

SENATE.

MONDAY, January 8, 1894.

Prayer by the Chaplain, Rev. W. H. MILBURN, D. D.

The Vice-President being absent, the President *pro tempore* took the chair.

RICHARD F. PETTIGREW, a Senator from the State of South Dakota, appeared in his seat to-day.

The Journal of the proceedings of Thursday last was read and approved.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore* laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting, in response to a resolution of December 7, 1893, a report from the First Comptroller of the Treasury, containing two statements of the amounts paid to the United States district attorney for the southern district of New York from January 1, 1873, to October 31, 1893, etc.; which, on motion of Mr. JONES of Arkansas, was, with the accompanying paper, ordered to lie on the table, and be printed.

He also laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a report from the Commissioner of Indian Affairs relative to the claim of Hon. JOHN T. HEARD for services rendered the Western Cherokee Indians; which, with the accompanying papers, was referred to the Committee on Indian Affairs, and ordered to be printed.

He also laid before the Senate a communication from the Postmaster-General, transmitting, in compliance with the act of May 9, 1888, the claim of Dennis McIntyre, postmaster at Mackinac Island, Mich., for credit on his postal and money-order accounts by reason of losses resulting from the burglary of his office September 17, 1893, stating the amount of such losses and recommending that his accounts be credited with such amounts; which was, on motion of Mr. PLATT, referred to the Committee on Post-Offices and Post-Roads, and ordered to be printed.

He also laid before the Senate a communication from the Attorney-General, transmitting, in response to a resolution of the Senate of December 11, 1893, statements of the number of indictments found for violations of election laws since 1870, etc.; which was read.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. This communication is in answer to a resolution submitted by the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. GALLINGER]. What disposition does he desire made of it?

Mr. GALLINGER. I move that the communication, with the accompanying papers, be printed, and lie on the table.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. HOAR subsequently said: What became of the letter of the Attorney-General which was just read?

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The letter of the Attorney-General was in answer to a resolution submitted by the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. GALLINGER]. It was ordered printed and goes to the table.

Mr. HOAR. I suppose it should be referred to the Committee on Privileges and Elections, but I will let it lie on the table until the Senator comes in.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The Chair called the attention of the Senator from New Hampshire to it, and he asked that it be printed and laid on the table.

Mr. HOAR. He is not in the Chamber at this moment.

PERMITS FOR OPENING STREETS AND ALLEYS.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore* laid before the Senate a communication from the Commissioners of the District of Columbia, transmitting, in response to a resolution of November 1, 1893, certain information relative to the opening of streets and alleys, for laying or repairing water pipes, sewers, etc., since the 1st day of November, 1892; which, on motion of Mr. SHERMAN, was ordered to be printed, and, with the accompanying documents, referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

REPORT OF THE PUBLIC PRINTER.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The Chair lays before the Senate a letter from the Public Printer, which will be read.

Mr. HALE. Let it be referred.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The letter should be read and referred to the Committee on Printing.

Mr. HALE. I do not think it has been the practice to read communications from any except heads of Departments.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. It is immaterial. The communication is about five lines long.

Mr. CULLOM. We should like to know what the document is before it is referred.

Mr. HALE. If it is no longer than that I do not object. Generally heretofore, my recollection is, the time of the Senate has

not been taken up even by reading communications of any length from the heads of Departments, but they have been printed and referred, with all accompanying papers, to the proper committees. The Senate will very clearly see, as the Presiding Officer will, that if all such communications are read the morning hour will stretch out indefinitely. Nobody listens to the communications. They are printed, and are reached in that way.

Mr. CULLOM. If the Senator from Maine will allow me, it seems to me the rule has been exactly the reverse. When we get a report from a Department the letter of the head of the Department is read, and then the documents accompanying it are ordered to be printed.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The Chair remembers no instance during the service of the Chair where the letter of the head of a Department has not been read.

Mr. MANDERSON. The letter of transmittal.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The letter of transmittal. The documents accompanying it are of course a totally different matter.

Mr. HALE. Undoubtedly; and therefore the letter of transmittal simply communicating the documents and indicating the subject-matter may be read, but my recollection is that the only communications of the kind read which are of length are from the President of the United States.

Mr. HOAR. Or a State Legislature.

Mr. HALE. Or a State Legislature. And long letters even from the heads of Departments are not read.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The Chair would hold that a letter from the head of any Department should be read, but the reading of an accompanying document depends upon the order of the Senate.

Mr. MANDERSON. I think a consultation of the RECORD in the morning will show that the communications which have been read at the Secretary's desk this morning have been simply the letters of transmittal.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. Always.

Mr. MANDERSON. So far as this particular document is concerned, I apprehend it is the annual report of the Public Printer.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. That is true.

Mr. MANDERSON. The Public Printer is an official of the Congress of the United States, and he makes his report direct to Congress just as the head of one of the great Departments makes his report.

Mr. HALE. Then he comes under the rule applying to heads of Departments.

Mr. MANDERSON. Unquestionably. The letter of transmittal should be read, and if it is the annual report, it should be referred to the Committee on Printing.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The Secretary will read the letter of the Public Printer.

The Secretary read as follows:

OFFICE OF THE PUBLIC PRINTER,
Washington, D. C., January 8, 1894.

SIR: I have the honor to transmit herewith to Congress a report of the condition and operations of this Office for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1893.

Very respectfully,

F. W. PALMER, Public Printer.

HON. A. E. STEVENSON,
President of the Senate.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The letter of transmittal will be printed, and, with the accompanying document, referred to the Committee on Printing.

Mr. MANDERSON. I ask unanimous consent that the annual report of the Public Printer be printed, without a reference of the question to the Committee on Printing, as that is the usual course, and it is important to have it speedily in the consideration of the general printing bill.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. It will be so ordered, if there be no objection; that is, the letter of transmittal and the document accompanying it will be printed and referred to the Committee on Printing.

HAWAIIAN AFFAIRS.

Mr. DAVIS. I desire to give notice that on Wednesday next, at the conclusion of the morning business, I shall move to take from the table the resolution introduced on the 3d instant by the Senator from Maine [Mr. FRYE] respecting Hawaii, for the purpose of submitting some remarks thereon.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore* presented a memorial of the Legislature of Idaho; which was read, and referred to the Committee on Public Lands, as follows:

EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENT, Secretary's Office, State of Idaho.

I, James F. Curtis, secretary of the State of Idaho, do hereby certify that the annexed is a full, true, and complete transcript of house joint memorial

No. 4, which was filed in this office the 4th day of March, A. D. 1893, and admitted to record.

In testimony whereof I have hereunto set my hand and affixed the great seal of the State. Done at Boise City, the capital of Idaho, this 23d day of March, A. D. 1893.

[SEAL.]

J. F. CURTIS, *Secretary of State.*

House joint memorial No. 4. (By Crane.)

To the Senate and House of Representatives
of the United States in Congress assembled:

Your memorialists, the Legislature of the State of Idaho, respectfully represent:

That the waters of Lake Coeur d'Alene near the mouths of the St. Marys and Coeur d'Alene Rivers, inlets of said lake, cover large areas of land to a depth of 5 feet and less.

That by reason of being so overflowed all of such land is rendered useless and valueless.

That the Spokane River, the outlet of said lake, at and near said lake, is very rapid and has an average fall of not less than 20 feet per mile.

That the dredging and clearing of the channel of said Spokane River at and near said lake to a depth of 5 feet below its present level would reclaim and render very valuable for agricultural purposes fully 50,000 acres of land now valueless because submerged.

That such dredging and clearing would not be expensive, but that the land reclaimed would be of a value of at least \$500,000 so soon as such dredging and clearing should be done.

Wherefore your memorialists respectfully petition that an appropriation be made sufficient to defray the expense necessary to make surveys and estimates of the cost of lowering the mean level of said lake at least 5 feet.

The secretary of state is hereby requested to forward copies of this memorial to the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States, to the Secretary of War, and to our representatives in Congress.

Approved March 3, 1893.

W. J. McCONNELL, *Governor.*

Mr. SHERMAN presented memorials of 450 farmers of Montgomery County, Ind.; of 126 citizens of Adams Township, Seneca County, Ohio; of the Philadelphia (Pa.) Board of Trade; of 25 employes of Dormer Bros., in Cincinnati, Ohio; of 51 manufacturers of Anderson, Ind.; of 27 employes of the Joseph Turner and Sons Manufacturing Company of Cleveland, Ohio; of 26 citizens of Cardington, Ohio; of employes of Henry Fox & Co., of Urbana, Ohio, and of 264 citizens of the Fourth ward of Akron, Ohio, remonstrating against the passage of the so-called Wilson tariff bill; which were referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented a petition of the Chamber of Commerce of Cleveland, Ohio, praying that the tariff question may be speedily settled; which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented a memorial of the Board of Directors of the Louisville (Ky.) Silvering and Beveling Company, remonstrating against any change in the tariff on mirrors; which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented a memorial of miners of lead ores in Southern Missouri and Southeast Kansas, remonstrating against a reduction of duty on lead ores; which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented a memorial of manufacturers of clothing and cloaks of Cincinnati, Ohio, remonstrating against the duty on imported clothing and cloaks as proposed in the so-called Wilson tariff bill; which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented a petition of the Cuyahoga Republican Club of Cleveland, Ohio, praying for the annexation of Hawaii; which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

He also presented a petition of the Greenwich (Ohio) Farmers' Institute Association, praying that no appropriation be made by Congress for the irrigation of arid lands in the West; which was referred to the Committee on Irrigation.

He also presented petitions of 8 cigar manufacturers of Cincinnati; of 24 cigar manufacturers of Springfield, and the petition of Vincene Woboril of Cleveland, all in the State of Ohio, praying for the imposition of a uniform duty of 35 per cent on unstemmed leaf tobacco; which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented a petition numerous signed by soldiers and sailors of the late war, praying for an investigation of the Pension Bureau; which was referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also presented petitions of soldiers of the late war of Kyger, Pioneer, Wilkesville, Centerburg, North Georgetown, Coshocton County; Berlin Center, Mount Pleasant, Sullivan, Knox County, of Hocking County, of Piqua and Miami Counties, of Gahanna, Byhalia, Independence, Chesterville, and Defiance, and of Fairfield County, all in the State of Ohio, praying for an investigation of the Pension Bureau; which were referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also presented petitions of Typographical Union No. 99; of Cigar-makers Local Union No. 173; of Mayflower Assembly No. 469, Knights of Labor, of Zanesville; of Cincinnati Typographical Union, No. 3 and of 107 citizens of Youngstown, all in the State of Ohio, praying for the governmental control of the telegraph service; which were referred to the Committee on Post-Offices and Post-Roads.

Mr. BUTLER presented a petition of 44 citizens of Port Royal, S. C., praying for the location of a custom-house at that place; which was referred to the Committee on Commerce.

Mr. HOAR presented memorials of the Louisville (Ky.) Silvering and Beveling Company; of sundry citizens of Roxbury, Mass., and of John C. Tobin and 4 others, in behalf of 850 employes of the Roxbury (Mass.) Carpet Company, remonstrating against the passage of the so-called Wilson tariff bill; which were referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented a petition of the Boston (Mass.) Lithographic Artists and Engravers' Association, praying for an amendment of the clause of the so-called Wilson tariff bill relating to lithographic work; which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented a memorial of the Fatuneh Farmers' Club of Massachusetts, remonstrating against any change in the present tariff rates as laid down in the so-called McKinley tariff act; which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented a memorial of 270 manufacturers of firearms of Worcester, Mass., remonstrating against any reduction of duty on firearms; which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented petitions of Typographical Union No. 13, and of the Wood Carvers' Association, of Boston, Mass., praying for the governmental control of the telegraph service; which were referred to the Committee on Post-Offices and Post-Roads.

Mr. WASHBURN presented petitions of cigar manufacturers of Northfield, Chaska, Minneapolis, and Glencoe, all in the State of Minnesota, praying for the imposition of a uniform duty of 35 cents on unstemmed leaf tobacco; which were referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented a petition of sundry citizens of Ely, Minn., praying for the retention of the present duty on iron ore; which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. PETTIGREW presented a memorial of citizens of Enterprise, S. Dak., remonstrating against any reduction of the duty on barley and its products, as proposed by the so-called Wilson tariff bill; which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented petitions of citizens of Yankton and Huron, S. Dak., praying for the imposition of a uniform duty of 35 per cent on unstemmed leaf tobacco; which were referred to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. HAWLEY presented the memorial of D. F. Bates and 65 other tobacco-growers of Canton, Conn., remonstrating against any change in the present duty on leaf tobacco and cigars; which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented the memorial of A. P. Whitehouse and 127 other employes of the Capewell Horse Nail Company, of Hartford, Conn., remonstrating against any reduction of the duty on horse nails; which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented a memorial of the Fur Hat Manufacturers, of South Norwalk, Conn., remonstrating against any change in the present duties on materials used in the hat manufacturing industry; which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. CULLOM presented petitions of cigar manufacturers of Monmouth, Champaign, and Keithsburg, all in the State of Illinois, praying for the imposition of a uniform duty of 35 per cent on unstemmed leaf tobacco; which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented the memorial of Charles F. Hawk and other citizens of Springfield, Ill., remonstrating against the passage of the so-called Wilson tariff bill; which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented the memorial of Joseph Capps & Sons, Limited, of Jacksonville, Ill., manufacturers of woolen goods, remonstrating against the proposed change of duty on such goods, and urging that the duty shall not be less than 50 per cent ad valorem; which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented a petition of the board of directors of the Chicago (Ill.) Board of Trade, praying for the passage of House bill No. 4182, for the establishment of an international conference for the better protection of animals in transit; which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented a memorial of the miners of the Menominee iron district of Michigan, remonstrating against any change in the duty on iron ore, as proposed by the so-called Wilson tariff bill; which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented a memorial of Cigar-makers' Union, No. 114, of Jacksonville, Ill., remonstrating against any increase of the internal-revenue tax on cigars, as proposed by the so-called Wilson tariff bill; which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented a memorial of sundry citizens of Illinois, remonstrating against any change in the duty on shirts, cuffs, collars, and linen, as proposed by the so-called Wilson tariff bill; which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented a memorial of sundry citizens of Illinois, remonstrating against any reduction of the duty on wool; which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. STEWART presented a memorial of the California Jute

Mill Company, remonstrating against any reduction of the duty on jute grain bags, as proposed by the so-called Wilson tariff bill; which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented a memorial of miners of lead ore in Southwest Missouri and Kansas, remonstrating against the duty on lead ore, as proposed in the so-called Wilson tariff bill; which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. FRYE presented a petition of 6 cigar manufacturers of Portland, Me., praying for the imposition of a uniform rate of duty of 35 per cent on unstemmed leaf tobacco; which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. PROCTOR presented the memorial of C. A. Grinshaw and other cotton-mill operatives of Springfield, Vt., remonstrating against the passage of the so-called Wilson tariff bill; which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented the memorial of W. B. Fonda and W. I. Harwood, of St. Albans, Vt., remonstrating against any reduction of the duty on lime, as proposed by the so-called Wilson tariff bill; which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented a petition of 13 cigar manufacturers of Burlington, Vt., praying for a uniform duty of 35 per cent on unstemmed leaf tobacco; which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented the memorial of A. Jarvis and 68 other employees of the National Horse Nail Company, of Vergennes, Vt., remonstrating against any reduction in the duty upon horse nails; which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. GALLINGER presented a memorial of employees of the Devonshire Woolen Mills, of Goffs Falls, New Hampshire, remonstrating against the passage of the so-called Wilson tariff bill; which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. MCMILLAN presented the petition of Henry Frankenstein and other citizens of Detroit, Mich., praying for the imposition of a uniform duty of 35 per cent on unstemmed leaf tobacco; which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented the memorial of Andrew Gulgren and 123 other citizens of Iron River, Mich.; the memorial of Alfred Kidder and 88 other citizens of Palmer, Mich.; and the memorial of J. J. Anderson and 177 other citizens of Bessemer, Mich., remonstrating against the passage of the so-called Wilson tariff bill; which were referred to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. STOCKBRIDGE presented memorials of lead ore and mining companies of Missouri, Idaho, Indiana, Illinois, Nevada, New Mexico, South Dakota, Utah, Kansas, Virginia, Washington, Wisconsin, Colorado, California, and Montana; and the memorial of C. O. Frye and other miners of lead ores in Southwest Missouri and Southeast Kansas, remonstrating against the duty on lead ore as proposed by the so-called Wilson tariff bill; which were referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented the memorial of F. O. Mills and 221 other citizens of Ishpeming, Mich., and the memorial of Andrew Gulgren and other citizens of Iron River, Mich., remonstrating against placing iron ore on the free list; which were referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented the petition of G. F. Fand and 37 other citizens of Ionia, Mich.; and the petition of A. J. Pierce and 18 other citizens of Coldwater, Mich., praying for the imposition of a uniform duty of 35 per cent on unstemmed leaf tobacco; which were referred to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. CHANDLER presented the memorial of John A. Buguey and 42 other employees of the Waumbek County Wilton Mills, New Hampshire, remonstrating against the passage of the so-called Wilson tariff bill; which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. PLATT presented the memorial of 225 employees of hat manufacturers of Bethel, Conn., remonstrating against any reduction of the duty on fur felt hats, as proposed by the so-called Wilson tariff bill; which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented the petitions of Typographical Union No. 47, of New Haven, Conn., and of Typographical Union No. 252, of Bridgeport, Conn., praying for the governmental control of the telegraph service; which were referred to the Committee on Post-Offices and Post-Roads.

He also presented a memorial of 210 overseers and operatives in the Ashland Cotton Mills, of Jewett City, Conn., remonstrating against the passage of the so-called Wilson tariff bill; which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented the petition of Philip S. Wales, medical director United States Navy, praying that he be granted certain relief by Congress; which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES.

Mr. MANDERSON, from the Committee on Indian Affairs, to whom was referred the bill (S. 870) authorizing the issue of a

patent to the Presbyterian Board of Home Missions for certain lands on the Omaha Indian Reservation for school purposes, reported it with amendments, and submitted a report thereon.

Mr. MARTIN. I am directed by the Committee on the District of Columbia, to whom was referred the bill (S. 1305) to amend "An act relating to the incorporation of certain corporations within the District of Columbia," approved October 1, 1890, to report it with amendments, and to submit a report thereon. I am also directed by the committee to ask the unanimous consent of the Senate for the immediate consideration of the bill. I ask that the bill and the report be read.

Mr. ALLEN. I should like to know more about the bill before it is taken up, and would like to have it read at length.

Mr. MARTIN. I have asked to have the bill and the report read.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The bill will be read for information, subject to objection.

The Secretary read the bill.

Mr. SHERMAN. It seems to me that is a measure too important to be considered now. It involves a very large subject.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. There being objection, the bill goes to the Calendar.

Mr. MARTIN. Do I understand the Senator from Ohio to object to the consideration of the bill at the present time?

Mr. SHERMAN. I think the matter is too important to be acted upon without having it before us in print at least.

Mr. MARTIN. I think if the Senator from Ohio will listen to the reading of the report he will withdraw his objection.

Mr. SHERMAN. I will listen to it with pleasure. I will listen to the Senator in explanation of the bill.

Mr. MARTIN. I should like to have the report read.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The Senator from Kansas asks unanimous consent that the report prepared by the committee may be read. Is there objection?

Mr. ALLEN. Mr. President, I object.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The request is objected to. The report will be printed, and the bill goes to the Calendar.

Mr. BUTLER. I wish to make an inquiry in regard to the bill which has just gone to the Calendar. Will the bill with the amendments be printed?

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. Necessarily.

Mr. BATE. And the report?

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. And the report.

Mr. BERRY, from the Committee on Public Lands, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. 4859) for the relief of certain settlers upon the Iowa Reservation, Oklahoma, reported it without amendment, and submitted a report thereon.

He also, from the same committee, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. 683) for the relief of the heirs of Martha A. Dealy, deceased, reported it without amendment.

WILLIAM HENDERSHOTT.

Mr. DOLPH. By direction of the Committee on Public Lands, I report favorably, without amendment, the bill (S. 1377) for the relief of William Hendershott, of Butteville, Oregon, and I ask for the immediate consideration of the bill, as it is a local and a private matter.

Mr. MANDERSON. Let the bill be read for information.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The bill will be read subject to objection.

The Secretary read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, directed, on application of William Hendershott, of Marion County, Oregon, and on proof being made by the said Hendershott to the satisfaction of the Secretary of the Interior that the land hereinafter described was, in November, 1854, filed upon at the Oregon City land office, in the State of Oregon, as a donation land claim under the act of Congress approved September 27, 1850, by Louis Forcier; that he resided upon and cultivated the same for four consecutive years; that he proffered final proof to said land office in 1858, and that such proof was rejected for the reason that he could not establish the fact that he was a citizen of the United States; and further, that he, William Hendershott, was a purchaser in good faith of said premises by mesne conveyances from said Louis Forcier, and that he is in possession of and has made valuable improvements thereon, to issue to him, the said William Hendershott, his heirs and assigns, a patent for the following-described pieces and parcels of land, to wit: Lots 1, 2, 3, and 4, in section 21, township 4 south, of range 1 west of the Willamette meridian, containing 97 acres, in the Oregon City land district, in the county of Marion and State of Oregon.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill.

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

Mr. DOLPH. I ask that the petition of the claimant be inserted in the RECORD. It comprises less than two pages of written matter.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. Is there objection to inserting

in the RECORD the petition of the claimant? The Chair hears none.

The petition is as follows:

BUTTEVILLE, MARION COUNTY, OREGON, December 11, 1893.

To the honorable the Congress of the United States:

I would most respectfully petition your honorable body for relief, as follows:

One Louis Forcier, who was born in Canada in the year 1801, and came to the Northwest Territory 1825, in employ of the Hudson Bay Company, in November, 1851, filed at the Oregon City land office a donation land claim upon the following-described parcel of land, to wit:

Lots 1, 2, 3, and 4, in section No. 21, township 4 south, of range 1 west of the Willamette meridian, containing 97 acres.

On November 1, 1858, the said Forcier appeared before the officers of the said Oregon City land office to make final proof, but failed because he could not establish proof of naturalization or citizenship.

Forcier resided in what is now county of Marion, State of Oregon, from 1842 until 1865, when he returned to Canada and has since died.

Since the organization of Oregon Territory there is no court record or any other evidence to show that Forcier has ever acquired naturalization papers or citizenship.

In the year of 1860 he, Forcier, transferred the above-described land by warranty deed to one Robie, and in 1863 Robie, by warranty deed, transferred to one Arquette, and in 1891 Arquette transferred by warranty to myself; all of said transfers being of record in this county and State.

The land cost me with improvements \$1,200.

Improvements consist of one residence, storeroom, cellar, barn, all under fence, 13 acres under cultivation, 2 acres of which are in orchard.

There has never been a patent issued for the land as described, and I now pray your honorable body to grant relief.

Respectfully, yours,

WILLIAM HENDERSHOTT.

TIMBER AND STONE LAND PURCHASES.

Mr. DOLPH. By direction of the Committee on Public Lands I report back without amendment the bill (H. R. 71) for the relief of purchasers of timber and stone lands under the act of June 3, 1878. Until this morning I was under the impression that the bill had already passed the Senate at this session. It is an exact copy of a bill which passed both branches of Congress during the last session of the last Congress, and I supposed it was a law; but when the bill came from the other House I telegraphed to the Secretary of State and received a telegram which explains the condition of the bill of the last Congress. It is a very simple bill. It merely authorizes affidavits to be made before the proper officer in purchases of timber and stone lands.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. Does the Senator from Oregon desire to have the telegram read?

Mr. DOLPH. I should like to have the telegram read.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The Secretary will read as requested.

The Secretary read as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF STATE, December 19, 1893.

To Hon. J. N. DOLPH, United States Senate:

Senate bill 2275 was received here December 30, 1892, bearing a note in the following words:

"This bill was presented to me on the 15th day of December, 1892. Congress, pursuant to a concurrent resolution adopted on the 21st day of December, 1892, adjourned from the 22d day of December, 1892, to January 4, 1893. I have not approved the bill.

"December 30, 1892."

"BENJ. HARRISON.

W. Q. GRESHAM.

Mr. DOLPH. The former bill was not approved simply because there was a recess of the Senate. I think the bill is a law without the President's signature, but as that question can not be raised very well and the House of Representatives has sent us another bill, I report the bill favorably from the Senate committee and ask that it be acted upon.

Mr. GORMAN. Let the bill be read.

Mr. DOLPH. Let the bill be read. It is short. It will be seen there is nothing in it that will give rise to controversy.

Mr. GORMAN. Let it be read for information, subject to objection.

The Secretary read the bill, and, by unanimous consent, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to its consideration. It provides that hereafter all necessary affidavits and proofs required by law of any purchaser of lands under the provisions of an act entitled "An act for the sale of timber lands in the States of California, Oregon, Nevada, and Washington Territory," approved June 3, 1878, and the act amendatory thereof approved August 4, 1892, in order to perfect his title to the lands, may be made before any officer qualified to take proof in home-stand cases.

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

BILLS INTRODUCED.

Mr. SHERMAN (by request) introduced a bill (S. 1382) to secure the vested rights of soldiers of the Union and their heirs and legal representatives, and to remedy certain wrongs in the administration of the Interior Department; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also introduced a bill (S. 1383) granting a pension to Russel N. Reynolds; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also introduced a bill (S. 1384) granting an increase of pension to Solomon E. Homan; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also introduced a bill (S. 1385) to restore Mary E. Trickey and children of Hartwell M. Trickey to the pension rolls; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also introduced a bill (S. 1386) to promote peace among nations and for the creation of a tribunal of international arbitration; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

He also introduced a bill (S. 1387) for the relief of Laura B. Miller; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Select Committee on Ford Theater Disaster.

Mr. ALLEN introduced a bill (S. 1388) increasing the circulating medium, and for other purposes; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. CULLOM (by request) introduced a bill (S. 1389) for an act to provide pensions for freedmen released from involuntary servitude, and to afford aid and assistance for certain persons released, that they may be maintained in old age; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. JONES of Arkansas introduced a bill (S. 1390) providing an additional circuit judge in the eighth judicial circuit; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. TURPIE introduced a bill (S. 1391) granting a pension to Mrs. Levenia D. Athon; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. STOCKBRIDGE introduced a bill (S. 1392) for the relief of Walter S. Kimmel; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

Mr. HARRIS (by request, Mr. JONES of Arkansas in the chair), introduced a bill (S. 1393) for the relief of N. C. Perkins, administrator; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

He also (by request) introduced a bill (S. 1394) authorizing the Secretary of the Treasury to purchase a place of deposit for the records of the Executive Departments of the Government; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Mr. HILL introduced a bill (S. 1395) for the relief of George P. Rowell & Co.; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

AMENDMENT TO A BILL.

Mr. PERKINS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the naval appropriation bill; which was referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs, and ordered to be printed.

APPOINTMENT OF DIPLOMATIC AGENTS.

Mr. CHANDLER submitted the following resolution, which was read:

Resolved, That the Committee on the Judiciary be directed to inquire and report to the Senate their opinion as to the cases in which the President may constitutionally send to foreign countries agents, representatives, or commissioners, without the advice and consent of the Senate, and whether or not there was constitutional authority for the appointment in March last, without the advice and consent of the Senate, of Hon. James H. Blount as commissioner to the Hawaiian Islands with the powers conferred upon him by his letter of appointment and such other instructions as were given to him.

Mr. CHANDLER. I ask for the present consideration of the resolution.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

Mr. GORMAN. I object. Let it go over.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. Objection being made, the resolution goes over.

Mr. GORMAN. It goes over under the rule.

PAYMENTS TO COMMISSIONER BLOUNT.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The Chair lays before the Senate a resolution coming over from a previous day; which will be read.

The Secretary read the resolution submitted by Mr. HOAR on the 4th instant, as follows:

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Treasury be directed to inform the Senate what sums have been paid from the Treasury to the Hon. James H. Blount for salary, services, or other expenses, as a special commissioner to Hawaii, together with copies of all orders, vouchers, or receipts for such payment; and also to inform the Senate from what fund and under or by virtue of what appropriation or law the same have been paid.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The question is on agreeing to the resolution which has been read.

Mr. GORMAN. I move to refer the resolution to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. HOAR. I think the Senator must have made that motion under a misunderstanding of the scope of the resolution. It is merely an inquiry as to how much money has been paid from the Treasury for a certain purpose, which is well known to the Senate by the message of the President, and from what fund it has been paid.

I have never known in my experience in the Senate that a committee could throw any light upon the question whether the Senate should know how money in the Treasury had been spent, and I never have heard of any delay or objection to such information. I hope the Senator will not press his motion to refer.

Mr. GORMAN. Mr. President, I shall be compelled to insist on my motion. I submit to the Senator from Massachusetts and to the Senate that this is a very extraordinary inquiry as to the expenditure from a fund which has been placed at the disposal of the Department of State in the nature of a secret fund. It is a matter which ought not to be inquired into with great particularity. I know there are some precedents for it.

Mr. HOR. Does the Senat or understand this money has been paid from the secret fund?

Mr. GORMAN. I take it for granted that it has been.

Mr. HOAR. That is all I want to know.

Mr. GORMAN. I know nothing whatever about it, but I assume that it has been paid from that fund. I know that in the last Administration, and it has been so with all preceding Administrations, Congress, without the slightest hesitation, have placed at the disposal of the President of the United States a sufficient amount of money to conduct the business of the Department of State, and that that fund, being placed in his hands at his discretion, has always been expended without further inquiry—I will not say "always," for there have been probably a few exceptions; but the rule has been the other way.

Mr. HOAR. No. The statute settles that.

Mr. GORMAN. I shall be glad to hear the Senator.

Mr. HOAR. Allow me to read the statute. I do not ask that the details of what money has been expended at the discretion of the President in the secret service shall be furnished to the Senate. All I ask is whether this particular sum has been paid from that fund or not. I will read the statute:

SEC. 291. Whenever any sum of money has been or shall be issued from the Treasury for the purposes of intercourse or treaty with foreign nations, in pursuance of any law, the President is authorized to cause the same to be duly settled annually with the proper accounting officers of the Treasury, by causing the same to be accounted for, specifically, if the expenditure may, in his judgment, be made public; and by making or causing the Secretary of State to make a certificate of the amount of such expenditure as he may think it advisable not to specify; and every such certificate shall be deemed a sufficient voucher for the sum therein expressed to have been expended.

If the Senator will pardon me one word to explain my purpose, if the sum of money is one which the President thought the details of might be properly made public, then the ordinary vouchers are in the Treasury, and that will appear in answer to the resolution. If, on the other hand, it be a sum of money the expenditure of which the President thought it was not expedient to be made public, then there will be a simple voucher from the Secretary of State in the Treasury showing that. They are both public facts in the Treasury, which the Senate has a right to know, and which I suppose any Senator would have a right to go and ask for, and have shown to him as a matter of course. They are the ordinary public records of the country. All this resolution asks for—and I was surprised that the Senator asked to have it go over the other day—is that that statement may be furnished as part of the history of this transaction. That is all.

Mr. GORMAN. The question which has been before the Senate and which is attracting some attention in the country, which the Senator from Massachusetts himself has discussed, and which is being examined by the Committee on Foreign Relations of this body, ought to be settled and determined by this body without reference to the amount of money which has been expended during this Administration or the preceding Administration. It is too big a question, it is too great a question, to be brought down to the mere amount of the expenditure of money.

I want to say to the Senator from Massachusetts that, as an American Senator, I should consider it a great misfortune, under the peculiar circumstances, if this body were to enter upon an inquiry as to the amount of money which either the last or the present Administration has expended in this matter. It was a question which two years ago rose above party. At the disposal of the President was placed a fund so that he might protect the interests of this great country. I have no doubt that President Harrison discharged conscientiously, and as he thought best, his duty for the interests of the entire country. No inquiry as to his action was attempted then or is attempted now, and if the attempt were made upon this side of the Chamber I should take

the same position that I do about this resolution. That was a matter which the honor of the country required that we should not make inquiry about.

I say to the Senator that I thought when he introduced the resolution he did it without full thought and without having considered to where it would lead; that this was a matter, at least, which both sides of this Chamber would determine had better be left with the executive branch of the Government, and about which there should not be further inquiry on the part of the Senate of the United States. We can not enter upon any portion of this inquiry without extending it to the whole subject. I believe that the best interests of all require that at least this branch of the question should be passed over and not considered. Let us go on with the other question when we shall be ready and when all the facts are before us, and determine it in the interests of our country and in the interests of honor and of right.

But, Mr. President, if this particular fund, which has always been a large one since I have had the honor of being a member of this body, placed in the hands of the Secretary of State to be expended by the direction of the President of the United States, is to be inquired into, we shall hereafter, I think, embarrass the executive branch of the Government and prevent that activity in our affairs which has heretofore obtained.

As suggested by my friend on my right [Mr. VEST], the passage of a resolution of this character destroys the very object which Congress has in placing these large amounts at the disposal of the Executive.

Mr. HOAR. Mr. President, the Senator from Maryland and the Senator whose suggestion he has quoted strangely misunderstand the object and effect of the pending resolution. The precedent is well settled from the time of the inquiry in the Administration succeeding President Tyler's, and it is this, that the fact that a certain amount has been placed at the discretion of the President is a public fact; it is contained in the appropriation bills from year to year.

The President is required to determine whether the expenditure is to be treated as confidential or to be treated as an ordinary expenditure, and its vouchers put upon the files of the Treasury Department; and that is a public fact.

I presume it will turn out—though I know nothing about it—that the vouchers for Mr. Blount's expenditures will be found in the Treasury Department in the ordinary way. If, however, for any reason the President desires not to disclose the details of an expenditure, he directs the Secretary of State to put on record a certificate that such a sum has been expended, the detail of which it is not expedient to make known, and if that is put upon the records it is a public fact, not the detail of the expenditure, but the fact that such an expenditure has been made, the details of which the President thinks it is not for the public interest to be made known. But it has been the universal practice, and there never was heard, I will venture to say, a suggestion of an objection to it that either House of Congress should know how much money has been expended. If it were expended without secrecy, the vouchers themselves are in the Treasury Department, and that should be known. All the resolution asks for is a statement of what appears on the public records of the Treasury, and not for a disclosure of the method by which the President has made the expenditure.

Mr. GRAY. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator from Massachusetts what object he has in view in asking for information in regard to the amount of money that this special commissioner sent out by the President has expended in defraying the ordinary and necessary expenses in the discharge of his duty?

Mr. HOAR. I will tell the Senator very frankly.

Mr. GRAY. I should like to know.

Mr. HOAR. I want to know, and I want the Senate to know, and I want the country to know whether this gentleman, whose mission was conferred upon him, who exercised his authority and reported his action without the consent or advice of the Senate, was treated in all other respects as a public minister of the United States; I want to throw light upon the question whether he was in fact a private agent of the President within the precedents which have been cited here, or whether he was treated as a public agent, and the question of the method in which his compensation was paid to him bears very strongly, as it seems to me, upon that subject. That is why I desire the information.

Mr. GRAY. I do not feel at all disposed on any occasion to throw anything in the way of obtaining light on all governmental functions and exposing to the most absolute publicity all the transactions of this Government. It is a government of the people, and they have a right to know just what is being done and how it is being done. But a government of the people, Mr. President, is a decent government. God forbid that it should be anything else. I believe that this resolution, unusual and

out of the ordinary course, without any precedent so far as I know, would be, if passed, a direct reflection upon the estimable and honorable gentleman who has filled to the best of his ability and conscientiously, whatever may be our judgment as to his conclusions, the trust which has been reposed in him by the President of the United States, and I have no doubt that there has not been one cent of public money expended by him and defrayed out of the Treasury that was not reasonably necessary and reasonably just and pertinent to the matter he had in hand.

Mr. HOAR. If the Senator will pardon me, I agree with him.

Mr. GRAY. I do not care to sit here in the Senate and add up the items of Mr. Blount's board bill, or how much hack hire he paid, or whether he stayed at a first-class hotel or a cheap boarding-house. I am willing to trust both the President of the United States and the Secretary of State, and also Mr. Blount, to have acted within the bounds of propriety in that matter.

Mr. HOAR. So am I.

Mr. GRAY. And I do not believe that the Senate of the United States is at all curious in that regard. I do not believe the vouchers and items of these expenditures will throw light upon any side or phase of the great public question to which the Senator from Maryland has just alluded, which now occupies the Senate, and which the Senate has committed to one of its standing committees to investigate.

I do not feel inclined, and I do not believe the Senate feel inclined, to make a departure in this case from what seems to me to have been the proper and honorable usage of the Senate in this regard unless there is some foundation of suspicion or some allegation as to irregularity which will justify and demand investigation on the part of the Senate.

Mr. President, the pending resolution ought not to be so framed as to compel the President of the United States to say that this is a matter within his discretion as to the disbursement of this fund, which was put at his disposal. It ought not to be put upon him to decline a request of that kind unless there is some real ground for it. This request is:

That the Secretary of the Treasury be directed to inform the Senate what sums have been paid from the Treasury to the Hon. James H. Blount for salary, services, or other expenses, as a special commissioner to Hawaii, together with copies of all orders, vouchers, or receipts for such payment; and also to inform the Senate from what fund and under or by virtue of what appropriation or law the same have been paid.

To the latter part of the resolution there might be no objection; but the resolution requires, if it is passed, that there should be produced here all the items of expense and of disbursement by Mr. Blount in the prosecution of that mission. I certainly should never have consented that a similar resolution should have been passed when Mr. Bate was sent to Samoa on a precisely similar errand without the consent of the Senate and without its advice being asked, or when Mr. Babcock was sent down to San Domingo, or when Mr. Trescott was sent to Peru, or when Mr. Trist years ago was sent to Mexico. I think we had something else to do then, and that we have something else to do now, unless there is some allegation of irregularity about this matter, than to sit here as an auditing committee upon the amount paid by Mr. Blount for board, hack hire, and possibly cigars.

I therefore move, if it has not already been done, that the resolution be referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. HOAR. If the Senator will pardon me, I am very much surprised both at the objection and at the argument which is made by the Senator from Delaware in its behalf. I do not think it ever was heard before, from the beginning of the Government down, that when there was a request for accounts which appeared on the public records of the Treasury there was an objection made, or that any Senators or the representatives of any political party were afraid of such an inquiry.

These accounts are all spread upon the public records of the Treasury, now open to any citizen who goes there and asks in a respectful manner to see them. They are provided by the statute to be put there in order that the two Houses of Congress who legislate and the people who wish to know may know what is going on and what the expenditures are.

I am very happy to say that it never occurred to me that there had been any irregularity in the expenditure. I suppose Mr. Blount is a person who could be trusted with five or ten thousand dollars. What I want to know is whether this fund was expended in the ordinary way, with vouchers, as a public transaction, and if so what is the record of it; or whether the other alternative set forth in the statutes of the United States was pursued, to wit, that it was expended on the voucher of the President.

If my friends on the other side are afraid to have the country know how this was done; if they are afraid to have any light thrown on the public character of Mr. Blount; if they are afraid that the public shall understand that while he was performing the duties of a foreign minister abroad of the highest character,

he was not paid as are foreign ministers abroad, but was paid under a fund committed to the President to be expended in secret and on an emergency, I will not resist their attempt, but will let the resolution go to the Committee on Foreign Relations and let the Committee on Foreign Relations tell us what they think of that proposition.

Mr. GORMAN. Mr. President, if the Senator from Massachusetts is through—

Mr. HOAR. I was about to add that if I had any hostile purpose in this matter towards the Administration, or any political purpose in the matter, it has been ten thousand times more subverted by what has fallen from the lips of the Senator from Delaware and the Senator from Maryland than it would be by any answer to the resolution.

Mr. GORMAN. Mr. President, I will say to the Senator from Massachusetts that there is not any expenditure made by this Administration to which the Democratic party is not content to have the greatest publicity given; but the Senator from Massachusetts, an experienced Senator in this body, knows perfectly well that the compensation allowed to this envoy or agent, appointed by the President of the United States, could not be paid out of any other fund except the secret-service fund of the State Department. He is aware that every dollar appropriated for ministers and other agents of the United States which are provided for by law is appropriated for specifically by Congress. He is also aware that in this very case the last Congress, without any objection on the part of the minority of this body and with the full concurrence of a Democratic House of Representatives, gave to the then President of the United States a very large sum of money to look after our interests to the south of us and in the Pacific Ocean. That Senator knows perfectly well that an inquiry as to the amount of the expenditure and the vouchers of Mr. Blount would necessarily lead to an inquiry as to the expenditure under a former Administration of bringing about results which some of the people of this country regret; but that is a matter entirely apart from this kind of an inquiry. As a member of the majority of this body, I should regard it as a most unfortunate thing if it were proposed here to investigate the action of a former President of the United States and taunt the Republicans and the Senators on the other side with the fact that they were afraid to have these matters exposed.

Mr. President, nobody is afraid of it; nobody doubts the integrity of ex-President Harrison in the expenditure of a large amount of money; nobody doubts the integrity of the present President of the United States; and no man, whether he be a Republican or a Democrat, would be afraid to have it exposed to public view; but, like the consideration of the subject of a treaty, this is a matter which necessarily must be kept within the precincts of the State Department. Such an inquiry as is sought to be made now, though it has been attempted before, has always been rejected and resented, and the only response to such an inquiry that I have found, upon reaching the Secretary of the Treasury of the United States was the return, "I furnished so much money upon the order of the Secretary of State."

Mr. HOAR. That is all the information I ask for in this case.

Mr. GORMAN. Yes, the Senator asks only for that in this case; but why does he ask it? His remark a few moments ago indicates what his object is, that it may go to the country that the Administration, or its friends upon this floor, are afraid to expose the details of a transaction which I regret to say has now become somewhat political, but which ought to be settled upon its merits and without regard to the aisle that divides this Chamber. I regret, in a case which is so important for the future interests of our country, where I believe the future commerce of the country so much depends upon its proper settlement, that it should have drifted down to a mere inquiry which, as the Senator from Massachusetts knew when he offered the resolution, was an attack upon the expenditure of a secret-service fund which has always been regarded sacred and to be disposed of by the President of the United States.

Mr. HOAR. May I ask the Senator from Maryland one question?

Mr. GORMAN. With great pleasure.

Mr. HOAR. Has he any information or will he give the Senate any reason to think that this was made as a secret expenditure under the statute and not by the other alternative where the vouchers are put in the Treasury Department? Has he any reason to suppose that such was the case?

Mr. GORMAN. I know nothing more of the Administration and its conduct in this matter than the Senator from Massachusetts. I know of no information that has come to the members of this body except in a public way. If it has come I have not had it myself. But I do know, as the Senator from Massachusetts is himself aware of the fact, that every dollar expended for the ministers, consuls, and other diplomatic agents fixed by law is appropriated for annually by the Congress of the United

States; and in addition to that we place at times in the hands of the Secretary of State, under the control of the President of the United States, very large amounts of money, out of which he may employ agents and transact business which in its nature is secret; and out of those funds it has always been understood and known that in every Administration expenditures of this kind have been made. Now, from the law, and that is all I know, there can not be any other way in which this gentleman could have been compensated; and the mover of the pending resolution must have known it as well as I do.

Mr. HOAR. Then will the honorable Senator answer my question? Has he any reason to believe, and if so, will he state it, that it was a secret expenditure which was made by Mr. Blount? That is what I should like to have understood.

Mr. GORMAN. I have stated to the Senator from Massachusetts that of this transaction and every other connected with that branch of this subject I have no more knowledge than the Senator has, from the public documents and the statements which have been made in the public press.

Mr. HOAR. Will the Senator answer in this form, then? Does the Senator believe that it was a secret transaction?

Mr. GORMAN. As I said a moment ago, I have never known a case where any Secretary of State—the present Secretary of State, or a preceding one—could employ agents of this kind and compensate them in any other way except from the fund which Congress had given. There is no other way to do it—none known to the law.

I wish to state to the Senator from Massachusetts that it is not an unusual thing for the President of the United States to use the fund for such purposes and to employ whoever he sees proper. That practice is generally understood. We placed in the hands of President Harrison within the period of a year the large sum of \$250,000. We placed in the hands of that President in the early part of his Administration \$500,000. We did the same in Mr. Cleveland's former Administration. No inquiry has been made here of the expenditure, and none can properly be made. As I said to the Senator from Massachusetts a moment ago, it is not the purpose to conceal the amount that has been expended. If the resolution were to be followed, as it probably would be, by an inquiry as to what became of the fund placed in the hands of President Harrison, I as a Senator, with greater interest in the honor of my country and the promotion of its interests than I have in mere partisan advantage, would say that such an inquiry was wrong, and it ought not to be made.

Mr. President, I voted with great pleasure to give the former President of the United States all that he thought was necessary to care for our interests in the Pacific and south of us. If the present President were to say to Congress or to one of its committees, "I want a like amount," having as much faith in his integrity and honesty of purpose as I have had in his predecessor, I should vote to grant it again, and I would know when it was granted that if afterward I were to inquire into the detail of the expenditure it would be discrediting him and, as I believe, impairing the best interests of the country.

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. President, in dealing with this question about Hawaii, which seems to produce a great deal of feeling and friction whenever it is touched upon in this body, I think the Senate ought to be consistent with itself and it ought to preserve its dignity in the examination and further conduct of its action in regard to the whole matter. The Senate has referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations an inquiry of a very broad character. It includes the whole subject of irregularities, if any have occurred, in the conduct of our diplomatic and other affairs with Hawaii, and the committee has organized a subcommittee, which has been industriously engaged in the investigation of the matter.

The point referred to in the resolution of the Senator from Massachusetts raises the question of an irregularity in expenditure. That question, of course, depends upon two facts: First, whether the President of the United States had the right to appoint Mr. Blount as an agent, or as a diplomatic authority to Hawaii, I will call it; and, secondly, whether he has been paid, if paid at all, out of the contingent fund voted for the secret service of the State Department or under some other appropriation. The Committee on Foreign Relations, in the inquiry which has been addressed to it and which it is trying to execute, must necessarily ascertain and report to this body whether the President of the United States had authority to send Mr. Blount to Hawaii, and whether he had authority to commission him to the extent he was commissioned, and, therefore, whether his action in Hawaii was regular or irregular. That question carries with it necessarily the question of any expenditure made out of the Treasury of the United States, whether from the secret fund or any other appropriation, for the payment of his expenses while he was engaged in that service.

I think it is quite unnecessary, and it is an unhappy fact, too,

that so much agitation is being produced in the Senate of the United States by this and various other resolutions which seem intended to anticipate the action of the committee. Either the subject ought to be withdrawn from the committee and taken up in the Senate and disposed of entirely here by direct action, or else the Senate ought to wait until the committee shall have discharged its duty and brought before this body and before the country all the facts relating to these questions.

I therefore think that the reference of this matter to the Committee on Foreign Relations ought to be rather in the nature of an instruction to it, if the Senate wishes to take any action about it, that it should inquire and report what fund this gentleman has been paid from and whether that was regular or irregular. The whole subject of the inquiry, and every inquiry that is presented to this body now except the one offered by the Senator from Maine [Mr. FRYE], has been included in the instructions already given to that committee, and which, as I have observed, it is trying faithfully, and diligently also, to execute.

I do not desire to express any opinion upon what would be my judgment as to the irregularity of this expenditure, whether out of the secret-service fund or out of any other fund, inasmuch as the subject seems to be referred to a committee of which I am a member. I should rather withhold my judgment until I have had an opportunity to investigate that question. But I think all of this agitation in the Senate is premature and unnecessary, and that any inquiry touching this subject which Senators may deem it necessary to address to the Senate ought to be referred to that committee as an instruction to the committee to make inquiry and report.

I will not comment at all upon the motives which gentlemen may have for making these inquiries. At the same time I take the liberty to say that I think this proceeding is very unusual. It is hardly justified by anything we know or have heard of in respect to the conduct of the Administration in the expenditure of public funds.

Mr. HOAR. After the statement by the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations that the ascertainment of these facts, so far as they may properly be made public under the statute, is within the scope of the duties of the committee, I consent that the resolution may go to the committee.

Mr. VEST. Mr. President, if that be the construction, I shall vote against the reference of the resolution to the committee. If the Senator from Massachusetts puts a proper construction upon what has been said by the Senator from Alabama then it gives away the entire question at issue. I should infinitely prefer for myself to put my vote on record against the resolution, because I have never been clearer as to any question in my life than that the Senate has no power at all to ask the President of the United States either as to the amount of the expenditure from the secret-service fund which we have put at his disposal or the purpose for which he has expended it.

We have a general provision in the statutes of the United States which makes it a penal offense for any officer of the Government to expend the money in the Treasury or that may be under the control of the Secretary of the Treasury without an appropriation by Congress, except in this instance, where we have put under the discretion of the President a secret-service fund, to be used by him without accounting to Congress in regard either to the amount or the purposes. To admit that Congress has a right to call upon the President of the United States to give us an account of how he has expended that money is an absolute destruction of the idea of having any secret-service fund at all; and, as the Senator from Maryland and the Senator from Delaware have properly stated, it is a reflection upon the people of the United States, who are represented by their President, not as an individual, but as an executive officer, to say that we are now unwilling to trust him either as to the amount or the purpose of the expenditure.

Mr. HOAR. May I ask the Senator from Missouri a question?

Mr. VEST. Certainly.

Mr. HOAR. What does he understand is the purpose of the statute, which says unless the President desire to keep it secret he shall cause the vouchers to be put in the Treasury? This is merely a request to the Secretary of the Treasury and not to the President for the vouchers which the President in his discretion may have put in the Treasury Department. That is all there is of it.

Mr. VEST. It is useless to fence about this matter. We understand what is the real purpose of the resolution, and every intelligent man in the United States will understand it. Here is a pending controversy in regard to the Hawaiian question.

The position of the Senator from Massachusetts is very well understood, or else the English language is a complete failure. He is opposed to the policy of the Administration. He is attacking it constantly and persistently; and he now seeks to obtain an advantage in this discussion either by forcing Senators upon this

side of the Chamber, as he has openly avowed here, to decline to take any action because they are afraid—to use his parliamentary expression—or he wants to force the President to give an account even as to the amount of this expenditure, in order that it may be used for the further purposes of his argument. That is the whole of it. I say the idea of a secret-service fund implies distinctly and logically and beyond question that the President is to dispose of it, as to the amount and the purpose, without any account to Congress at any time or in any way.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The question is on the motion of the Senator from Maryland [Mr. GORMAN] to refer the resolution to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

The motion was agreed to.

HAWAIIAN AFFAIRS.

Mr. TURPIE submitted the following resolution, which was read:

Resolved, That from the facts and papers laid before us by the Executive and other sources it is unwise, inexpedient, and not in accordance with the character and dignity of the United States to consider further at this time either the treaty or project of annexation of the Hawaiian territory to this country; that the Provisional Government therein having been duly recognized, the highest international interests require that it shall pursue its own line of policy. Foreign intervention in the political affairs of these islands will be regarded as an act unfriendly to the Government of the United States.

Mr. TURPIE. I desire that the resolution may go over under the rule. I give notice that on next Thursday morning, immediately after the conclusion of the morning business of that day, I shall ask the courtesy of the Senate to submit some remarks upon the subject-matter of the resolution.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The resolution will be printed and lie upon the table for the present.

Mr. FRYE. A few days since I offered a resolution and requested that it might lie upon the table, giving information that my ultimate motion would be to refer the resolution to the Committee on Foreign Relations. I ask that the resolution be laid before the Senate.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The Chair lays before the Senate a resolution coming over from a previous day, which will be read.

The Secretary read the resolution (submitted by Mr. FRYE January 3, 1894), as follows:

Resolved, That in the opinion of the Senate, pending the investigation ordered by resolution of December 21, directing the Committee on Foreign Relations to inquire into our relations with Hawaii, there should be no interference on the part of this Government, by moral influence or physical force, for the restoration of Liliuokalani or the maintenance of the Provisional Government in the Hawaiian Islands, and that our naval forces should be used in said islands only for the protection of the lives and property of American citizens.

Mr. FRYE. In the light of the rumors of the last day or two it seems to me it becomes necessary (if not necessary, highly proper) that the Senate should give expression to its opinion, and I ask unanimous consent that a vote may now be taken on the resolution.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President—

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. Does the Senator from Maine yield to the Senator from South Carolina?

Mr. FRYE. I will ask unanimous consent for a vote.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The Senator from Maine asks the unanimous consent of the Senate that the resolution which has been reported be considered at this time.

Mr. BUTLER. I have no objection to the consideration of the resolution, but I understood the Senator from Maine to ask for a vote on it now.

Mr. FRYE. I do. I do not myself wish to make any remarks upon the resolution.

Mr. BUTLER. I object to the consideration of the resolution.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The resolution, coming over from a former day, is now before the Senate. The question is upon agreeing to the resolution.

Mr. BUTLER. Then, if the motion is in order, I move that the resolution be referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. That motion is in order.

Mr. FRYE. I do not desire to have the resolution referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations now. If it can not be considered I prefer that it should lie over until Wednesday morning, when the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. DAVIS] will call it up for the purpose of submitting some remarks upon it.

Mr. BUTLER. I have no objection to that course, Mr. President.

Mr. GORMAN. Let it go over.

Mr. BUTLER. Let it go over then.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. It is so ordered, if there be no objection.

WILLIAM E. WOODBRIDGE.

Mr. GORMAN. Some days ago, when Senate bill 418, reported by the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. PLATT], from the Com-

mittee on Patents, was under consideration, I asked that the bill might go over for the time being. I have looked at it since. I have no earthly objection to the bill. As it was on my objection that the bill went over, I ask unanimous consent that it may be taken up out of order.

Mr. PLATT. I should be glad to have the bill considered at this time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. JONES of Arkansas in the chair). The bill having been passed over informally and not having lost its place on the Calendar, it will be read as in Committee of the Whole.

The bill (S. 418) referring to the Court of Claims the claim of William E. Woodbridge for compensation for the use by the United States of his invention relating to projectiles, for which letters patent were ordered to issue to him March 25, 1852, was read and considered as in Committee of the Whole.

Mr. VEST. I should like to understand the nature of the bill. I could not catch it distinctly from the reading. The Senator who reported it may be able to explain it.

Mr. PLATT. A similar bill has passed the Senate twice, and I think three times heretofore on full explanation. Mr. Woodbridge claims to be the inventor of a shell, for use in rifled ordnance. His patent was ordered to issue, and, according to the rules of the Patent Office, it was then placed by him in the secret archives of the Patent Office subject to be issued at his order. Before he asked to have it issued the Patent Office changed its rules, and held that an application for issue must be made within six months; it would not issue it; and so he never obtained the patent. The present committee and former committees that have considered the matter, as well as the Senate in former Congresses, thought that the Government ought not take any advantage of that action. I have here the original letter of Mr. Ewbank, who was then the Commissioner of Patents, directed to Mr. Woodbridge, which is as follows:

UNITED STATES PATENT OFFICE, April 15, 1852.

Your favor of the 13th instant is received. Your application for letters patent for rifled ordnance has been examined, and on the 25th March, ultimo, a patent was ordered to issue thereon, and in accordance with your request the papers were filed among the secret archives of the office subject to your direction as to the time of issuing the same.

All there is in the question whether he is entitled to compensation is whether the Government ought to avail itself of the change of the rules of the Patent Office after having told him that the patent was subject to his direction as to the time of issue. There is a question about whether he was the first inventor. Other parties have claimed to be the first inventor. All that is left to the court to determine. As I said, this measure has received the sanction of the committees and of the Senate heretofore.

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

WHEELOCK SIMMONS AND WIFE.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The first case on the Calendar will be stated.

The bill (S. 79) to authorize a corrected patent to be issued for the donation land claim of Wheelock Simmons and wife, was announced as first in order on the Calendar, and the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to its consideration.

Mr. VEST. Let the report be read.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The report will be read.

The Secretary proceeded to read the report, submitted by Mr. DOLPH September 4, 1893, and read as follows:

The Committee on Public Lands, to whom was referred Senate bill 79, having considered the same, report the bill favorably and recommend its passage. The committee adopts the report of the committee on a similar bill at the last session of Congress as follows:

[Senate Report No. 1121, Fifty-Second Congress, second session.]

The Committee on Public Lands, to whom was referred Senate bill 3382, having considered the same, report the bill favorably, with amendments, and recommend its passage.

The object of the bill is simply to correct a patent heretofore issued to Wheelock Simmons and wife for a donation claim in the State of Oregon.

The facts sufficiently appear in the correspondence attached and made a part of this report.

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR,
Washington, D. C., August 4, 1892.

SIR: I am in receipt, by reference from you, of Senate bill No. 3382 entitled "A bill to authorize a corrected patent to be issued for the donation land claim of Wheelock Simmons and wife," with a request for an expression of the views of this Department thereon.

I herewith transmit a copy of the report of the Commissioner of the General Land Office on said bill, together with the accompanying papers.

I see no objection to said bill, after it has been properly corrected, becoming a law.

Very respectfully,

JOHN W. NOBLE, Secretary.

Hon. J. N. DOLPH,

Chairman Committee on Public Lands, United States Senate.

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR, GENERAL LAND OFFICE,
Washington, D. C., July 22, 1892.

SIR: I am in receipt, by reference from the Department of the 13th instant, for report in duplicate, of S. 3382, Fifty-second Congress, first session, entitled "A bill to authorize a corrected patent to be issued for the donation land claim of Wheelock Simmons and wife."

This bill was forwarded to you by Hon. J. N. DOLPH, chairman of the Committee on Public Lands, United States Senate.

The facts in this case and the views of this office upon the legislation proposed by said bill are as follows:

Lucinda Simmons, the wife of Wheelock Simmons, was formerly the wife of a man by the name of Hill. Mr. Hill died before the passage of the donation act of Congress of September 27, 1850 (9 Stats., 496), and shortly after his death his widow married Simmons.

After the passage of said donation law Mrs. Simmons, as the late widow of Hill, attempted to claim a donation of land for the heirs of Hill, deceased. She applied for and got a survey of the land claimed. As Mrs. Simmons could not complete her claim to this land under the law, her husband, Wheelock Simmons, filed his notice thereof with a slight difference as to the exterior lines, and procured a survey of the same.

The surveyor-general in platting the claim made his plat from the field notes of the survey of the Hill claim, and the register and receiver, when they issued their certificate as the basis of a patent, evidently described the land to be patented according to the description given in the survey for the Hill heirs.

The patent issued did not agree with the lines of survey as stated in the certificate. One of the courses, south 25° west 19.98 chains, was inserted in the patent as having been run north 25° east 19.98 chains. This error removed all the remaining lines of the survey quite a distance away from the proper location and included some of the lands intended to be patented and did not include other tracts, and caused the patent to include lands belonging to other parties.

Plat No. 1, inclosed herein, has been prepared by this office to show what lands would be included in the existing patent according to the metes and bounds given therein. I also inclose herein Plat No. 2, constructed from the field notes of the survey of the claim of Simmons. I notice that the inclosed bill does not describe the second course according to the field notes of the Simmons survey.

The field notes give this second course as having been run south 59° west 24 chains, while the bill, in line 14, gives this course as south 32° west 24 chains.

The course in lines 21 and 22 of said bill gives the course as running west 39.98 chains, while the field notes give this course as running west 53.93 chains.

A copy of the record of the outstanding patent, dated April 20, 1890, is also inclosed herein.

The exterior lines of this donation as described in the outstanding patent (see Plat No. 1) include tracts of land in sections 6, 31, and 33, which do not belong to the Simmons donation.

All these tracts of land which lie outside of this donation as surveyed for Simmons were disposed of and patented to other parties prior to the issuance of the Simmons patent.

The honorable Secretary of the Interior, in his decision dated March 22, 1893, copy inclosed herein, in the case of Simmons vs. Eastham, holds that the issuance, delivery, and acceptance of said patent for the Simmons claim exhausted the jurisdiction of the Land Department over the matters involved.

In view of this condition of affairs I can see no objection to the proposed legislation when the corrections herein suggested are made.

Said bill No. 3382 is herewith returned.

Very respectfully,

W. M. STONE, Acting Commissioner.

The SECRETARY OF THE INTERIOR.

Transcript of field notes of the survey of the Wheelock Simmons donation land claim—

Mr. VEST. It is not necessary to read the remainder of the report. I should like to ask the Senator from Oregon one question. A former Secretary of the Interior speaks of an amendment to the bill. Is that amendment incorporated in the present bill?

Mr. DOLPH. I think so. I will compare the bill and report and answer in a moment. It is an old donation claim. The title has passed out of the Government for many years; but in granting the patent the line was run east instead of west. So they do not inclose any land unless they evidence their title; and they can not do it, the Land Office holds, without this legislation. The title has not been in the Government for many years.

Mr. VEST. I understand that it is an old donation claim. I have no doubt the general object of the bill is right, but I want to know whether the amendment suggested by the Secretary of the Interior is incorporated in the pending bill.

Mr. DOLPH. Let the bill be passed over informally and I will run over the report and see.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over informally.

Mr. DOLPH subsequently said. I have examined the bill that was under consideration. I find that the amendments proposed by the Secretary of the Interior are in the bill. The bill is correct as it is printed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill having been informally laid aside, it is again before the Senate as in Committee of the Whole.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment.

Mr. HARRIS. Was the bill taken up in its order?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It was taken up in order and passed over informally a few minutes ago.

Mr. DOLPH. It has been read.

Mr. HARRIS. The hour of 2 o'clock having arrived, under the rules the Senate would proceed to the consideration of bills under Rule IX, but I ask unanimous consent that for the remainder of to-day's session we shall proceed under Rule VIII.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Tennessee

asks unanimous consent that during the remainder of to-day's session the Senate shall proceed under Rule VIII. Is there objection? The Chair hears none. The pending bill is in the Senate and open to amendment.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

The preamble was agreed to.

PUBLIC PARK RESERVATION IN OREGON.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The next bill on the Calendar will be proceeded with under Rule VIII.

The bill (S. 69) to grant to the State of Oregon townships 27, 28, 29, 30, and 31 south, in ranges 5 and 6 east of Willamette meridian, in the State of Oregon, for a public park, was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

Mr. DOLPH. All this land is embraced in the forest reservation now. A similar bill has several times passed Congress. It would not affect that question. It simply continues the reservation, but puts the burden on the State of protecting the park from being despoiled or trespassed upon. All the land has been withdrawn from settlement for several years.

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

EXECUTIVE SESSION.

The bill (S. 355) to provide for the disposal of the abandoned Fort Maginnis military reservation, in Montana, under the mining and homestead laws, for educational and other purposes, was announced as next in order on the Calendar.

Mr. VEST. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business. After fifty minutes spent in executive session the doors were reopened, and (at 2 o'clock and 53 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until to-morrow, Tuesday, January 9, 1894, at 12 o'clock m.

NOMINATIONS.

Executive nominations received by the Senate January 8, 1894.

MINISTER RESIDENT AND CONSUL-GENERAL.

John M. B. Sill, of Michigan, to be minister resident and consul-general of the United States to Korea, vice Augustine Heard, resigned.

CHIEF JUSTICE SUPREME COURT OF UTAH.

Samuel A. Merritt, of Utah Territory, to be chief justice of the supreme court of the Territory of Utah, vice Charles S. Zane, whose term expired January 7, 1894.

ASSOCIATE JUSTICE SUPREME COURT OF OKLAHOMA.

A. G. Curtin Bierer, of Oklahoma Territory, to be associate justice of the supreme court of the Territory of Oklahoma, as provided for by act approved December 21, 1893.

UNITED STATES MARSHALS.

Albert A. Wilson, of the District of Columbia, to be marshal of the United States for the District of Columbia, vice Daniel M. Ransdell, resigned.

Shaw F. Neely, of Kansas, to be marshal of the United States for the district of Kansas, vice Richard L. Walker, resigned.

J. V. Guilloite, of Louisiana, to be marshal of the United States for the eastern district of Louisiana, vice John B. Donnally, whose term will expire January 20, 1894.

O. J. Carroll, of North Carolina, to be marshal of the United States for the eastern district of North Carolina, vice Joshua B. Hill, resigned.

Joseph E. Cronan, of North Dakota, to be marshal of the United States for the district of North Dakota, vice Albert F. Price, resigned.

J. Shelby Williams, of Texas, to be marshal of the United States for the eastern district of Texas, vice J. J. Dickerson, resigned.

J. N. McKenzie, of Tennessee, to be marshal of the United States for the middle district of Tennessee, vice Carter B. Harrison, whose term will expire January 20, 1894.

UNITED STATES ATTORNEYS.

Cato Sells, of Iowa, to be attorney of the United States for the northern district of Iowa, vice Maurice D. O'Connell, whose term will expire January 27, 1894.

William M. Smith, of Kentucky, to be attorney of the United States for the district of Kentucky, vice George W. Jolly, whose term will expire January 27, 1894.

Charles Allen Jones, of Nevada, to be attorney of the United States for the district of Nevada, vice John W. Whitcher, whose term will expire January 27, 1894.

John H. Senter, of Vermont, to be attorney of the United

States for the district of Vermont, vice Frank Plumley, resigned, to take effect January 10, 1894.

COLLECTORS OF INTERNAL REVENUE.

Waverly Stairley, of California, to be collector of internal revenue for the fourth district of California, to succeed H. W. Byington, resigned.

George W. Wilson, of Florida, to be collector of internal revenue for the district of Florida, to succeed Dennis Egan, resigned.

Mellville E. Carter, of North Carolina, to be collector of internal revenue for the fifth district of North Carolina, in place of Kope Elias, nominated to succeed William W. Rollins, resigned. The nomination of Mr. Elias is withdrawn.

Henry Blackman, of Oregon, to be collector of internal revenue for the district of Oregon, to succeed Milton Weidler, resigned.

Raymond E. Shearer, of Pennsylvania, to be collector of internal revenue for the ninth district of Pennsylvania, to succeed Sam M. Fridy, resigned.

Grant Herring, of Pennsylvania, to be collector of internal revenue for the twelfth district of Pennsylvania, to succeed Thomas F. Penman, removed.

Samuel A. Townes, of South Carolina, to be collector of internal revenue for the district of South Carolina, to succeed Eugene A. Webster, resigned.

SURVEYORS OF CUSTOMS.

James R. Johnston, of Illinois, to be surveyor of customs for the port of Rock Island, in the State of Illinois, to succeed Walter Johnson, removed.

W. B. Humphrey, of Iowa, to be surveyor of customs for the port of Sioux City, in the State of Iowa, to succeed Jonas M. Cleland, resigned.

APPRAISERS OF MERCHANDISE.

Alfred S. Kimball, of Maine, to be appraiser of merchandise in the district of Portland and Falmouth, in the State of Maine, to succeed Eben E. Rand, removed.

Simon C. Karrer, of Michigan, to be appraiser of merchandise in the district of Detroit, in the State of Michigan, to succeed Charles F. Kimball, removed.

COLLECTORS OF CUSTOMS.

John B. Malony, of Michigan, to be collector of customs for the district of Detroit, in the State of Michigan, to succeed George H. Hopkins, whose term of office will expire by limitation January 19, 1894.

John T. Lesley, of Florida, to be collector of customs for the district of Tampa, in the State of Florida, to succeed Edward R. Gunby, whose term of office has expired by limitation.

Enoch A. Higbee, of New Jersey, to be collector of customs for the district of Great Egg Harbor, in the State of New Jersey, to succeed John Price, whose term of office will expire by limitation January 14, 1894.

Benjamin M. Price, of New Jersey, to be collector of customs for the district of Perth Amboy, in the State of New Jersey, to succeed William T. Hopper, whose term of office has expired by limitation.

Frank N. Potter, of New York, to be collector of customs for the district of Cape Vincent, in the State of New York, to succeed G. Harrison Smith, removed.

Stephen H. Lane, of North Carolina, to be collector of customs for the district of Pamlico, in the State of North Carolina, to succeed Robert Hancock, jr., resigned.

Wesley G. Andrews, of Virginia, to be collector of customs for the district of Petersburg, in the State of Virginia, to succeed T. Jefferson Jarratt, whose term of office has expired by limitation.

MEMBER MISSOURI RIVER COMMISSION.

Maj. Charles J. Allen, Corps of Engineers, United States Army, to be a member of the Missouri River Commission provided for by the act of Congress approved July 5, 1884, entitled "An act making appropriations for the construction, repair, and preservation of certain public works on rivers and harbors, and for other purposes," vice Ernst, resigned.

MEMBER MISSISSIPPI RIVER COMMISSION.

Lieut. Col. Amos Stickney, Corps of Engineers, United States Army, to be a member of the commission provided for in the act of Congress approved June 28, 1879, entitled "An act to provide for the appointment of a Mississippi River Commission for the improvement of said river from the Head of the Passes, near its mouth, to its headwaters," vice Ernst, resigned.

SURVEYOR-GENERAL.

Richard B. Hughes, of Rapid City, S. Dak., to be surveyor-general of South Dakota, vice Boetious H. Sullivan, to be removed.

REGISTERS OF LAND OFFICES.

Sylvester Hull, of Redding, Cal., to be register of the land office at Redding, Cal., vice Adolph Dobrowsky, to be removed.

James N. Fike, of Colby, Kans., to be register of the land office at Colby, Kans., a newly established office by consolidation of Kirwin with Oberlin land office and removal from Oberlin, vice Cyrus Anderson, whose term of office will expire January 8, 1894.

John I. Lee, of Ashland, Kans., to be register of the land office at Dodge City, Kans., a newly established office by consolidation of Larned with Garden City land office and removal from Garden City, vice Daniel M. Frost, whose term of office will expire January 8, 1894.

RECEIVERS OF PUBLIC MONEYS.

Lafayette S. Barnes, of Redding, Cal., to be receiver of public moneys at Redding, Cal., vice John V. Scott, whose term of office will expire January 8, 1894.

James F. Thompson, of Eureka, Cal., to be receiver of public moneys at Humboldt, Cal., vice Augustus J. Wiley, whose term of office will expire January 26, 1894.

Thomas J. McCue, of Norton, Kans., to be receiver of public moneys at Colby, Kans., a newly established office by consolidation of Kirwin with Oberlin land office and removal from Oberlin, vice James B. McGonigal, resigned.

George T. Crist, of Santa Fe, Kans., to be receiver of public moneys at Dodge City, Kans., a newly established office by consolidation of Larned with Garden City land office and removal from Garden City, vice Jesse Taylor, whose term of office will expire January 8, 1894.

Colin F. Macdonald, of St. Cloud, Minn., to be receiver of public moneys at St. Cloud, Minn., vice William Westerman, term expired.

Marvin E. Mathews, of Marshall, Minn., to be receiver of public moneys at Marshall, Minn., vice Everett P. Freeman, term expired.

Frank Harris, of Salt Lake City, Utah, to be receiver of public moneys at Salt Lake City, Utah, vice Hoyt Sherman, jr., whose term of office will expire January 21, 1894.

PENSION AGENT.

Harrison H. Wheeler, of Ludington, Mich., to be pension agent at Detroit, Mich., vice Edward H. Harvey, to be removed.

INDIAN AGENT.

Joseph Clements, of Dakota City, Nebr., to be agent for the Indians of the Santee Agency in Nebraska, vice James E. Helms, to be removed.

APPOINTMENT IN THE ARMY.

To be post chaplain.

The Rev. James Wilson Hillman, of New York, January 4, 1894, vice Tully, resigned.

PROMOTIONS IN THE ARMY.

Artillery arm.

First Lieut. Henry J. Reilly, Fifth Artillery, to be captain, January 3, 1894, vice Fessenden, Fifth Artillery, retired from active service.

Second Lieut. Oscar I. Straub, First Artillery, to be first lieutenant, January 3, 1894, vice Reilly, Fifth Artillery, promoted.

PROMOTION IN THE MARINE CORPS.

Second Lieut. Lawrence H. Moses, United States Marine Corps, to be a first lieutenant in said corps, vice First Lieut. James A. Turner, retired.

PROMOTIONS IN THE NAVY.

Lieut. (junior grade) James H. Glennon, to be a lieutenant in the Navy, from December 26, 1893, vice Lieut. Charles A. Stone, retired.

Ensign Robert B. Dashiell, to be a lieutenant (junior grade) in the Navy, from December 26, 1893, vice Lieut. (junior grade) James H. Glennon, promoted.

Lieut. (junior grade) William R. Rush, to be a lieutenant in the Navy, from December 26, 1893, vice Lieut. S. L. Graham, retired [subject to the examinations required by law].

Ensign Edward E. Capehart, to be a lieutenant (junior grade) in the Navy, from December 26, 1893, vice Lieut. (junior grade) William R. Rush, promoted [subject to the examinations required by law].

POSTMASTERS.

Thomas R. Wilcockson, to be postmaster at Paragould, in the county of Greene and State of Arkansas, in the place of John S. Barker, whose commission expired December 19, 1893.

Jacob L. Argabrite, to be postmaster at Ventura, in the county of Ventura and State of California, in the place of Nathan H. Shaw, whose commission expired December 20, 1893.

John A. Monaghan, to be postmaster at Nokomis, in the county of Montgomery and State of Illinois, in the place of R. Gelly, whose commission expired December 21, 1893.

John C. McGrath, to be postmaster at Jerseyville, in the county of Jersey and State of Illinois, in the place of A. H. Rue, resigned.

Samuel W. Chapman, to be postmaster at Elgin, in the county of Kane and State of Illinois, in the place of W. F. Hunter, whose commission expired December 21, 1893.

Jacob Marx, to be postmaster at Aurora, in the county of Kane and State of Illinois, in the place of John H. Hodder, whose commission expired December 19, 1893.

George E. Young, to be postmaster at Amboy, in the county of Lee and State of Illinois, in the place of J. E. Lewis, whose commission expired December 21, 1893.

Thomas K. Fleming, to be postmaster at Petersburg, in the county of Pike and State of Indiana, in the place of W. C. Adams, removed.

Emanuel B. Thumma, to be postmaster at Garrett, in the county of Dekalb and State of Indiana, in the place of Henry M. Bicknell, whose commission expires January 8, 1894.

Parley Sheldon, to be postmaster at Ames, in the county of Story and State of Iowa, in the place of J. E. Duncan, whose commission expires January 9, 1894.

Fred A. Lischer, to be postmaster at Davenport, in the county of Scott and State of Iowa, in the place of Henry Egbert, whose commission expires January 8, 1894.

William N. Hood, to be postmaster at Washington, in the county of Washington and State of Iowa, in the place of William Wilson, jr., whose commission expired December 19, 1893.

William S. McChesney, to be postmaster at Lexington, in the county of Fayette and State of Kentucky, in the place of James R. Howard, removed.

Alverdo M. Glover, to be postmaster at Aurora, in the county of Hamilton and State of Nebraska, in the place of John Tweedy, whose commission expired December 19, 1893.

Frank G. Tower, to be postmaster at Bloomfield, in the county of Essex and State of New Jersey, in the place of T. E. Hayes, whose commission expired December 20, 1893.

Samuel S. Bowne, to be postmaster at Cooperstown, in the county of Otsego and State of New York, in the place of F. L. Gilbert, whose commission expired December 19, 1893.

Nicholas Conzet, jr., to be postmaster at College Point, in the county of Queens and State of New York, in the place of H. Herbig, whose commission expired December 21, 1893.

J. Horatio Earll, to be postmaster at Skaneateles, in the county of Onondaga and State of New York, in the place of Edson D. Gillett, whose commission expired December 21, 1893.

David S. Haines, to be postmaster at Sandy Hill, in the county of Washington and State of New York, in the place of G. W. Clarke, whose commission expired December 21, 1893.

Josiah J. Hasbrouck, to be postmaster at New Paltz, in the county of Ulster and State of New York, in the place of Jesse Elting, whose commission expired December 21, 1893.

Leander B. Lent, to be postmaster at Brewster, in the county of Putnam and State of New York, in the place of E. W. Addis, whose commission expired December 21, 1893.

Daniel O'Leary, jr., to be postmaster at Glens Falls, in the county of Warren and State of New York, in the place of William W. Rockwell, whose commission expired December 21, 1893.

Stephen J. Lonergan, to be postmaster at Baldwinsville, in the county of Onondaga and State of New York, in the place of Lucian C. Smith, whose commission expired December 21, 1893.

Elijah W. Rawls, to be postmaster at Tarboro, in the county of Edgecombe and State of North Carolina, in the place of Joseph J. Martin, whose commission expired December 20, 1893.

Frederick Gerth, to be postmaster at Millersville, in the county of Lancaster and State of Pennsylvania, the appointment of a postmaster for the said office having, by law, become vested in the President on and after January 1, 1894.

Carroll M. Lovell, to be postmaster at Dickson, in the county of Dickson and State of Tennessee, the appointment of a postmaster for the said office having, by law, become vested in the President on and after January 1, 1894.

Oliver P. Basford, to be postmaster at Flatonia, in the county of Fayette and State of Texas, in the place of Julius Laux, whose commission expired December 20, 1893.

John Topp, to be postmaster at Columbus, in the county of Columbia and State of Wisconsin, in the place of John R. Decker, whose commission expires January 9, 1894.

Samuel M. Sinead, to be postmaster at Fond du Lac, in the county of Fond du Lac and State of Wisconsin, in the place of James T. Green, removed.

WITHDRAWALS.

Executive nominations withdrawn from the Senate January 8, 1894.

Frank W. Roberts, of Maine, whose nomination was delivered to the Senate December 5, 1893, to be consul of the United States at Barcelona, Spain.

John H. Stauffer, whose nomination was sent to the Senate on the 4th of January, 1894, to be postmaster at Millersville, county of Lancaster, in the State of Pennsylvania.

CONFIRMATIONS.

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate January 8, 1894.

RECEIVER OF PUBLIC MONEYS.

Terence Martin, of Fargo, N. Dak., to be receiver of public moneys at Fargo, N. Dak.

SURVEYOR OF CUSTOMS.

John D. Stocker, of Georgia, to be surveyor of customs for the port of Atlanta, in the State of Georgia.

POSTMASTERS.

Edmund B. McClanahan, to be postmaster at Waukegan, in the county of Lake and State of Illinois.

F. Charles Donohue, to be postmaster at Freeport, in the county of Stephenson and State of Illinois.

John D. Waterman, to be postmaster at Rockford, in the county of Winnebago and State of Illinois.

Lewis McCoy, to be postmaster at Golconda, in the county of Pope and State of Illinois.

Charles N. Smith, to be postmaster at Belvidere, in the county of Boone and State of Illinois.

John W. F. King, to be postmaster at Gainesville, in the county of Alachua and State of Florida.

E. H. Taylor, to be postmaster at Brownsville, in the county of Haywood and State of Tennessee.

Frank G. Wood, to be postmaster at Gerard, in the county of Macoupin and State of Illinois.

William H. O'Connell, to be postmaster at Audubon, in the county of Audubon and State of Iowa.

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate January 8, 1894.

CONSULTING ENGINEER.

Frank H. Dabney, of Louisiana, to be consulting engineer of the United States on the International Boundary Commission provided for in the convention with Mexico, of March 1, 1889.

COLLECTOR OF INTERNAL REVENUE.

Waverly Stairley, of California, to be collector of internal revenue for the fourth district of California.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

MONDAY, January 8, 1894.

The House met at 12 o'clock m. Prayer by the Chaplain, Rev. E. B. BAGBY.

The Journal of the proceedings of Saturday last was read, corrected, and approved.

Mr. CATCHINGS. I call up the report from the Committee on Rules, the pending question.

Mr. BOUTELLE. I call up the privileged question that I have raised.

ORDER OF BUSINESS.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. CATCHINGS] calls up the pending resolution.

Mr. BOUTELLE. I call up the question of privilege that I have raised, and that I claim to be pending.

The SPEAKER (continuing). The gentleman from Mississippi calls up the report from the Committee on Rules.

Mr. BOUTELLE. Mr. Speaker, I call up the question of privilege—

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Mississippi has called up a question of the highest privilege.

Mr. BOUTELLE. I make the point of order, if the Speaker pleases, that the action of the Speaker in giving precedence, or attempting to give precedence, to a report of the Committee on Rules at this time over a question involving the highest privileges of the House, is "in violation of the honor, dignity, and privileges of the House," under the rulings of this House as shown by the Journal of the Forty-ninth Congress, first session. I demand that the question shall be submitted to the House for its determination, as otherwise the privileges of the House might be absolutely abrogated in every contingency that could possibly arise.

In the Forty-ninth Congress, first session, page 2548 of the Journal, this rule was laid down by Speaker Carlisle, in accordance with the uniform practice of the House:

Whenever a point of order is made that any matter or proceeding is in violation of the honor, dignity, or privileges of the House, it is not a question for the Chair but for the House itself to determine.

Under this ruling, Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that

it is absolutely incumbent on the Speaker of the House to submit to the House, itself to decide, the question whether the privileges of the House, in determining the integrity of its own rights, proceedings, and functions, which are alleged to have been invaded, overthrown, or usurped by the Executive, presents a question of higher privilege than a mere rule as to the number of hours the House shall devote to the discussion or consideration of any bill.

It seems to me, Mr. Speaker, that this is a question of which the House itself must take cognizance, for there is not a court in the United States sitting on any case that is not, under the rulings and precedents of the common law, required to take cognizance of notorious facts and matters of public information. Certainly nothing is more notorious than the facts proclaimed in every portion of the public press that the acts and circumstances which form the basis of this question of privilege that I have brought before the House, and the House's action on which I think to be absolutely essential to the maintenance of the dignity, the rights, and the capacity to act of a coordinate branch of the Government have become flagrant by reason of what has transpired abroad, to which I need not refer in detail.

Every member of this House knows that the situation which I have deprecated, and to which this resolution refers, has culminated already in accordance with the prediction that I made when I introduced the resolution.

Mr. McMILLIN. Mr. Speaker—

Mr. BOUTELLE. Mr. Speaker, the House of Representatives can not afford, for any mere temporary political exigency—it can not afford, under any passion or prejudice, to ignore a fundamental question which goes to the right of existence of this House itself, which I claim has been invaded and usurped. I make the point of order, under the rules of the House, that the question should be submitted to this House. I make the point of order that these proceedings, the Speaker's refusing to entertain a question of the highest privilege and insisting upon the consideration of a rule involving only an order of legislative procedure, thus barring out every other question, would bar out a President's message, would exclude an impeachment of the President, would refuse consideration of the fact even that a President might have sent a message to this House declaring that he had usurped imperial power and assumed to dissolve the Congress. According to the rulings of the Speaker, the House stands here manacled and unable to assert its own dignity or to protect its own rights. I insist that the point of order shall be submitted to the House for its own decision.

The SPEAKER. The Chair, if the House will indulge him for a moment, will make a statement. The Constitution provides that each House shall establish rules for its own government. This House, in the execution of that power, has established rules. Among the rules so established is one prescribing the rights of the members as to questions of personal privilege, and the rights of members in the aggregate as to questions respecting the honor and dignity of the House. The House has also provided, in the same rules, the manner and method by which the rules may be changed or altered; and in order that force and effect may be given to any intention and purpose of the House to alter its own rules, provision has been made that when a report is brought in for their alteration no motion shall be in order except the motion to adjourn, or, using the language of the rule—
No other dilatory motion.

There is now pending before the House an order to change the rules of the House. If the gentleman from Maine [Mr. BOUTELLE] could invoke an existing rule to prevent the action of the House upon a proposed change of the rules, then you would be in that condition where you would have tied yourselves hand and foot, and could not change the rules that were once established. Suppose this report from the Committee on Rules was simply to repeal the very rule which the gentleman from Maine now invokes. Suppose it was a resolution to change the rules as to questions of privilege. Could it be contended for a moment that the gentleman from Maine [Mr. BOUTELLE] could defeat the wish of the House to change that rule by a resort to that rule itself; that he could say, "You shall not consider a proposition to change that rule, because I propose to ask you to act under that rule, although you now desire to change it?"

The proposition reported from the Committee on Rules is one which, if adopted, defines exactly what the House shall do from day to day until and including the 25th day of the month. And whilst it is true that there is a rule providing for matters of privilege, it is also true that this House has reserved the right to change that rule, to suspend or abrogate that rule; and the rule that is now before the House for its consideration has for its object the suspension of the operation of the very rule invoked by the gentleman, as well as any other rules which are in conflict with the express terms of the order itself. Therefore it is a question that is really for the House. If the House deems that its honor and dignity have been assailed by any action, either

of the Speaker or any department of the Government, then if the House desires to proceed at once to consider that question the House can vote down this rule and proceed to consider it.

Mr. BOUTELLE. Oh, no—

The SPEAKER. But the House has never delegated to one gentleman the exclusive right to take care of its honor and its dignity. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. BOUTELLE. Ah! but, Mr. Speaker—

The SPEAKER. That is a matter to be determined by a majority of the House.

Mr. BOUTELLE. That is exactly what I am demanding. [Cries of "Regular order!" on the Democratic side.]

The SPEAKER. If a majority of the House desire to proceed with the question called up by the gentleman from Maine, if the House shall vote down the pending proposition from the Committee on Rules, then the gentleman from Maine will be recognized to call up his question of privilege, and if the question of consideration is not raised against it—or, if raised against it, is not sustained—then the House would proceed to consider that proposition. So that there is no such thing as any individual binding the House. If the House declines now to proceed as indicated by the gentleman from Maine [Mr. BOUTELLE], it is because the majority of the House do not wish so to proceed at this time.

Mr. BOUTELLE. That has not been determined.

The SPEAKER. That question can be decided by the vote upon the report from the Committee on Rules.

Mr. BOUTELLE. If the Speaker please, I call his attention to the fact—[Cries of "Regular order!"] This is the "regular order." I call the Chair's attention to the fact that I am not arrogating to myself any special power. Speaker Carlisle, in the ruling to which I refer, held:

Whenever a point of order is made that any matter or proceeding is in violation of the honor, dignity, or privileges of the House, it is not a question for the Chair, but for the House itself to determine.

I make the point of order that it is a question which, *whenever* raised—and I am raising the question of order as to the ruling of the Chair—must be determined by the House. I make the point of order that the Speaker in his ruling, substituting his own interpretation as to his duties under the rules at this juncture, in place of the will of the House, is violating the privilege of this House to determine the question of order for itself. On that question Speaker Carlisle's ruling is perfectly clear—that "it is not a question for the Chair, but for the House itself to determine."

The SPEAKER. The Speaker is merely the organ of the House. The rules of the House direct the Speaker, when a report is pending from the Committee on Rules, that he shall entertain no motion except one motion to adjourn, nor shall he entertain any other dilatory motion; and the Chair holds that in the discharge of his duty as the executive officer of the House he must execute this rule. The House has made the rules. The present occupant of the Chair knows of no rule of action prescribed for him except such as is prescribed by the majority, embodied in the code of rules which they adopt.

Mr. BOUTELLE. Permit me to call the Chair's attention to this fact, which is very important here, that this can not be held in any sense to be a "dilatory motion." This resolution of mine was pending before the report of the Committee on Rules was brought in, and was recognized by the Speaker as a question of the highest privilege. I am simply asserting and urging the privilege which that resolution had acquired before the House.

The SPEAKER. The Chair has on two previous days determined the question, and the question now is—

Mr. BOUTELLE. Let us have it understood—

The SPEAKER. The Chair does not recognize the gentleman to make the motion.

Mr. BOUTELLE. I want to know the meaning of the ruling.

The SPEAKER. The Chair does not recognize the gentleman to make the motion at this time.

Mr. BOUTELLE. But the Chair has recognized me, and has made a ruling; and I appeal from that ruling of the Chair, and say if the rules and the privileges of this House collectively are less important than the question of a rule of procedure—

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will please be in order.

Mr. BOUTELLE. I appeal from the decision of the Chair.

The SPEAKER. The Chair can not entertain an appeal on a question of recognition.

Mr. BOUTELLE. I appeal from the Chair's refusal to entertain an appeal. [Cries of "Regular order!"]

The SPEAKER. The question is upon ordering the previous question—

Mr. REED. A parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. REED. Does the Chair rule out the appeal of the gentleman from Maine, my colleague, on the ground that it is a dilatory motion?

The SPEAKER. The Chair had stated to the gentleman from Maine [Mr. BOUTELLE] that under the rules the Chair was not permitted to recognize the gentleman to make the motion.

Mr. REED. But the Chair had recognized him—

The SPEAKER. The Chair had heard the gentleman.

Mr. REED. And had ruled.

The SPEAKER. The Chair ruled practically on the same question two days ago, on Friday and Saturday, and to-day had heard the gentleman, supposing that he might have some authority to offer.

Mr. BOUTELLE. I raised the point of order—

The SPEAKER. The Chair stated that he could not recognize the gentleman to make a motion, because the rules expressly say that he shall not recognize any motion except a motion to adjourn.

Mr. REED. A further parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. REED. The Chair has stated to the House that it would be in the power of the House to control this matter by direct action; namely, by opposing the adoption of the rule now presented. Would it be in order to raise the question of consideration against this in order test this very question? That the House should have control of its own proceedings would seem to be beyond dispute; but it can not have control of its own proceedings under the rules, as gentlemen upon the Democratic side are called upon to vote against a rule which otherwise they might desire.

They might be willing to vote against consideration upon the ground that as soon as they had disposed of this Hawaiian matter, either by laying it on the table or refusing to consider it, they could then proceed upon this proposed rule. But if they defeat the rule they deprive themselves of that right; and I take this occasion to suggest to the Chair that perhaps there ought to be a revision of the former ruling of the Chair, that the House could not raise the question of consideration against a report of the Committee on Rules. This is one of the bad consequences to which that ruling has led. That ruling, I think, was made under a mistaken idea that there was some analogy between the present situation and a motion for the suspension of the rules.

Of course, if the Chair believed that my colleague [Mr. BOUTELLE] was presenting this matter for purposes of delay, or anything of that sort, then, under the general parliamentary law of every civilized body, the Chair would have the right to rule it out, subject to future corrective action by the House if there were any abuse; but surely we ought not to be put in a position where the House may not take up a question relating to its own dignity by disposing temporarily of a proposition to change the rules without being obliged to dispose of it permanently. Allow me in this connection, in order to show the importance of this situation, and of the course of action that ought to be taken in regard to it, to suggest to the Chair a possibility. Suppose it were within the knowledge of any member of the House at this moment that somebody, some band of undisciplined or of disciplined people, were marching upon this House, and the House might desire to call for proper aid in order to preserve its existence. Suppose a member should rise in his place and say that he desired to present that as a question of the highest privilege, and to ask for action on the part of the House in order to preserve its own existence. Nobody would for an instant dispute the superior right of that question over the present proposition which the Speaker is about to lay before the House. The Chair will please observe that this point does not depend upon the importance of the question presented. I put an extreme case, because it is only by putting an extreme case that we can see the full extent of the ruling. The principle is precisely the same whenever any question of privilege is presented to the House, and the House alone can determine whether the question is of sufficient importance to justify the interruption of its present business.

Now let me say that a question of privilege is not dependent upon a rule of this House. Without any rule it is inherent in the nature of a legislative body that it must have the right to interrupt temporary business for the purpose of preserving its own existence; and what is necessary in order to preserve its own existence can only be determined by the House itself. I think that possibly the Speaker may have been led into error in regard to this—if he is in error. I mean to speak with perfect respect upon this subject, because I understand somewhat of the difficulties of ruling upon questions which spring up suddenly, and even of ruling upon questions as to which one has plenty of time for deliberation. But the question, I say, must be determined by the House, either primarily by the Speaker, with an appeal from his decision, or by submission to the House itself.

Now, this being the case, ought there not to be a series of rulings which will allow the House to remain in that position? It is perfectly true that the House has a right to change its rules, not merely under the Constitution, for in my judgment

the Constitution is only declaratory of an inherent power which exists in every parliamentary body. It undoubtedly has the right to change its rules, and if this were a direct proposition to change this rule alone in order to get rid of this question as the House might desire, why then the intimation of the Speaker would seem to be entirely correct.

But here is a general proposition, and I do not believe that by any rulings which have been heretofore made this order, either in its inception or in its execution, could be saved from interruption when any matter of privilege concerning the House itself was up. In other words, I mean to assert that if this rule were actually adopted it would not abrogate the other rule to which my colleague [Mr. BOUTELLE] has appealed. If, in the midst of the discussion which is to take place under this rule, and which is limited and prescribed by the rule, any member should rise in his place and present a question of privilege relating to the existence of the House—which of course would be a question of privilege of the highest kind—my judgment is that the Chair would be obliged to rule that that question of privilege had precedence and to call upon the House to dispose of it.

Of course the thing which the Chair really has in mind, perhaps, although he may not be conscious of it, because this is a question of feeling—the feeling may be that this is for purposes of delay. Upon that question I have nothing to say except that the Chair has a perfect right, subject to the animadversion of the House afterward in proper form—the Chair has a perfect right, on his responsibility as Speaker of the House, to rule that motion out. But I interpose here—my colleague [Mr. BOUTELLE] knows that I have had nothing to do whatever with the proceedings with regard to this matter heretofore—

Mr. BOUTELLE. I cheerfully relieve my colleague from all responsibility for my action in this matter.

Mr. REED. I have had nothing to do with it; but I do desire that this matter shall be put upon a basis where the rule would be such that we can transact business in orderly fashion, and it seems to me that if the Chair would give consideration to the whole condition of affairs he would either change the intimation which has already been made or else permit the question of consideration to be raised.

I am quite well aware that the Chair has been justified by the action of the House. I am quite well aware that the action of the House sustaining an appeal from the decision of the Chair is conclusive evidence, in a way, of what parliamentary law is for the time being. That I fully admit. But at the same time we all know that a Speaker is sustained ordinarily by his side of the House, and it is advantageous for the dignity and honor of the House that that should be so. Yet there have been instances where Speakers, upon examining the matter, have seen fit to submit the whole situation to the House.

I have discharged my duty in presenting this matter as it seems to my mind.

Mr. BOUTELLE rose. [Cries of "Regular order!"]

Mr. BOUTELLE. I desire to say—

The SPEAKER. One moment.

Mr. BOUTELLE. I desire to emphasize, Mr. Speaker—

The SPEAKER. One moment, please. On the suggestion of the gentleman from Maine [Mr. REED] as to the propriety of recognizing the right to raise the question of consideration on a report from the Committee on Rules, the Chair will say, it has always been held in this body that the question of consideration could not be raised against what is known and defined as the order of business. For instance, a gentleman makes a motion that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole to consider a certain bill. The question of consideration can not be raised against that. The question of consideration is determined on that motion by voting it up or voting it down. Now, the Chair, in making the ruling in respect to a report from the Committee on Rules, regarded it as in the nature of a motion relating to the order of business, and therefore held that the question of consideration could not be raised, because the House could determine that order of business by voting the proposed rule up or voting it down, and the effect would be the same as though the question of consideration were recognized. The Chair so held in the last Congress and again in this; and the decision was sustained by the House.

Of course the Chair is aware, painfully aware, of the fact suggested by the gentleman from Maine, that very often the occupant of the chair is forced to make decisions without such investigation as he would like to give, and doubtless is often in error. But in regard to the present decision the Chair does not see that any harm can come from it, because it is within the power of the House at any time to dispose of the question presented. Take the present case. Suppose there were a great emergency, as suggested by the gentleman from Maine; it would be in the power of the House to dispose of the report from the Committee on Rules in forty minutes—to get it out of the way; a majority could get it out of the way in forty minutes. There are thirty

minutes allowed for debate; and then in ten minutes more the majority of the House could get the question out of the way. So that there could be no hardship as the effect of this ruling.

Of course, if there were no quorum present, or if members present failed to vote, so that no quorum appeared, there might be some embarrassment; but if a majority of the House should desire to dispose of the pending matter, so as to reach another matter, some great privileged question, it could do so. This is not like a lingering matter; it could be disposed of certainly in an hour, so as to reach any business that the House might desire to reach.

The Chair has thus, in response to the suggestion of the gentleman from Maine, given expression to the views that governed him in originally holding that the question of consideration could not be raised against a report of the Committee on Rules. The question is now upon the demand for the previous question.

Mr. BOUTELLE. Has the Speaker ruled upon the question of precedence now presented. If the Chair has—

The SPEAKER. The Chair declines to recognize the gentleman to make the motion.

Mr. BOUTELLE. The Chair stated a moment ago that this presented a question of order—he recognized it as a question of "the order of business." I call the attention of the Chair to the fact that a question of privilege takes precedence of every question of the order of business, according to the specific language of the rule and precedent I have quoted.

The SPEAKER. The Chair has endeavored to express his views in regard to the question presented by the gentleman from Maine.

Mr. BOUTELLE. Does the Chair decline to entertain an appeal?

The SPEAKER. The Chair declines to recognize the gentleman again.

Mr. BOUTELLE. The Chair declines to entertain an appeal?

The SPEAKER. No appeal can be entertained upon a question of recognition.

Mr. BOUTELLE. I simply protest against this proceeding as a usurpation on the part of the Speaker, only equaled by the usurpation on the part of the Executive.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Maine will take his seat.

Mr. BOUTELLE. I shall do so.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will resume his seat.

Mr. BOUTELLE. I shall do so under duress.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will do so at once. The Sergeant-at-Arms will request the gentleman to resume his seat.

Mr. BOUTELLE. It will not be necessary. I understand what force and duress are—

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will take his seat.

Mr. BOUTELLE (continuing). And that they do not foreclose any constitutional right.

Mr. BOUTELLE resumed his seat. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

The SPEAKER. The question is on the demand of the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. CATCHINGS] for the previous question.

Mr. BURROWS. Mr. Speaker—

The SPEAKER. For what purpose does the gentleman rise?

Mr. BURROWS. Simply to make a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. BURROWS. There has been some delay in the adoption of this proposed rule presented by the Committee on Rules—

Mr. CATCHINGS. Let us have order, Mr. Speaker. It is impossible to hear the gentleman.

The SPEAKER. The Chair has endeavored to preserve order upon the floor, and will request gentlemen to resume their seats and cease conversation.

Mr. BURROWS. I was saying that there has been some delay in the adoption of the report from the Committee on Rules, and I query whether the language of the rule itself ought not to be changed. It provides now as it stands that "next Monday," in the language of the rule, the House shall take a recess until 8 o'clock, the evening session commencing at that time to be for general debate only. If that is the intention of the rule it will be well to have it understood now. That is, however, its language, and of course the rule does not become operative until it is adopted by the House, although introduced several days ago. To pass the rule in its present form would require that on next Monday, a week from to-day, there shall be an evening session, commencing at 8 o'clock, for general debate.

The SPEAKER. To what part of the rule does the gentleman from Michigan refer?

Mr. BURROWS. To the last clause of the rule.

The SPEAKER. That refers to the general debate only.

Mr. BURROWS. Yes. If it is the intention to have the debate begin next Monday it ought to be understood now.

The SPEAKER. It provides for this week also. It may be necessary, however, to bring in another rule to correct that.

Mr. RICHARDSON of Tennessee. It is impossible to hear the ruling of the Chair in the confusion.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Michigan rose to ask whether, as the order was not adopted when presented—and we all, of course, understand the reason why the difficulty arises—the construction would be that the general debate at the evening session should begin on next Monday.

Mr. RICHARDSON of Tennessee. I understood the Chair to make some ruling as to the question of debate.

The SPEAKER. The Chair suggested that this refers to night sessions only, not to the day sessions. The Chair stated that it was the intention of the order that beginning with to-night evening sessions should be held for debate only; and if there was any doubt about it the rule could be made to conform to that intention.

The gentleman from Mississippi demands the previous question on the adoption of the resolution from the Committee on Rules, on which the yeas and nays have been ordered.

Mr. BURROWS. Before that, Mr. Speaker, I wish to ask if the previous question be voted down whether it would be in order to amend the resolution by extending the time for debate a day or two?

Mr. OUTHWAITE. That would not be necessary. The rule itself provides that we may bring in another rule to extend the time if necessary.

The SPEAKER. The question is on ordering the previous question, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 190, nays 0, not voting 161; as follows:

YEAS—190.

Abbott,	Cox,	Ikert,	Pendleton, Tex.
Alderson,	Crawford,	Johnson, Ohio	Pendleton, W. Va.
Alexander,	Culbertson,	Jones,	Pigott,
Allen,	Cummings,	Kilgore,	Price,
Arnold,	Davey,	Kribbs,	Reilly,
Bailey,	De Armond,	Kyle,	Richards, Ohio
Baldwin,	De Forest,	Lane,	Richardson, Mich.
Bankhead,	Denson,	Lapham,	Richardson, Tenn.
Bartlett,	English,	Latimer,	Ritchie,
Barwig,	Enloe,	Layton,	Robbins,
Bell, Tex.	Erdman,	Lester,	Robertson, La.
Beltzhoover,	Fielder,	Lisle,	Russell, Ga.
Berry,	Fithian,	Livingston,	Ryan,
Black, Ga.	Forman,	Lockwood,	Sayers,
Black, Ill.	Fryan,	Lynch,	Schermerhorn,
Blanchard,	Geary,	Maddox,	Shell,
Bland,	Geissenhainer,	Magner,	Snodgrass,
Boatner,	Goldzier,	Maguire,	Somers,
Bower, N. C.	Goodnight,	Mallory,	Springer,
Branch,	Grady,	Marshall,	Stallings,
Brawley,	Gresham,	Martin, Ind.	Stevens,
Breckinridge, Ark.	Griffin,	McAleer,	Stone, Ky.
Breckinridge, Ky.	Hall, Minn.	McCreary, Ky.	Straitt,
Bretz,	Hall, Mo.	McCulloch,	Swanson,
Brookshire,	Hammond,	McDannold,	Talbert, S. C.
Brown,	Hare,	McDearmon,	Talbot, Md.
Bryan,	Harter,	McEstrick,	Tarsney,
Bynum,	Hayes,	McGann,	Tate,
Cabaniss,	Heard,	McKaig,	Taylor, Ind.
Caminetti,	Henderson, N. C.	McLaurin,	Terry,
Cannon, Cal.	Hendrix,	McMillin,	Tracey,
Capehart,	Holman,	McNagny,	Tucker,
Caruth,	Hooker, Miss.	McRae,	Turner,
Catchings,	Houk, Ohio	Meredith,	Turpin,
Causey,	Hunter,	Money,	Tyler,
Causey,	Hutcheson,	Montgomery,	Warner,
Clancy,		Morgan,	Washington,
Clark, Mo.		Moses,	Weadock,
Clarke, Ala.		Mutchler,	Wells,
Cobb, Mo.		Neill,	Wheeler, Ala.
Cockran,		Oates,	Whiting,
Cockrell,		O'Neil,	Williams, Ill.
Coffeen,		Outhwaite,	Williams, Miss.
Compton,		Page,	Wilson, W. Va.
Conn,		Paschal,	Wise,
Coombs,		Patterson,	Woodard.
Cooper, Fla.		Paynter,	
Cooper, Ind.		Pearson,	
Cornish,			

NAYS—0.

NOT VOTING—161.

Adams, Ky.	Bowers, Cal.	Cooper, Tex.	Gear,
Adams, Pa.	Brattan,	Cooper, Wis.	Gillet, N. Y.
Aitken,	Brickner,	Cousins,	Gillet, Mass.
Aldrich,	Broderick,	Curtis, Kans.	Gorman,
Apsley,	Brosius,	Curtis, N. Y.	Graham,
Avery,	Bundy,	Dalzell,	Grosvenor,
Babcock,	Bunn,	Daniels,	Grout,
Baker, Kans.	Burnes,	Davis,	Hager,
Baker, N. H.	Burrows,	Dingley,	Hainer,
Barnes,	Cadmus,	Dooliver,	Haines,
Bartholdt,	Caldwell,	Doolittle,	Harmer,
Beiden,	Campbell,	Draper,	Harris,
Bell, Colo.	Cannon, Ill.	Ellis, Oregon	Hartman,
Bingham,	Chickering,	Fletcher,	Hatch,
Blair,	Childs,	Funk,	Haugen,
Boen,	Cobb, Ala.	Funston,	Heiner,
Boutelle,	Cogswell,	Gardner,	Henderson, Ill.

Henderson, Iowa	Loudenslager,	Powers,	Strong,
Hepburn,	Lucas,	Randall,	Sweet,
Hermann,	Mahon,	Ray,	Tawney,
Hicks,	Marsh,	Rayner,	Taylor, Tenn.
Hilborn,	Marvin, N. Y.	Reed,	Thomas,
Hines,	McCall,	Reyburn,	Updegraff,
Hitt,	McCleary, Minn.	Robinson, Pa.	Van Voorhis, N. Y.
Hooker, N. Y.	McDowell,	Rusk,	Van Voorhis, Ohio
Hopkins, Ill.	McKeighan,	Russell, Conn.	Wadsworth,
Hopkins, Pa.	Meiklejohn,	Scranton,	Walker,
Houk, Tenn.	Mercer,	Settle,	Wanger,
Hudson,	Meyer,	Shaw,	Waugh,
Hulick,	Milliken,	Sherman,	Wever,
Hull,	Moon,	Sibley,	Wheeler, Ill.
Johnson, Ind.	Morse,	Sickles,	White,
Johnson, N. Dak.	Murray,	Simpson,	Wilson, Ohio
Joy,	Newlands,	Sipe,	Wilson, Wash.
Kem,	Northway,	Smith,	Wolverton,
Kiefer,	Payne,	Sperry,	Woomer,
Lacey,	Pence,	Stephenson,	Wright, Mass.
Lawson,	Perkins,	Stockdale,	Wright, Pa.
Lefever,	Phillips,	Stone, C. W.	
Linton,	Pickler,	Stone, W. A.	
Loud,	Post,	Storer,	

So the previous question was ordered.

The following pairs were announced:

Until further notice:

Mr. HATCH with Mr. GEAR.

Mr. COBB of Alabama with Mr. GILLET of Massachusetts.

Mr. CAMPBELL with Mr. BELDEN.

For this day:

Mr. BARNES with Mr. LEFEVER.

Mr. BUNN with Mr. PERKINS.

Mr. LAWSON with Mr. TAYLOR of Tennessee.

Mr. BURNES with Mr. LACEY.

Mr. WOLVERTON with Mr. HEPBURN.

Mr. SICKLES with Mr. SCRANTON.

Mr. COOPER of Texas with Mr. BINGHAM.

Mr. BRATTAN with Mr. RAY.

Mr. GRAHAM with Mr. POST.

Mr. RAYNER with Mr. WEVER.

Mr. ADAMS of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I desire to ask leave of absence for my colleague Gen. BINGHAM. I called to see him yesterday and found him sick in bed.

There being no objection, Mr. BINGHAM was excused.

During the roll call the following proceedings took place:

Mr. OUTHWAITE. Mr. Speaker, before the roll call proceeds further I ask the Clerk to read clause 7 of Rule XIV.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will read the rule at the request of the gentleman from Ohio.

The Clerk read as follows:

7. While the Speaker is putting a question or addressing the House no member shall walk out of or across the Hall, nor, when a member is speaking, pass between him and the Chair; and during the session of the House no member shall wear his hat, or remain by the Clerk's desk during the call of the roll or the counting of ballots, or smoke upon the floor of the House; and the Sergeant-at-Arms and Doorkeeper are charged with the strict enforcement of this clause.

Mr. DALZELL. Mr. Speaker, I hope that rule will be enforced thoroughly in all of its particulars as well as in one.

The roll call was then resumed and concluded as above.

Mr. REED. I desire to call the attention of the Chair to a fact just stated to me, that is, that there are a considerable number of members under arrest. Would they have a right to vote?

The SPEAKER. That is a question the gentleman from Maine may recollect which came up in the last Congress, and it was then held that they might vote on any question except on their own cases; the idea being that there was no power on the part of the House to deprive a member of his right to vote.

Mr. REED. The Supreme Court of the United States has decided—or, has given utterance to a dictum I should say to be more accurate—that the House might imprison a member. If the House may imprison a member, of course it may deprive him of his vote. I can hardly conceive of a member being allowed to vote while he was actually under arrest and in contempt of the House.

I should have called the attention of the Chair to it had it been called to my attention earlier; but I did it as soon as I was informed. I think it is a matter of very great importance for the House to know precisely what the situation is.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, no member has been brought before the bar of the House for contempt.

Mr. REED. No members have been brought before the bar of the House, but the Sergeant-at-Arms can not neglect his duty—

Mr. SPRINGER. There is no evidence of the fact before the House.

Mr. REED. I am informed that the Sergeant-at-Arms has arrested some thirty members. If he has done so, and is neglecting his duty to report the matter to the House, then we ought to know that.

Mr. McMILLIN. I rise to a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. McMILLIN. Whether any report has been made to the Chair of the arrest of any members?

The SPEAKER. No report has been made.

Mr. McMILLIN. That is all upon which the House will act, of course.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will state that, as a matter of fact, the Sergeant-at-Arms said to him just before the House met that he was preparing his report, but that it would take him some little time to get it in order.

Mr. REED. I understand he has some thirty members of the House under arrest.

Mr. BOUTELLE. The Sergeant-at-Arms so informed me.

Mr. SPRINGER. The gentleman from Maine [Mr. BOUTELLE] is not the person to whom the report of the Sergeant-at-Arms is to be made.

The SPEAKER. The ruling has been made heretofore that—

When a motion has been made to discharge from custody several members at the same time, the members thus in custody are not entitled to vote on the question; but when several members are present in custody under the same order, and a motion is made to discharge one, it is competent for the other members in custody to vote on the question.

Mr. SPRINGER. This is not a question of custody at all.

The SPEAKER. That simply shows that although a gentleman is in custody, yet he has the right to vote.

Mr. CAMPBELL. We have no official knowledge of anybody being in custody.

Mr. SPRINGER. Regular order.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Mr. Speaker, I understand a quorum is present.

The SPEAKER. There is a quorum present.

Mr. CAMPBELL. I am paired with the gentleman from New York [Mr. BELDEN]. I ask leave to withdraw my vote.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New York [Mr. CAMPBELL] asks to withdraw his vote, stating that he is paired with his colleague [Mr. BELDEN].

Mr. REED. My object in intervening in this matter is simply that we shall arrive at a proper conclusion. I ask that the Chair cause to be read the authority which I send to the Clerk's desk. I have not had an opportunity to look at it, have not read it myself, but I am told that it bears on the subject.

The Clerk read as follows:

[From the Congressional Globe, July 13, 1848, page 928.]

Mr. BOTTS moved the previous question—in order, he remarked, that they might get to the public business.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Virginia being one of the gentlemen in custody of the Sergeant-at-Arms, the Chair can not recognize him. [Great laughter.]

Mr. LINCOLN, remarking that he believed he was still a member, moved the previous question.

The Speaker announced the question upon dispensing with further proceedings in the case and remitting the fines imposed yesterday.

The previous question was seconded and the main question ordered.

Mr. VENABLE inquired of the Chair whether the gentlemen in custody were entitled to vote upon this question?

The SPEAKER. The Chair is of the opinion that they are not entitled to vote.

Mr. Pettit rose and addressed the Chair.

The SPEAKER. The Chair can not recognize the gentleman from Indiana.

[General laughter.]

Mr. HOUSTON of Alabama. I was here, sir. [A laugh.] I desire to know, if this motion should prevail, whether the amount of fees is to be paid to the Sergeant-at-Arms? [Cries of "Yes!" "Yes!"] And if the fines of gentlemen are remitted then are the fees to be paid out of the Treasury?

The Speaker replied in the affirmative.

Mr. REED. There is a distinct declaration on the part of the Speaker at that time.

The SPEAKER. The motion was to excuse the members in the aggregate.

Mr. REED. I think the Chair will see that the motion which was pending was simply to dispense with further proceedings.

The SPEAKER. The effect of which would be to discharge the members in custody.

Mr. REED. The effect might be that; but the ruling was that they could not vote.

Mr. OUTHWAITE. That was upon the theory that they were interested in the vote.

Mr. REED. I do not think that is it. It seems to me that a member of the House cannot vote when he is in custody. The House may dispose of the question and put him out of custody. I want to suggest to the Speaker that perhaps the principle may be this: The House has ordered the arrest of members; how can it proceed to business until it disposes of that question? Otherwise we should have the very singular spectacle of men under arrest and in charge of the House voting, although not free members.

The SPEAKER. Of course the reply to that would be that we have no official information that any gentleman who is under arrest has voted.

Mr. REED. It does not matter whether the Chair has official information or not, when a member states that such is the fact,

on his information, and the Speaker confirms it by stating that the Sergeant-at-Arms so informs him.

I think the fact is beyond dispute; I think we ought not to hasten about this until we understand exactly what the rights and proprieties of the case are. It certainly would be a singular spectacle if men were to vote and the House were to proceed to business with members under arrest and their cases not disposed of.

Mr. OUTHWAITE. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. REED. I should think that the proper course would be now to proceed with the members, dispose of their cases, and then have them vote or not vote as the punishment of the House might indicate. That might be done without abrogating anything that has taken place.

The SPEAKER. The Chair does not see how it would be in the power of the House, even if it were disposed to do it, to prevent a member voting unless it expelled him. You might put him in jail, and of course if you take his body away he can not vote; but if he were in the House under any circumstances I do not see how it is in the power of the House to prevent his voting.

Mr. REED. Who was the Speaker at that Congress, may I ask?

The SPEAKER. The Chair will examine and find out.

Mr. REED. That decision was certainly made; but I recognize the fact that it must have been made in the call of the House, when considerable confusion reigned.

Mr. BOUTELLE. This simply emphasizes the necessity of first determining what are the privileges of the House of Representatives, and whether we have a free and unshackled and unarrested House of Representatives to act upon a question.

Mr. BOATNER. I rise to a question of personal privilege.

The SPEAKER. The Chair can not hear the gentleman until the announcement is made. These statements have been made during a roll call. On this question the yeas are 189; the noes are none [applause on the Democratic side]; the yeas have it, and the previous question is ordered. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. CATCHINGS. I move to reconsider the vote by which the previous question was ordered, and move to lay that motion on the table.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will recognize the gentleman from Mississippi to control the fifteen minutes in favor of the proposition and the gentleman from Maine [Mr. REED] the fifteen minutes in opposition.

Mr. REED. I desire to present this point again—that there are now members of the House under arrest, that they are necessarily, as it stands now, in contempt of the House, and I think that that matter ought to be settled. I do not ask that the matter be determined now, but I simply want to present it, so that when the question comes up for a vote the Chair may be able to find authorities and dispose of the question one way or the other. I do not care which way it is disposed of.

Mr. CATCHINGS. In what form do you call it up?

Mr. REED. I simply call the attention of the Chair to the fact that the same question will arise when we come to a vote on the main question. That is all. [Cries of "Vote!"]

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. CATCHINGS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the gentleman from Maine if he desires to submit any remarks upon this question?

Mr. REED. I purpose to do so.

Mr. CATCHINGS. As some days have elapsed since this order was presented to the House, it may be well, perhaps, to restate distinctly just what the terms and conditions of the order are.

The purpose of this order is to so amend the rules of this House that up to and including a final vote on the passage of the bill only such business as is specifically named in this order shall be transacted. That business is as follows: It is allowable under the order to receive conference reports and reports from the Committee on Rules. It is allowable under the order to dispose of business on the Speaker's table. It is allowable for the Speaker to call committees for reports. When business of that character, if there shall be any such, has been disposed of, then, by the terms of this order, the House must proceed to the consideration of the bill. As the order is written what is known as "general debate" will expire with the adjournment of the House on Wednesday, the 10th of this month.

Beginning on Thursday morning, after such business as I have mentioned has been disposed of, the House is to enter upon the consideration of the bill under what is commonly known as the "five-minute rule," and its consideration under that rule is to proceed until the 25th, when it is hoped and expected that a final vote will be had. The rule also contemplated that, beginning with this night, there should be night sessions, the House being required to take a recess from the usual hour of adjournment

until 8 o'clock for the purpose of having night sessions, such sessions to be devoted entirely to general debate. It was expected, of course, that this rule would be adopted on the day of its presentation.

So far as these night sessions are concerned, the rule reads that "beginning with Monday next," which is this Monday, "at the hour of 5:30 o'clock on each day the House shall take a recess until 8 o'clock, the evening session to be devoted to general debate on said bill only." As the order now stands, adopted literally, Monday of next week would be "next Monday;" but it is the purpose of the Committee on Rules to supplement this with another report, so that if the House chooses to do so it can begin with this general debate at evening sessions to-night. That is a trouble which springs from the fact I have stated, that the order was not adopted when it was expected it would be.

I wish to state, as a matter of general information, that when the McKinley bill was under discussion four days were allowed for general debate. This order had contemplated setting apart five days for general debate. On the McKinley bill eight days were given for discussion under the five-minute rule. One Sunday having intervened, the effect was that on the 14th day from the beginning of the consideration of that bill the final vote was had. Under the terms of this rule seventeen days are allowed for the discussion and consideration of the bill, including general debate and debate under the five-minute rule. The Committee on Rules, or the majority of the committee, had no desire to curtail debate upon this bill; but it was of the opinion that the condition of the business of the country was such that speedy action was more desired than discussion. We believed that we could not act too promptly in disposing finally of this measure.

Every man must appreciate that, so long as there is uncertainty as to what the action of the House upon this measure is to be, so long will there be an unnecessary amount of suspense and uncertainty in the conduct of the great business enterprises of this country. I have myself received communications from several managers of business industries, including some who are utterly opposed to this bill, stating that it is very much to be desired that whatever action is to be taken shall be taken speedily, and the Committee on Rules believed, Mr. Speaker, that in providing for a short and limited debate they were fairly representing the views of gentlemen upon this side of the Chamber.

This is the first time for many years that the Democratic party has had the opportunity of putting in the shape of legislation its views on the question of tariff taxation. We believe that the Wilson bill may be taken fairly as a great stride in the direction of the inauguration of the Democratic theory of taxation. Of course it is not understood that it is claimed, even by those who framed the bill, that it is perfect in all respects, for no human work can be perfect; but it is at all events a long step taken toward the establishment as a part of our system of the Democratic theory of levying tariff taxes for revenue only.

I believe, Mr. Speaker, that we will subserve best the interests of this country by adopting this order and by speedily acting and voting upon the Wilson bill. There will undoubtedly be an opportunity given for votes upon important amendments that gentlemen may desire to offer, because there can be no wish on the part of anybody to force through a bill which is not acceptable at least to gentlemen on this side of the Chamber, or a majority of them.

I do not know, Mr. Speaker, that it is necessary or proper for me to add anything to what I have already said. I will state that it is my intention to yield now to my friend from Maine [Mr. REED], that he may occupy the fifteen minutes placed by the Speaker under his control, and after that I will yield such time as may remain of my fifteen minutes to the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. WILSON].

Mr. DINGLEY. Before the gentleman takes his seat I wish to make one inquiry. He has stated that a rule would be introduced later amendatory of this with reference to the evening sessions; is there any intention to introduce an amendment so as to give more than the three parts of days that remain for general debate?

Mr. CATCHINGS. That is a matter that we will take into consideration. My friend from Maine must remember that if two of the days which were intended to be devoted to general debate have been lost it has not been the fault of the overwhelming majority of members on this side of the Chamber.

Mr. DINGLEY. Oh, entirely their fault.

Mr. BOUTELLE. Overwhelming majority!

Mr. CATCHINGS. Yes, sir; I mean exactly what I say.

Mr. BOUTELLE. Well, it didn't "overwhelm" until a few minutes ago. [Laughter.]

Mr. CATCHINGS. The gentleman from Maine [Mr. BOUTELLE] has been overwhelmed so many times during the past week that I should think he could afford to be quiet upon an occasion like this. [Laughter and applause on the Democratic

side.] I hope that my friend from Maine [Mr. REED] will now occupy his fifteen minutes.

Mr. REED. I think, Mr. Speaker, that the proposition presented to the House is entirely unjustifiable. A bill has been brought in here which has so many different aspects that it needs more discussion than any bill that was ever submitted to the House. The House is not under the necessity, in any way, of crowding this measure. The majority of the party in control of this House is very large, and whatever it chooses to do it can do not only at the particular moment, but at any time when it sees fit. With a margin of 40 or 50 above a quorum and a majority over all of 80, there is not the slightest occasion for anything but perfectly liberal and open treatment of the other side. Nor has there been, prior to this, any system of hostility inaugurated. The only ground upon which it is even attempted to justify this course would seem to be the action which was taken upon the act of 1890. That action was then taken because the majority was not large, and also because a system of opposition from day to day had taken place to such an extent as rendered it essential that the majority should use its utmost power.

That bill, however, had been presented to the country for an entire month in completed condition; and the country had an opportunity to examine it. It had been prepared openly, not secretly. Everybody had had a hearing; everybody of either party had had an opportunity to present his views without stint and without limit. Moreover, the bill was not the establishment of any new principle, nor did it claim to establish any new principle. It was simply a revision of existing laws under the same principles which had governed those laws. Hence there was no such necessity for thorough discussion as there is at present.

You will notice that I do not bring up against this proposed rule the fact that the party which now presents it made the air vocal at that time with their declarations against any such rule. That I do not think is an argument; or if it is one, it is an argument which could so often have been repeated in this Congress and in the last that it loses its force on account of repetition. The spectacle of seeing the Democratic party repeat the actions which they condemned in the Congress when they were in a minority has been so common as not even to excite comment; and I suppose there is hardly a Democrat in this House who recalled, when the Speaker was presenting the right of the House to change its rules this very morning, that that battle was fought against the written protest of every Democrat in the House except Samuel S. Cox, who had too much sense to put himself on record in that way. [Laughter.]

The argument against the method of proceeding which is presented here is very simple and very concise. It does not allow sufficient time for the general discussion; it does not permit a thorough examination of the bill. The gentleman from Mississippi, with that keenness of insight which distinguishes him, attempted to break the force of this suggestion by saying that it was necessary that haste should be taken with the bill. Undoubtedly it is the duty of Congress in most thorough fashion to go over the bill and go over it as rapidly as possible. But haste in this House is not haste with regard to the bill. So far as we leave it wrong, so far as we leave it undiscussed, it will have to be discussed in the other legislative body; and the Constitution of the United States does not contemplate that the main discussion of a revenue bill shall take place in the Senate of the United States.

We are the representatives of the people, their direct representatives; and in our hands is placed the initiative with regard to all bills raising revenue. Upon us rests the first duty to consider carefully this measure; upon us rests the necessity of framing a bill which shall be satisfactory to the people before it is sent up to be ratified by the ambassadors of the sovereign States. [Laughter.] Yet that duty under the Constitution is the duty we propose to neglect; that is the duty which we propose to turn over to somebody else; and we are to do this because the gentleman from Mississippi has received some letters urging haste in the disposal of this matter. Right it is that there should be haste, but not haste in the tribunal which represents the people.

Further than that, to show the tendency of Democratic concentration and control, it is provided—the gentleman from Mississippi will correct me if I am wrong—it is provided in the pending order that this bill shall not be considered under the five-minute rule—shall not be considered under the rule which enables members to offer amendments to each section. On the contrary (am I right?), the bill is to be read as a whole and is then to be open to amendment in all its parts.

Mr. CATCHINGS. I was going to suggest that.

Mr. REED. It is to be read as a whole and then to be open for amendment in all its parts.

Mr. CATCHINGS. Certainly. That was the provision of the order in reference to the McKinley bill.

Mr. REED. Precisely; but you are no more in favor of that now than you ever were; are you?

Mr. CATCHINGS. I am no more in favor of the McKinley bill than I ever was.

Mr. REED. Of course not. Why, sir, I can remember when Mr. Blount, then "paramount" among the Democracy of the House, as he has since been "paramount" in foreign parts [laughter], rifted the atmosphere with his representative cries upon that subject. But that is not argument. That is a very pleasant reproach; but it is no argument. I purpose to address myself to the merits of the matter and to show why this is an unsuitable method of proceeding upon such a bill as this. This, being a bill that is new in every detail, is precisely the bill for which the rules of the House, without change ever since it began to do business, requires consideration by paragraphs. Now, why has this been so? Why was a member allowed to offer amendments to each paragraph? Simply because the Committee of the Whole was the most democratic part of the democratic assembly. Each member was to have his right, and nobody could abridge it; and under our rules nobody can abridge it. The member's right to debate may be taken away from him, but his right to offer an amendment to each paragraph as it comes up is a right of which he can not be deprived and never has been.

Mr. CATCHINGS. May I ask the gentleman one question?

Mr. REED. Surely.

Mr. CATCHINGS. Did every man who had an amendment which he desired to have voted on have an opportunity to offer it and have it voted on when the McKinley bill was under consideration?

Mr. REED. He did not; and the lesson to be drawn from that example is precisely what I am presenting to the House to-day.

Mr. CATCHINGS. I would like to ask the gentleman another question: whether about two hundred proposed amendments did not remain unacted on when we voted finally on the McKinley bill?

Mr. REED. Precisely. I am glad to have the gentleman afford that information; for it enables us to see what we are coming to. I am very much obliged to the gentleman for showing how such a proceeding works in practice.

Mr. CATCHINGS. You are now criticising the proceeding?

Mr. REED. I am now criticising a procedure by which you are trying to imitate what when the McKinley bill was up you condemned. I had hoped to hear you get up and apologize for what you have been doing, or at least that you would, as you have been doing in this Congress and the last, apologize silently.

Mr. CATCHINGS. We have not apologized at all.

Mr. REED. No; I know you have not got up and said so; but then imitation, my friend, is the sincerest form of flattery. [Laughter.]

Mr. CATCHINGS. I would like to ask my friend another question.

Mr. REED. Let me resume my argument, as I have but five minutes. But I yield to my friend from Mississippi, of course.

Mr. CATCHINGS. By no means; I will not take the gentleman's time.

Mr. REED. The point I make is that now you have the whole bill in front of you. What are you to expect? Have you any right, as a member of this House, to offer an amendment to that bill? Not at all. You are, each and every one of you, going to be dependent for recognition on whomsoever the Speaker shall put into the chair to preside in committee.

There is not a single one going to get an opportunity to offer an amendment except by the consent of the gentleman who is to preside over the Committee of the Whole. You are putting yourselves in his power absolutely, entirely, completely; and, yet methinks, this is the body, this is the set of men who are earnest and anxious for "debate," for "opportunities for discussion;" who were against having people "crowded out," as they were in the bad old times. [Laughter.] And here you are. Now, do you want to do it?

I do not appeal to you to stand by any former position which you took. That is optional with you. If you are satisfied from your own reasoning that you were then wrong it is a handsome thing not only for you to imitate us, but to say so openly, as the gentleman from Mississippi has declined to do.

But are you satisfied you were wrong? Are you satisfied that this is the right method for disposing of your power? For let me say to you, Mr. Speaker, and gentlemen of the House of Representatives, you are the depositories of power. The right you have to act as members of this House arises from the Constitution of the United States, and the duties which are entailed upon you come from the same source. Among those duties is the duty of preparing such a revenue bill as will be satisfactory to the people whom you represent.

Unless you do that you do not perform your duty; and the Constitution has so strenuously imposed that duty upon you alone that, until you act, the Senate of the United States can not so

much as stir a finger. If this House intends to be jealous of its honor and of its prerogatives it will take such care, not as anybody else took, but as commends itself to the wisdom and the judgment and the sense of the members, who are responsible for their actions. [Applause on the Republican side.]

I reserve the remainder of my time.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Maine has two minutes of his time remaining.

Mr. WILSON of West Virginia. I hope the gentleman from Maine will occupy the remainder of his time so that I may close the debate. I prefer that.

Mr. REED. I think I will retain my two minutes. If necessary to say anything I will close the discussion.

Mr. WILSON of West Virginia. I prefer that the gentleman should exhaust his time now. I have a right to close.

Mr. REED. Well, I do not suppose the gentleman has actually the right, for I may retain my two minutes and use it or not, as I see proper.

But I will take the two minutes to add simply this: That I trust if this thing is adopted the right of recognition may sacredly depend upon the judgment of the Chair, and may not be the subject of—ah—anything else. [Laughter and applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. WILSON of West Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I agree with the gentleman from Maine, who has just spoken, that whatever was done in the Fifty-first Congress in the consideration and passage of the McKinley bill is not necessarily persuasive, and does not necessarily excuse similar action by this House in the consideration of the bill now to be brought before us. It is our duty to have the bill brought before the House in such way that it shall have sufficient consideration under the rule for general debate, and that it shall have sufficient consideration under the rule for five-minutes debate, and that the members of the House who desire to do so shall have ample opportunity to present their amendments and have those amendments acted upon in the Committee of the Whole.

The rule proposed does not take away or abridge any of these necessary and proper rights. No men can be more interested in having this bill properly considered by the House, both under the general and the five-minutes debate, or in having the members of this body granted full opportunity to have their amendments offered and acted upon by the committee than those who have been charged with the duty of the preparation of the bill.

It did seem to us, after consultation with a very large number of our fellow-members, that the rule as originally presented by the Committee on Rules secured all of those rights. It proposed to give five days for general debate; it proposed to give twelve days for debate on the items of the bill; it proposed to begin the present week with night sessions for general debate, so that there could be no part of the bill and no item in it that might not have sufficient and instructive discussion in this House and before the country.

If two days of that time have been lost, the responsibility for that loss does not rest with those who were seeking to bring this bill before the House. But, sir, I do not propose, so far as I am concerned, that we shall throw even upon those who are responsible for it the loss of this time. I do not propose, so far as I am concerned, that there shall be any abridgment of the time to be given to general debate because of this loss, and I shall ask the House, before it takes the final vote upon this rule, to adopt, by unanimous consent, the amendments which I shall propose, first, that all of the present week, six days instead of five, as proposed in the original rule, shall be given to general debate; that beginning with to-night there may be, and if the members desire it there shall be, regular night sessions for general debate; that after the lapse of the present week, beginning with Monday morning of next week, debate shall begin upon the bill under the five-minute rule, and that the bill shall be put forward two weeks from that time, the 29th instead of the 25th, as proposed in the rule. [Applause.] And I shall also ask that the proposition of the rule allowing the privilege to print shall be incorporated also; provided, however, that the privilege shall end with the termination of the debate.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. WILSON of West Virginia. I ask unanimous consent for an agreement to these amendments.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. WILSON] asks unanimous consent that the order be modified so that the whole of this week may be given to general debate; that there be night sessions, beginning with to-night, and that the two weeks following shall be given to debate under the five-minute rule, with evening sessions for general debate, and that the vote be taken on Monday, the 29th, instead of Thursday, the 25th. Is there objection?

Mr. REED. Mr. Speaker, I do not object to any enlargement of debate, but I do not want, by my consent, to be supposed to admit that that leaves the thing in the proper shape, because

we do not assent to it with any such proposition. We simply find ourselves in a minority at last.

Mr. WILSON of West Virginia. We do not ask the gentleman's assent to the rule, but that gentlemen assent to these proposed amendments to the rule.

Mr. REED. Whatever rule you gentlemen make up, you make up on your own responsibility. I am going to ask the House to recommit with instructions, if we are to be allowed that opportunity.

The SPEAKER. Before that, then, is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none. Is there objection to the further request suggested by the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. WILSON], that this leave to print be construed to extend only up to and including the day of the passage of the bill, if it is passed; that it shall not extend indefinitely, but that gentlemen desiring to avail themselves of the leave to print must do so before or by the time the bill passes the House, should it pass?

Mr. SPRINGER. I think that might be extended to one month after the passage of the bill. [Cries of "Oh, no!"] It will necessitate a great deal of labor on the part of members to prepare remarks for printing, when they will naturally desire to devote their time to attendance upon the debate.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will submit the request of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SPRINGER].

Mr. REED. Before that consent is given I want to suggest to the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. WILSON]—does the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. WILSON] purpose to occupy an hour after the previous question is ordered, to close the debate on the bill?

Mr. WILSON of West Virginia. That will depend entirely upon developments during the debate. I reserve the right to do that.

Mr. REED. I desire, if that is the case, that we may be allowed an hour and a half prior to that.

Mr. WILSON of West Virginia. I understand that there is always an arrangement of that kind, by which the minority and the majority can close the debate.

Mr. REED. If that is the understanding, it is satisfactory.

Mr. WILSON of West Virginia. I would not make any understanding—

The SPEAKER. The Chair will suggest that it might be agreed that on the 29th, before the vote is taken, each side shall have one hour for debate in the House. That would cover it.

Mr. WILSON of West Virginia. I shall not object to that.

Mr. REED. That covers the right of the gentleman to close.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, then, that will be the understanding, that there shall be one hour of debate on each side in the House on Monday, the 29th, before the vote is taken. The Chair understands the modification of the order to have been agreed to. The gentleman from Maine [Mr. REED] desires to make a motion, as the Chair understands.

Mr. SPRINGER. The agreement just made does not include my proposition with reference to extending the leave to print.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will submit the proposition of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SPRINGER] that leave to print be extended thirty days after the passage of the bill. [Cries of "No!"]

The SPEAKER. Objection is made.

Mr. SPRINGER. I will say ten days. Members will not know the shape the bill is in on its passage.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman modifies his proposition so as to make it ten days.

Mr. CALDWELL and others. I object.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Maine desires to submit a motion.

Mr. REED. I desire to submit a motion at the proper time to recommit this order.

Mr. COCKRAN. Mr. Speaker, it is impossible to hear what is proceeding.

The SPEAKER. There is nothing before the House.

Mr. BOATNER. I rose to a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The Chair did not hear the gentleman.

Mr. BOATNER. A number of gentlemen desire to know whether this bill is to be considered in Committee of the Whole under the five-minute rule, read by sections, in order that amendments may be offered when the section is considered?

The SPEAKER. Under the order, on the first day of its consideration under the five-minute rule, the bill is to be read through, and then for two weeks amendments are in order to any paragraph of the bill.

Mr. BOATNER. There is nothing in the rule that will guarantee a vote on any amendment offered to any paragraph in the bill.

The SPEAKER. There is nothing to prevent the committee from coming to a vote whenever it desires to do so.

Mr. REED. We saw that when the act of 1893 was reported

to the House there were two hundred amendments, upon none of which could a vote be taken.

Mr. OATES. I desire further information. I desire to know if the bill will be read by sections in the usual way, and amendments offered and disposed of and the sections not recurred to, or will it be in order to offer amendments to any part of the bill?

The SPEAKER. It will be in order to offer amendments to any part of the bill.

A MEMBER. At any time?

The SPEAKER. At any time when a gentleman is recognized.

Mr. BURROWS. That was not my understanding of the matter. Do I understand that the bill is not going to be taken up by paragraphs and considered open to amendments, but that the whole bill is to be read and then anyone can offer any amendments to any portion of it and consume the whole time on that?

The SPEAKER. There is nothing in the order that provides for consuming the whole time on any amendment. The order provides that when general debate has expired, which, under the order as it has been amended will be on next Monday, on that day the bill shall be read through entirely.

Mr. BURROWS. Before any amendments are offered.

The SPEAKER. Before any amendments are offered; and then that any amendment is in order to any part of the bill, and not to the paragraphs as read in the usual order.

Mr. BURROWS. Then we could take up any part of the bill, such as the administration features of the bill, and spend all the time on it.

The SPEAKER. Any part.

Mr. BURROWS. Any amendment offered will be debated for five minutes for or against; and then, no matter what it may be, for instance, it may be the administrative portion of the bill, which comes last, and any amendment can be offered; at the very first opportunity a gentleman may rise and such time as the House finds necessary or the committee finds necessary to consume in it can be occupied, and then another section of the administration bill can be taken up, and so on, according to recognition of the Chair.

The SPEAKER. That is right.

Mr. REED. It is to correct that that I desire to offer this proposition.

Mr. PICKLER. I desire to make a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. PICKLER. Suppose that twenty amendments accumulate on the Clerk's desk.

The SPEAKER. They can not. Under the rules of the House but four amendments can be pending at one time. An amendment, an amendment to that amendment, an amendment in the nature of a substitute, and an amendment to the substitute.

Mr. PICKLER. And by this means the whole two weeks can be occupied.

The SPEAKER. Of course, if the committee does not vote them out of the way; but the committee can vote them out of the way, and, under the rule, ought to vote them out of the way. When five minutes' debate has been had for and against them it is the rule of the House that they shall be voted upon. The practice has extended it further, but the rule does not authorize it.

Mr. REED. These amendments can be offered in detail, and when one lot is disposed of another series can be offered.

The SPEAKER. Certainly.

Mr. REED. I want to make another suggestion. Would not the Committee on Rules have the right of way at all times, under the practice of the House?

The SPEAKER. The Chair thinks that the practice of the House is to consider first the amendments offered to the bill by the committee reporting the bill.

Mr. REED. That is the practice of the House, as they did in the case of the act of 1890.

Mr. OUTHWAITE. They asked the consent of the committee, and that consent was granted.

Mr. REED. They would have control by general law.

Mr. OUTHWAITE. No; the Committee of the Whole would have control. Gentlemen are arguing the question as if the Committee of the Whole can not be trusted to take care of itself.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Maine has a motion.

Mr. OUTHWAITE. There is so much confusion that we can not hear what is going on.

The SPEAKER. The House will be in order. [After a pause.] Does the gentleman from Maine [Mr. REED] desire to submit a motion?

Mr. REED. The proposition which I desire to submit, Mr. Speaker, if this is the proper time, is to recommit with instructions to report an order for consideration which will give more time for general debate or more time for debate, because I do not care to make general debate the principal question; I only

think that there ought to be some time for debate. I will therefore move that the order be recommitted with instructions to report an order for consideration which will give more days for debate and reserve the right to amend each paragraph as it is reached in reading.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will send up his motion.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, I rise to a question of order.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. SPRINGER. Is it in order to move to recommit a proposition to amend the rules? Under the rule the Chair is to entertain but one dilatory motion, the motion to adjourn, and it seems to me that the proposition of the gentleman from Maine is not in order. The pending proposition is in the nature of a motion to suspend the rules; it is a suspension of certain rules and the adoption of another rule in their place, and I hold that a motion to recommit with instructions is not allowable upon a proposition of this kind. I do not remember any case where a motion to amend the rules, or to suspend the rules—and this, I repeat, is in the nature of a motion to suspend the rules—has been held to be subject to a motion to recommit with instructions. A bill is subject to that motion on its final passage, but not a proposition like this.

Mr. REED. It is subject to every motion. It is a proceeding of the House.

Mr. SPRINGER. It is subject to all the motions that are allowed under the rules, but under the rule the Chair is to entertain but one motion—a motion to adjourn.

Mr. REED. But the Chair has already entertained a motion for the previous question.

Mr. SPRINGER. Of course. That is in order.

Mr. REED. Of course.

Mr. SPRINGER. Of course. That is a motion to cut off debates.

Mr. REED. The gentleman from Illinois will see at once that saying "Of course" does not answer the point. [Laughter.]

Mr. SPRINGER. Well, the motion for the previous question is a motion that is allowed for the purpose of cutting off debate. There would be no end of debate unless the previous question could be ordered. But, upon a proposition to suspend the rules or to change the rules, as in this case, which is the same thing as suspending the rules, only one motion can be entertained, which is a motion to adjourn.

Mr. REED. The gentleman will see that that can not possibly be so—

The SPEAKER (interposing). The Chair would not hold this motion to be dilatory. The rule provides that but one motion to adjourn shall be entertained, and no other dilatory motion, but the Chair would not hold this to be a dilatory motion.

Mr. BOUTELLE. The Chair entertained two motions to adjourn yesterday.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the motion of the gentleman from Maine [Mr. REED].

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. REED moves to recommit with instructions to report an order of consideration, which will give more days for debate, and reserve the right to amend each paragraph as it is reached in reading.

The question being taken on the motion to recommit, the Speaker declared that the yeas seemed to have it.

Mr. REED. I ask for a division.

The House divided; and there were—yeas 94, yeas 174.

Mr. REED. Mr. Speaker, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 6, nays 184, not voting 161; as follows:

YEAS—6.			
Blair,	Daniels,	Newlands,	Wanger.
Bandy,	Hopkins, Pa.		
NAYS—184.			
Abbott,	Bynum,	Cummings,	Gresham,
Alderson,	Cabaniss,	De Armond,	Griffin,
Alexander,	Caminetti,	De Forest,	Hall, Minn.
Allen,	Cannon, Cal.	Denson,	Hall, Mo.
Arnold,	Capehart,	Dinsmore,	Hammond,
Bailey,	Caruth,	Dockery,	Hare,
Baldwin,	Catchings,	Donovan,	Harter,
Bankhead,	Clancy,	Dunn,	Hayes,
Bartlett,	Clark, Mo.	Dunphy,	Heard,
Barwig,	Clarke, Ala.	Durborow,	Henderson, N. C.
Bell, Tex.	Cobb, Mo.	Edmunds,	Hendrix,
Berry,	Cockran,	Ellis, Ky.	Holman,
Black, Ga.	Cockrell,	English,	Hooker, Miss.
Black, Ill.	Coffeen,	Enloe,	Houk, Ohio
Bland,	Compton,	Epes,	Hudson,
Boatner,	Conn,	Erdman,	Hunter,
Branch,	Coombs,	Everett,	Hutcheson,
Brawley,	Cooper, Fla.	Fithian,	Iklit,
Breckinridge, Ark.	Cooper, Ind.	Forman,	Johnson, Ohio
Breckinridge, Ky.	Cornish,	Fyan,	Jones,
Bretz,	Covert,	Geissenhainer,	Kilgore,
Brookshire,	Cox,	Goldier,	Kribbs,
Brown,	Crain,	Goodnight,	Kyle,
Bryan,	Crawford,	Gorman,	Lane,
	Culberson,	Grady,	Lapham,

Latimer,
Layton,
Lester,
Lisle,
Livingston,
Lockwood,
Lynch,
Maddox,
Maguire,
Mallory,
Marshall,
Martin, Ind.
McAleer,
McCreary, Ky.
McCulloch,
McDannold,
McDearmon,
McEttrick,
McGann,
McKalg,
McLaurin,

McMillin,
McNagny,
McRae,
Meredith,
Money,
Montgomery,
Morgan,
Moses,
Mutchler,
Neill,
Oates,
O'Neill,
Outhwaite,
Paschal,
Patterson,
Paynter,
Pearson,
Pendleton, Tex.
Pendleton, W. Va.
Pigott,
Price,

Reilly,
Richards, Ohio
Richardson, Mich.
Richardson, Tenn.
Ritchie,
Robbins,
Robertson, La.
Rusk,
Russell, Ga.
Ryan,
Sayers,
Scaermehorn,
Shell,
Snodgrass,
Somers,
Springer,
Stallings,
Stevens,
Stone, Ky.
Strait,
Swanson,

Talbert, S. C.
Talbot, Md.
Tarsney,
Tate,
Taylor, Ind.
Terry,
Tracey,
Tucker,
Turner,
Turpin,
Tyler,
Warner,
Washington,
Weadock,
Wells,
Wheeler, Ala.
Whiting,
Williams, Ill.
Williams, Miss.
Wilson, W. Va.
Wise.

Neill,
Oates,
O'Neill,
Outhwaite,
Page,
Paschal,
Patterson,
Paynter,
Pearson,
Pendleton, Tex.
Pendleton, W. Va.
Pigott,
Price,
Reilly,

Richards, Ohio
Richardson, Mich.
Richardson, Tenn.
Ritchie,
Robbins,
Robertson, La.
Rusk,
Russell, Ga.
Ryan,
Sayers,
Schermerhorn,
Shell,
Snodgrass,
Somers,

Turner,
Turpin,
Tyler,
Warner,
Washington,
Weadock,
Wells,
Wheeler, Ala.
Whiting,
Williams, Ill.
Williams, Miss.
Wilson, W. Va.
Wise,
Woodard.

NOT VOTING—161.

Adams, Ky.
Adams, Pa.
Aitken,
Aldrich,
Apsley,
Avery,
Babcock,
Baker, Kans.
Baker, N. H.
Barnes,
Bartholdt,
Beiden,
Bell, Colo.
Beltzhoover,
Bingham,
Boen,
Boutelle,
Bower, N. C.
Bowers, Cal.
Brattan,
Brickner,
Broderick,
Brosius,
Bunn,
Burnes,
Burrows,
Cadmus,
Caldwell,
Campbell,
Cannon, Ill.
Causey,
Chickering,
Childs,
Cobb, Ala.
Cogswell,
Cooper, Tex.
Cooper, Wis.
Cousins,
Curtis, Kans.
Curtis, N. Y.
Dalzell,

Davey,
Davis,
Dingley,
Dooliver,
Doolittle,
Avery,
Babcock,
Baker, Kans.
Baker, N. H.
Barnes,
Bartholdt,
Beiden,
Bell, Colo.
Beltzhoover,
Bingham,
Boen,
Boutelle,
Bower, N. C.
Bowers, Cal.
Brattan,
Brickner,
Broderick,
Brosius,
Bunn,
Burnes,
Burrows,
Cadmus,
Caldwell,
Campbell,
Cannon, Ill.
Causey,
Chickering,
Childs,
Cobb, Ala.
Cogswell,
Cooper, Tex.
Cooper, Wis.
Cousins,
Curtis, Kans.
Curtis, N. Y.
Dalzell,

Johnson, Ind.
Johnson, N. Dak.
Joy,
Kem,
Kiefer,
Lacey,
Lawson,
Lefever,
Linton,
Loud,
Loudenslager,
Lucas,
Magner,
Mahon,
Marsh,
Marvin, N. Y.
McCall,
McCleary, Minn.
Grout,
Hager,
Hainer,
Haines,
Harmer,
Harris,
Hartman,
Hatch,
Haugen,
Heiner,
Henderson, Ill.
Henderson, Iowa
Hepburn,
Hermann,
Hicks,
Hilborn,
Hines,
Hitt,
Hooker, N. Y.
Hopkins, Ill.
Houk, Tenn.
Hulick,
Hull,

Robinson, Pa.
Russell, Conn.
Scranton,
Settle,
Shaw,
Sherman,
Sibley,
Sickles,
Simpson,
Sips,
Smith,
Sperry,
Stephenson,
Stockdale,
Stone, C. W.
Stone, W. A.
Storer,
Strong,
Sweet,
Tawney,
Taylor, Tenn.
Thomas,
Updegraff,
Van Voorhis, N. Y.
Van Voorhis, Ohio
Wadsworth,
Waugh,
Weaver,
Wheeler, Ill.
White,
Wilson, Ohio
Wilson, Wash.
Wolverton,
Woodard,
Woomer,
Wright, Mass.
Wright, Pa.

NAYS—1.

Kilgore.

NOT VOTING—166.

Adams, Ky.
Adams, Pa.
Aitken,
Aldrich,
Apsley,
Avery,
Babcock,
Baker, Kans.
Baker, N. H.
Barnes,
Bartholdt,
Beiden,
Bell, Colo.
Beltzhoover,
Bingham,
Boen,
Boutelle,
Bower, N. C.
Bowers, Cal.
Brattan,
Brickner,
Broderick,
Brosius,
Bunn,
Burnes,
Burrows,
Cadmus,
Caldwell,
Campbell,
Cannon, Ill.
Chickering,
Childs,
Cobb, Ala.
Cogswell,
Cooper, Tex.
Cooper, Wis.
Cousins,
Curtis, Kans.
Curtis, N. Y.
Dalzell,

Daniels,
Davey,
Davis,
Dingley,
Dooliver,
Doolittle,
Draper,
Dunn,
Ellis, Oregon
Felder,
Fletcher,
Funk,
Funston,
Gardner,
Gear,
Geary,
Gillett, N. Y.
Gillett, Mass.
Graham,
Grosvenor,
Grout,
Hager,
Hainer,
Haines,
Harmer,
Harris,
Hartman,
Hatch,
Haugen,
Heiner,
Henderson, Ill.
Henderson, Iowa
Hepburn,
Hermann,
Hicks,
Hilborn,
Hines,
Hitt,
Hooker, N. Y.
Hopkins, Ill.
Hopkins, Pa.
Houk, Tenn.

Hudson,
Hulick,
Hull,
Johnson, Ind.
Johnson, N. Dak.
Joy,
Kem,
Kiefer,
Lacey,
Lawson,
Lefever,
Linton,
Loud,
Loudenslager,
Lucas,
Mahon,
Marsh,
Marvin, N. Y.
McCall,
McCleary, Minn.
McDowell,
McKeighan,
Meiklejohn,
Mercer,
Meyer,
Milliken,
Moon,
Morse,
Murray,
Mutchler,
Newlands,
Northway,
Payne,
Pence,
Perkins,
Phillips,
Pickler,
Post,
Powers,
Randall,
Ray,
Rayner,

Reed,
Reyburn,
Robinson, Pa.
Russell, Conn.
Scranton,
Shaw,
Sherman,
Sibley,
Sickles,
Simpson,
Sipe,
Smith,
Sperry,
Stephenson,
Stockdale,
Stone, C. W.
Stone, W. A.
Storer,
Strong,
Sweet,
Tawney,
Taylor, Tenn.
Thomas,
Updegraff,
Van Voorhis, N. Y.
Van Voorhis, Ohio
Wadsworth,
Walker,
Wanger,
Waugh,
Weaver,
Wheeler, Ill.
White,
Wilson, Ohio
Wilson, Wash.
Wolverton,
Woomer,
Wright, Mass.
Wright, Pa.

So the motion to recommit was not agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question now recurs on agreeing to the resolution reported by the Committee on Rules.

The question having been put,

The SPEAKER. The ayes seem to have it.

Mr. REED. I call for a division.

The question being taken, there were—ayes 126, noes 55.

Mr. REED. I call for tellers.

Mr. CATCHINGS. Let us have the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 184, nays 1, not voting 166; as follows:

YEAS—184.

Abbott,
Alderson,
Alexander,
Allen,
Arnold,
Bailey,
Baldwin,
Bankhead,
Bartlett,
Barwig,
Bell, Tex.
Berry,
Black, Ga.
Black, Ill.
Blanchard,
Bland,
Boatner,
Branch,
Brawley,
Breckinridge, Ark.
Breckinridge, Ky.
Bretz,
Brookshire,
Brown,
Bryan,
Bynum,
Cabaniss,
Caminetti,
Cannon, Cal.
Capehart,
Caruth,
Catchings,

Causey,
Clancy,
Clark, Mo.
Clarke, Ala.
Cobb, Mo.
Cockran,
Cockrell,
Coffee,
Compton,
Conn,
Coombs,
Cooper, Fla.
Cooper, Ind.
Cornish,
Covert,
Cox,
Crain,
Crawford,
Culbertson,
Cummings,
De Armond,
De Forest,
Denson,
Dinsmore,
Dockery,
Donovan,
Dunphy,
Durborow,
Edmunds,
Ellis, Ky.
English,
Enloe,

Epes,
Erdman,
Everett,
Fithian,
Forman,
Fyan,
Geissenhainer,
Goldzier,
Goodnight,
Gorman,
Grady,
Gresham,
Griffin,
Hall, Minn.
Hall, Mo.
Hammond,
Hare,
Harter,
Hayes,
Heard,
Henderson, N. C.
Hendrix,
Holman,
Hooker, Miss.
Houk, Ohio
Hunter,
Hutcheson,
Ikirt,
Johnson, Ohio
Jones,
Kribbs,
Kyle,

Lane,
Lapham,
Latimer,
Layton,
Lester,
Lisle,
Livingston,
Lockwood,
Lynch,
Maddox,
Maguire,
Mallory,
Marshall,
Martin, Ind.
McAleer,
McCreary, Ky.
McCulloch,
McDannold,
McDearmon,
McEttrick,
McGann,
McKalg,
McLaurin,
McMillin,
McNagny,
McRae,
Meredith,
Money,
Montgomery,
Morgan,
Moses,

So the resolution was adopted.

On motion of Mr. CATCHINGS, a motion to reconsider the last vote was laid on the table.

WYLIE BAILEY.

The SPEAKER laid before the House a communication from the Court of Claims, transmitting a copy of the findings of the court in the case Wylie Bailey against the United States; which was referred to the Committee on War Claims, and ordered to be printed.

DENNIS M'INTYRE.

The SPEAKER also laid before the House a letter from the Postmaster-General, transmitting the papers in the claim of Dennis McIntyre, postmaster at Mackinac Island, Mich., for losses sustained by burglary; which was referred to the Committee on Claims, and ordered to be printed.

SAMUEL CODAY, SR.

The SPEAKER also laid before the House a communication from the Court of Claims, transmitting a copy of the findings of the court in the case of Samuel Coday, sr., against the United States; which was referred to the Committee on War Claims, and ordered to be printed.

ADMINISTRATION OF JUSTICE IN THE ARMY.

The SPEAKER also laid before the House a letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a draft of a bill to promote the administration of justice in the Army, submitted by the Acting Judge-Advocate-General of the Army; which was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs, and ordered to be printed.

EMPLOYÉS OF WAR DEPARTMENT.

The SPEAKER also laid before the House a letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a list of the names of the clerks and other employés of the War Department and its offices from December, 1892, to November 30, 1893, and showing the time each was actually employed and the sums paid to each; which was referred to the Committee on Expenditures in the War Department, and ordered to be printed.

JOHN T. HEARD.

The SPEAKER also laid before the House a letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a copy of a report from the Commissioner of Indian Affairs, and accompanying papers, relative to the claim of JOHN T. HEARD for services rendered to Western Cherokee Indians in their claim against the United States; which was referred to the Committee on Claims, and ordered to be printed.

LAW AND JOURNALS OF NEW MEXICO LEGISLATURE.

The SPEAKER also laid before the House a letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting two copies of the laws and journals of the Thirteenth Legislative Assembly of the Territory of New Mexico; which was laid on the table, and ordered to be printed.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will direct, if there be no objection, that the books accompanying this paper be filed in the library of the Hall of the House.

There was no objection.

R. S. PERKINS.

The SPEAKER also laid before the House a communication from the Court of Claims, transmitting a copy of the findings of the court in the case of R. S. Perkins vs. The United States; which was referred to the Committee on War Claims.

FORD THEATER BUILDING.

The SPEAKER also laid before the House a letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting sundry resolutions on the condition of the Ford Theater building, and calling attention to the necessity of providing quarters for the Record and Pension Division of the War Department; which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

NEW YORK AND NEW JERSEY BRIDGE COMPANIES.

The SPEAKER also laid before the House the following concurrent resolution of the Senate:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That line 22, on page 2, of the bill (H. R. 3239), entitled "An act to authorize the New York and New Jersey Bridge Companies to construct and maintain a bridge across the Hudson River between New York City and the State of New Jersey," as enrolled by the Clerk of the House of Representatives, consisting of the following words, namely, "and, provided further, That nothing in this act," which words were included in said bill by error in the conference report, be, and the same are hereby, stricken from said bill, and said bill is directed to be enrolled without said line and words.

Mr. DINGLEY. Is this a correction simply in accordance with the agreement of the conference committee?

The SPEAKER. It seems that some surplus language found its way into the bill. The Clerk will report the words proposed to be stricken out.

The Clerk read as follows:

And provided further, That nothing in this act.

The SPEAKER. These words seem to have been erroneously inserted.

Mr. DINGLEY. On the part of the enrolling clerks?

The SPEAKER. The Chair thinks not. The resolution shows that it was by an error in the conference committee.

Without objection, the resolution will be concurred in.

There was no objection.

DISQUALIFICATION OF REGISTERS AND RECEIVERS.

The SPEAKER also laid before the House the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 2796) relating to the disqualification of registers and receivers of the United States land offices, and making provision in case of such disqualification.

The SPEAKER. This bill is reported from the Senate with an amendment.

Mr. MCRAE. I move that the House concur in the Senate amendment.

The SPEAKER. The amendment will be reported.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That the bill from the House of Representatives (H. R. 2796) entitled "An act relating to the disqualification of registers and receivers of the United States land offices, and making provision in case of such disqualifications" do pass with the following amendment:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

"That no register or receiver shall receive evidence in, hear or determine any cause pending in any district land office in which cause he is interested directly or indirectly, or has been of counsel, or where he is related to any of the parties in interest by consanguinity or affinity within the fourth degree, computing by the rules adopted by the common law.

"SEC. 2. That it shall be the duty of every register or receiver so disqualified to report the fact of his disqualification to the Commissioner of the General Land Office as soon as he shall ascertain it and before the hearing of such cause, who thereupon, with the approval of the Secretary of the Interior, shall designate some other register, receiver, or special agent of the Land Department to act in the place of the disqualified officer, and the same authority is conferred on the officer so designated which such register or receiver would otherwise have possessed as to any such cause."

Mr. MCRAE. I move that the House concur in the Senate amendment.

Mr. DINGLEY. I notice that this is an entirely new bill.

Will the gentleman please explain the changes made in the House bill?

Mr. MCRAE. While it would appear to be an entirely new bill, in fact it is not.

The only difference between the House bill and the Senate amendment is this: That in section 1 of the House bill it was provided that parties in interest might waive this disqualification. That is not allowed by the Senate amendment. The second section of the bill as it passed the House provided for the pay of the actual expense of the officer designed to act. The Senate have reported these changes in the shape of one amendment, I suppose for convenience; but this is the only difference between the two Houses on this question.

The question being taken on concurring in the Senate amendment, it was agreed to.

On motion of Mr. MCRAE, a motion to reconsider the last vote was laid on the table.

UMATILLA IRRIGATION COMPANY.

The SPEAKER also laid before the House the bill (S. 738) extending the time allowed the Umatilla Irrigation Company for the construction of its ditch across the Umatilla Indian Reservation, in the State of Oregon.

Mr. ELLIS of Oregon. I ask unanimous consent that the bill lie on the Speaker's table for the present, as a similar bill is about to be reported from the House committee.

There was no objection, and it was so ordered.

JOHN W. LEWIS.

The SPEAKER also laid before the House the bill (S. 71) for the relief of John W. Lewis, of Oregon; which was referred to the Committee on Claims.

DAVID B. GOTTWALS.

The SPEAKER also laid before the House the bill (S. 439) for the relief of David B. Gottwals.

Mr. HULL. Mr. Speaker, as this bill is simply to cure a defect in the title of property here, I will ask unanimous consent that it be now put upon its passage.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the bill, after which the Chair will ask if there be objection to its consideration.

The bill was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That all real estate lying in the District of Columbia, heretofore purchased by and conveyed to David B. Gottwals, of said District, prior to the passage of this act, be relieved and exempted from all forfeitures heretofore incurred by the operation of an act entitled "An act to restrict the ownership of real estate in the Territories to American citizens," approved March 3, 1857.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the gentleman's request for unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill?

There was no objection.

The bill was ordered to a third reading, and was accordingly read the third time, and passed.

JOHN W. LEWIS.

Mr. HERMANN. Mr. Speaker, just a moment ago a bill for the relief of John W. Lewis, of Oregon, was reported and no response made. I ask that it be permitted to lie upon the Speaker's table pending a report from the Committee on Claims on a similar bill.

The SPEAKER. It was referred to the Committee on Claims. Mr. HERMANN. I ask that it be allowed to lie upon the Speaker's table.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the title.

The Clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 71) for the relief of John W. Lewis, of Oregon.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Oregon [Mr. HERMANN] asks that this bill may lie upon the Speaker's table temporarily, stating that a similar bill is before the Committee on Claims. Without objection the bill will temporarily lie upon the Speaker's table.

There was no objection.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE.

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows: To Mr. BRICKNER, for ten days, on account of serious illness in his family.

To Mr. HATCH, indefinitely, on account of serious illness.

To Mr. HARRIS, for two weeks, on account of a death in his family.

To Mr. PENCE, indefinitely, on account of a death in his family.

To Mr. GRAHAM, indefinitely, on account of sickness.

To Mr. WOLVERTON, for this day, on account of sickness.

To Mr. CORNISH, until Wednesday, on account of important business.

To Mr. GARDNER, for four days, on account of important business.

To Mr. CADMUS, for one day, on account of important business.

To Mr. COBB of Alabama, for five days, on account of important business.

LEAVE TO WITHDRAW PAPERS.

On motion of Mr. MEREDITH, by unanimous consent, leave was granted to withdraw from the files of the House, without leaving copies, the papers in the case of Martha F. Dickinson, there being no adverse report thereon.

REPRINT OF A BILL.

The SPEAKER. A reprint is asked of the bill (H. R. 4568) to revive and amend an act to provide for the collection of abandoned property and the prevention of fraud in insurrectionary districts within the United States, and acts amendatory thereof. It is stated that the print of this bill has been exhausted. Without objection a reprint will be ordered.

There was no objection.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE.

A message from the Senate, by Mr. MARSHALL, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment the bill (H. R. 71) for the relief of purchasers of timber and stone lands under the act of June 3, 1878.

COMMITTEE REPORTS.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will call the committees for reports.

The committees were called for reports; when bills of the following titles were severally reported, read a first and second time, referred to the Calendars named below, and, with the accompanying documents, ordered to be printed.

RECOGNIZANCES, ETC.

By Mr. WILLIAM A. STONE: A bill (H. R. 4954) relative to recognizances, stipulations, bonds, and undertakings, and to allow certain corporations to be accepted as surety thereon—to the House Calendar.

CAPTURED AND ABANDONED PROPERTY.

By Mr. WILLIAM A. STONE: The views of the minority of the Judiciary Committee to accompany the report of the committee on the bill (H. R. 4568) to revive and amend an act to provide for the collection of abandoned property and the prevention of fraud in insurrectionary districts within the United States, and acts amendatory thereof—ordered to be printed.

LIFE-SAVING SERVICE.

Mr. CARUTH, from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, reported back favorably, with amendment, the bill (H. R. 2795) to amend section 5 of the act approved June 18, 1878, entitled "An act to organize the Life-Saving Service," which was referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, and, with accompanying report, ordered to be printed.

SWAMP-LAND GRANTS.

Mr. McRAE, from the Committee on the Public Lands, reported back favorably the bill (H. R. 118) to finally adjust the swamp-land grants, and for other purposes; which was referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, and, with the accompanying report, ordered to be printed.

RESERVATION OF CERTAIN LANDS IN OKLAHOMA TERRITORY.

Mr. McRAE, from the Committee on the Public Lands, reported the bill H. R. 5065 as a substitute for the bill H. R. 3610, to ratify the reservation of certain lands made for the benefit of Oklahoma Territory, and for other purposes; which was referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, and, with accompanying report, ordered to be printed.

The original bill (H. R. 3610) was ordered to lie on the table.

EXTENDING TIME FOR FINAL PROOF AND PAYMENT UNDER THE PUBLIC LAND LAWS.

Mr. WANGER, from the Committee on the Public Lands, reported back favorably, with amendment, the bill (H. R. 3458) extending the time for final proof and payment on lands claimed under the public land laws of the United States; which was referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, and, with the accompanying report, ordered to be printed.

The SPEAKER. This completes the call of committees for reports. In accordance with the rule just adopted, the House will now resolve itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 4864.

THE TARIFF.

The House accordingly resolved itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union (Mr. RICHARDSON of Tennessee in the chair).

The CHAIRMAN. The House is in Committee of the Whole for the purpose of considering the bill (H. R. 4864) raising revenue. The Clerk will report the title.

The Clerk read as follows:

A bill (H. R. 4864) to reduce taxation and to provide revenue for the Government, and for other purposes.

Mr. WILSON of West Virginia. I ask unanimous consent to dispense with the first reading of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from West Virginia asks unanimous consent to dispense with the first reading of the bill. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. REED. If the gentleman from West Virginia desires more than an hour, I hope the committee will grant him the time.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Maine asks unanimous consent that the gentleman from West Virginia be allowed to proceed without limit. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

[Mr. WILSON of West Virginia addressed the Committee. See Appendix.]

Mr. McMILLIN. Mr. Chairman, as the gentleman from West Virginia is very much fatigued by the exertion that is necessary in making so long an address, if he will yield I will move that the committee rise, which will give him an opportunity to speak under less adverse circumstances.

The motion was agreed to.

The committee accordingly rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. RICHARDSON of Tennessee, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that committee had had under consideration the bill (H. R. 4864) reducing taxation and to raise revenue, and had come to no resolution thereon.

The SPEAKER. The Sergeant-at-Arms is ready to make a report on the writ given him, the Chair understands.

The Sergeant-at-Arms [Mr. Snow] appeared at the bar of the House.

Mr. SNOW (the Sergeant-at-Arms). Mr. Speaker, by virtue of the writ of the House, directed to me, I have to submit a written report, which I hand to the Clerk.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will read the report of the Sergeant-at-Arms in execution of the writ of the House.

The report was read, as follows:

OFFICE OF SERGEANT-AT-ARMS,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, UNITED STATES,
Washington, D. C., January 8, 1894.

SIR: I, H. W. Snow, Sergeant-at-Arms of the House of Representatives of the United States, have executed the within writ by service on the following members, and by acceptance of service as per telegrams herewith, to wit:

Hon. J. B. Brown, Hon. J. A. Geissenhainer, Hon. J. Lefever, Hon. J. F. Magner, Hon. C. S. Randall, Hon. D. E. Sickles (sickness, asks to be excused), Hon. L. E. Barnes, Hon. B. H. Bunn (sickness, asks to be excused), Hon. L. W. Turpin, Hon. F. A. Woodard, Hon. J. J. Gardner, Hon. D. B. Heiner, Hon. F. G. Newlands, Hon. E. M. Wooster, Hon. R. A. Childs, Hon. G. W. Fithian, Hon. J. L. McLaurin, Hon. W. J. Talbot, Hon. J. S. Sherman, Hon. G. B. Fielder, Hon. C. A. Cadmus, Hon. J. Cornish, Hon. T. J. Strait, Hon. W. J. White, Hon. D. N. Lockwood, Hon. J. A. Pickler, Hon. R. C. Davey, Hon. Sias Adams, Hon. C. J. Boatner.

The following members have not been personally served, but I return herewith the list with the information that I have from each:

Hon. S. B. Cooper, telegram received that he is on his way to Washington; Hon. A. A. Taylor, telegram received that he is on his way to Washington; Hon. P. S. Post, telegram received that he is on his way to Washington; Hon. W. W. Grout, telegram received that he is on his way to Washington; Hon. J. A. Scranton, sick, and asks to be excused; Hon. J. J. Belden, on the way to Washington; Hon. J. E. Cobb, on the way to Washington; Hon. George W. Ray, on the way to Washington; Hon. J. A. Tawney, on the way to Washington; Hon. Adolph Meyer, on the way to Washington.

The following members have not been found:

Hon. H. Bingham, Hon. T. R. Stockdale, Hon. H. C. Loudenslager, Hon. J. M. Weaver.

All of which I return with the writ, as I am directed.

H. W. SNOW,
Sergeant-at-Arms, House of Representatives.

The SPEAKER of the House of Representatives.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Kansas [Mr. BRODERICK] this morning stated that he was present on Saturday on the roll call, and the correction was made in the Journal; therefore the gentleman's name will be stricken from the writ, without objection. It ought not to have been placed there.

The Chair desires to state as to one or two of these gentlemen, that perhaps the Chair has been at fault. The gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. CORNISH] on Friday evening requested that the Chair present an application for a leave of absence for him until Monday. It escaped the memory of the Chair entirely. It was not the fault of the gentleman from New Jersey, but the fault of the Chair. The gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. GEISSENHAINER] telegraphed for a leave to attend the funeral of a friend, and that was not presented to the House through the fault of the Chair. It was an oversight.

The gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. BOATNER], who is not now in the House, being too unwell to remain, requested the Chair to state that he was absent by leave of the House, and as soon as he heard of the revocation of the leaves by the House, last Thursday or Friday, whenever it was, he started back. He

has gone out of the House now because he was too unwell to remain.

Mr. McMILLIN. I make the point of order that under the rule he would be excusable; he would have the right to come in.

Mr. HOPKINS of Illinois. Now, I insist that, inasmuch as he is under the writ, does not that require some action on the part of the House?

Mr. CATCHINGS. I was about to make a motion.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. BOATNER] was here, and requested that the Chair make the statement that he was too unwell to remain.

Mr. CATCHINGS. The object of the resolution having been accomplished, if it is not objectionable I will move that all gentlemen named by the report of the Sergeant-at-Arms be discharged from custody and excused.

The SPEAKER. If there be no objection that order can be made. Without objection that order will be made. [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. McMILLIN. I move that the House adjourn.

Mr. ALLEN. Mr. Speaker, I simply wish to state that I have seen it in several newspapers that I was one of the delinquents. I was absent with the leave of the House in the first place, and I was absent at home, detained by sickness in my family. As soon as I could leave the sick bed in my family I came to Washington.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will state to the gentleman from Mississippi that the Journal discloses the fact that the gentleman had leave of absence on account of sickness in his family. In first making out the list of absentees that excuse was not discovered, but before the writ was issued it was discovered and the gentleman's name was not included.

Mr. TALBERT of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I rise to a question of privilege.

Mr. McMILLIN. Before that is entertained I desire to withdraw the motion to adjourn, as I understand there are several gentlemen who desire to speak to-night under the order made.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Tennessee withdraws the motion to adjourn.

Mr. TALBERT of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, as I see that my name has been published in several papers among the names of members absent without leave, I desire to state that in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of December 21, page 453, there appears an announcement that I was excused indefinitely on account of sickness. Being excused, I left Washington before the House took the holiday recess and went home. I returned as soon as my condition would permit, and when I received the notification of the Sergeant-at-Arms I was already on my way back to this city. I want to state further, that during the extra session I came here on the 7th day of August and did not miss a single roll call or a single vote during the whole of that session.

After the adjournment I went home and returned on the first day of the regular session, and did not miss a single vote or a single roll call until the day before the House took a recess for the holidays, when, as I have already stated, having obtained indefinite leave of absence on account of sickness, I went home and returned as soon as I was able. Let me add that I have never absented myself or refused to vote for the purpose of breaking a quorum, that I am here to do all I can to help the Democratic party to redeem the pledges they have made to the people, and that I object to being published as an absentee when in fact I was absent by leave of the House on account of sickness.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will state to the gentleman from South Carolina that while his statement as to his leave of absence is correct, yet on last Thursday all leaves of absence were revoked by the House.

Mr. TALBERT of South Carolina. I telegraphed to my colleague [Mr. LATIMER] to have my leave of absence extended, and he put a written request to that effect upon the desk, but for some reason it was not presented.

COMMITTEE APPOINTMENTS.

The SPEAKER announced the following appointments:

Mr. HOUK of Ohio as a member of the Committee on the Election of President, Vice-President, and Representatives in Congress.

Mr. JONES of Virginia as a member of the Committee on Elections.

ORDER OF BUSINESS.

The SPEAKER. The order adopted to-day provides that at half past 5 o'clock the House shall take a recess until 8 p. m., the evening session to be devoted to debate only upon the pending bill; and also that during the operation of the order the House shall meet daily at 11 a. m. The Chair understands that the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. WILSON] has not concluded his remarks, and calls the attention of members to the fact that

the House will meet to-morrow at 11 o'clock, when the gentleman from West Virginia will continue his speech.

Mr. BURROWS. The gentleman from West Virginia, then, will not proceed this evening?

The SPEAKER. Not this evening. The Chair is informed by the Chairman of the Committee of the Whole that arrangements have been made for certain other gentlemen to speak at the evening session.

Mr. BURROWS. The evening session is for debate only?

The SPEAKER. For debate only upon the pending bill; and if there be no objection, instead of waiting until half past 5, the Chair will now declare the House in recess until 8 o'clock p. m.

There was no objection, and the House accordingly (at 5 o'clock) took a recess until 8 p. m.

EVENING SESSION.

The House reassembled at 8 p. m., the Speaker in the chair.

THE TARIFF.

The SPEAKER. The House is in session for debate only on the bill the title of which will be read.

The Clerk read the title, as follows:

A bill (H. R. 4864) to reduce taxation, to provide revenue for the Government, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER. The House will resolve itself into Committee of the Whole for the consideration of this bill, and the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. RICHARDSON] will take the chair.

The House accordingly resolved itself into Committee of the Whole, Mr. RICHARDSON of Tennessee in the chair.

Mr. LANE. Mr. Chairman, more than a year ago the Democratic party in its national platform, at Chicago, made the following declaration, which I select as my text on the present occasion. It reads as follows:

We denounce Republican protection as a fraud, a robbery of the great majority of the American people for the benefit of the few. We declare it to be a fundamental principle of the Democratic party that the Federal Government has no constitutional power to impose and collect tariff duties except for the purpose of revenue only, and we demand that the collection of such taxes shall be limited to the necessities of the Government when honestly and economically administered. We denounce the McKinley tariff law enacted by the Fifty-first Congress as the culminating atrocity of class legislation. We indorse the effort made by the Democrats of the present Congress to modify its most oppressive features in the direction of free raw materials and cheaper manufactured goods that enter into general consumption, and we promise its repeal as one of the beneficent results that will follow the action of the people in intrusting power to the Democratic party.

Since the McKinley tariff went into operation there have been ten reductions of the wages of laboring men to one increase. We deny that there has been any increase of prosperity to the country since the tariff went into operation, and we point to the dullness and distress, the wage reductions and strikes in the iron trade, as positive evidence that no such prosperity has resulted from the McKinley act. We call attention of thoughtful Americans to the fact that after thirty years of restrictive taxes against the importation of foreign wealth in exchange for our agricultural surplus the homes of the farmers of the country have become burdened with real-estate mortgage debt of over \$2,500,000,000, exclusive of all other forms of indebtedness. That in one of the chief agricultural States of the West there appears a real-estate mortgage debt averaging \$165 per capita of the total population, and that similar conditions and tendencies are shown to exist in other agricultural exporting States. We denounce a policy which fosters no industry so much as it does that of the sheriff.

In one of the most memorable campaigns ever conducted in this country, after a full and exhaustive discussion last fall a year ago, the foregoing sentiment and declaration of principles were indorsed by 5,554,267 votes of American freemen, and the present Administration went into power pledged to this doctrine. This Congress is now assembled for the purpose of crystallizing this idea into law and to change a system that has for nearly thirty years robbed the masses of the American people for the benefit of the classes. The language used in the platform is plain and unambiguous, and the people understood the effect of their action. The five million and a half of voters who cast their ballots for the Democratic party solemnly placed themselves on record in favor of the abandonment of this false doctrine of protection.

And now, Mr. Chairman, it seems almost useless to consume the time of the House in going over the ground again. But the report of the minority of the Committee on Ways and Means on the bill under consideration is filed, as it were, in the nature of a motion for a new trial, and with the usual audacity of error insists that the American people were mistaken in their action on the great question and that the proposition be resubmitted to them for their further consideration. The momentous issue may safely be intrusted in their hands. We read in Holy Writ that "The dog turned to his own vomit again, and the sow that was washed to her wallowing in the mire," but it can not be presumed that a people who have just beheld the "promised land" and the dawn of industrial liberty will again return to Egyptian bondage, "to make bricks even without straw" for the millions of this country. Republican protection is the great fraud of this or any other age and the most pronounced misnomer of all languages.

It is a living falsehood now known and read by all intelligent laborers in this country from center to circumference. Triumphant wrong has never yet challenged the attention of mankind without awakening a spirit that ultimately proved unconquerable. Republican protection, which makes wrong a virtue and proclaims iniquity as its highest and noblest aspiration, has deliberately led to its own destruction. The object and purpose of all protective tariffs is the taxation of one man for the benefit of another. Every intelligent voter now knows that this is robbery, and why not call it robbery as is done in the platform? This robbery is defended by its friends by the impudent statement that it is beneficial to all, in this: that it raises the wages of labor; that it preserves the home market to the farmers; that it rests only on the foreigner; that it makes things cheap, and by the worse than infamous blasphemy, that but for this protective system we would have no prosperity or happiness in this country. Every voter knows that this is false, and at the election in 1892 more than 5,000,000 of votes were so recorded with the names and residence of the electors. This falsehood must be battered down and its shameful injustice made known to the world.

Under the tariff of 1883 the average rate was 47 per cent on all imported goods, but in 1890, a year of profound peace, and no increased demand for a national increase of revenue, by the McKinley bill the average duty was raised to 62 per cent, and on some articles being entirely prohibitory. The total value of imports into this country for the year 1892 was \$827,402,462. Of this amount \$396,402,804 was dutiable, and the balance, \$457,999,658, was on the free list. The amount of customs duty collected for the year 1892 was \$177,452,964.15, and from internal revenue the amount collected was \$153,971,072.52. The amount of exports from this country in 1893 was \$1,015,732,011, of which nearly 80 per cent was farm products. The amount of duty collected in 1893 was \$203,355,016.73, and for internal revenue \$161,027,623.93. Of this vast sum of \$203,355,016.73, the farmers and laborers paid the greater part as the necessities of life, and the articles used by the poor are to-day taxed nearly double as much as luxuries and articles used by the rich.

The McKinley bill was passed as claimed by its authors to protect the American people from the importation of the cheap pauper manufactured goods of foreign nations. For this ostensible purpose, therefore, the American people were compelled to pay the import duty which I have mentioned of \$203,355,016.73. This vast sum was paid by the American people. It may at first have been paid by the importers, but it was finally paid by the consumers, and in the final adjustment of accounts it was paid by the farmers and laborers of this country, for in the end labor pays all taxes. Nearly all this vast sum was a protective tax, and the tax on articles consumed by the poor was nearly double the tax on articles used by the rich. In framing the McKinley bill the duty was laid on such articles as could be or were manufactured in this country, and such as could not be placed on the free list, and in the case of sugar a bounty was given to the producers of domestic sugar. So I am warranted in the statement that this gigantic sum of \$203,355,016.73 was levied for the purpose of protection—the revenue being simply an incident.

The purpose and effect of all protective tariffs is to raise the price of goods imported so that they can not be sold in competition with domestic manufactured articles. A tariff is laid for revenue or protection, or it may be for both. A revenue tariff would be a just tariff if luxuries were taxed higher than the necessities of life for the reason that the money would go into the public Treasury to pay the expenses of the Government, and it is supported by constitutional authority. A tariff for protection is laid upon the people for the benefit of a few and is without constitutional authority and therefore void, as there is no law to support it; hence it is robbery plain and simple. A protective tax is unjust because it is paid by the people, not for a public purpose, not to support the Government or to pay its debts, but to enrich the manufacturers.

This was the crime that brought about the Reign of Terror in France, more than a hundred years ago, when French manufacturers and aristocracy scoffed at all warnings and drank, laughed, danced, and collected their robber tariff from the people until public indignation gathered like a volcano, and, finally bursting forth, setting the guillotine at work upon the necks of the nobility. It was this nefarious protective policy that caused the prayer of millions in England to ascend to Heaven in vain for so many years for daily bread, and relief only came when the torch of the mob lit up the lurid sky and the cry of the multitude shook the very foundation of the House of Parliament itself, and it was then, and not till then, that Sir Robert Peel determined to give England the cheap loaf, which set at naught the crowning glory of his whole public career. As a matter of course, it is claimed by the tariff robbers that they share their plunder with the farmers and

laborers of this country, but that falsehood has been exploded a thousand times, and still the assertion is renewed.

The same claim was made in England and France when successful tariff robbery was carried on for generations, but the people finally unmasked the villainy and caused the oppressors to apologize for their oppressions.

This protective tariff is the same everywhere the world over. There is but one fact about protection, and that fact is immutable and certain, and it is that this form of protection is robbery, injustice, and oppression.

The root of the protective abomination is the taxation of the one man for the benefit of another, and always the taxation of the poor for the benefit of the rich. Taxation reaches down to the base of society, and in the end labor pays all. The protective tariff stands as the most abhorrent work of class legislation, and sooner or later the just sense of all nations must revolt against it.

The robber tariff lives on lies and fattens on falsehood. It justifies plunder and stigmatizes the people who dare to enter a protest against it as free traders and enemies of free government. On its lying tongue words are made to change their meaning, and it has made right a wrong and has branded truth as a falsehood. Under its false assumption of protection it has driven hundreds to starvation and thousands of honest laboring men to the poorhouse. Its teachings, that a people can become rich by taxing themselves, are dishonest and pernicious. It is a justification to every thief, robber, burglar, bandit, and freebooter in the country. If the tariff law justifies the rich in robbing the farmer, why not also justify the poor in robbing the rich.

What a dreadful example this iniquitous protective system sets our young and rising generation. It teaches that it is better to be dishonest so you are rich than to be honest and poor. It sets aside the teachings of the fathers of the Republic, that exact justice was always the best hope of mankind. It sets aside the principle that labor alone produces wealth, and teaches men to come to Congress, as they have done, to secure the passage of a law by which they secure a license to rob their neighbors.

The McKinley bill was so framed. The ready-made clothing business asked for a tax, and they got what they asked, from 100 to 300 per cent. The iron industry asked for a tax, and it was given, from 50 to 75 per cent; and so with the other industries of the country. They made their own demand on Congress and it was granted by McKinley and his cohorts. This is proven by the report of the hearings before the Ways and Means Committee and a comparison of the McKinley bill. This was all explained in the debate on the McKinley bill by gentlemen who were then of the minority of the Committee of Ways and Means, and I see it referred to now in the report of the majority on the bill under discussion. It was a deliberate plan to allow the manufacturers to rob the people.

When Caesar led his victorious army across the Rubicon and finally destroyed the liberties of his country, in order to secure the present and future support of his leading generals he divided a part of the plunder of war among them. And so the Republican party, in order to secure the support of millionaire manufacturers of this country in each returning election and to obtain the money to corrupt the voters of the country gave them permission to write the McKinley bill that authorized them to rob the farmers and laborers of this country in a single year of more than a billion of dollars—more than was ever divided among any gang of thieves or robbers since the dawn of creation. There may be some legal differences between Caesarism and McKinleyism, but morally there is none at all. A tariff for protection has always been a robber system. It derives its name from the pirate Tarifa and a town and castle called after him located at the Strait of Gibraltar, where the Moorish pirates for a number of years in the eight centuries of the Mohammedan sway in Spain exacted tribute from every vessel entering or leaving the Mediterranean.

A certain part of the value of every cargo was taken by the robbers (history does not inform us, however, whether the robbery was ad valorem or specific), but the crime was tamely submitted to by the nations of Europe rather than be at the trouble and expense of hanging the tariff robbers. History, however, informs us that the owners of the cargoes of the ships so robbed by tariff thieves lost nothing by the robbery, for they simply added the value of the stolen goods to the value of the remainder, and the consumer in purchasing the remaining goods paid the value of the articles stolen as well as those he received. It was then, as it is to-day, the consumer paid the tariff as well as the price of the goods.

It may not be just to hold the word tariff responsible for its antecedents, and after all there may be nothing in a name. "That which we call a rose by any other name would smell as sweet," but in this case the name has adhered to the thing with great

pertinacity if there is no kinship between them. Whatever else may be said of the tariff it is true to its history in one sense at least, that it always takes, but never gives; it always levies, but never contributes. It had its origin in crime, and it is a crime to-day. Any and every private interest in a public tax is a crime against liberty and against organized society. All of the collateral tariff infamies hang upon this one offense. Put an end to this feature of it and all danger will fade away, and it will then deprive no honest man unlawfully of anything that belongs to him.

The whole protection system is but a monstrous bribe. It is a bribe paid to Massachusetts and Pennsylvania for their support of the Republican party, the money to pay the bribe being stolen from the people of the West and South. The money is used to buy corporations, individuals, and the entire votes of a State. The system begins with bribery and is sustained by it, and its most notable triumphs are won by the use of money wrung from honest labor. In the language of the Chicago platform, "the McKinley bill is the culminating atrocity of class legislation and should be repealed."

A protective tariff as manifested in McKinleyism is the direst curse that ever damned the American people. It violates international law, human and divine, by prohibiting trade among the families of men, thus denying the fatherhood of God and the brotherhood of man. It has driven industry to want, beggary, and starvation; it has forced virtue dressed in rags to insanity; it has driven mothers with their infants at their breasts from the cottage hearth starving into the winter's blast and denied to the husband and father work necessary to support his family; it has made thousands of millionaires and millions of tramps—both a curse to society; it has filled prisons with criminals and the churches with hypocrites; it has driven millions of honest laborers to the soup houses to be fed in the name of charity with the products of their own labor, out of which they were robbed; it makes merchandise of men, slaves of women, beggars of children, and outcasts of all, and then retains power by bribery and fraud. It is the author of all the sweating systems in the world, where women and children sweat blood to be coined into money to satisfy the greed of Mammon, and it forges the promise of God into a lie, and we do see the seed of the righteous "begging bread," the divine promise to the contrary notwithstanding.

Mr. Chairman, "this is the indictment which was presented against the Republican party by the grand jury of the country and upon which it has been tried and convicted."

The first point made is that there is

NO CONSTITUTIONAL POWER TO IMPOSE A PROTECTIVE TARIFF.

This proposition is asserted in our platform. The Constitution reads as follows:

SEC. 8. The Congress shall have 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.

In the interpretation of this clause of the Constitution the emphases are to be placed on the words "to pay the debts," and in this way to provide for the common defense and general welfare. If the section should receive any other interpretation than this it would not be a government of limited powers, but Congress would have unlimited power to levy a tax for anything that Congress might consider for the general welfare; which is not true.

The power of taxation is the greatest power exercised by any government; for the power to tax is the power to destroy. Every government must have the power of taxation, for without that power it can not exist. But in all free governments there must be a limit on the taxing power. If not it would simply be a monarchy. A tariff is a tax and therefore comes within the meaning of the Constitution mentioned. What, then, are taxes? Taxes are defined to be "the enforced proportional contribution from persons and property levied by the State by virtue of its sovereignty for support of government and for all public needs." A tax can only be levied for public purposes. A protective tariff being for the benefit of a certain industry which is private, is not within the meaning of the law and is therefore null and void. This being mainly a legal question, I wish to call the attention of the House to the law on this point as announced by the writers on elementary law as well as the adjudication of the courts of last resort in this country, State and national. Burroughs on Taxation, on page 6, states the law to be "that taxes can only be imposed for a public purpose; they can not be imposed for a private purpose."

Cooley on Taxation, page 55, states the law to be as follows:

It is the first requisite of lawful taxation that the purpose for which it is laid shall be a public purpose.

The same author, on page 126 of his book, says:

However important it may be to the community that industrial citizens should prosper in their industrial enterprises, it is not the business of gov-

ernment to aid them with its means. Enlightened states, while giving all necessary protection to their citizens, will leave everyone to depend for his success and prosperity in business on his own exertions, in the belief that by doing so his own industry will be more certainly enlisted, and his prosperity and happiness more probably secured.

It may therefore be safely asserted that taxation for the purpose of raising money from the public to be given or even loaned to private parties in order that they may use it in their individual business enterprises, is not recognized as an employment of the power for a public use. In contemplation of law it would be taking the common property of the whole community and handing it over to private parties for their private gain and consequently unlawful. Any incidental benefits to the public that might flow from it would not support it as legitimate taxation.

Hilliard on Taxation, page 12, affirms the law to be as follows:

Taxation is allowable only for public purposes.

The text-books all read one way, and I will now call your attention to the adjudication of the courts.

I find in a note to volume 16, American States Reports, a very valuable compilation of the authorities on this point, which has greatly aided me and from which I have selected most of the following cases, and I will now read them to the House. In 58 California Reports, 639, the court says:

To promote a public purpose by a tax levy upon the property in the State is within the power of the Legislature; but the Legislature has no power to impose taxes for the benefit of individuals connected with a private enterprise, even though the private enterprise might benefit the local public in a remote or collateral way.

In 27 Iowa Reports, 46, the supreme court of that State say:

Taxes are burdens or charges imposed by the Legislature upon persons or property to raise money for public purposes or to accomplish some governmental end. A tax for a private purpose is a solecism in language.

In 9 Kansas Reports, 689, it is said:

Taxation to aid ordinary manufactures or the establishment of enterprise, is a thing until recently quite unheard of, and the power must be denied to exist unless all limits to the appropriation of private property and to the power to tax be disregarded.

The supreme court of Iowa has held that no authority or even dictum can be found which asserts that there can be any legitimate taxation, where the money to be raised does not go into the public treasury, and that the uniform weight of public authority is that taxes are to be imposed for the use of the people and not for the benefit of individuals.

In 20 Michigan Reports, 474, the supreme court of that State say in regard to taxation:

It must be imposed for a public, not for a mere private purpose. Taxation is a mode of raising revenue for public purposes only, and when it is prostituted to objects in no way connected with public interest or welfare it ceases to be taxation and becomes public plunder.

The supreme court of Maine has held:

No public exigency can require private spoliation for the private benefit of favored individuals.

It is held in 60 Maine Reports, 124, that the Legislature of the State has no power to pass a law to authorize a town to raise money either by taxation or issuing its bonds and loan the same to private parties to enable them to erect mills and manufactories in such town, thereby to increase its wealth and business as well as the accommodation of its inhabitants. Such an object is entirely a private one and in no sense entitled to be called a public use of such a character as to justify the imposition of taxes upon the inhabitants and property of a town by a vote of the majority of such town.

The court say in the closing part of the opinion in this case:

To take directly or indirectly the property of individuals to loan to others for the purpose of private gain and speculation against the consent of those whose money is thus loaned would be to withdraw it from the protection of the constitution and submit it to the will of an irresponsible majority. It would be the robbery and spoliation of those whose estate is thus confiscated. No surer or more effectual method could be devised to deter from accumulation, to diminish capital, to render property insecure, and thus to paralyze industry.

The Legislature of Massachusetts passed a statute to authorize the city of Boston to issue bonds to the amount of \$20,000,000 to be loaned to the owners of land upon which buildings were destroyed by fire. Commissioners were appointed to manage the loan and took a first mortgage upon the land at less than three-fourths its value to secure the payment of the money with interest.

The supreme judicial court of that State in 111 Massachusetts, 454, unanimously held that the statute was null and void and perpetually enjoined all proceeding to collect taxes to pay such bonds.

A similar statute was passed by the Legislature of West Virginia authorizing the city of Wheeling to issue bonds and loan the money for the purpose of encouraging the establishment of manufacturing interests, and to take bonds and mortgages upon property to secure its payment, and still the Supreme Court of the United States, in 106 United States Reports, held that such a statute was utterly void. The Supreme Court say in that case:

Taxation to pay the bonds in question is not taxation for a public object. It is taxation which taxes the private property of one person for the private use of another.

In 20 Michigan, 452, the supreme court of that State say:

It is not in the power of the State, in my opinion, under the name of a bounty or under any other cover or subterfuge, to furnish the capital to set private parties up in any kind of business or to subsidize their business after they entered upon it. A bounty law of which this is the real nature is void, whatever may be the pretense on which it may be enacted.

In 21 Pennsylvania State Reports, 168, the supreme court of that State say:

Taxation is a mode of raising revenue for public purposes; when it is prostituted to objects in no way connected with the public it ceases to be taxation and becomes plunder.

In 24 Wisconsin Reports, 356, the supreme court of that State say in regard to taxation:

It is conceded by all that a tax must be for a public and not for a private purpose. If, therefore, the Legislature attempts to take money from the people by legal compulsion for merely private purposes, that is not a tax according to the essential meaning of the word, and, therefore, such a law is not, strictly speaking, unconstitutional as being prohibited by any positive provision of the Constitution, but is void for the reason that it is beyond the scope of legislation.

The Legislature of the State of Kansas passed a law in 1872 authorizing the city of Topeka, in order to develop and improve said city, to appropriate from its general funds, or by the issuance of bonds of said city to such an amount as the city council might determine. The city issued bonds to a certain corporation to the amount of \$100,000 to enable the corporation to establish a manufactory of iron bridges in that city. In 20 Wallace, 664, the Supreme Court of the United States say of this case in refusing to allow said bonds to be paid by taxation from the property of the people of that city:

Of all powers conferred on the Government that of taxation is most liable to abuse. This power can as readily be employed against one class of individuals and in favor of another, so as to ruin the one class and give unlimited wealth and prosperity to the other, if there are no implied limitations of the use for which the power may be exercised. To lay with one hand the power of the Government on the property of the citizen and with the other bestow it upon favored individuals to aid private enterprises and build up private fortunes is none the less robbery because it is done under the forms of law and is called taxation. This is not legislation; it is a decree under legislative forms. Nor is it taxation. Beyond a cavil there can be no lawful taxation which is not laid for public purposes.

Mr. Chairman, many more decisions to the same effect could be cited, but I deem it unnecessary. In my examination of this question in the law library I found that the supreme court of nearly every State in this Union has passed on this question, and the consensus of judicial opinion is to the effect that there is no power under the Constitution, State or national, that authorizes a tax to be levied to build up private industries. I wish to call the attention of the House to another fact in connection with these decisions—that is, that a great many of these decisions were written by Republican judges who vote the Republican ticket and advocate a protective tariff on the stump. And yet when the question comes before them as to whether the State or nation can constitutionally levy a protective tariff or tax, under their oath of office and confronted with the crime of perjury they hold that it can not be done. Gentlemen, if an examination of the authorities I have cited does not convince you that a protective tariff is unconstitutional, then you are to be likened to the five brothers mentioned in the Scriptures, of whom Abraham said, "If they hear not Moses and the prophets, neither will they be persuaded though one rose from the dead."

There can be no legal doubt that under our Constitution a tax can not be levied on the people solely for the purpose of protection, and it should ever remain so. That power was not granted by the Constitution by the American people when the Government was formed nor has it been granted since. Such a law can be legally passed in England or Germany where they have no written constitution, but not in this country where our form of Government is one of limited powers. But for the sake of the argument grant the power to pass such a law; still it would be iniquitous and unjust, for it would be the right to tax one man for the benefit of another. If all the people are benefited alike then there is no benefit to any one.

If the sugar-raiser of Louisiana, Vermont, and Kansas should have a bounty from the public Treasury for the amount of sugar produced by them, then by parity of reason the corn-grower of Illinois, Iowa, and Indiana should have a bounty on corn. If the ocean carrying trade should be subsidized, then railroads and other inland modes of transportation should be subsidized. Why should one man in one trade be protected by a tariff tax for his encouragement and not another man in another occupation? Why should one man be compelled to pay a bounty to his neighbors when his neighbors pay no bounty to him? And if neighbors pay equal bounty to each other, where is the benefit?

It is therefore perfectly obvious that a tax to be protective must be unjust, for it must take from one class and give to another without receiving anything in return; that is what protection means and that is why it is called robbery. No man's rights can be based on another man's injury. If you take money from one man by law without his consent and give it to another

you are certainly doing the first one an injury. Law can not make wrong right nor black white; you may pass a statute to that effect, but the ethical principle implanted in every honest human breast would revolt against it.

Protection contravenes the adage of the fathers of the Republic—that of "equal and exact justice to all and special privileges to none." It promises large rewards to labor but it never fulfills the contract; it teaches that our farmers are the proper objects to be plundered if it can be done under the forms and sanction of law. It makes its levy upon the innocent and the unsuspecting without their knowledge and then divides it among the cunning and the unscrupulous. Every great fortune it creates results from the legal oppression of the poor. Protection draws its riches from the moans of the widow, the tears of the orphan, and the sweating-room of oppression. It is a financial-monstrosity.

We build railroads, construct ships, open harbors, span rivers, tunnel mountains, appropriate millions for the improvement of harbors, construct ocean steamers, all for the benefit of free commerce in order to secure our part of the trade of the world, and then McKinleyism builds a Chinese wall around the country 62 feet high, and declares it would be a benefit to the American people if the Atlantic Ocean were "a sea of fire," forgetting that commerce is the golden girdle that binds the world together, and that we are not only citizens of the Republic, but of the world as well, and that even the love of country should not be greater than the love of mankind, and that all politics that war against the law of God are hurtful to the race. Restriction belongs to the past and is contrary to the spirit of freedom.

Freedom is our greatest glory. Our soil is free, our thought is free, our ballot is free, our speech is free, our press is free, our laboring men should be free; and I sincerely hope that when the measure under consideration is enacted into law it will secure larger liberty to the toiling millions of the world. That is what the election in 1892 meant, the liberty of trade, industrial and personal liberty. It was the mightiest revolution ever enacted in this country, and a solemn protest against the robbery of taxation. The whole system stood on two colossal falsehoods, the one that it would secure "better wages" to labor, and the other that it would secure the "home market" to the American farmer. Mr. Speaker, I desire briefly to examine these two propositions.

THE LABORING MAN AND THE PROTECTIVE TARIFF.

The Democratic platform that I have read to the House declares "that since the McKinley bill became a law there has been ten reductions in the wages of labor to where there has been one increase." I maintain the truth of this proposition, and I am prepared to prove and maintain that a protective tariff never raised the wages of labor in this or any other country in the world. It was not intended by its authors that it should have that effect, and in the very nature of things it could not accomplish that end. The manufacturers of this country received the benefit of the protective tariff. I will grant that it enabled them to pay better wages to their laborers if they saw proper, but the question is, Did they do so? I insist they did not. The Carnegies, Rockwells, Scotts, and other tariff barons are able to pay their laborers \$20 per day and still have sufficient left to support themselves and their families in luxury and idleness if they should live to the age of Methuselah. Protected manufacturers never showed any disposition to share their "bonus" with their workmen except upon compulsion.

But what did these protected millionaire capitalists pay their laborers? Simply the ordinary market wages. I am willing to admit that wages are higher in America than they are in Europe, but this is not due to the protective tariff. Wages were higher in this country than in Europe before McKinleyism was in swaddling clothes. The high wages in this country, if they may be called such, are due to other causes than a restrictive tariff. The labor unions and Knights of Labor have done more to secure reasonable wages for laboring men than all the tariff laws passed by the Republican party. There are, also, many other reasons why wages should be higher in this country than across the waters in foreign lands. England has a population of 400 to the square mile, and the average wages paid were 97 cents per day.

New England has a population of 210 to the square mile, and the average wages paid here were 1.02 per day. 5 cents more than in England. The State of Ohio has a population of 80 to the square mile and their wages average about \$1.80. But while the wages are nominally 5 cents per day higher in Massachusetts than they are in England, yet this is more apparent than real when you take into account the purchasing power of money in that State and England.

I insist that a protective tariff always reduces the wages of labor, because it increases the price of consumption. When a protective tax is placed on anything coming into this country

from abroad, the price of that article to the consumer is increased to the amount of such tax.

If a man's clothing costs him more because of a restrictive tariff, then his wages will not purchase as much clothing. If the tariff were on labor, then the wages of labor would raise in accordance with the same rule that applies to goods; but the tariff is not on the labor (that is on the free list) but on the products of labor, which is entirely a different thing. If, however, the protective tariff should raise the price of wages at all, then it could only apply to those engaged in the protected industries, which only amount to less than 9 per cent of our laboring population. I wish to mention another fact that conclusively proves that a protective tariff does not increase the wages of the laborer, and that is that laborers in unprotective industries are as well paid off, if not better, than those in the protective industries. If a protective tariff raises the price of wages, then the wages in Germany and France should be higher than in free-trade England, which is not the fact.

There is a greater difference in wages of labor in the different States of the Union than there is between this country and Europe. Colorado pays wages three times as high as North Carolina, Dakota twice as high as Alabama, California nearly twice as high as Massachusetts, and Illinois higher than Virginia. At least this was the condition of things before the recent labor troubles in the West.

But when we make a final analysis of wages we find that it is not the dollars received, but the food and clothing that the money will buy. Profit is not the money handled, but the sum saved at the end of each year. But to prove conclusively, and beyond cavil, that the laboring man does not get the benefit of the protective tariff I will state the fact that the average labor cost of production in America in all the protected industries is but 18 per cent, or placed by the highest statistician at 21 per cent, and the average duty by the McKinley bill is over 50 per cent.

Now, who gets the tariff? The manufacturers, of course. If the laborers got it why should there now be 3,000,000 laborers out of employment willing to labor but no work to do? and in a country where there is more than sufficient for all, they are compelled to beg from place to place for their daily bread.

For the last twenty years the American people have been outrageously taxed "for the benefit of the laboring man." Why, then, manufacturers in robes and laborers in rags, millionaires and paupers? The poor are the laborers for whom these tariff laws were passed, for whose benefit the people have been taxed over a billion of dollars annually, yet organized cunning despoiled labor of it all.

When the McKinley bill was under consideration in this House Carnegie & Co. secured an increase of protection for their business (of course for the benefit of the laboring man, as is usual in such cases), but after the McKinley tariff went into effect Carnegie & Co. reduced the wages of their laborers; and in order to make the reduction more effectual they called in the Pinkerton thugs and knaves to shoot down the honest labor off of which they had grown rich. And finally the Republican recipe for all labor troubles, the militia, was called in, and organized labor at Homestead was again forced under the galling yoke of slavery. Then a committee of this House was sent to Homestead to investigate the question of wages by that highly protected institution which every man, woman, and child in the United States was taxed to support. And when the committee asked for information as to the manner in which these taxes were used the committee was informed that it was a private affair.

Not only did Carnegie & Co. reduce the price of wages in their factories, but since the passage of the McKinley tariff the wages of labor were reduced in several thousand other protected industries. My colleague and seat mate from New York [Mr. WARNER] in the last Congress furnished a list of the reduction of wages in the protected industries, which covers several pages of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. There is no doubt about the fact that the Chicago platform is correct in its statement that "since the passage of the McKinley bill there have been ten reductions in the wages of labor to where there has been one increase." The following statement, which I take from the Philadelphia Press of December 26, the very citadel of protection, as uttered by the General Master Workman of the Knights of Labor, reads that—

Everywhere is starvation and death, while corporate greed and avaricious money lords apply the arrogant lash with relentless fury, and Congress, like a wooden god, looks down in silent contempt on the miseries of the most patriotic and industrious people the world ever knew. With these conditions confronting the people everywhere, if we can not permeate society with a healthy public opinion on the subject of labor and force the adoption of our principles we deserve defeat. In the city of Philadelphia laboring men have been voting the Republican ticket solidly for the past twenty years. "They have sown the wind and they reap the whirlwind."

THE FARMER AND THE HOME MARKET.

The Republican national committee of 1892 issued a pamphlet to be used in the campaign, and on the first page of the book it

is promised of the McKinley bill "To scatter plenty over a smiling land;" and further on the statement is made that "It will secure work for thousands of idle men and women. It will materially reduce the farmer's expenses and greatly increase his profits, but it will not raise the price to the American consumer of one single article that can be termed a necessary expense." The McKinley bill is in force to-day and is scattering plenty over a smiling land. I wonder how the farmers of the country enjoy that plenty this year. What a roaring farce, this promise of the Republican party! If any class deserves well of this country it is the farming class.

The supreme rule of the Democratic party with reference to taxation is that the taxation from the citizen must be limited to the needs of the Government economically administered, and that any taxation beyond this, from whatever pretext of public policy, is an infringement upon Democratic freedom. In America the great burden of taxation falls upon the farmer. He belongs to a class which is first in number and economic importance to the country. It may be true that the question of numbers may not be of any particular consequence in considering the question of equal justice, for he would be entitled to equal political right if there were but one-half the number. It need not rest exclusively on the principle of the greatest good to the greatest number, but upon the theory that every man is entitled to equal and exact justice.

With the farmer there is no combination or monopoly; he is confronted with the necessity of selling to the world on a purely competitive basis. The farmers' burdens from year to year are gradually growing heavier. The trite saying was, "Young man go West and grow up with the country." But the plan now is to organize corporations in the East for the special purpose of placing mortgages all over the West upon farms at nearly double the rate of interest prevailing in the East, and in this way the profits of farming are largely abstracted by the corporations and their ally, the protective tariff. The farm mortgages of the country amount now to nearly \$4,000,000,000, and, of course, no sane person ever expects that this vast sum will ever be paid. It can not be paid; there is not money enough in the country to pay this stupendous debt. The cunning money sharks of the country have seen to it that there shall not be sufficient money in the country to transact its business, for they have contracted the currency nearly 50 per cent for that very purpose. The prisoner is in jail and they have destroyed the prison keys. What will the end be?

The Democratic platform explains the situation—that is, "that the protective system fosters no industry so fully as it does that of the sheriff." These mortgages will be foreclosed and the present occupants of the land will be turned out, as has been done already in thousands of cases in Kansas and other Western States, and these lands will be owned by the corporations which have eaten up the borrower by their modern cannibalism usury.

What next? Why, the axiomatic truth that "who owns the soil owns the labor on the soil" will have full operation. This is only another statement of the Divine truth that "the borrower is the servant of the lender."

The necessity that makes one man toil for the benefit of another man makes the first man the slave of the second whether his skin is black or white. This whole nefarious scheme is the work of plutocracy, aided by its natural guardian, the Republican party, and the special subject of attack is the farmer. He is made their dupe and victim. I had the honor during the last Presidential campaign to hear the distinguished Senator from Illinois [Mr. CULLOM], who is still serving in the other end of the Capitol, make a speech in my own town to the farmers. In his remarks he ridiculed the statement that Democrats make; that is, "that the consumers pay the tariff." He illustrated his position by the statement that under the McKinley bill the tariff duty on calico was 6 cents, and the price here was but 5 cents. He wanted the farmers to tell him who paid that duty, and the horny handed sons of toil laughed themselves almost silly at the profound wisdom of their Senator.

The Senator did not tell them, nor did they see proper to ask him, what would be the effect if there were no duty on calico. Clearly, if there were no duty at all on calico the domestic manufacturer would be compelled to sell for 4 cents, and if this is true then calico is protected 25 per cent. He used the same statement about a certain class of nails upon which the duty under the McKinley bill is more than the market price here. In each case he forgot, I suppose, to state what the effect would be if there were no duty on calico and nails. But he did not forget to tell them how the farmers were protected by the McKinley bill by a tariff on wheat of 20 cents, and then we had three cheers for the McKinley bill.

I saw some of the same farmers this summer selling their wheat for 40 cents per bushel, and I reminded them of the Senator's statement, and that I thought that if they would make out their bill

and send it to him for the 20 cents protection; the Senator would likely get it for them or give them a new chestnut.

Every intelligent person knew at the time that the pretended protection of the farmers by the McKinley bill on wheat was a fraud and a humbug. It could not be done in that way. Its real purpose was to still further deceive the farmers of the country into supporting the Republican party.

But, thank God, the scales have fallen from the eyes of the farmers and laborers, and they will not be deceived longer.

The requiem of the protective tariff system was sung in this country in 1892, and I know that it is dead, but I wish to punish the robber after death by giving it a few more kicks and cuffs. The Illinois farmer pays 50 per cent more for his manufactured goods than he would were there no tariff; therefore the Illinois farmer to the extent of that per cent is impoverished. Massachusetts sells her manufactured goods 50 per cent higher than she could sell them were there no tariff; therefore Massachusetts is enriched this per cent by reason of such protection. This being so, does not the Illinois farmer pay the tax of Massachusetts, and in addition thereto give her a bonus for the privilege? Labor creates all capital, and surely the laborer should at least have a just and full share of that which he creates.

If labor were allowed equal privilege with capital, then there would be no conflict between them. But when the Government steps in and by the exercise of power enters into partnership with capital and takes from labor the fruits of its production and gives it to capital, then labor becomes the slave of the master it has created, and in this way every farmer in the land is made the slave of capital.

Wealth has accumulated in this country in the last twenty years at a rate never before known, but it has been at a fearful cost to the farmer. The accumulation has not been of a uniform rate; hundreds have grown rich while millions have grown poor, all through the intervention of the Government that should protect all alike.

In order to show how unfairly the protective tariff treats the farmer, I will use some figures which I submitted to the House when the McKinley bill was under consideration, but they will bear repeating.

These figures are taken from the census of 1880 and they show the increase of wealth of the farmer under the Walker tariff, and the decrease under the protective tariff:

	Farm values.
1850.....	\$3,271,575,422
1860.....	6,545,045,007
1870.....	9,262,803,861
1880.....	10,197,095,776
<i>Increase</i>	
1850 to 1860.....	\$3,273,469,575 or 100 per cent.
1860 to 1870.....	2,717,758,854 or 41 per cent.
1870 to 1880.....	934,292,915 or 9 per cent.

It will be seen that there was an increase of 100 per cent from 1850 to 1860, and but 9 per cent from 1870 to 1880, when we had a high tariff.

Now I will take from the census of 1880 (Compendium, page 926) the following figures, which show the advantage manufacturers have over farmers:

<i>Farms, 1880.</i>	
Amount invested.....	\$12,104,080,000
Value of products.....	\$2,790,272,000
Persons employed.....	7,670,400
Product per hand.....	\$288
<i>Manufacturers, 1880.</i>	
Amount invested.....	\$2,790,270,000
Total product.....	\$5,369,573,000
Cost of material.....	\$3,369,825,000
Value of product less material.....	\$1,972,756,000
Persons employed.....	2,732,000
Product per hand.....	\$721

What a splendid margin in favor of the manufacturers. Now, another lesson. How have farms increased as compared with other values? In 1860 the farmers owned nearly one-half the wealth of the nation, as appears from the census:

Farm values, 1860.....	\$7,988,443,000
Other values.....	8,179,123,000
Farm values, 1880.....	12,140,081,000
Other values.....	31,537,902,000
Increase of farm values.....	4,123,688,000
Increase of other values.....	23,358,797,000
Increase of farm values in twenty years of protection.....	51 per cent.
Increase in other values for the same time.....	280 per cent.

Oh, for a name to call this infernal thing; robbery is too mild. I would call it Devil or Hell if I were not afraid it might offend his Satanic majesty.

As to the fallacy of the home market, I take some figures from the Statistician of 1893 as to our wheat product:

	Bushels.
Total wheat crop, 1891.....	611,780,000
Consumption for food.....	302,000,000
Seed.....	54,508,000
Surplus.....	255,172,000

Now, in order to consume the surplus so that the farmer would have a home market, it would require us to import into this country more than 50,000,000 persons to devour this wheat at 5 bushels per capita, or more immigrants than ever came to this country. What a blessing this would be for our laboring men. But this is not all; our surplus wheat is less than one-third the surplus of our farms that we ship and sell in foreign markets annually. So, therefore, in order to find a home market for all our farm surplus, we would be compelled to import three times 50,000,000 immigrants to consume it all.

What a ridiculous farce this would be. And yet Senator Cul- lom and men of his cloth talk to the farmers about their home market, and they swallow it as a Utopian dream and vote for a protective tariff, which will in the end, as certain as day follows night, result in driving the farmer from his homestead and his children to the poorhouse. The abandoned farms of New England tell more eloquently than words that the farmers have not shared in the increased profit from protection, neither has that home market of which they have heard so much materialized.

To sum the matter up, the census of 1880 shows that the manufacturers made on their business a net profit of 36 per cent per annum, and on investigations of the census of 1890 it is found that the McKinley bill adds about 7 per cent, making it now 44 per cent, while the farms have not made over 2 per cent. This is the effect of protection, and if this is justice I have no conception of the meaning of that word. Mr. Chairman, I speak for the farmer, and I represent on this floor an agricultural district the equal of any in this Union of States, and a constituency as patriotic and generous-hearted as the world ever saw, and in their names and by their authority I solemnly protest against this iniquitous system that has clothed the toiler in rags and the rascal in robes, that applauds cunning and sneers at integrity, that has driven the American flag from the seas and given our carrying trade to England. It has filled the cottage of the laborer with sorrow and sent his children supperless to bed: it threatens the safety of our free institutions.

Mr. Chairman, the man who does not comprehend the iniquity and injustice of the protective system is a fool; the man who does and fails to denounce it is a coward; the man who comprehends it and favors it for party or personal ends is a knave, and the man who understands its workings and has the courage to denounce it is worthy of being called an American freeman.

Gentlemen, do not deceive yourselves; the battle for tariff reform is on and "he who halts is a coward, and he who doubts is damned."

Every consideration of justice, safety, and patriotism demands prompt and decisive action in the passage of the bill under consideration. It will reduce the average rate of duty 18.40 per cent, and the taxes, as estimated, nearly \$75,000,000, and leave that sum in the pockets of the people; and more than \$300,000,000 will be saved to the farmers and laborers in the reduction of the prices of things they must necessarily purchase and consume.

When this bill becomes a law it may reduce the income of Carnegie so that he will not be able to build another wing to his castle in the mountains of Scotland this year, and he may have to reduce the number of horses that he drives to his tallyho, but it will bring comfort to thousands of American homes, the citadel of American liberty. It will bring a glow of health to the cheek of the farmer's wife and bread to the children of labor.

The true grandeur and safety of this nation consist not in its great cities, gorgeous capitals, great corporations where opulent princes trade in money coined from the sweat of labor; but in strong, noble, honest men, pure, free, and happy women, sweet healthy children—in a word, in the well ordered homes of our laboring peasantry.

Mr. Chairman, in these homes the indomitable and unconquerable spirit of freedom had its birth, which gave life to the American nation, and when the nation was in danger from these homes came its defenders. The farmers are the founders of civilization and the protectors of liberty, and yet for the last quarter of a century in this country our farmers have been manacled and chained in worse than Egyptian bondage. But thanks to their own good sense and intelligence, they have finally succeeded in unbarring their prison door, and on the passage of this bill they will be restored to their original industrial freedom, to which they are entitled by nature and nature's God. [Applause.]

Mr. MORSE. Mr. Chairman, I think the most absurd statement that I have ever heard made on this floor since I have been a member of this House was one made a few minutes ago by the honorable gentleman from Illinois [Mr. LANE] who has just taken his seat. If I understood him correctly he said that when a man went to a store and bought a dollar's worth of goods fifty cents of that dollar was taxes. I repeat, Mr. Chairman, that that is the most absurd statement I have ever heard made upon this floor since I have been a member of Congress.

Mr. Chairman, I listened attentively this afternoon to the

speech of the learned gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. WILSON], and heard him ring the changes for an hour on the charge that the tariff was a tax.

And I heard him charge that the poor man of this country was, in consequence, paying an awful, fearful, oppressive tax upon his clothing, and the distinguished gentleman exhibited on this floor samples of European woolen used by the middle classes of men and women in the United States.

He told of the terrible per cent the American people had to pay to get these goods with which to clothe themselves and their children, and he almost put the Democratic side of the House in tears over the wrongs of the poor working people who, I think he said, had to work one day in three to pay their taxes in the form of duty.

I believe it was Nasby who in describing the funeral of a dear friend which he attended, and with whom he had enjoyed drinking whisky and cocktails on numerous occasions, said that he was unable to weep at his friend's funeral because when he thought of these occasions all the juices of his body went to his mouth and he could not weep. [Laughter and applause on the Republican side.]

So I was unable to weep at the argument of the gentleman from West Virginia, because I know and everybody knows and he ought to know that the middle classes in this country do not buy the woollens or the clothing they wear in England, nor pay the awful duty he spoke of for the very good reason that they clothe themselves in better goods of American manufacture, and I affirm that the clothing worn by the great mass of the people in this country is manufactured in America, and that clothing in the United States is sold cheaper than in any other country on the face of the earth, and our countrymen are indifferent to the duty on European fabrics except as they protect American manufacturers and give employment to American labor. [Applause.]

The argument of the gentleman from West Virginia that the tariff is a tax has been so often exploded and refuted on this floor and elsewhere that it seems a waste of words to repeat the arguments.

Has the gentleman from West Virginia forgotten the delegation of merchants who appeared before his committee from Bermuda, and denounced the McKinley act and asked for its repeal, because they said they had to pay the duty in order to sell their goods in the American market? Two familiar illustrations of the fallacy of the tariff-tax argument suffice. I think that the duty on a barrel of salt is about \$2. Hundreds of thousands of barrels are sold by the salt manufacturers of this country at 50 cents a barrel and the barrel thrown in.

Will not the gentleman from West Virginia tell me where the tax comes in? [Applause.]

The watch business affords another illustration of the effect of the duty to cheapen articles to the American consumer. The effect of placing a duty on watches, which were formerly bought principally in Europe, was to start twenty watch factories in this country, and to-day, owing to American skill, invention, and genius, the best watch made on the face of the earth is an American watch, and can be bought for one-half what it could when the duty was imposed.

THE EFFECTS OF FREE WOOL

The gentleman from West Virginia was quite correct in saying that sheep-raising for wool—and he might have added for any other purpose—had largely disappeared east of the Mississippi; and that disappearance has moved with gigantic strides since it was known that this Congress would insert a free-wool provision in this bill. The truth is that the farmers of this country, without a protective duty, can not compete at the price of labor in this country with the foreign producers of this article.

The truth is that the farmers are all killing their sheep and going out of the business, which explains the present unheard of low price of mutton, and I am told that not in seventy years has wool been so low in this country as now, and that Canadian manufacturers of woollens are paying duty and importing wool from the United States into Canada.

I think the learned professor from West Virginia has something yet to learn in regard to the woolen business and the cloth and clothing trade and the cost of the cloth and clothing largely and principally worn by the people of this country, and learned and scholarly as he is, he is not the only college professor who has something to learn. I think it was Senator Hoar who said that President Elliot could not pass examination as a freshman in the matter of the construction, cost, and tariff on parts of a wagon with which he illustrated a tariff speech. And I think it was Senator Hawley of Connecticut who said "the learned president of Harvard was ignorant of anything that was out doors."

The gentleman from West Virginia denounced the duty on coal and iron as an unjust subsidy to the bloated bondholders

and the railroads of the country. And he would take this business away from the American railroads and American coastwise vessels.

Has the gentleman seen a map of the railroads of the United States that have gone into insolvency since this bill or its contents have been known.

I do not charge that threatened free coal is entirely responsible for this unprecedented failure of railroads, but it is undoubtedly due to the business prostration incident to Democratic success, and the threatened revolution in the economic and financial policy under which the country has enjoyed a wonderful prosperity for thirty years. [Applause.]

Mr. Chairman, I have the honor to represent upon this floor two hundred thousand people, largely engaged in the manufacturing business, and I think that I can truthfully say that for many years prior to one year ago last November, when it was known that Grover Cleveland was elected and the Democratic party was in control of all the Departments of the Government—I say prior to that time, and under the Republican policy of protection inaugurated by the Morrill tariff bill in 1860, my constituents in the old Second and new Twelfth (substantially the same) were as happy, contented, and prosperous as any people in any State or country on the face of the earth.

The manufacturing cities and villages were filled with happy and contented workmen, many of them owning their own homes. Many of the towns and cities were adding waterworks, electric light plants were being married together by a network of electric railroads, the benefit of which the rich and the poor, the high and the low, all shared alike.

Educational institutions were thriving and prosperous. I think every town and city in the district has a public library, and many of them were erecting library buildings and establishing reading rooms for the benefit of all classes.

Institutions of religion were well supported; the spire of the house of God pointed toward Heaven in every village and hamlet in my district.

The farmers in the agricultural sections of my district found a ready and quick sale for their product in the manufacturing towns and cities. And under the wise and far-reaching statesmanship of the McKinley tariff bill the farmer, the manufacturer, the workmen and employes, indeed all classes of citizens, and every occupation and business were enjoying a wonderful development and prosperity.

And I presume in this regard the history of the district I represent was the history of Massachusetts and other great Commonwealths of the Union.

At the election in November, 1892, the people for the first time in thirty years turned over the control of the House, Senate, and all the Departments of the Government to the Democratic party, elected upon the principles of the Chicago platform, which declared that all protection to American industries was unconstitutional, and which declared in favor of a tariff for revenue only, and which declared in favor of the repeal of the "10 per cent tax" and in favor of the revival of the old State bank.

The effect of this political revolution began to be immediately felt. The country was on the high tide of prosperity, and the result was not seriously felt at first; but in the face of the Democratic platform, manufacturers began to reduce their output; merchants began to buy sparingly, anticipating the lower prices promised by the Democratic speakers and papers, which resulted in the employment of less help and the discharge of many employes; one business reacted upon another, the consuming power of our people was gradually but surely reduced, and has been growing from bad to worse until the present time, until the conditions of 1857, when we were under a tariff for revenue the last time, are being repeated. In 1857, in the face of an abundant harvest, one inhabitant in thirteen and one-half in New York State was a pauper, and soup houses were opened in every ward in New York City to feed the starving poor.

So now in the face of the Wilson tariff bill, which threatens destruction to many of our great manufacturing interests, in the face of the abundant harvest of last year, relief committees are being organized in all the great centers of the country to feed the worthy and deserving poor.

And distress and gaunt hunger and want stares many an honest workman and his family in the face. Instead of prosperity we have adversity, instead of happy and contented workmen we have idle factories, or running on reduced time at reduced wages.

Instead of confidence we have distrust, and in consequence of the change in the economic and financial policy of the country from the Republican to the Democratic party it is believed that every species of property in this country has shrunk from 25 to 40 per cent, describing a grand total of \$15,000,000,000, and the end is not yet.

The Democratic speakers and newspapers attempted to charge this terrible changed condition, which condition nobody could deny, to the Sherman act, and to the purchase of silver under that act.

After an agony of three months, the Democratic Senate repealed the purchasing clause of that act. The Democratic speakers and papers predicted that business would immediately brighten, and that prosperity would again return to our distressed country. And if their premises, as to the cause, were correct, that Republican silver legislation was the cause of the distress, their prophecy would prove to be true. Neither was true.

The purchasing clause of the Sherman act should have been repealed, as it was, but it was preposterous, false, and absurd to charge the present situation to that act. The Government could sink \$3,000,000 a month in the ocean without producing any such result. The threatened revision of the tariff on free-trade lines, and as contemplated by the Wilson bill, now before us, was the immediate, direct, and almost the only cause of the appalling misfortune which has overtaken the country.

The Democrats are wont to describe their party and policy as the party of Jefferson, Jackson, and the Constitution. They must mean Jefferson Davis, Stonewall Jackson, and the Confederate constitution. Thomas Jefferson and Andrew Jackson were protectionists. [Laughter and applause on the Republican side.]

The Wilson bill is drawn on the line of the Confederate constitution, which stood for absolute, unrestricted free trade. and the Southern and Confederate end is at present the dominant and controlling end of the Democratic party of the country, and they demand the privilege of exchanging their cotton, lumber, tobacco, rice, hemp, raised with cheap negro labor, for European goods also manufactured with cheap, poorly paid labor; and that is the policy that dominates and controls the country now. That is the policy which dictates our economic policy to the great manufacturing and empire States of Ohio, Pennsylvania, New York, and Massachusetts [applause], and also dictates that the agricultural products of Canada and the lumber of that vast region shall have the duty so reduced as to come in competition with the products of the great States of Michigan, Indiana, Illinois, Wisconsin, Iowa, and Minnesota.

The following quotation from the platform of Andrew Jackson shows conclusively that the present Democratic party is not the party of Jackson:

PLATFORM OF ANDREW JACKSON 1832.

Resolved, That an adequate protection of industry is indispensable to the prosperity of the country, and that an abandonment of the policy at this period would be attended with consequences serious to the best interests of this nation.

PLATFORM OF BENJAMIN HARRISON, 1892.

We reaffirm the American doctrine of protection. We call attention to its growth abroad. We maintain that the prosperous condition of our country is largely due to the wise revenue legislation of the Republican Congress. We believe that all articles which can not be produced in the United States, except luxuries, should be admitted free of duty, and that on all imports coming into competition with the products of American labor there should be levied duties equal to the difference between wages abroad and at home.

PLATFORM OF GROVER CLEVELAND, 1892.

We denounce Republican protection as a fraud upon the labor of the great majority of the American people for the benefit of a few. We declare it to be a fundamental principle of the Democratic party that the Federal Government has no constitutional power to impose and collect tariff duties except for the purpose of revenue only.

The Democrats of 1832 and the Republicans of 1892 seem to agree.

Since the development of the Democratic policy an election was held last November, and the country condemned the Democracy in thunder tones that drowned the roar of Niagara in the States where elections were held—in Massachusetts, New York, Pennsylvania, Ohio, Illinois, and Iowa. The Democratic party was buried out of sight, and the people of those great States commanded the Democratic party to halt; and surely, in the face of this verdict, there should be no economic legislation until the country can be heard from again in the Congressional elections of next fall. If the Wilson bill should be deferred until such election it could never pass this body.

The people have already pronounced against it; patriotism and honesty demand that its consideration shall be deferred until the voice of the people can again be heard.

And this is not all; incompetency marks the Democratic administration in every department, if not something worse. Witness our humiliation in the eyes of the civilized world over the foreign policy of President Cleveland and Secretary Gresham in the affairs of the Sandwich Islands—in painful contrast to the diplomacy and wise statesmanship of Benjamin Harrison and James G. Blaine.

Incompetency marks the conduct of the Secretary of the Treasury; he undoubtedly precipitated the panic and augmented the distress of the country, and brought back our securities from

abroad by an authorized interview last summer, in which he said it might be necessary to pay the Government's obligations in silver, and by his more recent utterances in favor of destroying the collateral behind the Treasury notes, issued for silver bullion, by threats to coin the seigniorage.

Now, while towns and cities are attempting to devise ways and means and to give public work to the unemployed, what a grand chance there is for the Government to do something in the same line by pushing public buildings and public works, already authorized by Congress, which would give work to thousands of the unemployed.

Instead of that wise policy on the part of the Secretary of the Treasury, so far as I can learn, public buildings and public works are at a dead stand. Let me give an illustration or two: The Fifty-first Congress voted to erect a public post-office building at an expense of \$75,000 at the city of Taunton, in my district, upon the condition that the city would donate the site; the grand old patriotic city of Taunton responded promptly and donated a beautiful park in the center of the city to the Government of the United States, and got the act legalized by the Legislature of Massachusetts; this lot when donated would have sold for \$50,000 under the hammer; the title and all the preliminaries, survey, etc., were fully complete when the present Administration came into power nearly a year ago. In vain I have repeatedly urged upon the Secretary of the Treasury and upon the Supervising Architect the patriotic conduct of the city in donating the site, the unemployed workmen in the city, to whom the work would be a godsend, the fact that by the generous conduct of the city the Government would obtain a property worth \$125,000 for \$75,000. All my pleadings go for nothing. The grass in this beautiful park, now owned by the Government, was knee deep last summer, disfiguring the city, and not a blow was struck on this building, voted by Congress three years ago, and for which the money has been set aside.

Once more. The Government voted to build a post-office building in the city of Washington at the same time. There are thousands of unemployed mechanics in this city to whom this work would be a godsend, and would relieve the charitable people of Washington of a burden that they can ill afford to bear. A million dollars or more is to be expended for this building and practically nothing is being done upon it; a half dozen iron pillars have been stood up to show that the Secretary of the Treasury has not forgotten it, and on yesterday I saw two or three lonesome workmen pounding a bolt in one of these iron beams. These are but illustrations of the Government work which is so much needed all over the country.

A want of patriotism marks the conduct of the Secretary of the Interior, and these Halls have recently echoed with denunciations of that officer of the Government, and his unpatriotic and unjust conduct of the Pension Bureau, and, thank God, this denunciation was not confined to Republicans. There were found Democrats on this floor brave enough and manly enough to join with the Republicans, like the gentleman from Indiana Mr. MARTIN, and that scarred, maimed, and war-worn veteran of the Union Army, Gen. SICKLES, of New York. [Applause.]

Well may the country cry out, "How long: oh! how long?"

Now, I come to some specific items in the Wilson tariff bill now before us. This bill is certainly neither fish, flesh, nor fowl. It certainly is not drawn on the line of the Chicago platform.

While it ruthlessly slaughters many of the great industries of the country, and will either close these establishments or reduce the workmen to European level, it seems in other spots to be drawn on protection lines, especially when the interest to be protected is a Democratic one. On page 32 I find a high specific duty on the products of Florida, oranges and lemons, while apples raised in the Northern States are on the free list.

On page 30 I find a high specific duty on rice, a product of South Carolina and Louisiana and other Southern States.

Then it has its likes and dislikes in the Northern States, and there seems to be a method in this madness: To illustrate other features of the bill:

Gen. Alger, of Michigan, is perhaps the most extensive dealer in lumber in the United States; he is also a large contributor to the Republican campaign fund; his business is ruthlessly slaughtered by so low a duty or no duty as to bring him in direct competition with Canadian lumber just across the line.

On the other hand, the most extensive chocolate manufacturer in this country lives in Massachusetts. He is a very nice gentleman. He is a personal friend of mine. He makes the best chocolate, bromo, cocoa, and cocoa butter in the world. I use it in my family in preference to any foreign product. By his enterprise and skill, and thanks to the Republican policy of protection, he has built up an enormous business in these products. And I am told that his output reaches the enormous figure of 30 tons per day when the country is in its normal condition, and gives employment to many American workmen. He is a gener-

ous employer of labor, and an open-handed, generous, public-spirited citizen.

But I am sorry to have to say that this gentleman has gone astray upon the tariff, at least for other products than his own. He is a tariff reformer, and presides at their meetings; yes, more than that, he is a free trader and a staunch Democrat, and more than that he is the largest contributor in Massachusetts to the Democratic campaign fund; with that generosity which characterizes him in other directions he contributes thousands to the State and national Democratic campaign.

Now turn to page 34 of this bill, and there you read the strange device, "Chocolate, 2 cents per pound duty;" "Cocoa, 2 cents per pound duty;" "Cocoa butter, 3½ cents per pound duty."

The majority of the committee in their report argue at length in favor of ad valorem and not specific duty; but there is no ad valorem foolishness about the duty on chocolate and cocoa, but here is a specific duty of 2 cents per pound. Now I suggest to the committee that they offer an amendment here and make it 4 cents per pound, and thus enable my friend to double his subscription to the Democratic campaign fund, for they will need it at the next election. [Applause.]

Surely here is a sight for gods and men. In a bill drawn on free-trade lines these two illustrations which I have given are but illustrations of other similar inconsistencies and acts of favoritism: a lumber-dealer, a large Republican contributor, marked for slaughter; a chocolate manufacturer, a large Democratic contributor, has every principle of the bill slaughtered and has his business protected by a high specific duty.

There is a large factory in my district at old Plymouth, Mass., that manufactures binding-twine; the treasurer, Mr. Holmes, is a red-hot Republican; binding-twine is put on the free list. They make binding-twine in Hongkong, China; they have the most improved American machinery; they pay the workmen 15 cents per day. There are 12,000 men employed in the cordage industry in New England; it is needless to describe the effect of this bill upon these manufacturers and workmen.

There are extensive granite quarries in Eastern Massachusetts, particularly in Quincy, which was formerly in my district. Turn to page 15, you will find the duty has been reduced to one-half on finished granite; this would enable the manufacturer at Quincy or Randolph to send granite blocks as ballast to Europe and have them returned finished for buildings, capitals, and monuments, and make a large saving at the present price of wages, with the duty in this bill. One of two things must happen if this bill passes, every granite quarry in this country must reduce wages or close.

These are but illustrations of the slaughter of other industries in my district by the proposed Wilson tariff bill.

Now, how is it proposed to make good the large loss in revenue which this bill contemplates? Why, by an income tax, which is a tax upon thrift and prosperity, and however fine it may be in theory, it is well described by the gentleman from New York, Mr. COCKRAN, when he says it should be styled a "bill to fine honest men and pay a premium on perjury."

Under the McKinley tariff bill the foreigners who sent goods to this country paid the tax, as was testified to by the merchants of Bermuda who appeared before the Committee on Ways and Means.

Under this bill it is proposed to abandon that policy of having the foreigners who import goods into our country support the Government and pay the taxes. I say it is proposed to substitute for this policy a revival of the odious war tax to be paid by our own people, one of the most obnoxious and offensive of which is the income tax, which is paid by truthful, honest men, and entirely escaped by those that are dishonest. Of all the odious, unjust systems of taxation that were ever devised the income tax is the most odious and most offensive and most unjust. [Applause.]

On my return to Washington after the holiday recess, I sat in a seat with the agent of a great manufacturing corporation that employs thousands of workmen in the city of Fall River. He said to me, "If the Wilson bill becomes a law, our concern will have no alternative except to close our factory or reduce the wages of our employes 40 per cent, approximating the European level."

The talk about the benefit to manufacturers resulting from free raw material, free coal, free iron ore, and free wool called for by this bill will deceive no intelligent person.

The benefit to the manufacturers of my section resulting from the removal of 75 cents per ton on bituminous coal will in no way compensate for the reduced duty on the finished product of these establishments.

When you take into the account that a ton of iron when manufactured into tacks, rivets, printing presses, stoves, etc., is worth from \$150 to \$500 per ton, a duty of 75 cents per ton on coal and a small duty upon iron ore is not an important factor

of the cost, and, I repeat, is unimportant as compared with the protection of these finished products from the competition of European manufacturers and poorly paid workmen.

Mr. Chairman, it does not take a statesman to see that if we reduce the duty on American agricultural or mechanical products so that we are to buy any considerable quantity of our goods in a foreign market, we can not at the same time manufacture these goods in our own country and give employment to American capital and American labor.

This bill strikes a blow at the great tack industry of my district and of Massachusetts by an ad valorem duty upon tacks that is too low for protection, and which will expose American manufacturers to injustice of undervaluation by foreign importers.

This bill provides for the importation of coal free of duty into the United States, and thus strikes a blow at American shipping and coastwise industry, which is now principally maintained by the coal interest.

And I have placed in my hand a memorial and resolutions passed against this bill by the Vessel Owners and Captains' National Association.

There is little doubt in my mind but that this bill, substantially as reported by the committee, will pass this Democratic House and Senate and be signed by Grover Cleveland and become a law, but I believe it is the duty of every Republican member of Congress to resist its passage by every means in his power.

There may be a slight improvement in business when the worst is known, when the uncertainty is removed and the policy of the Government is determined, until another Presidential election can be had; but there can be no permanent prosperity of the country while the present Democratic nightmare of free trade sits upon the vitals of the nation.

The Wilson law, at the longest, will be short lived; the baby's epitaph will fit this bill: "If I was so soon done for, what was I begun for?"

The country will have had an object lesson in Democratic control that will last the country another thirty years, and the friends of protection, the friends of the American agriculturist, the friends of the American manufacturer and American workman will surely elect the next national House of Representatives and the next President, and restore the country to the safe and Republican economic and financial policy under which we enjoyed for thirty years a marvelous growth and prosperity, unprecedented in the history of States and nations.

The following letter is a specimen of hundreds and untold thousands of letters that are being poured in upon members of Congress:

Haverhill, Mass., January 6, 1894.

DEAR SIR: Please do all you can to defeat the amendment or passage of the Wilson bill. It seems specially designed to annihilate values on all kinds of property, to destroy American industries, and to make American conditions for wage-earners impossible. The threat of its passage is shutting up our mills and workshops, shortening our hours of labor, cutting down our wages, and curtailing the farmers' market.

Respectfully,

GEORGE W. RUSSELL.

Would refer you to Gen. COGSWELL.

The following is a specimen of resolutions of boards of trade and commercial organizations all over the country being poured in upon members of Congress denouncing and protesting against the passage of the Wilson bill, and undoubtedly speaks the sentiment of these great organizations representing the business and commerce of the country:

PHILADELPHIA BOARD OF TRADE, DREXEL BUILDING,
Philadelphia, January 5, 1894.

To the honorable the Senate and House of Representatives
of the United States in Congress assembled:

At a quarterly meeting of the Philadelphia Board of Trade, held December 18, 1893, the following preamble and resolutions were unanimously adopted:

"Whereas the threatened radical modification by Congress of the existing tariff has caused and is causing widespread alarm and dismay among the industrial masses of the country, and general anxiety and distrust by the admission of wool, coal, iron ore, and other so-called raw materials to the free list, and by the sweeping reduction in rates of duty, and by the large substitution of ad valorem for specific duties; and

"Whereas the projected tariff bill now being prepared by the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives, known as the Wilson bill, so far as the provisions of this bill have been given to the public, is intensifying alarm not only by its provisions, but by the uncertainty of the period when this bill, if enacted, shall take effect, is adding thousands to the already great army of the unemployed, creating deprivation and distress, which can not be easily relieved in the present depressed business condition of the country; and

"Whereas under the tariff system of the United States, which has existed since 1860, the unexampled prosperity of the nation can not be denied, and the threatened overthrow of such prosperity must not only be deplored, but condemned as rash and unjust; and

"Whereas the majority of the Ways and Means Committee of the House of Representatives, by continued and numerous amendments in the formation of the bill now about to be presented to Congress, show it is unsatisfactory even to its authors; and

"Whereas the apprehended passage of this unsatisfactory bill is throwing many thousands of the people out of employment, and compelling those

still employed to suffer great reduction in the wage received for their labor: Therefore.

Resolved, That the Philadelphia Board of Trade is unalterably opposed to the passage of the so-called Wilson tariff bill.

Resolved, That in the opinion of the Philadelphia Board of Trade the intended radical modification of the existing tariff is injudicious and unwise and must be condemned as tending to the destruction of industrial employment of vast bodies of the people, and so causing needless distress and hardship.

Resolved, That the executive officers of this board are requested to send the foregoing preamble and resolutions to Congress, and to urge our Senators and Representatives to oppose the passage of the so-called Wilson tariff bill as a measure destructive to the welfare of this nation.

[True copy.]

FREDERICK FRALEY,
President Philadelphia Board of Trade

Attest:

W. R. TUCKER.

Harmony, consistency, or unity is not expected in the Democratic party. The student of political history has only to turn back to the Congressional debates at the time the Republicans found it necessary to impose an income tax as a war measure to get money to carry on the war and save us a nation among the nations of the earth.

He will find that the Democratic party in Congress at that time denounced the income tax as inquisitorial, unconstitutional, and an outrage upon the private right of citizens.

It was then necessary as a war measure. There can be no justification of it in a time of profound peace. While one wing of the Democratic party is demanding this tax there is another wing that still adhere to their former position in regard to it.

The following quotations from leading papers of New York are fair illustrations, and undoubtedly voice the sentiment of the people in all the great centers of business and trade:

A HIGH-HANDED OUTRAGE.
[New York Herald.]

The majority of the Ways and Means Committee has committed the reckless blunder of deciding in favor of a sweeping general income tax.

Against such a monarchical, inquisitorial imposition American manhood would rebel and condemn to ignominy the political party responsible for it. There is no earthly excuse for the tax, since it is as unnecessary for needed revenue as it is obnoxious. To inflict it upon the people without necessity or excuse would be nothing short of a high-handed outrage.

A FATAL MISTAKE.
[New York Times.]

After protesting for twenty years against the continued imposition of war taxes in time of peace, the Democratic party can not reimpose the most odious of the war taxes and escape general condemnation. To make a personal income tax a feature of the Wilson tariff bill is to commit one of those fatal mistakes of policy that drive a party from power or destroy it, just as some great indiscretion destroys a private reputation, or a wrong step brings down a financial house.

To begin with, the income tax was decided upon in the Ways and Means Committee against the judgment and votes of those members of the majority who represent the principles of the Democratic party that are vital, sound, and continuing; while the proposition obtained its support from those members who, while no doubt perfectly sincere, are all of them in greater or less degree, and some of them altogether, imbued with those errors of economic and financial doctrine that have robbed the Democratic party of the confidence and support of thousands of men who, on other grounds, would gladly act with it.

INDIVIDUAL OPINIONS ADVERSE TO THIS METHOD OF RAISING REVENUE.

Thomas G. Shearman: The last years of the American income tax were a carnival of fraud, perjury, and blackmail.

Marshall Field: Such a tax is an iniquity itself, and has no place on the statute books of such a country as this.

Edward Atkinson: The adoption of an income tax will necessarily destroy that party responsible for it, no matter what its merits in other respects may be.

John Claflin: An income tax in time of peace is a perfect outrage. I have talked with many of the big wholesalers in the dry goods district, and neither there nor elsewhere have I found a single man in favor of it.

David A. Wells: It seems hardly open to dispute that a general income tax, with such inquisitorial features as are essential to make it effective as a revenue measure, can not be successfully administered under a free and popular form of government.

William E. Gladstone: I believe it does more than any other tax to demoralize and corrupt the people. So long as you consent, without special purpose, to levy the income tax as a part of the ordinary and permanent revenue of the country, so long it will be vain to talk of economy and effective reduction of expenditure.

A PREMIUM ON PERJURY.
[New York Press.]

An income tax is class legislation of the worst sort. It assails the fundamental doctrines of Americanism. It puts a premium on perjury. It necessitates the employment of a vast army of spies and informers, commissioned to pry into every man's business and intrude in matters with which the Government has no right, under ordinary conditions, to interfere.

ITS POLITICAL EFFECT.
[Brooklyn Eagle.]

If the Democratic party tries to pass, or by a majority of its Representatives and Senators at Washington favors, an income tax bill, it will probably lose control of the next Congress and will certainly deserve to do so.

AD VALOREM VS. SPECIFIC DUTIES.

An examination of the tariff bill now before the House shows that three hundred and fifty-four items of this bill are put under ad valorem duties. The claim made by the majority of the committee that it is impossible to make equitable specific duties, is not borne out by the facts or experience, either in this country or in other countries.

As has been so forcibly pointed out by others, the injustice to our merchants and manufacturers from ad valorem duties grows out of the fact that they open the door for fraud in undervaluation, and are thus another link in the free-trade evils to which this bill proposes to commit the country.

The following table confirms my statement above:

TARIFFS OF FOREIGN COUNTRIES.

The following shows the number of articles on which duties are imposed by ten foreign countries:

England imposes duties on 38 articles.
France imposes duties on 619 articles.
Austria imposes duties on 337 articles.
Russia imposes duties on 440 articles.
Sweden imposes duties on more than 300 articles.
Denmark imposes duties on 63 articles.
All the above duties are specific.
Germany's tariff makes 434 articles dutiable, and imposes specific duties on all but two.
Italy's tariff covers 837 articles, and on all but one the duties are specific.
Norway collects customs on more than 500 articles, and the duties are specific, except in six instances.
Spain with 399 articles on its tariff imposes an ad valorem duty on but one.
The above shows that out of more than 3,957 duties only 10 are on an ad valorem basis.

Thus it will be seen that this bill proposes to do indirectly, through the medium of undervaluation, what a majority of the committee have not the courage to do openly.

This bill by its extensive changes from specific duty—that is, by a duty by the piece, by the dozen, by the pound, by the cubic foot—to ad valorem duty, that is a percentage of the value fixed upon the goods by the exporter or importer, admitting of fraud in undervaluation. While it appears to afford protection and has the appearance of continuing something like the duty of the McKinley bill, as a matter of fact it throws down protection and exposes our manufacturers to cruel and unjust foreign competition.

Such a thing as consistency in the Democratic party is not looked for or expected. For thirty years they have repeatedly occupied the camp of the Republican party of previous Administrations.

The following quotation from Secretary Manning's report of 1886 shows the attitude of the Democratic party at that time as hostile to ad valorem duties:

Whatever successful contrivances are in operation to-day to evade the revenue by false invoices, or by undervaluations, or by any other means, under an ad valorem system, will not cease even if the ad valorem rates shall have been largely reduced. They are incontestably, they are even notoriously, inherent in that system.

And again, in 1888, Secretary Fairchild urged and demanded that when changes were made in duties they should be in the direction of substituting specific for ad valorem duties. This is what Secretary Fairchild said in 1888:

The high ad valorem tariff of the last quarter of a century has been the fruitful cause of devices to gain improper advantage at the custom-house. It is, therefore, desirable that in revising and reducing rates of duty they should be made specific instead of ad valorem, so far as the nature of the merchandise will admit.

That this bill is drawn in the interest of foreign and English manufacturers you have only to examine the files of English papers to discover. The Manchester (England) Courier says that the Wilson bill is "much more thorough than the most sanguine people on this side ventured to anticipate." It certainly is a good bill for people on that side.

I will insert in my remarks as germane to this discussion a letter from the author of the McKinley bill, giving his reason for protective policy and the protective bill which it is now proposed to repeal:

WHY MCKINLEY IS A PROTECTIONIST—COMPARISON WITH A REVENUE TARIFF.

I am a protectionist because I believe the protective system is best adapted to our conditions and citizenship. It does everything which a revenue tariff can do and vastly more. It supplies needed revenue—a revenue tariff can do no more. It accomplishes this end with equal if not greater certainty than a revenue tariff, and while doing this it widely discriminates in favor of American interests and is ever mindful of the welfare of the American people. It protects our own products against those of the alien and the stranger, while the domestic consumer is secured reasonable prices through domestic competition. It diversifies the employments and multiplies the opportunities of our people, secures an unrivaled home market for agriculture and unrivaled wages for labor. It encourages skill and genius to their highest activity and under its operation we have reached the foremost rank in invention and mechanism and the widest individual and national prosperity. It favors the United States and is the true friend of every American girl and boy struggling upward. It builds up; it never pulls down.

W. MCKINLEY, JR.

To sum up, the purpose of the pending bill is to relieve foreigners from paying the duties upon goods which they import into this country in competition with American goods, and to impose new and odious taxes upon our own people to make up the deficiency. And pray what benefit will free wool, free coal, and free iron ore be to the section of country which I represent, if the same legislation which gives it destroys the home market and deprives our manufacturers of an opportunity to dispose of their finished products?

The following anteconvention utterances of distinguished Democrats in 1892, in the light of the events of the past year, sound like the voice of prophecy, and I commend these prophecies, which are now history, to the thoughtful and serious consideration of Congress and the country:

I have frequent misgivings as to the wisdom of again putting me in nomination.—*Grover Cleveland.*

Grover Cleveland is the only man that could have led us to disaster.—*Senator Blackburn.*

Nominate Mr. Cleveland, and we march—through a slaughter house into an open grave.—*Henry Watterson.*

Mr. Cleveland by his message, for which I honor him, has challenged the protected industries of the country to a fight of extermination.—*Senator Vest.*

Mr. Chairman, if there is any doubt about the above utterances of distinguished Democrats being history that doubt will be entirely removed to the country and the world at the next Congressional and national election. [Laughter and applause.]

And I bid my distressed countrymen who are now suffering from Democratic rule, incompetency, and inefficiency to be of good courage. The country has learned a lesson that will not be forgotten by the living generation.

Weeping may endure for a night, but joy cometh in the morning.

The country will surely again return to the economic and financial policy of the Republican party, and the greatest Republic of all history, the Republic upon whose dominions the sun never sets, because evening twilight in Alaska gilds the rock-bound coast of Maine with the rays of the morning sun. I say this greatest Republic of all history, when the present Democratic nightmare shall have passed away, will again under Republican rule enter upon a history of glory, prosperity, and development unequalled in our past glorious history. [Applause.]

And I conclude these remarks with the prayer of Daniel Webster at the laying of the corner stone of this extension to the Capitol, July 4, 1851, as follows:

And all here assembled, whether belonging to public or private life, with hearts devoutly thankful to Almighty God for the preservation of the liberty and happiness of the country, unite in sincere and fervent prayers that this deposit and the walls and arches, the domes and towers, the columns and entablatures now to be erected over it may endure forever. God save the United States of America.

[Loud applause on the Republican side.]

[Here the hammer fell.]

Mr. BELL of Texas said: Mr. Chairman, the effect of tariff charges, or import duties, has probably been the theme of more thorough, exhaustive, and able discussions than any economic question which has engaged the attention of students, scholars, or statesmen, and it is impossible that anything could be added to the strength of the arguments with which the advocates of the conflicting theories on that subject have supported their respective positions; but the greatly improved methods of collecting statistics and the valuable experience of various countries under the different systems in recent years has rendered it possible to demonstrate the correctness of opinions which could formerly be upheld only by the force of reasoning.

In the remarks which I am about to submit I will not stray from the beaten paths, but I hope to be able to elucidate the subject under consideration by referring to and commenting upon certain facts and figures which were not available in previous discussions.

When individuals organized themselves into societies they conferred upon their government the right to take such portion of their property as might be necessary to enable it to execute the purposes for which it was formed. This is the power of taxation. It is an attribute of sovereignty, and one which is essential to the very existence of governments. The method of exercising this power by the imposition of imposts upon imports is called a tariff. There is no doubt of the authority of our Government to resort to this means of raising the revenue with which to meet its legitimate expenses, and it is generally conceded that no method has yet been devised by which the burdens of taxation can in this country be more equitably distributed than by a tariff when properly adjusted.

The question therefore naturally arises, in what way and for what purpose should the duties upon the importation of commodities be levied?

There are two kinds of tariff: one for revenue, and the other for protection. A tariff for revenue is one where the tolls are sufficiently low to permit the sale of imported goods without a loss. A tariff for protection is one where the tolls are so high as to prevent, under ordinary circumstances, the sale of imported goods without a loss.

If an article on which imposts are levied is imported, the duty collected passes into the national Treasury, and the consumer contributes to that amount to the support of the Government. This is a tax.

If an article on which an impost charge is levied is not imported, no revenue is derived from it; and the increased price which the consumer has to pay for it, in consequence of his not

being allowed to buy in a cheaper market on account of the duty, is not a tax, but is a donation under the forms of law of the property of the purchaser of the article to its original owner. This is so abhorrent to our ideas of justice, and is so foreign to our conceptions of the proper functions of legislation, that, stripped of all collateral considerations, no one could be found to defend it; but, say its advocates, "the good results which follow and flow from a protective tariff more than compensate for its inherent injustice and admitted evils," and they cite the enormous accumulation of wealth in this country in support of their position. If the wonderful development of our resources in the last thirty years is attributable to the operation of the protective system which has prevailed during that time, it affords a strong argument in its favor; but if it can be shown that we have grown great in spite of that system, and that in consequence of it some sections and classes had prospered at the expense of other sections and classes, then no excuse can be found for its continuance.

Let us, then, see what has been the effect of our tariff laws. While legislation can not create property, it can transfer its ownership. I will illustrate this by taking, as an example, a pair of shoes which if purchased in England would cost, landed at New York, \$1. The duty on them would be 25 cents. The purchaser of the shoes would have to give \$1.25 for them. If he should buy the imported shoes, the Government has taken 25 cents of his money for its own purposes. If he should buy a similar pair of domestic make at, say, \$1.20, the laws have taken 20 cents of his earnings and given it to another. It is entirely immaterial, so far as this branch of my argument is concerned, whether the additional 20 cents which the purchaser has been compelled to pay in consequence of the tariff charges inures to the ultimate benefit of the manufacturer or his employes.

The point I make is that the ownership of the 20 cents has by legislation been changed from the purchaser of the shoes to the manufacturer. I have not been able to learn the value of the boots and shoes which are consumed by the 65,000,000 people in the United States; but, as shown by the census of 1880, their value for that year was \$193,477,412, and at the present time it certainly could not be less than \$300,000,000 per annum. Of course, the cost of these articles is not enhanced by the tariff quite to the extent of the impost charges on them, for if so they would be imported; but the Statistical Abstract shows that the value of the boots and shoes imported for 1891 was \$74,567.38; for 1892, \$90,578.89, and for 1893, \$95,662.42.

The duty on boots and shoes, as I have stated, is 25 per cent ad valorem, and the manufacturers tell us that they can not afford to make them if the tariff is reduced. This indicates that the cost of these articles is increased nearly to the amount of the duty by it. But, to be perfectly conservative, let us assume that we only have to pay 5 per cent more on the first cost of our boots and shoes than we would if it were not for the tariff. The people of this country, then, pay \$15,000,000 per annum bounty on their boots and shoes, and the Government receives from the tariff which renders this necessary less than \$25,000 in taxes.

It would not be practicable in the limited time which I am allowed to consume under the rules to investigate many of the items which are subjected to tariff charges; but at the risk of being tedious, I wish to consider its effect on a few more articles, and in doing so I will select those which are in the most common use. The duty on nails, spikes, and tacks ranges from 14 to 4 cents per pound, being equivalent to an ad valorem charge of from 30 to 107 per cent, and the value of them imported during 1890 was \$2,728.15; for 1891, \$3,046.34; for 1892, \$3,552.94. I am informed by the officers of the Census Bureau that the value of the nails manufactured by the establishments engaged in the manufacture of iron and steel during the census year was \$12,333,603, but that as many establishments make nails that do not manufacture iron and steel, the actual output of nails in this country will largely exceed that amount.

It may be, then, safely assumed that the value of the nails, spikes, and tacks annually consumed in this country amounts to \$30,000,000. The average import charges on these items is 48 per cent; but if the manufacturers realized only 10 per cent more for them than they would if it were not for the duty, they received \$3,000,000 bounty on the nails, spikes, and tacks used by the people of the United States for the year 1892, while the Government obtained in taxes from the tariff on these articles \$1,316.

On common screws the duty ranged from 5 to 14 cents per pound, or from 46 to 110 per cent ad valorem, and yet, during the year 1892 there was absolutely none imported. I have been unable to obtain any estimate of the value of the screws manufactured in this country, but for the year 1880 it was \$2,184,894. If there has been no increase in the output of this industry, and if the cost of the screws was increased only 10 per cent by the tariff charges on them, the manufacturers collected a bounty of \$218,489 from our people on this item, while the Government did

not receive a cent of revenue from the tariff charges which rendered this possible.

Of course the articles which I have been discussing present extreme cases or there would be very little income obtained from the tariff, while as a matter of fact most of our revenue is derived from that source. But it is a notable fact that on almost all the articles which the necessities of the people compel them to have, the tariff charges are at present so high as to be prohibitory, but to make the injustice of the laws complete, on those articles which people buy only because they feel able to do so they are sufficiently low (as they should be on everything) to render it profitable to import them, and hence the purchasers are not deprived of the benefit of competition between home and foreign producers.

For instance, during the year 1892, the customs collected on wool hats amounted to \$9,864.83; on silks, to \$16,965,637.03; on blankets, to \$4,872.48; on wines, to \$5,058,661.71. In other words, the tariff on most of the necessities of life is prohibitory, while on the luxuries it is on a revenue basis.

By the census it was ascertained that the value of the manufactured goods of domestic make subject to duty consumed by the people of the United States was annually in 1870, in round numbers, \$3,000,000,000; in 1880, \$6,000,000,000, while it is supposed that for 1890 the amount will exceed \$8,000,000,000. If the average annual consumption of the protected articles for the past twenty years has been \$6,000,000,000, the total for that period would be \$120,000,000,000. The average of the imposts levied has during all that time exceeded 40 per cent ad valorem, but if the first cost of the goods was enhanced by them only 10 per cent, the bounty which one class of our citizens—the manufacturers—have been able to collect under the forms of law in the last twenty years, amounts to \$12,000,000,000, and yet during the same time the Government collected from the tariff which enabled them to do so only \$3,746,173,761.09, and nearly all of this from such luxuries as silks, wines, tobacco, diamonds, etc.

It will be observed that I have not been discussing the question as to the additional amount the consumer has been compelled to pay for the protected domestic products in consequence of the tariff charges, for that will be much more than the bounty which goes to the manufacturers. Every one who handles anything until it reaches the person who buys it for actual use will expect to make a profit on his entire investment which, in the case of a protected article, will include what might properly be called its legitimate cost and also the bounty paid on it. If, therefore, the wholesale merchant has to give \$110 for goods which he could get for \$100 but for the tariff, he will charge a profit on the \$100 and also on the \$10, and the retail merchant will charge a profit on the entire amount which he has paid the wholesale merchant, which will include the bounty and the profit on the bounty.

I am not sufficiently familiar with, and have not been able to learn enough about the per cent which the merchants add to the cost of the goods which they sell to enable me to form any satisfactory estimate of the profit on the bounty on the \$120,000,000,000 worth of goods of domestic make consumed by our people in the last two decades, but it must be enormous.

If all of our citizens were engaged in avocations which enabled them to receive equal advantages from the imposts levied neither injury nor benefit would result from them; but a large majority of the inhabitants of this country can not, in the very nature of things, be profited by a tariff, because there is a surplus of what they produce, which must be exported. While the population, as shown by the census of 1890, has been made known, the number following the different pursuits has not yet been ascertained; but it may be safely assumed that the proportion of those engaged in the various callings is about the same as in 1880.

At that time, of the 17,392,099 of our people who were engaged in all kinds of business, 2,623,089 were employed in such manufacturing industries as it was claimed were benefited by a high tariff. Of the others 7,670,493 were employed in agriculture, 4,074,238 in professional and personal service, 1,800,258 in trade and transportation, and the butchers, carpenters, blacksmiths, tailors, masons, bakers, and persons in similar avocations numbered 1,214,023. To put it in another form: one-seventh of the laboring population of this country is engaged in industries which are supposed to be benefited by a protective tariff, while six-sevenths are employed in those which can not receive any advantage from tariff charges.

I will illustrate this by taking the case of a farmer, though the same thing is applicable to the lawyer, the doctor, the blacksmith, the carpenter, the railroad employé, and most others. It is a familiar maxim of political economy that the surplus of a commodity regulates its price. There is a duty of 20 cents a bushel on wheat. If last year we had not produced as much wheat as our necessities required, the growers could, and would, have held their crops until the price advanced to a point nearly

equal to the value of the foreign article plus the transportation charges and impost duties. The tariff on wheat would then have benefited the wheat-raiser; but, as a matter of fact, we produced over 150,000,000 bushels more wheat than we could consume.

The owners of it were compelled to find a market for this surplus in some other country or allow it to go to ruin on their hands. When they sent it abroad they had to sell it in competition with the products of the foreign growers of similar produce. If the price obtained for the wheat sent abroad had been such as to realize to the shipper \$1 per bushel, after deducting the charges on it, competition amongst the home buyers would have fixed the value of that which was consumed here as well as that which was to be exported at \$1 per bushel, but when the consumers of wheat in foreign countries could obtain the supplies they needed from other sources at such prices that after deducting the charges only 60 cents per bushel could be realized for our wheat sent abroad, the price of that consumed in this country, as well as that exported, was correspondingly reduced.

This shows clearly that a tariff on an article can not enhance its price as long as there is more of it in the country levying the tariff than is needed there; and this is the case with nearly everything the farmers produce, such as cheese, butter, beef, bacon, lard, corn and other breadstuffs, cotton, etc. The farmer, then, must have the price of his products fixed in the foreign market, where he must come in competition with those who have been permitted to buy in a cheap or unprotected market. That is, the farmers in this country have been compelled, by the tariff, to pay, say, 10 per cent more than their competitors for all the articles covered by it which they and their families use.

I presume it will be admitted that the farmers work harder, live more economically, and utilize the services of their families to a greater extent than do any other class, and they might, therefore, reasonably expect that, at least, an equal proportion of the accumulating capital of the country would fall to their share; but as there has been for a number of years a protective tariff on nearly everything which they buy, if the theories I have been advancing are correct, this has not been the case.

The only benefits which it is claimed that the farmers derive from protection is that it is supposed to provide a market for such things as will not bear long shipments, like milk, vegetables, fruits, etc., and that it saves them freights on their other products. As most of the manufacturing establishments are located in New England, New York, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, and Ohio, the farmers of that section would, if this is correct, receive the greatest benefit from our tariff system. The statistics collected under the census of 1890 have not yet been compiled, but I have been able to procure returns as to most of the States, and they disclose some startling results. While the assessed valuation of the property in the ten States which I have just named increased from 1880, when it was \$9,094,289,423 to \$12,403,167,633 in 1890, making an actual increase of \$3,308,878,210, the value of the farm lands, including the fences and buildings on them, in the same States, decreased from \$3,930,930,755 in 1880 to \$3,585,938,744 in 1890, showing a net loss of \$344,992,011. The value of farms, like all other property, is regulated by their productive capacity. If a farm could be made to yield a revenue of 10 per cent per annum on the amount invested in it, after deducting all expenses, it would be worth just twice as much as if it could only be made to realize a net profit of 5 per cent. So, when we find that the value of the farms in the States spoken of have decreased as they have, we must look to the profits derived from them to account for the loss in their value.

In 1880 the value of the productions on the farms in the ten States that I have named was \$597,557,645, while in 1890 their value had decreased to \$551,541,564, making a net decrease of \$46,016,081. And yet, during this time the value of the implements and machinery used on these farms had increased from \$137,604,606 in 1880 to \$146,343,598 in 1890, making a net increase of \$8,738,992, and the value of the live stock on them from \$389,848,579 in 1880 to \$430,084,194 in 1890, making a net increase of \$40,135,615. It will be seen, then, that while the owners of the farms in the section of the country upon the growth of which I have been commenting have had \$48,000,000 more invested in machinery and live stock with which to make a profit on their holdings in 1890 than they had in 1880, still they actually realized \$46,000,000 less on them than they did in 1880. There must be some reason for this deplorable state of affairs. It can not be possible that such an avocation as that of farming could grow less profitable each year without some cause.

It may be said that there was no possibility of an advance in farm values in these States because the farm lands were thoroughly developed in 1880. This would prove a reasonable explanation of the fact that there has been no great increase in the value of the farms, but it can not account for an actual decrease in their value. It must be observed, too, that I am not arguing here

simply that the farmers are not receiving a just proportion of the increasing capital of the section of the country in which they are located, but I am showing that they have actually been suffering a loss. What explanation can be offered for this? When one class is less prosperous than another there must be some discrimination against it; and when we find that the farmers in the most favored region of the Union are not only not receiving any of the augmenting wealth of the country, but have been failing to keep what they had previously accumulated, we know that they must be laboring under some unnatural disadvantage.

What is this disadvantage? It can not be that the farmers, of whom I have been speaking, have been suffering from an insufficient volume of circulating medium with which to transact their business, because everyone knows that there is and has been an absolute plethora of money in the States where they live, and, besides, if that was the trouble, it would have affected all of those in the same section who are engaged in other productive callings; but some of them have been wonderfully prosperous. It can not be that the pension laws, the operation of which bear so heavily upon some other sections of our country, have caused the misfortunes of those of whom I speak, for they are to a greater extent than any other class the beneficiaries of those laws. It can not be that they are less industrious than their neighbors, or that they are more extravagant in their habits or mode of living, for it will not be questioned but that the farmers are the most industrious and economical of our citizens.

The only discrimination against the farmer is that he is compelled under the tariff laws to buy in a protected or high market, while, from the nature of his calling, he is compelled to sell in an unprotected or cheap market. When, therefore, we reason from cause to effect, we necessarily conclude that those of the inhabitants of our country who are the recipients of governmental favors are prospering at the expense of those who are not, and the correctness of this conclusion is substantiated not only by a comparison of the accumulations of those engaged in the different callings during the same periods, but of those in the same callings at times when such discriminations did and did not exist. From 1850 to 1860 the tariff was nearer on a strictly revenue basis than at any time in our history, and during that decade the value of the farms in the ten States already named increased from \$1,813,767,398 to \$2,800,081,466, a net increase of \$986,314,068, while all of the property in those States increased in value from \$3,635,715,971 to \$6,785,505,845. This shows that under that system each class received something like a just proportion of the aggregate earnings of the entire population.

But, convincing as are the figures I have just cited as to the injurious effects of our legislation upon a large class of our citizens, they are not more so than are the same character of statistics when extended to the entire country. According to the estimate of the Superintendent of the Census the wealth of the United States increased from 1880 to 1890, \$20,000,000,000, while the value of the farms increased \$3,080,000,000. During the same decade the value of the farm products increased \$246,000,000, while the value of the farming implements and the live stock used on the farms increased \$1,577,000,000. When it is remembered that those engaged in agriculture constitute about one-half of our population, it will be seen that there is for some reason a very uneven distribution of the accumulations of the wealth-producing forces of the nation. This was not the case formerly. Between 1850 and 1860 our country was not afflicted with a protective tariff, and the value of the property in the United States increased from \$7,135,780,228 to \$16,159,616,068, while the value of the farms increased from \$3,271,575,426 to \$6,645,045,007.

These well authenticated and undisputed statistics prove beyond controversy that under a low or revenue tariff those to whose energy and enterprise we are indebted for our marvelous growth, received the just reward of their toil and frugality, while under a high or protective tariff the fruits of their industry and economy are transferred to others.

But the protective system has not been more unjust or more discriminating in its operation upon individuals and classes than upon sections. From 1880 to 1890 the assessed valuation of property in Pennsylvania and Massachusetts, the principal manufacturing States of the Union, increased exclusive of farming properties \$1,529,442,166, while the assessed valuations in the agricultural States of Virginia, West Virginia, North Carolina, South Carolina, Georgia, Florida, Kentucky, Tennessee, Alabama, Mississippi, Louisiana, Arkansas, Wisconsin, Iowa, Nebraska, and Kansas increased, including farm values, city property, railroads, and everything else, only \$1,428,969,834 during the same time, and yet the population in the sixteen States named increased 3,729,709, as against 1,430,981 in the two States.

When it is remembered that the inhabitants of these different sections are of similar intelligence, industry, and habits, it must be conceded that there has been some unnatural cause for the

fearful disparity in their relative prosperity as shown by these figures. What can be this unnatural cause? I can imagine none except that those living in one section have been receiving the benefits of protection, while those living in the other have been suffering from its unjust and injurious operations.

I wish next to consider the effect of a protective tariff upon manufacturing enterprises, and in this connection I remind you that the Anglo-Saxon inhabitants of America are preëminently a manufacturing people. From the first settlement of the country, equally with the sister arts of agriculture and commerce, our manufactures, without any adventitious aids, advanced with the increase of population. As early as 1708 complaint was made to the British Parliament by the English manufacturers that three-fourths of the linens and woollens used in the province of New York were made there, and similar complaints were subsequently preferred against the other colonies. It was the efforts of the mother country to suppress their growing manufactories more than anything else which caused our ancestors to withdraw their allegiance from her.

For the decade beginning 1850, during which a strictly revenue tariff prevailed, the value of the products of our manufactories increased from \$553,000,000 to \$1,009,000,000, or at the rate of 90 per cent, while our population increased only 35 per cent. So it appears that the development of our manufactories has been continuous regardless of tariff legislation. And why should not this be the case? Our mechanics are confessedly the most intelligent in the world. They use labor-saving machinery to a greater extent than do the mechanics of any other country. And, after all, the marvelous inventions of recent years have reduced the issue of competition to the question of who can utilize to the greatest advantage the most labor-saving machinery.

A very small proportion of the inhabitants of the earth are capable of using to any great extent the complicated machinery which is being made to do the work formerly done by human hands. It is for this reason that the artisans of the United Kingdom are able to supply with manufactured products the markets of nations which have far greater natural advantages.

I do not question but that protection enables manufacturers to obtain better prices for their products, if they do not produce more than enough to supply the home market, but I do deny that it promotes their permanent prosperity.

As I have already shown, if there is less of a commodity, on which there is a tariff, produced in a country than is consumed, the owners of it can realize for it the cost of similar products in other countries plus the transportation charges and nearly the amount of the duty. If, however, the supply should exceed the demand, competition amongst the owners of the commodity would cause the price to decline until they could only obtain the cost of their possessions and a reasonable compensation for the use of their capital invested and for their personal services. It is, therefore, to the interest of the manufacturers of any article which is subject to a duty to keep down such competition at home as would prevent them from realizing the full benefit of the tariff rather than to extend their business to the utmost limit and secure foreign markets for the surplus products of their industry.

Hence it is that the manufacturers in so many lines have limited the output of their plants by the formation of trusts or the organization of combines. The effect of this on their employes I will discuss later on, but its injurious effect upon manufactories will be perceived at once. Instead of causing our manufacturers to strike out in manful strife and defiantly demand a share of the markets of the world it has caused them to content themselves with a monopoly of the markets of one country.

But we are told that our manufacturers can not compete with the English, and that if the tariff is materially lowered, they will be ruined. Let us see if their fears are well founded. The reason assigned by our manufacturers for their inability to compete with foreigners is because they pay higher wages to their employes. It is undoubtedly a fact that laborers of all kinds receive better compensation in this country than elsewhere, if we estimate it in money, by the week; but if we estimate their compensation by the results accomplished, then such is not the case. This is because of the greater intelligence and efficiency of our laborers, the more extensive use of machinery in this country, and the longer time which our mechanics work in a week. I will try to make this plain by illustrating with the boot and shoe industry, though what I say of it will apply equally well to others.

I find in Harper's Magazine a very well written article, in which an intelligent writer makes a careful estimate of the comparative labor cost in this country and in England of certain articles. The results of his investigations show as follows:

American ladies' shoes, wholesaling at \$1.50 per pair, cost for labor of making, 25 cents; English-made ladies' shoes, wholesaling at \$1.50 per pair, cost for labor of making, 34 cents; American-made men's shoes, wholesaling at

\$2.60 per pair, cost for labor of making, 33 cents; English-made men's shoes, wholesaling at \$2.60 per pair, cost for labor of making, 50 cents.

This corresponds with all the estimates I have seen on the subject. It shows that the American manufacturer actually obtains his labor for less than his competitor, and that in that respect he is prepared to successfully compete in the open markets with his rival. For the year 1892 we exported to the United Kingdom upper leather of the value of \$3,379,659 and sole leather of the value of \$1,314,121, while for the same period we imported from that country upper leather of the value of \$9,927 and sole leather of the value of \$20,783. This proves that leather is more costly in Great Britain than in the United States, for if it was not it would not be shipped from this country to that.

As leather is the only material used in making boots and shoes the cost of which is worth considering, it follows that the American manufacturer of those articles obtains his materials at least as cheaply as do those engaged in the same industry in England, and yet the value of the boots and shoes exported from the United States for the year 1892 was only \$914,974, and the total value of all manufactures of leather \$1,566,418, while there was exported from the United Kingdom for the year 1891 to Brazil alone manufactures of leather of the value of \$1,299,961.

Mr. MORSE. I would like to remark to the gentleman that there is a reason why American manufacturers sell goods abroad cheaper than they do in this country, a reason which operates for the benefit of American workingmen, by allowing the manufacturers to work off their surplus products, and thus to give additional employment to their operatives, often upon newer styles of goods.

Mr. BELL of Texas. The gentleman misunderstood me. I was stating as a matter of fact that they do not send their goods abroad.

Mr. MORSE. Then I did misunderstand the gentleman.

Mr. BELL of Texas. I state that as a matter of fact the value of manufactures of leather sent abroad by the manufacturers of this country is only about a million and a half a year, while England sends to Brazil alone a million and a quarter of such manufactures.

Mr. MORSE. Well, Mr. Chairman, the argument is frequently made on the other side against protection that American manufacturers sell goods cheaper abroad than they do at home, and I wanted to explain that.

Mr. BELL of Texas. I do not care to yield for that purpose just now, because my time is so limited. I see that the gentleman has fallen into an error as to my line of argument.

When we consider that our manufacturers of leather have an advantage of others in the cost of material and in the relative labor cost, in what way can we account for their surrender of the valuable markets for their products except on the theory that they are limiting the output of articles in that line so as to prevent an oversupply in the home market? In other words, it appears that they prefer making fewer articles at a larger profit to making more at a less profit, even if the aggregate gain should be greater.

What is true with reference to the one industry of which I have been speaking is also true of most others. Formerly, when a very large part of the work was done by hand, the labor cost of the finished product represented a much larger proportion of the cost of the article than at present. The various items which go to make up the cost of the finished manufactured product is discussed very fully in the Report of Statistics of Labor for Massachusetts for the year 1890.

This is a very valuable work, and I expect to quote from it frequently. So far as I can discover it deals fairly and candidly with the subjects of which it treats. It certainly can not be suspected of any prejudice against protection, for the arguments in it are all in favor of a protective tariff, though, as I say, I think the facts and figures given are correctly stated. According to this report the labor cost of all the articles manufactured in Massachusetts at the time it was published was 24.87 per cent of the value of the finished product.

The cost of material in some industries is enhanced by the tariff while in others it is not, but the disastrous effects of protection, so far as our foreign commerce is concerned, extends to nearly every manufactured product. For instance, take the item of cotton goods. As we are the greatest cotton-exporting country our manufacturers can obtain their raw materials cheaper than can others. If there is any enterprise in which they ought to outstrip all competitors it is in this, and when they were not hampered by restrictive laws, and when their enterprise was not stunted by the unnatural advantages conferred upon them, they were rapidly doing so.

As I have frequently stated, between 1850 and 1860 we had a low or revenue tariff, but between 1880 and 1890 we had a high or protective tariff. The value of the manufactures of cotton exported from the United States increased from \$4,734,424 in 1850

to \$10,934,796 in 1860, while it decreased from \$10,467,651 in 1880 to \$9,999,277 in 1890. Hence, it is clear that under a low tariff we were rapidly becoming the great cotton manufacturing nation, but under a high tariff we have been losing the prestige we had gained. Why is this? Were the circumstances surrounding the industries materially different during the two periods? At each time we had an advantage in the cost of raw materials equal to the expense of shipping it across the ocean.

In the latter decade we had been paying higher wages than did our competitors, but so we did in the former. Our monetary standard was in each instance the same. So far as the volume of money can contribute to the prosperity of a people the advantage was all in favor of the later period, for the greatest circulation at any time from 1850 to 1860 was \$12.85 per capita, while from 1880 to 1890 the lowest was \$19.41. We did not suffer during either of the decades compared from any general plague or pestilence and we were at peace with the world.

The friends of the protective system attribute much of the growth of our manufactures between 1850 and 1860 to the fact that the European nations were engaged in the Crimean war during a part of that time. The Crimean war lasted from March, 1854, to April, 1856, while the growth of our manufactures and the expansion of our foreign commerce preserved about the same proportion each year for the entire decade, except that in 1858 they declined in consequence of the monetary disturbance of 1857. But it might be supposed that the other nations were manufacturing their cotton goods, and that that was the reason of the falling off in our exports in that line. In order to show that this is not the case, and also to show the extent of the markets we have surrendered, I will give the figures on the importations of a few countries.

The value of the manufactures of cotton imported for the year 1891 was, into Mexico from the United States, \$602,382; from the United Kingdom, \$2,772,506. Into Brazil from the United States, \$803,700; from the United Kingdom, \$12,499,274. Into the Argentine from the United States, \$779,246; from the United Kingdom, \$8,216,730. And the proportion is about the same when applied to the other importing nations. In what way can we account for the abandonment of these markets by our manufacturers except upon the theory that they find the monopoly of the home market so satisfactory that they supinely content themselves with it.

What is true of the two industries which I have used as illustrations is true of most others; but I think a comparison of the growth of those I have mentioned under the different systems of tariff charges will suffice to refute the claim that our manufactures have been in any way benefited by protection.

But there is one other industry to which I desire to call special attention. There had been a tariff of 20 per cent on quinine prior to July, 1879, when it was placed on the free list. I have been unable to obtain any information of the amount of quinine manufactured in the United States at any time, because, in taking the census, it is not separated from certain other medicines, but it is manufactured from cincona and other barks, none of which are found in this country, and since an accurate account is kept of all importations, and since the barks to which I have referred are not used for any other purpose except to convert into quinine, we can calculate with reasonable certainty as to the amount of quinine manufactured at different periods. There was imported of the barks which I will designate under the general head of cincona, in 1876, 5,230,150 pounds; in 1877, 1,760,445 pounds; in 1878, 4,826,290 pounds; in 1879, 6,337,378 pounds.

This will afford some idea of the extent of the industry we are considering at the time of the repeal of the law imposing a tariff on its products. While the bill to repeal the duty was pending the usual cry of the beneficiaries of governmental favor was raised, and a doleful picture of the ruin which was about to be inflicted upon them was drawn; but, nevertheless, we find that about the same output of quinine from the American factories has continued. The cinchona imported for 1880 was 6,013,877 pounds; for 1881, 4,219,403; for 1882, 5,010,547, and while for some years the amount imported has been less, and for others more, the average has been greater since the tariff on quinine was repealed than before, which shows that the manufacturers of quinine in this country have been, and are, able to compete with foreign manufacturers. And they have been doing so in spite of the most unjust discriminations, for on the alcohol used by them in the process of manufacturing they have had to pay an internal-revenue tax equivalent to \$1.70 per gallon, while their European competitors obtained their solvents free of any similar charge.

It is a familiar claim of the protectionists that the prices of protected products are lower than they were formerly because of protection. They argue that because steel rails were selling at \$120 per ton when the law was passed which imposed a very heavy duty on rails, and are now selling at \$29 per ton, the reduction was caused by the stimulation in the production of the

rails occasioned by the duty on them. If this theory be correct how are we to account for the decrease in the price of quinine? As I am informed by the Statistician of the Treasury Department, that in 1877, quinine commanded \$4.50 an ounce; in 1878, \$3.60; in 1880, \$2.50; while in 1890 it could be obtained for 44 cents an ounce. As a matter of fact the decline in the price of quinine was occasioned by the improved methods of making it and by the great decline in the cost of cincona, and was not affected by the tariff. The same thing is true as to steel rails and other protected products.

But whatever may have been the cause of it, it is an undoubted fact that the ability of the American people to produce has outgrown their capacity to consume. We must, therefore, either find foreign markets for our manufactured goods, as we have for our agricultural products, or we must be content to not only not extend our manufactures, but to abandon some of those we now have. The suggestion that we ought to continue any policy which would retard our industrial development ought to be received with no favor by a people whose energy, ingenuity, and enterprise in peace has only been equaled by their valor and patriotism in war.

It was to have been expected that the efforts to reduce the tariff to a revenue basis would meet with opposition from those who have been accustomed to look to the Government instead of to rely upon themselves to promote their prosperity. And here history but repeats itself. The reforms in her tariff which enabled the United Kingdom to become the unquestioned commercial nation of the world were effected after the most stubborn contest, and yet no party which would suggest a return to the old system could now obtain a following in that country. When the low tariff of 1846 was proposed, the same cries which now fill the land were heard on every hand. It was said that the passage of that law meant the destruction of our manufactures, the debasement of our labor, and the general ruin of our country. Every representative of the four principal manufacturing States of New England voted against it. After the beneficial effects of the change had been demonstrated when in 1857 a proposition was made to reduce the duties still further, practically all the representatives of those States favored it. Mr. Blaine, in his history, says:

This act (the tariff act of 1857) was well received by the people, and, indeed, was concurred in by a considerable portion of the Republican party.

May we not reasonably hope that when the beneficent results which will flow from the adoption of the policy of the party now in power manifest themselves we will have the earnest cooperation of the bitterest opponents of the measure under discussion in making the further reduction in our tariff rates which will surely follow?

I do not contend that protection inures to the advantage of those engaged in all kinds of protected industries, for the experience of the past clearly demonstrates that it does not. This is particularly the case with the wool-grower, as will be shown by comparing the prices obtained for their clip in this country at different times and the amount realized here and in England for the same grades of wool at the same time.

This subject was thoroughly investigated by the Committee on Ways and Means of the Fifty-second Congress, and the result was embodied in a very interesting report. There had never been a high tariff on wool in this country prior to 1867, when the duty was fixed at from 10 to 12 cents per pound and at 10 to 11 per cent ad valorem, and while the rates have been slightly changed at different times since, they have always been very great; yet, as is shown in the report to which I refer, the average price realized for fine washed clothing wool for the ten years ending with 1860 was 50.8 cents per pound, and for coarse washed clothing wool was 38.2 cents per pound, while for the ten years ending with 1890 the average price realized for fine washed clothing wool was 34.1 and for coarse washed clothing wool 24.4 cents per pound.

Perhaps no better illustration could be given of the impracticability of forcing people into any calling by law than that which sheep husbandry affords. In 1868, when the high tariff on wool went into effect, there were in the United States east of the Mississippi and Missouri Rivers 37,864,600 sheep, and this number has decreased year by year until in 1891 there were in these States only 18,476,400. It will be observed that the time selected for making this comparison could not be more favorable for the sheep business, because the States referred to included those which had suffered most from the ravages of war, and in 1868 they had not had time to recuperate and regain their normal supply of sheep, and they accordingly show an increase, which, however, is more than offset by enormous decrease in the other States.

The showing in some of the States and Territories where they could obtain the free use of Government land is much better. For instance, in Montana the number of sheep increased from

2,000 in 1870 to 2,000,000 in 1891, and in Utah the increase for that time was about the same. The total number of sheep in the United States in 1868 was in round numbers 39,000,000, and in 1891 41,000,000. In other words, while the population of this country has about doubled in the last twenty-four years, the number of sheep has increased only 4,000,000.

The theory on which protectionists formerly justified their doctrine was that they were in favor of fostering infant industries until they could meet foreign competition. The wool-growers have had the benefit of the highest protection for twenty-four years, and yet the price of their product has been growing lower and the number of their sheep, except in a few favored localities, has been growing less all the time. When we had no or a low tariff on wool the increase in the number of sheep kept pace with the increase of population. Since we have had protection the number of sheep, in proportion to our population and the price realized for wool, have both decreased. Why is this? Like every result there is a cause for it, which we can find if we will investigate carefully.

The report of the committee to which I have referred shows the relative price in this country and in England of washed wool of the grades grown in the United States from 1867 to 1891. The average for the whole time was in England, where there has been no duty on it, 41.08 cents per pound; in America, where there has been a high duty all that time, it was 41.48 cents per pound; but most of the time the price in Philadelphia and Boston was less than in London. At first sight this would seem somewhat singular, but the reason for it is susceptible of a satisfactory explanation. We only grow one grade of wool in the United States, and in order to render that suitable for manufacturing into most kinds of woollen goods it is necessary to mix it with certain coarser grades of wool, which must be imported. The duty on this is so great that the American manufacturer of woollen goods is absolutely barred out of foreign markets.

There is, therefore, no demand here for more wool than enough to make the product sufficient for our local wants, and since the supply of the kinds of wool grown in this country exceeds the demand for it it follows that its price is fixed by the amount which could be realized for it in a foreign country. That is, the seller would not take less for it than he could obtain for it by shipping it abroad, and the purchaser not being compelled to have it will not give more. Of course the same law of supply and demand which regulates the price of everything else affects the price of wool, and hence we find that sometimes when the supply is limited and the demand great the wool-grower realizes an enhanced price for his product in consequence of protection.

For instance, during the years 1871 and 1872, owing to the temporarily increased demand occasioned by the tariff of 1867, the average price of American wool in Boston was 10 cents per pound greater than was the price of the same grade of wool in London; while if we except these two years the average price for the remaining twenty-two years between 1867 and 1891 has been greater in London than in Boston. If the wool-growers could organize a trust and limit the quantity of wool produced, or withhold it until the manufacturers were compelled to buy, they could realize for it the price of the foreign article, plus the transportation charges and nearly the amount of the duty on similar wool; but, as it is impossible for them to do so, whenever they grow more wool of any kind than is needed in this country, the competition between the sellers of it reduces the price. This seems to be a sufficient explanation of the well-established fact that wool commanded a better price in this country under a low than under a high tariff, and that its average price has been about the same in Boston where we have had a high tariff, as in London where they have had none.

But, it may be asked, why has not the consumption of wool increased in proportion to the growth of our population? The answer to this is very clear. In consequence of the high price of wools in comparison with other things the poorer class of our people have been using other kinds of goods and our manufacturers have been using substitutes for wool. As an evidence of this, look at the development of the shoddy industry, a business which would perhaps never have had an existence, and which certainly could never have attained its present proportions but for the exorbitant price which our manufacturers have obtained on their woollen goods. The value of the manufactures of shoddy in the United States increased to \$9,208,011 in 1890, from \$1,767,592 in 1870. There was grown in the United States for 1890 only 92,000,000 pounds of scoured wool, and there was used during the same year in the manufacture of woollen goods in this country 61,626,261 pounds of shoddy. When it is considered that shoddy is only one of the substitutes for wool which is used in the manufacture of wools the decreased demand for wool will be readily understood.

But there is another reason—and, in my judgment, a convincing one—why protection can not permanently benefit the wool-grower. Woollen goods are so indispensable not only to the

comfort, but to the health of those living in the latitude covered by the United States, that there never can be a permanent policy adopted which does not procure for our people the best goods for the least money. If, therefore, the tariff on wool enhanced its price there would be a continual agitation at each election for the repeal of the duty on it which would keep the industry in such a state of uncertainty that no wool-grower could make a reasonably accurate calculation on his income a year in advance.

This applies to all kinds of protected avocations, but to none with so much force as to wool-growing; because, owing to the absolute necessity for the use of woollens, the effort to have them cheapened will be so great, and because from the nature of their business the wool-growers can least of all guard against an over-supply of their products. If the manufacturers of woollens find that there is about to be a surplus of their outputs they can and do close down their mills until the stock on hand is reduced to such proportions as they desire, and the only loss they sustain in the meantime is the interest on their investment. On the other hand, the expense of the wool-growers is the same, regardless of the price they obtain for their wool; and if they realize that they are causing an overproduction of their product there is no way in which they can check it except by exterminating their flocks. If they attempt to do that there is an oversupply of mutton, and they can not sell their sheep. For these reasons I think it plain that protection has not and will not benefit the wool-grower.

The next point to which I wish to invite attention is as to the effect tariff charges have on the wages of those engaged in industries which are supposed to receive the benefit of protection. Of course the more the manufacturers realize for their products, the more they could afford to pay their employes; but manufacturers are like other people, and get whatever they have to buy as cheaply as they can and sell whatever they have to sell for as much as possible. It is conceded that wages are higher in the United States than anywhere else, and the protectionists claim that it is so because of protection. A complete answer to this is found in the fact that wages were much higher here than in foreign countries before our protective system was adopted, and are much higher in England, where they have free trade, than in Germany or France, where they have protection; but the truth is that wages are regulated by the supply of and demand for the service of the laborers.

If there were not enough mechanics in this country to do the necessary work in any particular trade, those who were here could command almost any price for their services until their high wages would cause their numbers to be increased by immigration or by others taking up their calling; but if a part of the mechanics could do the work in their line, the competition would cut down the price until the wages would become so low that a portion of them would have to seek other fields of employment. In this way the equilibrium between the demand for and supply of laborers is regulated. When it is considered that over one-half of the manual laborers in this country are engaged in agricultural pursuits, it will be perceived that anything which reduces the returns for agricultural services and diverts many from that calling must necessarily produce competition which will cause a reduction in the wages of those engaged in all the other avocations.

If, therefore, the farmers of this country were relieved of all unnecessary burdens, and allowed to buy their supplies where they could be had the cheapest, the increased profit of agriculture would enable laborers in all other callings to command better wages, and would result in loss to none except to those manufacturers who in consequence of protection have curtailed competition in the output of their products by the formation of trusts.

This proposition is too clear to admit of dispute or doubt, but I am prepared to support it, as I have all others that I have made, by an appeal to authenticated facts of history. I will present figures showing a comparison of the increase of wages during times when we had, and when we did not have, a high tariff, and also the increase in wages at the same time in countries where different tariff systems prevailed.

The report of the statistics of labor for Massachusetts for 1885 contains a comparison of the wages received in the United States at different periods in the various callings and brings the comparison up to 1883. As I have frequently stated, from 1850 to 1860 we had a low or revenue tariff, while from 1860 to 1883 we had a high or protective tariff. No periods could be selected which would have been more favorable for a comparison than those named, for the war between the States had not become a disturbing factor in 1860 and had ceased to be such in 1883. The increase of wages in most avocations was greater in the ten years when we had a low than in the twenty-three years when we had a high tariff.

I will give a few examples:

	1850.	1860.	1883.
Carpenters received for a day's work.....	\$1.37	\$2.03	\$2.41
Glass-makers received for a day's work.....	2.44	2.96	2.01
Machinists received for a day's work.....	1.62	2.15	2.25
Painters received for a day's work.....	1.47	1.85	1.97
Shipbuilders received for a day's work.....	1.35	3.65	3.25
Tanners received for a day's work.....	1.13	1.67	1.96

These will suffice to show that the increase of wages has neither been dependent upon nor advanced by our protective system.

The report from which I have obtained these statistics shows that the wages of workmen in only three industries in the United States had declined in 1860 as compared with 1850, while the wages of workmen in 118 industries had declined in 1883 as compared with 1860. But it might be suggested that for some reason there was an abnormal increase in wages during the decade ending in 1860.

As a matter of fact, wages have shown an upward tendency from the earliest recorded time. The progress has been broken at intervals by calamities which have checked the onward current, but as soon as the financial embarrassments which seem to visit all countries with periodical regularity have ceased to exercise a depressing influence, the upward flow has continued. This will be made to appear very clearly by comparing the increase of wages in any one calling for a long period. I will take the wages of a blacksmith as an illustration. A blacksmith received for a day's work in 1820, 84 cents; in 1830, \$1.12; in 1840, \$1.40; in 1850, \$1.47; in 1860, \$1.69; in 1883, \$1.92.

The experience of our country alone is sufficient to establish the correctness of the statement that wages have advanced, not in consequence of, but in spite of legislation; but this position can be fortified by comparing the increase of wages in other countries where they have had a different tariff system. The advance in wages in Great Britain, which had been continuous while they adhered to the protective system, was not only not checked but was accelerated when they embraced the more liberal doctrines of free trade.

In order to form a comparison of the growth of wages here and in Great Britain, the compilers of the excellent report to which I have referred investigated the wages paid in a given number of industries in the two countries from 1872 to 1883, and the result ascertained was that in 46.21 per cent of the industries investigated in Massachusetts there had been an increase of wages, while in 53.79 per cent there had been a decrease. In Great Britain in 44.42 per cent there had been an advance, and in 55.58 per cent there had been a decrease, but the average of all the wages in the callings investigated for the time mentioned showed an advance of 9.74 per cent in Great Britain, while in Massachusetts it showed a loss of 5.41 per cent.

Mr. PICKLER. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. BELL of Texas. Yes, sir; if it is not too long.

Mr. PICKLER. If the gentleman's statement be true, how does he account for the petitions from all the workingmen of this country pouring in against this change in the tariff?

Mr. BELL of Texas. I do not concede that to be the fact at all. I understand that some of the working people of this country, so far as they can be threatened and coerced and bulldozed into it by the manufacturers, have sent in some such petitions. [Applause on the Democratic side and in the galleries.]

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair must remind visitors in the galleries that they are not at liberty to applaud. They are here by the courtesy of the House and must observe order.

Mr. MORSE. I would like to remark to the gentleman from Texas that I represented numerous petitions from workingmen who were not bulldozed.

Mr. BELL of Texas. Oh, I do not doubt that there may be individual instances of that kind.

Mr. MORSE. Petitions from half a million workingmen.

Mr. BELL of Texas. Well, there may be half a million even who have sent in such petitions; but, while that may be true, I dare say, it is also a fact that there are hundreds and thousands and millions of the working people of this country who have expressed themselves at the ballot box and elsewhere in favor of the reversal of the system under which we have come so near to ruin. The people of the country have expressed themselves in that way by an overwhelming majority.

Mr. MORSE. Last fall? [Laughter on the Republican side.]

Mr. BELL of Texas. Yes, last fall and the fall before, and time and time again in the past, as they probably will do very frequently hereafter, whenever an election is held presenting the issue on which the members of this House were elected. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. Chairman, when it is remembered that in Great Britain they had no new land to be opened up and no new channels of employment into which their surplus labor could be diverted, as we have had, it will be perceived that a stronger showing than this could not be made against the restrictive system which we have so long maintained, as is now claimed in the interest of labor.

As I have stated, weekly wages have always been much higher in America than in England, but there are a number of differences in the economic conditions prevailing in the countries which render a comparison on this line very unsatisfactory. The American mechanic works 12 per cent longer on an average in a week than does his English rival, while he has much less steady employment. These two items alone are sufficient to prevent us from being able to determine absolutely the relative earnings of those engaged in the same lines of industry here and there, as expressed in money, but after all, it is not the rate of money wages which concerns the workmen so much, as what might be termed real wages, or the amount of subsistence obtainable for a given amount of labor.

If tariff charges do not enhance the price of products, they certainly do not benefit the manufacturer, and do not enable him to pay his employes better wages. If they do enhance the price of the finished products, the laborer has to pay more for the proportion of them which he consumes than does his competitor, and hence it is very doubtful if our mechanics do really receive better wages than do foreigners of equal skill engaged in the same callings. A strong evidence that they do not is found in the fact that very few mechanics immigrate to the United States. As our laws are much more liberal than those of other countries, especially in the educational advantages afforded the poor, if we were paying much better wages in mechanical pursuits than could be obtained elsewhere, we would receive a large immigration of skilled workmen; but nearly all of our immigrants are either farmers or laborers who engage in other avocations in which they can realize no benefit from protection.

Another consideration of the greatest importance to all persons, and particularly to those who must depend upon their wages to maintain themselves, is the steadiness of their employment. If a mechanic obtains a very high price for his work, but is idle most of the time, he will soon consume all he has earned while he was engaged. Manifestly the more extended the market the less likely it is to become oversupplied. There might be, and doubtless has many times been, more of a certain article produced than the whole world could consume; and in such case there is absolutely no remedy except to curtail production until the stock in existence is used up. In the mean time, those engaged in producing that commodity would have to remain idle or resort to some other employment. I have already shown how an oversupply of anything will prevent the owner of it from obtaining the benefit of the tariff on similar articles.

In order that they may realize the highest possible price for their products the manufacturers must keep the supply so limited that competition among themselves will not reduce it. When our manufactories were in their infancy and could not make as many goods as we needed, there was no occasion for our manufacturers to guard against an oversupply. Now, however, since they are able to turn out more than our people can use, whenever the quantity of their commodities is too large, instead of sending them to foreign markets, they close up their factories and throw out of work their employes. This same thing might happen if our markets were more extended, but it would be less likely to when we have access to the markets of the world for our manufactured products than when we are restricted to one market.

I think that I have shown very clearly that our protective system has not resulted, and can not result, in any advantage to the employes engaged in those industries which are supposed to be benefited by it. But if such was the case, and if every cent of the enhanced cost of the products of our factories caused by protection was paid directly to the laborers who made them, I would not abate one particle in my opposition to the system. If I should my memory would revert to the honest, patient, and laborious cotton-growers, working in an almost tropical sun, and requiring the assistance of all the members of their families, in order that they might overcome in the free markets of the world the competition of the poorest paid labor known to man. It seems as if the American mechanic would spurn the insinuation that he is unable to successfully contend with foreign competitors when his countrymen in other callings have under the most adverse circumstances, and in spite of the most oppressive governmental burdens, demonstrated their ability to defy all opposition. Let me show how this has been done.

Twenty-eight years ago the inhabitants of the cotton-growing section of the United States had just passed through the most disastrous experience with which any people have been afflicted

in modern times. Their stock had been stolen or confiscated; their buildings burned; their fences destroyed; their farms turned into waste places. They had no supplies for the coming year and no credit with which to obtain them. Thousands and tens of thousands, yea, hundreds of thousands, of the flower of the land had perished on the battlefield or wasted away in Federal prisons. Those who by education, intelligence, and experience were alone prepared to direct public affairs were disfranchised, and the most superstitions, ignorant, and easily imposed upon of people were invested with the ballot.

By a series of legislative enactments, the most cruel which have ever disgraced the annals of civilization, the management of their local concerns were turned over for years to unscrupulous adventurers, whose interest in those they governed was limited by the amount they could steal from them and from whose speculations more injury resulted than from the four years of relentless war. Thus handicapped the Southern people entered the race for supremacy in the production of cotton, and for the year 1868 grew 2,652,000 bales, while India, Egypt, and all other countries furnished 2,564,000 bales. It will be seen that we then supplied about one-half of the raw cotton for the world. Three years later the proportion had been slightly changed, for in 1871 the United States furnished 3,241,000 as against 3,036,000 supplied by all other countries. But the real struggle had hardly begun. Like the athletes of old, the Southern people girded up their loins for a renewed contest, and relying on their individual manhood, and looking to the Government for nothing, distanced all comers.

In 1881 they produced 6,073,000 bales of cotton, while all the other countries produced 2,500,000 bales, and still maintaining their lead in 1891 they furnished 10,800,000 out of a total supply of 14,190,000 bales. And yet we are told that the American laborer can not compete with foreigners. Pray, who are the American laborers if the cotton-growers are not? They have competed with foreigners and have taken from them their markets, and while they were doing so have been subject to the most grievous burdens. They have had to pay a bonus on the implements with which they cultivate their crops; on the machinery with which they rendered their cotton available, and on the very bagging and ties with which they prepared it for shipment. They have had to pay a bounty on everything worn or used by them or their families; on all materials used in building their houses, their barns, and their fences; and yet the value of the exports of the raw cotton produced by them from 1866 to 1893 was \$5,925,932,320.

Mr. SIMPSON. Will the gentleman permit a question?

Mr. BELL of Texas. Certainly.

Mr. SIMPSON. I want to ask the gentleman from Texas if those workmen of whom he is speaking now have been sending up petitions against a change in the tariff?

Mr. BELL of Texas. They! No, sir; they are only sending such petitions as they have always sent, just asking us to give them a fair show and no favor. That is all in God's world they have ever asked or ever will ask. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. DOOLITTLE. I would like to ask the gentleman what rate of wages those men get who are employed in producing the cotton that competes with the cheap labor of India. And does the gentleman desire to reduce the intelligent white labor of this country to the same conditions that exist in India?

Mr. BELL of Texas. I will answer that. It is the intelligent white laborer that is now competing successfully in the markets of the world in the production of cotton.

Mr. DOOLITTLE. What rate of wages is paid to the labor which produces in the gentleman's State the cotton that comes into competition with the India cotton?

Mr. BELL of Texas. Of course, the wages paid there are just whatever—

Mr. DOOLITTLE. What rate of wages is paid per day or per month?

Mr. BELL of Texas. Of course, the men working on those farms get whatever—

Mr. DOOLITTLE. How much do they get per day or per month?

Mr. BELL of Texas. Of course, I am not prepared to answer such a question. I do not know precisely what they get. But I do know as a matter of fact that they have to pay 25 per cent tax on the shoes which they buy, a tax which goes not to the support of the Government, but to the manufacturer.

Mr. DOOLITTLE. Will the gentleman be kind enough to answer my question?

Mr. BELL of Texas. I am not able to do so in exact terms.

Mr. DOOLITTLE. Does not the gentleman know it to be true that this labor in his State to which he has referred is not paid per month or per day the wages that is paid for the same kind of labor performed in the North and West by white men?

Mr. BELL of Texas. I suppose the wages are substantially the same, or the laborers in other sections would come to our country.

Mr. DOOLITTLE. The same rate of wages?

Mr. BELL of Texas. Substantially. Of course, I do not suppose that farm laborers are paid so much anywhere in this country as skilled labor receives; but I suppose that farm labor throughout the country is paid about the same that is paid in the State of Texas.

Mr. DOOLITTLE. Is it not true that such labor in your State is not paid more than \$10 or \$12 a month?

Mr. BELL of Texas. I think that is about correct.

Mr. DOOLITTLE. I have heard it so stated here frequently by Representatives from your State.

Mr. HEINER of Pennsylvania. May I put an inquiry to the gentleman?

Mr. BELL of Texas. You may if you will be quick, for my time is very limited.

Mr. HEINER of Pennsylvania. Are the laboring men you speak of represented on the floor of this House?

Mr. BELL of Texas. They are. I presume the gentleman imagines that the laboring men who make cotton in Texas are colored people. If that is his supposition it is simply an illustration of the want of information which gentlemen on the other side have in regard to our affairs in the South. Let me say here that the district which I have the honor to represent on this floor has probably fewer colored voters in it than the district represented by any gentleman on the other side of the House. There is one county in my district which cast last year 3,500 votes, and which has not a single colored man in it. I do not mean to say merely that a colored vote was not cast, but that there is no colored man in the county; and that county shipped last year 25,000 bales of cotton. In the county in which I have lived for the last eighteen years there was only one colored man residing at the last election. I do not mean only one colored man voting, but only one living there. The ignorance of some gentlemen on the other side in regard to the condition of things in the South is a constant source of surprise to us.

Mr. Chairman, almost as good a showing as that which I have made for the cotton-grower can be made for the wheat-raiser of the Northwest, while the products of those engaged in these pursuits have never been enhanced one particle by protection.

But we are asked, Do not the farmers get what they have to buy cheaper than they formerly did? Our reply is, certainly they do; and if it is right that other people should receive all the benefits arising from the cheapening of products occasioned by the inventions of labor-saving machinery they have no right to complain; but the competitors of our farmers not only get their supplies for less than they formerly did, but as applied to those things which are subject to a protective tariff for less than our farmers can now obtain them, and certainly we ought not to longer continue a system which places at a disadvantage and renders harder the lot of those upon whom we all are ultimately dependent. As the price of the farmer's products is fixed in foreign markets we can not by legislation enhance it, but we can assist him to overcome competition there, by lessening the expense of production, and the only way we can do that is by reducing the cost of his supplies; but of this I desire to say more later on.

The doctrine of protection proceeds on the erroneous theory that every time people trade one party to the contract loses, when in fact the more they trade the richer they get if each receives from the other something he needs which it would have taken him longer to produce than it did to produce the article he parted with for it. When people are not hampered by restrictive legislation, and are permitted to trade where they can buy the cheapest, experience soon demonstrates where the various necessities or luxuries of life can be produced with the least expenditure of labor, and they adapt themselves to the conditions prescribed by the laws of nature. Those I represent could, by some hot-house process, raise all the coffee they use, but since they can for less than one-tenth the cost raise other things which they can exchange for the coffee they consume, it would be foolish for them to do so.

It would be more absurd in detail, but not a particle different in principle, for our Government to attempt to coerce her citizens into growing their coffee than to try to force them to engage in any of the other unprofitable businesses. An industry which requires the assistance of protection is an unprofitable one, and if we take out of profitable employment a part of our citizens and put them at unprofitable work, those who remain in the profitable employment must support them. Hence it is that our agriculturists, being engaged in a business which is profitable, as theirs is, not on account of the large returns they receive, but on account of the economies they practice, are compelled not only to maintain their own business, but to con-

tribute enough from their savings to render profitable the calling of others. Such an unjust and unnatural condition as this could not be productive of prosperity, and, unless my reasoning is very much at fault, it will be found that the growth of our country since we have had the protective system will not compare favorably with its development before we adopted it.

No periods could be found which would be more favorable for a fair comparison of the effects of the different tariff systems than the decades ending in 1860 and 1890. The low tariff of 1846 had time to be put into full operation at the beginning of the former and the high tariff had been in operation for years at the beginning of the latter. The economical conditions otherwise than as to the customs laws were very similar, as has been previously stated. I have already shown how under a low tariff our agriculture flourished, our manufactures prospered, our commerce extended, our wages advanced, and how the wealth of the country was somewhat evenly divided amongst those who created it. I have also shown how under a high tariff our agriculture faded, our manufactures languished, our commerce dwindled, our wages decreased, and how the wealth of the country became concentrated in the hands of the few.

I desire now to make a few final comparisons, but, before doing so, there is one other matter which ought to receive some consideration. As I have already stated, the wealth of the country increased during the decade ending in 1890 to the enormous amount of \$20,000,000,000, and this fact is by some regarded as an evidence of the beneficial effects of protection, and we are asked why there was such an increase if the operation of a prohibitory tariff is as injurious as we contend that it is. Our reply is, that our resources are so bountiful and the energies of our people are so great that we have been prospering in spite of the difficulties under which we have labored. Our condition has been aptly likened to that of a spendthrift who has inherited a magnificent estate which yields an income larger than he can squander, and which continues to accumulate in spite of his extravagance. However, it is not the actual, but the relative increase which affords the proper basis of comparison to enable us to determine whether we have been augmenting our wealth more rapidly under the one system than the other.

Between 1850 and 1860 the aggregate wealth of the United States increased 126 per cent, while the population increased 35.58 per cent. Between 1880 and 1890, it increased 46 per cent, while the population increased 24.86 per cent. The value of the exports from the United States between 1850 and 1860, increased 130 per cent; between 1880 and 1890, 2½ per cent. This last statement seems almost incredible, and would, at least, raise a question as to whether there was not some unusual reason for so slight a gain in such an important item as that of our exports to foreign countries.

I, therefore, will extend the comparison. Between 1879 and 1889 the value of our exports increased 2.4 per cent, while between 1881 and 1891 it actually decreased 4.7 per cent. The value of the imports into this country increased from 1850 to 1860, 104 per cent; from 1880 to 1890, 18 per cent. In 1860 of the total imports into and the exports from the United States, 66.5 per cent was transported in our own vessels, while in 1890 only 17.4 per cent was, and in 1890 it decreased to 12.9 per cent, and in 1892 to 12.3 per cent, thus affording us abundant grounds for fearing that if our laws are not modified the American merchant marine, once the pride of every patriotic heart, will soon entirely disappear from the high seas.

But convincing as are these comparisons of the injurious results of the efforts of man to defy the laws of nature, they are not more so than was the condition in which our country was after a fair trial of the different tariff systems for a sufficient time to afford an opportunity for each to thoroughly demonstrate its effects. After fourteen years' experience under a strictly revenue tariff our people were fully and profitably employed, and the public countenance exhibited tranquillity, contentment, and happiness. It was this period which Gen. Garfield, in one of those speeches delivered in this House which so much added to his fame, described in this language:

The fact is, Mr. Chairman, the decade from 1850 to 1860 was one of peace and general prosperity.

Senator MORRILL one of the ablest advocates of protection, in a speech delivered in 1867, describing the condition of our country in 1860, said:

And that was a year of as large production and as much general prosperity as any perhaps in our history.

What a contrast does this picture present to the enforced idleness, misery, and suffering which we now see on every hand. But some say that the stagnation prevailing in all kinds of business in our country is caused by the apprehended change in our tariff schedules, and much complaint is heard of those who are attempting to lessen the burdens under which we have been laboring so long.

If it be true that our disturbances are occasioned or aggravated by threatened legislation, it would be as unreasonable to blame those who are trying to make needed changes in our customs laws as it would be to blame the surgeon who applies the probe, and to allow the assailant who inflicted the wound to go without censure.

But are our troubles due to the causes assigned by those who are trying to defeat the reforms for which the American people have so overwhelmingly pronounced? From their statements one would imagine that until within the last ten months we had been in the enjoyment of unbounded prosperity, when, as a matter of fact, our ills are merely the culmination of troubles begun long before there was any reasonable prospect of early tariff reform, and when, in truth, the possibility of that reform was hastened, if not occasioned, by the prevalence of the hardest times and most universal suffering which had been experienced for years.

The McKinley tariff bill, under which the already exorbitant customs tolls were greatly increased, became a law in 1890, and it so stimulated the home industries that their output greatly exceeded the capacity of our people to consume them. The inevitable result was that the factories closed down, strikes ensued, riots followed, and the party to whose legislation this deplorable state of affairs was properly attributed met with the most overwhelming rebuke which had been administered to any political organization within the memory of man. These occurrences are of such recent date that it is, perhaps, useless to substantiate the statement which I have just made; but I will submit some evidence to establish its correctness. The extracts which I will read are taken from reliable journals.

January 14, 1892:

The mills of the Oxford Nail and Iron Company, of Oxford, N. J., have been shut down for over two months. It is a mystery how the people live. In many houses there has not been a coal fire for weeks. If something is not done soon families are likely to starve to death.

February 14, 1892:

Owing to continued depression in the iron trade the Chesapeake Nail Works, and the puddling department of the Central Iron Works shut down to-night, throwing between 200 and 300 men out of employment.

March 17, 1893:

Twelve iron furnaces at Birmingham, Ala., reduced wages 10 per cent on Tuesday, because of the low price of iron. The men accepted the inevitable.

The Trade Review says:

The one thing in order is curtailment. There are signs, too, that the work has begun. Five Valley furnaces will quit within a week we are assured. That all that has been said within these past three months of the desperately unwholesome condition of the market was founded on fact appears on the one hand by the wholesale discharge of employes and the shutting down of puddling mills, and on the other hand by the bad failure of a prominent Valley iron firm, which there can be but little doubt will be followed by the blowing out of more than one stack.

April 13, 1893:

The Quaker Oatmeal Mills of Ravenna, Ohio, employing 150 men, have shut down indefinitely. This is part of the plan of the American Cereal Company, "The oat-meal trust," to limit production and force prices up, in order that some returns can be earned on its capital.

May 12, 1892:

The Iron Age reported that the manufacturers of the Mahoning and Shenango Valleys have agreed upon a scale of wages which they will present to the Amalgamated Association of Iron and Steel Workers in June, and that "it is understood that a thorough rearrangement of prices has been made and that quite a material reduction in the price of puddling has been demanded."

June 5, 1892:

At a mass meeting of the Cloth Hat and Cap Makers' Union in New York on to-day over 700 men, representing 25 out of the 30 shops in the city, discussed the grievance of wage reduction. It was said that during the last year several reductions in their wages at different times had made a total reduction of 70 per cent, and that during the best four months of the year the best men have been unable to earn more than \$6 a week. They will make an effort to get wages back above starvation point. Pitiable as is the lot of these men it is no worse than that of hat-makers elsewhere in this country since the McKinley bill came their way. A few years ago the hat factories of Bloomfield, Watessung, and East Orange, N. J., were prosperous and gave steady employment to hundreds of hands. The almost prohibitive duty on hatters' raw materials has caused the business to dwindle until now no mill in Bloomfield is running on full time and many of the employes have sought work in other business.

Similar evidence of the evil effects of the increased duties imposed by the act of 1890 could be added indefinitely, but these will suffice to show the falsity of the claim that our business paralysis has come upon us since there has been a prospect of a speedy tariff reform, and much less has it been caused by it.

What, then, has been the cause of the depression which has become so severe, so universal, and so long-continued? The explanation is to me perfectly clear. Everybody in this country is dependent, directly or indirectly, upon the agriculturists. If, therefore, the farmers are prosperous others will be. If they are not, none can be.

I have already shown how, under the operation of the high tariff, a portion of the earnings of the farmers, which ought to have remained their property, has been for years diverted from

them and donated to others. As prior to the adoption of the protective system the property of the country was somewhat evenly divided, the farmers had about their just proportion of it. But gradually, though surely, their possessions were drawn from them; since after paying protection prices for what they had to buy while realizing only free-trade prices for what they had to sell, they could not, even with the strictest economy, earn enough to supply themselves and their families with the comforts and conveniences which modern civilization demands, their original capital became impaired. To make good their losses they were compelled to borrow. The Census Department has compiled the figures showing the amount of the mortgage debt on real estate, outside of the cities and towns, in all the States and Territories, except Texas, Virginia, West Virginia, and Washington, and the result is startling.

In 1891 it was \$537,236,947, an increase since 1880 of 57.58 per cent. In some of the agricultural States the per cent of increase largely exceeded the average. In Alabama it was 270 per cent; in Georgia, 218 per cent; in Florida, 533 per cent; in Tennessee, 197 per cent; in Mississippi, 143 per cent; in Arkansas, 150 per cent; in Missouri, 106 per cent; in Nebraska, 234 per cent. It is claimed that the money borrowed has been devoted to the improvement of the farms, and that is doubtless so to a considerable extent in the new States, though it can not be the case with those east of the Mississippi River.

But there is a limit to all things. The money-lenders realized that they had advanced all they could with safety on the farmers' property, and this source of obtaining ready money was cut off. Our farmers, therefore, being unable to buy the merchants' goods the merchants had no occasion to purchase from the manufacturers, and our manufacturers being restricted to the home markets were compelled to close their establishments and deprive of work thousands of their employes. This, happening as it did at a time when values had been unduly inflated by wild speculations conducted to a great extent on borrowed capital, caused the collapse which has resulted in so much suffering, misery, and loss.

It remains now to discuss the means by which we can check the adverse tide, which seems to be about to engulf our country in wreck and ruin.

The remedy proposed by the advocates of protection, represented on this floor by the Republicans, is to allow the existing tariff laws to remain unaltered. Unless everything that I have said is utterly fallacious, this suggestion should not be dignified with controversy. It is as if the physician whose patient had impaired his health and undermined his constitution by the continued use of alcohol should prescribe more excessive libations of the same fluid as an antidote for that which had caused his troubles.

The remedy proposed by the advocates of inflation, represented on this floor by the Populists, is to, in some manner, make money more plentiful. Though the methods by which they have heretofore proposed to do this do not commend themselves to my judgment and will encounter my earnest opposition, still with the results they will seek to accomplish, if they should ever make an effort to expand our circulating medium, I will be in full sympathy, and I am not only willing but anxious to vote for any measure looking to an increase in the volume of our currency to the very uttermost limit to which that can be done without impairing its absolute and immediate convertibility into the coin of the country.

But while I believe that it would be to our interest to have the very largest possible circulation, provided it is safe and sound, still I do not agree with those who contend that an insufficient quantity of money contributed to any material extent to our present troubles. It must not be forgotten that we have had a much larger circulation, aggregate and per capita, each year for the past ten years, while the vast body of our people have been growing poorer and poorer, than we had at any time when they were growing richer and richer. Nor should it be forgotten that our circulation has been increasing every year during the past fifteen years, and that as our circulation grew larger the times grew harder. In 1878 the money in the United States in circulation, that is, outside of the Treasury, was \$15.32 per capita. In 1890, when the acute stage of present troubles struck us, it had grown to \$22.82, in 1891 to \$23.41, in 1892 to \$24.44, and in 1893 to \$25.57.

Just at this time, when there is almost a complete stagnation in all kinds of business enterprises, the banks all over the land have the largest balances of cash on hand which has ever been known. Money can be had in the financial centers at as low a rate of interest as any reasonable man could desire. Business has not been paralyzed because money can not be had at reasonable rates of interest, but money can not be loaned at reasonable rates of interest because business has been paralyzed. The cure for this state of affairs must be found not so much in increasing

our circulating medium as in adopting some policy which will permit a more extensive and just circulation of the medium we already have.

Another thing which must not be overlooked is that the price of our agricultural products, as I have shown, is fixed in foreign markets. How, then, could the fact that we have a larger volume of money affect the price of our cotton, our wheat, or our corn when we can not increase the volume of the money of the country where their prices are fixed.

But, after all, if we had a per capita circulation of \$50, the causes which have drained practically all of the capital of the country into one section of it and concentrated it in the hands of a comparatively few people would affect the increased circulation in the same way.

The remedy proposed by the advocates of tariff reform, represented on this floor by the Democrats, is to abandon the system under the operation of which we have been brought to the verge of ruin and to return to the one under which all will be "free to regulate their own pursuits of industry and improvement," and which "will not take from the mouth of labor the bread it has earned," and to restore the prosperity of all by permitting the prosperity of those upon whom all are dependent.

A bill by which we seek to accomplish this result has been framed by the committee having the matter in charge, and is now the subject of consideration. It is one which, with the exception of a single item, meets with my unqualified approval. I can not agree that because the policy of paying a bounty to one class of our citizens (the sugar-growers) was inaugurated by another party, we should undo that wrong gradually. I am in favor of an immediate repeal of the law which provides that a part of the taxes which have been collected from all our people should be donated to a few of them. Otherwise I regard the measure under discussion as one which, in view of the depleted condition of our Treasury, is as nearly up to the ideal tariff reform bill as could be reasonably hoped for.

If the changes proposed should be accomplished the present duties on imported goods, which are equivalent to an ad valorem rate of 49.58 per cent, will be reduced to 30.66 per cent. If this reduction applied in equal proportions to all imports it would neither satisfy the just demands of our people nor be consistent with our platform declaration, that "the Federal Government has no constitutional power to impose and collect tariff duties, except for the purpose of revenue only."

But, as I have shown, the tariff on many articles is already on a revenue basis, and accordingly we find that, as to those things, there has been but little and in some cases no reduction, while as to a few there has been an increase. For instance, the revenue derived from the duty on champagnes and wines imported in 1892 amounted to \$5,058,661.71, and it is not proposed to change the rates on these articles. The revenue paid on imported silks for 1892 was \$16,965,637.03, and it is only proposed to reduce the tariff charges on silks from 53.56 per cent to 45.13 per cent. On the imports of tobacco the revenues collected was \$10,265,067.98, and it is only proposed to reduce the duty from 117.82 per cent to 91.58 per cent. The duty on diamonds and pearls, which has heretofore been 10 per cent, it is proposed to increase to 15 per cent.

In contrast to these, I will state the present and proposed rates on a few of the articles on which the duty is now prohibitory. On wool hats the present duty ranges from 86 to 106 per cent; the proposed duty from 25 to 35 per cent. On flannels the present duty from 84 to 103 per cent; the proposed duty from 25 to 40 per cent. On blankets, present duty from 80 to 103 per cent; proposed duty from 25 to 35 per cent. On shawls, present duty from 88 to 150 per cent; proposed duty 40 per cent.

The average duty on metals and the manufactures thereof, under the present law, is 58.91 per cent, under the proposed law it would be 35.50 per cent. In this, as in other lines, the reductions which it is proposed to make do not apply to everything in equal proportions, but is greatest on such articles as we are compelled to use. It is not proposed to make any change in the duty of 35 per cent now imposed on swords, sword blades, and side arms; while cotton ties, now subject to a duty of from 40.03 to 50.23 per cent, are to be placed on the free list.

No change is recommended in the duty of 25 per cent now imposed on watches; but on screws it is proposed to reduce the present rate, which runs from 46 to 110 per cent, to 30 per cent. The duty on dice, chessmen, and billiard balls is to remain 50 per cent, as at present. Salt, now subject to a duty of from 35.14 to 82.33 per cent, is to be put on the free list. The duty on fire-crackers, gunpowder, and percussion caps, which now ranges from 25.81 per cent to 147.32 per cent, is to remain as at present; coal, now subject to a duty ranging from 22.72 to 28.68 per cent, is to be admitted free. No reduction is proposed in the present tariff charges of 20 per cent on furs; lumber, now subject to a duty ranging from 8.33 per cent to 21.40 per cent, is to be placed on

the free list. The tariff of 25 per cent on the manufactures of amber, asbestos, coral, and jet is to remain as at present; but iron, which is now subject to a tariff ranging from 15 to 42.70 per cent, is to be admitted free.

So, it will be seen that while the reductions of the duties on necessities is very considerable, the average is not very great, because the reductions on luxuries is so small.

What changes will place the tariff on a revenue basis as to an article on which the duty has heretofore been prohibitory can only be determined by experiment. If, after the lapse of sufficient time to test the matter, it is ascertained that on some things the rate is still prohibitory, further reductions can be and doubtless will be made.

Representing, as I do, a constituency which is as essentially agricultural perhaps as any represented on this floor, I can not forbear to express my gratification at the consideration the committee which framed the bill under discussion has accorded to that most important of all industries.

Each change recommended by the committee will, if adopted, lessen the disadvantages under which our farmers have labored, and will enable them to retain a larger portion of the wealth they create. While they will still be compelled to have the price of their products fixed on a free-trade basis, they will be able to obtain much of what they buy at free-trade prices.

This is particularly the case with the cotton-planter. If the recommendations of the committee are adopted, he can obtain, without having their cost enhanced by a tariff on them; the lumber with which he builds his houses, his barns, and his fences; the oil with which he lights and the fuels with which he heats his dwelling; the salt with which he seasons his food and preserves his meats, the medicines with which he heals his sick, the implements with which he cultivates his crop, the machinery with which he renders his cotton available for market, the ties with which he prepares it for shipment, and when exported the bagging with which he protects it. He can obtain the benefit of the lower prices which will result from the competition between the home and foreign producers of the hardware he uses; of the clothes, the hats, and the shoes he wears, and of everything else he consumes.

It is not strange that one who has been the recipient, as I have, of continued favors from a constituency whose chief industry is the production of cotton, should hail with delight the prospects of the adoption of a policy which will lessen the burdens and render more prosperous the condition of those who have contributed so much to the prosperity of, but who have received such little consideration from their Government as have the cotton-growers.

For this policy the American freemen have declared in no uncertain tones. But the battle is not yet won. Self-confident from continued triumphs and the possession of unlimited capital, tenacious of old theories and honestly fearing the result of any change, the beneficiaries of protection will contest every inch, and, like the old guard, will to a man die in the last ditch.

With unfaltering faith the Democracy of the nation, never elated in victory, never daunted in defeat, marches to the performance of her mission, and will renew charge after charge until she solves the people's problems and rights the people's wrongs. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. BOWERS of California. Mr. Chairman, in some remarks made in the Fifty-second Congress when a bill similar to this was pending, which was intended to give some manufacturers a bonus at the expense of the wool-grower, I said:

I have sometimes thought that if the people of these United States would highly resolve to hang by the neck until he was dead the first citizen, and every other citizen or alien, whether in Congress or out of Congress, who proposed, within the next twenty years, any change whatever in the tariff laws of the United States, it would conduce more to the permanent prosperity of the country than any resolution ever made and enforced by the American people. [Laughter.]

What this country wants, and must have, for its permanent prosperity, is certainty and stability of its laws; not continual change and uncertainty.

I said then "I sometimes thought so;" I say now I think so all the time; for the very threat of such change, coupled with the power the Democratic party now has to put the threat into execution, has produced widespread disaster throughout the land.

We were told three or four months ago that the so-called Sherman law caused all the trouble and distress that then covered the land, and the President called the Congress together to remove that cause by repealing that law. It was done. The law was repealed, but it is now seen that it had no more power to allay the public distress than would the casting of a pebble to still the mighty waves of the Atlantic. It is now patent to everyone what a wicked fraud this hue and cry set on the Sherman law was. What a clumsy and futile attempt to divert attention from the real cause of the distress that then hovered over all our country and rests on it to-day, which was the attack of the Democratic President and his managers upon the business

interests and welfare of the American people for the benefit of all Europe.

It is unfortunate for all the people that the exigencies of the Democratic party seem to require it always to attack the business interests of the country, and every industry in it, except those clustered around Wall street, and of the foreigners doing business within its shadows; but it is a party that is only democratic in name. It is in fact the close ally and servant of aristocracy; witness its attempt to overthrow a republic and set up a monarchy; the attorney for foreign money-lenders and domestic stock gamblers and corporations.

This bill is nothing more and nothing less than the ordinary tariff tinkers' bill, which has made its appearance often in Congress for years past; but owing to the fact that a Republican Senate or a Republican President has heretofore stood between the people and the threatened harm, no injury had been done.

The pending proposition is entitled "A bill to reduce taxation, to provide revenue, and for other purposes." But this title does not express the true purpose of the bill. To do that it must be amended so as to read, "A bill for the relief of the Democratic party, at the expense of the producers and laboring people of the United States, and to reduce the revenue."

The authors of the bill confess that it will reduce the revenue \$70,000,000, and there is no doubt that it will accomplish its purposes most effectively, and also in a different direction from that intended. It will relieve that party from all responsibility for legislation for twenty years, beginning March 4, 1895, and will soon after relieve it of the cares of government in every department.

It is true that a majority of the people of the United States voted for the policy set out in the Democratic platform adopted at Chicago by voting for the candidates standing upon it. There was no uncertainty about the tariff plank in that platform. It was plain and concise, admitting of but one meaning. Of course it may be charged that not being double-faced it could not be a genuine Democratic plank. However that may be, they put it in their platform and every Democratic candidate stood upon it. The people of this country can not claim to have been deceived by the tariff plank.

The Democratic party claimed that the policy of "protection was a fraud," a "robbery," and, besides that, was unconstitutional. It said to all the raisin-growers of the twelve counties of the Seventh California district—for in every county of that district the production of raisins is a leading industry—"The tariff that gives you a protection of 2½ cents per pound on raisins, that compels the raisin-growers of Spain to pay 2½ cents per pound toll, to come into your markets and compete with you, is a fraud and a robbery of the many for the benefit of the few, and besides is unconstitutional. We will reform that tariff, take that protection you now enjoy away."

They said to nearly all the producers in the country—not to all, for they had some pets—the same to nearly all operatives in the factories throughout the land—not to all of them—that "the protection given you by the tariff to the articles you are manufacturing, thereby enabling you to receive greater wages than you otherwise would, is a fraud, a robbery of the many for the benefit of the few, and is unconstitutional."

Mr. Chairman, theories are beautiful things sometimes; facts are very obstinate things. I have a few facts to present. Here are some raisins for which the other day I paid here in Washington at retail 15 cents a pound; here are some purchased at another store, for which I paid 25 cents a pound; here are some for which I paid at another store 30 cents a pound. All these raisins are from Fresno County, Cal., in my district. All of them are of the same grade. These raisins, the retail price of which was at different stores 15 cents, 25 cents, and 30 cents, are, as I have said, of the same grade, a grade of which Fresno County alone has sent out this year over 2,000 car loads. For those raisins the producers receive from 3½ cents to 4 cents a pound, free on board the cars.

Now, I want to ask any really smart gentleman (I do not want anybody else to attempt to reply) whether he supposes that if this tariff bill, taking 1 cent off the duty on raisins should go into effect, the man on F street here who charges me 40 cents a pound for imported raisins will the next day after the bill is passed cut the price down to 39 cents; or that the man from whom I bought this other specimen of imported raisins for 35 cents a pound of the same brand (his store being on the avenue and not quite as stylish as the one on F street, where I bought those for 40 cents), will put the price down to 34 cents a pound. You all know better than to suppose such a thing. You know how stupid and ridiculous it is to make an argument that this reduction of the duty on raisins will in any case inure to the extent of 1 penny to the benefit of any consumer in the United States. Every man of common sense knows that such will not be the effect. [Applause.] You simply lose that much money from your Treasury.

Then you propose in this bill to reduce the duty on oranges. The duty now on oranges is 10 cents per cubic foot, which you propose to reduce to 8 cents. Now with first-class large oranges there will be about forty in a cubic foot—from forty to fifty. The reduction of duty proposed in this bill on a dozen oranges, sold at retail in the city of Washington to-day at 75 cents a dozen, would be about one-half of a cent. Do you suppose that if you reduce the tariff in this way the man who is now charging 75 cents a dozen for those oranges will, after you have adopted this Democratic tariff, reduce the price to 74½ cents? You know he will not. That is your argument. You know as well as I do that it does not affect the customer at all, and all your bill is to benefit the importer, the handler, the dealer, and nowhere in this bill is the interest and welfare of the consumer benefited.

Your Democratic argument—one of your strongest arguments—has circled around the dinner pail of the workingman. I bought one to-day and weighed it. It weighed 4 ounces, and cost 10 cents. You propose to reduce the tariff about 1 cent a pound on tin. That would reduce the price of the workingman's pail in accordance with your idea, if it be a correct one, exactly one-fourth of a cent. Allowing the workingman four pails a year, you would take off the burden of taxation each year to the amount of a whole red cent from that workingman. [Laughter and applause.]

But while making this tremendous saving in the way of taxation laid upon him, you have taken \$150 from him of his wages for that year; and then you can boast that you have reduced the price of his dinner pail a quarter of a cent!

Mr. MORSE. Will the gentleman allow a suggestion?

Mr. BOWERS of California. Oh, yes.

Mr. MORSE. I want to suggest to my friend that I fear the workingman is more concerned now about something to put into the pail than what he has to pay for it.

Mr. BOWERS of California. That is the lamentable fact. I have here a letter from an old friend in Wisconsin, one of the proprietors of a large manufactory. It is as follows:

PORT ATKINSON, WIS., December 22, 1893.

DEAR SIR: What I want is a copy of the Wilson tariff bill, if you can send it to me, and I would also like the minority report. I am taking quite an interest in this tariff matter because it affects us somewhat. While the tariff on tins is to be reduced, it seems as though it would be to our advantage; but dealers in Chicago tell us that tin would be no cheaper under the new tariff law, as manufacturers in England have told them this summer that if it was reduced they should advance the price on tin, and I believe that the dealers and brokers in tin in Chicago firmly believe this to be so.

I am in hopes that our tin industry has got such a start that it will be able to hold its own, even now, but of this I am a little doubtful. Had it continued two years longer we should have been able to obtain all the tin wanted in America, made by American manufacturers.

Yours respectfully,

D. W. CURTIS.

HON. W. W. BOWERS,
123 Fourth street, S.E., Washington, D. C.

The gentleman from Texas who preceded me told us about the resources of the cotton States, and how cotton-growers went to work like men without any aid or any tariff for protection and raised so much cotton. But he did not tell why the rice-growers in the Carolinas did not wade into their work like men without asking a cent and a half a pound protection? Why do you give it to them? Did they ask for it, or is it a fact that you have some friends, some pets, in the rice business, who own some rice plantations? [Laughter.]

The people of six of the nine counties then comprising the Seventh California district accepted the Democratic platform and went Democratic by a good majority, and when the returns came in showing that the Democratic platform had won, they celebrated the victory in grand style, got up big processions, held large ratification meetings, shouted themselves hoarse, and fell on each others' necks in an ecstasy of joy. As it was in California, so everywhere, the victory of reform was celebrated, and if any man was happier than a Democrat in those days, it was the festive Mugwump, who was once a Republican, but failing to get a nomination for some office, let the canker of disappointed ambition prey upon him until the very blood in his veins ran sour, and he became a natural-born Mugwump; and by the way, specimens of this kind of homo were greatly prized and admired by our Democratic friends; they laid the best offices they had at their feet and Democrats became their servants.

I am speaking of the conditions that existed one year ago. There have been some changes since then, some very great changes, even among Democrats, although I may say, parenthetically, that the condition I have described of Democratic admiration for, and subservience to, Mugwumps seems to remain the same in the higher circles of Democracy, as shown by recent events.

But now in California those people who were so enthusiastic for reform are again holding meetings, not to ratify reform over again. Oh, no; very serious business meetings have taken the place of political meetings. These people are not quite as delirious as they were. The low diet prescribed for them by the

Democratic reform doctors has cooled their fevered blood. Somehow the great reform victory has not panned out the blessings it promised in the blossom; they find its fruit—like the apples of Sodom, fair to the eye—turn to ashes in their mouths, and even the pretty little roosters they carried on their hats so proudly have turned into poor little scrawny black crows.

Hardly had the echoes of the anvils which were fired at the cross-roads ratification, or of the cannon fired in the towns in celebration of the great reform victory died away before the people began to realize that a change was taking place. They felt a chill in the air. For more than twenty years they had basked in the sunshine of American prosperity, and during all these years the ring of the hammer on the anvil, the whir of the mill-wheel, the sounding blows from the forges, the throbbing of all the mighty machinery everywhere, all blending together in the grand anthem of industry, had rung in their ears, and they had kept time with its step and melody, and every breeze carried the swelling notes of the chorus of the worker's song.

But now fainter and fainter came the melody; farther and farther away it seemed; note after note dropped out of the song, and in their stead there came the discordant cry of dismay, the wail of distress, the sounds of the mourning for murdered opportunities and industries. They saw the fires die in the furnaces, the wheels of the mill fall asleep, the miner's pick growing rusty, and the sounds from the forge had died away. They saw the black clouds of Democracy drifting across the sky, and prosperity fly away. They saw that Democracy and prosperity could not dwell together; that they were opposites, incompatible, unassimilable, and must forever remain strangers to each other.

Forced to see and feel all this, these people now say to you, "We have deceived ourselves; we have been punished enough for our folly; give us back the prosperity and the peace and the comfort we enjoyed under protection, for one day of the glorious sun of Republican prosperity is worth a thousand years of such as this one given us by the Democracy. Take away your tariff reform, take it back to the devil who invented it and who owns it; we want no more of it." So say the farmers, so say the producers, so say all the workers in the field and shop who have made this country what it is.

Who asks for the passage of this bill? Is it the farmer? No. The miner? No. The wool-grower? No. The manufacturer? No. The workman in the factories? No. Any American industry? No. All of these protest against it; from every section of the country, from Maine to Texas, from Florida to Washington, the protests come thick and fast.

Mr. PICKLER. But the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BELL] says that they are "coerced."

Mr. BOWERS of California. Coerced! Well there will be some other gentlemen coerced about the next time the people get a chance to talk to them at the polls. [Laughter and applause.]

This bill comes in here followed by the imprecations of the American people, and in his secret heart many a member who will be forced to vote for it curses the fate that compels him, and will hereafter. Pushed in here by Democratic politicians at the demand of importers and foreigners, denounced by every industry in the United States, who is left asking for it? England, France, Germany, Spain, Italy, and Canada; all these are asking for it. It is in fact "all Europe against America," and in this contest we see the Democratic President and his managers espousing the interests of Europe as against their own people. Who else demands this legislation? The newspapers owned by foreign importers. Who else? The bond dealers. Who else? The capitalists. Who else? The corporations. Who else? The man who would rather give employment to an English or a French manufacturer than to an American industry; to a vineyardist in France or Spain than to one in the United States. Who else? The man who would rather see thousands and tens of thousands of American citizens walking the streets asking for work and bread, as they do to-day under this Democratic Administration, than employed in the mills and mines and on the farms as they were under the American policy of the Republican party. Who else? No one. Have I overdrawn the picture in this statement?

Mr. SIMPSON. I think you have.

Mr. BOWERS of California. I will cite the best Democratic authority, and call the President of the United States as a witness, that I have not. Will you accept his evidence?

Mr. SIMPSON. I do not know that I will.

Mr. BOWERS of California. Here is what he says to you. Here is the extraordinary confession he makes in his message to this Congress:

In my great desire for the success of this measure I can not resist the suggestion that its success can only be attained by means of unselfish counsel on the part of the friends of tariff reform, and as a result of their willingness to subordinate personal desires and ambition to the general good. The local

interests affected by the proposed tariff are so numerous and so varied that if all insisted upon them, legislation embodying the reform must inevitably fail.—*Cleveland's Message.*

Can there be a better reason given than the one he has here given you for the defeat of this bill? He tells this Congress plainly that if it consults the interests of the people of the United States, then this tariff cake becomes dough on both sides. This reform must fail if the local interests of the people are consulted. Well, a reform that is antagonistic and harmful to the local interests of our people ought to fail, and will fail sooner or later. All interests are local; what is termed the general interest is but the sum of the local interests, and there is not a local interest but this bill touches. Not a change it proposes to make from existing law that will not be detrimental to the true interests of our people and advantageous to the interests of the people of Europe, and there is hardly a township in the United States, inhabited by a white person, that this malign bill does not threaten with harm.

The motto of the Republican party always has been, and is now, "American opportunities and American markets belong to American citizens who have made them."

The motto of the Democratic party to-day is: "American opportunities and American markets belong to the world. No discrimination in favor of American citizens as against foreigners."

I read from the Pall Mall Gazette, one of the leading journals of England:

LONDON, November 9, 1892.

The Pall Mall Gazette this afternoon says that "both the merchants and the unemployed workmen of England have reason to rejoice at the Democratic victory, as with the possibility of the reopening of the American market to the goods of Birmingham, Bradford, and Manchester, capitalists will get a chance to procure some return on their money invested, and the workmen will have an opportunity to get a decent price for their labor without the necessity of striking."

And every English journal said substantially the same. England is unanimous for the passage of this bill; so is France, and Germany, and Spain, and Italy, and Canada. It has no opposition anywhere in the world except from the great mass of the people of the United States.

One more citation from an English newspaper, the Warehouseman and Draper. It says:

Speaking at Sheffield at the banquet in honor of the anniversary of American independence, Mr. Folsom, the United States consul in that town, who is now on the point of retiring, expressed the satisfaction that he felt in the belief that "before another twelve months have rolled by Sheffield will not be subjected to the onerous and oppressive duties of the United States which have so restricted her trade."

For years the Democratic politicians have rung the changes on Republican extravagance and corruption. They have sought to impress upon the people the idea that they were being robbed by the protective tariff; that our workmen were being oppressed and the country going to the dogs, and a lot more of such rubbish. It is true that comparisons are odious, but as the Democratic politicians invite them they should have them. Let us contrast the condition of this country as it was under Republican rule, as it is under Democratic rule. I will hold up the picture of the Republican rule as painted by some first-class Democratic artists. We will not go back far, only to last year.

On the 17th of July, 1892, the New York Herald (Democratic) remarked:

The business of the country is in a provokingly healthy condition. * * * New industrial enterprises for manufacturing iron, cotton, and woolen fabrics are going into operation in various sections. * * * In the face of such a condition of things the calamity howler must remain silent.

On July 15, 1892, the Boston Herald, a pronounced advocate of Cleveland and free trade, asked:

Where is the idle woolen mill to-day? There is none. * * * Not only are the great majority of the woolen mills employed, but many * * * are contemplating enlargements and improvements, or such enlargements and improvements are already begun. What does all this mean? It means simply the greatest consumption of wool the country has known for many years.

On the 10th of September, 1892, the Dry Goods Economist, also tarred with the free-trade brush, was constrained to remark that—

Dress goods manufacturers ought to be happy this season because they are busy delivering the goods already ordered and booking orders for more. * * * They can confidently look forward to a continuous run of business for the next six months.

R. G. Dun & Co.'s Report, a colorless trade paper, in July, 1892, said:

A fiscal year never matched in the history of the country in volume of industrial productions, in magnitude of domestic exchanges, or in foreign trade has just closed.

That eminent free-trader Edward Atkinson, whose knowledge of economics compares with that of Mr. Cleveland as an encyclopedia compares with a primer, says, speaking of the country under Republican rule:

There has never been a period in the history of this or any other country when the general rate of wages was as high as it is now, or the price of goods

relatively to the wages as low as they are to-day, nor a period when the workman, in the strict sense of the word, has so fully secured to his own use and enjoyment such a steadily and progressively increasing proportion of a constantly increasing product.

The honorable member from New York, Mr. COCKRAN, taking as his authority the Aldrich report, which, he said, emanated from a Democratic Bureau of Statistics, and the accuracy of whose figures had never been disputed, showed that "never before in the history of human civilization have wages been so high, measured by gold." And that "by the figures of this Aldrich committee we find that labor enjoys to-day the largest proportion of that which it produces that it has ever enjoyed in the history of the world." As the Aldrich report was made March 3, 1893, one day before the Democratic party came into power, and most of its figures only include the year 1891, this is valuable testimony to the prosperity of the country under Republican rule.

This is the picture painted by Democrats and free traders of the prosperous condition of this country up to the time it was ascertained that the Democrats had come into power in all the Departments of the Federal Government. Never before did this nation or any other that ever existed on earth make such progress and enjoy such a degree of prosperity as the United States during the twenty-five years of Republican rule preceding the 5th day of November, 1892. Never before anywhere, in any land, did the common people receive so large a recompense for their labor or enjoy to so great an extent the luxuries as well as the comforts of life, as did all the people of the United States during that period.

Shall I draw the picture of the condition of the country under Democratic rule as it is to-day? I hardly deem it necessary. It is too familiar to all of us. You see it everywhere; every morning it stares at you from your newspaper, the pictures of closed mills, of dead industries, of enforced idleness and destitution in places where heretofore work and wages, comfort and contentment, held the reins and kept even pace with the passing days. Never before in the history of the nation did such widespread, and universal commercial and financial disaster come upon it as came with the accession of the Democratic party to power. It would seem that disaster and Democracy were twins, bound by a common tie which, if severed, leads to the death of both.

This bill is a fraud; a proposition to rob the many for the benefit of the few. It is so characterized by the assembled wisdom of the Democratic party the last time it pulled itself together at Chicago. I will read from the gospel according to Democracy, its last testament, chapter 3:

We denounce Republican protection as a fraud and a robbery of the many for the benefit of the few; * * * the Federal Government has no constitutional power to impose and collect tariff duties, except for the purposes of revenue only.

And yet in the face of this declaration the chiefs of that party bring in here this unconstitutional bill, without a doubt the worst specimen of a protective tariff bill ever introduced in Congress, containing the most outrageous discrimination against the many for the benefit of the few, against the farmer and the producer and in favor of the toll-taker. Do the farmers and the producers of this country constitute the few and the manufacturers the many? [Applause.]

This extraordinary specimen of a protective tariff bill says to all the wool-growers of this country, "The Republican policy which protects your product by a tariff of from 25 to 40 per cent is a fraud and a robbery of the many (big mill-owners) for the benefit of the few (sheep-herders). It shall cease. You must take your places by the side of and on a level with the bushmen of Australia and New Zealand, and compete with them if you will persist in such low-down business as wool-growing." At the same time it pats lovingly on the back the big mill-owner who manufactures that wool, and says to him, "You are my hearty; your product shall have 40 per cent protection; you shall not be forced to compete with the cheap goods of Europe. Those foreign manufacturers shall pay you half their goods are worth before they shall come into the American market and compete with you. We will take care of you; but we've no use for that sheep-herder, doncher know."

What a beautiful sample of Democratic revenue reform this thing is. Was there ever a more shameless discrimination attempted?

I read a few days ago in a newspaper a large number of New Year's sentiments, contributed, the paper said, by many of the greatest men in the world; among them I read the following sentiment:

Powerful as our Government is, it never had or can have authority to tax one man to make another's vocation pay.

This sentiment was signed by one of the distinguished members of this House from Tennessee. I have read many times that the tariff was a tax, and this our Democratic friends to the last

man stoutly maintain. They denounce the McKinley tariff law, charging that it does exactly the thing that the honorable gentleman from Tennessee declared this Government had no authority to do; and yet, wherein does this bill, which I presume the honorable gentleman will support and vote for, differ from the McKinley act? In two respects only; both are essentially and entirely protective tariff bills, different first in this: The McKinley act was intended to raise an adequate revenue for the support of the Government by increasing the tax on foreign goods, in the form of a tariff, and thus decreasing the tax upon our own people and our own products.

This bill proposes the exact reverse—to reduce the revenue by reducing the tax on foreign goods and thus creating a necessity for increasing the tax on our own people and our own products. Second. The McKinley act sought as far as possible to do equal justice; to give all an equal share of protection. It gave the wool-grower the same protection it did the wool-handler, the manufacturer. This bill makes the most abominable and shameless discrimination as to the persons, industries, and localities it seeks to protect, and every line in this bill fixing a tariff rate is drawn for the protection of some article, some industry, some class, and not "for revenue only."

Upon what theory of a tariff for revenue only can paragraph 193, page 29, be defended, which fixes the duty on barley 20 per cent ad valorem and barley malt 30 per cent ad valorem? Upon none. It was to protect the maltster, and to give him 33½ per cent more protection than was given the barley-grower, and the change was made from 25 per cent, as it was in the original draft of the bill, to 30 per cent, upon the representation to the committee that the maltster needed that amount of duty for the protection of his industry.

Upon what theory of a tariff for revenue only is the duty upon rice made specific—1½ cents per pound—while other grains have ad valorem duties upon them. Why ad valorem duties on barley and specific duties on rice? Upon what theory of a tariff for revenue only can the sliding scale of bounties to be paid the sugar producer be defended? None. It is protection. Nothing else; and if there is anything in our system of taxation that taxes one man to make another's vocation pay it is this sugar schedule. It is an impossibility for a tariff for revenue only to have a sliding scale of ad valorem duties, or both ad valorem and specific duties, or a free list; because any and every variation in a rate of duty or exemption from duty is for protection; must be. Neither the Democratic party nor any other party ever introduced a general tariff bill for revenue only, which, of course, must tax all imports alike. No party dare to do so stupid a thing. All these bills are for protection and revenue the same as this one, only this is the most unjust, illogical proposition of the kind ever made.

See paragraphs 101 and 102, page 15, marble, rough in block or squared, 40 cents per cubic foot; but sawed, dressed, or otherwise manufactured, 75 cents per cubic foot.

In tariff for revenue only, why should there be different ad valorem rates of duty on marble?

The Oakland Times, one of the leading Democratic papers of California, said editorially a few days ago:

This Congress was elected to reform the tariff. The complexion of the Senate was changed to facilitate the work. Benjamin Harrison was displaced from the Presidency to make room for Grover Cleveland in order that tariff duties could be reduced to a revenue basis.

"A tariff for revenue" in contradistinction to a tariff for protection was the issue of the last Presidential election. It was debated on the stump in every State and discussed in every newspaper and periodical in the land. Party platforms clearly defined the issue, and parties accepted the gauge of battle on the lines thus laid down. The issue was not dodged, nor was it, as in many cases, so connected and cumbered with other issues that it did not stand alone and sharply defined.

The Times states the exact facts as to this issue. The Democratic party was pledged to "a tariff for revenue only" and against protection. The Republican party was squarely pledged to protection.

In view of all these indisputable facts, the following letter, written by the honorable chairman of the Committee of Ways and Means, and whose name is given to this bill, becomes very interesting reading:

INTERESTS OF MANUFACTURERS—CHAIRMAN WILSON POINTS OUT THAT HE HAS A TENDER CONSIDERATION FOR THEM.

BOSTON, January 8.

The American Wool and Cotton Reporter will to-morrow publish the following letter from Chairman WILSON, of the Ways and Means Committee: "In your issue of December 28 I find in a letter from Mr. James McLaughlin, jr., Glenside Woolen Mills, the following statement:

"The writer has just returned from Washington, after having a conference with Mr. WILSON and the Hon. DAVID B. HILL, and both of these men expressed themselves as having no interest in the mill-owners, but if it can be shown that it will affect the voters' interest they are ready to consider a change in the tariff bill." etc.

"Permit me to state that so far as I am referred to this statement is absolutely incorrect. I never expressed any such statement and never entertained any such idea. I do not recall any conversation with the writer, but that may be due to my inability to remember all with whom I have recently

talked. I do believe, and have said to gentlemen thus interviewing me, that the interests of 70,000,000 men, women, and children, who consume woolen goods, should have paramount consideration; but the fact that I have reported a bill carrying 40 per cent protection to mill-owners—\$4 on \$10 worth of goods—shows a very tender consideration for the interests of the mill-owners, especially in view of the fact that in 1866 the joint report of the wool manufacturers and wool-growers only asked that all manufactures composed wholly or in part of wool or worsted shall be subjected to a duty which shall be equal to 25 per cent net. This is only one of numberless misrepresentations I have undertaken to correct.

“WM. L. WILSON.”

Now, if there is any one man more competent to speak of this bill, what it means to do, what it is, it must be the gentleman whose name it bears, and is in large part the architect and superintendent of it, and he here unequivocally declares that the bill he has reported “carries 40 per cent protection to mill-owners, \$4 on \$10 worth of goods.” So I have the testimony of the chairman of the committee that I have characterized this bill aright; it is for protection, and is in no respect consonant with the Democratic platform adopted at Chicago, and no Democrat who is honestly in favor of that platform and its tariff plank can consistently vote for it, and no Democrat can redeem his pledge to support “a tariff for revenue only” by voting for this bill. On the contrary, he squarely violates that pledge.

Having shown that this bill is for protection, the only argument germane to it is, Is it a better protective-tariff bill than the McKinley act? Are the benefits of protection more evenly distributed, and the burdens, if any, more equitably laid? To all these questions the American people answer emphatically, no. From beginning to end this bill singles out certain industries and products to which it accords protection, and from others equally entitled it refuses protection. Protection is refused to the miner who digs out the iron ore and the coal to melt it, but is given to the man who burns the coal and lets liquid iron run into the open troughs of sand. You say that coal and ore are raw material. But they are the finished product of the miner, and the rough, shapeless pig of iron when it goes into the rolling-mill or foundry is as absolutely and entirely raw material as is the coal placed under it to melt it, or as is the farmer's wool when it enters the woolen factory.

The honorable chairman of the committee labored hard and long to-day in his speech to show that wool should be put on the free list. I present for his consideration the following telegram, to show what the wool-growers and manufacturers of California think about it—practical men engaged in the business about which they telegraph me—and I place their declarations beside those of the politicians and theorists who bring in such bills as this:

HON. W. W. BOWERS,

House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

At a meeting of the wool-growers, dealers, and manufacturers held this day, it was resolved that we, the wool-growers, dealers, and manufacturers of California, irrespective of party, do hereby protest in the most emphatic terms against changes in the tariff affecting wool and woolsens as proposed by the Wilson bill. We assert that to remove the duty from wool and woolsens will prostrate, if not wholly destroy, an industry which gives direct employment to 30,000 of our citizens. We call upon you as a representative of California interests to work and vote against these propositions.

I. R. HALL,

B. P. FLINT,

THOMAS DENIGAN,

C. S. MOSES,

JAMES P. HULME,

JOHN E. SHOEBERT,

JACOB ROSENBERG, *Committee.*

FRED S. MOODY, *President.*

And in this connection I present this letter from the honorable Assistant Secretary of Agriculture:

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,

OFFICE OF ASSISTANT SECRETARY,

Washington, D. C., December 22, 1893.

SIR: I have the honor to acknowledge the receipt of your favor of December 18, covering report on silk culture in Southern California from Mrs. Carrie Williams, and to thank you for transmitting the report to this office.

The entomologist to whom the report has been submitted states that he has long been aware of the perfect adaptability of the climate of California to the culture of the domestic silk-worm, but that the difficulty in the matter of silk culture in this country is the absolute lack of a profitable market for the cocoons. Raw silk is imported from abroad at such low rates as to practically preclude competition on the part of American sericulturists.

Respectfully, yours,

EDWIN WILLITS, *Acting Secretary.*

HON. W. W. BOWERS, M. C.,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

As a companion piece to the letter of the honorable Assistant Secretary I present herewith extracts from the letter referred to by him, which was dated at San Diego, Cal., December 29, 1893:

W. W. BOWERS,

House of Representatives, United States:

DEAR SIR: Your esteemed favor of the 22d instant came to me to-day. I thank you sincerely for the same.

Yes: “the last paragraph” gives the whole silk business away. On page 16 of that “report of silk culture in New South Wales” which I lent you last summer, C. V. Riley, M. A., Ph. D., entomologist of the American Government, is quoted as saying “The greater value of labor here as compared with labor in older silk-growing countries has been in the past a most serious ob-

stacle in the United States, but conditions exist to-day that render this obstacle by no means insuperable.”

Then he contrasts the conditions and requirements here and in the older silk-growing countries, showing that 20 or 30 cents a day there is as much toward a living as three or four times that amount here. He also shows that there are hundreds of thousands of women and girls all over our country who might produce silk without depriving the laboring classes of their employment, and yet tend to enrich both themselves and their country. Perhaps Mr. Willits was not aware of his superiors' sentiments now before the world on this subject.

You know, Mr. BOWERS, and so do I, that the industry may be made continuous for nine months of the year. This is the strong point in our favor, and it has never been even hinted at before. It is a demonstrated fact now. I have the evidence here. There could not be a greater farce perpetrated on any people than to import silk as raw silk when it is reeled silk. This is the pivot of silk on the tariff. The silk importers call it raw silk as a blind, while they know, and I know, and all who have investigated the subject know, that it is reeled. Every thread of silk is twisted on the reels before it is imported, and yet they call it raw silk. What! Is raw cotton cotton yarn, or is it not raw just as it comes from the pod, not twisted or operated on by machinery?

With due respect, yours,

MRS. CARRIE WILLIAMS.

Mr. Chairman, whatever may have been the sentiments of the American people one year and a half ago on tariff reform, the evidence presented us on all sides is overwhelming that to-day the great majority of the people of this nation are in favor of adequate and equitable protection for all American industries; protection not only against the competition of the products of the cheap labor of foreign countries, but protection against the importation of the cheap laborers themselves. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. RYAN. I move that the committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

The committee accordingly rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. RICHARDSON of Tennessee, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that committee had had under consideration the bill (H. R. 4864) to reduce taxation, to provide revenue for the Government, and for other purposes, and had come to no resolution thereon.

And then, on motion of Mr. KILGORE (at 10 o'clock and 25 minutes p. m.), the House adjourned until to-morrow, Tuesday, January 9, 1894, at 11 o'clock a. m.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced, and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. MOSES: A bill (H. R. 5061) to repeal section 4716, Revised Statutes of the United States—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. BAILEY: A bill (H. R. 5062) to grant the Gainesville, McAlister and St. Louis Railway Company the right to build two branch lines and to grant the right of way therefor through the Indian Territory, and for other purposes—to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. WAUGH: A bill (H. R. 5063) prohibiting the dropping, suspending, or reducing of pensions, and the restoration of pensions already dropped, suspended, or reduced in certain cases—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HOPKINS of Illinois: A bill (H. R. 5064) to reclassify and prescribe the salaries of railway postal clerks—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. COFFEEN: A bill (H. R. 5066) to encourage and establish better facilities for travel to and from, into and through, the Yellowstone National Park, and for other purposes—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. HENDERSON of Illinois (by request): A bill (H. R. 5067) authorizing the Secretary of War to deed Ford's Theater building and grounds to the Grand Army of the Republic and the Local Legion of the District of Columbia—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. O'NEIL: A bill (H. R. 5068) to authorize the Secretary of the Treasury to borrow money in anticipation of the revenues, and for other purposes—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HAUGEN: A concurrent resolution directing the Secretary of War to appoint a commission to examine and report upon the cost of deepening the harbors of Superior and Duluth and their entries to a uniform depth of 20 feet—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. RICHARDSON of Tennessee: A concurrent resolution to print 8,000 copies of the report of the Bureau of Ethnology—to the Committee on Printing.

PRIVATE BILLS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills of the following titles were presented and referred as follows:

By Mr. AVERY: A bill (H. R. 5069) making appropriation for construction, repairs, etc., of public works for Charlevoix

Harbor, Charlevoix, Mich.—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. BAKER of New Hampshire: A bill (H. R. 5070) for the relief of the sufferers by the wreck of the United States steamship Tallapoosa—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. BRECKINRIDGE of Kentucky: A bill (H. R. 5071) for the relief of Oldham County, Ky.—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. BERRY: A bill (H. R. 5072) for the benefit of John W. Kirby, late sheriff of Gallatin County, Ky.—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. BARTHOLDT: A bill (H. R. 5073) to correct the military record of John Bach—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5074) to correct the military record of Andrew Duda—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5075) to correct the date of muster of Company F, Pacific Battalion Missouri Home Guards—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5076) to correct military record of Charles Burswitz—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. CRAIN: A bill (H. R. 5077) to amend an act of Congress approved May 12, 1890, granting to the Aransas Pass Harbor Company the right to improve Aransas Pass—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. CUMMINGS: A bill (H. R. 5078) for the relief of George P. Rowell & Co.—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. EDMUNDS: A bill (H. R. 5079) for the relief of J. Henry Rives—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. FITHIAN: A bill (H. R. 5080) granting a pension to Garrett L. Joice—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5081) granting a pension to Mary C. Taylor, widow of William N. Gilbert, deceased—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. FLETCHER: A bill (H. R. 5082) for the relief of E. Douglass, late Indian agent at White Earth Indian Agency—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5083) granting a pension to Anson Northrup—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. GEISSENHAINER: A bill (H. R. 5084) granting a pension to Luther L. Rogers—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HARMER: A bill (H. R. 5085) to relieve Francis Remenlein from the charge of desertion—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. HENDERSON of Illinois: A bill (H. R. 5086) granting a pension to James G. Laughlin, Alexander M. Laughlin, Williamson Durley, and Charles Leeper—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. HUDSON: A bill (H. R. 5087) granting a pension to Margaret Brennan—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. KIEFER: A bill (H. R. 5088) for the relief of Andrew Deffel—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. TALBOTT of Maryland: A bill (H. R. 5089) for the relief of the Merchants and Miners' Transportation Company, of Baltimore, Md.—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5090) for the relief of Thomas Buckingham—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. PATTERSON: A bill (H. R. 5091) for the relief of Mrs. Clara E. Bryant, Shelby County, Tenn.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5092) for the relief of Amas Woodruff, of Shelby County, Tenn.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5093) for the relief of Mrs. Sarah E. Norton, of Memphis, Tenn.—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. POWERS: A bill (H. R. 5094) granting an increase of pension to James H. Bolton—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. TRACEY: A bill (H. R. 5095) for the relief of Henry B. Kretzler—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. TYLER: A bill (H. R. 5096) for the relief of George W. Wood—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. UPDEGRAFF: A bill (H. R. 5097) to increase the pension of Mary Stahl—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WRIGHT of Pennsylvania: A bill (H. R. 5098) for the relief of Charles N. Warner, late first lieutenant of the Fourth Artillery of the Army of the United States—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

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. ADAMS of Pennsylvania: Petition of the Philadelphia Board of Trade, against the passage of the Wilson tariff bill—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. APSLEY: Petition of 125 employes of Abbott & Co., of Graniteville, Mass., protesting against the passage of the Wilson tariff bill—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. AVERY: Protest of C. O. Frye, I. E. Stilwell, Clay Gregory, and 200 others, against the lead-ore clause of the Wilson bill—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, protest of C. O. Frye, E. D. Porter, and O. H. Bicker, against the lead-ore clause of the Wilson bill—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, protest of Philadelphia Board of Trade, against the passage of the Wilson bill—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of lead miners all over the country, protesting against the passage of the Wilson tariff bill—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of Isaac Cole and Nellie Cole, of St. Louis, Mich., asking for uniform rate of 35 cents per pound on leaf tobacco—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of the Pacific Pine Lumber Company, California, against repeal of duty on lumber—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of John O'Neil, Robert O'Neil, and David H. Fisherman, of Grand Traverse, Mich., asking that linen netting twine be placed on the free list—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BABCOCK (by request): Petition of M. S. Sickles and 34 others, for the reduction of duty on unstemmed tobacco—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BALDWIN: Petition of workmen and citizens of Ely, Minn., requesting that the present tariff on iron ore be retained—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of workmen and citizens of Virginia, Minn., requesting the reduction of present tariff on iron ore—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, resolutions of a citizens' meeting at Duluth, Minn., requesting their Representatives in Congress to work for and vote for the passage of the Wilson bill—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BARTHOLDT: Petition of glass-bottle workers of South St. Louis, against the reduction of the duty on manufactures of glass bottles—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of the St. Louis Lithograph Artists and Engineers' Protective Association, against certain schedules of the Wilson bill—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of Ironworkers of South St. Louis, against the passage of the Wilson bill—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of miners of Southwest Missouri and Southeast Kansas, against the lead schedule of the Wilson bill—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BRICKNER: Petition of A. Boetteher, manufacturer of cigars at Cedarsburg, Wis., praying for a uniform rate of 35 cents on all unstemmed leaf tobacco—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of William Theil, of St. Michaels, Wis., manufacturer of cigars, praying for a uniform rate of 35 cents on all unstemmed leaf tobacco—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of M. A. Williams and others, of North Prairie, Wis., protesting against any change in the duty on barley and barley malt—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BROOKSHIRE: Petitions of Maj. Collins and 140 others, of Brazil, Ind., and of Andrew Yount and 170 others, of Yountsville, Ind., protesting against the Wilson tariff bill—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BUNDY: Memorial of Eagle Lodge No. 15, Ohio Amalgamated Association of Iron and Steel Workers, of Ironton, Ohio, opposing the passage of the Wilson tariff bill—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition R. B. Miller and 123 other citizens of Ironton, Ohio, protesting against the passage of the Wilson tariff bill—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. COFFEEN: Petition of 23 citizens of Casper, Wyo., and vicinity, against the repeal of the McKinley tariff law—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of 29 citizens of Rock Springs, Wyo.; of 18 citizens of Douglas, Wyo., and vicinity; of sundry citizens of Rawlins Springs and vicinity, and of 18 citizens of Douglas, Wyo., and vicinity, protesting against the repeal of the McKinley tariff law—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. COGSWELL: Petition of the Board of Trade of Salem, Mass., in favor of a permanent appropriation for Sandy Bay breakwater and harbor of refuge—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Also, petition of Board of Trade of Salem, Mass., for improvement of Salem harbor—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. COVERT: Petition of Alois Hubal and other citizens

of Suffolk County, N. Y., relative to duty on unstemmed leaf tobacco—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FUNSTON: Petitions of citizens of Humboldt, Kans., also of the manufacturers of cigars of Fort Scott, Kans., for a uniform rate of duty of 35 cents on all unstemmed leaf tobacco—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of citizens of Osawatimie, Kans., for the defeat of the Wilson tariff bill—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GEISSENHAIN: Workmen in the phosphorus works of Rancocas, N. J., requesting that no change be made in the existing duty on phosphorus—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of manufacturers and makers of cigars of New Brunswick, N. J., in relation to the duty on unstemmed tobacco—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of employes of Loyal T. Ives, of New Brunswick, N. J., against changing the duty on knitting-machine needles—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of employes of the Rariton Woolen Mills, Rariton, N. J., against the passage of Wilson bill—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GROSVENOR: Memorial, preamble, and resolutions of the Board of Trade of Philadelphia, Pa., and a petition of J. W. Harrison and 59 others, of Wilkesville, Ohio, protesting against the passage of the Wilson tariff bill—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, memorial of persons, firms, and corporations engaged in lead mining in Missouri, Idaho, Indiana, Illinois, Nevada, New Mexico, South Dakota, Utah, Kansas, Virginia, Washington, Wisconsin, Colorado, California, and Montana, protesting against certain provisions of the Wilson bill—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HAINES: Petition of the Lithographers' International P. and I. Association of the United States and Canada, urging a specified duty on lithographic goods—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, protest of the Commercial Knitting Company, of Troy, N. Y., against the reduction of duty on knit goods—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HARMER: Memorial of employes of Cunningham & Patton, manufacturers, of Germantown, Pa., protesting against the passage of the Wilson tariff bill—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, preamble and resolution of the Philadelphia Board of Trade, protesting against the passage of the Wilson tariff bill—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HAUGEN: Resolution of the State Legislature committee of the Travelers' Protective Association of Wisconsin, in favor of the passage of House bill 3291, providing for the issuance of a joint interchangeable 5,000-mile railroad ticket with special privileges as to free baggage—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. HENDERSON of Iowa: Petition of I. E. Bigsby and 82 other citizens of Blackhawk County, Iowa, praying for the defeat of the Wilson bill—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of Geo. F. Gawin and 3 others, of Waterloo, Iowa, for a uniform rate of duty of 35 cents on all unstemmed leaf tobacco—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of Wm. W. Davis and 44 other ex-Union soldiers, of Buchanan County, Iowa, praying for the enactment of a just and equitable service pension law—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, petition from I. G. Eberhart, esq., La Porte City, Iowa, praying for the reduction of postage to 1 cent an ounce—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

Also, petition of Messrs. Morrill & Co., of Waterloo, Iowa, praying for the reduction of postage to 1 cent an ounce—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

Also, petition from Smith, Lichty & Hellman Company, of Waterloo, Iowa, praying for the reduction of postage to 1 cent an ounce—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

Also, petition of Upper Iowa National Conference of the M. E. Church, praying for the repeal of the Geary law—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, paper from Wesley E. Dobson, esq., of Cedar Falls, Iowa, urging the establishment of a technical department at the National College of the Deaf at Kendall Green—to the Committee on Appropriations.

Also, papers from Leonard Hutchinson, esq., of Waverly, Iowa, urging the establishment of a technical department at the National College for the Deaf at Kendall Green—to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. HILBORN: Resolutions adopted by the Philadelphia Board of Trade opposing the passage of the Wilson tariff bill—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HITT: Petition of C. O. Frye and 257 others, miners

of lead and ores in Missouri and Kansas, for specific duty of three-quarters of a cent per pound on lead ore, and protesting against the Wilson bill—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, memorial and resolution of the lithographers of New York, Brooklyn, and Jersey City, praying a specific duty on lithographic goods instead of the existing or proposed ad valorem duty—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of 212 citizens and companies interested in lead and ore mining for duty of three-quarters of a cent a pound on lead ore—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HOLMAN: Remonstrance against the removal of the Southern Ute Indians to San Juan County, Utah—to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. HOOKER of New York: Petition of 252 miners of lead ore in southwest Missouri and southeast Kansas, protesting against the Wilson tariff bill—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HOPKINS of Pennsylvania: Thirteen petitions of citizens of Tioga County, Pa., containing 428 names, against any reduction of the tariff on leaf tobacco and cigars—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of 31 citizens of Lycoming County, Pa., against the passage of the Wilson tariff bill—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of citizens of Joplin, Mo., against the reduction of the duty on lead ore—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of 51 citizens of Murray, Pa., against any change in the present tariff rates—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of the representatives of 175 men of Clinton County, against the passage of the Wilson bill—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of 25 citizens of Pennsylvania, against any reduction of the duty on gold, silver, aluminum, or any metal leaf—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HULL: Petition of C. W. Green & Co. and 8 others, asking that all suspended pensions be restored, and that hereafter no pension be suspended until after proof of fraud—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, petition of Wm. H. H. Brown and 40 others, asking the enactment of an equitable pension law—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. IKIRT (by request): Petition of 24 citizens of Middle Branch, Ohio, of 57 citizens of Hanover, Ohio, and of 24 citizens of Plain Township, Ohio, protesting against the passage of the Wilson tariff bill—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KEM: Petition of citizens of Sheridan County, Nebr., praying that no change be made in the present tariff on barley—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MAHON: Petition of citizens of Burnham, Pa., against the passage of the Wilson tariff bill—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. McALEER: Petition of Frank Teller and others of Philadelphia, for a uniform rate of 35 cents per pound on unstemmed leaf tobacco—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of manufacturers and makers of cigars of Philadelphia, for a uniform duty of 35 cents on all unstemmed leaf tobacco—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of H. A. Wass, of G. Flaudenmerer and others, of Louis Michaelson, of Frederick Heil and others, and of Trautveler and others, for a uniform rate of 35 cents on all unstemmed leaf tobacco—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, protest of the employes of the Germantown Spinning Company, against the passage of the Wilson tariff bill—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, protest of employes of Economy Mills of Seville, Schofield & Co., Manayunk, Philadelphia, Pa., against the passage of the Wilson bill—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of lithograph artists and others, asking for an increase of duty—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. McCALL: Petition of the Boston Society of Natural History, for the removal of all duties on scientific and philosophical apparatus whose use is in instruction or research—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MERCER: Two petitions for a reduction on letter postage—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

Also, petition that Ford's Theater be not used for Government purposes—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. MEREDITH: Affidavits and account of Edward S. Davis against the United States for property taken during the late war—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. MORSE: Petition of Boston Typographical Union, No. 13, praying for the Government ownership and control of all telegraph systems in the United States—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. MUTCHLER: Protest from employers of labor, work-

ingmen, and others of Redington, Pa., against the passage of the Wilson tariff bill—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. NORTHWAY: Petition of Lewis T. Bowers, of Chardon, Ohio, against the passage of the Wilson bill—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of William H. Crock and others, of Cayahoga Falls, Ohio, against the passage of the Wilson bill—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of William T. Grandel and others, of Ravenna, Ohio, against the passage of the Wilson tariff bill—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of W. W. Davis and others, of Trumbull County, Ohio, against the passage of the Wilson bill—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of Henry B. Shields and others, against the passage of the Wilson bill—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of Thomas Kelley and others, of East Precinct Township, Norton County, Ohio, protesting against the passage of the Wilson bill—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PIGOTT (by request): Memorial and bill of Sarah Winthrop Smith, of Seymour, Conn., for the extension of the right of suffrage—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also (by request), remonstrance of John L. Gray and others, of the Waterville Cutlery Company, against the reduction of duty on cutlery—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. REYBURN: Petition of M. Whiteley & Co., of Philadelphia, against the passage of the Wilson tariff bill—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. RANDALL: Petition of the overseers and operatives of the Westport Manufacturing Company and cotton manufacturers of Westport, Mass., protesting against the passage of the Wilson tariff bill—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. RITCHIE: Petition of Roth & Friedman, of Toledo, and employers, protesting against the passage of the Wilson tariff bill—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ROBINSON of Pennsylvania: Petition of the employers of labor, workingmen, and other citizens of Phoenixville, Pa., protesting against the passage of the Wilson bill—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of employers of labor, workingmen, and other citizens of Phoenixville, Pa., protesting against the Wilson bill—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of employers of labor, workingmen, and citizens of Phoenixville, Pa., protesting against the Wilson bill—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. RUSSELL of Connecticut: Protest of 29 employés of the Greenmanville Company's woolen mill at Mystic, Conn., against the Wilson tariff bill—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, protest of a representative convention of 8,000 farmers of Hartford County, Conn., against the tobacco reduction of the Wilson tariff bill—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SHERMAN: Petition of Kirtland Bros. and others, of Utica, N. Y., favoring a uniform rate of duty on unstemmed leaf tobacco—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. STEVENSON: Memorial of the board of supervisors of Dickinson County, Mich., irrespective of politics, protesting against the reduction in any manner of the duty on iron ore, and affirming that such action would strike a death blow to the business interests of the Upper Peninsula of Michigan—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, memorials from the workmen, employers of labor, and others, citizens of Iron River, Mich., and from the employers of labor, workmen, and other citizens of Palmer, Mich., without regard to politics, protesting against placing iron ore on the free list, and affirming that such action would result in great distress and suffering in Northern Michigan—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. STEVENS: Petition of 105 employés of the woolen establishment of Philips & Kunhardt, of Lawrence, Mass., protesting against the passage of the Wilson tariff bill—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of August Fels, agent, and 258 other employés of the Merrimack Woolen Mills of Lowell, Mass., protesting against the passage of the Wilson tariff bill—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SPRINGER: Petition of Cigarmakers' Union, No. 114, of Jacksonville, Ill., against any increase of the internal-revenue tax on cigars—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. TRACEY: Petition of G. W. Van Slyke & Horton and 110 of their employés at Albany, N. Y., praying for a uniform rate of 35 cents a pound on all unstemmed leaf tobacco—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. UPDEGRAFF: Petition for the relief of Mary Stahl, wife of Josiah F. Stahl—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WAUGH: Protest of James A. Bieber and 279 labor-

ers and mechanics of Frankfort, Clinton County, Ind., against the passage of the Wilson tariff bill—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WHITE: Petition of 120 workingmen against the passage of the Wilson tariff bill—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of 182 lithograph artists, engravers, printers, transferrers, and others, asking an increase of duty on Schedule C, plates, and Schedule M, paper books—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of 50 citizens of Cleveland, Ohio, against the passage of the Wilson tariff bill—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of 86 citizens of Cleveland, Ohio, against the passage of the Wilson tariff bill—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of 229 employés of Landesman, Hirschheimer & Co., manufacturers of cloaks, of Cleveland, Ohio, asking that the duty on cloaks remain as it is in the McKinley bill—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of merchants, jobbers, and dealers, protesting against the 10 cents a pack tax to be placed on playing cards—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of 124 employés of Adams Jewett Company, Cleveland, Ohio, asking that a duty be placed on burlap bags, both new and second-hand—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WRIGHT of Pennsylvania: Petitions of W. F. Dibble and others, tobacco-growers, of Albany Township, Bradford County, Pa., and of George W. Wilson and others, of Canton, Bradford County, Pa., against reduction of duty on tobacco—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

SENATE.

TUESDAY, January 9, 1894.

Prayer by the Chaplain, Rev. W. H. MILBURN, D. D.

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

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE.

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. T. O. TOWLES, its Chief Clerk, announced that the House had agreed to the resolution of the Senate to correct an error in the report of the committee on conference on the bill (H. R. 3289) to authorize the New York and New Jersey Bridge Companies to construct and maintain a bridge across the Hudson River between New York City and the State of New Jersey.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 2796) relating to the disqualification of registers and receivers of the United States land offices and making provision in case of such disqualification.

The message further announced that the House had passed the bill (S. 439) for the relief of David B. Gottwals.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED.

The message also announced that the Speaker of the House had signed the enrolled bill (H. R. 3289) to authorize the New York and New Jersey Bridge Companies to construct and maintain a bridge across the Hudson River between New York City and the State of New Jersey; and it was thereupon signed by the President *pro tempore*.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore* presented the petition of J. Berre King and George R. King, of New York City, manufacturers of calcined plaster, praying for the retention of the present duty upon calcined and land plaster; which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. LODGE presented the memorial of Foss & Co., of Boston, Mass., and 797 other dealers of the New England States in woolen rags, remonstrating against woolen rags being placed on the free list, as proposed by the so-called Wilson tariff bill; which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented memorials of A. S. Potter and 61 others, overseers and operatives of the Adamsdale Yarn Mill, of Adamsdale, Mass., and of Charles W. Wolf and 119 others, overseers and operatives of the C. A. Edgerton Manufacturing Company, of Shirley, Mass., remonstrating against the passage of the so-called Wilson tariff bill; which were referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented the petition of Rev. Millard F. Johnson, of Middleboro, Mass., praying that all tariff legislation be deferred until the Fifty-fourth Congress; which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented the petition of John Curran and other citizens of Lynn, Mass., praying that the so-called Wilson tariff bill