Maine and New York, Iowa, and other States will relish this we may learn in due time. For one I will say if the ad valorem duties now in the bill remain, and with the rulings of the Treasury Department as stated, the bill, or rather the construction given it, will make it a sham and a fraud on wool-growers and will ruin our wool industry. And if this is to come, free trade will come with it. If protection is to be only for manufacturers, and not for farmers as fully as for manufacturers, I care not how soon free trade comes. The farmers are patient, but the Farmers' Alliance looks to a future when they will not be so patient. It must become political to the extent of claiming for farmers the benefits of protection.

In this view, Mr. President, I concur, although as the bill stands I regard such construction as is attributed to the Department in advance of the passage of the bill, by the Boston Journal, above quoted, as wholly strained and unwarranted by any of its provisions. But that any such an outrageous construction may be prevented beyond the possibility of doubt, I trust the Finance Committee will consent to such an amendment of the section as will not leave its meaning open to construction. If we are to have protection, then let it be dealt out with an impartial hand. Let the balances be held with a steady nerve. Let it be meted out to the farmer of the West and South in equal measure as to the manufacturer of the East, to the wool-grower as well as to the woolen manufacturer.

The truth is, Mr. President, justice to the producers of all wools, and of all coarse wools in particular, in this country demands that a specific duty of at least 4 cents per pound be imposed on wools of the third class, valued at 12 cents or less per pound, and of 8 cents per pound if

of the value of over 12 cents, and from two and a half to three times these rates if scoured. The fact is, wool has never had its full and just share of protection under any of our tariff laws. This is essentially so in so far as combing and carpet wools are concerned.

The act of 1867, while extending adequate protection to clothing wools, withheld it unjustly from combing and carpet wools, while the act of 1883 kept up the unjust discrimination, aggravating instead of relieving against it, by reducing the rates on coarse or carpet wools one-half and one cent per pound, according to value, while a less reduction, compared with the relative duties under the act of 1867, of about 3.3 cents per pound was made in the duties on the clothing and combing wools. The claim that has been persistently made for years by the manufacturers and importers that certain kinds of coarse, hairy, kempy wools, used in making carpets, are not, can not, or will not for some reason be raised in this country, and that certain qualities of lustrous Australian wools are required to mix with our American wools in order to impart to our delaines a peculiar luster which, it is alleged, can not be obtained from our product, is not well founded, and has in recent years been completely exploded and dissipated by the most accomplished experts and statisticians.

It is true there has these recent years been a larger falling off in the production of carpet wools in this country than in the other grades, but this can be traced with almost mathematical accuracy to the lack of adequate protection. The Bureau of Statistics estimated the production of carpet wools in the United States in 1883 at 22,000,000 pounds. Hon. William Lawrence in a recent address estimated the wool product of the United States for 1889 at 240,000,000 pounds, 10,000,000 pounds of which he estimates as belonging to the class of carpet wools. Bearing upon the question of our capacity to produce under proper economic conditions all grades of wool required for any purpose in this country, whether of carpets or the finest of delaines, I quote the following from this same able and instructive address of Mr. Lawrence. He says:

Under proper conditions all the needed wools can be produced in the United States. We have the lands, the labor, the skill, and among our people the will to produce all. The tariff acts of 1867 and 1883 classed wool as clothing, combing, and carpet wools. Since 1867, by improvements in machinery, merino wools can be combed as well as the long wools, so that the distinction between them has practically ceased. Of these classes clothing and combing wools beyond question can all be produced in this country. The distinguished president of the National Association of Wool Manufacturers, William Witman, esq., in his letter of November 22, 1889, to another eminent manufacturer, Jessie Metcalf, esq., of Providence, said:

"The American staple wools are better adapted for the fabrication of satisfactory clothing for the American people than any other wool grown. We may invoke the teachings of Darwin in support of the same view. The environments which determine the character of wools are chiefly breeds of sheep, soil, climate, food, and husbandry. Within our borders we have substantially every variety of these to be found on the globe. * * * The carpet-wool product of the United States is almost exclusively the fleece of sheep of Mexican origin, which are raised chiefly in Texas, New Mexico, Arizona, and certain of the Territories of the mountain region of the country situated between the Mississippi Valley and the Pacific Slope."

The Boston Wool Reporter, in its issue of September 26, speaking on this subject, says:

We not only grow carpet wools in New Mexico, Colorado, and parts of Texas, but wherever one fourth blood wools are grown we have the breech and belly wool, which is carpet stock. And the skins of the coarser grades of sheep are excellent for the manufacture of fine gloves.

The statistician of the Department of Agriculture, in a letter to Mr. Lawrence, of November 11, 1889, says:

The grasses of the South, many of them peculiar to this region, are numerous and valuable. Especially should this region undertake at once the supply of all the carpet-wool required by the manufacturers, which is now almost the only foreign wool manufactured in the United States. Indeed, not an ounce of any sort of wool need be imported.

As bearing on this feature of the subject, I beg also to incorporate into my remarks the very able and conclusive letter of our present Secretary of Agriculture, Hon. J. M. Rusk, of date February 28 last. It is as follows:

Letter from the Secretary of Agriculture upon the possibilities of wool-raising in the United States.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE, OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY,
Washington, D. C., February 28, 1890.

SIR: Your letter is received, making inquiry whether "our country lacks conditions of soil and climate for producing every variety of wool, and that, too, in commercial quantities, and as a fairly remunerative branch of agriculture."

This inquiry is suggested by the following quotation from the Providence Journal of a recent date: "We have tried all sorts of wool tariffs in years past, and never yet have they caused the production here of certain kinds of wool that are absolutely necessary to give the required finish to woolen and worsted fabrics and to make carpets. We never can accomplish the feat. It is physically impossible. Certain wools require for their production conditions of climate and soil which we do not possess, and that settles it."

This country possesses a marvelous range of climate conditions, having twenty-four degrees of latitude between twenty-five and forty-nine degrees, with altitudes compassing levels from the semi-tropical to those of perpetual snow, and ocean currents modifying the climate of both coasts. Soils range from those of geological formations of the early geologic ages to the alluvium of the present day. A continent so broad, so varied in soil and climate, is properly designated as the Western World, and the United States compasses all its possibilities, except those of strictly tropical and absolutely polar areas.

It can therefore produce, with no limitations of practical importance, all the races and breeds of sheep in the world. The families of the merino race, originating in Spain, all thrive in this country, and include a large proportion of existing flocks. All the mutton breeds of Great Britain, the breeds producing medium and long wool, flourish here, and are to be found scattered throughout the regions on which sheep husbandry is fostered almost exclusively for the

wool production. The coarse-wool type is also represented by the Spanish varieties, which went first to Mexico and then to all our Southern domain, and formed the foundation to most of the flocks in the territory of the arid region beyond the Missouri. There have also been importations of Asiatic and African sheep in the South. We actually possess the flocks and produce the wools of the three groups in the customs wool classification, namely, the carding, the combing, and the carpet wools. The supply of each class, it is true, is not equally proportioned to the manufacturing demand, for very obvious reasons, which have nothing to do with soil or climate or impossibility of adaptation to the physical conditions prevailing on the Western continent.

Our manufactures of wool have had a natural development. Two generations ago the domestic manufacture was very generally distributed through the districts then settled. The rise of the factory system destroyed the hand manufacture of wool throughout the world. The development of manufacture by machinery was slow, beginning with coarse fabrics. For many years the carding processes only were in vogue. A single generation ago there was little combing or worsted manufacture and fine cassimeres were unknown. Few carpets were then made here. Both industries have since had a remarkable development, nearly supplying the home demand, and no demand for foreign carpets exists, except to supply the fancies and whims of the fastidious, who want a particular pattern or a foreign name.

Our patented machinery is now sought abroad, with which to manufacture the supplies of other countries. Thus our progress in manufacturing, apparently slow and by steps from lower to higher forms, has been really rapid, and every stage of progress has created demand for greater variety of wool, which there was before no inducement to produce. The Saxon merinos, for instance, bearing the finest wool in the world, were imported and bred when our manufacturers were pressed to supply the requirements of the country for cloths of medium fine wools, and were not yet ready to produce fine broadcloths, and therefore could not offer prices that would foster increased supply of that grade. But there is no climatic difficulty in their production.

As to carpet wools, the principal reason why they have not been produced in sufficient quantities is because they have been discriminated against in tariff rates. For instance, the imports of clothing wool in 1888-'89 paid an average duty of 49.03 per cent., worsted wools a duty of 42.5 per cent., and carpet wools a duty of only 26.16 per cent. The average duty per pound was 10.55 cents for clothing wools, 10.09 for worsted, and 3.18 for carpet wools. This is not all of the discrimination. The classification which includes in the third class all wools except English and merino is a drag-net for all other wools of the world, covering a range of quality and style wide enough for a very extensive variety of manufactures. Besides, there is admitted in this class a valuable line of incidentals or so-called waste products of manufacture, worth very much more a pound in its cleansed state than the imports of clothing wools. Naturally, under these discriminations the carpet wools constituted 75 per cent. of all imports. Thus the third class is a loop-hole for the admission of a great variety of wool through which the barrier for the protection of wool-growers is practically broken down.

Very respectfully,

J. M. RUSK, Secretary.

RECIPROCITY.

In view of the vast interests involved in the wool industry of this country, in view of the fact that must be apparent to the most casual observer that any measure of domestic legislation, as proposed by the Democratic party, looking to the placing of wool on the free-list, or any international reciprocal arrangement, as has been suggested in certain quarters, which would as a part of the project open our ports to the wool either of all nations or those of South and Central America alone, could but result, and that too in a brief time, in the absolute destruction of this great industry in the United States, as also in the serious crippling, if not destruction, of many others fostered by and depending on it for existence, it does not seem possible that either of these proposed schemes, and to my mind the one is as irrational and objectionable as the other in so far as free wool might be made a factor, is sufficiently pregnant with compensation in any possible view, in respect of trade advantages or otherwise, either domestic or foreign, to justify a sacrifice of the almost immeasurable interests involved in the sheep industry of this country by a total surrender of the rights and interests of this great producing class, either to the rapacity of the manufacturers of our own country or to the greed of the syndicate representing the owners of a hundred million sheep in the Argentine Republic.

In 1864 that Republic had but 23,000,000 head of sheep. Twenty years later, in 1884, it had over three times that number, or over 70,000,000, and to-day the number is rapidly approaching and soon will be over 100,000,000 head. Reciprocity of trade, if established on a basis of opening our ports to such necessities as we do not produce here, or only in quantities far short of home consumption, in exchange for free foreign ports for our surplus products, is commendable and has my hearty support, but reciprocity which would strike down any of the great industries of this country is something not to be thought of.

LEGISLATION ALREADY ENACTED THE PRESENT SESSION IN THE INTEREST OF WOOL-GROWERS.

Already has the present Congress placed upon the present statute-books two acts—one, known as the Dingley worsted bill, making worsted cloths dutiable the same as woolen cloths, and the other, the administrative bill, checking frauds upon the part of importers—that have been and will continue to be still more in the future of immense value to the wool-growers of this country. The effect of the passage of these acts, especially the one known as the Dingley bill, which, among other things, classifies these worsteds as woolens, was to cause an advance of about 2 to 3 cents per pound in the price of fine delaine wools in this country, while it immediately took the breath out of about thirty-five hundred looms in England that had been engaged in making worsteds to be shipped to this country, and the result will be the starting up of a corresponding number of American looms, which will give employment to thousands of operatives in this country, increase the home market for agricultural products, and upon which these goods will be manufactured in the future.

The effect of this enactment, together with certain rulings of the Treasury Department since the present Administration came into power, has been further to reduce the importation of worsted coatings from 21,400 pieces brought in during the month of May, 1889, to 11,340 pieces imported during the month of May, 1890, or a reduction in the importation of this quality of goods of nearly 50 per cent.

WAGE-WORKERS.

The wage-workers, the laboring classes of this country, like the farmers, are vitally interested in the maintenance of a protective tariff that will increase the demand for labor in this country and advance the rate of wages. T. V. Powderly, the great leader in the interest of labor and of the laboring classes, understands this question fully. Here is what he said, among other things, in a recent address:

I am a tariff man and a protectionist, and for the reason that I am an American and a friend of American laborers. No workingman has ever called for a reduction and no reduction should be made until it is demanded by the people. We need no tariff tinkering. We want protection from one end of the country to the other. Touch not the tariff; raise the tariff so high that not a single article of foreign manufacture can come to it.

WAGES.

It is insisted by our Democratic friends that a protective tariff is in principle and practical effect hostile to the interests of the wage-workers. If this is so, then it would follow as a logical sequence that wage-workers, the employés in the various kinds of factories and mills in free-trade England, would be higher and better than are those of this country or at least certain portions of it, for instance, the State of Massachusetts, in the special interest of which State it is claimed the protective tariff has been engineered and where its influence has been most powerfully felt.

The following article, however, taken from a recent issue of *The American Economist*—and its statistics are accurate—will show that in the different mills of cotton, woolen, worsted, and linen the rates of wages of men, women, boys, and girls range from 84 per cent. in cotton mills to 121 per cent. in woolen mills, 139 per cent. in worsted mills, up to 142 per cent. in linen mills higher in the State of Massachusetts than in these same character of mills in the United Kingdom. The table is as follows:

WAGES IN GREAT BRITAIN AND MASSACHUSETTS.

Consul Brown, of Glasgow, has lately furnished the State Department with fresh statistics, prepared under the auspices of the British Board of Trade, concerning the rates of wages of men, women, boys, and girls in the cotton, woolen, worsted, and linen mills of the United Kingdom. It is interesting to compare these figures with those of Mr. Wadlin, chief of the Massachusetts bureau of labor statistics, in his latest report for similar industries in the United States. The average yearly wages of men, women, boys, and girls in the United Kingdom and in the United States are as follows:

	United States.	Great Britain.	Difference.	Per cent.
Cotton.....	\$329.33	\$179.50	\$149.83	84
Woolen.....	364.34	165.00	199.34	121
Worsted.....	361.99	151.00	210.99	139
Linen.....	305.44	126.00	179.44	142

In this connection I beg to submit and incorporate in my speech the following, taken from the columns of *The Daily Press*, of New York, in its issue of October 5, 1888, which gives at a glance the difference in wages in this country and in free-trade Great Britain:

Below we print a telling talk by Nathaniel McKay in the shape of a tabular statement of wages per week in England and the United States:

Occupations, etc.	United States.	England.
Angle-iron smiths.....	\$12.00	\$6.48
Blacksmiths, Liverpool and New York:		
Shipsmiths.....	19.50	6.48
Chain-smiths, man and wife.....		4.50
Staffordshire.....		2.50
Staffordshire, female.....		1.25
Boilermakers, Liverpool and New York.....	16.80	8.50
Bookbinders.....	5.00 6.00 7.00 8.00	3.50
Bricklayers, London and New York.....	24.30	10.80
Calkers, Liverpool and New York.....	19.50	10.50
Carpenters, house, London and New York.....	21.00	10.80
Carpenters, ship, Glasgow and New York.....	19.50	7.30
Carpenters, ship, Liverpool and New York.....	19.50	10.80
Conductors.....	14.00	4.50
Engineers, locomotive.....	21.00	8.75
Firemen, locomotive.....	12.00	6.50
Hod-carriers, Liverpool and New York.....	15.00	4.50
Helpers, Glasgow and New York.....	10.00	5.00
Holders-on, Glasgow and New York.....	10.50	5.00
Joiners, Glasgow and New York.....	18.00	7.02
Laborers:		
London and New York.....	12.00 15.00	4.80
Liverpool docks; longshoremen, New York.....	24.00	6.00 7.50
Farms (with board).....	2.75 3.75	1.40
Glasgow and New York.....	10.50	4.22

Occupations, etc.	United States.	England.
Laborers—continued:		
Ordinary, Glasgow and New York.....	\$9.00	\$3.78
On roads, streets, etc., London and New York.....	10.50	
Factories, Wigan and Providence.....	7.50	4.80
Machinists, first-class, Liverpool and New York.....	8.50	3.75
Machinists, second-class, Glasgow and Philadelphia.....	21.00	8.50
Masons, London and New York.....	15.50	6.48
Molders, Glasgow and New York.....	24.50	10.80
Painters, London and New York.....	19.50	7.50
Plasterers, London and New York.....	15.00	8.40
Pattern-makers.....	21.00	9.60
Plumbers, London and New York.....	21.00	7.50
Platers, Philadelphia and Glasgow.....	18.00	9.90
Printers.....	12.00	6.48
Policemen, London and New York.....	16.50	8.00
Riveters, Glasgow and Philadelphia.....	25.00	6.00
Riggers, Liverpool and New York.....	13.00	6.48
	15.00	8.50
	5.00	
	6.00	
Saleswomen, Manchester and New York.....	7.00	3.00
	8.00	3.50
	9.00	
	10.00	
	5.00	
	6.00	
Sewing girls, London and New York.....	7.00	3.00
	8.00	
	9.00	
Stage-drivers, London and New York.....	12.00	7.00
Station-masters.....	18.50	4.37
Street pavers, London and New York.....	15.00	8.40
Spinning girls, Wigan and Providence.....	6.18	2.00
Spinning girls, factories (children), Wigan and Providence.....		2.75
Tailors, Liverpool and New York.....	3.25	.95
Telegraph operators, female, Manchester and New York.....	15.00	8.40
Teamsters, Liverpool and New York.....	15.00	4.00
Waiters, female, London (board themselves).....	20.00	5.00
	15.00	3.00
	6.00	

The mechanics of the United States work but nine hours a day, those in England ten to eleven.

These figures were obtained by Mr. McKay from the best mechanics in Europe as in the United States.

SAVINGS-BANKS.

No better test of the prosperity of the wage-workers of this or any other country can be found than in the number of savings-banks, the number of depositors, and the amount of deposits of such country. And hence no better rule of comparison by which the condition of the working classes of the United States can be compared to that of these same classes in England or other countries than by contrasting the condition and number of this character of institutions in the two countries. It is conceded the deposits in savings-banks are composed principally of the savings of wage-workers, those composing the working classes.

The financial records show that there are in New England, where, more than in any other section of this country, has been felt the influence of protection afforded by a protective tariff, \$7 in savings-banks to every \$1 in all England, where free trade prevails and dominates the interests of the wage-workers and of all other classes. And the marvelous increase in the number of savings-banks in protected New England, as also the great increase in the number of depositors and in the amount of deposits in the past thirty years, is a convincing commentary in favor of protection and in opposition to free trade, considered in connection with the interests of those who toil for their daily bread.

The increase in the deposits of the savings-banks of England was but \$350,000,000 in little less than forty years, whereas the increase of deposits in the six New England States, and including also the three States of New York, New Jersey, and Pennsylvania, was in less than half that time, or about nineteen years, nearly double this amount, or about \$623,000,000. The statistics show that in 1889 there were in the six New England States deposits in savings-banks to the amount of \$592,000,000, deposited by 1,658,000 persons, or about \$350 to each person, and including the States of New York, New Jersey, and Pennsylvania, \$1,250,000,000. In Massachusetts alone the number of savings-banks had increased from 89 in 1860, with 230,068 depositors and \$45,054,000 deposits, to 177 in 1889, with 1,029,694 depositors and an aggregate amount of deposits amounting to \$332,723,000, or an average of about \$323 to each depositor.

SUGAR.

The tariff on sugar, although heretofore imposed and maintained by the Republican party with a view of developing and building up the sugar industries in this country, which it is to be regretted has been to a very great extent a failure, has in a very large sense proven to be a tariff for revenue only, and as such the tariff has in a very great measure, if not wholly, been a tax, as claimed by our Democratic brethren, that has been added to the price paid by the consumer.

Our imports of sugar and molasses the last fiscal year amounted to 2,700,547,667 pounds, the duties on which amounted to \$55,975,984.52, and to this extent a tax was imposed on the consumers of this country, rich and poor. The pending bill proposes to release the people of this

country from this tax on their sugar and molasses, as the tax from their tea and coffee was taken off by the Republican party some years since.

By the bill as it passed the House and as reported from the Senate committee, there is a marked difference in the sugar schedule, although in the main each House proposes free sugar with a proposed bounty of 2 cents per pound to the producers of sugar in this country each year until July 1, 1905, to encourage the manufacture of sugar from sorghum, beets, sugar-cane, and maple-sap in this country. The total reduction on sugar and molasses proposed by the House bill is \$55,975,984.52, while the total reduction proposed by the Senate committee is \$55,758,220.98, a difference between the two Houses, so far as it relates to a reduction of the revenue, of only \$217,763.54.

This difference arises as follows: The bill as it passed the House proposes to place on the free-list all sugar not above No. 16 Dutch standard in color, all tank bottoms, all sugar drainings and sugar sweepings, the sirups of cane-juice, melada, concentrated melada, and concrete and concentrated molasses, and molasses. This is a reduction of 2 cents per pound on all sugars not above 13 Dutch standard and of 2½ cents per pound on all not above 16 Dutch standard, while under the House bill, on all sugars above 16 and not above 20 on which the existing rates of duty are 3 cents per pound, and on all above No. 20 on which the present law imposes a duty of 3½ cents per pound, the bill as it passed the House reduces the rate of duty to four-tenths of 1 cent per pound.

The effect of this is to give the people of this country free sugar, whereas on the same grades there is under existing law a duty equivalent to an ad valorem rate of 99.95 per cent. Sugar of the grades thus made free by the bill as it passed the House of Representatives, including molasses, was imported into this country during the fiscal year 1889 of the value of \$83,388,286.49, and on which custom-house duties were collected of \$55,975,984.52. The bill as reported from the Senate committee proposes a modification whereby all grades of sugar, only including No. 13 Dutch standard, and all below that grade, shall come in free.

With those grades above thirteen and not above sixteen and on which under existing law there is a duty of 2½ cents per pound and which under the bill as it passed the House are placed on the free-list, the Senate Finance Committee provide shall be dutiable at three-tenths of 1 cent per pound, while all above No. 16, which by the House bill are made dutiable at four-tenths of 1 cent per pound are dutiable at six-tenths of 1 cent per pound, and the effect of which would be, taken as a whole, if enacted into law on the basis proposed by the Senate committee, to make free sugar and molasses which were imported the last fiscal year of the value of \$83,170,423.61, and on which duties were paid to the amount of \$55,758,220.98, provided always that the statements and estimates of the Senate Committee on Finance are accurate, which I take it they are.

The general effect, therefore, it will be seen, of the two propositions of the House of Representatives and the Senate Committee on Finance, respectively, is in so far as it relates to placing sugar on the free-list, according to these statements, not materially different, only to the extent of difference of \$217,862.88 on the values of imports, and a difference in revenue of \$217,763.54, taking the transactions of last year as a basis. The vital difference arises between the proposition of the House and that of the Senate Committee on Finance from the limit proposed to be placed by the committee in confining the free-list to those grades of sugar not above 13 Dutch standard, instead of to those grades not above 16 as proposed in the House bill.

I frankly confess I prefer the House proposition. The effect of this limit is, I fear, to promote to a certain extent the interests of the sugar refineries by giving to them raw sugar free, while at the same time it very materially, or at least to quite an extent, denies to certain classes of the people who use the grades of sugar above 13 and not above 16, a free article, and one that is generally used for household purposes and table use by many people.

At the same time it must be admitted, if the statistics and tables presented by our Finance Committee are accurate and if the removal of duties from grades of sugar above No. 13, Dutch standard, including all not above 16, would not tend to increase the importations of those grades, that then it would seem that there would be no very great difference in effect to the people between the House and Senate committee propositions, as it appears from these tables and statistics that the total amount of importations for the fiscal year 1889, of all sugars of the grade of above 13 and not above 16, was only 7,918,673 pounds, of the custom-house value of but \$217,862.82, or less than 2½ per cent. of the total value of all sugars not above 16 Dutch standard imported into this country the past fiscal year.

But inasmuch as there were collected as duties on the 7,918,673 pounds of all sugars above No. 13, and not above No. 16, 99.95 per cent. duty, amounting to \$217,763.54, is it not much more than probable that a very much greater per cent. of these grades of sugar, much superior for household uses as they are than the grades under 13 Dutch standard, which are scarcely fit for such use without refining, would be imported, thus giving more liberally a free sugar, of a reasonably good quality, for household purposes to the masses, as provided in the

House bill, than would be the case under the bill as amended by the Senate committee?

But while the pending bill removes the burden of customs taxation from the consumers of sugar and molasses to the extent of nearly \$56,000,000 annually, and the larger portion of which, of course, is paid from the pockets of the great masses—the working classes—it wisely provides a means of encouragement to the producers of sugar in this country by offering a bounty of 2 cents per pound for all sugar produced in this country. This bounty of 2 cents per pound comes from the Treasury of the United States, and not direct, as does the existing tariff on sugar, from the pockets of the consumers of sugar, and of course falls most heavily on the rich, whose general taxes on property, real and personal, are heaviest.

GREAT BRITAIN'S ATTITUDE AND POWER.

But time fails me, and it is quite impossible to discuss the various schedules. The principle of protection to our home industries, however, and home labor, is one that should never be lost sight of. It is as important to the material welfare of this country and the people of this country now as it was when advocated and enforced by the earliest and best statesmen and the first Presidents of the Republic. If Great Britain was in those days standing in the pathway of the industrial progress of the nation, she is doing so none the less, but to an infinitely greater extent and with an infinitude of expansion of power to-day. As her power and influence as a nation have increased, her audacity has assumed a more defiant attitude. She aspires not only to crush us in the markets of the world, by controlling and fixing the purchasing power of our currency and fixing the prices of our products, but actually seeks to dictate the terms of our legislation and to control our home markets.

Do those who insist on consenting to the demands of Great Britain in the matter of free trade ever pause to consider the magnitude in area, in wealth, in influence, in power, of that mighty empire? Do we appreciate fully the manner in which the great industries of this country are menaced from this source? Is it not well to remember that she has a total area of colonies alone distributed throughout Europe, Asia, Africa, the West Indies, and Australasia of 7,599,347 square miles, occupied by a population subservient to British influence and under British control of 19,797,893; that these are distributed as follows:

In Europe and Asia 3,705 square miles, with a population of 382,169; in Asia 113,610 square miles, with a population of 44,565,951; in Africa 455,863 square miles, with a population of 4,230,246; in America, at our very doors, an area of 3,756,338 square miles, with a population of 5,444,913; the West Indies, an area of 12,175 square miles, with a population of 1,306,236; and in Australasia an area of 2,257,656 square miles, with a population of 3,868,378? But not only so. In India and Burmah her area extends to 1,058,814 miles, with a population of 210,754,578, or more than three and one-half times greater alone than that of the United States.

In the feudatory states she has an area of 509,730 square miles, with a population of 37,453,374, which, with the United Kingdom of England, Ireland, Scotland, and Wales, with an area of 121,562 square miles and a population of 37,453,574, give the tremendous aggregate, the enormous sum total of area of Great Britain, her colonies and dependencies included, of 9,289,453 square miles, and an aggregate population of 328,388,511.

This, therefore, is the area and population of the British Empire. This includes India and fifty-nine separate colonies, but comprising forty distinct and separate governments. These vast possessions have been gradually but rapidly accumulated by this great power by settlement, purchase, treaty, and conquest. From the date of the settlement of Newfoundland in 1550, with an area of 200,000 square miles; of Bermuda at our very eastern doors in 1612, with an area of 13,347 square miles; Barbadoes and the Bahamas to the southward in the years 1605 and 1629, respectively, and the acquisition of St. Helena in 1673, of Canada in 1759-60, down to the cession of the Fiji Islands in 1874 and the annexation of New Guinea in 1884, the mighty and irresistible march of the British Empire in the extension of her area, population, wealth, and industrial and political power has been onward.

As a matter of interest and for the purpose of attracting attention to the gradual but remarkable growth and expansion of this empire, and as illustrating the grasping and insatiate greed and disposition to control, of this great power, a list of the various acquisitions, with areas and populations and the dates when and the manner in which respectively acquired, from the date of the settlement of Newfoundland in America to the present time, is herewith submitted and believed to be historically correct.

It is as follows:

General statistics of the colonies and dependencies of Great Britain.

Colonies, etc.	Area.	Population, 1887.	How and when obtained.
	<i>Sq. miles.</i>		
Europe:			
Gibraltar.....	1 1/2	19,200	Conquest, 1804.
Heligoland.....	1 1/2	2,200	Treaty cession, 1814.

General statistics of colonies and dependencies of Great Britain—Cont'd.

Colonies, etc.	Area.	Population, 1887.	How and when obtained.
	<i>Sq. miles.</i>		
Europe—Continued:			
Malta, etc.....	119	160,769	Treaty cession, 1814.
Cyprus.....	3,584	200,000	Convention with Turkey, 1878.
Total Europe.....	3,705	382,169	
Asia:			
Ceylon.....	24,702	3,000,000	Treaty cession, 1801.
Hong-Kong.....	32 1/2	212,951	Treaty cession, 1841.
Straits Settlements.....	1,472 1/2	537,000	Treaty cession, 1785.
Protected Malay states.....	15,664	300,000	
Labuan.....	30 1/2	6,000	Treaty cession, 1847.
British North Borneo.....	20,709	210,000	
Sarawak.....	41,000	300,000	
Total Asia.....	113,610	4,565,951	
Africa:			
Ascension.....	34	166	Annexation, 1815.
Cape, etc.....	213,917	1,252,341	Treaty cession, 1815.
Basutoland.....	10,293	175,500	
British Bechuanaland.....	162,000	43,785	
Natal.....	18,750	477,100	Annexation, 1843.
Zululand.....	8,900	150,000	
Mauritius, etc.....	881	385,145	Conquest and cession, 1810-1814.
St. Helena.....	47	5,100	Conquest, 1673.
Sierra Leone.....	3,000	75,000	Transfer from company, 1807.
Gambia.....	69	15,000	
Gold Coast Colony.....	29,401	1,426,450	Conquest and cession, 1663-1871.
Lagos.....	1,071	100,000	
Niger.....	7,500		
British Imperial East African Company.....	7,500		
Total Africa.....	455,863	4,230,246	
America:			
Bermuda.....	19	13,347	Settlement, 1612.
Canada.....	3,470,257	4,922,679	Conquest, 1759, 1760; treaty cession, 1763.
Newfoundland.....	162,000	206,006	Settlement, 1550.
British Guiana.....	109,000	277,038	Conquest and cession, 1803-1814.
British Honduras.....	7,562	30,000	Conquest, 1788.
Falkland Islands.....	7,500	1,843	Treaty cession, 1770.
Total America.....	3,756,338	5,444,913	
West Indies:			
Bahamas.....	4,446	48,471	Settlement, 1629.
Barbadoes.....	166	180,000	Settlement, 1605.
Turk's Islands.....	169	5,000	
Jamaica, etc.....	4,282	607,798	Conquest, 1655.
Trinidad and Tobago.....	1,869	203,821	Conquest, 1797.
Grenada.....	133	48,346	Treaty cession, 1763.
St. Lucia.....	238	42,300	
St. Vincent.....	133	45,000	Cession, 1763.
Antigua, etc.....	170	35,000	
Dominica.....	291	29,500	Cession, 1763.
Montserrat.....	47	10,083	Settlement, 1632.
St. Kitts and Nevis.....	158	45,000	
Virgin Islands.....	58	5,000	
Total West Indies.....	12,175	1,306,236	
Australasia:			
New South Wales.....	310,700	1,042,919	Settlement, 1787.
Victoria.....	87,884	1,036,119	Settlement, 1834.
Queensland.....	668,497	366,940	Settlement, 1824.
South Australia.....	903,690	317,446	Settlement, 1836.
West Australia.....	1,060,000	42,488	Settlement, 1826.
Tasmania.....	26,215	142,478	Settlement, 1803.
New Zealand.....	104,235	645,330	Purchase, 1840.
Fiji.....	7,435	124,658	Cession from natives, 1874.
New Guinea.....	89,000	150,000	Annexation, 1884.
Total Australasia.....	3,257,656	3,868,378	
Total of colonies.....	7,599,347	19,797,893	
India and Burmah.....	1,058,814	210,754,578	
Indian feudatory states.....	509,730	60,382,466	
United Kingdom.....	121,562	34,952,204	
Total for Empire.....	9,289,453	328,388,511	

Mr. President, the interests of the wage-workers, the manufacturers, the farmers, the operatives of this country are to-day menaced by the 22,000,000 operatives in England and those of Canada, France, Germany, Belgium, Holland, Denmark, Sweden, Russia, Turkey, China, India, and Africa, all of whom are waiting anxiously to have the markets of the United States opened to their multiplied and cheaply manufactured products.

By England's census in 1885 she had a population of 35,000,000 people; of this number nearly 2 1/2 per cent., or 780,000, were paupers; whereas in the United States our population was 50,000,000 in 1880, while but a fraction over one-sixth of 1 per cent., or about 88,000, were paupers. In 1888 (January 1) the number of paupers, exclusive of

vagrants, in receipt of relief in the several unions and parishes in England and Wales was as follows:

Indoor	200,666
Outdoor	624,842
Total	825,509

So it will be seen that on January 1, 1888, out of every 100 persons in England and Wales, 3½ were in receipt of work-house relief. The statistics are from Whittaker's Almanac for 1889, a standard English work.

While England proclaims in favor of free trade in a manner which would indicate that she collected no revenue whatever from customs duties, or in fact not very much from any source, the truth is she to-day levies, and collects annually nearly \$100,000,000 from customs duties; and, what is still worse, these duties are levied in the main and almost exclusively on the necessities and not the luxuries of life. In 1888 her customs duties were \$97,897,380, and over \$23,000,000 of which amount—to be entirely accurate, \$23,066,560—was levied on the single article of tea, nearly \$1,000,000 on coffee, \$1,587,553 on currants, \$355,060 on chicory, \$883,000 on raisins, \$414,707 on cocoa, \$25,790 on prunes, and \$146,220 on figs. The following are the articles now on England's dutiable list and the amount collected from each:

Articles.	Amount collected.	
	English money.	American money.
Beer, etc.....	£10,213	\$51,065
Chicory.....	71,012	355,060
Cocoa.....	82,940	414,707
Coffee.....	187,562	937,810
Currants.....	317,511	1,587,553
Figs.....	29,244	146,220
Plate.....	9,746	48,730
Plumes.....	10,122	50,610
Prunes.....	5,188	25,790
Raisins.....	176,696	883,480
Spirits.....		
Rum.....	2,034,286	10,171,430
Brandy.....	1,307,417	6,539,085
Geneva.....	125,510	627,550
Other sorts.....	756,733	3,783,665
Tea.....	4,613,312	23,066,560
Tobacco, etc.....	8,713,943	43,569,715
Wine.....	1,085,646	5,428,230
All other.....	2,159	10,795
Deliveries.....	32,420	162,100

This table, it will be seen, shows the amount in pounds and also in dollars collected on such items.

But aside from these the poorer classes in England are ground to powder by taxation. Everybody is taxed. The humble householder, the tradesman, professional man, public officers, deaths, legacies, wills, probates, etc. The gross revenue collected in England during the year ending March 31, 1888, was £92,951,480, but only £89,829,773 reached the national treasury, £3,121,706 being used in repayments, allowances, discounts, bounties, etc. The following table will show the various items of the net public revenue for 1888:

Net public revenue for 1888.

Sources of revenue.	English money.	American money.
Excise.....	£25,625,520	\$108,127,600
Customs.....	19,579,476	97,897,380
Income tax.....	14,375,501	71,377,505
Stamps.....	13,056,950	65,284,750
Post-office.....	8,697,085	40,485,425
House tax.....	1,917,614	9,588,070
Telegraphs.....	1,944,528	9,722,640
Land tax.....	1,041,388	5,206,940
Crown lands.....	507,428	2,537,140
Interest on Suez Canal shares.....	242,479	1,212,395
Miscellaneous.....	2,941,804	14,709,020
Total.....	89,829,773	449,148,865

The chief items contributing to the excise or internal revenue are as follows:

Items.	English money.	American money.
Spirits.....	£13,028,204	\$65,141,620
Beer.....	8,711,532	43,557,660
Railways.....	314,993	1,574,965
Licenses.		
Auctioneers.....	79,300	396,500
Beer and cider.....	186,574	932,870
Brewers.....	19,279	96,395
Dog.....	354,278	177,390

Items.	English money.	American money.
Licenses—Continued.		
Armorial.....	£74,526	\$372,630
Carriages.....	549,525	2,747,625
Male servants.....	136,287	681,495
Game.....	179,143	895,715
Plate dealers.....	47,919	239,595
Gun.....	86,317	431,585
Hawkers.....	26,941	134,705
Medicine-vendors.....	5,396	26,980
Pawnbrokers.....	35,722	178,610
Refreshment houses.....	7,140	35,700
Distillers and rectifiers.....	4,242	21,210
Spirit-dealers.....	121,194	605,970
Publicans and grocers.....	1,485,936	7,429,680
Tobacco.....	84,855	424,275
Wines.....	67,366	336,830
Other.....	10,310	51,550

The customs items I have already given. The total amount accounted for by the board of inland revenue as net receipts is £14,275,502 for the years 1887-1888, or \$71,377,510, as follows:

Items.	1886-'87.	1887-'88.
A. Lands, tenements, etc.....	£5,510,840	\$4,879,901
B. Occupation of land, etc.....	414,359	329,735
C. Annuities, dividends, etc.....	1,396,654	1,290,168
D. Trades, professions, etc.....	7,799,980	6,872,641
E. Public offices, etc.....	989,341	903,057
Totals.....	16,111,174	14,275,502

From stamps alone are realized £13,056,950, including that accounted for under the head of "Miscellaneous," £13,797,471, the largest portion of which comes from the deaths, probate, legacies, and succession duties, which amount to £8,241,682.

OUR COUNTRY PROSPERS UNDER THE PROTECTIVE SYSTEM.

But notwithstanding the fact that the mighty influence of this powerful of all empires is in constant antagonism with our best interests, notwithstanding the paralyzing influences on the home value of American products by the demonetization of silver in this and other countries, and the acknowledged lack of volume of circulating medium, our country in the matter of increase in external and internal commerce, in material wealth, expansion of business, and national prosperity, has, under our protective system, moved gradually and grandly upward and onward. Never in the history of our Government has the value of foreign trade—our imports and exports of merchandise—attained an amount equal to that of the fiscal year ending June 30, 1890, when it reached the enormous aggregate of \$1,647,192,014, or \$159,658,987 more than that of the preceding year, when the aggregate value was \$1,487,533,027.

And although the value of our importations for the fiscal year just recently closed was the greatest in the history of our country, amounting in value to \$789,335,855, or an increase of \$44,204,203 over that of the fiscal year ending June 30, 1889, when the aggregate was \$745,131,652, the balance of trade has not been against us, but in our favor to the extent in value of \$68,520,304, the total value of our exports of merchandise for the year ending June 30, 1890, being \$857,856,159, or an increase of \$115,454,784 over that of the fiscal year ending June 30, 1889, when the value of our exports was \$742,401,375. During the past fifteen years, commencing with the year 1876, with the two exceptions of 1888 and 1889, the balance of trade has been in our favor.

During the fiscal year 1888 the value of our imports exceeded our exports by \$28,002,607, and in 1889 by \$2,730,277, while the year just closed, June 30, 1890, the excess in value, as I have stated, of exports over imports was \$68,520,304. The greater portion of this increase of \$115,020,219, we are told by Mr. J. M. Whiting, acting chief of the Bureau of Statistics of the Treasury Department, in his exhibit of July 21, 1890, occurred in the following articles, stated in the order of magnitude of increase: provisions, breadstuffs, raw cotton, iron and steel and manufactures of. Of this increase, we are further informed, \$89,873,724 were in the value of exports of the articles named as follows:

In exports of raw cotton.....	\$13,190,974
In breadstuffs.....	30,546,437
In provisions.....	31,234,815
And in cattle, sheep, and hogs.....	14,901,498

While there has been a falling off in the value of our exports of breadstuffs over that of 1880-1885, inclusive, and a slight falling off over that of 1887, our exports of breadstuffs for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1890, were \$30,546,437 in excess of that of the preceding year and \$27,231,411 in excess of that of the fiscal year ending June 30, 1888—the value for 1888 being \$127,191,687; for 1889, \$123,876,661; and for 1890, \$154,423,098; while our exports of provisions, comprising meat and dairy products, were greater for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1890, by \$21,-

003,471 than that of any other year since 1882, and \$31,224,815 greater than that of 1889, the total value for 1889 being \$104,122,444, while for 1890 it was \$135,357,259. The value of our exports of cattle, sheep, and hogs for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1890, was greater by \$18,775,682 than was the average for ten years preceding; the average value for these ten years (1878-1889, inclusive) was \$13,465,658, while for 1890, just closed, the value was \$32,241,360.

Mr. President, the Republican party, its principles, organization, and leaders were found equal to every emergency in the darkest hours ever experienced in this Republic. They met with steady nerve the stern realities of war and proved victorious amid the clash of arms. They were equal to the demand of the times in the great work of reconstructing a shattered Republic, nor shall they now prove impotent in organizing and weaving into the forms of law such legislation as will tend to advance the perpetuity and promote the general welfare, not only of the Republic at large, but of all the people.

The legislation formulated by a Republican Congress at the present session, and enacted into law and approved by a Republican President, on the subject of silver has already quickened the business sensibilities of the nation, given impetus to trade, advanced the prices of commodities all along the line, and given to the producers of this country a living, breathing promise of increased prosperity and better times. If the price of silver goes up, all will agree the prices of commodities generally will advance also. When the present Congress convened in December last silver bullion was selling in London at 41½d. to 43d. per ounce of 925 grains fine, the English standard. To-day it is selling at 50½d. per ounce.

In the United States it was selling in December last at from 92 to 94 cents per ounce. Now it brings 112½ cents per ounce, the effect of all of which will inevitably be to stimulate the mining industries of the far West. New mines will be developed, those in existence will be worked at a fair profit, and employment will be given at better wages to hundreds and thousands of miners and other wage-workers. A market will be created for all kinds of farm and garden products, and, better than all, the prices of farm and garden products will necessarily be advanced as the volume of the circulating medium is increased, and as a general result the spirit of apathy and business stagnation that has for years, and since the demonetization of silver, prevailed will be broken as the prices of all kinds of commodities are increased to fair and living rates.

The value of the Indian rupee has gone up, and, as a consequence, English merchants get less wheat for a rupee than formerly. In the discussion of that bill it was insisted by the monometallists that only by an international arrangement could the imperial power of London to fix not only the price of our silver bullion, but also of all our commodities, be broken, but the result of this legislation is rapidly showing that this is not so. The English secretary of agriculture, in a recent speech, referred to the significant advance in the price of farm products throughout the world, and attributed the same to the recent advance in the price of silver, and this latter he very properly attributed to the late legislation on silver by the American Congress.

The fact is, this legislation has been, and will continue to be, not merely national, but international and world-wide in its salutary influence and effect. No longer will London fix the price for us; no longer will her financiers regulate and fix the price of our wheat and cotton, but we ourselves will in the future, if we are true to ourselves, fix the price of all these commodities, and this, too, at living rates, by such determined, resolute, and stalwart action as we may take in Congress from time to time.

W. T. PATE & CO.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The Chair would state that during the morning business a resolution offered on a previous day by the Senator from Indiana [Mr. TURPIE] was inadvertently overlooked by the clerks. It is properly morning business and is entitled to consideration in the morning hour. The Chair lays the resolution before the Senate.

The resolution submitted on the 12th instant by Mr. TURPIE was read, as follows:

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Treasury be directed to include the claim of Silas Q. Howe, surviving partner of W. T. Pate & Co., audited by the Commissioner of Internal Revenue, under section 3220, Revised Statutes, in the list of claims covered by the resolution adopted by the Senate August 11, 1890, directing him to transmit to the Senate a list of claims allowed by the several accounting officers of the Treasury Department, etc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. PLATT in the chair). The pending question is on the motion to refer the resolution to the Committee on Claims.

Mr. TURPIE. Mr. President, I hope the resolution will not be referred, but that it may be adopted. As I remarked yesterday, this matter has been twice before the Committee on Claims of this body and both times they have reported in its favor and we have twice passed a bill for the payment of the claim. The Secretary of the Treasury, January 2, 1889, makes the following report in compliance with a resolution of that time:

I have the honor to transmit herewith the information called for, as furnished by the Commissioner of Internal Revenue on the 31st ultimo.

C. S. FAIRCHILD, Secretary.

TREASURY DEPARTMENT, OFFICE OF INTERNAL REVENUE,
Washington, December 31, 1888.

SIR: I have the honor to return herewith a resolution of the United States Senate and other papers submitted by you, calling for information relative to Senate bill 2001, with the following report:

The amount paid by W. T. Pate & Co. on distilled spirits, in excess of the quantity withdrawn by them from the United States bonded warehouse between July 1 and December 31, 1884, stated in Senate bill 2001 at \$19,622.19, is the difference between the actual amount originally claimed, \$19,908, and \$245.81 allowed as leakage in transit in December, 1884. (See letter from Commissioner Raum to Secretary Folger, dated May 18, 1882.) A careful auditing of the claim of Pate & Co. at that time showed that \$19,622.19 was the true amount paid on spirits lost in warehouse.

Hon. JOHN SHERMAN, while Secretary of the Treasury, approved the payment of such claims, and in his letter dated November 14, 1877, said:

There can be no doubt that the assessments for leakage were erroneous and improper.

Hon. Green B. Raum, Commissioner of Internal Revenue, also certifies under date of May 18, 1882:

Pate & Co., from July 1 to December 31, 1884, deposited in bonded warehouse 4,186 barrels distilled spirits, containing 213,885½ gallons proof spirits. When these packages were removed from warehouse they contained, by actual inspection, only 200,613½ proof gallons. This tax of \$1.50 was collected on the full quantity deposited, amounting to \$320,828.25. The tax due on the 200,613½ gallons actually found in the packages on withdrawal was \$300,920.25, showing an excess of \$19,908 collected. In computing the leakage in transit, the sum of \$245.81 was computed on the full quantity bonded. I propose to allow the claim for the remainder of the tax appearing to have been paid by these claimants in December, 1884, as set forth, on spirits lost by leakage and evaporation while stored in bonded warehouse, to wit, \$19,622.19.

It was that amount of money which was paid as taxes upon a dead loss to these parties. It is now in the Treasury of the United States. It has been audited twice by different Commissioners of the Revenue and held to be correct. I hope, therefore, that the motion to refer the resolution will not prevail. I ask for the adoption of the resolution.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the motion to refer.

The motion was not agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question recurs on agreeing to the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

PRESIDENTIAL APPROVAL.

A message from the President of the United States, by Mr. O. L. PRUDEN, one of his secretaries, announced that the President had this day approved and signed the joint resolution (S. R. 75) to accept from the national encampment of the Grand Army of the Republic a statue (and pedestal) of the late General Ulysses S. Grant.

THE REVENUE BILL.

The Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 9416) to reduce the revenue and equalize duties on imports, and for other purposes.

Mr. REAGAN. Mr. President, I have listened with much interest to the elaborate and able argument of the honorable Senator from Oregon [Mr. MITCHELL], which had for one of its principal objects to establish the doctrine that Congress has power to pass a protective as contradistinguished from a revenue tariff for the purpose of regulating trade and industries. I beg to call attention to the purpose indicated by the argument, to regulate trade and industries. The constitutional provision on this subject is section 8 of Article I:

The Congress shall have the power to lay and collect taxes, duties, imposts, and excises, to pay the debts and provide for the common defense and general welfare of the United States.

There the power to lay duties is given, and the purpose for which it is given is specified. That purpose is specified to be "to pay the debts and provide for the common defense and general welfare of the United States."

As I shall attempt to show, the Federal Government is one of limited and delegated powers. As indicative of that I read the tenth amendment to the Constitution of the United States:

The powers not delegated to the United States by the Constitution, nor prohibited by it to the States, are reserved to the States respectively, or to the people.

I will look further at that question after a moment.

What is to be the effect of a recognition of the doctrine that by act of Congress we are to regulate the trade and industries of the United States? If we do that as indicated in the debates as one of the purposes of the bill under consideration, we propose to regulate the prices of commodities and the price of wages; we propose to assume a position which enables Congress to declare what industries shall be prosperous and what shall bear the burden of the prosperity of others; we propose to assume eminently and essentially the position of a paternal government controlling the domestic, the commercial, and all other industrial interests of the country.

One of the effects of the adoption of this policy is to place the industries and the interests of the people of the United States at the mercy of a popular majority, however it may be obtained. One of the chief objects of the Constitution of the United States was to protect minorities against the injustice and oppression of majorities.

If we can say what industry shall receive a bonus at the expense of other industries beyond what may be done by a revenue tariff, then I

do not understand that the written Constitution which has been regarded as the great bulwark of American liberty is any longer useful as a protection to the people against the avarice of a majority. When we see the extent to which special interests have been fostered in this country, the enormous fortunes which they have been able to control, the power which through those fortunes they are able to exert over the press of this country, over the politicians of the country, over the legislation of the country, we already see the dangers to which the doctrine must of necessity lead, and we see where it must necessarily end: in the subversion of the Constitution and the destruction of the rights of the people so far as any protection of those rights by the Constitution is concerned.

If any one during the first seventy-five years of the existence of the Federal Government had asserted the doctrine that Congress had the power to control the industries and trade of the country with a view to determining what portion of them should be prosperous and what other portion of them should bear the burden of that prosperity, the proposition would have been considered so monstrous that it could not be entertained. I think it would have been regarded as an evidence of a want of intellect or of insanity. Yet that doctrine seems to be firmly implanted now in the minds of the Republican party and acted upon, and by the honorable Senator from Oregon is boldly advocated in an elaborate argument to-day.

Mr. President, reference was made by the honorable Senator from Oregon to the impoverished condition of the American States immediately succeeding the Revolution, and, as I understood his argument, this was attributed to the practice of free trade.

Mr. MITCHELL. I had reference to the impoverished condition after the formation of the new Government of the Confederation and during the six years between that date and the time of the formation of the Constitution. I insist that by reason of the fact that there was no power in Congress to regulate trade with foreign nations, and that that power was confined alone under the Articles of Confederation to the States respectively, the country was flooded with foreign importations to such an extent that ruin stared the people in the face from one end of the land to the other, and that very fact, the lack of power on the part of Congress under the Articles of Confederation to restrain this trade and protect their own industries, more than any other cause, led to the formation of the new Constitution.

Mr. REAGAN. Mr. President, I said that the chief object of the transition from the Articles of Confederation to a constitutional Government was to enable Congress to regulate commerce between the States and with foreign nations and with the Indian tribes; but I do not concede that that fact is to be used as an argument to establish the proposition that Congress shall regulate trade and industries with a view to benefiting whom they please and to the injury of whoever may fall in the way of their policy.

When it is remembered that the American colonies preceding the war of the Revolution suffered much from the paternal legislation of Great Britain fostering the industries of that part of the empire at the expense of the colonies, instead of that being an argument in favor of the proposition of the Senator from Oregon, it is a warning against the application of a like doctrine as between the American States.

The prevention of the colonies from manufacturing, in order to give the profits of manufacturing to Great Britain, and the cramping of the energies of the colonies in various ways, in order to prevent their growth and the assertion of their power, was that sort of government which was not restrained by a written constitution intended to protect minorities, but it was the result of the policy of a monarchy determined to maintain the interests of the people of the home Government as far as might be at the expense of the colonies, legislating for the purpose of benefiting the interests of one class of people against another class of people in the British Empire and another class of interests.

Then succeeding to the poverty which resulted from the policy of the British Government came the Revolutionary war, which exhausted to the last degree the resources of the people of the American colonies. Seven years of wasteful war, with no accumulated capital in the beginning, wasted the little substance of the people until, when independence was achieved, the people found themselves utterly impoverished, and they then had a struggle to meet as great as the one which they had met in achieving their independence, that of restoring the industry and the prosperity of the American States.

They adopted first the articles of confederation. Those were found insufficient. They afterwards made the transition from the confederation to our present constitutional government. In that constitutional government they gave the Federal Government the power to regulate commerce with foreign nations, among the several States, and with the Indian tribes, for a very important reason, different from that suggested by the argument of the honorable Senator from Oregon. It was for the purpose of preventing hostile legislation by one State against another; it was for the purpose of giving uniformity to the regulation of commerce; for the purpose of preventing strife between the States; for the purpose of preventing the seaboard States from holding the interior States at their mercy with reference to internal and commercial policy.

These were the reasons which in part induced the conferring upon Congress of the power to regulate commerce with foreign nations and

among the several States, and it was not for the purpose of enabling Congress to regulate trade and industries within the several States.

Mr. President, while Congress has power to levy import dues as a means of procuring revenue for the support of the Government, the very fact that it may do so incidentally furnishes protection to American products which come in competition with those which may be imported from abroad. This mode of taxation was adopted then and is preserved now as a mode of indirect taxation and a means of raising money in a way that the people do not seem to understand that they are contributing to the support of the Government, and because of the fact that to raise money by direct taxation for the support of the Government would have imposed a burden upon them that it was probable then, and as it would be probable now, would be resisted.

If we can disregard the provisions of the Constitution, if it is true that we have a Government which can regulate trade and commerce, what becomes of that great distinction in the constitutional interpretation which leaves the local and domestic interests of the country in the hands of the people and of the several States? What becomes of those great and universal laws of trade and commerce which leave all men free or ought to leave all men free in the prosecution of their proper pursuits subject to such competition as may arise in trade? If we would respect the provisions of the Constitution, if we would respect individual and property rights, if we would allow the people to stand in relation to the Government of all having the same protection and none having exclusive privileges, is it not to be seen that we should have a contented and happy people, a people loving their Government because of its justice?

On the other hand, if we are to give the Constitution the construction which will enable Congress to regulate trade and industries, which will enable Congress to levy high duties on imports of one kind for the protection of domestic fabrics and impose thereby burdens on the part of the community which consumes those fabrics, is it not certain that the people will feel the wrong, will know the wrong, will know the oppression, and will feel that they have an unjust Government, a Government which can not command their respect and confidence?

Wise statesmanship, it seems to me, would look to a question like this and would look to a policy of impartial justice as between all the people of this Government, so that each citizen might have the proud consciousness within him that he stood on equal terms with all other American citizens and that no other man is by partial and unjust laws given advantages which are denied to him, that no man is entitled to appropriate his property by a transfer by law for the benefit of the person in whose interest the legislation was enacted.

It was stated by the honorable Senator that the change to the constitutional Government from the Confederation was dictated by the necessity of making such regulations as he advocates. Mr. President, it was, as I have stated, an incident to that change that the power to regulate commerce with foreign nations, among the several States, and with the Indian tribes should be conferred upon Congress. But I submit that the great object of establishing the Constitution of the United States was higher and nobler and holier than a mere commercial regulation. I submit that it was "in order to form a more perfect union, establish justice, insure domestic tranquillity, provide for the common defense, promote the general welfare, and secure the blessings of liberty to ourselves and our posterity." The great object of it was to secure liberty, equality of right and justice between man and man, and not to establish a Government which should rob one part of the American people to enrich another part of the American people.

Another suggestion made by the Senator from Oregon was that the bill under consideration had for its object to equalize the duties on imports. I will not assume that the honorable Senator in a grave argument intended to perpetrate a joke. It would, perhaps, not be fair to him to assume that; but yet how are we to understand that this bill equalizes duties on imports and for what purpose? We find that the duties on woolen manufactures are increased; we find that the duties on cotton manufactures are increased; we find that the duties on the average upon iron and steel and their products are increased; we find that the interests which favor protection, the class interests of manufacturers, every interest which they have has been protected by an increase of duty, so as to enable them to increase the price of their products and compel the American people to pay the increased price.

Mr. MITCHELL. May I ask the Senator a question right there?

Mr. REAGAN. Certainly.

Mr. MITCHELL. The Senator disputes the power in the Constitution to levy any customs excise for the purpose of protecting American industry or American labor, but he concedes the right, I suppose, under the Constitution, to lay imposts for the purpose of raising revenue. Now, suppose he had his way about it and was getting up a bill for the purpose of raising revenue only, on what classes of foreign products would the Senator impose those duties? Would he impose them on those articles which are not raised in this country or on articles which are raised in this country?

Mr. REAGAN. On that subject I beg to say that I shall speak for myself and nobody else. If I had the power to regulate duties on imports, I would make ad valorem duties.

Mr. MITCHELL. That is not the question. That relates to the

method. The question is upon what class of articles; that is to say, would the Senator impose the duties on those articles the like of which we do not produce in this country or would he impose them upon those articles the like of which we do and can produce in this country?

Mr. REAGAN. If the object of the Senator is to ask me if I would agree to discriminating rates of duties, I tell him no, I would not so far as I am concerned.

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. President—

Mr. REAGAN. Now, if the Senator will allow me—I was right in the midst of a statement—I would, if I had the power to regulate the import duties, levy an ad valorem tariff. I would levy a duty on sugar and coffee and tea, the same as on woolen goods, cotton goods, and iron and steel goods, and let them pay their proportion of the duty. I would levy a tariff for revenue for the support of the Government, and would not attempt to use the powers of the Government by Congress to enrich the party who had control of the Government.

Mr. MITCHELL. Now, if the Senator would lay a tax, as he calls it, an impost, to raise revenue only, would he not very naturally—that being the sole object, simply to raise the revenue—would he not aim to impose that duty upon those articles which are not produced in this country, so as to get the greatest possible amount of revenue from the least possible rate of tax?

Mr. REAGAN. I have answered the question the Senator asked me by saying that I would, if it were in my power, levy an ad valorem tariff.

We see the effect of a large free-list. Every time we propose to increase duties for the protection of manufacturers, we propose to enlarge the free-list to reduce their expenses on one hand while we increase their profits on the other.

Mr. MITCHELL. If the Senator will allow me now, what would the Senator put upon the free-list?

Mr. REAGAN. I would have no discrimination. I would collect the revenue to support the Government on products that would yield a revenue as well as on those that give incidental protection.

Mr. MITCHELL. Would the Senator permit raw material to come in free of custom rates, any raw material at all?

Mr. REAGAN. I would permit raw material to come in, and perhaps I ought to qualify what I have said by remarking that I would do so on the condition that the duty on the manufactured product should be lowered in proportion to the advantages obtained from the receipt of raw material free of duty.

Mr. MITCHELL. Then the Senator would levy discriminating duties and he would have a free-list after all?

Mr. REAGAN. As I have suggested. Now, if the Senator from Oregon is through with his catechism, I should like to go on with my remarks.

Mr. MITCHELL. I do not wish to be rude, of course.

Mr. REAGAN. I have rarely seen an occasion on this floor, unless there was some special request, when suggestions were being made that are bringing points home that whoever was making them was not interrupted by repeated catechism, either relevant or irrelevant.

Mr. MITCHELL. Will the Senator yield to me a moment?

Mr. REAGAN. Yes, sir.

Mr. MITCHELL. I am not feeling particularly hurt by anything the Senator has said, as far as that is concerned, but I was really anxious to know a certain thing, and I put the question in all sincerity to the Senator; and I do not think, notwithstanding the Senator's protestation to the contrary, he has yet answered it. My question was this: Would he or would he not, in imposing his tariff rates simply for the purpose of revenue only, levy them on articles which are produced in this country or on articles which are not produced in this country?

Mr. REAGAN. I suppose I shall be obliged to answer the Senator again. I have told him that I would levy a duty on tea and coffee and sugar, as I would upon iron and steel and cotton and woolen goods.

Mr. MITCHELL. Now, one other question: Holding to the view the Senator does, that the only power there is to levy a tariff for revenue merely, would he not naturally and logically, carrying out that view, aim to impose the tariff solely upon those articles of foreign importation the like of which we do not produce in this country, and therefore in that way would he not add to the consumers of this country the price of the tariff?

Mr. REAGAN. I do not know that I understand that question.

Mr. MITCHELL. I will repeat it again. The question is this: It seems to me that the logical conclusion of the Senator's view would lead him in imposing a tariff for revenue only to impose that tariff solely upon foreign articles of importation the like of which we do not produce at all in this country, in order that he might obtain the greatest amount of revenue from the least amount of duty, and in that event, of course, the consumer would be compelled to pay the whole amount of the duty.

Mr. REAGAN. I listened to the argument of the Senator from Oregon for two hours and a half with patience, and there were many places where I might have desired to interrupt and propound interrogatories to him. But he was making, as it seemed to me, a systematic argument, and I did not choose to interrupt him—

Mr. MITCHELL. I will not interrupt the Senator again.

Mr. REAGAN. And now the Senator wants to inject into what I have to say theories of his own. I have tried to state as well as I could, in answer to his inquiries, that if I had the power of controlling the levying of duties I would make them ad valorem.

I admit as a qualification to this that if I could reduce the cost of the manufactured fabrics to the extent of the reduced duty on the raw material, I would admit the raw material that went into the manufactures free of duty. That would hurt nobody; and while it is not precisely upon the theory, it seems to me preferable, and I would practically agree to such a course as that.

Mr. HOAR. Will the Senator be kind enough to tell us a little more fully why he would do that? It is very interesting.

Mr. REAGAN. I shall leave the Senator from Massachusetts, who is able, to make the deduction, and I think he can do it without my assistance. If the simple object is to throw me off from the discussion of this question, I hope such interrogatories will be deferred.

Mr. HOAR. The Senator will allow me to say that I sincerely beg his pardon. I did not put to him any question to throw him off. The Senator said he would assert a policy—a very interesting one—and I asked him if he would go a little more fully into the reasons for it. I do not propose to put any question further than that.

Mr. REAGAN. I can conceive of one reason, that if raw material was admitted free it would enable the manufacturers to make goods so much cheaper, and it would enable them, if they would do so, to sell the goods to the people that much cheaper, and therefore it would benefit the people; but there is where the trouble comes in. Take this very tariff bill, which greatly enlarges the free-list and also greatly enlarges the duties upon imports of manufactured articles; and so, as I said some time back, when we benefit the manufacturers on the one side by free raw material we benefit them on the other side by levying higher duties, and all the time oppress the consumers by exacting from them what they ought not to have to pay.

Mr. President, I believe I was talking about the proposition of the Senator from Oregon for the equalization of duties when I was interrupted, and I had referred to the fact of the enlargement of the free-list and the increase of the duties upon imports competing with manufactured articles. When we speak of equalization, I said that I did not think I ought to accuse the Senator from Oregon of perpetrating a joke in a serious and elaborate speech. How are we equalizing when we say as to beams and joists and things of that kind that they shall pay 117 per cent. or 87 per cent. when imported in forms of the largest size of iron, millions of tons of which are used in the construction of bridges and houses and vessels and otherwise—a duty so monstrous that no man can doubt its iniquity?

Then, while we find that in the schedule of duties everything which benefits Eastern manufacturers is put into it, let us turn to another part of the country, and we find that the duty is reduced, almost taken off sugar, which is a most important agricultural product of the Southern States, and the duty is proposed to be largely reduced on rice. I do not complain of the rate fixed, because I think that the rate fixed is fair enough, but I speak of it in contrast with the raising of higher duties for the benefit of articles of manufacture, instead of lowering as we lower them on an agricultural product which is raised in the South.

I call attention to the reduction of the tax on cotton-seed oil from 25 cents a gallon to 10 cents a gallon. That has become one of the great agricultural products of the Southern States. I call attention to the increase of the duty on the article of cotton-ties from an ad valorem duty of 35 per cent. to a duty of 103 per cent. and a fraction. Everything that is in that section, the weaker section, unable to protect itself and relying upon the justice and conscience of the American Congress, is not only denied protection, but all that can be done conveniently is done to oppress its industries.

Mr. President, that is an illustration of what I said awhile ago about a construction of the Constitution which may enable Congress to regulate trade and industries and to fix the price of labor, to fix the price of commodities, to assume the paternal control of the interests of the people.

When we have done that we have placed the power of the Government in the hands of the few who may use it as they now use it to enrich the controllers of the Government, instead of using it to do justice between the American people—a power by which one part of the people is to be impoverished while another part is to be enriched; a power which is creating the millionaire capitalists engaged in manufactures, which is shingling over the farms of the West with mortgages and debt. Is this a power to be assumed? Is this a construction of the Constitution which ought to be encouraged? It is paternalism turned loose and made mad, intending by the exercise of power to make overgrown fortunes for the few while it makes serfs and slaves of the great body of the American people.

Mr. President, instead of such a doctrine and instead of such results as these, suppose, if possible, we come back to the construction of the Constitution which prevailed for nearly three-quarters of a century after the formation of the Government; suppose we come back to that system of legislation which prevailed in Congress looking to the protection of all the people alike as it had been until the Republican party came into

power. Suppose we can look back, as some of us are able by memory to do, to the times when every citizen of the United States was proud of his Government, proud of its flag, proud of its industries, proud of every square acre of American soil, and proud of the character of being an American freeman; a time when there were no millionaires, but the freest and the happiest people that the sun of heaven had ever shone upon; a time when there were no discriminations in legislation, but honest government administered by a Congress and by parties that had conscience and respect for the rights of minorities.

Mr. President, I, of course, do not propose, on the spur of the moment, to attempt to answer the many points made by the honorable Senator from Oregon in his two and a half hours' speech. I only rose to protest against its theory and to protest now upon the heels of the speech that it was an ingenious and able and elaborate argument for the subversion of the American Constitution and for the perversion of the powers of Congress to benefit the few at the expense of the many.

Now, I do not attribute to that Senator any unpatriotic motive. I have no doubt he believes what he says, and that is the misfortune of this whole question, that interests, either pecuniary interests or partisan interests, have warped the judgments of so many people that we are hardly able to consider questions like this in the light of reason and truth and conscience.

It seems to me as if gentlemen are seeking the overthrow of our constitutional form of government and the establishment upon its wreck and ruin of a paternal government which may take charge of the trade and industries of the country, which may abolish the ordinary laws of commerce and trade and assume the control of the domestic and local interests of all the people. It seems to me that men who are engaged in this ought to be able to see that an awakening is taking place in the minds of the American people upon that subject and that they can not permanently subvert the Constitution, they can not permanently enslave a majority of the American people by capital and class legislation.

If Senators would only look to what is occurring outside of this body in organizations being awakened by their oppression and suffering and see the declarations which they are making, sometimes wise, sometimes unwise, but indicating that they have at last found out since capital has combined to impoverish them that it is necessary to combine to resist this effort to impoverish them, such Senators might have reason to hesitate in such a course. The evidence of this has come from all over the country, and the effects of the movement Senators need not deceive themselves about, because they will be made known. The people are too intelligent, too self-reliant, too independent yet to submit to be quietly enslaved by class interests and to have the great body of the American Republic made subordinate to the interests of a very small part of it.

Mr. President, I do not desire to detain the Senate, but I desire while up to make a prediction that the final vote upon this tariff question will be taken by the people on Tuesday after the first Monday in November, and there will be no limit to debate, and the yeas and nays of the American people will be called upon it and a voice will be heard, I think, that will make Senators understand that the American people yet recognize the fact that they have some rights under this Government which must be respected by the Republican party.

Mr. BATE obtained the floor.

Mr. HOAR rose.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. PLATT in the chair). Does the Senator from Tennessee yield?

Mr. HOAR. I simply wish to observe in reply to the last sentence of the Senator from Texas [Mr. REAGAN], where he says there will be no limit of debate before that vote is taken, that there will also be no talking against time.

Mr. PLUMB. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Tennessee is recognized.

Mr. BATE. I yield to the Senator from Kansas.

Mr. PLUMB. I understand the Senator from Tennessee has a formal speech to make, and I do not wish to interfere with him. If the Senator from Tennessee is not specially desirous of proceeding now, I wish to give notice of an amendment which I propose to offer to this bill and to make a few remarks on it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Tennessee yield to the Senator from Kansas?

Mr. BATE. It depends on how long the Senator from Kansas desires to occupy the floor. I am ready to proceed. I should like to accommodate the Senator from Kansas.

Mr. PLUMB. I do not wish to interfere with the Senator from Tennessee, who I understand desires to deliver a formal speech.

Mr. BATE. I will yield ten minutes to the Senator with the greatest pleasure.

Mr. PLUMB. I give notice that at the proper time—I do not know what the parliamentary situation now is—I shall move to strike out, on page 29 of the bill, all after the word "steel," in line 1, with a view of moving also to insert, at the close of paragraph 139, the following words:

Provided, That there shall be paid to manufacturers of tin-plate made in the

United States, from any moneys in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, a bounty of 1 cent per pound, under such rules and regulations as the Commissioner of Internal Revenue, with the approval of the Secretary of the Treasury, shall prescribe.

My purpose by this amendment is to limit the question of the added protection to manufacturers of tin-plate to a bounty similar to that provided for the producers of sugar in another portion of this bill.

Mr. HIGGINS. I should like to have that amendment stated again.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there be no objection, the amendment will be read for information.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 29, line 1, after the word "steel," it is proposed to strike out all down to and including the word "pound," in line 7 of the same paragraph, as follows:

And on and after July 1, 1891, all iron or steel sheets, or plates or taggers iron, coated with tin or lead or with a mixture of which these metals or either of them is a component part, by the dipping or any other process, and commercially known as tin-plates, terne-plates, and taggers tin, shall pay 2.2 cents per pound.

And to insert at the end of the paragraph the following:

Provided, That there shall be paid to manufacturers of tin-plate made in the United States, from any moneys in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, a bounty of 1 cent per pound, under such rules and regulations as the Commissioner of Internal Revenue, with the approval of the Secretary of the Treasury, shall prescribe.

Mr. PLUMB. Mr. President, I want to say, in the first place, that I have grave doubts as to the effect of the proposition made by the committee. I doubt very much whether it will permanently introduce into this country the manufacture of tin-plate in quantities sufficient for the use of the people.

And this for a variety of reasons. First, because I have observed that the American manufacturer, which I do not speak of to complain about especially at this time, has been swift to avail himself of duties upon articles which gave him large profits and has formally abandoned the production of other articles which gave him only small profits.

In competition with tin for various purposes, for roofing, for vessels, there have come a large number of other articles, including galvanized iron, granite-ware, and things of that kind. Every one of these will be increased in value by the imposition of the duty proposed by the Finance Committee. If tin is to go up 1.2 cents per pound, then every article which comes into competition with it, under existing conditions, will go up similarly, perhaps not to the full extent, but at least very largely.

Tin is made into sauce-pans and various other articles which are used for cooking purposes. During the last two years a very profitable industry has grown up in making what is known as granite-ware, used for a somewhat similar purpose, costing a little more, and which I think would go into almost universal use at the price of tin and to the exclusion of tin. If tin is put up, as undoubtedly it will be, by the adoption of the proposition now pending, granite-ware will go up to some extent also, and just as much as may be necessary to enable it to take the place, as far as possible, of tin which is used for domestic purposes, and to that extent tin will not be in demand, and will not be produced or imported.

In addition to that, galvanized iron is used for roofing in competition with tin, and maintains, as I am told, just about the same price, the price of it being governed by the price of tin, with which it is in active competition for a variety of purposes; not for all purposes, I agree, but for many purposes of the kind which may be designated generally as roofing. Therefore, when we put up the price of tin we put up the price of a large number of other articles as well.

Now the persons who are proposing to make tin—I do not mean to say particularly the individual persons, but the general class of investors who are proposing to make tin—are also interested in making iron in the various forms used for roofing, for vessels for domestic purposes, and so on. They will not make tin under this proposition unless they can make it at greater profit than they can make these other things. That can be set down, I think, as not needing further demonstration. If, therefore, they can make granite-ware, or the base of granite-ware, the steel or iron sheet which is covered finally with the silicon which makes it impervious to rust and useful for cooking purposes, they will not make tin. If they can make galvanized iron to take the place of tin at a reasonable profit they will not make tin to take the place of galvanized iron, because they are already making these two other articles under processes the full extent of which they know and the profits of which are entirely satisfactory, and they will not enter upon a new line of manufacture to make profits that they could make under an old line.

Therefore, out of this proposition is to come American tin, if at all, by accident or by a combination of circumstances which can not now be foreseen.

Second, I have a letter in my possession which I am not authorized to read, but which comes from an entirely reputable house in the West engaged in the manufacture of vessels of tin, stating that they have failed heretofore to obtain from an American manufacturer an article of sheet-iron or of iron sheets to distinguish the plate cut into ordinary sizes from what is known ordinarily as sheet-iron, of a satisfactory qual-

ity to take the place of that which they have heretofore imported and which they use for the purpose of coating with melted tin. They say in substance that the American manufacturer does not now make an article known as iron sheets, to be used as the base upon which tin is to be put for the purpose of making domestic utensils, of sufficient ductility and uniform strength to enable these persons to buy with any degree of certainty whatever. The consequence is they are obliged to buy them abroad.

The American manufacturer therefore to-day, if this statement is to be credited, as I believe it is, does not make an article of iron sheets which is suitable for the manufacture of tin, although he has had the inducement of the proffer of large purchases upon the part of persons who are engaged in the manufacture of domestic utensils of which this iron sheet is the base.

Now, when we come to consider the propriety of imposing this new and large duty of 2.2 cents per pound, it is not merely the question of the manufacture of tin in the United States which is to be taken into account. It is always said, when we come to consider these schedules where an industry has been established behind the shelter of a certain duty, that vested interests had accrued and those vested interests ought to be recognized to the extent of preventing at least any very considerable reduction of duty which might hurt capital already invested or disturb arrangements already existing. There is great force in that argument. I subscribe to it; and I agree that wherever an industry has been built up under conditions established and maintained by law, those conditions ought not to be arbitrarily changed to the hurt of the persons who have invested their capital in consequence of them.

Now, from the tin-plate imported into the United States, and which is about somewhere from twenty to twenty-five million dollars' worth per annum, is made, by manufactures carried on in the United States by American capital and American labor, a product variously estimated at from ninety to one hundred million dollars in value per annum. This manufacture is widely extended. It exists on the seacoast, and there is no degree of longitude from the seacoast west to California within the limits of which there is not carried on some manufacture of cans, cups, buckets, of spouting, or of some other form of the manufacture of tin which goes into local or other markets. It employs many thousands of men.

If the proposition contained in this bill to levy an additional duty of 1.2 cents per pound upon tin-plate is adopted there will either have to be a shifting of this business, which will probably occur, or a large addition to the capital of those now engaged in it. Any disturbance of the business is almost certain to throw both labor and capital out of employment.

It has been said here that the addition to the cost of a single can on account of the added duty would be trifling, a half a cent I think it has been stated to be. That half cent represents only the cost of the tin. To that will be added all the other costs that go to make up profit—insurance, taxes, interest, and so on, so that that half cent when it emerges finally from the pockets of the consumer would probably be multiplied two or three fold.

Whatever the added cost it will also represent an equivalent cost placed upon the contents of such vessels, as meats, fruits, vegetables, etc. The use of these is widespread and it is altogether likely, if not absolutely certain, that this increased cost would diminish consumption, thus contracting the market of the farmer who produced the meats and other articles of food.

But, admitting for the sake of the argument, that the purchaser would not have to pay the additional cost on the can, bucket, cup, or whatever other form the tin might be manufactured into, somebody would have to pay it. The American manufacturer, the American wholesaler, or the American retailer, or all combined would have to pay it if the consumer did not, and these people, I beg to observe, are not only American citizens, but they are very large in number, and they employ more labor than all that ever would become necessary to the manufacture of a national supply of tin-plate; and they are widely scattered, and their interests are as much to be taken into account as the interests of some possible future American manufacturer. You put a burden upon them of an addition to the capital which they are required to put in their business in order to carry it on and of an increased cost for their raw product whereby their profits are reduced. One of the effects would be that the smaller manufacturer, by reason of his inability to get this additional capital and of his diminished profits, would go out of business, and therefore this manufacture, so widely extended, would be concentrated in the hands of a few men possessing large capital. The small and near-by manufacturers would have to give way to the distant and more wealthy ones.

Now, these things are all to be taken into account when we come to say what we shall do about this duty. Shall we put on a duty, shall we enact a provision of law here which changes the course of business as existing under the present law, not only now, but for the last twenty-five years, and shall we take the risk of what will come from that? Shall we put upon these manufacturers and these wholesalers and these retailers—supposing, now, that the consumer pays nothing whatever additional—this burden which is to grow out of the imposition of this

tax, and shall we do it upon the assumption of something for which we have no foundation whatever, to wit, that the manufacture of tin will be introduced into the United States and carried on under conditions which will finally give us a full supply of this necessary article as the result of American manufacture and at a diminished price?

Who knows that we shall get it? It is stated over the signature of the president of the association located at Pittsburgh, designing apparently to go into this business, that the present tariff is protection enough, except for the condition inferentially stated that the foreign manufacturer will arbitrarily reduce his price below that at present prevailing to such an extent as to deprive the persons who may enter upon this manufacture from making a profit. As incidental to that, although I did not introduce it into this debate and do not specially depend upon it, I beg to read here a letter which I received this morning from a firm whose telegram I read yesterday, Messrs. J. M. Melloy's Sons, of Philadelphia, Pa. I know nothing about them, but so far as I know their only offense is that they are importers and manufacturers of foreign tin. They sent me also a telegram, which I will first read:

PHILADELPHIA, PA., August 14, 1890.

Hon. P. B. PLUMB, Senate Chamber:

Prices wired you yesterday were per box of 108 pounds, containing 112 sheets, not per pound, as papers report you stated.

J. M. MELLOY'S SONS.

The letter is as follows:

PHILADELPHIA, PA., August 13, 1890.

DEAR SIR: We understand there was some discussion in the Senate to-day about the cost in England of the kind of tin-plate that is used for canning for some years back. So we give you below the prices that ranged from 1877 to 1890. These prices all include the cost of boxing and delivered free on board at English shipping ports, less 4 per cent.

Year.	January.	July.	Average for the year.
	s. d.	s. d.	s. d.
1877.....	18 9	17 6
1878.....	17	14
1879.....	15 3	14 6
1880.....	30	14 6	19 1
1881.....	15	14	15 5
1882.....	18	15 9	15 11
1883.....	16 6	16	15 11
1884.....	15	15	14 10
1885.....	14 6	12 6	13 8
1886.....	13	13 3	13
1887.....	13	13	13 1
1888.....	14 6	12 9	13 6
1889.....	13	13	13 7
1890.....	15	13 6

Hoping this will be of some use, we remain,
Very respectfully, yours,

J. M. MELLOY'S SONS.

Hon. P. B. PLUMB,

United States Senator, Washington, D. C.

From this statement it will be seen that beginning with January, 1877, at which the price is given at 18s. 9d., continuing on down to the same month in 1890, the price was reduced to 15s. In July, 1877, the price was 17s. 6d., and it was reduced gradually until in 1890 it was in the same month in 1890 13s. 6d. The average for the year is stated to have been in 1880 19s. 1½d., extending on down until with the gradual decline it turned up in 1889 at 13s. 7d. Now, that seems to show—

Mr. McPHERSON. Then it is lower now than it has ever been before?

Mr. PLUMB. According to this statement it seems to have gone through the mutations of ordinary manufacturing business and been subjected to those conditions which have gradually pressed down the prices of manufactured articles the world over.

Mr. TELLER. If the Senator will allow me, the Senator from New Jersey says the price is lower now than it ever has been. I should like to put in a prediction that in a year from now it will be a good deal lower if we pass this bill.

Mr. CARLISLE. Will the Senator from Kansas allow me to call attention to the fact that in July, 1888, the price was 12s. 9d., which seems to have been the lowest figure reached between 1877 and July, 1890?

Mr. PLUMB. I should like to have the Senator from Colorado state whether he thinks that if we pass this bill tin will be lower immediately to the American consumer than it ever has been.

Mr. TELLER. I mean to say that the tariff on tin will do for tin what it has done for every other product of iron and nearly every other product: eventually reduce the price to the consumer. That is what I mean to say; and I should like to add, if any Senator doubts that, it can be proved and has been demonstrated in the Senate over and over again, as was done yesterday by the Senator from New York in his statement in reference to the fall in the base of tin, which is iron, the fall of that being 30 per cent., while tin has remained practically just where it has been for a series of years except with the occasional fluctuations of which he spoke.

Mr. PLUMB. The word "eventually" is an elastic one, which is entirely safe for any one to utter.

Mr. TELLER. I will put it at a year, then.

Mr. PLUMB. The Senator will have ruined his reputation as a prophet if he puts it at one year.

Mr. President, I am not discussing that general question at all. It undoubtedly happens that wherever manufactures are extended prices are reduced, whether they be at home or abroad, at home alone or abroad alone. Increasing competition undoubtedly tends to bring down prices. There can be no question about that.

Therefore, I have no doubt that in time, eventually, to use the expression of the Senator from Colorado, if we enter upon the manufacture of tin in a large way in the United States one of the results will be to reduce the price. But I do not find in the present situation any guaranty or any ground for even a reasonable presumption that if we put on this duty we shall have the tin manufactured in the United States during the next year, or the next ten years, to meet the local demand. I do not believe such will be the case.

Now, we have been going along without any special complaint upon this subject. I do not know of any demand that has been made from any part of the United States that this duty shall be put on. The only persons so far as I know who have ever asked that a higher duty shall be put upon tin are the persons who hope to manufacture it. Are they entitled now to special consideration? If they had been engaged in an unavailing attempt to make tin in competition with foreign manufacturers, if they had put up factories and manufactured tin, and in so doing had lost money in what for the occasion might be called a patriotic effort to make upon American soil an article not before manufactured here, and under those circumstances should come here and ask us to give them some duty or some bounty in the nature of protection in order to reward them for this unavailing attempt and in order to put them on their feet, that would be a claim which I should be willing to take into account.

But, Mr. President, I do not find that anything of this kind has ever been done, and I venture to say that no manufacturer in the United States has ever made an output of tin-plates or even of iron plates or steel plates, whichever may be used for this purpose, which are really of a character to make the base of a good article of tin-plate.

Mr. McPHERSON. Will the Senator permit me to ask him a question?

Mr. PLUMB. I will.

Mr. McPHERSON. If I understood correctly the reading of the Senator's amendment, it continues the present duty of 1 cent per pound on tin-plate and proposes a bounty of 1 cent per pound upon the manufacture of tin-plate of this kind.

Mr. PLUMB. Yes.

Mr. McPHERSON. I want to ask the Senator, tin-plate being on the free-list, if that would not be quite a sufficient amount of bounty to bestow upon a manufacturer being already protected 1 cent a pound upon his iron-plate by the plate schedule. Would not 1 cent a pound be a considerable amount of duty to bestow upon the manufacturer for simply coating it with free tin?

Mr. PLUMB. I can not say about that, Mr. President. In this, as in other cases, I have been willing to resolve doubts in favor of the American manufacturer and do everything I could, consistent with what I conceive to be my obligations to the consumers, in order to enable the American manufacturer to go ahead and produce essential articles of manufacture. I would say, if I were to speak from my own information and judgment and belief, that the duty upon the sheet-iron, together with free tin-ore or tin-pig, was sufficient, together with the protection afforded by transportation, to enable the manufacturer to do this if he chose to work for a reasonable profit; but as a rule he is not willing to work for a reasonable profit. We have had that demonstrated over and over again.

I am willing to do more than that; I am willing to say to him that if he will not exact of us, because he has apparently the power to exact anything that he wants at the present time, this large extra duty, thereby putting a tax upon all the tinware used in the country, upon every tin-cup and tin-plate can, and coffee-pot, upon every yard of roofing made of tin used by the people of the United States, and also increasing the price of galvanized iron and graniware and so on, he shall have a bounty, instead, of 1 cent per pound to put into his pocket. If he is a reasonable man or if he can be moved by any appeal whatever, it seems to me that he will be willing to accept that.

I know, Mr. President, that when you introduce the question of bounty into this tariff discussion you enter upon a sea which has no shore. But it is the proposition which is made in this bill in regard to sugar, an agricultural product. The American consumers of sugar have been tempted in this bill by free sugar with a bounty to forego the opposition which they might naturally feel to an indiscriminate increase of duty upon articles almost as necessary and almost as widely and as largely used as sugar. They have been tempted to forego their opposition to an increase of duties upon cheap cutlery, cheap carpets, cheap linoleums, cheap guns, cheap crockery, cheap cotton and woolen goods, cheap glassware, and so on generally all through these schedules, if thereby

they can get free sugar, and in order to save something for the manufacturer or producer of sugar a bounty of 2 cents a pound is proposed.

Mr. EDMUNDS. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. FRYE in the chair). Does the Senator from Kansas yield to the Senator from Vermont?

Mr. PLUMB. I do.

Mr. EDMUNDS. I should like to ask my friend from Kansas a question, not to take up his time by argumentation at all, but upon this very point, whether he thinks that putting sugar on the free-list, leaving bounty aside entirely, will diminish the cost of sugar to the people who use it in the United States to any degree; and, if so, in his judgment to what degree.

Mr. PLUMB. I have no doubt it will diminish the price of sugar to the consumer very considerably, as a rule; but I do not say that it will under all circumstances, because I can conceive of conditions in which sugar may go up notwithstanding. There may be a diminished supply or a greatly increased demand, and the German and French Governments might cut off the export duty which they now pay to their sugar producers; a hundred things might occur to increase the price of sugar; but I say logically, inevitably, and necessarily in the present conditions, whatever the reduction in the rate of duty on sugar, it will correspondingly reduce the price to the American consumer.

Mr. EDMUNDS. May I ask another question?

Mr. PLUMB. Yes.

Mr. EDMUNDS. I am simply after the truth about it, and not to go into any details; but, after what the Senator has said, may I ask him what our experience has been in putting articles on the free-list in respect to which he refers, of diminishing the price to the consumer? Take coffee, in 1870, I think it was, when we reduced the duty from 5 to 3 cents a pound, and in 1872, when we put it on the free-list altogether. Did the American consumer get any benefit from that?

Mr. PLUMB. The South American Governments which sold coffee, that is to say which were interested in the production of coffee, like that of Brazil, and perhaps Brazil alone, as I understood, put on an export duty.

Mr. SPOONER. And kept it on.

Mr. PLUMB. And have kept it on. That was something which the American Congress, in its haste to throw a tub to the whale, to make an excuse apparently for keeping up the duties upon other articles, overlooked.

Mr. EDMUNDS. I should be sorry to have my friend from Kansas, whose historical knowledge is usually so perfectly complete—and I say that in all sincerity—

Mr. PLUMB. There is no doubt about the Senator's sincerity.

Mr. EDMUNDS. I should be sorry to have my friend stay under the impression that he and a great many other people have, that when we reduced the duty first on coffee, and then took it off altogether two years afterwards, the Brazilian Government imposed an export duty. I beg to assure him from documents which are in print that the Brazilian Government did nothing of the kind. There had been for a great many years an export duty on coffee by Brazil when we had the regular duty of 5 cents a pound. The Brazilian Government never changed it at all until five or six years after we had taken off the duty, and then she reduced her export duty instead of increasing it. That appears in the printed documents sent to us by the State Department.

Mr. PLUMB. Then, if that be true and if circumstances remain the same, the converse of that must be equally true, and that is that if we were now to put on a duty on the coffee imported the price of coffee to the people of the United States would not be increased. It is absolutely useless in casting the horizon of the entire world to ignore all the conditions except one. One of the conditions which affected the price of coffee was apparently the duty imposed by the American Government.

Mr. BUTLER. Coffee is cheaper now than ever.

Mr. EDMUNDS rose.

Mr. PLUMB. I yield further to the Senator from Vermont.

Mr. EDMUNDS. I do not want to debate it; I only want to make a suggestion.

Mr. PLUMB. I am aware of the Senator's unwillingness to enter into a discussion of this or any other subject.

Mr. EDMUNDS. I will stop here.

Mr. PLUMB. The tariff is only one of the things that enter into the question of price, but if the duty on tin is not to increase the price of tin why put it on? In what way will it help the American manufacturer if it does not increase the price of the product he is obliged to compete with? No one has risen here to deny that the price of tin will be increased to the American consumer by reason of the imposition of this duty. The Senator from Vermont will not do it.

Mr. EDMUNDS. I will when I get a chance.

Mr. PLUMB. Very well; if he does his temerity will exceed his judgment by several hundred per cent.

Mr. EDMUNDS. That may be and it may not.

Mr. PLUMB. I say now, as I have always said, anything which leads to the multiplication of manufactures in the United States, to the

development of our national resources, to the manufacture of articles which are essential and on account of the absence of which we might have to go to war in order to obtain, is a thing to be wisely taken into account in the adjustment of duties or in the establishment of a national policy. So also of a home market, and considerations of this character have given to protection great strength with the people, and induce them in large measure to overlook irregularities, discriminations, and unnecessary burdens in some of the schedules.

The first effect of a duty is to put up the price. The subsequent effect may be, as it usually has been, to put the price down; but in the present case I do not believe that result will be reached the next year or for many years to come, if ever.

Therefore, I would plead with these people, if I had them here, to forego the power which they have, the power of controlling this bill and determining its passage and its terms and all that sort of thing, and ask them if they would not take a cent bounty, or 2 cents bounty if necessary, upon the tin which they shall actually manufacture and leave the price of tin to be governed by the markets of the world and the competition of all mankind. That is what I should like to have them do. If, as the Senator from Vermont says, putting a cent and two-tenths duty on this tin will not add to its price to the American consumer, perhaps he would be willing to go as far as the Irishman who said that if one stove would save half the wood two would save it all, and thus say that a duty of four and four-tenths would make it still cheaper.

I want out of this thing to get, if I can, that which, while conserving the manufacturing interests of the country, takes into due account the consumer.

In 1883 this question was before the Senate in the tariff bill of that year; a similar proposition to the one now pending was under consideration. The Senator's colleague [Mr. MORRILL], then as now the chairman of the Committee on Finance, in addressing himself to this particular question said:

I trust, notwithstanding the possibility that we might at some time hereafter manufacture tin, that we shall not raise the duty to 2 cents a pound, for I somewhat doubt whether we can get children to dip this article for a good many years yet at the wages that are paid for dipping tigger iron into melted tin.

I know it is heretical, Mr. President, to doubt the propriety of conceding anything that the manufacturers ask. But I also know that not one single consumer of tin on this continent has asked for this increase of duty. The volume of testimony taken does not disclose one; the newspapers of the country have not brought him to view, and public opinion does not demand it.

Therefore, to be justified it must be upon high public policy which does not take into account present public opinion nor the present interests of the consumer, but simply takes account of some overruling general purpose, one of national importance to be accomplished, which warrants the disregard of public opinion and the immediate interests of consumers. And yet the Senator from Vermont [Mr. MORRILL] only seven years ago said that the time to impose this duty had not come, by reason of the fact that we had not got the necessary cheap labor, child-labor, labor of persons too young and inexperienced to organize, and thereby unable to fix the wages for its employment.

May I be pardoned if I say I do not believe the time has yet come, and that I believe we can afford to forego any attempt at this particular time, to introduce this manufacture into the United States by the imposition of this large duty?

Put, Mr. President, there is one other consideration which I think is worth taking into account. We have had, as the result of the circumstances and surroundings of manufacturing in this country, great congestion of population at different places, with results not always favorable to republican government. If this manufacture is entered upon, it will be undertaken chiefly at Pittsburgh. There are tens of thousands of wage-people there working for a handful of employers.

A system of that kind gets out of order sometimes. It breeds extravagance, and sometimes worse, a demand for high wages, which can not always be met; friction of a personal and other character, which induces strikes and lockouts and other things which are injurious to the people of the country. If the manufacture of tin could and would be established at some New England, or Vermont, or New York, Ohio, or Kansas town, if it could be widely scattered, a small factory here and one there, whereby the people of the neighborhood could get a local market for their crops and the girls and boys and the unemployed men of the neighborhood could be given something to do at or near home, I would feel like contending against it; but as it must go to these large places, over-congested already, and must contribute to increasing the army of the people who are to be employed by a handful of men, and thus increase the chances for friction of the kind of which I have spoken, and others which need not be referred to, it seems to me but wise to wait, unless in the plenitude of their mercy the manufacturers who have control of the situation are willing to take the bounty which I have proposed.

This industry, even if established, will not add, in my judgment, one farthing to the wages of any laborer on American soil. It will be followed by a large influx of labor from the outside. If we could cut off

that influx and use the industry for the employment of men already here, of whom there are hundreds of thousands to-day unemployed, it would be a more meritorious proposition. But, Mr. President, everything of this kind will be heralded, as it has always been, all over the world as an evidence of high wages to be paid to American labor, bringing people here, for whom there is no adequate employment. The skilled labor necessary would have to be brought here.

The strike in Chicago last summer was not for higher wages, but for limited hours of labor, in order that more people might be employed to do the same work that was being done by those already under employment.

Let us, before we invite this influx of foreign labor to depreciate prices and to disturb existing conditions, see if we can not adopt some measures to employ those laborers we have already got.

One of the chief advocates of this measure, one of the newspapers which assume to speak the public opinion upon this subject, had this to say about the condition of affairs a short time since when the silver bill was under consideration.

The article was headed:

NO TIME TO FOOL WITH VALUES.

The United States never grew more grain than in the past year. It never but once grew more cotton. It never made more iron, lead, or copper. It has spun as much cotton as it ever did. It has made more boots and shoes. It has built more houses. In all the lesser lines of products the output of the United States was never greater than for a year past.

The result of all this is that there have never been fewer idle people, taking the whole country. The wages of labor have never, on the average or in their total, bought more. Every dollar buys more in all the land to-day than it has bought for thirty years, and that once was a time of unemployed labor. Even for the farmer, what he buys has fallen more in ten years than what he sells. The capitalist is badly off. He can only get 4 or 5 per cent. The speculator is worse off. No broker is paying his rent in any speculative center.

These are the sober facts of the present situation. In view of them, can Congress afford to fool with the standard of value by beginning its march towards a silver standard?

So, Mr. President, when it was sought to prevent Congress from passing a bill to increase the use of silver as money and to increase the volume of currency of the country, whereby the wages of labor might be enhanced and the prices of agricultural products be increased, the country was represented as being so prosperous that nothing whatever was needed in the way of legislation. Congress was asked to keep hands off. It was the capitalist, then, who was bad off, and we were implored not to add to the volume of circulating medium, and thereby cut down his 4 or 5 per cent. profit. Mr. President, it is the same voice now crying in the wilderness that demands the passage of this bill, demands that a higher duty shall be put upon tin, and demands it not in the name of labor, but in the name of capital.

I will go as far as any one to help establish industries upon American soil where it can be done properly. I will yield any prepossession I may have, not too deeply grounded, in favor of doing what is asked in order that new industries may spring up in our midst. But is it necessary in order to do this that a burden shall be put upon all the people in the shape of increased prices for this essential article which they are required to purchase? Will not a bounty do just as well? I venture to say that if a bounty is given we shall not pay very much in discharge of it, because I do not believe much, if any, tin will be manufactured, but if it is let the bounty be paid until Congress takes it off, or for a term of years.

Do not put this high duty on in this bill, which according to the calculation of those interested is to remain upon the statute-book for ten years at least, which is to be a part of the permanent legislation of the country. Why disturb one business already representing \$100,000,000 of annual products, and larger by far than the one which it is hoped to establish by the imposition of this large duty? Better conserve the industries we have than to risk their destruction or serious damage by the establishment of others through the instrumentality of the law.

Therefore I hope, Mr. President, that the proposition which I have made for a bounty may be acceptable, and that, if it is objected to on account of the principle, it will be borne in mind that the same principle is applied in regard to the producers of sugar. They are to be cut off from the benefit of protection, from the help of the duty, and the people of the United States are to be given the experiment as to the price of sugar free of duty. If, as the Senator from Vermont says, they do not get sugar at a lower price during a period of years, we shall be all the wiser on account of it; but the House of Representatives and the Committee on Finance of this body have determined that that experiment shall be tried.

If it is a good thing to try in regard to the agricultural product of sugar, in regard to an industry which does exist to-day in more than a name, which has its footing not only in Louisiana, but in Nebraska and Kansas, with hopeful prospects there as well as in Texas and other States—if it is to do good for this industry that there shall be a bounty given to it only, why is it not wise to apply that rule to an industry which has not yet got foundation, or roof, or a single dollar of invested capital, and nothing in it except the wind and the assurance of the men who have invaded the Senate and the House and succeeded in having this increase of duty put into the bill before us?

Mr. CARLISLE. Mr. President, I have received from the Commissioner of the Department of Labor a communication, in response to an inquiry made by me, showing the direct labor-cost in the production of a ton of steel rails in an establishment in the northern district of the United States, in an establishment in Great Britain, and in an establishment on the continent, including, of course, in this direct cost all that was expended for labor in the production of the coal, the iron ore, the limestone, and the other materials used.

Mr. EDMUNDS. If I may interrupt my friend, does that statement include the cost of the incidental labor besides the direct wage-labor?

Mr. CARLISLE. Separately.

Mr. EDMUNDS. But it is all there, the whole?

Mr. CARLISLE. It is all here. From this statement it appears that the direct labor-cost in the production of a ton of steel rails in the establishment in the northern district of the United States is \$11.597; the cost in the establishment selected in Great Britain, in which the Commissioner says the labor-cost was less than usual in that part of the world, is \$7.817, showing a difference of \$3.78; and the direct labor-cost in the production of a ton steel rails on the continent, which I believe was taken from an establishment in Belgium, was \$8.104, showing a difference between the cost there and here of \$3.493.

Mr. EDMUNDS. May I interrupt my friend right there in his explanation?

Mr. CARLISLE. Certainly.

Mr. EDMUNDS. I ask my distinguished friend from Kentucky whether it is true that the ore used in Belgium is about one and a half as great in quantity to make the given ton of steel rails, and therefore that the necessary cost of labor would be that much greater.

Mr. CARLISLE. Nearly so, because the ore is not so rich in iron, all of which is explained, I think, in the written communication made by the Commissioner.

Mr. EDMUNDS. I have not had the advantage of seeing the tables.

Mr. CARLISLE. My purpose in rising is not to discuss the question, but to ask to have the communication and tables printed. The Commissioner says:

I desire to say, in forwarding you these statements, that I have made them up for three localities, instead of for two, as requested, because of the resolution introduced yesterday by Senator EDMUNDS and now pending. Should that resolution be adopted I could not at present more fully answer it than I have done in this letter. The facts called for by you and by Senator EDMUNDS in the letters of the 6th and 8th instants, on account of the difficulties which I have intimated here, could not have been incorporated in the preliminary report, House Miscellaneous Document No. 222.

In view of this statement, I desire to ask that the communication may be printed as a document, because it seems to me to contain all the information which the Commissioner can give us on this subject at this time.

Mr. EDMUNDS. We shall all be very glad to have it done. It will be very valuable.

Mr. McPHERSON. Will the Senator from Kentucky yield to me?

Mr. CARLISLE. Certainly.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Kentucky asks that the document which he presents be printed—in the RECORD or as a document?

Mr. CARLISLE. I have not asked that it be printed in the RECORD, because I believe there is generally objection to that course; but if there be no objection I think it would be very well to have it in the RECORD, because it is an important document, and it may be several days before we can receive it in document form.

Mr. EDMUNDS. I do not object. Let it be printed in the RECORD and also as a document, which is much more convenient to read than in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there be no objection, it will be printed in the RECORD and also as a document. The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

The communication is as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF LABOR, Washington, D. C., August 13, 1890.

SIR: I have the honor to acknowledge the receipt of your letter of August 8, in which you ask for a statement showing the direct cost of labor in the manufacture of one ton of steel rails in Great Britain and on the continent of Europe, such statement to be prepared in the same way as that sent to Senator EDMUNDS on the 6th instant, relating to the cost of steel rails in the northern district of the United States. In reply I send you herewith three statements:

First. An analysis of costs in one ton of standard steel rails made in the United States. This analysis is based mainly on establishment No. 1, reported on page 35, House Miscellaneous Document No. 222 of the present session, and is substantially a copy of the statement sent to Senator EDMUNDS on the 6th instant. I have repeated it here because it was hurriedly made for Senator EDMUNDS, and the proper credit for the value of scrap produced in the ingot and rail department's was not made. The cost given in the statement of the 6th instant related to total gross cost of one ton of 2,240 pounds of steel rails in the northern district of the United States. This statement shows the total net cost of such a ton of steel rails. It varies but 11 cents from the total cost given as for establishment No. 1, page 35 of the document referred to.

As stated, this statement is based mainly on establishment No. 1. It is not wholly so, because of the impossibility of tracing from the schedules relating to establishment No. 1 the labor cost of all the materials entering into the manufacture of one ton of standard steel rails; so labor-cost has been taken from several establishments making steel ingots. Using an average as derived from these several establishments makes a variation of but 11 cents in the result.

This fact clearly establishes the soundness of the analysis of cost as based on establishment No. 1, and as reported on page 35 of the document referred to. The credit for the value of scrap produced raises the per cent. of cost of direct labor in the production of one ton of standard steel rails from 45 per cent., as stated in the letter from this department of the 6th to Senator EDMUNDS, to 47 per cent., as shown in the last item in the statement herewith sent.

Second. A statement showing the analysis of costs in one ton of standard steel rails made in Great Britain. The calculation in this statement is based on establishment No. 22, page 35, House Miscellaneous Document No. 222. In this case we started with the cost of steel rails as given in the establishment just referred to, and were able to trace the costs back through the preceding processes of making the blooms, ingots, pig-iron, coke, coal, and limestone, because all these elements were made under the direction of the same company that made the rails, and we had schedules covering all these costs. As to the iron ore, we did not have the exact mine from which it was taken, but we did have a representative mine in the same district from which it was taken, and we also had the cost for transportation given; so that the element of possible error in calculating costs is of necessity very slight.

As to "profit to producers," shown in the item relating to iron ore, a part of this is accounted for by the royalty or rent paid to the owners of the soil, which amounted to about 60 cents for the amount of ore shown in the statement. The remainder was made up by deducting the costs as calculated from the ore schedule from the cost delivered at the furnace, as charged in the pig-iron schedule. You will notice that the total net cost of one ton of steel rails, as stated in this analysis, is \$18.614, while the cost as shown in establishment No. 11, page 35 of the report referred to, is \$18.588, or a difference of only 2.6 cents.

The labor at the establishment for which this analysis is made is paid less, I am informed, than at most other steel-rail establishments in Great Britain, but we were obliged to take this establishment, as it was the only one having a schedule for standard rails and for the previous processes, and furthermore, it is a representative establishment, whose production largely governs the price of standard steel rails. The other statement (No. 10) for Great Britain, on the same page, is for light rails, and the processes are not comparable fully with those for making standard rails.

Third. A statement of analysis of costs in 1 ton of standard steel rails made on the continent of Europe, this statement being based mainly on establishment No. 3, page 35, House Miscellaneous Document No. 222. The rails covered by this statement are standard steel rails, like those in the first and second statements just described. In making this analysis for the continent of Europe we were enabled to follow the processes back, as in the case of the English establishment, until we came to the pig-iron, when, owing to the incompleteness of the pig-iron schedule for establishment No. 3, we found it necessary to use another schedule for the cost of converting materials into pig-iron.

For the costs of materials themselves, except limestone and iron ore, we had data from establishment No. 3, and we used the schedules of that establishment. For the limestone we had the cost as reported at the pig-iron furnace, but had no schedules for the continent of Europe showing the amount of labor, etc., in 1 ton, so we used the cost as reported at the furnace, and subdivided that cost into elements in the same ratio as that indicated in the limestone schedules for the northern district of the United States. The iron ore used was the same kind as that used in the English case just given; so we used the same schedule from which to ascertain the cost of it.

In other respects the same plan was pursued as in the English case, except that it was found that the cost of pig-iron, as charged in the ingot-mill, amounted to \$1.46 more than as figured from the materials; so we were obliged to charge that amount to the profits going to the pig-iron producer. The net cost of standard rails per ton as given in the schedule for establishment No. 3, with which we started for this analysis, is \$19.576, while as shown by this careful calculation it amounts to \$19.635, an excess of 5.9 cents only by the use of other factors to supply those missing in the schedules of establishment No. 3.

I desire to say, in forwarding you these statements, that I have made them up for three localities, instead of for two, as requested, because of the resolution introduced yesterday by Senator EDMUNDS and now pending. Should that resolution be adopted I could not at present more fully answer it than I have done in this letter. The facts called for by you and by Senator EDMUNDS in the letters of the 6th and 8th instant, on account of the difficulties which I have intimated here, could not have been incorporated in the preliminary report, House Miscellaneous Document No. 222. In the completed reports I am in hopes not only to give more elaborate analyses on the basis of those sent herewith, but for certain typical establishments, those that largely regulate prices, I anticipate being able to trace back through all the processes of manufacture the various labor elements entering into the production. The difficulty of doing this is at once discernible on a very casual examination of the facts.

You will pardon me if I call your attention to one analytical feature which should be observed in the use of the analyses herewith forwarded. Labor-cost in 1 ton of steel rails—I mean after all the materials have been assembled in the steel-rail works and are ready to be subjected to the proper manipulations for the production of standard steel rails—should be less per ton relatively in this country than in Great Britain or on the continent, because American producers of standard steel rails dispense with at least one expensive process still adhered to by the foreign producer; and, furthermore, our materials, ore, etc., are purer than those used in most other places; so the quantity of ore, for instance, required for the production of a ton of standard steel rails is less in this country than in other places, and of course the labor required to produce one ton of steel rails is, so far as the purer materials are concerned, less here than abroad.

By reference to the statements herewith submitted it will be seen that in establishment No. 1, for the northern district of the United States, 4,137 pounds of iron ore were necessary for the production of 1 ton of standard rails, while in establishment No. 11, for Great Britain, 5,127, or nearly 1,000 pounds more of iron ore were necessary for the production of 1 ton of the same kind of rails than in the United States, while on the continent of Europe, in establishment No. 11, 5,701 pounds, or nearly 1,600 pounds more, of iron ore were necessary for the production of 1 ton of standard steel rails. Very many of those things which appear to be incredible when studying the total figures given disappear on a close examination of the analysis, and reasons for the figures can, as a rule, be found in the analysis, if properly studied.

The establishments selected for the statements herewith forwarded are thoroughly representative, and are far more indicative of the true conditions surrounding the production of standard steel rails than any of the others given in the preliminary report referred to.

Of course, as remarked in the letter from this Department to Senator EDMUNDS, the cost of making rails, over and above what is in the previous statements denominated "direct labor-cost," is largely resolvable into labor; that is, a very large percentage of the items above direct labor are labor in some form, but it is difficult to separate the elements, as in transportation, for instance.

Trusting that the statements herewith handed you fully answer your communication of the 8th.

I am, very respectfully,

CARROLL D. WRIGHT,
Commissioner.

Hon. J. G. CARLISLE, United States Senate.

[illegible]

Statement showing the proportion of cost attributable to direct labor in the production of one ton of steel rails.

Total cost of ore, limestone, and coke (coal included) for 2,912 pounds of pig-iron.....	\$11.401
Cost of direct labor in production of ore, limestone, and coke (coal included) for 2,912 pounds of pig-iron.....	\$3.546
Per cent. of cost of direct labor in production of ore, limestone, and coke (coal included) for 2,912 pounds of pig-iron.....	31
Total cost of converting the above materials and 341 pounds of cinder, scrap, etc., into 2,912 pounds of pig-iron.....	\$1.573
Cost of direct labor in converting the above materials and 341 pounds of cinder, scrap, etc., into 2,912 pounds of pig-iron.....	\$0.784
Per cent. of cost of direct labor in converting the above materials and 341 pounds of cinder, scrap, etc., into 2,912 pounds of pig-iron.....	50
Total cost of converting the above pig-iron and 383 pounds of scrap and spiegeleisen into 2,798 pounds of steel ingots.....	\$2.106
Cost of direct labor in converting the above pig-iron and 383 pounds of scrap and spiegeleisen into 2,798 pounds of steel ingots.....	\$0.981
Per cent. of cost of direct labor in converting the above pig-iron and 383 pounds of scrap and spiegeleisen into 2,798 pounds of steel ingots.....	47
Total cost of converting the above steel ingots into 2,700 pounds of steel blooms.....	\$1.437
Cost of direct labor in converting the above steel ingots into 2,700 pounds of steel blooms.....	\$0.845
Per cent. of cost of direct labor in converting the above steel ingots into 2,700 pounds of steel blooms.....	59
Total cost of converting the above steel blooms into 1 ton (2,240 pounds) of steel rails.....	\$2.151
Cost of direct labor in converting the above steel blooms into 1 ton (2,240 pounds) of steel rails.....	\$1.661
Per cent. of cost of direct labor in converting the above steel blooms into 1 ton (2,240 pounds) of steel rails.....	77
Total net cost of above ore, limestone, coke (coal included), cinder, scrap, and spiegeleisen, and of converting them into 1 ton (2,240 pounds) of steel rails.....	\$18.614
Cost of direct labor in the production of ore, limestone, and coke (coal included) and in converting them and the cinder, scrap, and spiegeleisen, into 1 ton (2,240 pounds) of steel rails.....	\$7.817
Per cent. of cost of direct labor in the production of ore, limestone, and coke (coal included), and in converting them and the cinder, scrap, and spiegeleisen, into 1 ton (2,240 pounds) of steel rails.....	42

Analysis of costs in one ton of steel rails made on the continent of Europe.

[Based mainly on establishment No. 3, page 35, House Miscellaneous Document No. 223.]

Materials and successive stages of conversion.	Other expenditures.						Total.
	Expenditures for direct labor.	Officials and clerks.	Supplies and repairs.	Taxes.	Transportation to point where used.	Timber.	
For production of 5,701 pounds of iron ore.....	\$0.957	\$0.028	\$0.206	\$0.033	\$3.744		\$8.783
For production of 1,582 pounds of limestone.....	.174	.016	.021	.001	.086		.298
For production of 4,927 pounds of bituminous coal.....	2.336	.175	.315	.042		\$0.480	3.338
For conversion of above coal into 3,509 pounds of coke.....	.590	.051	.047	.024	.064		.776
For conversion of above ore, limestone, and coke into 3,061 pounds of pig-iron.....	1.246	.021	a.381	(a)			1.476
For conversion of above pig-iron into 2,612 pounds of steel ingots.....	.512	.110	.832	.012			1.456
For fuel (782 pounds of coke) for conversion of above pig-iron into 2,612 pounds of steel ingots.....	.649	.050	.081	.016		.107	.903
For conversion of above steel ingots into 2,580 pounds of steel blooms.....	.203	.049	.240	.049			.541
For fuel (217 pounds of coke) for conversion of above steel ingots into 2,580 pounds of steel blooms.....	.180	.014	.022	.005		.030	.251
For conversion of above steel blooms into one ton (2,240 pounds) of steel rails.....	1.043	(b)	b.448	.010			1.501
For fuel (474 pounds of bituminous coal) for conversion of above steel blooms into one ton (2,240 pounds) of steel rails.....	.224	.017	.030	.004		.046	.321
Total gross cost of one ton (2,240 pounds) of steel rails.....	8.104	.531	2.643	.196	3.894	.663	21.322
Deduct value of scrap produced in ingot, bloom, and rail departments.....							1.687
Total net cost of one ton (2,240 pounds) of steel rails.....							19.635

a Taxes are included in "Supplies and repairs," not separable.

b Salaries paid officials and clerks are included in "Supplies and repairs," not separable.

Statement showing the proportion of cost attributable to direct labor in the production of one ton of steel rails.

Total cost of ore, limestone, and coke (coal included) for 3,061 pounds of pig-iron.....	\$13.195
Cost of direct labor in production of ore, limestone, and coke (coal included) for 3,061 pounds of pig-iron.....	\$4.047
Per cent. of cost of direct labor in production of ore, limestone, and coke (coal included) for 3,061 pounds of pig-iron.....	31
Total cost of converting the above materials into 3,061 pounds of pig-iron.....	\$3.124
Cost of direct labor in converting the above materials into 3,061 pounds of pig-iron.....	\$1.246
Per cent. of cost of direct labor in converting the above materials into 3,061 pounds of pig-iron.....	40
Total cost of converting the above pig-iron into 2,612 pounds of steel ingots.....	\$2.389
Cost of direct labor in converting the above pig-iron into 2,612 pounds of steel ingots.....	\$1.161
Per cent. of cost of direct labor in converting the above pig-iron into 2,612 pounds of steel ingots.....	49
Total cost of converting the above steel ingots into 2,580 pounds of steel blooms.....	\$0.792
Cost of direct labor in converting the above steel ingots into 2,580 pounds of steel blooms.....	\$0.383
Per cent. of cost of direct labor in converting the above steel ingots into 2,580 pounds of steel blooms.....	48
Total cost of converting the above steel blooms into one ton (2,240 pounds) of steel rails.....	\$1.822
Cost of direct labor in converting the above steel blooms into one ton (2,240 pounds) of steel rails.....	\$1.267
Per cent. of cost of direct labor in converting the above steel blooms into one ton (2,240 pounds) of steel rails.....	70
Total net cost of above ore, limestone, and coke (coal included) and of converting them into one ton (2,240 pounds) of steel rails.....	\$19.635
Cost of direct labor in the production of the above ore, limestone, and coke (coal included) and in converting them into one ton (2,240 pounds) of steel rails.....	\$8.104
Per cent. of direct labor in the production of the above ore, limestone, and coke (coal included) and in converting them into one ton (2,240 pounds) of steel rails.....	41

Mr. McPHERSON. If the Senator from Kentucky will kindly yield to me I will state that the other day the Senator from Vermont [Mr. EDMUNDS] presented a statement here, made by the Commissioner of Labor, as to the amount of direct labor cost which he said in the letter directed to the Senator was made upon six establishments in the northern district of the United States. I therefore appealed to the Commissioner of Labor to make a corresponding statement upon an equal number of establishments in Europe.

After several days I called at the office of the Commissioner of Labor, and the chief clerk, who was present, gave me to understand that the comparative statement, which I had made myself in the mean time, gave the result within at least \$1 per ton, but I have been unable to get any written statement from the Labor Department as to a verification of that statement.

Mr. EDMUNDS. Mr. President—

Mr. McPHERSON. No, I decline to yield at this moment; I will yield later.

Mr. EDMUNDS. I wished to ask a question merely.

Mr. McPHERSON. The Senator from Kentucky says that this

statement is made upon three establishments—one in Great Britain, one in Belgium, and the other in the northern district of the United States. Now, I want to know if that is any fair way to answer this disputed question. What I wanted the Commissioner of Labor to do was to make up a statement of all the establishments contained in the preliminary report No. 222, to correspond with the six establishments that he had given us in the northern district of the United States in Senate Report 198, and that he fails or refuses to do.

Mr. EDMUNDS. If my friend from Kentucky will allow me to have a word with my friend from New Jersey I shall be glad.

I think that my friend from New Jersey is now satisfied that the combination of figures and tables that he presented on his own account the other day is not exactly accurate—quite a way from it—and that he has been convinced of that fact by a re-examination of the figures and tables that had appeared in print before. I am satisfied myself that is so, which led me to offer the amendment that I did.

Now, as to the point my friend makes, if my friend from Kentucky will excuse me for a single minute, I do not wish to take his time. Statements about all the establishments in the United States and all

the establishments in other countries would be very valuable as one of our means of information; but everybody knows in the United States that a given establishment may produce a ton of steel rails from beginning to end cheaper than another one, and comparing that with the highest one in another country the comparison would not be fair. On the other hand, a given establishment in the United States may be obliged to spend a certain percentage more than another one in producing the same results, and comparing that with the cheapest establishment in a foreign country would not be fair.

Therefore, in order to get at the truth of the business of what each country does for its labor, if we care anything about labor—and we all say we do—we would have to try the lowest against the lowest and the highest against the highest, and so on, because as my friend from Kentucky so perfectly well knows, as he just now said, in some of these European establishments it takes nearly once and a half as much ore to make a ton of steel rails as it does of American ore. That will account for the cost in the establishment which uses that kind of Spanish, or French, or Belgian, or English ore, and will run the cost of labor on the ton of steel rails very much nearer up to the United States cost than in another case.

Then, in respect of some of these European ores, I am informed and believe that they are still obliged to resort to very expensive processes of manipulation that the American ores are not subjected to, and the cost of labor goes into that; but it does not show that the laborer who does it gets the price or the comfort that the American laborer exerted on the same thing is getting. That is all I have to say.

Mr. McPHERSON. Will the Senator allow me a single moment to reply to the Senator from Vermont?

Mr. CARLISLE. Certainly.

Mr. McPHERSON. That is exactly the thing of which I have complained. I complain of this, that in the statement made to the Senator from Vermont the Commissioner of Labor gave us an estimate from six establishments in the northern district of the United States. In his preliminary report, No. 222, he gives us a statement of seven establishments upon the continent of Europe and two in Great Britain. I therefore desired a statement from all of the establishments on the continent of Europe and in Great Britain, all taken from his preliminary report, No. 222, and no one will dispute that this would not give a fair comparative statement of establishments in the United States and Europe. The Senator from Vermont refuses to have that done. The Senator from Vermont does not think it necessary, and why? Simply because it would show a lower labor-cost than expected on a ton produced in Europe.

Mr. EDMUNDS. I have not refused to have anything done that I know of.

Mr. McPHERSON. Now, I want to state this: If the Senator from Vermont can deny the correctness of the multiplication table he can then begin to deny the correctness of my statement, and that will have to be decided first.

Mr. EDMUNDS. Yes, but if my friend will excuse me, I must deny the authority and correctness of a multiplication table which is one of imagination, and not of arithmetic.

Mr. McPHERSON. Very well; I have had it verified by several experts. I want to state broadly and fully that if you take the preliminary report No. 222 of the Commissioner of Labor and take all the nine establishments which he has given on the continent of Europe and Great Britain and compare that with the statement addressed to the Senator from Vermont, and known as Senate Miscellaneous Document No. 198, the difference in direct labor-cost will be less than \$1 per ton.

This is a very singular answer that is made to the Senator from Kentucky, to select a single establishment in Belgium, another single establishment in Great Britain, and another single establishment in the northern district of the United States, and from these three selected establishments attempt to give the general average cost of direct labor-cost in the three countries in a ton of steel rails. I presume the Commissioner of Labor has had his instructions with respect to making out these reports. That is the suspicion that I have about the whole thing.

Mr. BATE. Mr. President—

Mr. BUTLER. Will the Senator from Tennessee pardon me while I ask a question of the Senator from Kentucky?

Mr. CARLISLE. If the Senator from Tennessee will yield.

Mr. BATE. Very well.

Mr. BUTLER. I shall not occupy two minutes.

Mr. CARLISLE. All right.

Mr. BUTLER. The Senator from Rhode Island read a statement the other day purporting to come from Mr. Abram S. Hewitt, and appeared to attach great importance to that statement, in which it was made to appear, I believe, that labor constituted about 90 per cent. of a ton of iron. I should like to ask the Senator from Kentucky, if it will not disturb him, if he can inform the Senate what per cent. is shown by this report of the Commissioner of Labor.

Mr. CARLISLE. The Senator from South Carolina speaks of a ton of iron.

Mr. BUTLER. Yes, a ton of iron.

Mr. CARLISLE. This communication relates to steel rails.

Mr. BUTLER. Well, what is the cost of a ton of steel rails?

Mr. CARLISLE. This relates to the direct cost of labor in the production of a ton of steel rails.

Mr. EDMUNDS. Mr. Hewitt was speaking of a ton of iron, and you can not make the comparison. He was taking, besides the direct wage-labor, all that entered by the way of labor in every part of the transaction, as, for instance, the man who worked on the roof of the building that sheltered the man who melted the iron.

Mr. BUTLER. Precisely. That is a ton of iron. If the Senator can give us approximately the result of this report, I shall be very glad to get it.

Mr. CARLISLE. I will state to the Senator from South Carolina that if he will examine the preliminary report on the cost of production submitted by the Department of Labor a few days ago, he will find the direct cost of labor in the production of a ton of pig-iron. My recollection is that the statement which I have just submitted to the Senate shows that the percentage of the labor-cost in the production of steel rails in this country is 47 per cent. The statement first was that it was 45 per cent., and by making some corrections the Commissioner brings it up to 47 per cent.

Mr. ALDRICH. If the Senator will permit me, the Commissioner of Labor also further states in answer to the request of the Senator from Vermont [Mr. EDMUNDS] that the labor-cost in transportation and in all the collateral industries is not included, and that he has no data, but says—

Mr. CARLISLE. It is included in all the industries connected with the production of this article.

Mr. ALDRICH. Directly, but not the cost of transportation, etc.

Mr. CARLISLE. The cost of transportation is not on account of labor. I have always supposed that the railroads belonged to the capitalists of the country, and that the cost of labor in transporting a ton of iron or a ton of steel rails was so small as to be almost incalculable. They carry hundreds of tons on the same train and it is impossible to ascertain the almost infinitesimal cost of the labor in carrying a single ton.

Mr. ALDRICH. Does the Senator mean to say that the cost of the transportation goes entirely to the capitalists?

Mr. CARLISLE. I did not say anything of the kind.

Mr. ALDRICH. I understood the Senator to say that the labor-cost was infinitesimal.

Mr. CARLISLE. I say that the cost of labor in transporting a single ton of iron or steel is so small as to be almost infinitesimal, because the same train will carry hundreds of tons with a very few hands, and the principal labor-cost is the loading and unloading.

Mr. ALDRICH. But suppose that the average cost was half a cent a ton per mile, which I suppose is about the cost, what proportion of that would be labor?

Mr. CARLISLE. That is what I say is so small you can not calculate it.

Mr. ALDRICH. I say it is so large that it takes almost everything except the amount paid as dividends.

Mr. CARLISLE. As I understood the Senator, capital gets comparatively nothing.

Mr. ALDRICH. They get a fair rate of dividends upon their capital and the rest of it goes to labor in one form or another.

Mr. CARLISLE. If the Senator will excuse me, I am occupying the floor by the courtesy of the Senator from Tennessee; and, as I stated, it is not my purpose now to enter upon a discussion of this question as to the relative cost of the production of steel rails here and elsewhere. That is a question which will come before the Senate when we go back to the paragraph relating to the duty upon steel rails.

But while I am upon the floor, if the Senator from Tennessee will indulge me for a moment longer, I should like to supplement the statement made by the Senator from Kansas [Mr. PLUMB] in regard to the indisposition upon the part of domestic manufacturers to produce tin-plate, by reading a part of a letter received by me upon that subject this morning. The letter is dated Philadelphia, August 13, 1890, is addressed to me, and is as follows:

DEAR SIR: The following information may be useful to you in the tariff discussion:

A large consumer of this city asked all the mills in the vicinity of Pittsburgh for a price on the thickness of steel that they make canning tin-plate out of, and he only received one quotation. All the balance—

And I call the attention of the Senator from Kansas to this—

All the balance stated that they could not make it as thin as it was required. The one quotation was 5½ cents per pound.

For the sheet-steel alone, untinned:

This was in large sheets. The present selling price of canning-plates is 4.22 cents per pound, and this includes 3 pounds of tin, worth, say, 22 cents per pound, duty 1 cent per pound, cutting to size, tinning, boxing, and freight. So you see there is really no one who wishes to make tin-plate, and it is only done to take the attention from black sheet-iron, which they are now getting very high prices for.

Any proofs required can be telegraphed down if you will drop me a wire at my expense to-morrow.

Very truly yours,

CHAS. W. POTTS.

It appears from this statement that but one single establishment at

Pittsburgh was willing to fix a price at which it would furnish the sheet plates, all the others saying that they could not make them of this thickness; and that establishment offered to supply the sheets alone at 5½ cents per pound in large sheets, when the tin-plate, including 66 cents' worth of tin, 1 cent duty, all the cost of labor in cutting them the proper size, putting them in the boxes, and the freight, can be purchased for 4.22 cents per pound in the American market. I read this letter simply to show what the situation now is in regard to this industry.

Mr. McPHERSON. May I ask the Senator from Kentucky a single question before he takes his seat?

Mr. CARLISLE. If the Senator from Tennessee yields, of course.

Mr. McPHERSON. I simply want to inquire if I have correctly understood the statement made by the Senator from Kentucky as to these three selected establishments which have been selected by the Commissioner of Labor. Shall I understand that it was on the direct labor-cost or on all the cost, including officials and clerks and taxes and everything, that he made the difference of three dollars and some cents?

Mr. CARLISLE. The cost of officials is in a separate column and is not included in the aggregate stated by me.

Mr. McPHERSON. Then he has made the difference between three and four dollars a ton in the labor-cost between the United States and the continent of Europe.

Mr. CARLISLE. The greatest difference is \$3.78.

Mr. McPHERSON. Upon which it is proposed to levy a duty of \$11.20 to protect American labor! That is practically what it is.

Mr. ALDRICH. Will the Senator from Tennessee yield to me for a moment? He has yielded to everybody else. I shall only take two or three minutes.

Mr. BATE. That will induce somebody else to come in, I fear.

Mr. ALDRICH. Very well.

Mr. BATE. I will yield to the Senator, sir.

Mr. ALDRICH. I wish merely to say a few words in regard to the letter which has just been read by the Senator from Kentucky. The Senator understands as well as I that there is no inducement for the steel or iron manufacturers of Pittsburgh or anywhere else to have a plant on hand prepared to roll thin sheets of iron or steel as long as the legislative prohibition exists against the manufacture in this country. I say to him, as everybody understands, that with taggers iron at 30 per cent. duty and with tin-plate at 1 cent a pound duty thin sheets of iron and steel can not be rolled in this country at a profit. There is, as I said before, no possible inducement why any manufacturer in Pittsburgh or anywhere else should have an expensive plant ready at hand to roll thin sheets of iron or steel.

Mr. CARLISLE. But the Senator from Maryland read yesterday a circular issued by a Pittsburgh firm, in which it was stated that they had the plant and had been making them and could furnish them at present prices. I read this letter mainly for the purpose of showing the price at which these people desired to sell their sheet-steel untinned.

Mr. ALDRICH. There are very few people who can roll thin sheets in the United States, very few, indeed; but if this portion of the bill becomes a law I will make the prediction that there will not be a steel establishment in the United States within five years from this time that will not be able not only to roll thin sheets of iron and steel, but to make tin-plate for the American market.

Mr. CARLISLE. I can not answer the Senator's prediction; that is not argument.

Mr. PADDOCK. Will the Senator state what the cost of the necessary plant would be to perform this work?

Mr. ALDRICH. The plant for rolling the sheets would be more expensive than the plant for dipping the plates.

Mr. PADDOCK. Is the Senator able to state it approximately?

Mr. ALDRICH. I can not state it approximately. Of course it would depend upon the number of rolls and the size of the establishments.

Mr. BATE. Mr. President, having on a former occasion in this Chamber discussed at length the fundamental principles and subjects which, in my judgment, included proper tariff legislation, I shall to-day confine my remarks to what I believe to be the injurious effects of the proposed bills, whether that of the House or of the Senate or of some composite measure which may be cooked in a conference committee, upon every industry, upon all trades and employments, and endeavor to express the reasons which cause me to fear that this legislation may turn back the current of national prosperity and work irreparable injury to individual welfare.

Criticism of the title of a bill may be "sticking in the bark," but when the details of the provisions of the bill contradict the assertions of the title there is about it a degree of misrepresentation which should at least put this Senate on its guard.

In response to an acknowledged demand on the part of the people the House has sent to the Senate a bill "to reduce the revenue," but if, upon scrutiny and examination of the details of the bill, it shall be shown to be a measure which may increase the revenue, then at least let the Senate deal honestly and truthfully with the people and amend the title to correspond with the facts.

If the Congress will not assent to the public demand to lessen the burdens of taxation it can at least avoid deception by avowing openly and honestly in the title of the bill its real aim and effect. If a purpose ulterior to revenue, dimly forecast in the President's message by his words that "we can not limit their [duties'] effects by fixing our eyes on the public Treasury alone," is the real object of the bill, then let its title tell upon what other objects this Congress has fixed its eyes. If protection to domestic industries is paramount to reduction of taxation let the title read, "A bill to increase the taxes in order to protect domestic manufacture, check foreign importation, and for other purposes." Neither do I believe it to be honest or truthful to say in the title, "and equalize duties on imports," which, as framed in the original bill, avowed that we have not sought to make a uniform rate of duty upon all imported articles. This would be manifestly unjust and inequitable; but that "we seek, by the increased duties recommended, not only to maintain, but to enlarge our manufacturing plants and check those supplies from abroad which can be properly produced at home."

Turning from the title, which misleads and deceives, and examining the effects of the bill upon the revenue, with the best information that the committees and the Treasury experts have supplied, I shall endeavor to show that any bill framed on the principles of protection must increase the revenue and the burdens of taxation.

Permit me to remark here that it is to be regretted that the committee has not given a report, as is usual in such cases, setting forth reasons at length for their conclusions, that those of us not on the Finance Committee might avail ourselves of it in arriving at conclusions.

Mr. President, there are two ways to reduce the revenue. The direct and honest way is to repeal and reduce duties; the indirect and, if not dishonest, at least suspicious, which is to discourage importations by increased duties. The House bill, the foundation upon which the Senate bill has been erected, adopts both methods. By the open and honest method it repeals duties on sugar, transfers some heretofore dutiable articles to the free-list, and diminishes the internal revenue on tobacco and alcohol used in the arts.

The Senate bill modifies the provisions for reduction of revenue and reduces the House's reduction by over \$10,000,000. No man can conjecture the outcome of a conference committee.

The indirect mode of reducing revenue, that of discouraging importations by high duties, forms the real basis of both Senate and House bills and will underlie any conference committee's bill. What the ultimate result will be is altogether problematical. The country is expected to accept the bill, whether it be the House bill or a conference-committee bill, without its authors being able to indicate what its effects will be upon the revenue, upon taxation, upon national or individual prosperity or welfare.

All calculations, whether by the House committee or by its minority, are made upon tables the correctness of which is discredited alike by the committee and by the minority. The report says:

The exact effect upon the revenues of the Government by the proposed bill is difficult of ascertainment. That there will be a substantial reduction, as we shall show, admits of no doubt.

The views of the minority say:

It is impossible to state with entire accuracy how much the bill increases taxes.

The majority of the House committee can not ascertain the amount of decrease; the minority can not ascertain the amount of increase; all is doubt, confusion, and uncertainty as to the real effects of a "bill to reduce the revenue."

The reliability of the Senate tables is no more to be regarded than those of the House. The effect upon the revenue, the relief of the people from taxation, the reduction of invoices of commodities which make up the expense of living are by the House committee avowedly and emphatically admitted to have weighed very little with it in arranging the schedules of that bill. Another and entirely different object was kept in view from the title to the end of the bill. Neither has the Senate committee been any more mindful of the demand of the people for a relief from the burdens of taxation. Both bills make a merely nominal reduction of revenue, without the least modification of taxation. But in both bills taxation has been made an instrument to the accomplishment of an end, a means to effect an object totally different from the support of the Government or the relief of the people, and both bills are directed to establish a theory and carry into effect a scheme in which the majority loses more than the minority gains.

That scheme, upon which the bills have been constructed, is to remit duties on sugar and increase duties on other commodities. But, notwithstanding the increased duties, the revenues of the Government are not expected to increase, because it is hoped that importation will be checked by increased duties. The House committee says:

It is not believed that the increase of duties on woollens and upon glassware will have the effect of increasing the duties. That, of course, would follow if the importations of the last fiscal year were hereafter to be maintained, which, however, is altogether improbable. The result will be that importations will be decreased and the amount of revenue collected from these sources will be diminished.

The bills, then, are constructed on "plans and specifications" which

are expected to compel the imports of the country to decrease at least \$130,000,000.

The foundation upon which these bills rest is that commercial prosperity shall be retarded in order that manufactures may be promoted. What will be the effect of such legislation upon the exports of the country, neither committee has attempted to explain. Of the \$730,000,000 of exports the committee take no notice whatever; it did not enter into their deliberations. The labor, capital, enterprise, and energy embraced in that sum of production, as well as the capital employed in its transportation, never once interested either committee.

What is to become of the \$730,000,000 of our exports, when only \$600,000,000 of imports can be bought with them? The interchange of products—the buying of imports with the proceeds of the sale of exports—is to be disarranged. Such a policy must result either in diminishing exports or in an importation of \$130,000,000 gold. The largest importation of gold made since 1840 was \$110,000,000.

Either result would be injurious to the producers of this country. To diminish exports of agriculture would have a direct and ruinous injury to farmer, to merchant, to shipping. In order to diminish imports of merchandise to bring in gold would be a like injury to the producers of this country.

Merchants do not incur the risks of sea, and risk the loss of interest, insurance, and freight for the single profit on the sale of exports in foreign countries. The export trade is most valuable when its proceeds buy in foreign countries the goods of those countries at prices which will enable the selling of those goods at another profit when brought into this country. It is this double profit, first on exports and then on imports, that induces merchants to take the risks incident to foreign commerce. Any policy which diminishes the amount and value of imports necessitates either a diminution of exports or an importation of gold. If the exports diminish—this would be the legitimate result under this bill—that loss falls on American producers; and if production continues under this bill as at present, by retaining a still larger amount of home products in this country, the price of the whole crop is lessened.

The Chicago Tribune of May 10, very pertinent to this, said:

Other nations can take our breadstuffs and provisions only in case we receive their goods in exchange. They can not pay for everything in specie without sweeping away their money and precipitating themselves into a panic. If we refuse to take their goods in exchange for ours, they must trade elsewhere, and hence the McKinley policy of barring out imports would react and deprive this country of markets for the products it must export.

If the American products are sold for gold, the profit on imports of merchandise is lost to the American merchant and to this country. So that whether or not foreigners retaliate with a "restrictive policy," there is an actual and large loss to Americans by any policy which restricts importations. The bulk, volume, and value of our exports are agricultural products which, when sold in foreign countries, enable the American merchant to purchase the products of those countries.

When the aggregate value of American agricultural products in foreign countries purchases an aggregate value of foreign products at prices which when resold in this country pay the double profits and freights, insurance, and interest, the trade is valuable to the country, and the measure of the value is the amount of the double profit. The producers of American agricultural products share directly in the profits of the sale of the exports and indirectly in the profits of the imports. The higher the price of agricultural products in foreign markets, the greater will be the price realized by the farmer for his whole crop, that part sold at home and that part sold abroad, for it is active and retroactive. Any policy or tariff which directly or indirectly restricts the sale of American products abroad reacts on the price in the market at home and reduces the prices of the whole crop. That result follows as much from restriction of imports as from an embargo on exports.

In his report on an international monetary standard (page 180, dated June 9, 1868), Senator SHERMAN said:

Every advance towards a free exchange of commodities is an advance in civilization; every obstruction to a free exchange is born of the same narrow, despotic spirit which planted castles upon the Rhine to plunder peaceful commerce; every obstruction to commerce is a tax upon consumption; every facility to a free exchange cheapens commodities, increases trade and population, and promotes civilization.

The avowed policy of these bills is to embarrass the exchange of commodities, restricting imports, and its inevitable consequences, such as predicted by the Senator, will be a loss to the American agriculturists, merchants, and shippers. The policy of these bills helps only a small part of the American manufacturers; the losses fall on the whole American people, and thus the majority lose more than the minority gain; the poor and the many are impoverished that the rich and the few may profit.

A part of the fallacy upon which this bill is framed rests upon a corollary of the protective idea: that a trade which returns gold to this country is more profitable than a trade which returns merchandise.

In trade \$100 in merchandise is worth more than \$100 in gold, or otherwise the merchandise would not have been purchased. In commerce, \$100 in merchandise means the \$100 in gold plus the profit on the sale of the merchandise. Therefore, a trade with foreign countries which brings to this country \$150,000,000 in merchandise is more val-

uable to this country than the same trade when it returns \$150,000,000 in gold, and the measure of the increased value of that trade is the amount by which the profits on the merchandise exceeds the value of exchange on gold. In other times, when the relations of trade were studied under the dogmas of the restrictive or protective system, the balance of trade was regarded as profitable only when the exports exceeded the imports and the difference was returned in gold.

The effect of such trade must necessarily be a diminution of exports, since the foreign purchaser of American products, by paying in gold, loses his profits on the sale of the foreign goods. He either does not purchase when he can not sell or purchases at a less price in gold than he would give if he could make a profit on his goods. In either case the loss falls on the American product and reacts on the American agriculturist, who suffers a double loss: a loss on the exported part of his crops and a loss on the home-consumed part by a diminution of price on the whole crop. It was blatantly claimed and proclaimed that this "House was a business House, not a debating society." But this bill is not a business bill for the American farmer, nor for the American people, but a strictly business bill for a few, a selected part of the people.

This bill lays a heavy hand on agriculture and shipping. It is framed to restrict importations; such a result will be a diminution of exports, of agricultural values. Keeping at home more of the crop diminishes the price of the whole crop by increasing the supply when the demand has already been filled. The shipping interest by the working of this bill loses the freight on the restricted importations as well as upon the diminished exportation. What avail will bounties be to ship-builders when the tariff has deprived them of so large a part of their freights both on imports and exports? This protective policy not only embarrasses the building of ships, but follows those which bounties induce to be built and deprives them of the means of living on the ocean after they are completed.

The alleged policy of the bill is to encourage and promote American manufactures by securing to them the home markets without the competition of foreign products. That has been the avowed policy of every protective tariff since 1816, and after seventy-four years our infant industries are said not to be able to stand alone and at the age of three-quarters of a century are represented by the Republican party to be in a state of primary dentition, requiring Government pap and the leading strings and the helping hand of protection.

That portion of the products of our farms, our forests, and our mines not needed at home make up the surplus of products after supplying our people and are the products which we must dispose of abroad or retain at home to swell the volume in the home market beyond the home demand, thus reducing the price of the whole crop. Of that surplus agriculture contributed in breadstuffs \$123,876,061; provisions, \$104,122,444; raw cotton, \$237,775,270; manufactured tobacco, \$18,901,068; live animals, \$18,734,805; other articles, \$70,908,158; total of agriculture, \$532,141,490.

AGRICULTURE.

Mr. President, a recent bulletin from the Agricultural Department says:

The returns of prices of farm products to the Agricultural Department are lower than ever before. The lowest average estimated value of corn in former years was 31.8 cents, in 1878; and since that date 32.8 cents, in 1885. The present average is 29.1 cents. The average of wheat estimates is 70.6 cents. This is not the lowest, as the average in December, 1884, was 64.5 cents; in 1887, 61.1 cents; in 1890, 68.7 cents. The average price of oats is lower than ever reported. In 1878 it was 24.6 cents per bushel; at the present it is 23.23 cents. Prices of barley, rye, and buckwheat are also very low.

The remedy proposed by this bill for that extraordinary condition of farming values is to be found in duties raised as follows: On corn from 10 cents to 15 cents. Last year there were imported 2,388 and exported 69,592,929 bushels. Not enough imported to feed the consumers of one of the small villages of our 60,000,000 inhabitants. Wheat is tariffed from 20 to 25 cents. There were imported last year 1,946 bushels, and brought in revenue to the enormous amount of \$389,20, and exported 46,414,129 bushels. Oats from 10 cents to 25 cents; imported 22,324, exported 624,266 bushels. Wheat flour from 20 to 25 per cent. ad valorem; imported 1,155 barrels, and exported 9,373,803 bushels. And so on through the whole range of agricultural products. The imports are so insignificantly small when compared with the exports as to become farcical, and this is done to win the farmer. Birds are not always captured with chaff, Mr. President! The only examples which could be cited of agricultural products being imported to any extent were those from Canada, whence the article of beans finds its way into New York and Boston.

Turning to the volume of hearings before the Ways and Means Committee (House), the Senate will find (from page 842 to page 861 almost exclusively devoted to the argument of protecting beans) nineteen pages of closely printed matter on this product, the burden of the grievance being that Canadian beans were underselling the American article and that unless the great principle of protection was invoked there would be ruin all along the line of the great Erie Canal from Buffalo to Albany. The point was carried before the committee, and beans are hereafter to be protected against the Canadians by a duty (in four different paragraphs under chemicals) as a farm and field product "40 cents per bushel of 60 pounds."

Beans demonstrate the virtues of protection, but this object of protection has heretofore been so mixed with peace that it is impossible to find what has been the amount of imported beans that is to be guarded against. The duty on hay is to be raised from \$2 to \$4 per ton because of Canadian help to feed the horses of New York City. Also, from the same restricted locality came the cry for an increased duty on wheat. The whole wheat crop of Canada (as stated in the volume on Commerce and Navigation, page 54) was 32,000,000 bushels, which, after supplying its population, would not leave for exportation flour enough to make a "johnny cake" around for the canal-boatmen who would transport it.

These are the examples of protection to agriculture that are injected as "stump speeches" in the report to deceive and delude the farmers of the country by leading them to suppose that equal protection has been given to agriculture with that extended to manufactures. Such bald hypocrisy is an insult to their intelligence.

The Finance Committee of the Senate not having made virtually any report of the reasons and arguments which induced that committee to limit its reductions of duties imposed in the original bill, we are compelled to seek in the report of the House Committee on Ways and Means for the reasons of public policy which underlie this bill. The Committee on Ways and Means in its report pays to agriculture the tribute of most complimentary words, saying:

This great industry is foremost in magnitude and importance in our country. No prosperity is possible to other industries if agriculture languish. In so far as the fostering care of Government can be helpful it must be faithfully and forcefully exerted to build up and strengthen agriculture.

Brave and handsome words. But when agriculturists call for bread they get a stone, and for meat a serpent; for one looks in vain through this bill for one helpful, faithful, or forceful provision that is to lift the existing "widespread depression" that now prevails among our farmers. The voice is that of Jacob, but the hand is that of Esau.

The House committee say that "all the relief which tariff legislation can give to it" is to "advance the rates upon the products of the soil which either do supply or can be brought to supply the home consumption. Horses, cattle, hogs, sheep, bacon, barley, beans, pease, beef, mutton, pork, buckwheat, butter, cheese, eggs, hay, hops, milk, poultry, flaxseed, vegetables, potatoes, flax, hemp, hides" (this last was properly transferred to the free-list after the report was written, upon the demand of New England leather manufacturers), "wool, tobacco, and many other products are advanced with a view to save this entire market to the American farmers."

If this entire market for agricultural products was not already the exclusive market of the American farmer there might be some value in such tariff legislation. But it is simply "carrying coal to Newcastle." The American farmer already possesses this entire market, and his productions not only fill this market, but overflow and seek other markets from which the operation of this bill would shut him out.

Mr. McKINLEY says that, "For whatever the foreign market is worth to our citizens will be just as accessible under this bill as under the present law." But the committee report says:

The world's market, to which the advocates of tariff for revenue only invite the farmers of this country, is to-day crowded with products of the cheapest human labor on earth. All over the Old World there is a rush of their surplus to their market, and it is to such as this that free-trade should allure American agriculture.

What else can be done? After supplying the home market with all that it could possibly consume, there remained last year \$532,141,490 of agricultural products which sought sale in that world's market, poor as it is represented to be by the committee. There was nowhere else for it to go. It was not wanted at home, could not be used in America, and unless sent abroad must rot and decay as well as reduce the price in the home market.

American agriculture is confronted with a condition of affairs for which this bill makes no attempt at relief. But, if made a law, this bill will compel the farmer either to grow smaller crops—less wheat, less corn, less everything—or sacrifice his surplus at home and let that surplus sacrifice the price of his whole crop. It is so now, even to the burning of corn for fuel in the West.

The horses, cattle, and sheep of the farmer the bill makes a pretense of protecting from foreign importations, in order "to save this active market" to them; and the report says that—

In the last ten years not less than \$60,000,000 worth of cattle, horses, and sheep, ordinary marketable stock, has been imported.

If last year's importation of horses was a fair sample, the stock imported heretofore was indeed "ordinary." The average value of the 52,454 horses imported last year was \$42.81. Of these, 29,590 came from Mexico, with an average value of \$8.80. These Mexican ponies, bought by the cowboys of the plains, paid \$52,369 in duties, under the existing law, but under the McKinley bill would pay \$887,700; that is to say, they would not be imported, and American products which were sent into Mexico with which to buy the ponies will have to stay at home and be saved in this market of surplus.

Of cattle imported last year the number was 62,380, with an average value of \$9.68—cheap cows to replenish farmers' dairies. The duty under this bill is, "on cattle more than one year old, \$10 per head; less than one year old, \$2 per head;" 100 per cent. duty the farmer must

pay, unless he is a capitalist farmer breeding fancy cattle, and then he may import duty free. This bill will make the majority—the working farmers—pay 100 per cent. on cheap cattle, but the minority—the cattle fanciers—may import duty free. The farmer who would import a hog must pay \$1.50. The swine fancier may import his pure-bred pig duty free. And so also for sheep. The majority must pay duty—double duty—but the minority may import duty free.

So, Mr. President, it is purely class legislation and operates for the few against the many, the rich against the poor. If the duty on the foreign article protects the home manufacture, does not the cattle duty protect the cattle trust, which is, I believe, a purely American institution, of which we hear so much? It was but a few years ago that the State Department collected from all countries full information on breeds of cattle, and published the excellent work on dairy farming in all countries of the world. Of what avail will the information, great and valuable as it is, which that book contains, be to the farmer who wishes to import for use and not exclusively for breeding purposes, when he must pay 100 per cent. on such milch cows?

I allude to these futile and ineffectual pretenses of protecting farmers with no purpose to excite again the unfriendly criticism and ridicule with which their first announcement was received. Nor is it my purpose to dispute the honesty of the motives which led the authors of this bill to insert these useless duties. It was reducing, it is true, protection to an absurdity, but no doubt it was honestly done by those who worship at that false shrine of protection. Confirmatory of what I have said, I quote from the honorable chairman of the Appropriation Committee of the Senate, who in 1870, on this same protection of the farmer, said:

But I am told you must so legislate as to furnish a home market for all our agricultural products, and this can only be done by high tariff. Any one examining the subject will see that our agricultural products increase more rapidly than our population, so that if we do not export these products in their natural condition we must do so by converting them into manufactured articles and export these articles. But this can not be done under a high tariff, for all nations will buy manufactured products where they are cheapest, and the nation selling cheapest controls the market. This rule excludes our highly taxed materials from the markets of the world, although we have natural advantages possessed by no other nation.

Protection is a remedy common alike to agriculture, commerce, and manufactures, and can not be made a success. (RECORD, page 544.)

Mr. President, I have read of a traveler who saw two doses of the same medicine administered at the same time, one to a weaver and one to a farmer. The unfortunate farmer died; the weaver recovered. Our Baconian traveler entered in his note-book that the medicine kills farmers, but cures weavers. Your protection nostrum may be a specific for tin-plate, but is death to wheat and corn.

I will not say that it was carelessness, I do not believe it was indifference, which induced the committee to say:

We have not been as much concerned about the prices of the articles we consume as we have been to encourage a system of "home production."

And yet the consumers are the whole body of the people.

Such an avowal of utter disregard of the interests of the whole people, and pronounced purpose to construct a bill on lines which would foster, encourage, and pamper with inordinate profits a small part of the people, at the cost and expense of the whole country, certainly was applying the fiscal power of the Government to party and personal ends with more vigor and directness than was ever attempted before in the history of the country. But it is in thorough harmony with the theory and details of the bill, which are utterly indifferent to the cost of living, the prices of products, and the expenses of farmers, provided the profits on clothing, hardware, tableware, carpets, earthenware, glassware, and agricultural products are made by increased duties to flow in unbroken and increasing streams into the tills of rich protectionists—those from whom, in current parlance, the "fat was fried," whose "sinews of war" commanded "blocks of five," and who, to save the enormities of this bill, are again to be sacrificed by the same process on the same altar.

However unconcerned the committee may be about prices, the great, the absorbing question among farmers, and not only among farmers, but among manufacturers also, is how to increase the price of products. That question exceeds at present in importance the one which seemed to concern the committee most, how to increase production? The committee dodged the former and devoted its consideration to the latter.

Show the farmer how to increase the prices of his products and he will soon find the way to lift the mortgage from his homestead. It is worse than cruelty to tell him that he is paying less for all he buys than ever before; that protection has reduced the cost of living, lowered the price of clothing, utensils, and provisions; that he is far better off in the good things of this world than the pauper peasant of Europe. There stands the mortgage, a living fact, and alongside of it are the returns of this year's sale of products at prices which fail to meet expenses, to keep down interest, or to supply an installment on his mortgages.

Your thirty years of protection has brought no relief; to-day he is worse off than ever before. He demands a change from "protection." He feels that no change in the fiscal policy can injure him. He has relied on the home market. He finds it glutted with American farm products and their prices lower than ever before, as the Agricultural

Department shows. He stands on the brink of ruin and exclaims, "If such protectionists are my friends, then save me from my friends!" He reads in the testimony before the Ways and Means Committee from Mr. Girard C. Brown, of Pennsylvania (page 863), that—

The fact is prices are too low to yield a living profit, while taxes remain unreduced and the expenses of living are disproportioned to the means of meeting them.

The protective system has not, at least in the case of those farmers located near the great protected industries, resulted in the protection promised them, that of an ample and sufficient home market. Hence the loss of profit on their products followed by the loss of value of their farms, which, unless checked, must result in the loss of the farms themselves.

Pennsylvania farmers are not alone "confronted with this condition." In New England the "dry-rot" is still worse. Lacking some of the advantages which enabled us to still hold out, they sooner went to the wall.

I quote from a recent report: "There are eight hundred and eighty-seven deserted farms in New Hampshire with buildings on them in a fair state of repair or that might easily be made fit for occupancy. This information has been received in reply to an official circular of the State commissioner of emigration making inquiry of the selectmen of one hundred and sixty towns. These deserted farms are in easy reach of the busy factories of New England. They have a home market, with its attractions, and are a sample of the way a home market enriches the husbandman."

Further as to New Hampshire I cite another authority: "Perhaps no better answer to the stock argument of the protectionists—that the farmer gains more from the local market made by manufacturing villages and towns than he loses in the increased cost of the goods he buys—can be found than a statement of the condition of some of the towns near these manufacturing cities on the Merrimack River. The Merrimack turns more spindles than any other river in the world. Within a few miles of each other, around the great bend of the river from south to east, are the cities of Nashua, Lowell, Lawrence, and Haverhill. In the farming towns of Windham, Pelham, and Hudson, N. H., situated within the bend, and so within easy access of all four of the above-named cities, we ought to find prosperous 'protected' farming."

"On one main road from Lowell to Windham, 12 miles, I count six deserted sets of farm buildings, besides several which have already gone to ruin. Fields and pastures are growing up to wood; houses in which, a generation ago, sturdy manhood and womanhood flourished, are gone to utter ruin; in many school districts there are not sufficient children to have a school. The whole appearance is one of poverty and decay; to ride along our country roads is extremely depressing. In no part of New England with which I am acquainted is the decay of the farming interests so obvious and so complete as here by the manufacturing cities. Instead of the homogeneous population of thrifty, intelligent, self-respecting farmers and mechanics that occupied this section fifty years ago, we now have, in our cities, a few fine streets of residences for the capitalists and employers, and in our 'French Acre,' 'Irish Acre,' corporation boarding and tenement houses, and in our country a desert—for it is already nearly that."

"Possibly this may be 'progress,' and a modern, improved kind of progress—one that has not been brought about by rude, natural causes, but one that results from the incomparable wisdom of our legislators, who are so kindly taxing us into wealth. Our farming interests would have suffered enough from the inevitable competition with more favored sections; but the ruin has been precipitated by the tremendous burden of taxation that the farmer has borne. It is no small thing when a nation renders impossible the existence of a class that has been the source of so much energy, talent, and character as have the New England farmers."

While as to Massachusetts, Connecticut, and New York we do not have a similar official record, it will be noticed by the traveler that deserted farms are not unknown, and it is a fact that hundreds of farms can be purchased in those States for less than the cost of buildings, making the land practically free of cost to buyers.

In New Jersey, Judge Forsyter, of Pemberton, says: "The farmers are not prosperous; although they are all depending on a home market, they are all going behindhand."

Mr. Edmund Cook testified at a late meeting of the State board of agriculture: "The farms of Burlington County if put on the market to-day would not bring the cost of buildings and improvements, to say nothing of the land."

In New York, State Assessor Wood says "that in a few decades there will be few or none but tenant farmers in this State."

In Illinois the report of the Bureau of Labor Statistics for 1887 shows farm indebtedness—

1870	\$65,721,900
1880	103,525,237
1887	123,733,098

And states that "mortgage indebtedness of farmers for money borrowed has increased 23 per cent, since 1880, more than twice the increase of farm lands."

From report of same bureau for the next year, 1888, I quote:

"This table shows that there are 8,082,794 acres of Illinois land under mortgage besides the mortgages on 237,336 lots and on chattels. From statistics on the same page it appears that there were filed in the single year 1887 a total of 125,923 new mortgages for the immense sum of \$117,152,857, covering 2,178,532 acres of land and 65,066 lots, as well as miscellaneous property or chattels to the value of \$17,000,000. These figures of the new indebtedness for a single year are, it will be observed, more than one-fourth of the total mortgage indebtedness of the State, as estimated in the table quoted above. This fact shows that the estimated total is below the real amount, yet even the low estimate is startling."

"The population of Illinois by the census of 1880 was 3,077,871. Say that is now 4,000,000, and divide that amount by five to arrive at the number of heads of families. We have thus 800,000, which is close to the real number, as the total Illinois vote of 1888 was 748,000. Averaging among these the total mortgage indebtedness, as estimated by the State administration, it makes a debt of \$520 for every head of family in the State, while the new debt contracted in 1887 alone makes \$146.25 for each head of family."

"The condition of Kansas and other Western States is even worse."

Another report places indebtedness represented by Western farm mortgages at \$3,422,000,000, or \$200 per capita for about 17,000,000 population. From Kansas a private letter from an old resident, who moved into the Neosho Valley from Pennsylvania in 1856, a good, successful business man, says:

"Times are close, never so bad before. Though blessed with good crops we can not sell for half what they are worth. During all the years I have been here I never knew things so low. Corn is 15 cents per bushel; oats, 10 cents; wheat, 55 cents; potatoes, 22 cents; fat cows and heifers, 11 cents on hoof; hay, \$2 a ton; 50 bushels of corn for a plain overcoat. To sell 25 acres of corn, or 1,000 bushels, for \$150, after hauling it ten miles, is a hard way to make money."

But why multiply the "cloud of witnesses?" No one denies the unfortunate condition of our finances and no one can claim that the vaunted home market has materialized. It is proper for this committee to consider the facts as they are about to consider the revision of a system under which this unfortunate condition has arisen.

I do not come here with any panacea. I present admitted facts. They are stubborn. Other great and important interests, which, however, their warmest

devotees will not vote as more important than agriculture, may claim that a protective tariff has benefited them; it clearly has not us. They may assert it as necessary to their existence, that "it is the breath of life to their nostrils;" it does not seem to vitalize agriculture.

If agriculture was as flourishing as manufactures ought to be with 47 per cent. tariff, then doubtless they would be told that this was the cause of their prosperity. How, then, can we resist the inference that it is a factor of our depression?

Now we hear the cry that agriculture must have the same protection as manufactures. Grant it; how can we get it through a tariff?

What will you favor with higher rates of duty? How can you thus help the price of any of our great staples, when we produce them largely in excess of our needs and always have a surplus to sell abroad?

If we produce 450,000,000 bushels of wheat and can consume but 325,000,000, the remaining 125,000,000 must find another market or eventually rot here, and the price wheat sells for in that market delimits the market price of the much larger portion that we do use here. The present tariff of 20 cents a bushel does not affect the price, and were it twice 20 cents, or were it \$20, it still would not increase it 1 cent a bushel. This illustration holds for the great staple products of our farms.

As we can not help their producers by imposing a higher tariff, I do not see how we can aid them by giving more protection to sundry minor crops, mere specialties, of which the major part can only be produced in certain localities or under peculiar conditions.

To do any real good to agriculture we must do that which will benefit the great majority, and not the small minority.

As the present tariff does not solve this problem, as its increase since 1861 has been accompanied by a decline of agricultural prosperity, it seems also to look in that direction for relief.

Mr. Brown very logically concludes:

We might try the other way out of the dilemma and see what would be the result of reducing the tariff on those things which the farmer needs but does not produce.

Since you ask what is my remedy, I say, knock off the tariff for surplus. Give us a tariff which is not framed to pay a bounty to other interests at the expense of the farmers, who are the largest consumers and the heaviest tax-payers, which is limited to the needs of an honest economical government, and which is levied as much as possible on the luxuries and as little as possible on the necessities of life.

This is the kind of protection we need, and I think is about all the real protection you can give us.

Compare Mr. Brown's remedy with Mr. McKINLEY'S. Contrast the two by the light of experience and reason; the former reduces taxes, the latter increases them; the former lightens the burdens of government, the latter augments them; the former asks fair play and equal rights, a just and honest spreading of Government's necessary expenses over all classes; the latter concentrates those expenses on one class and distributes the profits of trade, manufacture, and commerce among another class exclusively.

Mr. President, the depression among the farmers began with the panic of 1873, and has continued to this day, when it has reached the point where agricultural values have almost disappeared. The placards that are posted all over Western towns, that fill the advertising columns of all papers, "Eastern money to loan on improved farms," tell the true character of existing conditions, which make farming no longer a valuable employment.

Republicans say that "the farmer lives until he dies," but the laborer under this robber tariff dies even while living. If Western farmers groan under mortgages, what misery must be felt by New Hampshire, Vermont, New York, and New Jersey land-owners—no longer farmers!

The Boston Herald says:

You can buy a New Hampshire and Vermont farm for just about what you have to pay for a 7 by 9 room for a single season at a fashionable summer hotel.

The bulletin from the Agricultural Department having shown the farmer's receipts for corn to be 29.1 cents, for wheat 70.6 cents, for oats 23 cents, and so on through a descending scale to ruin, I will not trace the increased expenditures which tariff legislation helps in accelerating his speed to bankruptcy. While it is true that no Federal tax-gatherer presents an annual bill for taxes, yet the collection goes on daily, hourly, on every article of clothing, on every utensil of farm or household; and the same holds true with the wage-earner—the day-laborer, the clerk, the mechanic, the car-driver, the coachman, the cook, the nurse, or the newsboy—they are contributing not only in patriotic taxes, but in hard wrung tribute to the extra profits of another class of their fellow-citizens. For every dollar the farmer or wage-earner pays to the Government \$5 go to the manufacturer as bounty.

On a suit of working clothes costing \$7 the bounty to the manufacturer is \$2.27; on a better suit costing \$20, bounty \$6.48; overcoats costing \$15, bounty \$4.85; two flannel shirts \$1.50, bounty 64 cents; two pairs of flannel drawers \$1.50, bounty 64 cents; six pairs of woolen socks \$2, bounty 86 cents; one woolen hat \$3, bounty \$1.29; one woolen cap \$1, bounty 43 cents; one pair of suspenders 50 cents, bounty 14 cents; one pair of shoes \$3.50, bounty 70 cents; one pair of woolen gloves 50 cents, bounty 21 cents; rubber coat \$3.50, bounty 80 cents; umbrella \$1, bounty 34 cents; three linen handkerchiefs \$1, bounty 26 cents; one silk tie 50 cents, bounty 17 cents; one pocket-knife \$1.25, bounty 42 cents; shaving-brush 35 cents, bounty 9 cents; four cotton shirts \$3, bounty 75 cents; two pair of cotton drawers \$1, bounty 31 cents; one woven scarf 50 cents, bounty 21 cents; three calico dresses for wife, cost \$2.25, bounty 50 cents; three aprons 50 cents, bounty 10 cents; two woolen dresses \$16, bounty \$6.60; two balmoral skirts \$3, bounty \$1.10; two cotton skirts \$1.50, bounty 25 cents; two flannel suits \$3, bounty \$1.29 cents; woolen cloak \$12, bounty \$2.89; shawl \$6, bounty \$2.79; hood \$1.25, bounty 54 cents; straw bonnet \$1, bounty 23 cents; two pairs of shoes \$4,

bounty 80 cents; rubbers 50 cents, bounty 10 cents; parasol \$2, bounty 40 cents; veil 70 cents, bounty 24 cents; 5 yards of ribbon 50 cents, bounty 17 cents; three linen collars 50 cents, bounty 12 cents; three pairs of linen cuffs 60 cents, bounty 14 cents; three handkerchiefs 75 cents, bounty 20 cents; tuck-comb 20 cents, bounty 7 cents; tooth-brush 35 cents, bounty 8 cents; pair of woolen mits 50 cents, bounty 21 cents; pair of gloves \$1.25, bounty 47 cents.

These are the tributes paid under the existing tariff; so that at present, on an expenditure of \$61.90 for a wife's store bill, the farmer or wage-earner has to pay \$20.76 in tariff taxes, about one-fifth of which goes to swell the surplus when it is not needed and four-fifths to pamper the luxurious-living capitalists.

The Mills bill would have given relief from part of this tax, but the McKinley bill adds to all these bounties by increasing the duties. For example, under the act of May 9, 1890, classifying worsteds as woolens, the protection is 91.47 per cent. Proposed duties additional by H. R. 9416, 120.93 per cent. on coats, astrakhans, and plushes; the present rate of duty on silk plushes costing 50 cents is 50 per cent. in the McKinley bill; with the Senate attachment it will be 225 per cent.; astrakhans costing 48 cents, present duty 75 per cent., proposed rate of duty 172 per cent.; astrakhans costing 35 cents, present rate 80 per cent., proposed 180 per cent., etc. (See protest, page 11.) In dress goods the same discrimination against the lowest-priced goods is seen in the following table.

Foreign price, in cents.	Width.	Present duty.	Proposed duty.
	Inches.	Per cent.	Per cent.
8	26	80.01	103.25
12	26	65.08	82.16
15	26	59.08	73.73
15	36	63.33	86.69
15½	36	68.03	102.91

Women's and children's dress goods under 4 ounces square yard, cotton and wool goods at present pay duty, if value is not over 20 cents per square yard, 5 cents per square yard and 35 per cent.; if valued over 20 cents per square yard, 7 cents per square yard and 40 per cent. The new tariff is 7-40 up to 15 cents per square yard, then 8-50 provided the warp is wholly of cotton and under 4 ounces to the square yard.

SILK WARP HENRIETTES.

All-wool dress-goods not over 4 ounces per square yard:

Value in cents.	Present duty, (9-40).	Present duty.	New duty, (12-50).	New duty.
	Cents.	Per cent.	Cents.	Per cent.
30	22	73.33	28.33	94.44
40	26	65	33.33	83.33
50	30	60	38.33	76.67
60	34	56.66	43.33	72.22

Comparison on "all-wool" or "in part wool" dress-goods over 4 ounces per square yard, say 42-inch goods:

Value in cents.	Weight.	Present duty.	New duty.
		Per cent.	Per cent.
30	(*)	78.33	98.13
40	(*)	68.75	86.10
50	(*)	63	78.80
60	(*)	59.16	74.06
100	(*)	51.50	64.44

* 4½ ounces per square yard.

The importers in their protest against the bill show the difference of rate of tax on a black brilliantine: in Holland 5 per cent., Turkey 8 per cent., Belgium 10 per cent., France 15 per cent., Italy 25 per cent., Germany and Austria 27½ per cent., Canada 27½ per cent., United States 61½ per cent. at present and 92½ per cent. under the McKinley bill. Black and colored cotton-velvets, used almost exclusively by the laboring classes, at present pay an ad valorem duty of 40 per cent. The following table exhibits the unnecessary increase of taxes upon the class of people least able to bear increased burdens:

Cost in cents.	Present duty.	Proposed duty.
	Per cent.	Per cent.
10	40	81
12	42	82
16	40	55
20	40	50

Thus it appears that the cheaper grade of goods will suffer the worst from the proposed bill. Its provisions will bear with greatest weight on the laboring classes and will lay its greatest burden on the poor man.

A study of the subjoined table on silks and velvets will show that it is in the low grades of goods, bought by the poorer classes, that the greatest increase of duty is found.

Description of goods.	Price.	Present duty.	Proposed duty.
		Per cent.	Per cent.
Silks and satins:			
Satins, piece-dyed, 18 inches.....	\$0.21	50	68
Satins, piece-dyed, 24 inches.....	.25	50	80
Satins, piece-dyed, 36 inches.....	.45	50	61
Satins, yarn-dyed, 20 inches.....	.45	50	61
Satins, yarn-dyed, 20 inches.....	.60	50	46.5
All-silk satin.....	1.00	50	47
Piece-dyed surahs.....	.27	50	81
Black faille.....	.80	50	60
Do.....	2.00	50	42
Black gros grain.....	.70	50	67.5
Do.....	1.30	50	63
Black faille française.....	.95	50	72
Do.....	2.10	50	51
Black merveilleux.....	.75	50	65
Silk and cotton.....	.45	50	118
Do.....	.65	50	143
Do.....	1.10	50	109
All silk.....	2.25	50	54
Ribbons:			
Colored velvet, silk, and cotton.....	.82	50	88
Black satin and velvet.....	.17	50	72
Black all-silk gros grain.....	.07	50	64
Do.....	.16	50	40

An examination of the linen schedule will show that the harshest additions to the cost of goods are to be found in the cheaper grades, such as are in common use by the masses. Thus, cheap table-cloths and handkerchiefs are taxed almost double, while the finer grades as a rule are untouched. Its direct and necessary effect will be to enhance the cost of articles that enter into the daily life of the working masses.

Description of goods.	Foreign value in sterling.	Present rate of duty.	McKinley tariff and administrative bills.
	Pence.	Per cent.	Per cent.
Union linen lawn for women's dresses.....	3	35	60
Printed lawn for women's dresses.....	3½	35	60
Crash for roller towels.....	2	35	70
Huck towels.....	75	35	65
Unbleached damask for table linen.....	9	35	65
Bleached damask for table linen.....	14	35	65
Do.....	120	35
Unbleached table-cloths.....	11½	35	65
Bleached table-cloths.....	240	35
Gray damask stair crash.....	2½	35	70
Gray damask floor or carpet covering.....	16½	85	65
Women's linen handkerchiefs.....	18	35	60
Do.....	240	35
Men's linen handkerchiefs.....	24	35	60
Do.....	120	35
Housekeeping linens:			
No. 1. 1 bale 18½-inch striped crash, at 2s.....	35	65
No. 2. 1 case 20 by 40 loom huck towels, at 4s.....	35	60
No. 3. 1 bale 19-inch fine bleached crash, at 4s.....	35	99
No. 4. 1 case 54-inch loom damask, at 8s.....	35	55
No. 5. 1 case 63-inch bleached damask, at 15s.....
No. 6. 1 bale 15-inch "Russia" linen crash, used by all poor people.....	35	76
No. 7. Bale 16-inch "Irish" linen crash.....	35	69
No. 8. 1 bale 17-inch "Irish" twilled linen crash.....	35	69
Unbleached damask.....	8½	35	60
24-inch brown farmer's drill, used for summer clothing.....	3½	35	63
34-inch duck coating, used for clothing.....	3½	35	60.25
25-inch elastic canvas, used as raw material by clothing manufacturers.....	2½	35	66
26-inch brown linen duck, used as raw material by clothing manufacturers.....	4½	35	60

This contrast of the two sides of a farmer's account—that which he receives for his farm products and that which he pays for his daily consumption—shows that under Republican legislation he is "cutting the ditch at both ends," and that unless there is a change of policy, change of party, change of Administration, the day can not be distant before the corporation that loaned the money must foreclose the mortgage and enter in possession and the farmer become a tenant at will to the capitalist who owns the homestead by virtue of the operation of Republican laws and policy.

SUGAR.

But, Mr. President, it is under the sugar schedule that the great bulk of reduction of duties is made, both by the House bill and by the

Senate amendment. The House bill reduces the revenue by the sugar schedule \$55,975,884.52. The Senate amendment reduces its sugar schedule \$55,758,220.98, less than the House \$217,663.54. The total reduction of duties by the House bill is \$60,736,896.12 and by the Senate amendment \$60,599,343.69, so that it is from sugar that the reduction of the revenue is mainly desired by both the House bill and the Senate amendment.

The House committee, as the reason for selecting sugar as almost the sole article upon which reduction of duties should be made, says:

When it is considered that this increase in cost due to the duty on sugar falls on an article of prime necessity as food, your committee are persuaded that justice as well as good policy requires that such an unnecessary burden in the way of a direct tax should be removed from sugar, and that the encouragement required to induce the production of sugar in the United States should be given through a bounty rather than by an import duty.

The "encouragement" to the production of sugar in this country, proposed by the committee, is a bounty of 2 cents per pound. The work to be performed by this "encouragement" is expected to increase the sugar product of the United States from 375,904,197 pounds, the amount of sugar at present annually consumed in this country, to 3,076,277,072 pounds. The bounty, the first of the fifteen years, will be \$7,520,000, and increase yearly with the encouraged product until it reaches \$61,528,426, the bounty of the present annual consumption. But each year the population increases, and with that increase the consumption of sugar increases, so that the bounty must grow annually larger and larger and draw even more heavily upon the Treasury and upon the people.

Without stopping to inquire into this annual growth of the bounty tax the existing data shows that the revenue losses from the repeal of the duty on—

Sugar	\$55,975,610
And from the bounty	7,520,000
Total loss the first year	63,495,610

and the fifteenth year, without any increase of population and consumption, if this country should then raise all the sugar it consumes, the bounty paid from the Treasury would be \$61,528,426, which, with the loss of revenue now received from its importation, amounting to \$55,975,610, would together amount to \$117,504,036, equal to a tax of 3.9 cents per pound on sugar. Thus, to relieve the consumer from a tax of 2 cents per pound, the result will finally be a tax of 3.9 cents per pound, and that tax will increase each year as the bounty increases with the increased production, so that the premium of 2 cents, paid by the bounty, and the loss of revenue of 2 cents, both to be made up in other taxes by the people, is virtually an increasing charge upon the consumer rather than a repeal of a tax upon a necessary of life. The House committee adds an additional reason:

In providing that not only raw sugar, but also sugar up to and including No. 16, shall be admitted free of duty an opportunity is given for the free introduction of yellow sugars suited for family use, an arrangement which will secure to our people sugar at the lowest price existing in the markets of the world, while even imported white refined sugar will be subject to a duty of only four-tenths of 1 cent per pound.

It is only necessary to remark that the Senate committee destroys that whole paragraph by substituting No. 13 for No. 16 and subjecting all sugars between No. 13 and No. 16 to a duty of three-tenths of 1 cent per pound, preventing the yellow sugars from free importation and substituting for the House duty of four-tenths of a cent on all sugars between No. 16 and No. 20, a duty of six-tenths of a cent, and thereby giving to the refiners the whole American market and practically destroying all competition in white refined sugars.

The Republican party in the House and in the Senate take different views of this sugar schedule, "the two wings do not flap together;" and Mr. McKenna, Representative from California, charges both wings with having deserted the principle of protection, which he avers should be universal or not at all, should promote the welfare of the whole and not pamper the profits of a part of the people.

Will the repeal of all duties on sugar, or free sugar, reduce the price of sugar to the consumer? At present, sugar from the Sandwich Islands is admitted free of duty and reaches the people of California without the burden of custom taxes. Has that free importation reduced the price to the consumer? In reply to that question I quote from the RECORD (page 4630) the following colloquy between two Republican Representatives in the House, Mr. GEAR, a member of the Ways and Means Committee, and Mr. CANNON, the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. CANNON. May I ask the gentleman a question?

Mr. GEAR. Certainly.

Mr. CANNON. Do I understand the gentleman to say that sugar which comes from the Sandwich Islands under the reciprocity treaty, without the payment of duty, commands the same price when it lands in our ports on the Pacific coast or elsewhere, and when it goes to the consumer, which the sugar commands which comes from Cuba and elsewhere and pays the duty of 2 cents a pound and over?

Mr. GEAR. Yes, sir.

Mr. CANNON. So that therefore the consumer does not get the benefit of the absence of duty on the sugar that comes from the Sandwich Islands, but the advantage inures to the producer of sugar in those islands?

Mr. GEAR. Certainly.

Take another Republican authority, Mr. BUTTERWORTH, of Ohio:

Now let us see what else is proposed to conciliate the farmer. He is offered some free sugar, but that takes revenue from the Treasury which must be made up in some other way, if that revenue shall be needed. He saves in the cost of sugar as many millions of dollars, but he loses it to the revenue. His loss does not stop there, for he has to pay it out in bounty. But that is not all. The farmer will have, after all, to pay well for his sugar, if he be required to pay a bounty, and when that bounty will stop no one knows. So he may not in the end realize any cheaper sugar if the bounty is continued, and he has lost revenue to the Government which must be made up. He has also, on account of his good fortune in having the abolition of the sugar tariff, to become realized to being fleeced by those other industries, so called, that I have just mentioned.

This Republican leader from Ohio shows that to save \$1 on sugar the farmers lose \$5 to the "other industries, so called."

Again, the distinguished leader, Secretary Blaine, warns his party and his country that free sugar may be obtained at an expensive cost; may be found not worth the price; and he insists that if the necessities of the Republican party demand free sugar it should exact a consideration from the countries that grow sugar. The Sandwich Island experiment of free sugar having utterly failed to reduce the price of the article, Mr. Blaine would secure something more in compensation to this country. He says, writing to Mr. Daniel A. Cony, ex-mayor of Augusta, Me.:

MR. BLAINE ON FREE SUGAR.

You are in error in supposing that I am opposed to sugar being admitted free of duty. My objection is not to free sugar, but the proposed method of making it free. If, in the pending tariff bill, sugar is placed upon the free-list, we give to certain countries a free market for \$95,000,000 of their products, while they are not asked to open their markets to the free admission of a single dollar of American products. We ought to have in exchange for free sugar from certain countries a free market for breadstuffs and provisions, besides various fabrics from all parts of our country. In short, we ought to secure in return for free sugar a market for \$90,000,000 or \$70,000,000 worth of our own products. It will not require reciprocity treaties to secure this great boon. The tariff bill can contain all the necessary conditions. The legislative power is able to secure the desired end. Within the last twenty years we have given the countries south of us free admission for nearly \$90,000,000 worth of their products without receiving a penny's advantage in exchange. If sugar be now made unconditionally free we shall have given to the Latin-American countries free admission for \$150,000,000 of their products. It is time, I think, to look out for some reciprocal advantages. We are a very rich nation, but not rich enough to trade on this unequal basis.

And, Mr. President, in a more important and official form, as Secretary of State, and it is to be supposed with the approval of the President, the matter of legislating on this tariff bill to procure the advantage of a wider market for American products has been brought by Mr. Blaine to the attention of this Congress. The Senator from Maine, Mr. HALE, has offered an amendment to this bill authorizing absolute free trade "with any nation of the American hemisphere" who will reciprocate the offer as to nearly every American product. If that amendment is adopted, then under the "most favored nation" clause of our treaties with other nations must we not "declare the ports of the United States free and open to all" the world? Can we only have free trade with Latin America and high exclusive duties with "the most favored nations" of Europe?

Mr. Blaine evidently regards such legislation that gives all and gets none as "bad politics," hurtful and injurious to home interests. He virtually protests against such trifling with the best interests of the American people, because, however rich the country may be, it is "not rich enough to trade on this unequal basis."

That is not the warning of a Democrat, it is not the caution of a free-trader; it is the advice of an avowed protection Republican, the former candidate of that party for the Presidency, the present Secretary of State. That "unequal basis" of trade, which Mr. Blaine condemns, is the fundamental principle upon which the McKinley bill is constructed; "unequal trade" with foreign countries underlies every schedule of this bill and now finds condemnation from the very leader the party once delighted to follow. Could a party be placed in such a dilemma without embarrassment? Could leaders be more embarrassed by conflicting policies? With a bill carefully constructed on all the lines of advanced protection, tendering a delusive and deceptive benefit of free sugar, in order to advance duties on manufactures, it is suddenly brought, by its own great leader, to face its own "unequal basis" of trade, to confront the great injury it is about to inflict upon American producers, and to consider the vast opportunity it is about to throw away.

There is an evident tone of indignation in the remarks of Mr. Blaine, that in this (McKinley) "tariff bill sugar is placed on the free-list," by which "we give to certain countries a free market for \$95,000,000 annually of their products, while they are not asked to open their markets to the free admission of a single dollar of American products."

Such neglect of American interests would be conspicuous in a bill which blatantly avows its purpose to be "to foster and promote American products and diversify American industry," if it was not the fact that the only report with which this Congress has been favored upon this bill frankly avows that the Republican Ways and Means Committee has not been "much concerned about prices." Hence the free admission of American products to new markets was a matter of such small importance with that committee that it threw away an opportunity which might have formed a market for \$70,000,000 of American products, even while procuring free sugar for our consumers.

It is for this reason that Mr. Blaine cuts loose from the un-Ameri-

can policy of this bill and calls upon his party to halt in its wild and reckless career of neglect of the American producer.

I have cited the assurance of Republican Representatives that the people of this country derive no benefit from that homeopathic pellet of free sugar from the Sandwich Islands.

Now, when the McKinley bill proposes the allopathic bolus of free sugar from all the world, Mr. Blaine, as Secretary of State, advises this Senate "to go slow," in the language of popular caution, and not to throw away an opportunity of opening wider the world's markets for American agriculture.

The corner-stone of the McKinley bill is to check importations of foreign goods, to raise duties, which, by deterring importations, shall encourage home manufactures.

But the Secretary of State, the leader of his party, proposes to encourage importation as the best means of promoting exportations. He advises making a bargain with the Latin-American nations, free sugar imports for free agricultural exports.

When the Democratic platform of 1888 declared that "We favor an American policy based on more intimate commercial relations with the sixteen sister republics of North, Central, and South America," the country was told by the Republican party that it was a free-trade platform, designed to destroy American industry and reduce American labor to the scale of the pauper peasantry of other countries.

Now, the Secretary of State, the Republican leader, without fear, if with his party's reproach, adopts the Democratic platform, and the Senator from Maine openly avows, if not an entire, at least a hemispherical free-trade policy.

If the blessings of increased markets for American agriculture, if a wider range for the products of our farmers can be secured by the suggestions of Mr. Blaine, will it not come sooner and more surely by a proviso in this bill which shall apply immediately and act *pari passu* with the repealing of duties?

Would it not be trifling with a most important subject to repeal duties on sugar and seek by a proviso in the future for free markets? Why should the foreigners enjoy *in presenti* the benefit of our market and the American farmer be relegated *in futuro* to the hoped-for free markets of South America?

Will the Republican party act with Mr. Blaine? Will it accept his suggestion—no free sugar until we get free markets? "We'll see what we will see."

But, Mr. President, in this dilemma what can the "grand old party" do, standing at the Five Forks with sign boards pointing in every direction, the House committee's sign reading "Free sugar below No. 16;" the Senate's sign reading "Free sugar below No. 13;" Mr. Blaine's sign, "No fooling away our sugar market;" the Senator from Maine pointing to "half, or hemispherical, free trade;" the President indicating "Subsidies to steam-ships," and the last of them is the dim and blotted sign set up by the Senate Finance Committee in 1888, "Half-taxed sugar?" No matter, Mr. President, which road the grand old party takes, the country will regret it did not take some other.

Mr. President, this bill itself shows and extracts from the RECORD from Republican leaders in the House, when by the gracious permission of its ruling spirit its innumerable provisions, involving millions, were allowed a little brief discussion, show that free sugar means increased duties in greater amount on other necessities of life; that it carries no saving to the people, no economy in the expense of living, and lessens the revenue in an amount so small and insignificant that it may be revision of the tariff, but it is not reduction of taxation.

GLUCOSE.

While the advocates of this bill profess a purpose of protecting agriculture, and with a profuse hand scatter bounties from the Federal Treasury to produce the production of corn, beet, sorghum, and maple-sap sugar, the bill is profoundly silent as to the largest production of domestic sugar, that from corn, and known as glucose. This industry is already established in the country; unlike beet sugar, it is no experiment; it is made from a farmer's product. Its prosperity is the prosperity of the corn-grower. But nowhere in the bounty provision of the bill is there any encouragement to its increase. A duty of three-fourths of 1 cent is all that protects 600,000,000 pounds of corn sugar, valued annually at \$17,128,800, from competition with \$163,573 imported in 1888 or \$748,560 imported in 1889. There are seventeen glucose factories, with \$20,000,000 of invested capital. The daily capacity is 61,000 bushels of corn and the annual capacity is 19,032,000 bushels. To produce that amount it required 732,000 acres of land at 26 bushels per acre, which, at 3 men per 100 acres, employed 21,960 farmers. The factories gave employment to 4,575 wage-earners, who received \$2,058,570 in annual wages.

Between cane sugar and corn sugar there has been a sharp contest of competition ever since corn sugar has been manufactured. The report of the Ways and Means Committee states the amount of cane sugar produced in this country at 375,904,197 pounds and I find the annual product of corn sugar to be 570,960,000 pounds; yet the bill selects one of these competing industries for a bounty of 2 cents and remits the other to the cold protection of three-fourths of 1 cent a pound.

While opposed to a bounty in all shapes, I can not understand why the farmer who raises corn should be denied the same bounty that is given to the planter who grows cane, or beets, or sorghum, or taps a forest tree for sap and boils it into granular form without the expense of machinery and without the cost of plowing, gathering, and housing, as both are required of the grower of corn. Why has not the same liberal and extravagant bounty been bestowed upon corn-growers? It is expected that the bounty feature of the bill will promote the cultivation of beet and sorghum, and thus increase the domestic sugar product. Why not extend the same profuse liberality to the sugar which is the product of the corn-raiser?

With what propriety does the United States Treasury select between sugars of domestic production to favor and foster one? Is not this another illustration of the hurtful influence of Government when it attempts to enter into the domain of private affairs and to foster and encourage one product to the detriment of the other?

The average selling price of glucose last year was 3 cents per pound. This bill proposes to bestow upon the competing product—cane, beet, sorghum, and maple sugar—a bounty of 2 cents, or two-thirds of the selling price of corn sugar. The result will probably be that the corn-sugar manufacture will be destroyed by the bounty to its competitors. Thus, while professing to encourage and promote domestic protection, an important industry may be crippled or destroyed by the mischievous application of a bounty system unknown to the constitution and foreign to the fair play and equal opportunity of our system of government.

TIN.

Mr. President, a most glaring instance of the prostitution of the fiscal power of the Congress to private ends and individual gains is exhibited in the schedule increasing the tax on tin-plates. The exhaustive and conclusive argument of the Senator from Maryland [Mr. WILSON] on day before yesterday threw a flood of light upon it. There are present in this country but four firms, as the report of the committee shows, which are now making sheet-iron and sheet-steel, and which desire to add to their present business the making of tin-plates.

The speech of the chairman of the committee, when he introduced the bill, showed that heretofore in every instance the attempt to make tin-plates has disastrously failed, the cause of the failures being attributed to combinations in foreign countries reducing the price. But now it is the opinion of one of these firms that if it—

Can be generally established in the minds of the people that the Republican party will continue to govern this country in the future there will be plenty of money forthcoming to embark in the manufacture of tin and tin-plates.

And another firm, equally anxious to bask under the favor of the Republican party, writes that:

If Congress will place a suitable protection upon the production of tin-plates it will not be long before this country can supply the world with a better article than is now furnished by England.

These private opinions of individuals, instigated by personal ends and business hopes, appear to be the main reasons which moved the House committee to double the tax on tin-plates and increase the cost of all culinary utensils, milk-pails, workmen's buckets, tin roofing, spouting, and guttering and the cans for vegetables, fruits, and meats.

The present duty on tin-plates amounts to \$7,000,000, which is to be increased after July 1, 1891, by \$8,371,378.67, making then a total of \$15,371,378.67. Thus, in order that four firms may add a new business to their plant, the whole people are to be more than doubly taxed, and if these firms, under the forcing system of enormous protection, shall be more successful than those which previously tried the experiment, they are to become the monopolists of this important industry.

It has never been satisfactorily established that there exists any tin in the United States, and, while the committee express themselves satisfied with the reported tin in the Black Hills, from abundant caution or for the private interest of partisan business firms, the bill puts block-tin on the free-list.

The chairman says:

We have now four mills which can be at once adapted to making tin-plates. They can produce 4,000 tons a year.

He also says:

We consumed last year 300,000 tons of tin-plate, all of it imported.

If this bill becomes a law the people will be made to pay double taxes until these four firms can enlarge their plants from a capacity of 4,000 tons to that of 300,000 tons, or until "the capital required, \$30,000,000," can be induced to embark in the new enterprise. In the opinion of the chairman, there is "no more certain and encouraging field for labor and capital" than this tin-plate prospect, provided always that the Republican party is continued in power; otherwise it will prove extremely hazardous. And, Mr. President, from the present outlook under the new ballot system recently adopted by many of the States, where manipulation and purchase of ballots is better guarded against, it will be still more hazardous to rely on Republicans remaining in power.

Turning from the manufacturer's interest and the politician's policy to the practical judgment of business men interested most deeply in the fate of the important business assailed, it is shown in the protest of importers that, without any increase in the consumption the increased

duties of this bill will impose a tax of over \$15,000,000 per annum upon the tin-plates needed for consumption in this country; that prices will be increased on the various kinds from \$1.08 to \$2.43, from \$1.36 to \$3.06, from \$1.57 to \$3.54, and so on, until they reach from \$4 to \$9, and on roofing plates from \$1.08 to \$2.43, and from \$2.16 to \$4.86.

These are the premiums offered by this bill to the four firms who propose to go into the business. If the consumption in the future should keep pace with the increase of population there can be no doubt that these four firms, charged to be Republicans, will have a "good thing," after the order of Carnegie. This \$15,750,000 is to be annually drawn from the pockets of the people and turned into the tills of these four firms to establish and encourage American production and diversify American industry. The revenue is not needed by the Government; indeed the demand of the people is to reduce the revenue of the Government, not to transfer the taxes from the people to partisan firms.

New industries are desirable when they arise naturally and in response to business requirements—but when hot-housed into existence by enormous taxation, they become intolerable nuisances—and when the increased taxes thus turned over to partisan firms, extends through the long years that tariff legislation contemplates, the enormous fortunes of these four firms of protectionists can only be measured by the impoverishment of the people, which this new business will cause.

Practical men engaged in the importation of tin-plates, whose business the bill proposes to ruin in order to build up four firms, ask:

If an increased tariff would establish such a home supply of this material in America as would enable this country to control the whole trade, why do not those who favor it put their money in it?

The answer and reason will be found in the letters from the four firms, read by Mr. McKINLEY in the House (RECORD, page 4542). Because they "did not under existing circumstances consider the investment a safe one." This danger, however, says the witness, is in a measure removed by the Republican victory; that if the "Republicans continue to govern this country in the future there will be plenty of money forthcoming to embark in the manufacture of tin and tin-plates."

The same fictitious aid, the same unjust and iniquitous taxation would make the growing of tropical plants in hot-houses in Maine equally profitable and attract "plenty of money" to the cultivation of pine-apples, bananas, guava, and other fruits amid the snow-clad hills of New England.

Contrasting the statements made before the Ways and Means Committee in favor of this increased duty, it will appear that the failures heretofore made in the attempt to manufacture tin-plates in Pittsburgh had their causes, not in combinations of Welsh tin-plate-makers, but in causes incidental to and inseparable from the successful establishment of a new business.

If the financial outcome of successful tin-plate manufacture was certain of realization, would it be a wise policy to subject every family to an increased cost of culinary utensils? There are over one million of men who now, in one way or another, manipulate tin-plates in this country. Shall these men be interrupted in their trade, its cost increased fourfold, in order that four prohibition firms, employing less than one thousand men, may increase their trade? According to the theory of this bill it is. But, Mr. President, it is such protection as vultures give to lambs, seeking and devouring them, and should not be tolerated.

No demand for this increase of duty is made except by the four prohibition firms. Tin-plate is a raw material, used in one city alone—Baltimore—to make 600,000,000 of cans a year, and, owing to the fact that they can be used but once, Mr. T. L. Bunling, of the New York Canned Goods Packers' Association, says they "represent fully one-third the cost of canned products as placed upon the markets," and that—

The percentage of tariff charged against canned goods is greater than that voiced against any other industry for its use of tin-plates. This disproportion of tariff assessment is still further augmented through the fact that the duty being specific it falls as heavy per pound on the cheap grades of plate used by canners as on the better grades, which is a most unjust discrimination.

The duty increases the capital required in canning for these reasons. Protests from Maryland, from Virginia, from Ohio, from Chicago, from Philadelphia, from Maine, from Boston, and from Tennessee, too, presented by myself, confronted the prayers of the four protection firms, but were unavailing with the committee, which had, it seems, determined to diversify American industry by taxing the American people and destroying an American production.

FIRE-ARMS.

Mr. President, at my home in Tennessee the young men are given to gunning, as their chief sport, for deer and turkeys in the mountains and smaller game in the valleys, and I have examined with care that section of this tariff schedule relating to fire-arms. The section for fire-arms in this bill presents anomalies which are utterly irreconcilable with any regard for the interest of the whole people or with any other hypothesis except that of benefiting, at the cost of the whole, the fortunes of a class. For example, a few manufacturers of fire-arms, desiring to increase their profits, represent to the committee, in view of the extremely low cost of labor in foreign countries, the "present tariff of fire-arms to be entirely inadequate to properly protect" their manufacture. The increase is asked for solely to benefit labor.

Perhaps there is no other branch of manufactures in which machinery has supplanted manual labor to a greater extent than the making of fire-arms. The gun-brands are on the free-list, the wood is without duty, material free, and machinery is capital.

This machinery is the only labor which the tariff protects; and protection of machinery has built up the fortunes of capital. The pauper labor of Europe does not and can not compete with the profits of protected machinery in America. The framers of this bill seem not to have consulted the welfare of human labor, but only the profits of machine labor; and when it becomes a law the false pretense of protecting human labor will have consigned all American consumers to the mercy of the owners of machinery.

The present duty of 35 per cent. afforded so much protection to the machinery of gun-making that one of the proprietors testified before the Committee on Ways and Means that—

Representing a rifle-manufacturing concern, I ask no increase of that amount; we do not require it. American rifles are the best in the world and are now exported. In regard to revolvers the present duty is 35 per cent., and there are very few revolvers imported, only comparatively few. The competition which the American manufacturers meet with is entirely of their own making.

Another witness said:

That the low selling price of common American makes is unquestionably due to overproduction, and excessive, unreasonable competition among themselves, and not due to foreign competition, while the better American makes, such as "Smith & Wesson" and "Colts," are exported extensively to all parts of the world.

Another witness said:

The strongest argument which I can make to this is that during the present tariff of 35 per cent. there have been at least twenty firms, manufacturing concerns, corporations, and individual concerns, and all of them with the exception of two or three have been organized under this 35 per cent. tariff, by which, therefore, we may reason it was a protective tariff on fire-arms.

The bill as it came from the House made but one change from existing rate of 35 per cent., and that was on guns valued at more than \$12, which were increased to 40 per cent. But the Senate has made an entirely new rated classification, granting in full the prayers of the manufacturers and assigning this reason for the change:

This is a change from ad valorem to specific rates. The industry is gradually being destroyed by undervaluations of foreign importation and inadequate protection. The average of the proposed rates is believed to be not greatly in excess of existing ad valorem rates.

The advance from 35 per cent. ad valorem to the Senate rates runs the duty from 65 to 100 per cent. (See Hearings, Gales, page 1250.)

Mr. Gales said:

Sporting breech-loading guns are made almost entirely in this country, the retail averaging from \$9 up, which cost to make them from \$5.50 up, leaving a good deal of margin for profit. The only single breech-loading gun is what is known as a transformed musket-gun which is made of a foreign military gun. On that the proposed duty makes them 127 per cent.

It was shown that to a limited extent all exported single breech-loading guns had met competition in foreign markets; that in breech-loading guns "the Americans have the market almost entirely," of which 90 per cent. are made in this country of those averaging over \$30.

The rates proposed by the Senate committee are particularly burdensome on that class of guns not made in this country, and which are imported from Germany and sold to "farmer boys who can not afford to buy a high-priced gun."

These cheap guns are perfectly safe. These are the cheapest guns made, and they are such that we can not make in this country.

There is, therefore, no American manufacture to benefit by the duty or to injure by foreign competition; the Treasury does not need the revenue, and yet the Senate rates mulct the farmers' boys with an unmeaning duty of \$2 and 35 per cent. on a \$6 gun, and \$1 and 35 per cent. on a single barrel.

I do not find in all the testimony printed in hearings one intimation or insinuation of undervaluations, assigned by the note of explanation by Senate committee, and yet, according to the table showing the average rate of duty, it is 83½ per cent. against 35 per cent. at present.

The discrimination between "the weapon of the wealthy"—the fine Law-Merless shotgun—costing from \$60 to \$300, and the shotgun of the masses—the meat-getting gun of the farmer's boys—costing from \$3 to \$12, is, on the Birmingham gun, from 38 to 45 per cent., on the German cheap gun from 70 to 100 per cent.

The same unwise discrimination against the poor in favor of the rich is shown in the duties proposed on cutlery, where, on the knives used by the farmers and mechanics of poorer classes, the increase of duty ranges from 100 to 169 per cent., while the duty on the knives used by the well-to-do people ranges from 40 to 80 per cent. On razors, the present duty is 50 per cent.; the proposed duty averages 75 per cent., but on the cheaper grades is as high as 130 per cent. This is the "protection" given to those who are unable to buy high-priced guns, and a specimen of that "equalization of duties on imports" of which the committee boasts.

WAGES OF LABOR.

The Committee on Ways and Means, reporting this bill to the House, assumed that a protective tariff "would encourage a system of home production which shall give fair remuneration to domestic producers and fair wages to American workmen." I quote the language.

In other words, the friends of protection claim for their system a guaranty of good wages for the American laborer. If the system was capable of any such benefit it would better commend itself to consideration, for the laboring men of this country are confined to no section, but are employed in every industry, and constitute the bone and sinew of every product, and necessarily the great mass of our people. No public man would desire or dare to impose any legislation upon the country which would harden the lot of the laborer or oppose any law which lessened or impaired the opportunities of so large a part of his fellow-countrymen.

The fact that in this country the laboring man receives higher wages than in other countries is erroneously assumed as due solely to the higher taxes which we impose. The argument must go farther and assume that the more we tax the people the more wages the laborer receives, and that taxes, therefore, are unmitigated blessings. It is only necessary to state such an argument to refute it; common sense refuses to believe any reasoning which arrives at any such absurd conclusions. There are, therefore, other conditions than high taxes which give to the laborer in this country greater remuneration for his labor than follows hard work in other countries.

There are two causes for high wages in this country which more than any others contribute to the happiness of the laboring man. The first is our vast public domain open to homestead settlement, which continually draws men from the factory to the field. This constant and unvarying attraction lessens the number of workmen in factories, and the law of supply and demand operates to increase the wages as the supply of labor diminishes.

The second cause results from the immense amount of labor which machinery has displaced and supplemented. This operates to increase the rate of wages, but lessens the number of operatives, thus reducing the sum of wages in manufactured goods. The laborer receives a higher wage, while the aggregate cost of labor is diminished. The report of the Massachusetts bureau of statistics says:

In proportion as capital, through machinery, becomes more effective, the relative number of laborers is decreased in proportion to products, the rate of wages is increased, and the sum of wages is reduced; that is, lower cost is compassed by way of higher wages.

It is not higher duties, therefore, which bring higher wages, but improved machinery, which, reducing the number of laborers, pays the few retained higher wages as skilled operatives than would be paid to unskilled workmen. Thus the wages of a few increase while the total cost of labor decreases, but higher duties fasten upon the product which has paid less for labor because made by machinery, and thus increase the price of the product to the laborer and to the public.

If the protective duties are the cause of higher wages, how comes it that the same cause produces different effects? The same law operates differently in different States.

From the address delivered by the Senator from Maine, Mr. FRYE, before the Home Market Club of Boston, in 1887, I find that protective duties pay different wages even in New England States, and that in Maine the average wages are \$357 a year; in Massachusetts, \$364 a year; in Connecticut, \$385 a year.

These are some of the inconsistent figures of the Home Market Club as to the operation of protective duties on wages in only three of the New England States. If we consult the census of 1880 we find unskilled wages in blast furnaces to be, in Virginia, 82 cents per day; in Alabama, 98 cents; in Pennsylvania, \$1.29; that skilled labor receives in Alabama, \$2.25; in Massachusetts, \$2.70; in Pennsylvania, \$3.03; in Ohio, \$3.87, and in Kentucky, \$4.62. Tennessee is not placed in this list of 1880, but the very marked development in the use of machinery since then has caused investigations to show an average rate. By sections the yearly average wages are: Eastern States, \$417; Western, \$396; Pacific, \$354, and Southern, \$304. It is not, therefore, protective duties that affect the wages of labor. If that cause alone operated, or operated even chiefly, in fixing the price of labor, there would not be such different results in different States in the same industries and in every section of the country.

It has been wisely said that "when two employers run after one workman, wages rise, and when two workmen run after one employer, wages fall;" and, Mr. President, that single sentence tells more of the rise of all the wages of labor than can be proven by any reasoning on the effect of high duties.

The cost of labor in a manufactured product is necessarily an element of its price, but in that cost of labor the wages of the workman and the interest on capital invested in machinery are so mixed as to mislead when the whole sum is stated to be paid to the laborer. Machinery has been a blessing to the whole country. While it has lessened the number of laborers, it has increased the wages of those necessary to its management, and it has reduced the sum of the price of labor and brought down the price of the product.

If protection had left machinery free to work out all its benefits, if protection had not enabled capital to mulct the consumer with \$5 while the Government received but \$1, the laborer would have been five times better off than he is under protective tariff. It is not for the laborer that the duties are raised. They benefit not the wage-earner; they do not induce the capitalist to pay higher wages, but they do en-

able capital to exact higher prices for factory products. To any man who will investigate this subject of taxation as a means of increasing the price of labor or as an instrument in reducing the cost of living, the absurdity will become so patent that deception will no longer be possible. And to the man who looks into that absurdity he will be almost amazed at another, for the Ways and Means Committee say:

Those who advocate duties for revenue solely see only as a result of their theory cheaper prices of wares and merchandise and are blind to the other necessary effect, that of lower wages and cheaper men.

If that sentence has any meaning whatever—which I do not assert—it is that the less price one pays for provisions and clothes the more expensive is living and that the cheaper the cost of necessities the cheaper are the buyers.

I find a similar thought embodied in a speech accredited to General Harrison, in March, 1888. He says:

I am one of those uninstructed political economists that have an impression that some things may be too cheap, that I cannot find myself in full sympathy with this demand for cheaper coats, which seems to me necessarily involves a cheaper man and woman under the coat.

I will not do the President the injustice to infer that he measured the value of the man by the cost of the coat which covered him or that he held a laboring man in a jeans coat to be less worthy of his consideration than a manufacturer in broadcloth; but as an "uninstructed political economist" he has fallen into the error of implying that a man who wears a coat which was bought with the price of 10 bushels of wheat was a "cheaper man" than if he had paid the price of 20 bushels of wheat for the same coat; or that the housewife whose dress was bought with 50 pounds of butter was a "cheaper woman" than she would have been if she had bought the same dress with 100 pounds of her butter.

It is by such reasoning and such examples as that of the committee and the President that error has been disseminated all over the country to benefit the manufacturing classes. But the "schoolmaster has been abroad" since 1888, and error ceases to be dangerous where reason freely combats it.

TRAMPS.

It should not be forgotten when weighing the results of tariffs upon labor and the welfare of the people that it was under a high protective tariff that the word "tramp" was invented to express the actual condition of a large class of our people, that homeless, thriftless, wandering, gypsy population which from year to year lead the life of beggary and destitution. Was that, as the author of this bill says, a "condition of independence and prosperity the like of which has never been witnessed in any other period in the history of our country?" Under a high tariff tramps began and continued their weary wandering, begging from door to door for daily sustenance. I do not find in Mr. McKinley's fanciful and imaginary picture of "independence and prosperity" the figures and facts which establish that condition of affairs which brought forth that army of tramps. The data nevertheless exist and, though overlooked and omitted by the framer of this bill, yet can easily be traced in the changes and revolutions produced and brought about under the transition from a low to a high tariff.

In the last twenty years of protection not only was tramping developed into a trade or profession, but strikes, lockouts, discontent, degradation, and misery were fruits which grew alongside of the protection tree. Western railroads were destroyed, Mollie Maguires rioted in Pennsylvania, tramps wandered all over the land, and panic in business, gambling in corners and futures, were some of the new features of American history and society unknown under a tariff for revenue. When next the advocates of protection shall imitate Mr. McKinley and show "what protection has done," let them not forget to include the chapter of tramps and tramping and the fungi that have grown upon the stocks of American trade and business under the protective system.

Mr. President, it is accepted by men of all parties that the principal part of the revenue required for the support of the Government shall be derived from duties on imports. That system of indirect taxes disguises from the citizen the amount of his contributions, but it is none the less taxation. It may become, and under a system of high duties must become, a drain upon every man's income, whether derived from the dividends of capital or the sweat of labor. Every increase of duties beyond what is absolutely needed for an economical administration of the Government's expenditures is a distortion of the system of direct taxation, by which the expenses of living are increased upon that large class of the people least able to bear an increase of expenses. The very fact that indirect taxation conceals the amount exacted from the individual should put an honest legislator upon his guard not to increase beyond the limits of economy in expenditures the contributions of the people to the Government. To divert indirect taxation from its proper purpose of supporting the Government to a system of benefits and bounties to a class is an application of taxation to a purpose not contemplated by the Constitution.

It is in this misapplication of indirect taxation to the promotion of the business of the smaller at the expense of the larger part of the people that the two political parties diverge and separate on fiscal affairs. The Democratic party seeks to confine indirect taxation to its constitutional purpose: "to pay the debts and provide for the common

defense and general welfare of the United States." The Republican party seeks to carry the system of indirect taxation beyond its legitimate and constitutional purpose, and make it embrace the fostering and protection of one or more classes of the people, and diversify by its bounty the industries of the country. However desirable such ulterior ends may be they are outside of and foreign to constitutional indirect taxation, and can not be indulged in without increasing the cost of living to the whole people. To divert and increase taxes levied and paid for the support of the Government to other ends and purposes finds no warrant in the Constitution, as well as violates every principle of sound political economy, and is none the less robbery because it is done under the forms of law and is called "protection of American industry and labor."

To oppose that misapplication of indirect taxation and to demand a strict adherence to the Constitution in levying taxes for the support of the Government evinces no opposition to manufactures. Within the bounds of duties for revenue, where they reach hundreds of millions of dollars, there is room and range enough to foster any industry whose infancy may need protection. This was the spirit of the first tariff bill—that of 1789—which threw its fostering care over the distaff, the handloom, the hammer, the anvil, the jack-plane, the drawing-knife, and the shoe-bench, and stood with its protecting benefits over the workshop of the citizens in their unequal competition with foreign capital and organized labor. But the industries of the home and the workshop have long passed away, and vast manufacturing establishments vie with each other in attracting the world's capital by the hundreds of millions, and supply the power and machinery which have supplanted the handwork of the earlier industries.

Mr. President, protection now is not to labor, but to capital, not to human beings, but to iron machinery driven by steam or water power and supplanting the labor of millions of men in the outputs of the establishments. Every dollar of taxes diverted from the honest purposes of taxation to encourage these vast manufacturing establishments is a premium to monopoly—the outcome of protection—and a strain upon the timbers of the Constitution. The system of protection has for the last thirty years turned the stream of taxation to run the mills of monopoly and has fostered and raised up that aggregation of trusts, which in their combinations and power have laid every industry under tribute and every family under contribution. The artificially restricted markets, which the high tariffs of the last thirty years have effected, have proved to be the forcing ground of these trusts. The remedy for relief from these heartless greedy cormorants will not be found in any criminal code, which can always be evaded and escaped, but in that reform of the revenue which, by opening our country on liberal terms to the world's competition, shall break up and destroy the baleful operations of that offspring of protection duties.

The law against trusts enacted by this Congress may drive them from combinations into corporations, it may impose severe penalties and provide courts for their trial, but conviction and punishment will be escaped. This wish to uproot the noxious plant by depriving the soil of those elements of support upon which these plants feed and thrive will be without effective results. Eradicate protective duties from our fiscal system, remove the fostering hand of protection, cease to water them with the tears of widows and orphans, and they will die out.

The delusion of a "home market" for all the products of our immense country, with its teeming soil and varied climates, is another subterfuge which protection has employed to delude the people. We necessarily consume nearly 90 per cent. of our agricultural products. The small portion that we export must either rot at home or find purchasers abroad. This small percentage of American agricultural products in 1889, which was shipped to foreign markets, aggregated \$532,141,490. Manufacturers added to those exports \$138,675,507; mines and mining added \$19,947,518; the forests added \$26,997,127; the fisheries added \$7,106,388, and all other products added were valued at \$5,414,579, together making the grand total of \$730,282,609.

These were the home products our home market could not consume, and they were shipped to foreign markets because they were not salable in the home market. They were not needed to feed or clothe our people, and no system of fiscal legislation can make our well fed people eat all they can grow or wear better clothing than at present makes them the best-clothed people in the world. Every people seek their home market before they seek a foreign sale, and ship to foreign countries only what can not be consumed at home. The home market always, and in every country, and under all systems of fiscal legislation, takes care of itself and needs no fostering, no protection, and no encouragement from the Government.

In the effort to find other markets and to escape from the home market our exports in 1889 increased over those of 1888 \$46,420,505, of which increase agriculture supplied \$31,301,464, leaving an increase to all the other sources of supply of only \$15,109,100. This increase of exports came from corn, unmanufactured cotton, provisions, animals, manufactures of wood, refined mineral oils, manufactures of iron and steel, copper ore, wheat, wheat-flour, unmanufactured tobacco, manufactures of cotton, copper ingots, bars, etc., and refined sugars.

It was from the sale of these exports, to which agriculture contrib-

uted 72.87 per cent., that our merchants purchased \$745,131,652 of the products of other people. The foreign products were purchased for our home market, because their sale in the United States would bring more money than the overplus of our home products would sell for at home.

The total amount of all our manufactures in 1880 was \$7,800,000,000, and in 1889 probably reach \$9,000,000,000 or \$10,000,000,000, yet our people needed \$745,000,000 of foreign products for their happiness and prosperity. The "home market," Mr. President, is an old protection spook which no longer frightens the people. "It is only the eye of childhood that fears the hobby-horse;" neither can it be used to cajole them into longer submission to unneeded taxes and to restrictive duties which operate to check the sale of our exports in foreign markets.

Our true policy lies in an exactly opposite direction from that of this bill. The real American policy is to enlarge the scope of our foreign sales, to increase our buying in foreign markets that we may increase our selling in those markets, to buy more from other countries that we may sell more to other people. That policy enlarges our manufactures, increases our agriculture, and revives our commerce. Under its beneficent influence the farmers, the manufacturers, the merchants, the ship-builders, prosper—the whole people are benefited. It was once said that "it is impossible for one country to gain except by the loss of another," and that exploded idea of political economy is the regnant thought which underlies this bill. It is not true, as asserted by Voltaire, that—

Such is the lot of humanity that the patriotic desire for one's country's grandeur is but a wish for the humiliation of one's neighbor.

There is a wider scope, Mr. President, under the beneficent blessings of the interdependence of nations for the interchange of products, where each and every nation and all peoples may grow in wealth and prosperity.

It was such a thought that inspired the late Hon. R. W. Townshend, in 1884, to set on foot, in the House of Representatives, the movement for an international congress of American nations, with a view to a customs union among all the countries of both continents, and which was voiced in the Democratic platform of 1888, for intimate commercial relations with the Latin-American nations, and which, through the bill introduced by the Senator from Maryland [Mr. GORMAN], eventuated in the International Congress, which has but recently adjourned.

Such congresses are not designed to check importations by excessive duties; they are called to widen and broaden the exchanges of products between nations and to break down all barriers to progress. The purpose of the McKinley bill is to check importations and to stop exportation. These congresses in the interest of all nations seek to promote exactly what the McKinley bill endeavors to repress.

The Secretary of State, rejecting the policy of the McKinley bill, desires this Senate by amendment to this bill to promote the purpose of the International Congress. The remedy which he suggests to meet the errors and unwisdom of the protective policy is an amendment to the pending tariff bill, authorizing the President to declare the ports of the United States free to all the products of any nation of the American hemisphere upon which no export duties are imposed, whenever and so long as such nation shall admit to its ports free of all national, provincial (state), municipal, and other taxes certain named products of ours.

Mr. President, as questionable as such legislation may be, it is hoped that whatever fate betide the injection into this bill of the principle of international reciprocity that good will come of it to the agricultural interests of our country, upon the success of which so much depends. Whatever may be its source, I hail it as a move in the right direction and trust it may in the end prove the entering wedge to rift the gnarled and hitherto unwedged oak of so-called protection. Unfriendly tariff legislation for a quarter of a century has brought that interest to the brink of ruin.

The patient and trustful farmer has submitted to the stealthy, thievish operations of our tariff laws until their baleful influence has well nigh taken away his strength. He has, under the forms of law, been plundered by the robber tariff of his hard and honest earnings. The law, as it exists, holds him in the grip of the vise of Republicanism, and this bill is but another turn of the screw to still further crumple and grind the bones of his strength regardless of the victim's writhing.

But coming events cast their shadows before. That unrest which comes of injustice and oppression has found its way into the field of the farmer, and is rising in the majesty of organized form to right his wrongs through the ballot. Let us hope that before an uncorrupted, unobstructed, and enlightened ballot, the invidious laws that oppress the many for the benefit of the few will vanish; that monopolists will stand aghast, as true manhood asserts itself and restores to our statute-books just and equal laws.

Under renewed hope and patriotic inspiration, let us turn with idolatry to the Constitution of our fathers, and learn to love, as of yore, that pure, plain, and simple Government bequeathed to us by them, which, in its better days, had neither millionaires nor paupers; had no castles and but few hovels. Let us realize that love of country is born of just and wholesome laws, promptly and impartially executed, and that, when liberal and enlightened policies guide legislative counsels,

prosperity and happiness follow. Let us cherish as "apples of gold set in pictures of silver" those words of Andrew Jackson, which he sent to the United States Senate as an implied rebuke on a memorable occasion, when among other things he said:

I would persuade my countrymen that it is not in a splendid Government, supported by powerful monopolies and aristocratical establishments, that they will find happiness or their liberties protection, but in a plain system—void of pomp, protecting all, and granting favors to none—dispensing its blessings, like the dews of heaven, unseen and unfelt, save in the freshness and beauty they contribute to produce.

It is such a Government that the genius of our people require, such a one only under which our States may remain, for ages to come, united, prosperous and free.

Mr. ALDRICH. Mr. President, I hope that we may now have the vote on the pending amendment.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The amendment will be stated.

The SECRETARY. In paragraph 137, on page 29, line 6, after the word "pay," it is proposed to strike out "two and two-tenths cents" and insert "one cent."

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The question is on agreeing to the amendment. [Putting the question.] The yeas appear to have it.

Mr. VEST. The yeas and nays were ordered upon that.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The yeas and nays were not ordered.

Mr. VEST. I asked for them, I know.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The Senator from Missouri asks that the yeas and nays may be entered on the Journal on the amendment.

Mr. TURPIE. May I ask upon what question we are about to vote?

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The Chair will have the amendment again reported.

The Secretary again read the amendment.

Mr. TURPIE. Mr. President, I would much prefer, as was said by the Senator from Delaware the other day, to vote to put tin-plate upon the free-list, and I should have been very glad if the amendment had been offered in that shape. I recollect that in the discussion in the last Congress, and especially that before the people in the last canvass, tin-plate was one of the four principal articles which were to be put upon the free-list under the tariff bill proposed at that time. I think it is somewhat of a departure, though I am perfectly willing to vote for the amendment as moved, and to consent that a small duty shall be retained upon tin-plate. I doubt, however, very much whether the manufacture of tin-plate will be helped by imposing the additional tax now offered or whether it will be retarded at all by refusing to increase it.

I have heard somewhat and I have read considerably about the existence of tin ores in Dakota, and whenever I have read of the existence of those ores I have read also of their irreducibility; that it was impossible to reduce the Dakota tin ore; that it could not be done by any known process so as to make it available in the market. The existence of tin in that section has been known for about twenty years, and I think if there was any method of reducing the ores and actually making block-tin that it would have been discovered ere now.

The actual experiments, so far as I have read them, with Dakota tin ore where the tin has been made out of it and has been reduced to a form or ingot, cost three or four times the mercantile value of the article. Nevertheless, I am of the opinion that, even if a tin bar or ingot could be produced or if it ever had been produced in Dakota from the ore there at four times its mercantile value, there would have been such a demand for it that it would be now manufactured in considerable quantities.

Tin bars or tin ingots have a great deal of value apart from their use in making tin-plate. Tin is largely used as an alloy in many of the works of science and many of the artificial methods used in the works of art, and the novelty of a base or of a new species of base for operations of this character would have induced a very large sale of Dakota tin ingots and bars if such things had an existence or possibly could have any.

I have no doubt that in a debate of this character, where more than 100 per cent. additional tax is asked upon the tin-plate, the air would have been filled with assertions and crammed with certificates about the richness of the Dakota tin mines, about their fertility, about the ease and cheapness with which the ore could be reduced and the facility with which bars or ingots could be prepared for the market. I have not heard of any such. I have no doubt they could have been furnished. For my own part, I do not place the smallest credence in any of those assertions. I do not believe that the increase of duty proposed is offered with any reference to the production of tin-plate in the United States or of tin in Dakota or to the discovery or use of tin ore in the Black Hills.

It is without doubt proposed here to further the personal and private interests of the American Tinned-Plate Company, a corporation composed of ironmasters who have adopted a very taking and attractive title, a company who have taken the name of tin-plate because they never have manufactured and never will manufacture any of that article—a tinless tin plate company. This association is largely engaged in the manufacture of what may be called Pittsburgh tin, not Dakota tin, but Pittsburgh galvanized iron, Pittsburgh planished plate, an inferior article of iron, a very cheap kind of scrap-iron, which it intends to put upon the mar-

ket, and will put upon the market in large quantities as a substitute for tin, both in the canning and other industries, if by putting a prohibitory duty upon tin-plate they can prevent its coming here from abroad.

The only object of the imposition of this very heavy tax is to make an additional market for these bogus wares, for the American tin-plate of Pittsburgh, for galvanized iron, planished plate, to take the place of the buckets and pans and cans and other utensils which are now manufactured with pure tin.

Tin is very valuable on account of its imperviousness to the juices of fruits, of meats, and of fish. It resembles glass in these respects, but it does not resemble glass in being frangible. It is upon this account that tin-plate is valuable. The most careful experiments and experience have shown that no kind of tinless American Association plate, galvanized iron, or planished plate has this character of imperviousness to the acids and juices of fruits and flesh.

The immediate consequence of forcing this Pittsburgh American Association plant and its growth upon the useful industries of this country will be to deteriorate the contents of the can, the tomato, the salmon, the oyster, the peach, the apple, and everything which is canned; this inferior galvanized can and inferior planished-plate can will deteriorate the contents, the volume of the canning business will be largely decreased, tin cans will become an article of luxury, and their contents will become still more so. The result will be that an existing industry, now employing many thousands of workmen and engaging in their interest many thousands of consumers, will be vitally injured and very materially lessened, for the sake, as claimed, of an industry not now in existence and never intended to be put into operation.

I do not know that this has been accounted a romantic age or an age of credulity. On the contrary, I think it may be called a very practical age—that is, outside of the domain of the devotees of protection. The moment you approach that sect, the age does become extremely romantic, devoted to chimeras, a worshiper of mere will-o'-the-wisps.

There is now no tin-plate industry in the United States, as has been often asserted. There has been only a thought, a speculation, a conjecture by the American tinless tin-plate association that such an industry might in the next century be successfully conducted, as some philosophers have already proposed centuries ago and may again tomorrow (considering that this is an age of protective chimeras), to manufacture from sea-water some valuable product or from the most ordinary clay or alluvium a metal more valuable than gold.

It is not necessary that they should have done it or that they have any plan whatever for doing it. It is only necessary that they contemplate doing it and should appear before a committee of this body or some other body stating that they are ready to do it and are willing to do it, and the devotees of protection immediately take the idea, follow it to its extreme, and are willing to tax every inhabitant of the United States in order to carry out this visionary scheme of the alchemist, wilder than any dream of the Rosicrucians in the Middle Ages.

I suppose it is in vain for us to protest against any such abuse of legislative authority. Legislators and law-givers themselves have become the subjects of this forlorn and miserable delusion, and are perhaps as much the objects of pity and compassion as of denunciation, but I think we ought soberly, before the vote is taken, at least once more think what possible advantage there may be in depressing a universal industry long established and so generally successful for the sake of what would be called, in the vernacular of the protectionist, a future, a bare future, without put or call.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The question is on the amendment of the Senator from Missouri [Mr. VEST].

The Secretary proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. CARLISLE (when his name was called). I am paired with the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. PIERCE].

Mr. MITCHELL (when Mr. DOLPH's name was called). My colleague [Mr. DOLPH] is detained from the Senate necessarily. If he were here, he would vote "nay." He is paired with the senior Senator from Georgia [Mr. BROWN].

Mr. HAMPTON (when his name was called). My pair with the Senator from Nevada [Mr. STEWART] has been transferred to the Senator from Ohio [Mr. PAYNE]. I shall vote "yea."

Mr. BATE (when the name of Mr. HARRIS was called). My colleague [Mr. HARRIS] is necessarily absent and not very well. He is paired with the Senator from Vermont [Mr. MORRILL].

Mr. FAULKNER (when Mr. KENNA's name was called). I desire to state that my colleague [Mr. KENNA] is detained from the Senate by illness. If present, he would vote "yea."

Mr. McMILLIN (when his name was called). I am paired with the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. VANCE].

Mr. PADDOCK (when his name was called). I am paired with the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. EUSTIS]. The Senator from Florida [Mr. PASCO] is paired with the Senator from Illinois [Mr. FARWELL]. By a change of the pairs we are both at liberty to vote, and I vote "nay."

Mr. PASCO (when his name was called). Under the arrangement just announced, I vote "yea."

Mr. QUAY (when his name was called). By arrangement and understanding with the Senator from Montana [Mr. SANDERS], I have

transferred my pair with the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. FAULKNER] to the Senator from Montana, and I vote "nay."

Mr. SHERMAN (when his name was called). I am paired with my colleague [Mr. PAYNE], but the pair has been transferred to the Senator from Nevada [Mr. STEWART], and I am at liberty to vote. I vote "nay."

Mr. ALLEN (when Mr. SQUIRE's name was called). My colleague [Mr. SQUIRE] is paired with the Senator from Virginia [Mr. DANIEL].

Mr. DAVIS (when Mr. WASHBURN's name was called). My colleague [Mr. WASHBURN] is paired with the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. BLODGETT].

Mr. GORMAN (when the name of Mr. WILSON, of Maryland, was called). My colleague [Mr. WILSON] is paired with the Senator from Iowa [Mr. WILSON]. If my colleague were present, he would vote "yea."

The roll-call was concluded.

Mr. McMILLAN. I transfer my pair with the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. VANCE] to the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. PIERCE], and that will enable the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CARLISLE] and myself to vote. I vote "nay."

Mr. CARLISLE. Under that arrangement, I vote "yea."

Mr. PETTIGREW. I am paired with the Senator from Florida [Mr. CALL]. If he were present, I should vote "nay."

Mr. BLODGETT. My pair with the junior Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. CHANDLER] having been transferred to the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. GEORGE], I vote "yea."

Mr. DANIEL. I am paired with the Senator from Washington [Mr. SQUIRE]; otherwise I should vote "yea."

Mr. BLAIR. I am paired with the senior Senator from Mississippi [Mr. GEORGE], but that pair has been transferred in such a way that my colleague [Mr. CHANDLER], who is absent, is paired with the Senator from Mississippi, and I vote with the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. BLODGETT]. I vote "nay."

Mr. CULLOM. I desire to announce the illness of my colleague [Mr. FAREWELL] and that he is paired with the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. EUSTIS].

Mr. COCKRELL (after having voted in the affirmative). I observe that the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. DAWES] is not present, and when I voted I forgot the fact that I was paired with him. If he were present he would vote "nay" and I should vote "yea." I withdraw my vote.

The result was announced—yeas 26, nays 30; as follows:

YEAS—26.

Barbour,	Coke,	Hearst,	Ransom,
Bate,	Colquitt,	Jones of Arkansas,	Reagan,
Berry,	Davis,	McPherson,	Turpie,
Blackburn,	Faulkner,	Morgan,	Vest,
Blodgett,	Gorman,	Pasco,	Walthall.
Butler,	Gray,	Plumb,	
Carlisle,	Hampton,	Fugh,	

NAYS—30.

Aldrich,	Edmunds,	Jones of Nevada,	Quay,
Allen,	Everts,	McMillan,	Sawyer,
Allison,	Frye,	Manderson,	Sherman,
Blair,	Hale,	Mitchell,	Spooner,
Cameron,	Hawley,	Moody,	Stockbridge,
Casey,	Higgins,	Paddock,	Teller.
Cullom,	Hiscock,	Platt,	
Dixon,	Hoar,	Power,	

ABSENT—28.

Brown,	Eustis,	Morrill,	Stewart,
Call,	Farwell,	Payne,	Vance,
Chandler,	George,	Pettigrew,	Voorhees,
Cockrell,	Gibson,	Pierce,	Washburn,
Daniel,	Harris,	Sanders,	Wilson of Iowa,
Dawes,	Ingalls,	Squire,	Wilson of Md.
Dolph,	Kenna,	Stanford,	Wolcott.

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. GORMAN. On page 29, line 2, I move to strike out "ninety-one" and insert "ninety-two;" so as to read:

And on and after July 1, 1892, etc.

Extending the time one year.

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. PLUMB. I am not certain that I know precisely what the Senator from Missouri [Mr. VEST] proposed to strike out in his amendment, but I think it embraced the same as I had given notice of my intention to move to strike out, all after the word "steel," in line 1, on page 29, down to and including the word "pound," in line 7. If not, I wish to move that amendment now.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The amendment will be stated.

The SECRETARY. In paragraph 137, page 29, after the word "steel," in line 1, it is proposed to strike out:

And on and after July 1, 1891, all iron or steel sheets or plates, or taggers iron, coated with tin or lead or with a mixture of which these metals or either of them is a component part, by the dipping or any other process, and commercially known as tin-plates, terne-plates, and taggers tin, shall pay 2.2 cents per pound.

Mr. PLUMB. I make that motion with a view of moving to amend, in line 8, paragraph 139, by inserting a provision for a bounty of 1 cent a pound.

Mr. EDMUNDS. The Senator I understand merely gives notice of the reason for his amendment.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. Is the Senate ready for the question?

Mr. FAULKNER. I ask whether there are two amendments suggested by the Senator from Kansas, or one?

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. One amendment. The Senator from Kansas proposes to strike out the words read by the Secretary.

Mr. ALDRICH. I suggest that by unanimous consent the two motions may be considered together.

Mr. VEST. No, Mr. President, as I understand the effect of the motion of the Senator from Kansas, his amendment would put tin-plate on the free-list, and then his bounty proposition is a separate and distinct thing.

Mr. EDMUNDS. They had better be taken separately.

Mr. VEST. My amendment was simply to strike out "2.2 cents" and insert "1 cent."

Mr. ALDRICH. That would not be the effect of the amendment of the Senator from Kansas.

Mr. VEST. That would be the preliminary step towards it. It would strike out all of the duty.

Mr. ALDRICH. It might be a preliminary step, but it would not have that effect.

Mr. VEST. I take it for granted that that is what he means.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The question is on the amendment of the Senator from Kansas to strike out what has been read.

Mr. HIGGINS. Mr. President, I had not expected to say anything in the course of this debate, but after the persistent attempt which has been made here to lead the country to believe that the imposition of the proposed duty will amount to a tax upon the farmers of the country to the extent of the duty, and that for that reason it should be voted down, I feel that I should not allow the vote to be taken without saying a few words upon that question.

If the amendment of the Senator from Kansas [Mr. PLUMB] means that this class of articles shall be placed upon the free-list, I think it is the only consistent ground which can be taken by those who oppose the proposition of the Committee on Finance, for unquestionably the rate of duty as now imposed is nothing else but a tax upon every citizen of the United States who uses this article in any form in which it may go into consumption or use; for it is not high enough to promote domestic production and it is not high enough to enable the American manufacturer now to make it, and it is just high enough to impose upon the people the maximum tax that the article will stand without promoting domestic production.

I am willing to concede most freely that if there is any class in this country which should be exempted from anything like invidious taxation it should be the farmers upon whom this falls, the laborers upon whom it falls, and, although in one sense it may be a fair tax, because the article is in very general use, yet in many respects, as has been already shown in the debate, it falls most unfairly in the incidence of taxation.

But is it true that this article can not be produced in this country at as low a rate as it already is, or, still further, that it should remain under the existing condition? It has been stoutly contended that, while every other article in all the great line of manufactured articles in the country has fallen in price, this also has fallen along with the rest, and there has been some dispute in regard to what are the exact figures. I beg to submit a table here and to ask that it may be printed in my remarks, which is a statement showing the average invoice value per unit of quantity of tin and terne plates and sheets and taggers tin, imported into the United States for the fiscal years 1869 to 1890, inclusive:

Year.	Value per pound.	Rate of duty.	Year.	Value per pound.	Rate of duty.
1869.....	\$0.05	25 per cent.	1880.....	\$0.045	1.1 cts. per lb.
1870.....	.051	Do.	1881.....	.039	Do.
1871.....	.055	Do.	1882.....	.038	Do.
1872.....	.06	Do.	1883.....	.037	Do.
1873.....	.077	15 per cent.	1884.....	.036	1 cent per lb.
1874.....	.077	Do.	1885.....	.033	Do.
1875.....	.082	Do.	1886.....	.031	Do.
1876.....	.052	1.1 cts. per lb.	1887.....	.030	Do.
1877.....	.044	Do.	1888.....	.030	Do.
1878.....	.041	Do.	1889.....	.029	Do.
1879.....	.037	Do.	1890.....	.031	Do.

Mr. EDMUNDS. Those are all iron plates and not metallic tin.

Mr. HIGGINS. Not the metallic tin at all, but simply the iron plates after being coated with tin. These figures, I will say, have been taken from the official reports on Commerce and Navigation, prepared by the Treasury Department, and the value per pound represents the dutiable value; that is to say, it does not include freight and other charges, commissions, consular fees, or anything of that sort. It is simply the prices taken from the reports of the Treasury Department, as given at the time these goods are taken to the consuls for invoice to this country, and therefore represents what may be called the simple Welsh prices after production.

Mr. EDMUNDS. And at the place of production.

Mr. HIGGINS. And at the place of production. The rate per pound in 1869 was 5 cents; in 1870, 5.1 cents; in 1871, 5.5 cents; in 1872, 6 cents; in 1873, 7.7 cents—and that was the interesting year when the duty fell from 25 to 15 per cent. and the foreign price went up from 6 to 7.7 cents. In 1874 the value was 7.7 cents; in 1875, 8.2 cents; in 1876, 5.2 cents; in 1877 it fell to 4.4 cents, and that was the year when the advanced duty first fell from 15 per cent. ad valorem to 1.1 cents per pound, which made it, I think, about 40 per cent. ad valorem. As the duty went up the price went down. In 1877 it was 4.4 cents; in 1878, 4.1 cents; in 1879, 3.7 cents; and in 1880, 4.5 cents, though I will state that in that year tin-plate advanced in the same foreign value, from 16s. or \$4 per box, in September, 1879, to 30s. or \$7.50 per box, in January, 1880, and receded to 14s. or \$3.62 per box, in June, 1880.

It was during that time that a very high price was marked for about five months in the year, going from 3.7 cents per pound up to the high mark already indicated in the figures I have read, and back again, so as to make the average for that year in which that great fluctuation occurred only 4.5 cents.

Mr. EDMUNDS. Have you information as to the cause of that?

Mr. HIGGINS. It was the incident which only needs to be mentioned to be recalled by all, of the very great advance in all products of iron at that time. I have always assumed and supposed that the explanation was plain. We were still going on under the effects of the revulsion of 1873 which had not been entirely overcome, and there was a great advance in trade generally, and there was found to be a short supply of iron, so short that in view of the demand it was forced up to this high price.

Mr. EDMUNDS. Was there any legislative enactment of any country, ours or any other, that affected the question at the time?

Mr. HIGGINS. None whatever that I know of. In 1881 the value was 3.9 cents per pound; in 1882, 3.8 cents; in 1883, 3.7 cents; in 1884, 3.6 cents; in 1885, 3.3 cents; in 1886, 3.1 cents; in 1887, 3 cents; in 1888, 3 cents; in 1889, 2.9 cents, the lowest rate, and, in 1890, 3.1 cents.

It will thus be perceived that from the time of that phenomenal advance in 1880 until 1890 the price has remained most remarkably steady in view of the mutations which overtook almost every other branch of production and industry, the highest being 3.9 cents in 1881, coming down to 3.6 cents in 1884, and then in 1885 to 3.3 cents, and running along from that down to 2.9 cents in 1889 and rising again to 3.1 cents in 1890, and thus remaining almost steady.

Sir, what I contend and what I believe is that this steadiness of price of this peculiar product was not without cause, and that cause is not without its interest and its significance to the people of the United States as well as the people of Wales. It seems to me to be perfectly apparent that it was because this product had been in the hands of men in Wales who could control and who had controlled it and who have kept it just steadily there. All others have changed, others have gone down, and this has been kept steady.

Now take the American price. The American price I have not been able to get for this entire period, but I have already called the attention of the Senate to it at a previous stage of this debate, and I will ask to have inserted in the report of my remarks a table furnished by the importers, who have hastened to send telegrams here to overcome the result of their own figures, the table which they presented to the House Committee on Ways and Means, which is printed in "Revision of the Tariff Hearings before the Committee on Ways and Means" in the present House, at page 1208. This is from the firm of J. M. Melloy & Sons, of Philadelphia, on the 6th of January, 1890. They say:

We give you below a table showing the average price the merchants of New York sold at during the following years. This is far better than the misleading prices laid before you:

Months.	1884.	1885.	1886.	1887.	1888.	1889.
January	\$4.75	\$4.44	\$4.43	\$4.24	\$4.75	\$4.21½
February	4.66	4.41	4.36	4.25	4.79	4.20½
March	4.66	4.39	4.38	4.24	4.74	4.22
April	4.77½	4.36	4.43½	4.30	4.69½	4.28
May	4.78½	4.30	4.38	4.28	4.63	4.27½
June	4.76½	4.29	4.33½	4.29	4.46	4.25
July	4.86	4.50	4.36	4.37	4.51	4.25
August	4.85	4.51	4.30	4.50½	4.58	4.25½
September	4.80	4.51	4.23	4.46	4.62	4.32
October	4.69	4.56	4.25½	4.40½	4.47	4.51½
November	4.60	4.52	4.19½	4.55½	4.29½	4.73
December	4.50	4.51	4.17	4.79	4.24

Here comes in the middleman, here comes in the importer, here comes in the American side of this very comfortable and very nice arrangement, one which I do not complain of at all, that for their interest they do not wish disturbed, but there the price ranges from January, 1884—it is all given by years and months—\$4.75 a box, to November, 1889, when the price was \$4.73. Taking the first and the last item, it allows a difference of only 2 cents per box during the whole period.

Mr. EDMUNDS. One hundred and eight pounds to the box?

Mr. HIGGINS. I presume so. The average for 1884 was \$4.73 per box. I have had these calculations made: The average in 1885 was \$4.44; the average in 1886 was \$4.32 per box; the average in 1887 was \$4.39; in 1888, \$4.56 per box; and in 1889, \$4.30 per box.

Mr. EDMUNDS. That is the American price?

Mr. HIGGINS. That is the American price, and it has preserved this very remarkable steadiness. I say again, Mr. President, that, if we can not produce the article here, I think it ought to be put on the free-list if it can be made to appear that putting it on the free-list will make it any cheaper than it is now, and that is a question which only time and experience can test. I have been told that in regard to a great many things which have been put on the free-list the result has not been a reduction of price.

We have paraded before us here a company which has proposed to engage in this industry, as the Senator from Indiana [Mr. TURPIE] a few moments ago so wittily said, a tinless tin industry, and so when, in the crisis of the struggle of this nation for its life, it took those steps to preserve its existence and in the same breath took those steps in the establishment of the protective system which have given it its unexampled industrial growth, the same argument might have been used, not against this industry alone, but against the entire range of those industries which then were put under the protection of this great principle at that time embodied in our tariff laws.

I have not heard it seriously contended that it was not the purpose of that statute or of its framers at that time to have included this branch of the iron industry under it; but it is a fact that because they happened to call iron-plate coated with tin "tin-plate" it therefore did not fall under the duty and it has remained out of it ever since as an object-lesson to show this people the difference between the reduction of price brought about by the protective tariff and the steady elevation of that price when it has been under the control of the foreign producer.

There is the contention simple enough. Which side of it shall we take? Oh, say the Senators on the other side of the Chamber, if you raise this duty you increase this tax. If I believed that I would consider voting for this bill and against this amendment as iniquitous, as baneful; but I believe to the contrary, and I am not to be frightened from it by the suggestion that the only way tin can be dipped is by Welsh boys. I am told that there are already inventions by which it can be dipped without the help of boys, and I do not believe that that step is beyond the stretch of Yankee ingenuity.

I do not see why that product can not be made just as cheaply here as in Wales, the one thing always excepted of the price of labor. That is the one thing which they can get cheaper than we can get. I do not believe they can ever keep up with us in the pace of ingenuity, but against that difference in the cost of American labor and Welsh labor, I put the combine—not a trust, but the combine—between the gentlemen in Wales and the gentlemen in New York and Philadelphia who are now importing this tin. By the absence of a duty high enough to be protective they have been enabled to keep it at a steady price, and one constantly high to the consumer.

I believe profoundly, sir, in the necessity to this country of not only a protective tariff, but a competitive tariff, as suggested by the teachings of the lamented Garfield, quoted by the Senator from Virginia [Mr. DANIEL] yesterday. If not Mr. Cronmeyer, somebody else in this country can go into this market for the production of this article. Can we not expect that those profits now unfair made on the other side can be shared by manufacturers on this, and that when the profits shall be so shared the whole price shall be brought lower to the American people? If this result has been brought about on the whole line of protection, why can it not be done on this? If this article practically not brought under absolute protection has yet been kept at a steady price to the consumer, is not the *onus* upon gentlemen who hold the opposite contention to undertake to show here that we should not take the step proposed by the Committee on Finance and adopt the higher duty proposed?

It is asked, for what other reason should this be done? I think, sir, that it would be well for this country to have that many more men employed in this country in the manufacture of this article of iron, as we have in other articles here, rather than on the other side. I think it would be well that this industry should be established. It might be established in Pittsburgh. I believe we have a very good chance of establishing it on the Atlantic coast. There are drawbacks allowed under this bill upon all articles of raw material that are needed in this manufacture. That would be to the advantage of manufacturers on this coast, and I do not know of any better place than on the Delaware River. I know of no better place than my own city of Wilmington. I know of no more favorable spot on this continent than there, where water transportation and steam come into closest proximity to the mines of coal and of iron, as they do in that neighborhood.

If it should so happen, would it not be well for the farmers who live there and near there? I respectfully submit that it would. I do not believe that the farmers of Delaware or of the adjacent States have been in any degree injured by the fact that during this time of agricultural depression in the great cereal products they have had at their elbow

markets for all sorts of products other than grain and the staples in the great city of Philadelphia and the city of Baltimore on the one side and the other; of Chester, in Pennsylvania, and of my own city of Wilmington, with a prosperity marked by a growth of over 41 per cent. in population in the last decade.

Mr. EDMUNDS. What would become of their product but for those cities?

Mr. HIGGINS. Exactly, as the Senator from Vermont well says, what would have become of their products had we not had in America during all that time this vast population of consumers prosperously employed and rich, so far as from the enjoyment of unexampled wages in the history of the world they may be called rich.

Mr. President, at this late hour I do not want to detain the Senate long, but no more pregnant or interesting topic is before this people or before the world to-day than the causes of our agricultural depression. I believe that this depression has already touched its depth. I believe that the present rise of prices marks a change that is not likely ever to turn back in our time.

There has been a contribution to the discussion of this question lately made that I consider deserves attention and is entitled to the very deep interest of all the people of this and of every other country. These contributions were made by a citizen of Kansas already referred to in the course of this debate, Mr. C. Wood Davis, in three articles in *The Forum* of April, May, and June, of the present year, and in a series of articles in *The Cultivator and Country Gentleman*, running from early in May until the current number just out. In these he gives the whole statistics of the development of the agricultural lands of our own Western country during twenty-two years last past, in four periods, the last three being of five years each and the preceding one of the seven years before that time, and gives the growth of the land devoted to the culture of cereals and the number of acres as compared with the increase of population. And I beg to read from what he says in an article of the 5th of June:

Assuming that there had been no material overproduction of rye, oats, barley, buckwheat, potatoes, and tobacco up to 1887, we can easily measure the quantity of land necessary to produce so much of these staples, as well as hay and cotton, as is needed at home and provide so much tobacco and cotton as other people look to us for. With wheat, nearly all estimates, including those of the Department of Agriculture, place the domestic consumption—for all uses—at 5.66 bushels per capita, which, with an average yield per acre, is equal to forty-seven-one-hundredths of an acre. Of corn it is shown that the product has, during the fourteen years ending with 1888, averaged 29.75 bushels per capita, and, calling the exports of corn and meal equal to 1 bushel per capita, the home requirement of this grain is found to be 28.75 bushels per capita, which, with an average yield, is equal to 1.15 acres per capita.

Thus getting his unit of measure he goes on:

Taking the acreage of staples, other than corn and wheat, prior to 1888, as representing the normal requirements for such staples, it is found (on the basis of average annual yields per acre) we require the following amount of land to supply the population and permit the usual proportion of meats, tobacco, and cotton to go abroad:

Acreage per capita in corn	1.15
Acreage per capita in wheat	0.47
Acreage per capita in oats	0.43
Acreage per capita in hay	0.63
Acreage per capita in cotton	0.31
Acreage per capita in rye, barley, buckwheat, potatoes, and tobacco	0.16

Total acreage per capita..... 3.15

This shows that to provide so much of all the staples as are required at home and so much meat, tobacco, and cotton as there is sale for abroad at good prices, it is necessary to employ 3.15 acres for each unit of population, and we may safely assume that when the acreage does not exceed this amount prices will be remunerative and the farmer prosperous. We may at the present standard of living call 3.15 acres the normal requirement of the American people. Eliminating the proportion required to furnish the meat, cotton, and tobacco exported, the requirements for home consumption would be an even 3 acres per capita.

Having ascertained what are the acreage requirements of our people, is it not easy to determine whether it is or is not cultivated acres in excess of requirements that causes the "trouble with the farmer," and in case such is found to be the cause, when and how a healthy balance will be restored?

In the quinquennial period ending with the year 1874, the annual additions to the cultivated area in staple crops averaged 3,307,000 acres, the per capita quota of cultivated land being 2.65 acres, farm products high in price, and the farmer not in trouble.

During the five years ending with the year 1879, the acres in staple crops show an annual average increase of no less than 9,525,710 acres, and prices fell materially.

That was during the period when Kansas and Nebraska, the western parts of them, as well as more of that western country, were very rapidly settled.

In the semi-decade ending in 1884, the annual average additions to the acreage in staple crops fell to 6,841,000, but, still being altogether out of proportion to the increase in population, prices continued to fall and the per capita quota of cultivated land reaching 3.51 acres.

Still, that was far above the 3.15 acres which he estimates to be the normal amount.

In the next five-year period, ending in 1889, annual average additions to the cultivated acreage are found to have been less than 3,200,000 acres, showing the near exhaustion of the arable areas, and would have materially enhanced prices but for the enormous surplus of cultivated acres brought into use during the ten years ending in 1884.

I give again in round numbers this acreage: For the period ending

in 1879, 9,500,000 acres; in 1884, 6,800,000; and in 1889, 3,200,000 acres.

In 1884, after assigning 3.15 acres of cultivated land to each unit of population, there remained no less than 20,249,000 acres, the products of which must be forced upon foreign markets. Of this surplus acreage, 13,300,000 acres were employed in growing wheat, to be marketed in competition with the products of the cheap labor of Russia and India, and the remainder in growing a surplus of corn, to press upon domestic markets with ever-increasing weight.

Owing to the fact that population has increased since 1884 in much greater ratio than cultivated acres, this surplus of more than 20,000,000 acres then existing has been reduced nearly one-half, and will wholly disappear in three or at most four years, and with the disappearance of this surplus of cultivated acres will end forever the existing depression of agricultural interests. Such will be the limit of this state of affairs, which does not seem to be indefinite either in cause or duration.

But for the enormous corn crop of 1888 and 1889 and the large wheat crop of 1889, but such relief is coming, and many a discouraged farmer will pluck up courage and work hopefully when he can see the end of these troubles in plain view and realize that we have already traveled more than half the distance from the enormous surplus of 1884, and that instead of exporting a great surplus of cereals to glut foreign markets we are altogether likely to import wheat long before the end of the century.

I will take the liberty, Mr. President, of having printed in the *RECORD* further tables from *The Forum*, giving the average increase of population as compared with the number of farms, of cattle, of swine, of cotton, of corn, of wheat, and of oats during the respective periods to which this writer has called attention, from which it will appear that our normal increase of population has had no cessation except during the war; that during this period of extraordinary Western growth we have added an amount to the acreage of cultivated land utterly beyond the experience of mankind before in natural growth, and further tables show that that area of cultivable land is at last approaching its end. The falling off during the past five years shows that the end has been reached and that the farmers not only of America, but of the British Islands and the continent of Europe are to be relieved from this unexampled competition put upon them by the policy and the growth of this country.

I say policy, Mr. President, for where have we had in the experience of mankind a policy like our homesteading, that enables every man who can get there to get a farm for the lowest possible sum? Where else have there been conditions by which railways could empty pioneers upon the prairie, at once to go into active competition with the owners of farms, with all their investment of barns, buildings, fertilizers, and fences, which had been the slow making of years here in the East? Why, it has not only struck down the agricultural prosperity of the East, but of the West alike, and of Europe. I submit the tables, which are as follows:

During a period of thirty-nine years, ending in 1889, population, farms, and the production of the more important staples increased as follows:

	Per cent.
Population.....	175
Number of farms.....	260
Cattle.....	185
Swine.....	201
Bales of cotton.....	257
Bushels of corn.....	389
Bushels of wheat.....	411
Bushels of oats.....	411

As the result of an increase of farms and farm products so outstripping the increase in population, the only staples the growing of which is even fairly remunerative are pork and cotton. This is accounted for by our monopoly of the world's supply of cotton and by the fact that the number of swine has not kept pace with the increase in population; but it does not follow that there is a deficient supply of swine, for the number of both swine and cattle was greatly in excess of requirements prior to the civil war.

Except for brief periods, the prices of cattle continued remunerative up to the middle of the ninth decade, when the new farms of the West, the open-range regions of Texas, the plains, and the mountain areas furnished a supply far in excess of demands, swamping the markets and reducing prices to a level precluding all profit. The time of war excepted, the increase in population has been quite uniform in rate, while the increase in the production of the staples has been by "leaps and bounds," as appears from the following summaries, showing the rates at which population and various products have increased. The increase from 1850 to 1860 was:

	Per cent.
Population.....	36
Number of farms.....	41
Cattle.....	30
Swine.....	43
Bales of cotton.....	117
Acres in corn.....	41
Acres in wheat.....	70
Acres in oats.....	17

In this decade farms, swine, cotton, corn, and wheat increased more rapidly than population, the increase in cotton and wheat having been stimulated by an active foreign demand, especially during the Crimean war. Cotton-growing took its greatest strides at this time, increasing from 2,469,000 bales in 1850 to 5,387,000 in 1860, and then falling away to 3,000,000 in 1870. Not until 1880 did it reach as high a mark as twenty years before.

From 1860 to 1870 the increase and decrease were as follows:

	Per cent.
Increase:	
Population.....	23
Number of farms.....	30
Acres in corn.....	24
Acres in wheat.....	66
Acres in oats.....	50
Decrease:	
Cattle.....	7
Swine.....	25
Cotton.....	42

Again, farms and acres of wheat and oats are found to increase much more rapidly than population, but such was the activity of the foreign demand and so great the consumption and waste incident to a state of war that farm products sold at such prices as to bring great prosperity to the agricultural interest. The reduction in the number of swine and cattle was largely due to the waste and destruction following in the wake of war, and this diminution in numbers made meat production one of the most profitable branches of husbandry. The great reduction of the cotton fields during the civil war accounts for the fact that cotton-growing has not reached that state where supply waits impatiently on demand.

From 1870 to 1880 the increase was:

	Per cent.
Population.....	30
Number of farms.....	51
Number of cattle.....	41
Number of swine.....	90
Number of bales of cotton.....	91
Acres in corn.....	61
Acres in wheat.....	61
Acres in oats.....	49
	101

During the eighth decade the increase in farms and all staple products completely outran population. That was the period of greatest expansion in area and production, when all farm products brought remunerative prices and the farmer was sighing for more acres to sow and plant, in order to hasten the unhappy day that such excessive expansion foretold.

From 1880 to 1889 the increase has been:

	Per cent.
Population.....	27
Number of farms.....	20
Number of cattle.....	51
Number of swine.....	5
Number of bales of cotton.....	45
Acres in corn.....	26
Acres in oats.....	70
Acres in wheat.....	0.4

As yet, statistics of the increase in number of farms are not obtainable, but it is estimated that it has not kept pace with the increase of population. There has been a general slowing down of the killing pace of the preceding decade, except in the case of cattle, and even here the increase has been very slow since 1887, being but 2.04 per cent. per annum. In the first half of this period the wheat area increased 1,489,000 acres; it has since decreased 1,352,027 acres, a net increase in nine years or four-tenths of 1 per cent.

From The Forum for May, 1890:

During the last five years population has increased 13.7 per cent., the area in corn 12.3, that in oats 29, cattle 20, and swine 14, with a decrease of 3.4 per cent. in the wheat area. Seven-tenths of such increase in the corn area occurred in the first two years, indicating that the expansion in corn-growing is nearing its end. That such is the case will be seen when an inquiry is made into the present sources of supply and we compare the present rate of increase and distribution of areas with those obtaining in preceding periods, as set forth in the following table:

Table showing acreage of corn and its geographical distribution in the years 1874, 1879, 1884, and 1889.

Groups of States.	Corn acreage, 1874.	Corn acreage, 1879.	Corn acreage, 1884.	Corn acreage, 1889.
North Atlantic.....	2,780,204	3,608,036	3,669,741	3,646,676
Lake.....	13,903,883	18,353,646	17,311,852	17,499,440
Missouri Valley.....	8,721,076	17,243,738	21,590,851	27,388,602
Southern.....	13,292,302	19,136,458	21,339,493	22,783,290
Arkansas and Texas.....	2,246,272	3,766,897	5,610,410	6,704,044
Mountain and Pacific areas.....	93,181	100,094	261,403	300,599
Totals.....	41,036,918	62,368,869	69,683,780	78,319,651
Percentages of increase.....		52.1+	11.7+	*12.3+

*The increase in the corn area during the last three years has been but 1.2 per cent. per annum, as against 4.1 per cent. in the two preceding years.

The preceding exhibit shows that corn-growing is apparently approaching its limit, and that contraction in area is not improbable, the increase in acreage having ceased in the coast region, extending from Maine to Maryland, and in the Lake group, which includes such States as Ohio, Indiana, Illinois, Michigan, Wisconsin, and Minnesota.

In the States of the Missouri Valley—Iowa, Missouri, Kansas, Nebraska, and the Dakotas—the area in corn nearly doubled in the five years ending in 1879, and the reduction in the rate of increase shows that the quantity of new land being devoted to this crop is less than formerly.

This is the scene of the excessive expansion in corn-growing which flooded the markets, depressing prices to the present unprecedented level; yet in this district the corn acreage has nearly reached its limit, settlement having passed beyond the corn area and partially overrun the arid plains where corn culture is impracticable except upon such limited areas as can be irrigated. The process of converting corn-fields into dairy farms, orchards, and meadows is here in active operation, and we may conclude that the corn-fields of this district will not in this century, if ever, exceed 80,000,000 acres.

South of the Potomac and Ohio corn-growing made great strides from 1874 to 1879, but advanced much less rapidly from 1879 to 1886. Since 1886 there has been but small increase. In Arkansas and Texas the increase has been better sustained than elsewhere and shows fewer signs of an early halt, although there is an encouraging slackening in the rate. A moderate increase may be looked for in these States.

The acreage employed in corn-growing in the vast regions extending from the one hundred and second meridian to the Pacific does not equal that of the corn-fields of two counties in Kansas; and this entire area, being but poorly adapted to the production of this staple, will ever remain an unimportant factor in determining the extent of the supply.

From this survey of the sources of supply it appears that any material increase of the corn acreage must be looked for in the States of the Missouri Valley, in Arkansas and Texas and in that portion of the Indian Territory lying east of the ninety-eighth meridian, the latter being the only body of land adapted to this product yet to be occupied. Of these lands by far the best are likely to remain in the possession of the Indians, and those familiar with Indian farming will look for but little addition to the supply from lands so occupied. Nor are the blacks

now migrating to the Indian Territory likely to increase the surplus, as much of their labor will doubtless be employed in cotton-growing, to which soil and climate are adapted. It is safe to say that the Indian Territory will not for years produce any considerable surplus, but will, by the end of the century, have two or three million acres employed in growing corn, which will no more than compensate for losses in area east of the Mississippi.

The tendency of the present very low price will be to contract the area in corn wherever the land can be otherwise employed—at the South, for instance, in the production of cotton—and some expansion of the wheat-fields may result from a decrease in the corn area in northern localities.

This review of the area of corn production leads to the conclusion that the acreage devoted to this staple will not exceed 83,000,000, until such time as far higher prices shall render profitable the cultivation of soils of very low fertility; and it is not likely to exceed 80,000,000 acres within five years.

Careful computation of the extent of the exportation of animals and animal products now and fifteen years since shows the increase in such exports to be equal to an addition of 1 bushel of corn per capita; and what with the increased exportation of corn in this form and its larger employment in the manufacture of various forms of glucose and as a substitute for Canadian and home-grown barley, a moderate estimate would put her per capita requirements at least 15 per cent. above the amount consumed prior to 1875.

With consumption at the rate of 23 bushels per capita, an average yield from 83,000,000 acres would supply a population of 74,000,000, which we may expect to see as soon as the year 1895.

Table showing the acreage of wheat and its geographical distribution in the years 1875, 1880, 1884, and 1889.

Groups of States.	Wheat acreage, 1875.	Wheat acreage, 1880.	Wheat acreage, 1884.	Wheat acreage, 1889.
North Atlantic.....	2,489,724	3,203,155	3,279,925	2,851,453
Lake.....	11,011,734	16,221,457	14,183,543	13,621,659
Missouri Valley.....	5,406,160	8,950,331	9,011,817	6,276,440
Southern.....	4,869,364	6,109,064	6,472,815	5,883,817
Mountain areas.....	125,213	293,100	442,795	507,136
The Dakotas.....	10,000	300,000	1,540,200	4,431,084
Pacific coast.....	2,469,317	2,907,610	4,545,290	4,532,320
Totals.....	26,381,512	37,986,717	39,475,885	38,123,359
Percentage of increase and decrease.....		44.0+	3.9+	3.4—

The table covers the period of greatest expansion in wheat culture and shows the distribution of acreage now, at the commencement of that period, and at its climax in 1884, when acreage and aggregate product were at the highest point ever reached, with population about 9,500,000 less than now. Although the table tells the story of the westward movement of wheat-growing, and shows that it has reached and passed its limit, analysis of gains and losses will enable us to estimate the future cost and extent of production.

I think, Mr. President, that nothing more brutal has ever taken place in history than the overthrow of British agriculture during this period. This same writer, in another article, quotes from the leading authority in England as to its effect upon English agriculture. He says:

Since the death of James Caird, Mr. H. Kains Jackson is probably the best English authority on this subject, and to show that I am not alone in looking for high prices for breadstuffs I quote the following from a recent communication to "Dornbusch," wherein he says:

"While foreign competition has depressed wheat, some of the depression is due to the poverty of English farmers, who have undersold wheat in English markets. In fact, The Spectator estimates the loss to English farmers in recent times, from low prices and decline in land values, at \$3,000,000,000."

That is the measure given by the best English authority as to the loss in that tight little island of its agriculturists under the most blessed reign of free trade that can win or earn the admiration of the Senators on the other side of this Chamber. Their panacea needs stronger proof; it has been there applied under circumstances except as to tariff duties identical with our own (since ocean transportation has been so reduced), and its result is thus garnered in a single short sentence, telling more of suffering, more of woe, and of the deadliest blows struck at the proudest class that has ever stood upon this earth.

I believe, Mr. President, that this period is over for us all. The present crop of wheat is a short one. It is already ascertained that the present crop of corn is a short one; and I think that the shortage of both of those crops this year is going to use up the surplus which we have annually and usually carried over, and not even the largest crop of those grains in another year can bring their production up to the growth of population in this country, now that the period of prairie development has come substantially to its close.

We have spent a good deal of time in this session on the arid-land question; but, as this writer in one of these articles well says, while it is very tempting and has been very tempting to settlers and pioneers to go into that arid country after some year when the rain-fall has been greater than usual, they always come back just as certain as the frosts of autumn. To-day we have upon the table, if we have not already passed, a joint resolution giving aid to the settlers of Oklahoma, most of whom were the overflow of those who had been accustomed to go into these broad prairies knowing that there was substantially a boundless home and farms for all, but the end of which they have now seen. Why, the rush of these settlers took up that Oklahoma Territory and Sioux reservation as a sponge does a drop of water. What are they going to do now? I grant you we can enlarge the products of our homesteads over the settled parts of the country, that we can increase the marketable product of the farms in all this territory, but not as fast as population grows.

Mr. President, it seems to me that it is fortunate for this country that this question has come at this time. In 1883 the Republican party had possession of two branches of this Government, the Presidency and the House, and a tie, I believe, in the Senate. We have the authority of the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. ALDRICH] that the reason why this tin-plate industry was not treated in the same spirit in which it is now was that it was impossible at that time to command a majority for it. The tariff was dealt with then, and now seven years more have rolled around and it comes again to the Republican party now in control of the three branches of the Government to deal with it.

I say, I think it is fortunate for this people that this opportunity has not come until we have been able to go through with all this period of agricultural depression and been able to see the beginning of the end, that we can thus have laid before us the facts and the figures going to show what has been the cause of this agricultural depression, and feel that we can deal with this question of such momentous interest to all the country in whatever branches of industry its people may be engaged, free from this specious argument that because the farmers are now or have been in bad case and have to be consulted and their opinion taken about it, we can appeal only to the extremity of their experiences.

Mr. President, I doubt if there is a more intelligent constituency in the world than that agricultural constituency which stands to-day behind the Republican party. It has stood this dreadful fire with even more steadiness than Wellington's troops stood at Waterloo. It has not blinched; it has not flinched. It has been willing in the past, as it is willing to-day, to take the present possible ill for the ultimate good. It has stood by the wage-earner while the wage-earner has been led by these false leaders throughout the North to endeavor to overthrow this protective principle, without the maintenance of which he would come speedily and sorrowfully to find who were his true friends and who his false ones.

I wonder at the temerity of gentlemen representing such constituencies of wage-earners when they dare longer to tamper with the interests of those who have had such a blessed harvest from this protective policy. I know that the farmers of Delaware have suffered from Western agricultural competition. I know they have been benefited, as I said before, because they have had markets near by developed by the growth of protected manufactures to which they could send most of their produce. But I turn from them to that population there which works with its hands in iron, in wood, in cars, in ships, in leather, in morocco, in all the articles supplied to the people of this country and to South America and the world, and I say you can not find anywhere in the history of mankind wage-earners who have had such a steady and high rate of wages and food at once so cheap and so good.

Mr. President, I think that that farming constituency will sustain the Senators on this side in correcting the oversight, if it were only an oversight, of a quarter of a century ago, and try the experiment, if experiment it be, of putting this industry into the class of all the industries which have been preserved by protection, and thereby adding that much more to the opportunity for the labor of the country, employed or unemployed; that much more opportunity for the wise and fortunate application and use of capital.

Mr. PLUMB. I wish to modify my amendment.

Mr. ALDRICH. I rose to move that the Senate adjourn.

Mr. PLUMB. I want to modify my amendment so as to have the corrected form of it go into the RECORD. I withdraw the amendment I offered, and will move to amend in line 6, on page 29, by striking out the words "two and two-tenths cents" and inserting the words "one cent;" and then adding, after the word "pound," in line 7, the words:

And there shall be paid to the manufacturer of tin-plate in the United States etc.

Following the language of my former amendment. That, if adopted, will then practically be followed by the striking out of paragraph 139.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The Senator from Kansas withdraws his amendment to strike out and moves to amend as will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 29, line 6, strike out "two and two-tenths cents" and insert "one cent;" so as to read:

Shall pay 1 cent per pound.

Mr. ALDRICH. I suggest that that is the amendment just voted on by the Senate.

Mr. PLUMB. I understand, but my other amendment goes with it; so that it is different.

The CHIEF CLERK. And after the word "pound," in line 7, add:

And there shall be paid to the manufacturers of tin-plate in the United States from any moneys in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, a bounty of 1 cent per pound, under such rules and regulations as the Commissioner of Internal Revenue, with the approval of the Secretary of the Treasury, shall prescribe.

Mr. ALDRICH. I move that the Senate adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 6 o'clock and 5 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until to-morrow, Friday, August 15, 1890, at 10 o'clock a. m.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

THURSDAY, August 14, 1890.

The House met at 12 o'clock m. Prayer by Rev. J. H. CUTHBERT, D. D.

The Journal of yesterday's proceedings was read and approved.

NATHANIEL M'KAY ET AL.

The SPEAKER. The first business in order is the taking of the vote by yeas and nays on the question before the House yesterday at the adjournment—"Shall the decision of the Chair stand as the judgment of the House?" on which no quorum voted. The Clerk will call the roll.

Mr. BAKER (after the Clerk had called the first name on the roll). One moment, if the Chair please. I want to ask unanimous consent to read a telegram which has been received from Oklahoma in regard to the destitution and suffering there; and I would like to ask the consideration of a resolution on the subject, which was objected to yesterday. I have in my hand a telegram received from the United States district attorney—

The SPEAKER. The Chair does not think the roll-call ought to be interrupted.

Mr. BAKER. With the understanding that I may have this telegram read afterward—

The SPEAKER. In the opinion of the Chair the roll-call should not be interrupted.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 114, nays 31, not voting 182; as follows:

YEAS—114.

Anderson, Kans.	Culbertson, Pa.	Knapp,	Ray,
Atkinson, Pa.	Cummings,	Lacey,	Reed, Iowa
Atkinson, W. Va.	Cutcheon,	La Follette,	Rockwell,
Baker,	Darlington,	Laidlaw,	Rowell,
Bankhead,	Dibble,	Lanham,	Sawyer,
Bartine,	Dingley,	Lansing,	Sayers,
Bayne,	Dolliver,	Lee,	Scull,
Beckwith,	Dunnell,	Lester, Ga.	Sherman,
Belknap,	Evans,	Lewis,	Simonds,
Bergen,	Farquhar,	McClammy,	Skinner,
Bliss,	Featherston,	McCord,	Smyser,
Blount,	Flick,	McDuffie,	Stivers,
Brewer,	Gear,	McRae,	Stockbridge,
Buchanan, N. J.	Gest,	Miles,	Stone, Ky.
Burrows,	Gifford,	Moffitt,	Stone, Mo.
Burton,	Hall,	Morgan,	Struble,
Butterworth,	Hansbrough,	Morrow,	Taylor, E. B.
Cannon,	Hare,	Niedringhaus,	Thomas,
Carlton,	Harmer,	O'Donnell,	Tillman,
Carter,	Haugen,	O'Neill, Pa.	Turner, Ga.
Caswell,	Haynes,	Osborne,	Turner, Kans.
Cheadle,	Henderson, Ill.	Owens, Ohio	Vandever,
Clements,	Henderson, Iowa	Payne,	Van Schaick,
Comstock,	Hermann,	Paynter,	Walker,
Conger,	Hitt,	Payson,	Watson,
Connell,	Hopkins,	Perkins,	Wilkinson,
Craig,	Kennedy,	Pickler,	Williams, Ohio.
Crain,	Kerr, Iowa	Pugsley,	
Culbertson, Tex.	Kinsey,	Quackenbush,	

NAYS—31.

Breckinridge, Ky.	Edmunds,	Lane,	Rowland,
Brickner,	Forman,	McClellan,	Springer,
Brookshire,	Forney,	Montgomery,	Stewart, Tex.
Brunner,	Hayes,	Moore, Tex.	Wheeler, Ala.
Chipman,	Henderson, N. C.	Norton,	Williams, Ill.
Clarke, Ala.	Holman,	Peel,	Wilson, Mo.
Cooper, Ind.	Hooker,	Pearington,	Yoder.
Covert,	Kerr, Pa.	Quinn,	

NOT VOTING—182.

Abbott,	Caruth,	Gibson,	Milliken,
Adams,	Catchings,	Goodnight,	Mills,
Alderson,	Cheatham,	Greenhalge,	Moore, N. H.
Allen, Mich.	Clancy,	Grimes,	Morey,
Allen, Miss.	Clark, Wis.	Grosvenor,	Morrill,
Anderson, Miss.	Clunie,	Hatch,	Morse,
Andrew,	Cobb,	Heard,	Mudd,
Arnold,	Cogswell,	Hemphill,	Mutthler,
Banks,	Coleman,	Herbert,	Nute,
Barnes,	Cooper, Ohio	Hill,	Oates,
Barwig,	Cothran,	Houk,	O'Ferrall,
Belden,	Cowles,	Kelley,	O'Neill, Ind.
Biggs,	Crisp,	Ketcham,	O'Neill, Mass.
Bingham,	Dalzell,	Kilgore,	Outhwaite,
Bianchard,	Dargan,	Lawler,	Owen, Ind.
Bland,	Davidson,	Laws,	Parrett,
Boatner,	De Haven,	Lehlbach,	Perry,
Boothman,	De Lano,	Lester, Va.	Peters,
Boutelle,	Dickerson,	Lind,	Phelan,
Bowden,	Dockery,	Lodge,	Pierce,
Breckinridge, Ark.	Dorsey,	Magner,	Post,
Brosius,	Dunphy,	Malsh,	Price,
Brower,	Elliot,	Mansur,	Raines,
Brown, J. B.	Enloe,	Martin, Ind.	Randall,
Browne, T. M.	Ewart,	Martin, Tex.	Reilly,
Buchanan, Va.	Finley,	Mason,	Reyburn,
Buckalew,	Fitch,	McAdoo,	Richardson,
Bullock,	Fithian,	McCarthy,	Rife,
Bunn,	Flood,	McComas,	Robertson,
Bynum,	Flower,	McCornick,	Rogers,
Caldwell,	Fowler,	McCreary,	Rusk,
Campbell,	Frank,	McKenna,	Russell,
Candler, Ga.	Funston,	McKinley,	Sanford,
Candler, Mass.	Geissenhainer,	McMillin,	Scranton,
			Seney,

Shively,
Smith, Ill.
Smith, W. Va.
Snider,
Spinola,
Spoonier,
Stahlnecker,
Stephenson,
Stewart, Ga.
Stewart, Vt.
Stockdale,

Stump,
Sweeney,
Tarsney,
Taylor, Ill.
Taylor, J. D.
Taylor, Tenn.
Thompson,
Townsend, Colo.
Townsend, Pa.
Tracey,
Tucker,

Turner, N. Y.
Vaux,
Venable,
Waddill,
Wade,
Wallace, Mass.
Wallace, N. Y.
Washington,
Wheeler, Mich.
Whitting,
Whitthorne,

Wickham,
Wike,
Wiley,
Willcox,
Wilson, Ky.
Wilson, Wash.
Wilson, W. Va.
Wright,
Yardley.

The following pairs were announced, until further notice:

Mr. KETCHAM with Mr. CAMPBELL.

Mr. COLEMAN with Mr. CUMMINGS.

Mr. RAINES with Mr. BUNN.

Mr. TOWNSEND, of Colorado, with Mr. ENLOE.

Mr. LEHLBACH with Mr. COTHRAN.

Mr. WILSON, of Washington, with Mr. COBB.

Mr. BOOTHMAN with Mr. COWLES.

Mr. ARNOLD with Mr. MAGNER.

Mr. LODGE with Mr. ANDREW.

Mr. HILL with Mr. MORGAN.

Mr. SCRANTON with Mr. STAHLNECKER.

Mr. PETERS with Mr. MANSUR.

Mr. HOUK with Mr. RICHARDSON.

Mr. GROUT with Mr. FITCH.

Mr. MCCOMAS with Mr. BOATNER.

Mr. RUSSELL with Mr. MARTIN, of Texas.

Mr. COOPER, of Ohio, with Mr. MAISH.

Mr. BOUTELLE with Mr. HERBERT.

Mr. COGSWELL with Mr. O'NEIL, of Massachusetts.

Mr. RANDALL with Mr. SPINOLA.

Mr. THOMAS M. BROWNE with Mr. WASHINGTON.

Mr. RIFE with Mr. ANDERSON, of Mississippi.

Mr. BAKER with Mr. ELLIOTT.

Mr. MOORE, of New Hampshire, with Mr. GIBSON.

Mr. WALLACE, of New York, with Mr. MCCARTHY.

Mr. THOMPSON with Mr. OATES.

Mr. CANDLER, of Massachusetts, with Mr. STEWART, of Georgia.

Mr. DORSEY with Mr. FOWLER.

Mr. DE HAVEN with Mr. BIGGS, on all questions except bankruptcy and national-bank legislation.

Mr. MCKINLEY with Mr. MILLS.

Mr. WADDILL with Mr. HEMPHILL.

Mr. MCCORMICK with Mr. ROBERTSON.

Mr. WILSON, of Kentucky, with Mr. PERRY.

Mr. SPOONER with Mr. DARGAN.

Mr. WHEELER, of Michigan, with Mr. BLAND.

Mr. BANKS with Mr. BUCHANAN, of Virginia.

Mr. MCKENNA with Mr. CLUNIE.

Mr. CLARK, of Wisconsin, with Mr. WIKE.

Mr. TAYLOR, of Tennessee, with Mr. O'NEALL, of Indiana.

Mr. BELDEN with Mr. FLOWER.

Mr. MORRILL with Mr. DOCKERY.

Mr. FRANK with Mr. DICKERSON.

Mr. DE LANO with Mr. DUNPHY.

Mr. ATKINSON, of Pennsylvania, with Mr. HEARD.

Mr. SANFORD with Mr. RUSK.

Mr. STEPHENSON with Mr. DAVIDSON.

Mr. LIND with Mr. PIERCE.

Mr. NUTE with Mr. BARNES.

Mr. STEWART, of Vermont, with Mr. BLANCHARD.

Mr. PERKINS with Mr. KILGORE.

Mr. SMYSER with Mr. SENEY.

Mr. FINLEY with Mr. CANDLER, of Georgia.

Mr. MORSE with Mr. ELLIS.

Mr. JOSEPH D. TAYLOR with Mr. OUTHWAITE.

Mr. WRIGHT with Mr. GEISSENHAINER.

Mr. ADAMS with Mr. WHITING.

Mr. SMITH, of West Virginia, with Mr. ALDERSON.

Mr. DALZELL with Mr. CLANCY.

Mr. SWENEY with Mr. McMILLIN, on this vote.

Mr. BROWNE, of Virginia, with Mr. MCCREARY, on this vote.

Mr. VAN SCHAICK with Mr. BARWIG, for this day.

Mr. BOWDEN with Mr. VAUX, on this vote.

Mr. WICKHAM with Mr. PRICE, for this day.

Mr. EWART with Mr. STUMP, for this day.

Mr. WADE with Mr. VENABLE, for this day.

Mr. YARDLEY with Mr. MUTCHLER, for this day.

Mr. REYBURN with Mr. TRACEY, until Tuesday next.

Mr. MILLIKEN with Mr. ABBOTT, for ten days, Mr. MILLIKEN reserving the right to vote to make a quorum and on the original-package bill.

Mr. MASON with Mr. HATCH, until August 19.

Mr. TUCKER with Mr. GREENHALGE, until August 14.

Mr. WILSON, of West Virginia, with Mr. GROSVENOR, until August 17.

Mr. WATSON with Mr. REILLY, until Friday next.

Mr. SMITH, of Illinois, with Mr. FITHIAN, until Friday next.

Mr. TOWNSEND, of Pennsylvania, with Mr. MARTIN, of Indiana, until further notice, except on the Atkinson railroad bill.

Mr. GREENHALGE. My pair, Mr. Speaker, extends only to political questions, but this may possibly be considered as such a question. I withdraw my vote.

Mr. RICHARDSON. I am paired with my colleague, Mr. HOUK, but voted on this question for the purpose of making a quorum. As the vote is not necessary for that purpose, I desire to withdraw it.

Mr. TARSNEY. My colleague, Mr. HEARD, was necessarily absent from the House yesterday on account of sickness, and he is absent today for the same reason, and requested me to ask that he be excused.

Mr. PERKINS. I am paired with the gentleman from Texas, but voted to make a quorum.

Mr. BOOTHMAN. I am paired also, but voted to make a quorum. If the vote is not necessary, I withdraw it.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the names of members present and not voting.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. BELDEN, Mr. BOOTHMAN, Mr. BROWNE of Virginia, Mr. JASON B. BROWN, Mr. BYNUM, Mr. CALDWELL, Mr. CANDLER of Georgia, Mr. CARUTH, Mr. CRISP, Mr. DOCKERY, Mr. FITHIAN, Mr. GEISSENHAINER, Mr. GREENHALGE, Mr. GRIMES, Mr. MCKENNA, Mr. MORGAN, Mr. MORROW, Mr. MUDD, Mr. PARRETT, Mr. RICHARDSON, Mr. ROGERS, Mr. TARSNEY, Mr. TAYLOR of Tennessee, Mr. TOWNSEND of Pennsylvania, and the SPEAKER.

The SPEAKER. On this question the yeas recorded are 114, the nays 31, and, with those members noted as present and not voting, a quorum being present, the decision of the Chair becomes the judgment of the House.

ORDER OF BUSINESS.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, I suppose the bill is now before the House for consideration?

The SPEAKER. It is.

Mr. STRUBLE. I ask the gentleman to yield to me for a moment to present a resolution authorized by the Committee on the Territories in relation to the destitution in Oklahoma.

Mr. BAKER. I ask in that connection to have read a telegram I have received in regard to the same subject.

The SPEAKER. If there be no objection, the gentleman from Iowa can submit the resolution.

Mr. BAKER. And this telegram I ask to have also read.

Mr. THOMAS. I shall object if this is going to take up any great length of time.

Mr. STRUBLE. I do not think it will. I ask that the resolution I have presented be read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the unexpended balance, or so much thereof as may be necessary, of the appropriation made by the joint resolution approved April 25, 1890, for the relief of destitute persons in the district overflowed by the Mississippi River and its tributaries, is hereby reappropriated and authorized to be used for the relief of such destitute persons in the Oklahoma Territory as may require assistance, said sum to be expended under the direction of the Secretary of War.

Mr. BAKER. I now ask that the telegram bearing on this subject be read.

The Clerk read as follows:

GUTHRIE, IND. T., August 13, 1890.

Hon. CHARLES S. BAKER, Washington, D. C.:

Captain Cavanaugh has personally inspected, under orders, and reported that at least one-third of the settlers within 10 miles from Guthrie need food at once and have no means to get it. I know the destitution is general. Urge that appropriation as recommended by President be put through.

HORACE SPEED.
W. P. HACKNEY.

Mr. PERKINS. I desire to have read a telegram that I have also received.

The Clerk read as follows:

GUTHRIE, IND. T., August 13.

Hon. B. W. PERKINS, Washington, D. C.:

Please push appropriation for relief of destitute in Oklahoma. At least one-third require help at once. I have this from Captain Cavanaugh, who made personal inspection within radius of 10 miles from Guthrie.

HENRY E. ASH.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

Mr. WALKER, of Massachusetts, and Mr. McCLAMMY objected.

The SPEAKER. Objection is made on both sides of the Chamber.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE FOR EMPLOYEES IN THE CUSTOMS SERVICE.

Mr. BELDEN. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. THOMAS] yield to the gentleman from New York?

Mr. THOMAS. I understand it will take but a moment, and with that understanding I yield.

The Clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 276) providing for leave of absence for officers and employees in the customs service of the Government who receive per diem compensation.

Be it enacted, etc., That all officers and employees of the customs service of the Government who receive a per diem compensation shall be entitled to receive

the same leave of absence as is provided for clerks and employes in the several Executive Departments at Washington, D. C., by chapter 128, section 4, of the United States Statutes at Large, volume 22, pages 563 and 564, approved March 3, A. D. 1883.

SEC. 2 That the Secretary of the Treasury shall make all rules and regulations necessary to carry the provisions of this act into effect.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. HEADLE. I object.

The SPEAKER. Objection is made. The gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. THOMAS] will proceed.

Mr. CANNON. It seems to me that we can not afford in one breath to object to relief for the starving in Oklahoma and in the next to propose to grant additional pay, or its equivalent, to Government officials who are already well paid.

NATHANIEL M'KAY ET AL.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, I desire to raise the question of consideration of the McKay bill. Does the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. THOMAS] desire to call up this bill now?

Mr. THOMAS. I am going to call it up now. I did call it up.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman has been recognized and began to debate it.

Mr. SPRINGER. The gentleman did not indicate for what purpose he rose when he was recognized. As soon as he indicated what he was on the floor for, I raised the question—

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Wisconsin will proceed.

Mr. SPRINGER. Does the Chair decline to entertain the question of consideration?

The SPEAKER. Why, certainly; the bill has begun to be debated.

Mr. SPRINGER. When was it begun?

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Wisconsin was recognized some time ago.

Mr. SPRINGER. There is not a line in this RECORD of debate on that subject, not a line. [Cries of "Regular order!"]

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Wisconsin has been recognized and has yielded to two different gentlemen. The gentleman will proceed.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, this bill, I suppose, is probably as well understood as any bill that has ever been before this House. It is a bill to refer to the Court of Claims the claim of persons named in the bill, to ascertain whether they have any demand against the Government or not. It arises out of the construction of three iron-clad vessels. These vessels were three out of about twenty or thirty ordered by the Government during the war, during 1862 and 1863. These parties entered into a contract to construct these vessels in about eight months' time. The entering into such contract to build so many vessels naturally employed a great many contractors, employed a great many men, and took a vast amount of material.

The contractors supposed they would be able to complete their contract in eight months, according to the terms of the contract; but from the very start, Mr. Speaker, of the laying of the keels of these iron-clad monitors until they were finished the Government changed the plans and made alterations, found that the plans and specifications which they furnished these contractors, under which they were to complete these vessels, were wrong; that, in fact, a vessel built under those conditions would sink, and they had to be remodeled and reconstructed, and instead of being able to complete them in eight months, it took twenty-two months to do the work. They were idle four months at a time, maintaining great yards and a large number of men, and the consequence was they lost vast sums of money.

This claim has been investigated by committee after committee of this House and of the other House, and no committee has failed to report it favorably. The claim has been reported fourteen or fifteen times favorably. It has passed Congress. It was vetoed by President Grant because there was a clause left out by accident, which should have been put in, to guard the Government and to instruct the court as to the line upon which it was to decide the case. That is in this bill. It passed the Fiftieth Congress and was vetoed by President Cleveland upon a misapprehension of facts which are easily shown, the President himself being misinformed as to the facts.

The Committee on War Claims, not only of this House, but of the Senate, have carefully examined the case, and have unanimously reported in favor of submitting the case and this claim to the Court of Claims. We are not voting a cent out of the Treasury of the United States, unless a court, duly constituted, shall upon a fair hearing, with the Attorney-General to defend the Government, decide that the Government is justly indebted, and then, if the Government thinks the court is wrong, it has an appeal to the Supreme Court of the United States, where the case can be finally decided.

There is nothing in this case that is ambiguous; there is nothing that can be suggested in the way of honest and fair criticism, which shows that there is anything wrong. And to show you that the Government and its officials and its engineers have always recognized this as a just claim, I wish to read to you the testimony given by the chief engineer of the Government of the United States, who drew the plans for the construction of these ironclads and who made the alterations

and superintended the construction of the vessels, and knows all the facts.

Chief Engineer Stimers says:

Before expressing an opinion on the matter as an expert I must explain that the principles upon which the contractors of this and the contractors of similar vessels were to be paid were settled upon before I left the office, and I have always understood that these principles were adhered to, and they were as follows: That we should pay for the contract work by making the contract payments, or the payments provided for in the contract; that we should pay for alterations and changes a proper sum, as might be agreed upon between the Government and the contractors at current rates.

Now, that being the case, I consider that the Government is still indebted to the contractors of the Etah, because, although the original contract work has been paid for as originally agreed upon and the extra work may have been paid for *per se*, the fact of calling upon the contractor to make the changes on his vessel and his compliance with those demands delayed him in the execution of the original contract work. This delay compelled him to pay the increased rates for labor and material which obtained at the time the work was actually performed; and although the contractor took the risk of a rise in prices when he signed his contract, it was only for a risk during the period of his contract, or the period he would have required to perform the work if the Government had not delayed him by their direct interference.

Now, whatever increase there was in the cost of the original work contemplated by the contract, due to the delay caused by the Government, that increase is now due, as there has been no pretense on the part of the officers of the Government to have paid it.

The Etah is one of the vessels built under exactly the same circumstances as the vessels mentioned in this bill. Here is a statement by the chief engineer, the man who drew the plans and specifications upon which these contractors entered upon an agreement to build these vessels, and the Government justly owes these parties something by reason of their delay, by reason of the unexpected alterations and changes, and by reason of compelling them to tear down and rebuild over and over again, and by compelling them to stop work for months at a time. To show the House, Mr. Speaker, one of the causes of loss to these claimants in this case, let me read from the testimony of this same chief engineer. He testifies as follows:

In addition to all this, the prices of labor and materials required for the work, and for which the contractors had made provision during the time of the contracts, rapidly advanced, so that, as found by the Committee on War Claims of the first session of the Forty-third Congress, iron, that at the date of the contracts was worth \$65 per ton, advanced during the prolonged time to \$220 per ton and labor from \$2.50 per day to \$4 per day.

Now, these parties, through the fault of the Government, and not by their own fault in any manner, have been compelled to lose whatever advance there was in material, whatever advance there was in labor during the prolonged time of the construction of these vessels; and, besides that, they have not received fair compensation for the additional work done in tearing down and rebuilding, but have been held to the strict conditions provided for in the original agreement, without regard to the fact of the increase of cost of material and labor. For all these reasons, it appears to me to be self-evident that these claimants have a just and valid claim against the Government. The amount is uncertain. No one but a court, hearing testimony and knowing all the facts, can determine what amount, if any, is due these contractors; therefore this bill provides that it shall be referred to the Court of Claims, and that that court shall decide this question the same as it decides any other question.

There are provisos and guards in the bill, so that there may be no injustice done to the Government. Every suggestion that has ever been made to protect the Government has been incorporated in this bill, and no fault can be found with the bill so far as that is concerned. These cases have been acted on by Congress from time to time; and a long time ago the Senate passed a resolution of inquiry for the purpose of ascertaining whether or not these parties and other parties who had suffered loss, as they claimed, on this account should be paid.

The resolution I speak of was merely a Senate resolution asking the Secretary of the Navy to inquire into the matter and report. Under this resolution a board was organized by the Secretary of the Navy called the Selfridge board. It was to examine into the matter and did examine into many cases of this kind, but these claimants were not able to get their claims before the Selfridge board for the reason that the vessels were not then completed, and the resolution provided that it should apply to only such vessels as the Government had accepted. Consequently the Selfridge board was not able to hear and decide this question, and no report was made on these claims. Afterwards, by an act of Congress, the Marchand board was organized, a board to investigate and determine the actual facts of these cases.

But, Mr. Speaker, the Marchand board, in violation of an exact provision of the statutes under which it was organized, refused to examine into the facts or to make any report upon the subject whatever. They reported, without hearing the witnesses, without hearing the parties, without hearing the attorneys of the parties, without knowing anything about the facts, against these thirty or forty claims pending before them for additional compensation caused by the rise in prices of material and labor during the prolonged time of the construction of these vessels, caused by changes and delays on the part of the Government.

Congress has taken this matter into its own hands, and at various times passed acts which show that these parties have just claims. Here, Mr. Speaker, are some claims which Congress has passed and which are identical with the claims of these parties. They claimed upon the

same ground, having the same rights and based upon the same cause of loss. Congress has passed bills here amounting to \$1,719,473 for the relief of other parties.

The following are some of the parties I refer to who have thus been relieved by Congress.

	On iron-clads.
J. S. Underhill, Congress direct.....	\$23,000.00
C. W. Whitney, Congress appropriated.....	50,000.00
D. S. Mershon, Congress appropriated.....	48,000.00
James Tellow, Congress appropriated.....	85,000.00
Donahue, Ryan & Cook, Congress appropriated.....	179,000.00
Miles Greenwood, Court of Claims.....	76,000.00
John Ericsson, Congress direct.....	1,070,000.00
Harrison Loring, Congress direct.....	38,513.00
Atlantic Works, Congress direct.....	4,852.00
Aquila Adams, Congress direct.....	4,852.00
M. F. Merritt, Congress direct.....	4,852.00
Tomlinson, Hartup & Co., Congress direct.....	15,171.00
Pool & Hunt, Congress direct.....	5,694.00
Secor & Co., and Perine, Secor & Co.....	115,539.01
Total.....	1,719,473.01

Congress made a careful and critical examination of these claims, and they were found to be just and honest, and time did not invalidate their equity, but these were no more just or equitable than the one now before the House.

To show you a sample of the injustice done these claimants, I refer you to the claim of one G. C. Bestor, of Peoria, Ill., who built the Shiloh. It cost about the same amount as the monitor Squando, built by McKay & Aldus, mentioned in this bill. By an act of Congress, passed 1873, they were paid \$125,000, by direct appropriation of Congress, for loss sustained by reason of the increased price of labor and material. It was built at the very same time, under the same circumstances as the vessels mentioned in this bill; and that is an illustration of the way in which Congress has acted in relation to these claims, picking out or selecting out cases no more meritorious than the ones mentioned in this bill, and by direct act paying the parties who had sustained losses in that way to the amount of nearly two millions of dollars.

The claims thus paid were of the very same kind as the claims mentioned in this bill, and these claimants, with just as good claims, if not better, have been before Congress for twenty years begging, not an appropriation of money direct, as in these other cases, but only the privilege of going to the court and proving to the satisfaction of the court that the Government justly and equitably owed them.

Can there be anything wrong in that? I certainly can not see that any one can object to such a proposition. Has it indeed come to this, that Congress will not let the citizens of this country go before the courts of the United States under rules and regulations such as are contained in this bill, all favorable to the Government and all of which preclude the possibility of any fraud or imposition?

I say has it come to pass that Congress will not trust its own courts and has under such circumstances become so determined to resist just claims of the citizen as to refuse to pass a bill of this kind? I do not believe it. I think that the desire of the members of this House is to know that there is probably a just claim, and as soon as that fact is settled there can be no desire on the part of any fair-minded man to deprive the claimant of a just opportunity to show the facts in court. That is all this bill does. It does not appropriate a cent, but leaves the question as to whether or not the Government owes these parties to the courts.

At the time these vessels were constructed they were needed for the defense of the country, and they proved very valuable in the overthrow of the rebellion. The men that entered into these contracts were as anxious that the vessels should be successfully constructed and used in the service of the Government as were the officers who caused the contracts to be made, but the whole matter of the construction of iron-clads was at that time a new one. The engineers and the naval constructors were unacquainted with the manner of building that class of vessels, and after they had made plans and specifications they found by tests of use that they were a failure, and they had to recast and rebuild and reconstruct, to tear them down and make them over anew. This caused the contractors vast additional expense and loss of money. While this was evident, yet the Government officers were bound down by the laws and the form of contracts to pay only so much money, leaving it to the generosity and the honesty of the Government and of Congress to see that the contractors received just compensation. These claims have been before Congress for twenty years. Many of these claimants have been pauperized and lie to-day in paupers' graves because Congress has neglected or refused to do them justice. These particular claimants come to-day, as they have been coming for twenty years, and ask of Congress, not an appropriation, but simply that the Government shall send these claims to a court, a tribunal organized by the Government itself, to have the question determined whether or not, in justice and equity, they should be paid the money that they put into these vessels under the circumstances I have described.

Mr. Speaker, I am surprised that there should be any opposition to this claim. I am surprised that any gentleman should think it necessary to come here and contend that this is a dishonest claim, because the facts, as developed by careful examination, show that there never

was a more just or righteous claim presented to Congress. In proof of that I cite the fact that, without regard to party, every committee that has examined the claim has reported in its favor.

Mr. KERR, of Iowa. Is it not a fact that this claim was submitted to an investigation in 1867, and did not Senator Grimes at that time report against this and all claims of the same class?

Mr. THOMAS. It never was reported against by any committee of Congress that I have been able to discover. What Senator Grimes may have done or said about these claims I do not know; but of one thing I am sure, if Senator Grimes or the gentleman from Iowa who asks me this question had as carefully examined these claims as I have, he would come to the conclusion that the claimants ought to have a chance in court. In 1867 Congress passed an act providing as follows:

That the Secretary of the Navy shall be authorized and directed to investigate the claims of all contractors for building vessels of war and steam machinery for the same, under contracts made after the 1st day of May, 1861, and prior to the 1st day of January, 1864; and said investigation to be made on the following basis: He shall ascertain the additional cost which was necessarily incurred by each contractor in the completion of his work by reason of any changes or alterations in the plans and specifications required and delays in the prosecution of the work occasioned by the Government which were not provided for in the original contract; but no allowance for any advance in the price of labor or material shall be considered unless such advance occurred during the prolonged time for completing the work rendered necessary by the delay resulting from the action of the Government aforesaid, and then only when such advance could not have been avoided by the exercise of ordinary prudence and diligence on the part of the contractor, etc.

Here, Mr. Speaker, Congress by this act recognized the fact that these parties were entitled to compensation for any advance in the price of material and labor during the prolonged time for completing the work rendered necessary by the delay resulting from the action of the Government. If I am correct about this, and I think there can be no doubt about it, it settles and establishes a principle which renders it impossible to dispute the justice and propriety of this bill, for it is exactly what the bill proposes; and I ask any gentleman here if it is not right.

Suppose that it is a fact that the delay in the construction of these vessels was caused by the action of the Government, and that by reason of that delay it cost these contractors for labor and material a large sum more than it would have cost them if the Government had caused no delay, is there a gentleman within the sound of my voice that would not consider it right that the Government should sustain this loss? Would it not be an injustice, an outrage, to compel the contractor to suffer the loss? Mr. Speaker, this is all this bill asks; it submits the case to the court to first ascertain whether the delay resulted from the action of the Government, and, if so, whether there was an advance in the price of labor and material during the time of that delay which caused expense to claimants, and, if so, the amount. This appears to me to be right, just, and equitable, and the act which I have read a precedent for this which Congress can not afford to ignore.

Under that law the Secretary of the Navy organized what was called the Marchand board. That board met and made a most remarkable decision. They decided to confine their examination to the question of extra work, holding that the question of the increased cost of labor and material by reason of delays caused by the Government was one sounding in damages and therefore beyond the jurisdiction of the Department and not included in this act. I say this was a most remarkable construction of the act, and as I have shown by reading the act was an absolute disregard of an express and plain provision of the act.

Upon that ground they disallowed every claim of this kind, notwithstanding the fact, as I have before stated and shown, that the law under which they were organized contained this provision:

But no allowance for any advance in the price of labor or material shall be considered unless such advance occurred during the prolonged time for completing the work rendered necessary by the delay resulting from the action of the Government aforesaid, and then only when such advance could not have been avoided by the exercise of ordinary prudence on the part of the contractor.

It will be seen that the Marchand board shut its eyes to the law.

It appears to have been too indolent to make a proper investigation, in obedience to the law, or else to have been organized for the purpose of defeating the law and these claims. It never took a line of testimony upon the question of the rise in the prices of material or of labor, upon the question whether the contractors had been paid in full for the extra work or not, or upon any other question provided for in this act of 1867. The board simply closed its doors, refused to hear any testimony, refused to hear the parties or their attorneys, and made a return that there was nothing due from the Government.

This is the solemn and absolute fact, and it can not be disputed. When I first investigated this matter I did not suppose it could be possible that such could be the fact. I did not suppose that any set of men occupying a position of that kind would so absolutely disregard the law to which they owed their powers and existence as a board, but the Marchand board itself in its findings says expressly that it considers that the law requires that the board should look into a speculative case for damages, and that it refused to do so.

That board refused to inquire whether, by reason of the delay of twenty-two months, the price of labor had increased or whether during that time the materials of which the vessels were constructed had increased in price. It refused to consider those questions in any manner

whatever, and consequently the decision of that board has never been regarded as worthy of attention.

If that board had performed its duty and carefully investigated the facts which the law required it to examine and investigate, it would have been of great service to these claimants and have promoted the just and equitable settlement of their claims, and have released the United States Government from the just charge so often made against it of being the most unconscionable and the meanest creditor in the world; and there is another thing that would have happened if this board had performed its duty. Instead of sitting only one hundred days to investigate the accounts of fifty-five vessels, it would have required two years' time, proving the statement which I have heretofore made, that it made no investigations, heard no testimony, and would not even listen to the claimants or their attorneys. Yet, sir, I expect to hear to-day in this House the action of that board set up as a bar to these claims.

Congress has time and again since that board refused to perform its duty made appropriations to other contractors in cases where the Marchand board had reported that they had no claim against the Government, upon this express ground that the board refused to investigate and examine whether there had been any loss or not from this cause—

Mr. KERR, of Iowa. Can you mention any case of that kind?

Mr. THOMAS. Oh, yes. Does the gentleman want me to refer to a case in which Congress has allowed and made appropriation?

Mr. KERR, of Iowa. A case where the Marchand board had reported adversely and Congress afterward made the allowance.

Mr. THOMAS. James Tetlow was allowed \$86,000; Donahue, Ryan & Cook were allowed \$179,000; John Ericsson, \$1,070,000; Harrison Loring, \$38,513, etc. I might name a great many other cases showing that Congress in various years has without a reference to the Court of Claims allowed the Committee on War Claims and other committees of this House to take evidence to ascertain what in the opinion of the committee the parties had lost; and Congress has passed direct appropriations for the sums thus reported.

Mr. KERR, of Iowa. I ask the gentleman whether he has examined particularly and knows that the Marchand board reported against the claims to which he has referred and that the action of the board in those cases was overruled by the action of Congress.

Mr. THOMAS. Most certainly. I will say to the gentleman that I have here a list of cases in which the Marchand board acted. I could read some of the cases; some of them are exactly similar to those I have read. These cases are about thirty-five or forty in number, cases in which the Marchand board found that there was nothing due from the Government.

The board undertook to determine "the amount of such increase caused by the delay and action of the Government as determined by this board to be due"—not as determined by an investigation of the facts under the law; they say they will not do that. The board does not say that under the law they have investigated the facts and found that these parties have or have not lost anything; but the board assumes to determine outside of the law, contrary to the law, contrary to the facts, that there is nothing due to these parties.

Mr. KERR, of Iowa. I will ask the gentleman whether he has examined the report of Mr. Hanna, of Indiana, adverse to this claim?

Mr. THOMAS. I have not. I am informed that this is a minority report and that Mr. Hanna was entirely mistaken in relation to the facts. The facts are as I have stated them.

Mr. KERR, of Iowa. I understood the gentleman to say that all the committees had reported unanimously.

Mr. THOMAS. I said that fourteen committees had reported in favor of this claim, and that to my certain knowledge six or eight of the committees that have last examined it reported unanimously. I said that the Committee on War Claims at this session of Congress, after what I believe to have been a most thorough, conscientious, and exhaustive examination of the facts, came to the conclusion that the grossest injustice had been done these parties. And I am happy to add that judging from the report made in the Senate (if I may be permitted to speak of that) the Senate committee—the Committee on Claims—has unanimously come to the same conclusion, that this is a just claim.

The claim has not only passed the Committee on Claims of the Senate, but it has passed the Senate by a very large majority after an exhaustive discussion and is the bill now before us, which we are considering. This claim and claims like this have been considered by such men as Vice-President Hendricks and Mr. Sumner when they were in the Senate; by such men as Hon. S. S. Cox of this House. These men have given their time and attention to these claims; and I could read their declarations in most emphatic language that it is due to these parties that a court should investigate these claims.

They say it is one of the greatest outrages ever perpetrated upon a citizen of the United States that these parties have been compelled to spend hundreds and thousands of dollars in building up in time of war a navy which defended the coast of this country and was able to deter the foreign navies of the world from making an attack upon us at the time of our last war; they say it is an outrage that the men who constructed these navies should be robbed, pauperized, and not have per-

mission even to go before a court to have their claims investigated to see and ascertain whether they have in this way paid out their money by hundreds of thousands for the benefit of the Government. Justice, right, and patriotism, it seems to me, would dictate that, if these men have done this and if they have by the act of the Government suffered losses, they should have the right to show it either before a committee of Congress or before a court.

The fairest tribunal is a court. Before a court there is least chance of imposition. All possible efforts have been made and all suggestions adopted in framing this bill to guard against any chance of imposition. In conclusion I will say, for I do not propose to occupy a great while on this cause—

Mr. BREWER. I want to ask the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. THOMAS] whether there is any reason why the parties in interest here could not have presented their claim to the Court of Claims in years gone by?

Mr. THOMAS. Most certainly. I am glad the gentleman has suggested that matter. Until 1887, as the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BREWER] well knows, the Court of Claims had no equity jurisdiction. By the Tucker bill, so called, equity jurisdiction was conferred upon the court. By the strict letter of the contract under which these parties entered upon the construction of these vessels they had no remedy at law. They agreed to build the vessels for a certain price and they agreed that the Government should make alterations; that these alterations should be paid for upon such terms as the parties should agree upon.

But the understanding of the Government and the contractors was that this should be done within the eight months. The naval battles soon disclosed the fact that the plan under which these vessels were constructed was defective. The Government had furnished all the plans, specifying the kind and quality of materials, etc., and the stipulation was that the vessels should be finished in eight months. Instead of that work was stopped upon these vessels for four months at a time—

Mr. BREWER. Then I understand this is an equitable claim, not a legal one.

Mr. THOMAS. It is an equitable claim in this way: That in consequence of the work of the contractors having been stopped for four months at a time, in consequence of reconstruction of the vessels being required, so that the work occupied twenty-two months instead of eight months, and from the fact that iron rose from \$65 to \$220 a ton, that wages increased from \$1.50 or \$2 a day to \$4 and \$5 a day, justice and equity require that the parties should be recompensed in the actual amount which they were thus obliged to expend.

The Court of Claims did not have jurisdiction of that kind of action before Congress recognized the justice and right of the case by passing the act to which I have already referred in 1867, authorizing the Marchand board; and the only trouble, I will say to the gentleman from Michigan, is that the Marchand board disregarded the law, refused to carry it out, refused, as the law expressly provides, that there shall be estimates made of the loss these parties incurred by reason of the delay of the Government, and they have never had a remedy at all until the jurisdiction given to the court by the act of 1887.

Mr. BREWER. Does the statute of limitation prevent these parties from going before the court and maintaining their claim?

Mr. THOMAS. That is just the point. They have no standing whatever in court without the removal of the statute. The time has gone by, and they can not bring the case in the court without a special act, and if any one will examine the bill with care, it will be seen that the Committee on Claims of the Senate and the War Claims Committee of the House have taken every possible precaution to see that no advantage shall be taken of the Government. After authorizing them to commence their suit within six months after the passage of the act, it provides—

That the investigation of said claim shall be made upon the following basis:

Then it particularly specifies upon what basis the claim shall be entertained by the court, and the bill provides further:

That it must be shown that such additional cost in completing the same and such changes or alterations in the plans and specifications required and delays in the prosecution of the work were occasioned by the Government of the United States before these parties can recover anything whatever.

Permit me to say that that clause having been omitted in the bill which passed at the time that General Grant was President, and which bill was vetoed by him, was the cause of the veto. It was omitted by a mistake in draughting the bill. That clause is embodied in this bill, however, and the objection General Grant had to the bill as President of the United States, causing him to veto it, is entirely obviated.

Mr. WILLIAMS, of Ohio. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. THOMAS. Certainly.

Mr. WILLIAMS, of Ohio. I understood you to say that many of these claimants were dead.

Mr. THOMAS. I was speaking, I will state to the gentleman, of some of the claimants who constructed some vessels which were constructed for at the same time those embodied in this bill were constructed for. Many of these people have died after long years of wait-

ing, some in poverty because Congress has been derelict in according them the rights to which they were entitled.

Mr. WILLIAMS, of Ohio. Who owns the present claim covered by this bill? Is it in the hands of speculators?

Mr. THOMAS. No, sir. Mr. McKay and the executors of his brother, Donald McKay, mentioned in the bill, are the parties. They were the original contractors.

Mr. WILLIAMS, of Ohio. Then it is not in the hands of speculators?

Mr. THOMAS. Not at all; never has been. It is in the hands of the parties who built the vessels, so far as they are living, and the administrators of those who are dead, men who put their money, labor, and material by the thousands of dollars into these vessels that were constructed to defend the Government and maintain the integrity of the Union.

I wish to read what some of the great men of all parties have said in relation to these claims in times past. Here is what Senator Hendricks said in regard to this McKay claim:

I am of the opinion that these sums ought to be paid, as a matter of justice and right, by the Government to these contractors. Each case, of course, has its special merits or demerits. But, sir, I believe in the doctrine that where a man contracts to do a great and very important work for the Government he ought not to be allowed to be a large loser, and, in some cases, as will be the result here, to be broken up by the contract that he may have made, and especially in the case of contracts made at such a time as these were made and for such work as they were made. * * * We had to have these ships; the Government could not progress in the war without them, and great numbers had to be manufactured or contracted for about the same time.

What was the effect of that? The Government made a contract with one man, then with another, then with another, and started her own ship-yards with all the force it was possible to command. What was the effect of that? Of course, to increase the price of labor; of course, to increase the price of material required in the construction of the ships. There are some general views about the equity of these claims without reference to the particular merit of each case.—*Congressional Globe*, 1866, page 1890.

The point is that, these contracts being made in 1862 and 1863, the prices continued to advance during all the time that these parties were building the vessels and constructing the machinery for them, so that they were overtaken by this enormously high rate of prices, and destroyed.—*Congressional Globe*, page 1892.

These contracts were made by some below their own propositions, and at barely fair prices at the then current rates. Is there any Senator here who wishes to see these men broken up merely because they entered into a contract with the Government? Is there any Senator here who wishes to say to these men, "We have your bond and we will hold you to your bond; we will take the blood out of your business; we will have the pound of flesh?"—(*Congressional Globe*, page 1864.)

Here is what Charles Sumner said in relation to these claims:

The Senator from Kentucky said that they took the war into their calculations. Perhaps they did; but who among these contractors could take the war adequately into his calculations? Who among those sitting here or at the other end of the Avenue properly appreciated the character of the great contest that was then going on? Sir, we had passed half a century in peace; we knew nothing of war or war preparations, when all once we were called to efforts on this gigantic scale. Are you astonished that these contractors did not know more about the war than your statesmen? Be to these contractors as gentle in judgment and as considerate as you have been to others in public life who have erred in their calculations with regard to it.—*Congressional Globe*, page 1987.

The building of that invulnerable Navy was one of the great victories of the war, not to be commemorated on any special field, but to be seen in those mighty results which we all now enjoy.

And now again I ask are you ready to see these contractors who have done this service sacrificed? You do not allow the soldier to be sacrificed, nor the national creditor who has taken your stock; will you allow the mechanic to be sacrificed? * * * My friend on my right [Mr. Nye] asked you to be magnanimous to these contractors. I do not put it in that way. I ask you simply to be just. Do by them as you would be done by. The Senator from Nevada also very fully reminded you of the experience of other countries. He told you that England, at the close of the Crimean war, when her mechanics had suffered precisely as your mechanics have suffered, did not allow them to be sacrificed, but every pound and shilling of all their liabilities under their contracts was promptly met by that Government. Will you be less just to your mechanics than England? It is an old saying that "Republics are ungrateful." I hope that this Republic may certainly vie with any monarchy in gratitude to those who have served it.—*Congressional Globe*, page 1987.

Senator COCKRELL, who was opposed to this bill at this session of Congress, said:

This bill was passed over without losing its place on the Calendar at my solicitation. I believe, as I desired time to examine it. I have examined the bill very carefully, as I have also the reports which have heretofore been made upon it, and the veto of the former bill for the benefit of the same parties by the late President Cleveland, and I have concluded after a thorough examination that the objections do not lie to this bill which I supposed did justly exist, and it is for that reason that I offer no further objection to it.

And such will be the verdict of every impartial man who examines the facts in the case.

Every gentleman who has carefully examined the bill and ascertained these facts, and who has no prejudice, political or otherwise, against the claimants, and is impartial, as a court of law should be to pass upon the matter, will see on such examination that there is a just claim against the Government by these parties and that it is but right and proper beyond all question that it should be submitted to the court to determine. A great Government should be above trickery, and when able, as our Government is, should pay its honest debts.

I reserve the remainder of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. DINGLEY). The gentleman has seventeen minutes of the hour remaining.

Mr. SPRINGER. I ask the indulgence of the House for a few minutes, perhaps thirty or forty, while I endeavor to explain the facts involved in this case and the law applicable to them.

This bill has been pending in Congress for a great many years; there have been various decisions of committees upon it, some in favor and some against the claim. This claim is a type of a class of cases, and if we allow this one to go to the Court of Claims, as provided in this bill, we will be under obligations to grant the request in regard to many other cases similarly situated which will come before us. So that the question involved here is much more than the pending bill; for I hold, if gentlemen concede the right of these claimants to go to the Court of Claims, when other claimants come in precisely the same situation you can not refuse their application. What are the facts in regard to this claim?

In the beginning of the war the Government desired to construct a number of gunboats to be used on the inland waters of the United States. The whole amount provided for this class of vessels and appropriated in the beginning was \$14,200,000. After these contracts had been partially completed the contractors insisted that they were entitled to additional compensation on account of extra work performed. There have been filed, for alleged alterations made by the Government, in the aggregate, claims for extra work of this kind amounting to over \$10,000,000. I speak of them as a class, because this is simply one of the number that you will have to deal with exactly as you deal with the pending one. I have no doubt you will find that other cases are on the Calendar or are embodied in bills pending before the committees of the House. The Government proceeded to ascertain the amount that was justly due the contractors on account of this extra work. Two efforts were made. One was in pursuance of a resolution that passed the Senate of the United States on the 9th of March, 1865. That resolution was passed only by the United States Senate, and simply requested the Secretary of the Navy to organize a board of not less than three persons, who were requested to pass upon these various claims for extra allowance. That, not having the force of law, could only have the effect to obtain a report from the Navy Department, which should be submitted to Congress for its further action. A board was organized in pursuance of that resolution, known as the Selfridge board. The claimants involved in the pending bill did not make any application to this board.

Mr. THOMAS. Will the gentleman permit me to ask him a question? Is it not a fact that the reason they did not make application was because the vessels were not completed, and that it was only completed vessels, accepted by the Government, that were considered by the board?

Mr. SPRINGER. I was going to state the fact. The gentleman simply anticipated me. I had not reached that. They did not make application, because the vessels were not then completed, as they alleged, and therefore the Selfridge board made no award as to them, but the cases were referred. The Selfridge award went to the Senate of the United States or to Congress, and then Congress passed an act for the purpose of covering all these cases. That act was passed on the 2d day of March, 1867, and was entitled "An act for the relief of certain contractors for the construction of vessels of war and steam machinery."

Now, I desire to call the attention of the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. THOMAS] to the fact that when Senator Hendricks made the statement which he quoted in regard to these claims some of these contractors had never received a cent for their extra work, and he was advocating this very bill, which was approved March 2, 1867, when he made those remarks.

Mr. THOMAS. Does the gentleman say that these parties have received money since that time?

Mr. SPRINGER. I state that they received their pay since Senator Hendricks made that speech.

Mr. THOMAS. You are mistaken.

Mr. SPRINGER. Am I mistaken about that?

Mr. THOMAS. Yes.

Mr. SPRINGER. Well, I will stand corrected then. The date of Senator Hendricks's speech was April 11, 1866, and this act it seems was approved on the 2d day of March, 1867, which was nearly a year afterward.

Mr. THOMAS. Will the gentleman permit me to interrupt him to make a statement in relation to that matter.

Mr. SPRINGER. I have stated the fact, have I not, according to the record?

Mr. THOMAS. No; these parties have never received one cent for any claim made here. The amount they have received was an amount for extra work, the items of which are contained in the report of the committee—extra work agreed upon and allowed between the contractors and the Government.

Mr. SPRINGER. I understand that.

Mr. THOMAS. But this amount for which the Marchand board was organized they have never received one cent for.

Mr. SPRINGER. I am stating now the fact, and the gentleman seems to have diverted me or to have raised an issue with me on the point that when Senator Hendricks made the statement he has quoted the bill had not passed which organized the Marchand board, and he was advocating the bill which created that board, which bill was subsequently passed; and in that award there were \$5,000,000 out to these various claimants—not to those involved here, but to others

with them. That is the point I made; so that Senator Hendricks's speech does not apply to this case, because all he claimed has been accomplished by the awards of the Marchand board. Now, at that time when that bill was pending, which resulted in the organization of the Marchand board, Senator Grimes, of Iowa, than whom no purer or better man ever occupied a seat in the United States Senate, stated, in reference to this class of cases, as follows—I quote from his speech of April 11, 1866, to be found on page 1888 of the Congressional Globe, first session Thirty-ninth Congress:

Let it not be supposed by any Senator that after we shall have passed this bill, which includes about two and a quarter millions of money, we are thereafter absolved from making any future appropriations for contracts entered into between private individuals and the Government under precisely similar circumstances, for I have upon my desk an abstract of contracts between the Government and contractors made under similar circumstances, upon which there would be claims as much entitled to consideration as almost any that are embraced within this bill under consideration, amounting to nearly \$60,000,000. If there be a loss upon that property equal to the amount which it is claimed has been lost by the contractors provided for in this bill, then the amounts that will hereafter be claimed from the Government by these contractors will exceed the sum of \$12,000,000.

He referred to the contractors involved in that bill.

That was the statement of Senator Grimes before the Marchand board met, and speaking of cases that were involved where the principle was the same as in this case. Now I want to call the attention of the gentleman—

Mr. BREWER. Was Senator Grimes favoring the passage of the bill?

Mr. SPRINGER. No, he was opposing it and Senator Hendricks was favoring it.

Mr. STOCKDALE. Which bill was that?

Mr. SPRINGER. That was the Marchand board bill. Now, Mr. Speaker, I desire to call the attention of the House to the fact that the act of March 2, 1867, under which the Marchand board was organized, submitted these cases to a board of commissioners appointed by the Secretary of the Navy, which commissioners had precisely, in respect to the point at issue, the same jurisdiction that is now sought to be conferred upon the Court of Claims.

I quote now from the act of March 2, 1867, under which the Marchand board was organized:

But no allowance for any advance in the price of labor or material shall be considered, unless such advance occurred during the prolonged time for completing the work rendered necessary by the delay resulting from the action of the Government aforesaid, and then only when such advance could not have been avoided by the exercise of ordinary prudence and diligence on the part of the contractor.

That is the act of March 2, 1867. The Marchand board was organized with that jurisdiction. Now, what does the present act say?—"An act for the relief of Nathaniel McKay and the executors of Donald McKay." It says:

Provided, That such additional cost in completing the same, and such changes or alterations in the plans and specifications required and delays in the prosecution of the work were occasioned by the Government of the United States; but no allowance for any advance in the price of labor or material shall be considered unless such advance occurred during the prolonged term for completing the work rendered necessary by delay resulting from the action of the Government aforesaid, and then only when such advance could not have been avoided by the exercise of ordinary prudence and diligence on the part of the contractors.

Almost precisely the same language as the act of March 2, 1867, is contained in this act.

Now, this is a part of the case that the gentleman says has never been adjudicated. I say without fear of contradiction that that very fact was submitted to the Marchand board, and that board had jurisdiction of that very question in precisely the words by which it is conferred upon the Court of Claims by this bill.

Mr. THOMAS. I will ask the gentleman, if he will allow me—

Mr. SPRINGER. Certainly.

Mr. THOMAS. Is it not a fact that that board in its report said in substance that they would disregard any case that sounded in damages, and that they did not think they had any power to adjudicate unliquidated damages against the Government, and therefore they refused to hear the witnesses and take testimony in such cases?

Mr. SPRINGER. I have not the report before me, and it is possible that they made use of such language; but they had jurisdiction of this very question.

Mr. THOMAS. But they refused to exercise it.

Mr. SPRINGER. They may not have exercised it, but they had the jurisdiction; and they not only referred cases to Congress under that act, but Congress acted and made appropriations.

Mr. THOMAS. Is it not a fact that the Marchand board in no case made an appropriation, but that they merely reported in favor of claims?

Mr. SPRINGER. Certainly.

Mr. THOMAS. And certainly it was not an adjudication of anything.

Mr. SPRINGER. They had the right to hear and adjudicate the same fact that it is claimed here by these parties has never been adjudicated. They have had their day in court under a bill that gave jurisdiction over this fact, and that court decided against them.

Mr. THOMAS. Will the gentleman permit me there?

Mr. SPRINGER. Yes, sir.

Mr. THOMAS. Had that Marchand board any jurisdiction to adjudicate anything? Were not they simply a board of inquiry, and were not they simply to make a report?

Mr. SPRINGER. I have said that.

Mr. THOMAS. Then they did not adjudicate anything.

Mr. SPRINGER. They reported something which was carried out by Congress.

Mr. Speaker, I desire now to call attention to the fact that a joint resolution was passed in 1871 entitled "A resolution for the relief of certain contractors for the construction of vessels of war and steam machinery." This joint resolution provided for referring this class of claims to the Court of Claims, and omitted that part of the act of 1867 to which I have called attention, in regard to advances in the price of material and labor and delays not the fault of the contractors. President Grant vetoed that bill for the reason, as stated, that those words were left out, which were in the act of 1867. I desire to ask gentlemen who have opportunity to read the careful veto of President Grant on that subject, which is found in the Congressional Globe, third session of the Forty-first Congress, page 1023. They will there see more between the lines in regard to this case than they see in the lines themselves.

President Grant had been well advised in regard to this matter, and evidently saw that it was opening the door to a flood-tide of claims. It was opening the door to a principle that would undo all the adjudications of the war, and therefore he put his veto upon the passage of that bill. Since President Grant vetoed the omnibus bill, these claimants, it seems to me, have scattered, and they are coming in pairs or singly.

Mr. BREWER. Have any of them been referred to the Court of Claims?

Mr. SPRINGER. I believe one was, and I am glad the gentleman has called my attention to that. In the case of Chouteau against the United States, the Court of Claims decided the case, it went to the Supreme Court, and it is reported in 95 United States Reports, at page 61. I desire to call the attention of the House to the syllabus of that case and would like gentlemen to read the whole case for themselves.

Mr. BREWER. That is the decision of the Supreme Court?

Mr. SPRINGER. Yes; it is the decision of the Supreme Court.

A. having a claim against the Government under his contract with the Navy Department for building the iron-clad steam battery Etah, executed to B a power of attorney authorizing him to sue for, recover, and receive all such sum or sums of money, debts, goods, wares, and other demands whatsoever, and especially payments that were or would be due on his contract for building the Etah, with full power in and about the premises; to have, use, and take all lawful means and ways in his name for the purposes aforesaid; and to make acquaintances or other sufficient discharges for him and in his name, and generally to do all other acts necessary and lawful to be done in and about the premises.

The contract fixed the amount to be paid for the battery, and provided for its completion and delivery within eight months from June 24, 1863. For every month that the delivery might be made earlier than the time fixed, the contractor should receive \$4,500 and for every month later he should pay a like sum. It also provided that the Department might, at any time during the progress of the work, make such alterations and additions to the plans and specifications as it might deem necessary and proper, the extra expense caused thereby to be paid at fair and reasonable rates, to be determined when the changes were directed to be made. The battery was finished for delivery in November, 1865, and proper authorities of the Department certified that the extra work and materials rendered necessary in making the alterations and additions that were ordered, amounted to \$116,111.

A portion of that sum having previously been paid, a voucher, in favor of A for \$26,653.17, "being in full and final payment on all extras, and in full for all claims and demands for that work," was approved by the Department April 24, 1866, and paid May 11, following, to B, who, under his power of attorney, received it in full. A's assignee, asserting that the extra work amounted to \$172,273.55, brought suit in the Court of Claims to recover the excess over the amount paid, and \$118,283.39 alleged to be due irrespective of extras, on account of an increase in the price of labor and materials during the time that the completion of the vessel was delayed by reason of such alterations and additions.

Here you have the precise claim that is made in the case at bar. Now what did the court hold? The court held as follows:

Held: 1. That the power of attorney authorized B to accept payment of the voucher, which upon its face declared it was the last and full payment for the extra work, and that his acceptance bound A and barred a recovery for such work.

2. That the United States is not liable to A for the increased cost of the labor and materials.

Mr. THOMAS. Will the gentleman permit a question?

Mr. SPRINGER. Yes.

Mr. THOMAS. That case arose before the passage of the law under which the Marchand board was created, did it not? Was not that suit commenced before the passage of that law?

Mr. SPRINGER. Yes; this suit originated before the Marchand board was created.

Mr. THOMAS. Congress did not recognize at that time, as it did in the act of 1867, that these parties were entitled to payment by reason of the extra cost of labor and material resulting from delays caused by the Government itself.

Mr. SPRINGER. But the decision of the Supreme Court covered the principle involved in this case, holding that the claimant was not entitled to anything for the advance in the price of labor and material.

This decision was pronounced by Mr. Justice Miller, and it is the unanimous judgment of the court. I read from the decision:

The Court of Claims finds that the delay in completing the vessel was caused by the changes ordered by the United States, and that, owing to the rise in the

prices of labor and materials on the work done under the original contract, and without reference to the changes, the cost of that work was increased to the builder \$118,283.20. The appellants asserted a claim for this amount also, which the court refused.

Now, the Supreme Court affirmed that judgment, and said:

But we are very clear that without any such provision he must be held to have taken the risk of the prices of the labor and materials which he was bound to furnish, as every other contractor does who agrees to do a specified job at a fixed price. It is one of the elements which he takes into account when he makes his bargain, and he can not expect the other party to guaranty him against unfavorable changes in these prices.

Mr. THOMAS. That is the strict rule of law. Now, will the gentleman permit another question?

Mr. SPRINGER. Yes, sir.

Mr. THOMAS. If the Government, by the alteration of the plans which it furnished to the contractor, was the party that actually caused the delay, and if during that delay an increase of the price of materials and in the price of labor took place to such an extent that the contractors actually expended \$118,000 extra for the benefit of the Government, do you not think it would be just that that money should be reimbursed to them?

Mr. SPRINGER. I have read the decision of the Supreme Court.

Mr. THOMAS. That is the strict rule of law; but, even if the court decided that, according to the strict rule of law, they were not entitled to compensation, do you not think that they would have an equitable right to be compensated?

Mr. SPRINGER. The Supreme Court did decide that they were not entitled to it.

Mr. THOMAS. But what do you think about it?

Mr. SPRINGER. I think the Supreme Court decided justly.

Mr. THOMAS. The gentleman thinks that, even if these men spent this amount of money for the benefit of the Government, still they should not be paid.

Mr. SPRINGER. Does the gentleman from Wisconsin dissent from this opinion of the Supreme Court? If so, I will have his dissent properly entered of record. [Laughter.]

Mr. THOMAS. I do not dissent from it as not being strictly according to the rules of law; but I do say that equity and justice require that these men should be reimbursed if the fact is found to be that, by reason of the delay caused by the action of the Government, they were compelled to expend this amount of money extra for the benefit of the Government.

Mr. BREWER. Suppose there had been a fall in the price of labor and material.

Mr. SPRINGER. Yes, as the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BREWER] suggests, if there had been a fall in the price of labor and material does any one suppose that these gentlemen would have come forward to divide the extra profits with the Government?

But I meet the gentleman from Wisconsin upon the very point he suggests. The Government of the United States was prevailed upon to take the view of the case which he has indicated and to pass the act of March 2, 1867, submitting that very question to a naval board, a board friendly no doubt to these contractors as it was to all contractors at that time. That board took a most liberal view of the question, reporting in favor of what they believed to be substantial justice under all the circumstances of the case—

Mr. THOMAS. Does not the gentleman know that the board reported they would not take that matter into consideration, notwithstanding the law?

Mr. SPRINGER. The gentleman has so stated, and I have not controverted his statement.

Now, I want to ask what the Marchand board did with these two claimants in this bill. I have before me a letter from the late Secretary of the Navy, Mr. Whitney, dated February 16, 1888, in which he sets forth the facts in regard to this claim. He says that there are three vessels involved, the Squando, the Nauset, and Ashuelot; that the contract price for these vessels amounted in the aggregate to \$1,056,000; that this claim was for extra work on the three vessels and for advance in materials to which the contractors were subjected by reason of the change of conditions; that these matters went to a naval board and the board allowed the parties \$409,000 for their extra claim, whatever it may have been, and they received that sum in addition to the contract price.

That amount, however, was less by \$323,483 than they claimed; and the claim now before the House is for \$323,000, which the Marchand board had jurisdiction to allow if it had seen fit to do so, but which it refused to allow and which the Government up to this time has not paid. This bill proposes that these claimants be permitted to go before the Court of Claims in order to secure the allowance of this amount.

Mr. FARQUHAR. Will the gentleman allow one question?

Mr. SPRINGER. Certainly.

Mr. FARQUHAR. The gentleman has stated, as I understand, the substance of the letter of Secretary Whitney. Is there anything in that letter to indicate that Secretary Whitney thought these claimants had any just claim?

Mr. SPRINGER. There is nothing that indicates an opinion on the part of the Department or the Secretary as to whether they should be

paid or not; but I will state that I found in the Navy Department at the time, so far as I could ascertain, an atmosphere entirely hostile to any further allowance upon these claims.

Mr. FARQUHAR. Does the gentleman state that the then Secretary of the Navy was entirely adverse to the passage of this bill?

Mr. SPRINGER. No, sir; I did not say that. I stated that I found it the opinion of persons in the Department generally, so far as I talked with them, that justice had been done in this matter and that nothing further should be done.

Mr. FARQUHAR. As I wish to be fair in this matter, the gentleman will permit me to make a statement. I know there are members on this floor who have the impression (and they have obtained it at headquarters) that Secretary Whitney was in favor of this bill being signed by President Cleveland. Now, sir, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SPRINGER] had a better opportunity than other members of Congress at that time to ascertain the reasons and motives of the Secretary; and I simply wish to know whether Secretary Whitney really thought, as an honest man, that these claimants had any case in court.

Mr. SPRINGER. I am not authorized to speak for Mr. Whitney.

Mr. FARQUHAR. I merely desired to ask that question.

Mr. SPRINGER. It was my impression—I did not get it from any conversation with Secretary Whitney—that he was opposed to any further allowance in this matter. But that was merely my impression, and I will not be responsible for any statement as to his position.

Mr. STONE, of Kentucky. I can say that Secretary Whitney in conversation with me indicated his belief that the bill should be signed and that these claimants should be allowed to go to the court.

Mr. FARQUHAR. My information was in the same line, and that is the reason I put the question to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. SPRINGER. I did not submit to the Secretary any request for his opinion as to the merits of the case.

Mr. FARQUHAR. But Secretary Whitney had gone over the case very carefully with the help of other parties.

Mr. SPRINGER. Referring to the subject which I was discussing when interrupted, I desire to call attention to the fact that the claim embraced in this bill, if submitted to the Court of Claims, will amount, according to the previous records in the case, to \$323,000. The cases similarly situated are set forth in the Secretary's letter of the date to which I have referred.

The whole amount allowed for extra work of this character was \$5,000,000; and the amount still claimed by persons situated similarly to the claimant in this case is \$4,700,000. So that if you pass this bill you open up the avenue to the Court of Claims for cases occupying a precisely similar situation, aggregating \$4,700,000. The newspapers have made some comments in regard to the extravagance of this House on the subject of public buildings; but there is a larger amount involved in this case than in all the public-building bills you have passed this session. Hence, I thought this an important bill and one worthy to be considered at least an hour or two, so that we could understand it.

I believe with Senator Grimes that this measure involves a principle which if applied to like cases will entail upon the Government an expenditure of \$60,000,000, provided you deal with other claimants in the same manner you propose to deal with these. The action here proposed amounts to an undoing of all the adjudications of the late war and the establishment of the principle that the gentleman from Wisconsin now contends for, that every contractor who made contracts with the Government during that time is entitled to additional compensation if, from the beginning of the contract to its completion, there was a rise in the price of materials and labor or any additional expense caused by delay of the Government in ordering extra work.

If that principle is to be recognized then you have opened up the whole subject, gentlemen, and undone all the adjudications which have been made since the war. And I desire to call the attention of this House to the fact that this bill is not a fair submission of the merits of the question to the Court of Claims at all; very far from it. What does the bill propose? It refers the case to the Court of Claims and provides:

And said court shall have jurisdiction to hear and determine and render judgment upon the same.

Now, how shall it render judgment? Why, in this manner:

Provided, however, That the investigation of said claim shall be made upon the following basis: The said court shall ascertain the additional cost which was necessarily incurred by the contractors for building the light-draught monitors Squando and Nauset and the side-wheel steamer Ashuelot in the completion of the same, by reason of any changes or alterations in the plans and specifications required and delays in the prosecution of the work.

That is the first item. The next provides—

That such additional cost in completing the same, and such changes or alterations in the plans and specifications required, and delays in the prosecution of the work were occasioned by the Government of the United States; but no allowance for any advance in the price of labor or material shall be considered unless such advance occurred during the prolonged term for completing the work rendered necessary by delay resulting from the action of the Government aforesaid, and then only when such advance could not have been avoided by the exercise of ordinary prudence and diligence on the part of the contractors.

So that this is simply referring the case to the court under an iron-clad rule that makes the court similar to a referee in chancery, to find certain facts and enter judgment upon them; not to refer them back to

Congress for consideration and action, but to find the alleged facts, and on them to enter judgment.

Mr. BUCHANAN, of New Jersey. And a fair one at that.

Mr. SPRINGER. Yes, that is the gentleman's opinion. He says it is very fair. I say it is not fair to subject the Government to such a condition. It is a very good thing for the claimant, of course, but not for the Government, to thus submit a case, to be taken, if desired, from the opinion of the Court of Claims on appeal to the Supreme Court, when the merits of the question are decided beforehand, as they are in this bill. You decide in this bill that these parties are entitled, under the claim submitted, for the increased price of material and labor, and you ask the Court of Claims to say how much it amounted to and render their judgment thereupon.

Now, the lawyer who drew this claim was up in the business. He understood his business well, and I imagine that if ever the case goes to the Court of Claims he will laugh in his sleeve many a time when he considers how he overreached Congress.

Mr. THOMAS. Let me ask the gentleman if that same condition is not in the law of 1867 that organized the Marchand board?

Mr. SPRINGER. Just so. I have no doubt that the same lawyer drew it. It is the old thing over again. He is an old hand in the business and has had experience since 1867, at least, in the business.

Mr. THOMAS. So he has been here since 1867 then?

Mr. SPRINGER. He has been here a long time, I have no doubt, and understands his business better than almost anybody else in that line. He knows how to submit a case to the Court of Claims and decide in advance what he wants allowed by the court.

Now, I submit that if this case is to go to the Court of Claims it ought to go with at least a chance given to the Government to show that it does not owe anything. The Court of Claims is required to certify to a particular fact, and this bill settles the principle and tells the court to enter judgment for the amount found.

The gentleman from Wisconsin stated that this case had been reported by various committees and that favorable reports had been made upon it. I desire to call his attention to the fact that this case has been reported adversely too. This very case was before the Committee on Naval Affairs in the Forty-fifth Congress, and, together with several other cases of a similar nature, was considered and a unanimous report submitted by the gentleman from Indiana, at that time representing a district in that State, the predecessor of my distinguished friend who sits in front of me [Mr. BYNUM]—I refer to Mr. Hanna, of Indianapolis.

Mr. KERR, of Iowa. I understood the gentleman from Wisconsin to say that that was only a minority report.

Mr. SPRINGER. That is a mistake; this is the report.

In the Forty-fifth Congress, second session—a unanimous report of the Hanna committee—the Committee on Naval Affairs submitted the following report in the Secor and McKay cases—

Mr. KERR, of Iowa. But the gentleman from Wisconsin, I thought, said that was a minority report; at least so I understood him.

Mr. SPRINGER. The gentleman from Alabama [Mr. HERBERT] stated to me on yesterday that the committee reported unanimously against it. He was a member of the committee, and I have the report in my hand. This was called to the attention of the committee before, and the President of the United States, Mr. Cleveland, refers to it in his veto message as the report of the committee. I know that report was before President Cleveland when he wrote the message.

Now, Mr. Hanna stated at that time as follows—and I desire to call the attention of gentlemen to the report drawn by Mr. Hanna, who was one of the ablest lawyers in Indiana, a Republican, a man of the highest character and integrity, and who gives an exhaustive examination and report of the facts and the findings of the committee in the report. He says:

The Committee on Naval Affairs, to whom was referred the petition and statement of Secor & Co. and Perine, Secor & Co., respecting the claims for losses sustained in building the harbor and river monitors Tecumseh, Mahopac, and Manhattan, also in relation to sundry payments received by them as "extras" on those vessels, having considered the same, respectfully submits the following report:

So, it shows upon the face of it that it was a report of the Committee on Naval Affairs, and not a minority report.

Your committee finds—

Not a minority of the committee—

that the contract price for the building of each of said vessels was the sum of \$460,000.

He then proceeds to state the facts in regard to what is known as the Secor claim, and after the Marchand board's award in that case had been paid by the Government, Secretary Robeson—he is not mentioned by name, but he was the Secretary at the time—ordered another investigation as to the Secor case, and that commission allowed the Secors \$93,000 in excess of the allowance of the Marchand Board, and Secretary Robeson paid that award, and after doing so the sobriquet of "Secor" was attached to his name and a public scandal was believed to have been created.

Mr. KERR, of Iowa. Does the gentleman say that this report covered this case?

Mr. SPRINGER. It was in precisely the same category, as the next case will show. In deciding the McKay case he refers to the de-

cision in the Secor case as involving the same principle precisely. Now what does Mr. Hanna say?

Now, in view of all these facts, the claimants come again and ask Congress to authorize the Court of Claims to take jurisdiction of these alleged claims and ascertain whether or not some additional sum can not be had out of the Treasury. First, they get the contract price.

Now, see how on all-fours this case is.

Second, their claim for extra work, as adjusted by the officers of the Navy, is received.

That was the additional board that I have spoken of.

Mr. THOMAS. There is some little misunderstanding here. Will the gentleman permit me to ask him what is the case that that committee are deciding?

Mr. SPRINGER. That was the case of Secor & Co. and Perine, Secor & Co. for extra compensation for building one of these gunboats.

Mr. THOMAS. It is not the McKay case.

Mr. SPRINGER. No, sir, not the McKay case, but exactly like it, on all-fours, except that they got \$93,000 from the Secretary of the Navy afterward.

Mr. THOMAS. Oh, no, it is not like it.

Mr. SPRINGER. Let us see what he says:

Third, the amount found to be due by the Morehouse board is received, and a receipt given in full discharge of all claims against the United States on account of the vessels upon which the board made the allowance as per their report under the act of March 2, 1867. The act of Congress of July 13, 1868, providing for the payment of these awards required that the receipts so given should thus be a finality. Fourth, the Boggs board, created by the Secretary of the Navy, make an additional allowance of \$93,116.98, and that has been paid.

Then says the report:

Pray, when are we to have a finality? The alleged claim is barred by the statute of limitation. It has been adjusted by a board created at the instance of claimants, and the award received was receipted for in manner and form as stated. The claimants are estopped by every rule of law or equity from further lawful claim. With full payment, limitations, and estoppel staring us in the face, we are asked to consent that the whole matter may be relitigated. To consent would be to trifle with public justice.

Your committee report adversely.

That is the report of the committee, not a minority report. Then immediately following the statement of that report Mr. Hanna made another report. We will see what that is:

The Committee on Naval Affairs, to whom was referred bill H. R. 1969, having considered the same, respectfully submit the following report:

This is a bill for the relief of Nathaniel McKay, who claims "further compensation for the construction of the light-draught monitor Squando, one of the vessels referred to and embraced in the act entitled 'An act for the relief of certain contractors for the construction of vessels of war and steam-machinery,' approved March 2, 1877." The bill proposes to refer this claim to the Court of Claims for adjudication, vesting that court with "authority and jurisdiction" in the premises.

Under the facts and the law, should the prayer for relief be granted?

Without going into all the details, it is sufficient to say that during the late war the Secretary of the Navy was authorized and empowered by law to contract for the construction of a number of a certain class of vessels, of which the monitor Squando was one. Your committee find that McKay & Aldus were the contractors; that the contract price was \$395,000;—

This bill only represented one vessel; the pending bill represents all three; hence the amount is less in the case then under consideration—

that the whole increased cost of the work over the contract price as now claimed by the contractors is the sum of \$337,329.46; that the contractors have been paid the full contract price, and in addition thereto have also been paid the sum of \$194,535.70.

From all the information which your committee has been able to obtain, it seems that the contract provided for the payment of a specific sum of money, and then in case of changes or modifications of plans or unreasonable delays caused by the Government, such additional sum as they might fairly be entitled to.

Upon settlement with the Secretary of the Navy, it appears that, in addition to the contract price, they were paid and they received from the Government the sum of \$194,535.70, as the sum found fairly due them in addition to the contract price on account of changes, modifications, etc. Then they claimed \$337,329.46, but that claim was investigated and passed upon by officers provided by law, and the sum found fairly due and owing by virtue of the terms and provisions of the contract was \$194,535.70, and this sum was paid to and accepted by the contractors.

Thus the matter was first adjusted in manner and form as by law provided. It appears that afterward, on the 2d of March, 1867, Congress passed an act entitled "An act for the relief of certain contractors for the construction of vessels of war and steam machinery;" that to carry into effect the provisions of this act the Secretary of the Navy, on the 6th of July, 1867, appointed a board, to whom claims of this character should be referred for re-examination and report to Congress. That board consisted of Marchand, King, and Foster. On the 4th of December, 1867, the Secretary of the Navy communicated to Congress the report of that board. It appears that McKay & Aldus submitted to that board their claim for remuneration. The board found and reported the contract price; that it had been paid the amount overpaid by reason of changes and modifications of plans; but that nothing additional was due the claimants on account of the matters complained of. Thus for the second time has this claim been acted upon in manner provided by law. Competent and lawful authority has twice settled this matter adversely to the claimants.

Your committee is clearly of opinion that the claim is without merit; that it has no foundation in either law or equity.

That is the McKay case, mind you, not the Secor case.

Having arrived at this conclusion upon the merits, it is deemed unnecessary to present the questions of limitations and estoppel, each of which would be fatal to the claim.

Courts regard with favor statutes of repose and do not favor reopening matters of controversy in the absence of fraud. The time has come when this claimant and all of the same class should distinctly understand that they have had their day in court and that it will be fruitless to attempt further recognition. The Government, by no known rule of law or equity, ought to consent that claimants of this class may enter her courts for further hearing. Such policy would not subserve the ends of justice.

Again the committee submitted another report by Mr. Hanna:

The Committee on Naval Affairs, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. 1264) for the relief of certain contractors for the construction of vessels of war and steam machinery, having considered the same, submit the following report:

All the matters of law and fact necessarily embraced in the consideration of this bill have been duly considered by the committee. The reports submitted on bill H. R. 1969, "A bill for the relief of Nathaniel McKay," and on the memorial of Secor & Co. and Perine, Secor & Co., present fully the views and conclusions at which your committee have arrived. The original contract price appears, in every instance, to have been paid. All lawful charges for extra work appear to have been fully paid. A board created by law, at the special instance of these contractors, have heard and determined all the matters complained of, and in all cases where said board found any sum due the contractor such sum has been received and receipted for in full of all claims. In some instances no sum whatever was found to be justly due. Your committee are of the opinion that all the claimants who are seeking further relief by virtue of the provisions of this bill have had their day in court; that great wrong and injustice might and would be done the Government to in any manner further recognize the existence of any legal or equitable claim against the Government; that by well settled rules of law these alleged claims are not only barred, but in fact are without merit. Your committee therefore report adversely.

This bill is of a similar character to the bill H. R. 1969, and the law and the facts applicable thereto are the same in all respects. So that the case of Nathaniel McKay, who is a party in this case, was decided by that committee in this report of Mr. Hanna.

Mr. DOCKERY. When was that report submitted?

Mr. SPRINGER. It was submitted on the 28th of February, 1878, in the Forty-fifth Congress; so that that was the opinion of the Naval Committee of that Congress, and that report was unanimously concurred in by that Congress, because no further action was taken at that time for the purpose of bringing up these claims. Now Mr. Speaker—

Mr. DOCKERY. Does the gentleman from Illinois know what amount is involved in this bill?

Mr. SPRINGER. The amount that is involved in the pending bill, so far as these claimants are concerned, that is to say, the extent of their claim before the Navy Department, which was not allowed, is \$323,483.25. That is the amount involved for these three vessels, for which they claim the Government has not paid them. The Government has already paid them \$409,000 in excess of the contract, which was for the sum of \$1,056,000.

Mr. THOMAS. But is it not a fact that that excess paid was for extra work, for which there was another contract made, under which these vessels were taken apart and rebuilt, and that none of it was for the advanced price of material or labor?

Mr. SPRINGER. I think I have so stated; and that after that the Government rejected their subsequent claims.

Mr. THOMAS. But this was for actual work.

Mr. SPRINGER. Although their claim was submitted to the Marchand board, that board declined to recognize it.

I want to state further that, while this individual case involves very much the same facts, as I have said, in the same class of cases which were referred to that board in this general bill, involving \$4,714,000, it is on all fours with the claim for extra compensation contained in this bill.

Mr. KERR, of Iowa. What distinction is there between this claim and the others, which Senator Grimes said would amount to \$60,000,000?

Mr. SPRINGER. These were cases amounting to \$4,700,000, and known as the gunboat claims. Senator Grimes was referring to that class of contracts with the Government, a memorandum of which he said he had upon his table, showing that the same principle was involved in those cases as in this, and which if allowed would involve the Government in a cost of \$60,000,000.

Mr. DOCKERY. Was this claim disallowed by this board?

Mr. SPRINGER. I have stated it several times, but I will repeat by way of recapitulation. The report in this case shows that the Government entered into a contract with these parties amounting to \$1,056,000 to build these boats. Extra work was ordered, and they put in a claim for pay for that work. A board was ordered by the Navy Department to investigate the allowance of the claim on account of extra work. They presented their claim to that board. It awarded them \$409,000 in excess of the contract. That was paid by act of Congress, and they receipted in full of all demands against the Government. They then went before the Marchand board, which was authorized to adjudicate on claims on account of the advance in the price of labor and material; and this board rejected the claim and said they were not entitled to it. Then they came to Congress and got this bill passed in order to allow them to go to the Court of Claims.

One word further and I will close. This bill passed the last Congress without sufficient debate. It was not properly understood. It went to the President and was vetoed by Mr. Cleveland. If I had time I would read that veto, but I have not time, though it is well known to you. Mr. Cleveland vetoed it upon the same ground that the Supreme Court decided the Chouteau case, and upon the same grounds set forth by Mr. Hanna in his report, to which I have called attention.

I need not refer to the veto, which was accepted by the House as conclusive, I suppose, or we should have heard of the case again at that time. But here it is again, and unless Congress now takes hold of this matter and puts its foot upon this case, like Banquo's ghost it will come

up from session to session, and we will never hear the end of it. I hope gentlemen will decide this question with a full view of their responsibility to their constituents. I want you to understand, gentlemen, in deciding this question, that if you allow this sum you are opening the door to all persons who may hereafter come before Congress to ask for relief upon the same ground—to have their cases sent to the Court of Claims in the way that this case is to be sent—not to hear and determine upon its merits. It is not sent to be heard on its merits. The merits were decided adversely in the Chouteau case in this appeal to the Supreme Court from the Court of Claims.

If this bill passes the Court of Claims is simply made a referee in chancery to report the facts in the case. They do not enter a judgment upon the facts and the law; the entry is of a judgment on the facts; and the law is taken out of their hands, and the principle involved in this case is taken away from the court. Now, here they claim that they are entitled by reason of a rise in the prices of material and cost of labor, a principle which the Supreme Court in the Chouteau case has decided is not admissible, as every gentleman knows. That is to be decided in this House; and, if Congress decides that all the adjudications of the war shall be opened, then nothing has been settled from the time of the first adjudication of claims for construction of ships and public works during the late war; everything is uprooted and chaos has come again.

Mr. THOMAS. How much time have I remaining?

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. The gentleman has seventeen minutes remaining.

Mr. THOMAS. I yield ten minutes to the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. STONE].

Mr. STONE, of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, I do not desire to occupy ten minutes. I really do not care to occupy any time in the discussion of this claim. I belong to the committee that has twice before considered this claim. I was on the committee that reported it favorably in the last Congress. I believed that these claimants had the right to at least be heard in court and to take the judgment of the court as to whether anything was due them or not. This claim was before the last Congress for two days, and that Congress sat here for that time and listened to just such statements as those which the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SPRINGER] has made to-day. The same statements were made in the last Congress by that gentleman himself and by others, and the result was that the bill passed this House by an overwhelming majority on a yea-and-nay vote.

It also passed the Senate without a dissenting voice. It went to the President of the United States, and there, as I am aware, it had the indorsement and recommendation of the Secretary that it be signed. I know, too, that gentlemen who opposed this claim upon this floor and who have opposed it here now had open and free access to the chamber of the President of the United States while the bill was being there considered; and I also know that gentlemen who had favored and defended the claimant upon this floor because they believed it was right were denied admission to the chamber of the President of the United States while the bill was being considered. This much, sir, I desire to say in answer to the question asked by the gentleman from New York [Mr. FARQUHAR] as to what the opinion of the Secretary of the Navy was at that time.

The President of the United States vetoed that bill. At the present session the bill was introduced again and referred to the Committee on War Claims. The very same state of facts exists now that existed before, and I assert that there was not a single, solitary sentence in the veto of the President that could be construed as refuting, or even disputing, the facts set forth in the report made by the Committee on War Claims in the Fiftieth Congress. There were no new facts presented. The President of the United States brought absolutely nothing to bear upon the case that could have a tendency to change the opinion of anybody who had investigated it.

I know that the limited investigation he was able to give the matter was as nothing in comparison with the investigation which the Committee on War Claims has been compelled upon several occasions to make of this case. Therefore, when the case came back to the Fifty-first Congress there was nothing to cause me to change my opinion, and there was no evidence produced before the Committee on War Claims to change its opinion. A bill like this had passed the Congress of the United States five or six separate times and had passed the Senate of the United States seven times. The present bill is better guarded with reference to the interests of the Government than was the bill which passed the Fiftieth Congress.

I was left, therefore, upon that committee in the position that I must decide again as I have already decided or else must change my opinion simply because the President of the United States had vetoed the bill passed by the Fiftieth Congress. Now I am as willing to decide any question of fact for myself upon an investigation of the facts as to take the opinion of any other man, no matter where he comes from. So that when this bill was introduced again in this present Congress and was referred to the Committee on War Claims I could do nothing but give it my assent.

I believe, Mr. Speaker, and gentlemen of the House of Representatives, that there can be no injustice done to anybody by passing this

bill and permitting these claimants to go before the Court of Claims. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SPRINGER] does not state the case fairly when he says that the equities are decided in this bill. The whole case goes to the court for an investigation, and I would like to know where there is a citizen in this country, who has a claim against the Government or a claim against a fellow-citizen, who does not feel that he ought to have the right to take it into court, where there is every opportunity for both sides to be heard. If the statements made by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SPRINGER] in his argument to-day are correct, nobody will be more likely to find it out than the Court of Claims.

The Congress of the United States can not investigate a case like this as that court can. The fact is, as stated by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. THOMAS], that the Marchand board never did investigate this case. That board closed its labors within a month after these claimants were notified that their accounts and vouchers must be presented. That board passed upon the claims for the construction of fifty-five vessels, made by forty-two contractors, in about one hundred days; fifty-five cases, in which millions of dollars were involved! The board decided those cases without the presence of attorneys, without hearing witnesses, without the presence of the claimants themselves, by a star-chamber proceeding organized, as is pretty clearly evident, with the idea of disallowing all such claims.

Besides, the McKay claim, upon the facts now presented, was never before that board at all. Furthermore, the decisions of the Marchand board have not been held as binding upon the Government. There are seven other claims that have been paid by special acts of Congress that were rejected by the Marchand board. That board said in those cases that nothing was due to the claimants, but the Congress of the United States, in its wisdom, afterwards decided that something was due to those claimants and that they should be paid.

Now, these parties ask only to be permitted to go to the Court of Claims. I do not know whether they can establish any rights or not. I do not know whether they can show any valid claims or not, but I am willing to permit them to go before the court and let the court decide, first, whether they have any grievance and, second, if they have, what is its amount and how it should be satisfied. I have confidence in the courts of the country. I am willing that the courts of the country shall decide these questions. I am willing that the courts shall say whether there is anything due or not, especially when I know that both sides will be fully represented in court and that each side will have its rights protected by the court.

Nor do I feel, sir, in making up my mind that these claimants are entitled to go into the Court of Claims, that I am deciding that anything is in fact due them. I do not claim to know whether anything is due them or not. I do say, however, that when any citizen of this country comes here and asks to be given a hearing in court upon any claim which he may have against the Government, his request ought to be granted. I do say that in every such case it is as little as Congress can do and as little as the people expect them to do to allow the claimant to go into court and have an opportunity to establish his case if he can do so.

As I have already said, so far as the question of allowing this claimant to go to the court is concerned, there are no new facts presented in this case. The case has been before Congress for many years, and it has been kept here largely because of the disposition of a number of gentlemen upon this floor, who have been here ever since I have been in Congress, and some of them longer, to fight with all the vehemence they can command and every sort of claim that does not come directly from one of their own constituents. That spirit has manifested itself strikingly in this case as in other cases of the same kind that have come before Congress in my time.

That sort of opposition has followed not only this claim, but every private claim from the time I came into Congress (and I do not know how long before) until now.

[Here the hammer fell.]

Mr. STONE, of Kentucky. Just one moment more. I wish to say that I do not entertain any of that sort of feeling. I am not in favor of paying unjust claims. I believe the best way to determine whether a claim is just or not is to allow the claimant to go to a court of the United States, that it may determine whether anything is due; and when such a court has determined the amount due I think the proper thing for Congress to do is to authorize the Secretary of the Treasury to pay it at once; because neither this nor any other Congress is competent (the incompetency does not proceed from lack of intellect, but from want of opportunity) to review the findings of any of the great courts of the country.

[Here the hammer fell.]

Mr. THOMAS obtained the floor.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. The gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. THOMAS] has five minutes.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SPRINGER], after searching the records extending over twenty years, was able to find one report against this claim. I had not been able to find it, though I examined fourteen reports of different committees of this and the other House, all of them in favor of the claim and many of them

unanimous reports. I acknowledge that I overlooked the report which the gentleman has read. The sum and substance of that report is that according to the strict letter of the law, without regard to any considerations of equity, these claimants have no legal claim against the Government.

The Supreme Court of the United States so decided. But when I asked the gentleman from Illinois this question: Supposing these parties to have invested \$118,000 of their own money in building vessels of the Government, this expenditure having arisen by reason of negligence or delay on the part of the Government, in consequence of which the prices of labor and material had increased, thus taking this amount out of the pockets of the claimants, whether, though the strict letter of the law might prohibit reimbursement to the parties, it would not be justice and equity to make them compensation—the gentleman declined to answer.

Now, Mr. Speaker, it seems to me this case has been fully discussed and we understand fully its merits. I propose now to ask—

Mr. KERR, of Iowa. Will the gentleman permit a correction? I understand that the report of Mr. Hanna declared this claim to be neither legal nor equitable.

Mr. THOMAS. The report states, if I understood the reading of it, that there is no legal claim.

Mr. KERR, of Iowa. And no equitable claim.

Mr. THOMAS. I do not think Mr. Hanna would say there was no equitable claim if he understood the facts; and the conceded facts, undisputed by the gentleman from Illinois or anybody else, are that the Government caused this delay by its defective plans, necessitating the tearing down and rebuilding of the vessels; that by reason of the course which the war took and the large duties which were meanwhile levied the price of iron was increased from \$65 a ton to \$220 a ton; that there was also an increase in wages of labor from \$1.50 or \$2 a day to \$4 or \$5 a day; these are the facts undisputed by anybody; and if Mr. Hanna or any one else says there is no equity in such a claim I think he does not know what the word "equity" means.

Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

Mr. SPRINGER. Will the gentleman allow me one moment for a correction?

Mr. THOMAS. Certainly. I do not withdraw my motion; but if the gentleman wishes to make a remark, I will yield to him.

Mr. SPRINGER. I wish to say that Mr. Hanna did state in his report that these claims were without any justification in law or equity.

Mr. THOMAS. That may have been Mr. Hanna's opinion; but I think the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SPRINGER] himself would not go to that extent; for when I asked him if he thought that men who had paid out \$118,000 of their own money under these circumstances had not an equitable claim, he declined to answer. I renew my motion.

Mr. SPRINGER. One moment further. I wish to make a remark in correction of a statement of my friend from Kentucky [Mr. STONE]. He said that the McKay case had not gone before the Marchand board. That is a mistake. It did go before that board and was rejected by it. I am referring now to the claim for additional allowance.

Mr. STONE, of Kentucky. Possibly I may have said that this case did not go before the Marchand board. That board held its sessions with closed doors; there is no telling what claims went before that board except from the cases reported by it; but the vouchers and other papers pertaining to this claim were never presented to the Marchand board by the McKays, because they had no time to do so after they had notification of the meeting of the board and before its adjournment.

Mr. SPRINGER. The gentleman had reference, no doubt, to the Selfridge board, not the Marchand board. It is true that the Selfridge board did not pass upon this case; but the Marchand board, under the act of March 2, 1867, did pass upon it specifically.

Mr. THOMAS. In answer to the gentleman's statement about the Marchand board I will say the board held that the question of increased cost by reason of delays caused by the Government was one sounding in damages and therefore beyond the jurisdiction of the Department and not included within the act, though the act itself expressly provided that that should be taken into consideration by the board.

Mr. SPRINGER. I have examined the report of the Marchand board and have found no such language; and I know that the act did confer jurisdiction upon the board.

Mr. THOMAS. I have stated what the board said: that they would not take the case into consideration because they did not think it came within the act, although the act expressly conferred jurisdiction upon them.

Mr. SPRINGER. I have not been able to find in the report any such language.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. The gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. THOMAS] demands the previous question.

Mr. BUCHANAN, of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, this bill having been read in the House, will it appear in the RECORD to-morrow morning?

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. The bill appears in full in the RECORD of to-day, being a part of the proceedings of yesterday.

Mr. SPRINGER. Before the previous question is put, will the gentleman from Wisconsin allow a motion to refer this bill to the Committee of the Whole House on the Private Calendar?

Mr. THOMAS. I insist on my motion for the previous question. The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. The question recurs on the third reading of the Senate bill.

Mr. SPRINGER. I move to refer this bill to the Committee on War Claims; or I will move to refer it to the Committee of the Whole on the Private Calendar if the motion is in order, and I believe it is.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. What is the motion of the gentleman? Mr. SPRINGER. To refer to the Committee of the Whole on the Private Calendar.

Mr. THOMAS. Is that motion in order?

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. Not to refer to the Calendar.

Mr. SPRINGER. I believe I was too fast in making the motion. The question is first on the third reading of the bill.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. That is the first question.

The bill was ordered to a third reading, and was accordingly read the third time.

Mr. SPRINGER. Now I move to refer to the Committee of the Whole House on the Private Calendar, so that it may go where the House bill is, if that motion is in order. Of course it is in order to move to recommit it to the Committee on War Claims.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. That motion is in order.

Mr. SPRINGER. Is it not in order to move to refer it to the Calendar and give it the same chance as the House bill?

Mr. THOMAS. Is that motion in order?

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. The question is on the passage of the bill, unless the gentleman moves to commit to the committee.

Mr. SPRINGER. But the motion to refer to the Committee of the Whole is in order, is it not?

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. Does the gentleman insist on the motion to commit?

Mr. SPRINGER. Of course; but I am asking first whether there is any difference between the motion to recommit or to refer to the Calendar?

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. The motion to recommit is in order.

Mr. BUCHANAN, of New Jersey. How can this bill be recommit-
ted, as it has never been committed to the committee?

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. The motion to commit or recommit would be in order.

Mr. SPRINGER. I move to commit the bill to the Committee of the Whole House on the Private Calendar.

Mr. CANNON. The rule is that the motion is only admissible to refer to a standing or select committee.

Mr. SPRINGER. I was trying to find the rule, but did not have it at hand. Then I move to commit the bill to the Committee on War Claims.

The question was taken; and on a division there were—ayes 35, noes 57.

Mr. SPRINGER. I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 51, nays 93, not voting 183; as follows:

YEAS—51.

Allen, Miss.	Dibble,	McClellan,	Sayers,
Bankhead,	Flick,	McCreary,	Shively,
Blount,	Forman,	McMillin,	Skinner,
Brewer,	Forney,	McRae,	Springer,
Briekner,	Goodnight,	Montgomery,	Stewart, Tex.
Brookshire,	Grimes,	Norton,	Struble,
Brown, J. B.	Henderson, N. C.	O'Ferrall,	Tillman,
Bynum,	Kerr, Iowa	Parrett,	Turner, Ga.
Candler, Ga.	Lane,	Paynter,	Vandever,
Clarke, Ala.	Lanham,	Peel,	Wheeler, Ala.
Clements,	Lawler,	Pickler,	Willcox,
Crisp,	Lester, Ga.	Rogers,	Williams, Ill.
Culbertson, Tex.	Lewis,	Rowland,	

NAYS—93.

Anderson, Kans.	Culbertson, Pa.	Kennedy,	Ray,
Atkinson, Va.	Cummings,	Kinsey,	Reed, Iowa
Atkinson, W. Va.	Cutcheon,	Knapp,	Rockwell,
Baker,	Darlington,	Lacey,	Rowell,
Bartine,	Dingley,	Laidlaw,	Sawyer,
Bayne,	Dolliver,	Lansing,	Scully,
Beckwith,	Dunnell,	Lee,	Sherman,
Belknap,	Evans,	McComas,	Simonds,
Bergen,	Farquhar,	McDuffie,	Smyser,
Bliss,	Funston,	Miles,	Stivers,
Bowden,	Gear,	Moffitt,	Stockbridge,
Brower,	Gest,	Morey,	Stone, Ky.
Browne, Va.	Gifford,	Morrow,	Sweeney,
Buchanan, N. J.	Greenhalge,	Niedringhaus,	Taylor, E. B.
Burton,	Hall,	O'Donnell,	Thomas,
Butterworth,	Hansbrough,	O'Neill, Pa.	Turner, Kans.
Caldwell,	Harmer,	Osborne,	Van Schaick,
Cannon,	Haugen,	Owen, Ind.	Walker,
Cheadle,	Henderson, Ill.	Owens, Ohio	Wiley,
Comstock,	Henderson, Iowa	Payne,	Williams, Ohio
Conger,	Hermann,	Penington,	Wilson, Mo.
Connell,	Hitt,	Pugsley,	
Covert,	Hopkins,	Quackenbush,	
Craig,	Kelley,	Quinn,	

NOT VOTING—183.

Abbott,	Cowles,	Lind,	Sanford,
Adams,	Crain,	Lodge,	Scranton,
Alderson,	Dalzell,	Magner,	Seney,
Allen, Mich.	Dargan,	Maish,	Smith, Ill.
Anderson, Miss.	Davidson,	Mansur,	Smith, W. Va.
Andrew,	De Haven,	Martin, Ind.	Snider,
Arnold,	De Lano,	Martin, Tex.	Spinola,
Banks,	Dickerson,	Mason,	Spooner,
Barnes,	Dockery,	McAdoo,	Stahlnecker,
Barwig,	Dorsey,	McCarthy,	Stephenson,
Belden,	Dunphy,	McClammy,	Stewart, Ga.
Biggs,	Edmunds,	McCord,	Stewart, Vt.
Bingham,	Elliott,	McCormick,	Stoddard,
Blanchard,	Ellis,	McKenna,	Stone, Mo.
Bland,	Enloe,	McKinley,	Stump,
Boatner,	Ewart,	Milliken,	Tarsney,
Boothman,	Featherston,	Mills,	Taylor, Ill.
Boutelle,	Finley,	Moore, N. H.	Taylor, J. D.
Breckinridge, Ark.	Fitch,	Moore, Tex.	Taylor, Tenn.
Breckinridge, Ky.	Fithian,	Morgan,	Thompson,
Brosius,	Flood,	Morrill,	Townsend, Colo.
Brown, T. M.	Flower,	Morse,	Townsend, Pa.
Brunner,	Fowler,	Mudd,	Tracey,
Buchanan, Va.	Frank,	Mutcher,	Tucker,
Buckalew,	Geissenhainer,	Nute,	Turner, N. Y.
Bullock,	Gibson,	Oates,	Vaux,
Bunn,	Grosvenor,	O'Neill, Ind.	Venable,
Burrows,	Grout,	O'Neill, Mass.	Waddill,
Campbell,	Hare,	Outhwaite,	Wade,
Candler, Mass.	Hatch,	Payson,	Wallace, Mass.
Carlton,	Hayes,	Perkins,	Wallace, N. Y.
Carter,	Haynes,	Perry,	Washington,
Caruth,	Heard,	Peters,	Watson,
Caswell,	Hemphill,	Phelan,	Wheeler, Mich.
Catchings,	Herbert,	Pierce,	Whiting,
Cheatham,	Hill,	Post,	Whitthorne,
Chipman,	Holman,	Price,	Wickham,
Clancy,	Hooker,	Itaines,	Wike,
Clark, Wis.	Houk,	Randall,	Wilkinson,
Clunie,	Kerr, Pa.	Reilly,	Wilson, Ky.
Cobb,	Ketcham,	Reynolds,	Wilson, Wash.
Cogswell,	Kilgore,	Richardson,	Wilson, W. Va.
Coleman,	La Follette,	Rife,	Wright,
Cooper, Ind.	Laws,	Robertson,	Yardley,
Cooper, Ohio	Lehlbach,	Rusk,	Yoder,
Cothran,	Lester, Va.	Russell,	

No quorum voting.

The following additional pairs were announced:

Mr. BURROWS with Mr. HOOKER, for this day.

Mr. CASWELL with Mr. BRUNNER, on this bill.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE with Mr. BRECKINRIDGE, of Arkansas, on this vote.

Mr. FRANK with Mr. LESTER, of Virginia, for the rest of the day.

Mr. POST with Mr. MOORE, of Texas, for the rest of the day.

Mr. BROSIOUS with Mr. EDMUNDS, for the rest of the day.

Mr. SNIDER with Mr. HAYNES, for the rest of the day.

Mr. COLEMAN with Mr. ENLOE, for the rest of the day.

Mr. YÖDER with Mr. CRAIN, on this vote.

Mr. FLOOD with Mr. MCADOO, on this vote.

Mr. CARTER with Mr. COOPER, of Indiana, on this bill.

Mr. McMILLIN. My colleague, Mr. RICHARDSON, is detained from the House this afternoon by sickness.

Mr. DOCKERY. Mr. Speaker, my colleague, Mr. HEARD, is also temporarily absent by reason of sickness.

The result of the vote was then announced as above recorded.

Mr. THOMAS. I move a call of the House.

The motion was agreed to.

The Clerk proceeded to call the roll; when the following members failed to answer to their names:

Abbott,	Cogswell,	Haynes,	O'Neill, Mass.
Adams,	Coleman,	Heard,	Outhwaite,
Alderson,	Cooper, Ind.	Hemphill,	Payson,
Allen, Mich.	Cooper, Ohio.	Hill,	Perry,
Anderson, Miss.	Cothran,	Holman,	Peters,
Andrew,	Cowles,	Hooker,	Phelan,
Arnold,	Culbertson, Tex.	Houk,	Pierce,
Banks,	Dalzell,	Ketcham,	Post,
Barnes,	Dargan,	Kilgore,	Pugsley,
Barwig,	Davidson,	Laws,	Quackenbush,
Biggs,	De Haven,	Lehlbach,	Raines,
Bingham,	De Lano,	Lester, Va.	Randall,
Blanchard,	Dickerson,	Lind,	Reilly,
Bland,	Dorsey,	Lodge,	Reynolds,
Boatner,	Dunnell,	Magner,	Richardson,
Boutelle,	Dunphy,	Maish,	Rife,
Breckinridge, Ark.	Edmunds,	Mansur,	Robertson,
Breckinridge, Ky.	Elliott,	Martin, Ind.	Rusk,
Brosius,	Ellis,	Martin, Tex.	Russell,
Brown, T. M.	Enloe,	Mason,	Sanford,
Buchanan, Va.	Ewart,	McAdoo,	Scranton,
Buckalew,	Featherston,	McCarthy,	Seney,
Bullock,	Finley,	McComas,	Smith, Ill.
Bunn,	Fitch,	McCord,	Smith, W. Va.
Campbell,	Fithian,	McCormick,	Snider,
Candler, Mass.	Flood,	McKinley,	Spinola,
Cannon,	Flower,	Milliken,	Spooner,
Carlton,	Fowler,	Mills,	Springer,
Caruth,	Frank,	Moore, N. H.	Stahlnecker,
Cheatham,	Geissenhainer,	Moore, Tex.	Stephenson,
Chipman,	Gibson,	Morse,	Stewart, Ga.
Clancy,	Grosvenor,	Mudd,	Stewart, Vt.
Clark, Wis.	Grout,	Mutcher,	Stewart, Vt.
Clunie,	Hatch,	Nute,	Stone, Mo.
Cobb,	Hayes,	O'Neill, Ind.	Stump,

Taylor, Ill.
Taylor, Tenn.
Taylor, J. D.
Thompson,
Townsend, Colo.
Tracey,
Tucker,
Turner, Kans.
Turner, N. Y.
Vaux,
Venable,
Waddill,
Wade,
Wallace, Mass.
Wallace, N. Y.
Washington,
Watson,
Wheeler, Mich.
Whitting,
Whitthorne,
Wickham,
Wike,
Wilson, Ky.
Wilson, Wash.
Wilson, W. Va.
Wright,
Yardley,
Yoder.

During the roll-call the following members reported to the Clerk and were recorded as present under the rule:

Mr. CULBERSON of Texas, Mr. COOPER of Indiana, Mr. BURTON, Mr. HEARD, Mr. GEISSENHAINER, Mr. DUNNELL, Mr. MUDD, Mr. MCCOMAS, Mr. CANNON, Mr. STEWART of Texas, Mr. TAYLOR of Tennessee, and Mr. SPRINGER.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk reports 170 members present—a quorum.

Mr. THOMAS. I move to dispense with all further proceedings under the call.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. THOMAS. I call for the regular order.

The SPEAKER. The Chair hopes that the House will be in order, so that the members will hear their names called and vote. The presence of a quorum has just been announced. There is important public business awaiting the action of a quorum. The Chair hopes every member will vote or present himself so that he can be registered as part of a quorum.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 44, nays 91, not voting 192; as follows:

YEAS—44.

Blount,	Goodnight,	McCreary,	Sayers,
Brewer,	Grimes,	McRae,	Skinner,
Brickner,	Hare,	Montgomery,	Springer,
Brookshire,	Heard,	O'Ferrall,	Stewart, Tex.
Catchings,	Henderson, N. C.	Owen, Ind.	Struble,
Clarke, Ala.	Kerr, Iowa	Owens, Ohio	Tarsney,
Culbertson, Tex.	Lanham,	Parrett,	Turner, Ga.
Cummings,	Lawler,	Paynter,	Wheeler, Ala.
Dibble,	Lester, Ga.	Peel,	Wilkinson,
Forman,	Lewis,	Pickler,	Willcox,
Forney,	McClellan,	Rowland,	Williams, Ill.

NAYS—91.

Anderson, Kans.	Cutcheon,	Kennedy,	Ray,
Atkinson, Pa.	Darlington,	Kinsey,	Reed, Iowa
Atkinson, W. Va.	Dingley,	Knapp,	Rockwell,
Baker,	Dolliver,	Lacey,	Rowell,
Barline,	Dunnell,	Laidlaw,	Sawyer,
Bayne,	Evans,	Lee,	Scul,
Belknap,	Farquhar,	McCormas,	Sherman,
Bergen,	Flick,	McDuffie,	Simonds,
Bliss,	Funston,	Miles,	Snyder,
Bowden,	Gear,	Moffitt,	Stivers,
Brower,	Gest,	Morrey,	Stockbridge,
Browne, Va.	Gifford,	Morrow,	Stone, Ky.
Bucanan, N. J.	Greenhalge,	Mudd,	Sweeney,
Burton,	Hall,	Niedringhaus,	Taylor, E. B.
Butterworth,	Hansbrough,	O'Donnell,	Taylor, Tenn.
Cannon,	Harmer,	O'Neill, Pa.	Thomas,
Cheadle,	Haugen,	Osborne,	Vandever,
Comstock,	Henderson, Ill.	Payne,	Van Schaick,
Conger,	Henderson, Iowa	Pennington,	Walker,
Connell,	Hermann,	Pugsley,	Wiley,
Covert,	Hitt,	Quackenbush,	Williams, Ohio
Craig,	Hopkins,	Quinn,	Wilson, Mo.
Culbertson, Pa.	Kelley,		

NOT VOTING—192.

Abbott,	Cheatham,	Hatch,	Norton,
Adams,	Chipman,	Hayes,	Nute,
Alderson,	Clancy,	Haynes,	Oates,
Allen, Mich.	Clark, Wis.	Hemphill,	O'Neill, Ind.
Allen, Miss.	Clements,	Herbert,	O'Neill, Mass.
Anderson, Miss.	Clunie,	Hill,	Outhwaite,
Andrew,	Cobb,	Holman,	Payson,
Arnold,	Cogswell,	Hooker,	Perkins,
Bainhead,	Coleman,	Houk,	Perry,
Banks,	Cooper, Ind.	Kerr, Pa.	Peters,
Barnes,	Cooper, Ohio	Ketcham,	Phelan,
Barwig,	Cothran,	Kilgore,	Pierce,
Beckwith,	Cowles,	La Follette,	Post,
Belden,	Crain,	Lane,	Price,
Biggs,	Crisp,	Laws,	Raines,
Bingham,	Dalzell,	Lehlbach,	Randall,
Blanchard,	Dargan,	Lester, Va.	Reilly,
Bland,	Davidson,	Lind,	Reyburn,
Boanner,	De Haven,	Lodge,	Richardson,
Boothman,	De Lano,	Magner,	Rife,
Boutelle,	Dickerson,	Malsh,	Robertson,
Breckinridge, Ark.	Doekery,	Mansur,	Rogers,
Breckinridge, Ky.	Dorsey,	Martin, Ind.	Rusk,
Brostus,	Dunphy,	Martin, Tex.	Russell,
Brown, J. B.	Edmunds,	Mason,	Sanford,
Browne, T. M.	Elliott,	McAdoo,	Scranton,
Brunner,	Ellis,	McCarthy,	Seney,
Buchanan, Va.	Enloe,	McClammy,	Shively,
Buckalew,	Ewart,	McCord,	Smith, Ill.
Bullock,	Featherston,	McCormick,	Smith, W. Va.
Burns,	Finley,	McKenna,	Snider,
Burrows,	Fitch,	McKinley,	Spinola,
Bynum,	Fithian,	Milliken,	Spoonor,
Caldwell,	Flood,	Mills,	Stahnecker,
Campbell,	Flower,	Moore, N. H.	Stephenson,
Candler, Ga.	Fowler,	Moore, Tex.	Stewart, Ga.
Candler, Mass.	Frank,	Morgan,	Stewart, Vt.
Carlton,	Geissenhainer,	Morris,	Stockdale,
Carter,	Gibson,	Morse,	Stone, Mo.
Carruth,	Grosvenor,	Mutchler,	Stamp,
Caswell,	Groat,		Taylor, Ill.

Taylor, J. D.
Thompson,
Tillman,
Townsend, Colo.
Townsend, Pa.
Tracey,
Tucker,
Turner, Kans.
Turner, N. Y.
Vaux,
Venable,
Waddill,
Wade,
Wallace, Mass.
Wallace, N. Y.
Washington,
Watson,
Wheeler, Mich.
Whitting,
Whitthorne,
Wickham,
Wike,
Wilson, Ky.
Wilson, Wash.
Wilson, W. Va.
Wright,
Yardley,
Yoder.

No quorum voting.

The Clerk announced the following additional pair:

Mr. MILLIKEN with Mr. TILLMAN, on this vote.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, as there is no quorum present, I move that the House do now adjourn.

INDIAN APPROPRIATION BILL.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Speaker, before that motion is put I ask unanimous consent to present a conference report on the Indian appropriation bill with the accompanying statement, and to have the report and statement printed in the RECORD. I was exceedingly anxious to have this report acted upon to-day. The appropriations under which the Department has been acting for fifteen days expire to-morrow, and the instructions issued by the Commissioner of Indian Affairs to the agents in all sections of the country, under which they have been acting for the past fifteen days, expire to-morrow.

For that reason it is very important to get this acted upon as soon as possible, and I had hoped that it might be acted upon to-day. I hoped that this call would reveal the presence of a quorum, so that the report might be considered. If we can not get a quorum present, I will yield to the motion to adjourn.

The SPEAKER. If there is no objection, the report will be printed in the RECORD.

Mr. MCCREARY. I understand this is the conference report on the Indian appropriation bill.

Mr. PERKINS. On the Indian appropriation bill.

The conference report is as follows:

CONFERENCE REPORT.

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 10726) making appropriations for the current and contingent expenses of the Indian Department, and for fulfilling treaty stipulations with various Indian tribes for the year ending June 30, 1891, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses, as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendments numbered 1, 4, 5, 6, 8, 10, 14, 63, 65, 66, 81, 82, 83, 84, 85, and 88.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 2, 7, 9, 11, 12, 13, 16, 17, 19, 20, 21, 22, 23, 24, 25, 26, 27, 29, 30, 32, 33, 34, 35, 38, 40, 41, 42, 43, 44, 45, 46, 47, 48, 49, 50, 51, 53, 54, 55, 57, 58, 59, 60, 61, 62, 64, 67, 68, 69, 70, 71, 72, 73, 77, 78, 80, 86, 87, 91, 92, 93, 94, 95, 96, 97, 98, 99, 100, 101, and 102, and agreed to the same.

Amendment numbered 3: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 3, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$1,200;" and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 15: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 15, and agree to the same with amendments as follows: Strike out from line 2 of said amendment the words "out of their funds in the Treasury of the United States;" and insert, after the word "Interior," in line 6 of said amendment, the following: "unless otherwise directed by the President of the United States;" and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 18: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 18, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: Add at the end of said amendment the following: "first paying therefrom to Thomas F. Richardson the sum of \$2,000, balance due him for services rendered his tribe and expenses incurred as chief and agent from March, 1886, to March 31, 1890;" and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 28: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 28, and agree to the same with amendments as follows: Restore the matter stricken out by said amendment amended as follows: Strike out in line 25, page 16 of the bill, the word "on" and insert in lieu thereof the word "of," and add at the end of line 27, same page, the following: "And the Secretary of the Interior shall take the necessary steps to collect the amount of principal and interest due on said bond, to be covered into the Treasury;" and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 31: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 31, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by said amendment insert the following: "But this shall not be held to impair or otherwise affect the rights or equities of any person whose claim to membership in said tribe is now pending and being investigated;" and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 37: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 37, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: Strike out in the last line of said amendment the word "section" and insert in lieu thereof the word "paragraph;" and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 38: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 38, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by said amendment insert the following: "For the erection of fifteen school buildings, being in part compliance with the requirements of section 20 of the above-mentioned act of March 2, 1889, \$15,000;" and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 39: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 39, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter stricken out by said amendment insert the following: "That \$2,000 of the above \$8,000 shall be expended for the Prairie Island settlement of Indians in Goodhue County; Provided further;" and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 52: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 52, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: After the word "persons," in line 14, page 33 of the bill, insert the following: "not more than two of whom shall be of the same political party;" and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 55: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment numbered 55, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: After the word "paid," in line 19 of said amendment, insert the following: "not to exceed;" and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 74: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 74, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: Strike out, in line 1 of said amendment, the words "expenses already incurred" and insert in lieu thereof the following: "necessary expenses;" and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 75: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 75, and agree to the same with amendments as follows: Strike out the matter proposed to be inserted by said amendment and strike out, in line 17, page 37 of the bill, the words "fifty-one" and insert in lieu thereof "seventy-six;" and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 76: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 76, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$125,000;" and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 79: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 79, and agree to the same with amendments as follows: Insert after the amended paragraph the following:

"That the Secretary of the Interior is hereby directed to repair and equip for use the buildings known as Fort Totten, at Devil's Lake, N. Dak., and recently turned over to his department by the Secretary of War, in order that they may be used to their full capacity for the purpose of an Indian industrial boarding school, and for this purpose he may use so much money as may be necessary, to be taken from the appropriation herein made for support of Indian day and industrial schools.

"For the erection of an industrial boarding-school building at the Blackfeet agency, in Montana, \$25,000, this sum to be charged to the appropriation for the Indians at the Blackfeet agency provided for in article 3 of the agreement with the Gros Ventre, Piegan, Blood, Blackfeet, and River Crow Indians, in Montana, ratified by the act approved May 1, 1888."

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendments numbered 89 and 90: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 89 and 90, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: Strike out the amended paragraph and insert in lieu thereof the following: "For the erection of buildings for an Indian industrial school at the Shoshone Indian reservation, Wyoming, \$25,000;" and the Senate agree to the same.

B. W. PERKINS,
O. S. GIFFORD,
S. W. PEEL,

Managers on the part of the House.

H. L. DAWES,

P. B. PLUMB,
Managers on the part of the Senate.

The statement of the House conferees is as follows:

The managers on the part of the House of the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 10726) making appropriations for the current and contingent expenses of the Indian Department, and for fulfilling treaty stipulations with various Indian tribes, for the year ending June 30, 1891, and for other purposes, submit the following written statement in explanation of the action agreeing upon said amendments, namely:

Amendment No. 1: Appropriates \$2,000 for the pay of the Indian agent at the Yakima Indian reservation, instead of \$1,800 as under existing law. The Senate recedes.

Amendment No. 2: Reduces the appropriation for the pay of the agent at the Colville agency from \$1,600 to \$1,500, as under existing law. The House recedes.

Amendment No. 3: Reduces the appropriation from \$1,500 to \$1,200 for the pay of the agent at the Fort Belknap agency. The Senate recedes with an amendment appropriating \$1,200 for the pay of such agent.

Amendment No. 4: Reduces the appropriation for the pay of the agent at the Standing Rock agency from \$1,800 to \$1,700. The Senate recedes, leaving the appropriation as under existing law.

Amendment No. 5: Appropriates \$1,800 for the pay of the agent at the Pueblo agency, instead of \$1,500, as under existing law. The Senate recedes.

Amendment No. 6: Appropriates \$1,800 for the pay of the agent at the Mesquero agency, instead of \$1,600, as under existing law. The Senate recedes.

Amendment No. 7: Reduces the appropriation for the pay of the agent at the Southern Ute and Jicarilla agency from \$1,600, the present law, to \$1,400. The Senate recedes.

Amendment No. 8: Reduces the appropriation for the pay of the agent at the Great Nemaha agency from \$1,300 to \$1,000. The Senate recedes.

Amendment No. 9: Increases the appropriation for the pay of the agent at the Union agency from \$1,800 to \$2,000; \$2,000 is the present appropriation and the House recedes.

Amendment No. 10: Reduces the appropriation for the pay of the agent at the White Earth agency from \$1,800 to \$1,600. The present appropriation is \$1,800 and the Senate recedes.

Amendment No. 11: Increases the appropriation for the pay of the agent at the Green Bay agency from \$1,500 to \$2,000. In consequence of the increased labor imposed upon this agent under recent orders of the Interior Department, the House recedes.

Amendment No. 12: Corrects the footing made necessary by the preceding amendments, and the House recedes with an amendment.

Amendment No. 14: Inserts an unnecessary title to the following amendment, and the Senate recedes.

Amendment No. 15: Appropriates \$400,000 belonging to the Creek Nation of Indians and held at the present time as a trust fund, and directs that it shall be paid per capita to the members of the tribe. In consequence of the large amount of money remaining in the Treasury to the credit of these Indians and in consequence of their advanced civilized condition and their present necessities, aggravated by an unfortunate season, the House recedes from its disagreement and consents to the amendment with an amendment. The Government is paying 5 per cent. interest annually upon this money, and in the judgment of the House conferees the Indians are fully competent to expend the money judiciously and wisely for their own benefit.

Amendment No. 16: Corrects an error in the statement of the amount appropriated, and the House recedes.

Amendment No. 18: Appropriates money belonging to the Miami Indians of Kansas and now to their credit in the Treasury, and directs that it shall be distributed per capita among the members of the tribe. The lands belonging to these Indians have recently been allotted to them in severalty and they have been made citizens of the United States and need the money for the improvement of their homes, and in the judgment of your conferees can use the money profitably and wisely. Hence the House conferees recede, with an amendment.

Amendments Nos. 19, 20, 21, 22, 23, 24, 25, 26, and 27: Pertain to the same paragraph and impose upon the President the power and responsibility of appointing the commission provided for therein instead of upon the Secretary of the Interior, and make some changes in the phraseology of the paragraph.

Amendment No. 28: Strikes out an appropriation made to pay a bond belonging to the Citizen Band of the Pottawatomie Indians, which bond has been lost; and the Senate recedes with an amendment.

Amendments No. 29 and 30: Make an appropriation of \$27,011.60 to pay to the Mexican Pottawatomie Indians of Kansas for losses they have sustained in that State. Nine thousand sixteen dollars and fourteen cents of this amount is in the Treasury at this time standing to the credit of these Indians, so that in fact but \$17,995.46 is appropriated from the public moneys, and in the judgment of your conferees this appropriation is right; and we recommend that the House recede.

Amendment No. 31: Modifies the preceding paragraph; and your conferees recommend that the House recede with an amendment.

Amendment No. 32: Appropriates the sum of \$1,405.76 for a like number of acres of land taken from the Seneca tribe of Indians without compensation by the United States, and in the judgment of your conferees the Indians are entitled to the compensation for the lands taken; and hence they recommend that the House recede from its disagreement to the appropriation.

Amendment No. 33: Increases the appropriation made for the subsistence of the Sioux Indians from \$850,000 to \$950,000. In consequence of the recent treaty made with the Sioux, as well as in consequence of former treaties and promises made to them, your conferees recommend that the House recede from its disagreement to this appropriation.

Amendment No. 35: Corrects the footing made necessary by amendment No. 33, and your conferees recommend that the House recede from its disagreement.

Amendment No. 36: Appropriates \$150,000 for the payment of interest due the Sioux Nation of Indians in Dakota under the act of Congress of March 2, 1889, for which amount the United States is to be reimbursed as provided in the act. The appropriation is an appropriate one in the judgment of your conferees, and we recommend that the House recede from its disagreement.

Amendment No. 37: Appropriates \$45,000, or so much thereof as may be necessary, to pay to the Santee Sioux, of South Dakota, \$1 per acre for lands not taken by them, but which under the recent treaty they would be at liberty to take if they so desired. This is reimbursable to the United States from lands belonging to these Indians when sold. The appropriation is an appropriate one, in the judgment of your conferees, and we recommend that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment.

Amendment No. 38: Appropriates \$30,000 for the erection of thirty school buildings for the Sioux Indians in South Dakota. In the judgment of your conferees some of these buildings should be erected during the present year, and hence they recommend that the House recede from its disagreement to the appropriation with an amendment.

Amendment No. 39: Strikes out a provision inserted in the paragraph making an appropriation for the Medawakanton band of Sioux Indians in Minnesota. In the judgment of your conferees the provision is a wise one, and we recommend that the House recede with an amendment.

Amendment No. 40: Fixes the compensation of the person who is to expend the money provided for in the preceding paragraph and is a wise provision, and your conferees recommend that the House recede from its disagreement thereto.

Amendment No. 40: Increases the appropriation for the support of the Chippewa Indians of Lake Superior from \$5,000 to \$36,000. In consequence of the needy condition of these Indians your conferees recommend that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments.

Amendment No. 46: Appropriates \$25,000 for the subsistence and civilization of the Northern Cheyenne and Arapahoe Indians in Montana. These Indians are in an unfortunate condition, and your conferees recommend that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment.

Amendment No. 49: Imposes upon the President of the United States, instead of upon the Secretary of the Interior, the duty provided for in the paragraph, and your conferees recommend that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment.

Amendment No. 50: Reduces the appropriation from \$10,000 to \$5,000, and your conferees recede from their disagreement.

Amendment No. 52 is an amendment of the same character, and your conferees recommend that the House recede with an amendment so as to provide that no more than two of the commissioners provided for in the paragraph shall be selected from the same political organization.

Amendment No. 53: Reduces the appropriation from \$10,000 to \$5,000, and your conferees recommend that the House recede from its disagreement thereto.

Amendment No. 54: Provides for a commission to visit the Puyallup Indian reservation, in the State of Washington, for the purposes expressed therein, and your conferees recommend that the House recede from its disagreement thereto.

Amendment No. 55: Provides for a commission to visit the Warm Springs Indian reservation, in the State of Oregon, and the Colville Indian reservation, in the State of Washington, for the purposes expressed in the paragraph, and your conferees recommend that the House recede from its disagreement to this amendment with an amendment.

Amendments Nos. 57, 58, 59, 60, and 61: Pertain to the pay of the Indian police, and your conferees recommend that the House recede from its disagreement to the Senate amendment. This amendment increases the appropriation made for this purpose from \$114,000 to \$123,000; but it is recommended by the Indian Office and by the Secretary of the Interior and it is believed that it will add to the efficiency of the police service, and hence the action of your conferees.

Amendment No. 63: Struck out a paragraph making an appropriation for Big Jim's band of Absentee Shawnees for losses sustained by them; and the Senate recedes from its amendment.

Amendment No. 64: Made an appropriation of \$548 for the pay of the party named therein, but was stricken out by the Senate, and your conferees recommend that the House recede from its disagreement to such amendment.

Amendments Nos. 65 and 66: Make appropriations for the parties named therein, which were stricken out by the Senate. The Senate recedes from these amendments.

Amendments Nos. 67 and 68 are covered by amendment No. 69, and your conferees recommend that the House recede from its disagreement to these amendments.

Amendments Nos. 70, 71, and 72: Make an appropriation for the Chippewa Indians of Minnesota, and your conferees became satisfied that these appropriations were right, and hence recommend that the House recede from its disagreement to these amendments.

Amendment No. 73: Provides for the employment of a special attorney for the Mission Indians of Southern California, and your conferees recommend that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment.

Amendment No. 74: Makes an appropriation to pay the necessary expenses incurred in the case of the United States against William H. Thomas and others and in the judgment of your conferees is a wise appropriation, and hence they recommend that the House recede with an amendment.

Amendment No. 75: Appropriates \$25,000 for a school building at the Blackfeet agency in Montana. The Senate recedes from this amendment with an amendment.

Your conferees recommend that the House recede from its disagreement to amendment No. 76 with an amendment made necessary by the action of the Senate on the preceding amendment.

Amendment No. 77 was made necessary in consequence of the preceding amendments, and your conferees recommend that the House recede from its disagreement thereto.

Amendment No. 79 struck out the language in the paragraph which reappropriated the unexpended appropriation of the last current year, and your conferees recommend that the House recede from its disagreement thereto with an amendment.

Amendment No. 80: Fixes the compensation of the superintendent of the schools at Albuquerque, N. Mex., and corrects an omission in the paragraph. Your conferees recommend that the House recede from its disagreement thereto.

Amendments Nos. 81, 82, 83, and 84: Pertain to the Indian school at Carlisle, and the Senate recedes from these amendments.

Amendment No. 85: Reduces the appropriation for the pay of the superintendent of the school at Chillicothe, Ind. T., from \$2,000 to \$1,500. The Senate recedes from this amendment.

Amendment No. 86: Limits the amount appropriated as an expended balance to \$16,000, and your conferees recommend that the House recede from its disagreement thereto.

Amendment No. 87: Provides for an industrial school near the village of Flandreau, in South Dakota, and appropriates \$25,000 therefor. In the judgment of the Commissioner of Indian Affairs this school is badly needed for the good of the Indians, and your conferees recommend that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment.

Amendment No. 88: Provides for an industrial school at Mandan, in North Dakota, and appropriates \$25,000 therefor. The Senate recedes from its amendment.

Amendment No. 90: Reduced the appropriation for an industrial school at the Shoshone Indian reservation in Wyoming from \$25,000 to \$12,000. Your conferees recommend that the House recede from its disagreement to this amendment with an amendment.

Amendment No. 91: Changes the phraseology of the paragraph and increases the appropriation for the erection of a new building and for the support of the Indian school at Grand Junction, Colo., from \$17,500 to \$35,000. In consequence of the need of better accommodations at this school your conferees recommend that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment.

Amendments Nos. 92 and 93 are administrative in their character, and your conferees recommend that the House recede from its disagreement thereto.

Amendment No. 95: Corrects an error in the footing, and your conferees recommend that the House recede from its disagreement thereto.

Amendment No. 97 is made necessary in consequence of the delay in the consideration and passage of the appropriation bill, and your conferees recommend that the House recede from its disagreement thereto.

Amendments 13, 34, 42, 43, 44, 45, 48, 51, 56, 62, 94, 96, 98, 99, 100, 101, and 102 are verbal or typographical, and do not change in any way the appropriations carried by the bill, and your conferees recommend that the House recede from its disagreement thereto.

The Senate amendments to the bill carried an appropriation of \$1,245,184.73. The reductions to the bill made by the Senate amendments were \$83,127.18, leaving a net increase of \$1,162,057.55. Of the increase made by the Senate amendments \$495,667.47 were from funds belonging to the Indians and now in the Treasury, but appropriated for the benefit of the Indians to whom they belong. Three hundred and ninety-five thousand dollars of the amount is to be reimbursed to the United States from the sale of lands belonging to the Indians for whom the appropriations are made. The conference agreement reduces the appropriations made by the Senate \$70,000 and restores to the bill items aggregating \$18,739.40, which were stricken therefrom by the Senate amendments.

B. W. PERKINS,
O. S. GIFFORD,
S. W. PEEL,

Managers on the part of the House.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE.

A message from the Senate, by Mr. PLATT, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment the bill (H. R. 7058) to ratify and confirm an agreement entered into by the commissioners on the part of the States of New York and Pennsylvania in relation to the boundary lines between said States.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed, with amendments, in which concurrence was requested, the bill (H. R. 11380) making appropriations for additional clerical force and other expenses, to carry into effect the act entitled "An act granting pensions to soldiers and sailors who are incapacitated for the performance of manual labor, and providing for pensions to widows and minor children and dependent parents from July 21, 1890, for the balance of the fiscal year ending June 30, 1891."

The message further announced that the Senate disagreed to the amendments of the House to the bill (S. 3918) in regard to collision at sea, asked a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and had appointed Mr. FRYE, Mr. WASHBURN, and Mr. GORMAN conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message further announced that the Senate receded from its amendment to the bill (H. R. 7885) granting a pension to R. Allen McCormick.

The message further announced that the Senate had passed a joint resolution (S. R. 120) appropriating money to the Territory of Oklahoma to relieve destitution therein; in which the concurrence of the House was requested.

The motion of Mr. THOMAS was agreed to; and accordingly (at 4 o'clock and 2 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned.

RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, the following resolution was introduced and referred as follows:

By Mr. GIFFORD:

Resolved, That the Committee on Rules be authorized and required to investigate into the expediency and practicability of the adoption and use by the House of a system of "electric voting," said committee to report the result of their investigation to the House;

to the Committee on Rules.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk and disposed of as follows:

Mr. DARLINGTON, from the Committee on Public Buildings and

Grounds, reported favorably the bill of the House (H. R. 9549) to provide for the purchase of a site and the erection of a public building thereon at Greensburgh, in the State of Pennsylvania, accompanied by a report (No. 2963)—to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. TAYLOR, of Tennessee, from the Committee on War Claims, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 11734) for the relief of Col. S. K. N. Patton, reported, as a substitute therefor, a bill (H. R. 11742) for the relief of the estate of S. K. N. Patton, deceased; which was read twice, and, accompanied by a report (No. 2964), referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. O'NEILL, of Pennsylvania, from the Committee on the Library, reported favorably the following resolution:

Resolved by the Senate (the House concurring), That Congress desires the removal of the remains of the illustrious soldier and statesman, Ulysses S. Grant, to, and their interment in, Arlington National Cemetery, and that the President be requested to convey to the widow of this eminent man such desire, tendering to her on behalf of the nation all necessary facilities for such removal and interment;

accompanied by a report (No. 2965)—to the House Calendar.

Mr. KINSEY, from the Committee on Military Affairs, reported favorably the bill of the Senate (S. 3080) providing for the construction of a military store-house and offices for army purposes at the Omaha military depot, Nebraska, and for other purposes, accompanied by a report (No. 2966)—to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. PERKINS, from the Committee on Indian Affairs, reported favorably the bill of the House (H. R. 11526) to change the boundaries of the Uncompahgre reservation, accompanied by a report (No. 2967)—to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, bills of the following titles were introduced, severally read twice, and referred as follows:

By Mr. GRIMES: A bill (H. R. 11743) to authorize the construction of a bridge across the Flint River, in the State of Georgia—to the Committee on Commerce.

By Mr. CARUTH: A bill (H. R. 11744) to amend section 3868 of the Revised Statutes of the United States—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

PRIVATE BILLS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills of the following titles were presented and referred as indicated below:

By Mr. BELDEN: A bill (H. R. 11745) increasing the pension of Anna G. Valk—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CARUTH: A bill (H. R. 11746) for the relief of Don Carlos Buell—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. FORMAN: A bill (H. R. 11747) granting a pension to Lydia Chapman, dependent mother of Samuel J. Chapman—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. GOODNIGHT: A bill (H. R. 11748) for relief of John B. Page, of Monroe County, Kentucky—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. HEARD: A bill (H. R. 11749) for the relief of the heirs or legal representatives of Xaver Zeltner, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. LANHAM (by request): A bill (H. R. 11750) for the relief of Daniel McKenzie—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. LODGE: A bill (H. R. 11751) for the relief of George C. Bucknam—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. QUACKENBUSH: A bill (H. R. 11752) for the relief of Leroy L. Barnard—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. STONE, of Missouri: A bill (H. R. 11753) for the relief of the heirs or legal representatives of Claiborn Osborn, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. TAYLOR, of Tennessee: A bill (H. R. 11754) for the relief of Isaac H. Diehl—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. WALLACE, of Massachusetts: A bill (H. R. 11755) to remove the charge of desertion against Warren V. Howard—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. WILKINSON: A bill (H. R. 11756) for the relief of Mrs. Mary I. Holland—to the Committee on War Claims.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, the following petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

By Mr. ANDREW: Memorial of 5 business firms of Boston, Mass., protesting against legislation by Congress compelling railroads to transport petroleum barrels free—to the Committee on Commerce.

By Mr. BURROWS: Memorial of retail grocers, citizens of Kalamazoo, Mich., protesting against legislation by Congress compelling railroads to transport petroleum barrels free—to the Committee on Commerce.

By Mr. LANHAM: Petition of Daniel McKenzie, praying that his claim for property taken by the Army during the late war be referred to the Court of Claims—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. LEE: Petition and affidavits for relief of Robert Graham—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. MOREY: Resolution of Farmers' Grange, No. 13, in favor of Senate bill 1454—to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. STONE, of Missouri: Petition of Isabel Osborne, praying that claim for property taken by the Army during the late war be referred to the Court of Claims—to the Committee on War Claims.

SENATE.

FRIDAY, August 15, 1890.

The Senate met at 10 o'clock a. m.

Prayer by the Chaplain, Rev. J. G. BUTLER, D. D.

The Journal of yesterday's proceedings was read and approved.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore* laid before the Senate a letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting, in response to a resolution of the Senate of the 11th instant, schedules of claims allowed by the several accounting officers of the Treasury Department; which, with the accompanying papers, was referred to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

He also laid before the Senate a communication from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting estimates of appropriations required by the various departments of the Government to complete the service of the fiscal year ended June 30, 1890, and for the postal service, payable from postal revenues; which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

He also laid before the Senate a communication from the Acting Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, in pursuance of the requirements of the eighth section of the act of Congress of July 22, 1854, the report of the United States surveyor-general for New Mexico on the private land claim in said Territory known as the Rito de los Frijoles grant, and also a copy of a letter dated August 11, 1890, from the Commissioner of the General Land Office, transmitting the report; which, with the accompanying papers, was referred to the Committee on Private Land Claims, and ordered to be printed.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION.

Mr. QUAY. Mr. President, I find in The Washington Post of this morning an account of what appears to have been the proceedings of a conference of Republican Senators last night, in the course of which the following occurs:

During the course of his remarks Senator QUAY said that he objected to having Southern Republicans in the House set upon him by Speaker REED to yelp at his heels like a pack of dogs in favor of Senator HOAR's measure.

I desire merely to say that the reporter of the Post was imposed upon, and every Senator who was present will bear me witness that I made no reflection upon the distinguished presiding officer of the House of Representatives or any member of that body in the remarks I made. I made no allusion whatever to him or to the Southern Republicans, and I have no recollection that any unfriendly allusion was made to either by any Senator there present. If the statement merely affected me personally, I would, of course, not notice it. The report is not true.

Mr. HOAR. I ask unanimous consent to make an observation in regard to the remarks just made by the Senator from Pennsylvania. I hope it will not be understood that because he feels called upon to contradict such a statement other people are also called upon to contradict mendacious statements about them made under similar circumstances.

Mr. QUAY. In reply to the suggestion of the Senator from Massachusetts, I will state that I think the explanation is justifiable, because it indicates that I cast an unwarrantable reflection upon an officer and members of another branch of Congress. It differs in that respect from the circumstance to which the Senator from Massachusetts alludes.

Mr. HOAR. The Senator knows, and most Senators within the sound of my voice know, that absolutely mendacious statements at the same time were made about me, which I have not thought it worth while to contradict.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES.

Mr. COCKRELL, from the Committee on Military Affairs, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. 2106) to remove the charge of desertion against Daniel W. Selleck, reported it with an amendment, and submitted a report thereon.

Mr. SPOONER, from the Committee on Claims, reported an amendment to the deficiency appropriation bill; which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. HAWLEY, from the Committee on Military Affairs, to whom was referred the amendment submitted by Mr. HEARST on the 12th inst., intended to be proposed to the deficiency appropriation bill, reported

it favorably and moved its reference to the Committee on Appropriations; which was agreed to.

He also, from the same committee, to whom was referred the bill (S. 4300) granting a right of way on Fort Douglas military reservation in the Territory of Utah, reported it with amendments, and submitted a report thereon.

BILL INTRODUCED.

Mr. HALE (by request) introduced a bill (S. 4329) to amend an act entitled "An act to provide for taking the eleventh and subsequent censuses," approved March 1, 1889; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Census.

AMENDMENT TO DEFICIENCY BILL.

Mr. EVARTS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the deficiency appropriation bill; which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE.

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. MCPHERSON, its Clerk, announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 10726) making appropriations for the current and contingent expenses of the Indian Department, and for fulfilling treaty stipulations with various Indian tribes, for the year ending June 30, 1891, and for other purposes.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED.

The message also announced that the Speaker of the House had signed the following enrolled bills; and they were thereupon signed by the President *pro tempore*:

A bill (S. 3787) to amend the laws relative to shipping commissioners;

A bill (S. 4207) extending the time of payment to purchasers of land of the Omaha tribe of Indians in Nebraska, and for other purposes;

A bill (S. 3917) to adopt regulations for preventing collisions at sea;

A bill (S. 3329) authorizing the city of Charleston to open Concord street through the grounds of the United States in that city;

A bill (S. 4225) to amend an act approved August 6, 1888, authorizing the construction of bridges by the Houston, Central Arkansas and Northern Railway Company;

A bill (H. R. 7885) granting a pension to R. Allen McCormick; and

A bill (H. R. 8391) making appropriations for fortifications and other works of defense, for the armament thereof, for the procurement of heavy ordnance for trial and service, and for other purposes.

DEFICIENCIES IN APPROPRIATIONS.

Mr. HALE, from the Committee on Appropriations, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. 11459) making appropriations to supply deficiencies in the appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1890, and for prior years, and for other purposes, reported it with amendments, and submitted a report thereon.

RIVER AND HARBOR BILL.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. Is there further morning business? If there be none that order is closed.

Mr. FRYE. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the bill known as the river and harbor bill.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The Senator from Maine moves that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the bill (H. R. 9486) making appropriations for the construction, repair, and preservation of certain public works on rivers and harbors, and for other purposes.

Mr. EDMUNDS. On that motion I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The Senator from Vermont asks that on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Maine the yeas and nays may be entered on the Journal.

The yeas and nays were ordered; and the Secretary proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. CARLISLE (when his name was called). Under the arrangement announced yesterday afternoon, by which my pair with the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. PIERCE] was transferred to the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. VANCE], as the arrangement I believe still exists, I vote "yea."

Mr. DAVIS. I am paired generally with the Senator from Indiana [Mr. TURPIE]. If he were here he would vote "yea" upon this question, and I venture to disregard the pair and vote "yea."

Mr. BATE (when Mr. HARRIS's name was called). My colleague [Mr. HARRIS] is paired with the Senator from Vermont [Mr. MORRILL]. My colleague is not well enough to be in the Chamber this morning.

Mr. PASCO (when his name was called). I am paired with the Senator from Illinois [Mr. FARWELL]. Not knowing how he would vote I will withhold my vote.

Mr. CULLOM. The Senator is at liberty to vote on this question.

Mr. PASCO. I vote "yea."

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