

SENATE.

THURSDAY, January 11, 1894.

Prayer by the Chaplain, Rev. W. H. MILBURN, D. D.
The Journal of yesterday's proceedings was read and approved.

REPORT OF NATIONAL ACADEMY OF SCIENCES.

The VICE-PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the annual report of the National Academy of Sciences for the year 1893; which, on motion of Mr. MANDERSON, was referred to the Committee on Printing.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS.

Mr. SHERMAN presented a petition of 9 soldiers of the late war, citizens of Dawn, Ohio, praying for an investigation of the Pension Bureau; which was referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also presented a petition of Federal Labor Union, No. 5335, of Cincinnati, Ohio, praying for the governmental control of the telegraph service; which was referred to the Committee on Post-Offices and Post-Roads.

He also presented memorials of 700 citizens of Wilmington; of 82 citizens of Clay Township; of 170 citizens of Cleveland; of 57 citizens of Richland Township; of 17 citizens of Cincinnati, and of 50 citizens of Crooksville, all in the State of Ohio, remonstrating against the passage of the Wilson tariff bill; which were referred to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. STOCKBRIDGE presented the memorial of S. W. McConnell and 88 other citizens of Gogebic County, Mich., and the petition of H. E. Hosking and 103 other citizens of Forsyth, Mich., remonstrating against the passage of the Wilson tariff bill; which were referred to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. LODGE presented a memorial of the St. Botolph Club, of Boston, Mass., remonstrating against the clause in the Wilson tariff bill proposing to place paintings and statuary on the free list; which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented the memorial of W. B. Allen and other citizens of Attleboro, Mass., remonstrating against the passage of the Wilson tariff bill; which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. QUAY presented memorials of manufacturers of green and flint glass bottles of Everett; of sundry citizens of Elk Creek; of Local Assembly, No. 22, American Flint Glass Workers, of Philadelphia; of the Philadelphia Board of Trade; of sundry wage-earners of Allentown; of cigar-manufacturers of Wells Township, all in the State of Pennsylvania, and of lead miners of Missouri, Idaho, Indiana, Illinois, Nevada, New Mexico, South Dakota, Utah, Indiana, Kansas, Virginia, Washington, Wisconsin, and Colorado, remonstrating against the passage of the Wilson tariff bill; which were referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented a memorial of the Foundrymen's Association of Philadelphia, Pa., remonstrating against a further agitation of the tariff question; which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented a petition of cigar manufacturers of Philadelphia, Pa., 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 memorial of cigar manufacturers of Ephrata, Pa., remonstrating against an increase of the internal-revenue tax on cigars; which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented a petition of the Philadelphia (Pa.) Board of Trade, praying that an appropriation be made for the purchase of ground adjoining the post-office at Philadelphia, Pa., for increased postal facilities; which was referred to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Mr. HOAR presented a resolution adopted at a meeting of the Boston (Mass.) Society of Water Color Painters, held January 6, 1894, unanimously indorsing the free-art clause of the Wilson tariff bill; which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. McMILLAN presented the petition of Rudolph Kunath and other cigar manufacturers of Lapeer, 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.

Mr. TURPIE presented a petition of sundry citizens of Winamac, Ind., praying that Robert A. Stuart, late of Companies B and C, First Regiment Delaware Cavalry Volunteers, be granted a pension; which was referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. MANDERSON presented a memorial of prominent citizens of Hastings, Nebr., remonstrating against the passage of the Wilson tariff bill; which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES.

Mr. ALLEN, from the Committee on Indian Affairs, to whom was referred the joint resolution (S. R. 8) authorizing the Secre-

tary of the Interior to cause the settlement of the accounts of Special Agents Moore and Woodson, under the treaty of 1854, with the Delaware Indians, etc., reported it with an amendment.

Mr. PLATT. I am directed by the Committee on Indian Affairs, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. 299) to extend the time for the construction of the railway of the Choctaw Coal and Railway Company, to report it favorably, and to submit a written report thereon. It is important that this bill should pass at an early date, but I do not ask consideration for it this morning. I ask that it may be put on the Calendar and the report printed, and I shall ask the Senate to consider it on Monday morning next. It is very essential that the bill should be considered early.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The bill will be placed on the Calendar.

Mr. PLATT, from the Committee on Indian Affairs, to whom was referred the bill (S. 985) to extend the time for the construction of the railway of the Choctaw Coal and Railway Company and to confer additional powers upon said company, reported adversely thereon, and the bill was postponed indefinitely.

Mr. FRYE, from the Committee on Commerce, to whom were referred the following bills, reported them severally without amendment, and submitted reports thereon:

A bill (S. 507) providing for the collection of fees for furnishing certificates of title to vessels;

A bill (S. 587) to amend an act entitled "An act to regulate the carriage of passengers by sea," approved August 2, 1882;

A bill (S. 511) providing for the establishment and enforcement of rules and regulations for the use and navigation of the United States canals and similar works of navigation, and for other purposes;

A bill (S. 495) to establish a marine board for the advancement of the interest of the merchant marine;

A bill (S. 509) to amend an act entitled "An act to amend section 4178, Revised Statutes, in relation to the marking of vessels' names at bow and stern, and also to provide for marking the draft," approved February 21, 1891;

A bill (H. R. 156) for the establishment of a light and fog signal station near Butler Flats, New Bedford, Mass.;

A bill (S. 588) to repeal section 4145 of the Revised Statutes of the United States, and to amend sections 4146, 4320, also section 1 of the act amending section 4214 of the Revised Statutes, approved March 3, 1883, and for other purposes; and

A bill (S. 1306) to establish a port of delivery at Bonners Ferry, Idaho.

Mr. FRYE. I am directed by the Committee on Commerce, to whom was referred the bill (S. 497) to amend "An act to amend section 4400 of Title LII of the Revised Statutes of the United States concerning the regulation of steam vessels," approved August 7, 1882; and also to amend section 4414, Title LII, of the Revised Statutes, "Regulation of steam vessels," to submit a written report thereon. The committee have also instructed me to present an amendment to the bill, which I shall do and file with the bill within a day or two.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The bill will be placed on the Calendar.

Mr. ROACH, from the Committee on Indian Affairs, to whom was referred the bill (S. 175) granting a right of way to the Jamestown and Northern Railway through the Devil's Lake Indian Reservation, in the State of North Dakota, reported it without amendment.

He also, from the same committee, to whom was referred the bill (S. 1060) to ratify and confirm an agreement with the Alsea and other bands of Indians located upon the Siletz Reservation in the State of Oregon, and to make appropriation for carrying the same into effect, reported it with amendments.

Mr. SHOUP, from the Committee on Indian Affairs, to whom was referred the bill (S. 897) to amend an act entitled "An act to provide for the adjudication and payment of claims arising from Indian depredations," approved March 3, 1891, asked to be discharged from its further consideration and that it be referred to the Committee on Indian Depredations; which was agreed to.

Mr. CAFFERY, from the Committee of Claims, to whom was referred the bill (S. 694) for the relief of Fanny B. Randolph and Dora L. Stark, for stores and supplies taken by the military forces of the United States for their use during the war for the suppression of the rebellion, as found by the Court of Claims, reported adversely thereon, and the bill was postponed indefinitely.

He also, from the same committee, to whom the subject was referred, submitted a report, accompanied by a bill (S. 1412), for the relief of Fanny B. Randolph and Dora L. Stark; which was read twice by its title.

Mr. WALTHALL, from the Committee on Military Affairs,

to whom was referred the bill (S. 1209) to regulate enlistments in the Army of the United States, reported it with amendments, and submitted a report thereon.

He also, from the same committee, to whom was referred the bill (S. 1363) for the relief of Francis Scala, asked to be discharged from its further consideration, and that it be referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs; which was agreed to.

Mr. MANDERSON, from the Committee on Military Affairs, to whom was referred the bill (S. 1312) for the relief of the heirs of Charles B. Smith, deceased, reported it without amendment, and submitted a report thereon.

INSPECTOR OF BOILER PLATES.

Mr. QUAY. I am instructed by the Committee on Commerce, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. 1920) to amend section 4430, Title LII, of the Revised Statutes of the United States, to report it favorably, without amendment. As it is a departmental bill and was passed unanimously by the other House several months ago, I ask for its present consideration.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The bill will be read for information.

The Secretary read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 4430 of the Revised Statutes of the United States be amended by adding thereto a paragraph, as follows:

"And the Supervising Inspector-General may, under the direction of the Secretary of the Treasury, detail assistant inspectors from any local inspection district where assistant inspectors are employed, to inspect iron or steel boiler plates at the mills where the same are manufactured; and if the plates are found in accordance with the rules of the supervising inspectors, the assistant inspector shall stamp the same with the initials of his name, followed by the letters and words, 'U. S. Assistant Inspector;' and material so stamped shall be accepted by the local inspectors in the districts where such material is to be manufactured into marine boilers as being in full compliance with the requirements of this section regarding the inspection of boiler plates; it being further provided that any person who affixes any false, forged, fraudulent, spurious, or counterfeit of the stamp herein authorized to be put on by an assistant inspector, shall be deemed guilty of a felony, and shall be fined not less than \$1,000, nor more than \$5,000, and imprisoned not less than two years nor more than five years."

Mr. QUAY. The object of the proposed amendment of the law is very succinctly stated in the report of the Supervising Inspector-General in a paragraph which I ask the Secretary to read.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Secretary will read as indicated.

The Secretary read as follows:

The object of this amendment is to provide for testing plate at the mills where manufactured instead of at the boiler works, and thus save the expense frequently incurred of returning plate that has been rejected to the mill, besides saving valuable time to the boiler manufacturers, whose workmen in many cases are kept idle whilst waiting for new plates to take the place of rejected ones.

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

On motion of Mr. CHANDLER, the title was amended so as to read: "A bill to amend section 4430, title 52, of the Revised Statutes of the United States relative to the inspection of iron or steel boiler plates."

DES MOINES RAPIDS POWER COMPANY.

Mr. CULLOM. I am directed by the Committee on Commerce, to whom was referred the bill (S. 1126) granting to the Des Moines Rapids Power Company the right to erect, construct, operate, and maintain a wing dam, canal, and power station in the Mississippi River in Hancock County, Ill., to report it with amendments, and I ask for the immediate consideration of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill; which was read.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The amendments of the committee will be stated in their order.

The first amendment was, in section 1, line 6, after the word "canal," to strike out "within 500 feet of the shore line of" and insert "along."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, in section 1, after the word "River," in line 17, to insert:

Provided, That the constructions hereby authorized do not in any way interfere with the existing low-water channel over the Des Moines Rapids, or with any interests of navigation: *And provided further*, That until the plans and locations of the work herein authorized, so far as they affect the interests of navigation, have been approved by the Secretary of War, the canal shall not be commenced or built.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was to add after section 1 the following additional section:

SEC. 2. That this act shall be null and void if actual construction of the works herein authorized be not commenced within two years and completed within four years from the date hereof.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. TELLER. Now, let the whole bill be read as amended.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The bill will be read as amended.

The Secretary read the bill as amended, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the assent of Congress is hereby given to the Des

Moines Rapids Power Company, a corporation created and organized under the laws of the State of Illinois, its successors and assigns, to erect, construct, operate, and maintain a canal along the east bank of the Mississippi River, between Nauvoo and Hamilton, in Hancock County, in the State of Illinois, to erect, construct, operate, and maintain a power station thereon, and to project, erect, construct, and operate, and maintain a wing dam 500 feet into the river from the head of said canal, and to make such other improvements as may be necessary within said limit for the development of water power and the generation, use, and transmission therefrom of electric energy and power at, in, and upon the Des Moines Rapids of the Mississippi River: *Provided*, That the constructions hereby authorized do not in any way interfere with the existing low-water channel over the Des Moines Rapids, or with any interests of navigation: *And provided further*, That until the plans and locations of the works herein authorized, so far as they affect the interests of navigation, have been approved by the Secretary of War, the canal shall not be commenced or built.

SEC. 2. That this act shall be null and void if actual construction of the works herein authorized be not commenced within two years and completed within four years from the date hereof.

SEC. 3. That the right to alter, amend, or repeal this act is hereby expressly reserved.

Mr. CULLOM. I wish to state for the information of the Senate that the bill was referred to the Secretary of War and by him referred to the local engineer, Maj. Mackenzie. He reported upon it, and then the Chief of Engineers, Gen. Casey, reported to the Secretary of War, and the Secretary of War reported on it. I have all the letters here indorsing the bill as amended.

Mr. MITCHELL of Oregon. I should like to ask the Senator from Illinois a question. If this is a good thing to do, what is the necessity to give the parties two years' time in which to commence the work? Is not that an unusually long time?

Mr. CULLOM. I suppose they are ready to commence work now, but generally in such cases we give a little time for the parties to get the machinery to the place and to get ready.

Mr. MITCHELL of Oregon. The bill gives them four years?

Mr. CULLOM. No; four years for the completion.

Mr. MITCHELL of Oregon. Two years in which to commence the work?

Mr. CULLOM. Yes; and four years in which to complete it.

Mr. ALLISON. I ask that the letter of Maj. Mackenzie be read, that we may learn what he thinks about it.

Mr. CULLOM. Very well. The Senator may have all the letters read if he wishes.

Mr. ALLISON. I should like to have them all printed in the RECORD.

Mr. CULLOM. I will put them in the RECORD.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The letter of Maj. Mackenzie will be read.

The Secretary read as follows:

UNITED STATES ENGINEER OFFICE,
Rock Island, Ill., November 7, 1893.

GENERAL: I have the honor to acknowledge receipt of Senate bill 1126, Fifty-third Congress, first session, granting to the Des Moines Rapids Power Company the right to "erect, construct, operate, and maintain a wing dam, canal, and power station in the Mississippi River, in Hancock County, Ill." This bill is referred to me for report by indorsement, dated Office Chief of Engineers, United States Army, November 3, 1893. (File number 4323-1893.)

The bill authorizes the construction of a canal within 500 feet of the shore line of the east bank of the Mississippi River, between Nauvoo and Hamilton, Ill., with power station, wing dam, etc. The legend attached to the map accompanying the papers provides for constructing outside embankment nearly parallel to high-water shore line, and for a width of canal of from 300 to 450 feet.

Previous to the construction of the Des Moines Rapids Canal steamboats used a low-water channel through the rock reef forming the Des Moines Rapids. Such channel is not much used at present time, boats preferring the canal at low or ordinary stages. But in case of any accident to the canal, an urgent necessity for the use of such channel might arise. Any works constructed on the east side of the river, as proposed, should not, therefore, interfere in any way with such channel; or, if they do so interfere, a new and equally good channel should be given elsewhere before the existing channel is closed.

If the proposed outer embankment is built parallel to the high-water shore line, and not to exceed 400 feet from it, it is thought there will be no such interference at any point, while if built 500 feet from shore line, as proposed by act, there might be such interference at one or two points. There are points at which the width could be greatly increased without any interference with channel.

To protect the interests of navigation, I would respectfully suggest the following modifications in the bill as proposed:

Section 1, line 6, omit the word "within."

Section 1, line 7, omit the words "five hundred feet of the shore line of," and substitute the word "along."

Section 1, line 17, add the words: "Provided the constructions hereby authorized do not in any way interfere with the existing low-water channel over the Des Moines Rapids, or with any interests of navigation: *And provided further*, That until the plans and locations of the works herein authorized, so far as they affect the interests of navigation, have been approved by the Secretary of War, the canal shall not be built."

It is suggested that a time limit, such as has been inserted in modern bridge acts, would be proper in connection with the proposed authority, and such modification is recommended, as follows:

"SEC. 2. That this act shall be null and void if actual construction of the works herein authorized be not commenced within two years and completed within three years from the date hereof."

Then follow with section 3:

"SEC. 3. That the right to alter, amend, or repeal this act is hereby expressly reserved."

Very respectfully, your obedient servant,

A. MACKENZIE,
Major, Corps of Engineers.

Brig. Gen. THOMAS L. CASEY,
Chief of Engineers, United States Army, Washington, D. C.

Mr. CULLOM. I will insert in the RECORD the letters of the Secretary of War and the Chief of Engineers. I will state that the Secretary of War suggested five years as the limit of time, but the committee put it at four.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Without objection, the letters will be inserted in the RECORD.

The letters are as follows:

WAR DEPARTMENT, Washington, D. C., December 4, 1893.

SIR: I have the honor to return Senate bill 1126, Fifty-third Congress, first session, "Granting to the Des Moines Rapids Power Company the right to erect, construct, operate, and maintain a wing dam, canal, and power station in the Mississippi River, in Hancock County, Ill.," which was referred to this Department on November 2, 1893, and to invite your attention to the accompanying letter from the Chief of Engineers dated the 1st instant, and to the copy of the report on the bill from Maj. A. Mackenzie, dated November 7, whose views are concurred in by the Chief of Engineers.

The bill has accordingly been amended by the Chief of Engineers, who remarks that as amended no objection, so far as the interests of navigation are concerned, are known to his office to its passage. The amendments meet with the approval of the Department, except the one proposed in section 2, which provides that the act "shall be null and void if actual construction of the works herein authorized be not commenced within two years and completed within three years from the date hereof." This time seems rather short. If the work is commenced within three years and completed within five years, it will be soon enough.

The petition and tracing which accompanied your communication are herewith returned.

Very respectfully,

DANIEL S. LAMONT,
Secretary of War.

The CHAIRMAN of the Committee on Commerce,
United States Senate.

OFFICE OF THE CHIEF OF ENGINEERS, UNITED STATES ARMY,
Washington, D. C., December 1, 1893.

SIR: I have the honor to return herewith, with its inclosed petition and drawing, the letter of the Committee on Commerce, United States Senate, dated November 2, 1893, inclosing, for views of the War Department thereon, a copy of S. 1126, Fifty-third Congress, first session, "A bill granting to the Des Moines Rapids Power Company the right to erect, construct, operate, and maintain a wing dam, canal, and power station in the Mississippi River in Hancock County, Ill.," with the following report:

A copy of a report upon the bill, dated November 7, 1893, by Maj. A. Mackenzie, Corps of Engineers, the local engineer officer, is also transmitted herewith, and attention is invited to his views, which are concurred in by this office.

It is recommended that the bill be amended as follows:

Section 1, lines 6 and 7, strike out the words "within five hundred feet of the shore line of," and substitute therefor the word "along."

At the end of section 1 add, "Provided, That the constructions hereby authorized do not in any way interfere with the existing low-water channel over the Des Moines Rapids, or with any interests of navigation: And provided further, That until the plans and locations of the works herein authorized, so far as they affect the interests of navigation, have been approved by the Secretary of War, the canal shall not be commenced or built."

Change the existing section 2 to section 3, and insert a new section 2, as follows: "Sec. 2. That this act shall be null and void if actual construction of the works herein authorized be not commenced within two years and completed within three years from the date hereof."

A copy of the bill with these amendments indicated thereon is inclosed, and as so amended no objection, so far as the interests of navigation are concerned, is known to this office to its passage by Congress.

Very respectfully, your obedient servant,

THOS. LINCOLN CASEY,
Brigadier-General, Chief of Engineers.

Hon. D S: LAMONT, Secretary of War.

Mr. BATE. Will the Senator in charge of the bill state what committee it was before?

Mr. CULLOM. The Committee on Commerce had charge of the bill.

Mr. BATE. What is the width of the Mississippi River where it is proposed to extend the dam 500 feet?

Mr. CULLOM. It is a mile wide, I presume, at that point. I do not remember exactly.

Mr. BATE. Are there any other dams like it above or below?

Mr. CULLOM. No, sir; not that I know of.

Mr. BATE. Is this to be the only dam of the kind in the Mississippi River?

Mr. CULLOM. It is to be the only one in that section. I do not know whether there is another anywhere else on the river or not.

Mr. ALLISON. This bill is a new matter to me, but if it does not interfere with the existing canal on the west side of the river—

Mr. CULLOM. It does not.

Mr. ALLISON. A canal which the Government has constructed at a very heavy cost and which it is now maintaining, I do not object to it. But it is a very delicate matter, it seems to me, to be granting to a private corporation an important franchise like this, which may at some time interfere with the water of the canal on the west side.

Mr. CULLOM. It can not possibly do so, because the bill is guarded so that if the dam should in any way interfere with navigation through the canal or any other channel there the act would be regarded as null and void. It is subject to repeal.

Mr. ALLISON. I know; but after a large expenditure has been made for the purposes indicated it is not an easy thing to

deal with a matter of this character. However, I shall not object to the bill.

Mr. HAWLEY. There are certain rules of the Senate, business rules, founded upon common sense. They are wise regulations drawn from experience. This important and interesting bill comes here with no written report, with riders and amendments pasted on, and immediate consideration is asked for it. I think there should have been a written report, including in it the letter from the Chief of Engineers, and that the bill and report should have been printed. I shall make no objection to the consideration of the bill at any other time, but if it is still open to objection I object to-day.

Mr. CULLOM. I hope the Senator from Connecticut will not object to this measure. It is not an uncommon thing for the Committee on Commerce to ask for the consideration of such bills when they are reported. The report of the Chief of Engineers is here; the local engineer's report is here, and the letter of the Secretary of War is here. Everything is here, and the bill has been amended exactly according to the requirements of the Chief of Engineers and the local engineer and the Secretary of War. It is even a little more stringent in its provisions than the Secretary of War required.

Mr. HAWLEY. All that matter is very good, and it might have appeared quite properly in a report. Just as strong an argument can be made for nine-tenths of the good bills that come here; but it is the usage and the rule that there shall be a report, and that the bill as proposed to be amended shall be printed. I insist on my objection.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. There is objection to the further consideration of the bill, and it will be placed on the Calendar.

ARANSAS PASS HARBOR COMPANY.

Mr. COKE. I am directed by the Committee on Commerce, to whom was referred the bill (S. 1378) to amend an act of Congress approved May 12, 1890, granting to the Aransas Pass Harbor Company the right to improve the Aransas Pass, to report it favorably. I am instructed by the committee to ask for the present consideration of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill; which was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Aransas Pass Harbor Company, which is engaged in the improvement of the Aransas Pass under the provisions contained in act of Congress entitled "An act for the improvement of Aransas Pass," approved May 12, 1890, is hereby relieved from the conditions of said act which require the construction of said work to be commenced within one year from the date of its approval, and to be diligently prosecuted by the expenditure of at least \$300,000 per annum thereafter, and to secure a navigable depth over the outer bar of 15 feet of water within three years after the date of approval of said act, and of 20 feet within five years from said date; and the said company is hereby authorized to continue and complete its work of improvement as set forth in said act: *Provided,* That work shall be resumed by the said Aransas Pass Harbor Company within six months from the date of approval of this act, and shall be diligently prosecuted to completion; and said company shall secure a navigable depth over the outer bar of at least 20 feet of water within two years from the date of approval of this act. And in the event of said company failing to resume said work within the said six months, or failing to diligently prosecute the same, or to secure a navigable depth of 20 feet of water over the outer bar within the time required by this act, then Congress may revoke the privileges herein granted in relation to said improvement.

SEC. 2. That the right of Congress to alter, amend, or repeal this act is hereby reserved.

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

Mr. COKE. I am directed by the Committee on Commerce, to whom was referred the bill (S. 1139) to amend an act of Congress approved May 12, 1890, granting to the Aransas Pass Harbor Company the right to improve Aransas Pass, to report it with a recommendation that it be postponed indefinitely.

The report was agreed to.

STEAMER EL CALLAO.

Mr. FRYE. I am directed by the Committee on Commerce, to whom was referred the bill (S. 432) to provide an American register for the steamer El Callao, to report it favorably, and to submit a written report thereon.

As the bill provides for an American register for a foreign-built vessel, as the spirit of the law has been very much more than complied with, and as the company is in very great need of the vessel for its coastwise line, I ask the immediate consideration of the bill.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Maine?

Mr. MILLS. I think that bill had better lie over for one day. I should like to look at it.

Mr. FRYE. There is a written report accompanying the bill and there has been expended in American shipyards on that vessel as much as the appraised value of the vessel to-day. I hope the Senator will not object.

Mr. MILLS. One day will not be much, and we shall then have an opportunity to look at the bill. I will ask the Senator if the bill is reported unanimously by the committee?

Mr. FRYE. The bill is unanimously reported.

Mr. MILLS. Then I withdraw my objection.

Mr. PERKINS. I call for the reading of the report which accompanies the bill.

Mr. FRYE. I hope the Senator will not delay the passage of the bill for that. There was expended in American shipyards on this wrecked vessel more money than the vessel is actually worth.

Mr. PERKINS. After that statement, I withdraw the request for the reading of the report.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. 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.

BRIDGE ACROSS BOEUF RIVER, LOUISIANA.

Mr. WHITE of Louisiana. I am instructed by the Committee on Commerce, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. 4414) to amend an act approved September 4, 1890, authorizing the New Orleans, Natchez and Fort Scott Railroad Company to construct two bridges across Boeuf River, in Louisiana, to report it favorably. I ask unanimous consent for the consideration of the bill at this time.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Is there objection?

Mr. ALLISON. Let the bill be read.

Mr. HARRIS. Let the bill be read at length for information.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The bill will be read.

The Secretary read the bill, and, by unanimous consent, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider it.

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

Mr. TELLER. I do not want to object to this bill, and I presume it is now too late to do so, but I wish simply to say that I do not believe in committees reporting their bills here and passing them immediately, unless in case of emergency. If there are any more bills of this kind, I shall feel at liberty to object to their consideration after this bill is disposed of.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The question is, Shall the bill pass?

The bill was passed.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE.

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. T. O. TOWLES, its Chief Clerk, announced that the House had passed the concurrent resolution of the Senate providing for the printing of the report of the Superintendent of the Coast and Geodetic Survey for the fiscal year 1892.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED.

The message also announced that the Speaker of the House had signed the enrolled joint resolution (H. Res. 93) authorizing the Secretary of the Treasury to permit the owners of cattle and horses transporting them into Mexico to reimport same into the United States at any time within twelve months from date of the passage of this resolution, and for other purposes; and it was thereupon signed by the Vice-President.

BILLS INTRODUCED.

Mr. MITCHELL of Oregon introduced a bill (S. 1413) granting a pension to Robert Markwood, of Oregon; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. MITCHELL of Oregon. I am requested by a leading member of the bar of the District of Columbia to introduce a bill, which I ask may be read the first and second time, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

The bill (S. 1414) to amend section 4 of the act entitled "An act to define the jurisdiction of the police court of the District of Columbia" was read twice by its title.

Mr. HARRIS. I am not sure if the bill should not go to the Committee on the District of Columbia. Does the Senator desire it to go to the Committee on the Judiciary?

Mr. MITCHELL of Oregon. A similar bill, or practically the same bill, has been referred to the Committee on the Judiciary in the House of Representatives, and it was suggested by the member of the bar who handed me the bill that it be referred to the Committee on the Judiciary. I am not particular as to its reference.

Mr. HARRIS. I shall not object to the Senator's request that the bill go to the Judiciary Committee.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The bill will be referred to the Committee on the Judiciary in the absence of objection.

Mr. PALMER introduced a bill (S. 1415) to restore to the pension roll Mary B. Christopher, and grant her a pension as widow of James Bringham, late a surgeon of the Twenty-eighth Regiment of Illinois Infantry Volunteers; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also introduced a bill (S. 1416) granting a pension to John W. Starr; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. QUAY introduced a bill (S. 1417) for removing the charge of desertion standing on the records of the War Department against Bernard Brennan, late of Company H, Forty-eighth Pennsylvania Volunteers; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

He also introduced a bill (S. 1418) for removing the charge of desertion standing on the records of the War Department against John Scanlin, late of Company F, Eighty-eighth Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteers; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

He also introduced a bill (S. 1419) to remove the charge of desertion from the military record of Bernard Stueber; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. PLATT introduced a bill (S. 1420) for the relief of J. Floyd Johnston, administrator; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

Mr. CAFFERY introduced a bill (S. 1421) granting a pension to Jane M. Anderson; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also introduced a bill (S. 1422) granting a pension to Mrs. Sophia Lessing; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also introduced a bill (S. 1423) to provide an American register for the steamer Goldsworthy; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Commerce.

Mr. CULLOM introduced a bill (S. 1424) to amend section 8 of "An act to authorize the construction of a bridge across the Calumet River," approved March 1, 1893; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Commerce.

WITHDRAWAL OF PAPERS.

On motion of Mr. MITCHELL of Oregon, it was

Ordered, That Joseph Hague have leave to withdraw his petition and papers from the files of the Senate, there not being any adverse report made or action had thereon.

COLUMBIAN MEDALS.

Mr. CHANDLER submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on the Quadro-Centennial (Select):

Resolved, That the Select Committee on the Quadro-Centennial be directed to ascertain what progress has been made in the preparation and issue of the Columbian medals for which appropriation was made by section 3 of the act of August 5, 1892, and to examine into the suitability of the design and the method of striking the medals, and to inquire whether any further legislation is necessary on the subject.

HAWAIIAN AFFAIRS.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Chair lays before the Senate the resolution submitted by the Senator from Maine [Mr. FRYE] January 3, 1894, proposing to declare as the opinion of the Senate that, pending the investigation by the Committee on Foreign Relations, there should be no interference on the part of the Government of the United States with affairs in Hawaii; on which the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. DAVIS] is entitled to the floor.

Mr. DAVIS. Mr. President, it is always to be considered in weighing testimony in this matter, and especially in considering the action of Minister Stevens, that there was as to American residents in the island a dual citizenship, that of the United States and that of the Kingdom of Hawaii. The constitution of Hawaii of 1887, which the Queen unconstitutionally attempted to abrogate, conferred upon all male residents of Hawaiian or of European or of American parentage, of a certain age and possessing the requisite property qualifications, the elective franchise and the right to hold office. The question might possibly arise, indeed had arisen, as to what the effect of such a provision would be upon the right of a citizen of the United States to be regarded thereafter as a citizen of the United States after his taking advantage of the privileges conferred upon him by the constitution of Hawaii, and whether he would be entitled to protection as an American citizen.

So far as that question is concerned it had received ample decision by the State Department, first by Mr. Frelinghuysen, whose views upon that subject are found in Senate Miscellaneous Documents of 1885-'86, vol. 10, page 177. The case arose long before the adoption of the Constitution of 1887, and was decided upon general principles. Jones was an American citizen domiciled in Hawaii; but in order to obtain the registry of a merchant

vessel under the Hawaiian flag he was compelled by the statute of the Kingdom to take an oath of allegiance to the Kingdom, which he did, and the question arose in that particular instance whether by so doing he had abrogated or could have been held to have renounced his privileges, rights, or status as an American citizen. Mr. Frelinghuysen says:

Your inquiry is as to what effect this proceeding may have upon the status of Mr. Jones's American citizenship.

In becoming a citizen of the United States the law requires that an alien shall not only swear to support the Constitution and laws of this country, but also to renounce all other allegiance, and especially that of the country of which he may be then a subject or citizen. In the oath taken by Mr. Jones there is no such express renunciation of his American citizenship, nor do the circumstances manifest any intention on his part to expatriate himself.

It may, however, at some future time, become a question for judicial investigation in his case.

The doctrine of the executive branch of the Government on this subject is thus expressed by the Attorney-General:

"To constitute expatriation there must be an actual removal, followed by foreign residence, accompanied by authentic renunciation of preëxisting citizenship" (8 Op., 139), and this view finds support in some judicial decisions (*Juando vs. Taylor*, 2 Palme, 632).

In the absence of a direct judicial determination of the question, I do not feel disposed to deny to Mr. Jones any right or privilege pertaining to his character of American citizenship, and therefore, while the Department will not undertake to express an authoritative opinion on the effect which his course in Hawaii may ultimately have on his status in that regard, you are authorized to extend to him such protection as may be properly due to a citizen of the United States residing in and having acquired a commercial domicile in a foreign state. This protection must, of course, be limited and qualified by the liabilities and obligations incident to such commercial domicile.

But the question directly arose under the operations of the constitution of 1887, and was passed upon by Mr. Bayard. (Vol. I, House Ex. Doc. Second Session, Fiftieth Congress, page 833.)

MR. BAYARD TO MR. MERRILL.

No. 61.]

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, September 30, 1887.

SIR: Your No. 134, of the 25th of July last, in reference to an oath required of foreign residents in the islands, is received.

This question was brought to the notice of the Department by Mr. Putman, in his No. 125, of the 1st ultimo, and in reply he was instructed on the 18th ultimo that citizens of the United States who take the oath of fealty prescribed by the new constitution of Hawaii remain citizens of the United States, and are entitled to be regarded and treated as such by our consular and diplomatic officers.

That such a result is contemplated by the Hawaiian Government appears evident from the last sentence of the oath, which reads:

"Not hereby renouncing, but expressly reserving all allegiance and citizenship now owning or held by me."

This Department is informed that this oath is indiscriminately required of citizens of other nations, who are nevertheless understood by their own governments to retain their own nationality of origin. Inasmuch also as this oath is a requisite condition for exercising any political privileges on the island, it is evident that a refusal on the part of this Government of the assent to taking it granted by other governments to their citizens would result in the destruction of any political power previously possessed by our citizens and its transfer to citizens of other assenting nations.

The Department, therefore, desires that you will consider the above instruction as addressed to yourself, and that you will relieve the minds of all bona fide American citizens who, while honestly desiring to retain their American nationality, are, in order to obtain the privileges necessary for a residence in the islands, obliged under local law to take an oath to support the constitution of the Hawaiian Kingdom.

I am, etc.,

T. F. BAYARD.

Mr. President, I shall proceed as rapidly as may be consistent with a very superficial examination of the testimony which is contained in Mr. Blount's report, repeating that I am limiting myself to that testimony strictly in my consideration of the events that I was discussing when the Senate adjourned yesterday. On Monday, the 16th day of January, the situation upon the island had become more critical. It was known to be such, and indeed had been recognized to be such, as it had been before, by the Queen's ministers. Accordingly, at 10 o'clock on Monday morning a meeting of the cabinet was called which resulted in the drafting and adoption of a proclamation to be signed by the Queen, stating that she would not attempt to modify the constitution of 1887 except by the methods prescribed therein. But she had gone too far. The fate of the monarchy was settled, and, although the cabinet visited the committee of public safety and showed that proposed proclamation to the committee, it was replied what faith could be put in the promises of the Queen after what had taken place? The cabinet was notified that it was too late.

It is always the case when thrones are falling under the blows of revolution that the tottering monarch offers that which he should have offered long before. If I am correct in my recollections of history, Lord Howe in the darkest period of the American Revolution sent a letter to Gen. Washington, addressing him as Mr. Washington, offering exemptions and privileges to the colonies and to the American people which for years before he had obdurately denied, and which denial had resulted in the glorious rebellion which gave us our independence. Gen. Washington's reply to those letters was the victories of Trenton and Monmouth. I am reminded by the learned Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. HOAR] that in that connection George III sent

over commissioners, of whom I think Lord Howe was one, authorized and plenarily empowered to make those promises.

Now, on this occasion, somewhere about 11 o'clock on Monday, Mr. Wilson made his way to the meeting of the committee of public safety and told Mr. Thurston, the master spirit in this singular rebellion, where those ministers who were intrusted with the preservation of the Kingdom were associating on the most familiar terms, terms almost of intimacy, with those who were termed the plotters, that this thing ought to stop, that there would be a proclamation issued. Mr. Thurston replied that it had gone too far; that they were standing on a volcano; that they would not trust the word of the Queen. Wilson then threatened him with arrest, and Thurston defied him. That is the nearest approach to the use of physical force to repress the revolution in all these four days of intense excitement.

On Monday the committee of public safety, knowing and having been informed that the United States minister would order the troops to be landed from the ship at 5 o'clock that afternoon, found that it did not accord with the then condition of their plans and purposes, that it would be too early for what they intended to do. Accordingly, they sent to Minister Stevens and asked him to postpone the landing of the troops until the next day, and his reply was that "As a precautionary matter I have ordered the troops be landed at 5 o'clock for the protection of American life and property, and landed they will be." And they were landed at that hour. That does not look much as if the minister were playing into the hands of those who afterwards became the Provisional Government.

I have no doubt that, as on such occasions always is the case, those who were back of the revolution endeavored to make it appear that the United States authorities and troops were to be in actual sympathy with them, but the United States was not responsible for that, and this evidence can be searched in vain for any instance where Mr. Stevens did not expressly say to every attempt to put him even in an equivocal attitude in this respect that he should land the troops for the protection of American life and property. What was he to do? Suppose he had not landed the marines and the results had been as everybody feared? He would have disobeyed the standing instructions of his office; and, as I said yesterday, if the Queen by her revolutionary acts, whereby she had absolved from allegiance to her every subject who chose, had created the situation which made it necessary to land troops for the protection of American life and property, she (having created that necessity) can not complain because its necessary exercise had the collateral and incidental effect of contributing in some degree to overthrow the monarchy. That it did so contribute I deny. I merely suppose the case.

Great stress is laid in Mr. Blount's report upon the use of troops. One would think from it that a *corps d'armée* had been marshalled in the streets of Honolulu. Mr. President, 162 marines were landed, and of those 14 were musicians, 9 were officers. It can be fairly inferred from Mr. Blount's report that those troops were massed in a commanding position with reference to the capitol building of the Hawaiian Kingdom. But the facts are, as appear from the testimony submitted by Mr. Blount, that when they marched from the landing up to Merchant street, the principal street of the city as I should judge from the map, a detachment was left at the consular office on that street, a company of marines went to the legation, where they remained, and the remainder of the force, being the main body, the number of which is not stated, went off towards Arion Hall seeking shelter. Not being able to find it there at once, application was made for the opera house. That building could not be had. The armory was otherwise occupied, and that could not be had. At a later hour they went on beyond Arion Hall to the residence of Mr. Atherton, a place which I should judge from the map is somewhere out in the suburbs; probably obtained refreshment there, and late in the evening came back and were quartered in Arion Hall.

Mr. PLATT. At what hour?

Mr. DAVIS. I can not tell exactly; probably it was 8 or 9 o'clock.

At this point another matter in my notes attracts my attention. It is the statement or testimony of Mr. Cornwell, found on page 27. He was the minister of finance. He says in substance that on Monday, having learned that United States troops were landing, Parker and Peterson called on Stevens and requested him to keep the troops on board. Stevens replied that he had landed the troops to protect American life and property, and proposed to keep them on shore. There was a distinct announcement by the minister of the United States to the Queen's ministers, consistent with all that he had said before and with all that he said afterwards, and with all that the naval officers said or did, owing to the necessity which had been created, and which he did not create, and for which he was in no degree responsible, namely, he would land troops solely to serve the pur-

poses of that necessity, which was the protection of American life and property.

As I have stated, during the meeting of the committee of public safety on Monday, Marshal Wilson made his way to the meeting, and in his testimony, commencing on page 552, he details his interview with Thurston. I think I stated that a few moments ago, but something else took place there which is corroborated by the testimony of Mr. Waterhouse about which Mr. Wilson says nothing, namely, the threat which Wilson then made to arrest Thurston, and Thurston's defiance.

It would be inferred from the report of Commissioner Blount that everything was serene and peaceful in Hawaii on this Monday; that there was no public alarm; that this situation so universally known to everybody had not created a ripple on the placid surface of business or municipal affairs.

It frequently happens, when testimony, given under the disturbing impulse of passion and discordant views is conflicting, that some incidental, some collateral circumstance comes in, some fact proved by unimpeachable testimony and not contradicted, which settles the entire controversy. Such a circumstance is not lacking here. I refer to the testimony of Mr. Scott, on page 480. Mr. Scott testifies in substance that he was the principal of a public school in the city of Honolulu, the number of pupils being 300 white children; that shortly after school began on the morning of Monday the mothers of those children from all parts of the city came to the school in their carriages to take them away. He was so impressed by the gravity of the situation that he dismissed the school before noon. Nothing but the existence of great alarm and the prevailing sense of impending danger could have carried that impression of insecurity into a hundred separate homes that morning. The feminine instinct in that case, as it so often is, was unerring. There was danger; it was so felt.

Tuesday, the day of final action came, and Mr. Cornwell, on page 27, testifies that Tuesday "We were informed that the Provisional Government would be proclaimed that afternoon." Wilson testifies or states in substance, on page 552, that he knew on Tuesday before 11 a. m. that the committee had agreed to proclaim a provisional government; to put Chief Justice Judd or Justice Dole at the head of it, and that they were to hold another meeting at noon; that they would move on the Government building at 3 p. m. and on the police station at 4 p. m. "I immediately sent for the cabinet, but there was no sign of cabinet."

Now, here was a meeting of the committee of public safety announcing that at certain hours of that day they would seize the Government of Hawaii and depose the Queen, giving the very line of action and the place and time of it. They were holding their meetings in a place not commanded or guarded or threatened in the least degree by United States troops, or defended by any forces of their own. Here, on the other hand, was the Queen's Government, with this amount of power behind it, of which Mr. Blount talks, and yet no motion was made to put this irresistible power into operation; not one of the Queen's guards nor one of Marshal Wilson's police force was sent to arrest those thirteen men, and there was no sign of the cabinet to be found. They had vanished

Into thin air; and what seemed corporal melted
As breath into the wind.

The substance of Mr. Bolte's statement, found on page 249, is that at 2 p. m., Tuesday, when they arrived at the Government house, there came up others of the revolutionary party, bringing rifles and pistols. He says this was premeditated; that the committee had notified the volunteers that they would go to the Government house at 2 o'clock, and that they, referring to the volunteers, arrived before the finishing of the reading of the proclamation. The testimony shows that before that reading was finished Capt. Ziegler, a German, brought on his company, he being the first, and by the time it was through the rest were there, so that when the act by which these gentlemen announced their determination to seize on the Government of Hawaii was finished, by reading the proclamation, the military force, which it was concerted should be there at the time the committee on public safety went to the public building, had arrived. They came from the armory, a place not at all commanded or dominated by any force of United States marines upon the island. They could have been met by this vague and yet invincible and irresistible royal force of which Mr. Blount tells, and the factions could have fought it out to their heart's content, without the least interference, so long as the contest did not result in or threaten violence and danger to the lives and property of American citizens.

It could be inferred, and I think it is expressly stated in Mr. Blount's report—and such is the desire to dwell upon minute matters for the purpose of making good the attack upon the Administration of President Harrison and upon Mr. Stevens—

that the committee on public safety furtively and by separate streets went to the Government building. In that he is squarely contradicted by the testimony of Mr. Waterhouse, page 47. My recollection of that testimony is that the committee of thirteen, with one other gentleman whose name is not given, making fourteen, started from the meeting place of the committee of public safety to go to the Government building, and my recollection is positive that the testimony of Mr. Waterhouse is that twelve of them went in one body, up the same street, of course, and the other two, for some reason not explained, took another street.

I infer that the twelve went up Merchant street, the principal business street of the city, upon which the police station is situated. They had no guard; no soldier went with them. The names of the committee of thirteen were known, and had been known since Monday, and perhaps before; yes, Saturday is the testimony, if my recollection serves me, and yet not one of this imposing military force which was at the back of the Hawaiian Government was invoked to stay or detain or arrest them.

Mr. Waterhouse states that they expected to meet resistance at the Government building; he had heard a report that there were 100 men there. He thinks that if the Queen's forces and the military forces had got to fighting, the United States troops would not have interfered except to protect American citizens. That was the conception of the situation which the committee of safety had when they set out for the Government building. He says that when they were going into the door of the Government building various volunteers kept coming into the yard with their rifles.

Mr. President, they took possession of that building. They found one government clerk there, making up some official figures.

Mr. Damon states in substance, on page 39, that some of the provisional troops came on the ground before the reading of the proclamation was finished. Immediately after the proclamation Dole and others met at the office of the minister of the interior, and Cornwell and Parker came up from the station house and held a conference, the result of which was that Damon and Bolte were requested to return with Cornwell and Parker to the station house (this was another of the amenities of this revolution) and recommend and urge upon the parties in power at the police station to surrender to the Provisional Government. They held a conference in the room occupied generally by the deputy marshal, at which were present Peterson, Colburn, Parker, Cornwell, Bolte, and, later, Neumann.

The President of the United States has stated in his annual message, as Mr. Blount had stated in his report, that this Provisional Government was established with the active aid of the United States minister, and by the puissant intimidation of the American troops. I have shown how they were distributed.

I say the United States troops were not drawn up in line, or at all in a menacing or military attitude or array.

Let us see whether Mr. Blount did not overlook some most important testimony as to what took place right there at the time when the Provisional Government was coming into being by reading the proclamation. If the testimony of any witness is to be regarded respecting the military situation at the time, it is the testimony of Mr. Wilcox, the military man who was educated by the Hawaiian Government in the military schools of Italy, and who at the time of this revolution was passively favorable to the cause of the Queen. Mr. Wilcox says in regard to the attitude of the troops—I can not give the page exactly—

Mr. GRAY. Who is the witness?

Mr. DAVIS. Robert Wilcox. I read this question and answer in the examination of Wilcox, on page 542:

Q. Where were the United States troops at the time of the reading of the proclamation?

A. Right behind the opera house, in a building they called Arion Hall.

Q. In the house or on the street?

A. Some inside and some outside. They took possession of that quarter.

Q. Were they armed or not?

A. No; they just guarded the place.

Q. Had they arms?

A. Yes; and one or two Gatling guns—one or two, I am sure of that.

What becomes of the claim that the United States marines were there drawn up in military array and menacing the operations of the Queen's Government or of her forces? They had been stationed at the Arion Hall because there was no other place in the city where they could find shelter, although other places had been sought for in vain, hospitality having been denied in other places.

Further, to show the utter incredibility of the report of Commissioner Blount as to the implied duress even in the presence of United States troops on that occasion, or as to what anybody had any right to expect or to fear from them, I refer to the testimony of Mr. Damon, on page 39. It seems that while the proclamation was being read, some timid soul among the revolutionists—and there are always such on occasions of that kind—

took it into his head that there was danger, and he wanted to know why they did not get protection from the United States troops; they were near at hand, but he did not see any protection particularly interposing between them and the danger which he feared. So Mr. Damon said in substance:

While the proclamation was being read, we were all nervous as to our safety. I asked one of the men with me there, "Will not the American troops support us?" Finally I asked one of the men to go over and ask Lieut. Swinburne if he was not going to send some one over to protect us. The man returned and said to me: "Capt. Wiltse's orders are, 'I remain passive; I will not support it in any way.'"

"I remain passive; I will not support in any way," was the response which the commander, Lieut. Swinburne, of the marines stationed in and about Arion Hall at the time of this transaction, made to a pressing demand for support for the personal safety of the men who were then instituting this Provisional Government. It all consists with the invariable declaration of Minister Stevens that he landed troops to protect American life and property, and that the incidental and collateral transactions might take care of themselves, provided American life and property were not put to peril.

Is it not passing strange, Mr. President—

Mr. GRAY. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MANDERSON in the chair). Does the Senator from Minnesota yield to the Senator from Delaware?

Mr. GRAY. I am trying to follow the Senator, and I am very much interested in what he is saying. Will it interrupt him if I call his attention—

Mr. DAVIS. I am making what I regard as a close statement from notes, speaking under that disadvantage, and I would rather not be interrupted. The Senator can reply to me when I shall have concluded.

Mr. GRAY. All right. I only wanted to call the Senator's attention to a piece of testimony which he could not find.

Mr. DAVIS. It is in the testimony of Mr. Damon.

Mr. GRAY. I have it before me.

Mr. DAVIS. It will be found in the testimony which is in the record, whether I have made a misquotation or not.

Mr. GRAY. Very well, I shall not interrupt the Senator.

Mr. DAVIS. The testimony is in the record, and that is what Lieut. Swinburne said when he was appealed to to protect and care for the personal safety of the men who were then reading the proclamation for the institution of that Provisional Government.

Mr. GRAY. Who was that?

Mr. DAVIS. Lieut. Swinburne.

Mr. FRYE. Lieut. Swinburne was in charge on shore.

Mr. GRAY. Certainly.

Mr. DAVIS. He was acting under the orders of Capt. Wiltse.

Mr. GRAY. He said "I remain passive." What else did he say?

Mr. DAVIS. He also said, "I will not support it in any way."

Mr. GRAY. I do not find that in the testimony which I have here.

Mr. DAVIS. I am endeavoring to make this statement with absolute fidelity. Of course entire accuracy can not be expected and error may creep in a matter so complicated as this, and of course I would not interpolate anything into the record.

Mr. GRAY. No one can be more sure of that than I.

Mr. DAVIS. It was on Tuesday afternoon at about half past 2 o'clock that this appeal to Lieut. Swinburne was made. The United States troops had been at Arion Hall from a certain hour on the evening before and had probably been there over twenty hours, within 700 feet of the palace, I should think, and within a shorter distance of the Government building. Does anyone suppose that Wilson and Cornwell and Parker and Colburn and Peterson and all persons representing the Queen being up to a comparatively recent date in the Government building and within a stone's throw of these troops, could not have ascertained from Lieut. Swinburne what his purposes and orders were, and that they would not have been given the same answer which was made to the members of the Provisional Government when they supposed they were in extremity? Can anyone doubt with the activity which Wilson displayed that he had not asked that question?

Why did not Commissioner Blount, with that thread of evidence placed in his hands, follow it up and ascertain whether it was not notified to both parties there that neither one could expect the active aid, assistance, or interference of the United States military force? The conviction is borne upon my mind so forcibly that I can not refrain from repeating that I firmly believe from their action that they had that information from Lieut. Swinburne, and had it over and over again.

It is suggested to me by the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. HOAR] that the Queen, if she had supposed that the force there was menacing her, would have made a formal inquiry as to why

it was there. No question of that kind is shown to have been asked. I presume it was asked. The fact is that in the exercise of reasonable diligence, surrounded by counselors such as she had, she and they knew, and were bound to know by inquiry, what the presence of that force meant on that occasion.

Mr. President, much has been said as to the time of this recognition. As in all cases where many events are crowded into a short time, there is confusion in the testimony and some degree of conflict, but after the Provisional Government was declared, Capt. Wiltse sent his aid to see if they were in possession of the Government building. Mr. Stevens, who had a military aid, sent him to see if they were in possession of the Government building, the British minister came over to see whether they were in possession of the Government building; Mr. Damon and Mr. Boite went down to the station house to confer with the force that was said to be there, and, coming back, they went over to see the Queen.

About 4 o'clock Parker, the minister of foreign affairs, came to the Government building, and said, "You are in possession and we can do nothing." The others had gone to the station house to recommend the surrender. Returning, as I said, they had gone to the palace to enforce their recommendation upon the Queen, two of her ministers and two members or delegates from the Provisional Government, and after some debate, some urging, the Queen yielded. About that time Minister Stevens recognized the Provisional Government.

It is said that in the letter from President Dole to Minister Stevens he states, "We have not yet got possession of the station house." But he also states, "We expect to be in possession in a few minutes." There was undoubtedly a time which elapsed between the agreement of the Queen and her cabinet to surrender the station house and the time of the actual surrender, which seems to have taken place about 7:30 o'clock.

The capitulation had been made; but, Mr. President, in my view of all the facts and circumstances which surround the transactions of this day, taking into consideration everything which had been done, it was utterly immaterial that the Provisional Government had not possession of that municipal building known as the police station house. They had taken, occupied, and possessed the very seat of government of the Hawaiian Islands; they held the capitol building of that Kingdom, the building wherein the Legislature sat, where the supreme court sat, where the offices of the ministers were, wherein all the executive functions of the Government were conducted. The Queen's government had possibly intended at one time to defend it, for when the supporters of the Provisional Government went through the building they found it vacant, it is true, as to armed men, but they found munitions of war in the foreign office. The intention, if it ever existed, had been abandoned. The Provisional Government had possession of the very center of power and domination of the Hawaiian Kingdom without resistance, and was actually negotiating with the Queen's ministers, her responsible counselors, without whom she could do no valid act, for the surrender of the last lurking place of her illusory power.

Under such circumstances as these Mr. Stevens recognized the Provisional Government. This was on the 17th, and it was recognized on the next day by the representatives of every foreign government on that island, excepting the representative of China, and he recognized it on the 19th. If there had been any irregularity about this, with this foreign influence perpetually intermeddling in the Hawaiian Islands, is it to be supposed for a moment that the recognition by representatives of the foreign powers would have been so instantaneous?

Mr. President, I have conducted this examination through the memorable four days of this revolution. My discussion of this matter, I am aware, has been inadequate. That record will yield rich mines of information to anyone who will sit down and examine it with an impartial eye. I am aware that there is testimony on both sides of this question. I have spoken solely from the evidence presented by Commissioner Blount. What I criticize is that he has ignored and has not been impressed with preponderating evidence of the gravest character, which tends to the support of his own country and his own countrymen.

The Administration of President Harrison was in judgment, and the conduct of Mr. Stevens was to be passed upon by Mr. Blount. Mr. Stevens expressly was upon trial. Mr. Blount was sent out there to test by investigation the validity and uprightness of Mr. Stevens's action. Mr. Stevens was upon the island. Mr. Blount saw him every day. According to Mr. Blount's report, Mr. Stevens's conduct was highly reprehensible, and he is indorsed in that statement by the President in his annual message. In the name of all that is fair, in the name of all proceedings that would not have scandalized even the star-chamber, why did not Mr. Blount apply to his countryman, Mr. Stevens, then on the island, for an explanation of the circumstances the evidence of which he was so industriously gathering against him?

Suppressio veri, suggestio falsi. Everything can be inferred against such a perverse and determined effort to avoid the sources of evidence.

President Dole bore a prominent part in this transaction. He, *ex officio*, as President of the Provisional Government, is the minister of foreign affairs, and he was also to be judged by Commissioner Blount. Why was not his statement taken? It would have been freely accorded. It was due to him. Mr. Blount being accredited to him, as he was by letters of credence, it was due to him; due to his character and standing, which Mr. Willis certifies are of the highest; due to his official position, that he should be allowed to make an explanation of the matters concerning which he was to be so gravely compromised by the report of Mr. Blount, to be adopted as a verity by the President of the United States in his annual message.

Thus, Mr. President, the curtain fell upon the last scene of this harlequin monarchy. The stage lords and stage ladies vanished into the mass of the population. The queen of the play laid aside her tinsel crown, put off her tawdry regalia, and reentered private life through the stage entrance. The play had had its run. The engagement, which had not been successful, was ended and the theater was to be closed. The whole proceeding throughout had been imitative. The monarchy was a spectacle. It had been tolerated by the civilized world, although frequently the performance had been rudely and forcibly interrupted by the foreign spectators. The domestic audience, heavily taxed for its support, when insulted by the actors, had repeatedly resented the indignity with violence. The practical and real took the place of this pernicious mockery. A firm government, conducted by just and able men, was installed upon the abandoned stage. The whole proceeding had been spectacular. Civilization had endured it. The lord of the demesne had for a brief period conferred his functions upon Christopher Sly. But to this general and correct appreciation of the melodrama there was one exception. As the play was ending the Democratic Administration came in as a spectator, as Don Quixote and Sancho Panza entered the puppet show in Spain. To it, as to the don, the performance was real, and, like real life, it was thought to be continuous. It saw in the mummies and puppets and in the stage queen weakness overpowered and virginity oppressed and disinherited, while Sancho, against the evidence of his senses, saw through the eyes of his master. [Laughter and applause in the galleries.]

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair calls the attention of the occupants of the galleries to the requirement of the rules of the Senate. No marks of applause or disapprobation are permitted. The Senator from Minnesota will proceed.

MR. DAVIS. And Mr. Blount was sent to the Hawaiian Islands on the chivalrous quest inspired by that delusion.

Mr. Blount was appointed on the 11th day of March, 1893. The treaty was withdrawn, I think, upon the 7th day of March, 1893. An inquiry more interesting and important than anything that I have discussed (because this Hawaiian question is fleeting; it will pass away) is whether the appointment of Mr. Blount was a constitutional appointment, in that it never received the advice or consent of the Senate.

A most important case as a precedent is immediately raised. It lays hold of the most distant future, and may affect our relations with other nations than Hawaii. The Constitution of the United States, Article II, section 1, provides as to the powers of the President:

He shall nominate, and by and with the advice and consent of the Senate shall appoint ambassadors, other public ministers and consuls, judges of the Supreme Court, and all other officers of the United States whose appointments are not herein otherwise provided for, and which shall be established by law.

All diplomatic officers and judges of the Supreme Court of the United States are, by express provision, out of abundance of caution, named to be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate.

Was Mr. Blount a diplomatic representative? Was he a diplomatic officer? I turn to his letters of credence, dated at Washington on the 11th day of March, in the year 1893, addressed by Grover Cleveland, President of the United States, to his great and good friend, Sanford B. Dole, the president of the executive and advisory council of the Provisional Government of the Hawaiian Islands:

GREAT AND GOOD FRIEND: I have made choice of James H. Blount, one of our distinguished citizens, as my special commissioner to visit the Hawaiian Islands and make report to me concerning the present status of affairs in that country. He is well informed of our sincere desire to cultivate and maintain to the fullest extent the friendship which has so long subsisted between the two countries—

I ask the attention of the Senate to the following—
and in all matters affecting relations with the Government of the Hawaiian Islands his authority is paramount.

In all matters affecting the relations of the Government of the United States with the Hawaiian Islands his authority is para-

mount. I should be pleased to hear anyone suggest language more forcible or comprehensive to confer supreme authority in all matters of diplomatic relations in any case upon any man. No matter what Mr. Stevens may have done or what he may hereafter in his office say, I, the President of the United States, by my letters of credence to you, Mr. Blount, notify President Dole that Mr. Blount's authority in all matters affecting relations between these two Governments is paramount.

I shall not discuss the instructions to Mr. Blount, because the commission comprehends it all and is broader in some respects than the instructions. What is the use of talking about names and words and trying to draw vain distinctions here when the fact, the thing, is what we are after? Mr. Stevens was instructed, I will say, that he could continue to perform the duties of his office in all matters where Mr. Blount's authority did not conflict.

Mr. President, if this right exists in the President of the United States there is not a court in Europe where his familiar can not sit down with paramount authority by the side of a duly confirmed minister and overrule him. There is not a court in the United States where his familiar can not sit down with paramount authority beside the district attorney and control him. There is not a United States marshal empowered by virtue of his commission to execute the processes of the courts of the United States who can not be accompanied by a familiar of the President of the United States with paramount authority to overrule and control him. The President is the Commander-in-Chief of the Army and Navy of the United States. There is not a colonel of a regiment, a commander of a military division, or the captain of a man-of-war who is not subject to have appear before him the apparition of a familiar of the President of the United States with a letter giving him paramount authority to overrule and control him.

It was not without reason that the framers of the Constitution of the United States provided, in express terms, that consuls and ambassadors, other public ministers, and the judges of the Supreme Court, shall be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate. They considered most prophetically what they were doing. By the terms of the Constitution they were framing (the wisest instrument of government ever prepared by the wit of man, and laying hold of more future contingencies than any such instrument ever did), they made the President the sole point of contact and means of communication between the Government of the United States and foreign powers. Congress in either body, or together, can hold no communication with any foreign power. No governor of a State nor any State authority can do it. No individual can do it. Everything must be done through the President of the United States, who makes the treaties and appoints the ministers.

It was felt that this extraordinary power, necessarily confided to the direction of a single understanding and a single will, was susceptible of the greatest abuse; for, although the President can not declare war, he can, through his foreign policy, conducted by diplomatic officers, embroil this nation in such difficulties as to bring a foreign war upon us, and compel Congress to declare a defensive war. So vast was this power that they deemed it important expressly to say in the Constitution that the names of these officers thus appointed should be submitted to the Senate, that the Senate might know what men were being sent abroad to conduct these difficult and delicate relations. They are first named as the most important, for they precede the judges of the Supreme Court.

On the other hand, as to the judges of the Supreme Court, the framers of the Constitution considered how republics and other constitutional governments have been sapped and mined by a pliant judiciary; how, while an irregular and improper exercise of the powers of appointment of foreign ministers might affect disastrously our exterior relations, similar improprieties and carelessness of appointment in judges might result in seriously compromising everything that was internal in our system of government. Accordingly with the same care with which they provided that ambassadors, other public ministers, and consuls should be named by the President to the Senate, to receive its advice and consent, they made the same provision in regard to the judges of the Supreme Court.

Section 1674 of the Revised Statutes provides that—

Diplomatic officers shall be deemed to include ambassadors, envoys extraordinary, ministers plenipotentiary, ministers resident, commissioners, charge d'affaires, agents, and secretaries of legation, and none other.

How does Mr. Blount's commission read?

THE PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MANDERSON in the chair). The Senator from Minnesota will please suspend his remarks. The hour of 2 o'clock having arrived, it is the duty of the Chair to lay before the Senate the unfinished business. It will be read by title.

THE SECRETARY. A bill (H. R. 2331) to repeal all statutes re-

lating to supervisors of elections and special deputy marshals, and for other purposes.

Mr. HOAR. I ask unanimous consent that the Senator from Minnesota may proceed and finish his remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Massachusetts asks that the unfinished business be temporarily laid aside and that the Senator from Minnesota be permitted to conclude his remarks. Is there objection?

Mr. GRAY. I rose merely to call the attention of the Senate to my understanding in regard to the bill. I understood there was unanimous consent that it should go over until 2 o'clock Monday and then be the unfinished business.

Mr. SHERMAN. That was the order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Minnesota will proceed, there being no objection.

Mr. DAVIS. The word "commissioner" in the statute which I have just read, enumerating who shall be diplomatic officers, distinctly comprehends Mr. Blount, for the letters of credence read:

I have made choice of James H. Blount * * * as my special commissioner.

He was a special commissioner, whose authority in all matters pertaining to the relations between the governments should be paramount. If special commissioner is not covered by the express language of the Constitution in its words of enumeration it is covered by the other more general clause, namely, the inferior officers to be designated by law.

To show Mr. Blount's understanding of his powers, my friend the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. HOAR] calls my attention to his mode of signature, page 139, Executive Document No. 47, in a communication to Mr. Gresham.

Mr. GRAY. What is the page?

Mr. DAVIS. Page 139. It is always the same way, I think, "James H. Blount, Special Commissioner of the United States." This is his formal report. What was there lacking in what Mr. Blount did or in what he was empowered to do to constitute him an ambassador or public minister? He falls within the purview of the constitutional enumeration. He falls expressly within the enumeration of the statute which I have just read. In my view, in the sense of the Constitution, an officer is one who has authority to act in the name of and on behalf of the United States and by whose actions the Government may be bound. Such was Mr. Blount.

Now, Mr. President, it is said that there are precedents for this. I deny it. I say that there is no precedent in our diplomatic history that protects this flagrant violation of the Constitution of the United States. He was empowered, as my friend, the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. PLATT], suggests, in his instructions given to him by Mr. Gresham, to invoke the naval and military force of the United States by virtue of his paramount official character:

In the judgment of the President, your authority, as well as that of the commander of the naval forces in Hawaiian waters, should be and is limited in the use of physical force to such measures as are necessary to protect the persons and property of our citizens; and while abstaining from any manner of interference with the domestic concerns of the islands, you should indicate your willingness to intervene with your friendly offices in the interest of a peaceful settlement of troubles within the limits of sound discretion.

He was empowered to call into force and active operation the military force, and was also empowered to use his friendly offices for a settlement. If there is anything wanting to endow him fully with complete diplomatic character, it does not at this moment occur to me.

Mr. PLATT. What greater power has any ambassador?

Mr. DAVIS. My friend, the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. PLATT], asks me what greater power any ambassador has. None. In fact, Mr. President, it is the only instance in our history that I recollect where any President has ever undertaken to appoint an ambassador. The distinction between an ambassador and a minister as laid down in the authoritative works upon international law is that the ambassador represents the person of his sovereign, whereas the minister does not. In imperial language in these letters of credence, the President of the United States notifies President Dole that he has appointed Mr. Blount "as my special commissioner."

Mr. HOAR. I should like to call the attention of my honorable friend to the fact that the recent statute authorizing the President to appoint ambassadors expressly provides that the functions shall not be enlarged beyond the existing functions.

Mr. DAVIS. Yes; of a minister or envoy. I denied a few moments ago that there was any precedent in our history which protects this transaction, even by remote analogy. I do not believe it can be found. I do not believe it ever will be again attempted to create another one. If found, it is valueless and should be disregarded. I am aware that during the debates in the Senate upon the fisheries treaty in 1888 a list of some 438 appointments

alleged to be of like character was brought forward, and that has been a fetish to conjure with ever since; and yet under the examination to which it was submitted in the remarks of the senior Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. CHANDLER] upon that treaty it lost its charm and should no longer have any efficacy. When sifted out there were but seven in all that list (minor matters, passing unquestioned at the time, and doubtless attributable to inattention) that could with even plausibility be maintained to be precedents. And even those were not, in my judgment, cases to which the constitutional provision under consideration is applicable. I shall ask leave, for the purpose of saving time and presenting that question better than I can do, to print a short extract from the remarks of the senior Senator from New Hampshire, made in the discussion of that treaty, wherein he discussed that particular subject:

No one has ever disputed the privilege of the President to negotiate treaties, using the Secretary of State and the regularly appointed and confirmed foreign ministers for that purpose. Why, then, do the minority particularize and parade about 438 cases of that character? Simply to obscure the flagrant nature of the case now under review and censure, and to break the force of the one great and overwhelming precedent against it, to be shortly stated. In addition to these 438 cases the report gives a list of three persons appointed by the Secretary of State and a list of thirty-two appointed by the President, and specially confirmed by the Senate to negotiate treaties. But of the three appointed by the Secretary of State, two, Hughes and Bates, were already diplomatic officers, and the thirty-two are of course all precedents against the minority and not in their favor.

There is to be extracted from the list of 473 only the following cases which are of any value to the minority, being those where private citizens were employed in negotiations without the prior consent of the Senate:

1. G. Morris, private agent, October 13, 1789, to ascertain the intentions of Great Britain as to the treaty of 1783, and make a treaty of commerce.
2. John James Appleton, May 12, 1825, to arrange for the settlement of claims of citizens of the United States against the Kingdom of Naples.
3. Charles Rhind, September 12, 1829, to conclude a treaty of friendship and commerce with Turkey.
4. Edmund Roberts, January 26, 1832, to conclude treaties of navigation and commerce with Cochin China, Siam, and Muscat.
5. A. Dudley Mann, March 28, 1846, to conclude with Hanover, Hungary, Switzerland, etc., treaties of commerce and navigation.
6. Benjamin E. Greene, June 13, 1849, to conclude treaties of commerce with Hayti and the Dominican Republic.
7. Isaac E. Morse, December 5, 1856, to conclude a treaty with New Granada with reference to transit across the Isthmus of Panama.

What a pitiful list among the whole 473 which are set out with such elaboration in the minority report! It is sufficient to say in relation to these 7, in the face of the overwhelming precedents the other way—the 466 cases where treaties have been negotiated by officials who had been confirmed by the Senate as required by the Constitution—that they are few in number, that the negotiations were insignificant, that the precedents were never acquiesced in, and that they constitute no real authority for or justification of the marked violation of the Constitution committed by the President in appointing Messrs. Angell and Putnam without the consent of the Senate.

I have stated that the object of the minority in cumbering their report with upward of 438 cases which have no bearing upon the point in controversy is simply to break the force of the one great and overwhelming precedent against them. It is impossible to resist this conclusion or a worse opinion upon the recorded facts.

On page 130 the minority give the case of the Joint High Commission which negotiated the Alabama Claims treaty, and they show Messrs. Ebenezer R. Hoar and George H. Williams as appointed while private citizens two of the five plenipotentiaries by the President alone; and the minority include the five in their number (on page 105) of 438 persons appointed by the President alone.

The minority, therefore, certainly thus appear to have found a pertinent precedent, especially as the High Joint Commission held its sessions, like the Bayard-Chamberlain Commission, and with similar festivities, in the city of Washington. The only objection that can be made against this precedent is that the facts are directly the opposite of those stated in the minority report. Commissioners Hoar and Williams, as well as Secretary Fish, Minister Schenck, and Mr. Justice Nelson, were nominated to the Senate and were confirmed on the 10th day of February, 1871, before they acted.

I have indicated, and others who have preceded me in this debate have indicated with an ability that I can not hope to equal, the serious consequences which are involved in this extraordinary assumption of power. The President has endeavored to break through the walls which divide our Government into departments. He has invaded the privileges of the Senate in this particular respect, and we are advised that we ought to sit silent under this attack; that we should let it pass by without criticism or protest. So far as we are concerned, perhaps, personally we might do so, but as guardians of the constitutional rights of the people we can not.

It is not the first time in history, Mr. President, that an attack upon the privileges of a Senate has been made by an Executive magistrate, nor is it the first time in history that resentment or discussion by the Senate has been deprecated. At a time in the history of the Roman Empire, when the Emperor was *Princeps Senatus*, connected somewhat with that body as the President of the United States is with this, a resolute man, a man determined to overthrow the privileges of the Senate, withdrew himself into seclusion for that purpose to the island of Capri, and as the last Administration is accused, as Mr. Stevens is accused, as the American men in that island are accused, as the privileges of the Senate of the United States are ignored, so he by a message accused and brought into question the privileges of the Senate. Discussion was to be stifled. Nothing was to be said. The few remaining arches which sustained the senatorial privileges were to be broken down with-

out question. When some one is represented by the satirist to have asked concerning the man attacked or the privilege to be overthrown, he thus said, and was answered to:

*Sed quo cecidit sub crimine; quisnam
Delator? quibus iudiciis; quo teste probavit?
Nil horum; verbosa et grandis epistola venit
A Capreis. Bene habet; nul plus interrogo.*

My friend from Massachusetts [Mr. HOAR] requests me to translate that. He does not need it, of course. But another Senator [Mr. WASHBURN] suggests that some of the rest of us do. I will not attempt to give a literal translation, but I will give an accurate paraphrase which will show its application: "Into what crime has he fallen? By what informer has he been accused? What judge has passed upon him? What witness has testified against him? Not one or any of these. A verbose and turgid message has come over from Capri. That settles it. I will interrogate no further." [Laughter.]

Mr. Blount was appointed on the 11th day of March, 1893, and he arrived at Honolulu on the 29th of April, 1893. He called on President Dole and presented the letters of credence to that "great and good brother" on the 30th day of April, 1893.

I communicated to him the friendly disposition of our Government toward him and toward the Hawaiian people. I assured him of its purpose to avoid any interference with the domestic concerns of the islands unless it became necessary to protect the persons and property of American citizens. I then offered my letters of credence.

Now, in the light of what he did immediately thereafter and what has been done since, the proprieties of language fail to properly characterize that delusive message, for he immediately proceeded, in violation of a statute of his country, which no President can dispense with, and of the precepts of international law to put himself into communication (as he wrongfully charges Stevens with doing) with an element, to wit, the royal element, which is in every way hostile to the government to which he had just presented his letters of credence, and in which he assured it of the entire friendship of the President of the United States. I refer to Section 1751 of the Revised Statutes:

No diplomatic or consular officer shall correspond in regard to the public affairs of any foreign government, with any private person, newspaper, or other periodical, or otherwise than with the proper officers of the United States.

Over and over again Mr. Blount violated that provision.

Mr. HAWLEY. He was sent to do nothing else.

Mr. DAVIS. The instructions which he had received were not the message which he communicated to President Dole. Those were concealed.

On the 30th day of March it had got out in Hawaii that Mr. Blount was there. The hopes of royalty in some way or other were excited, and a mass meeting of the Hawaiian League was held. It passed resolutions for the restoration of the monarchy and the restoration of Queen Liliuokalani, reciting that President Cleveland had sent Mr. Blount out as special commissioner. This was the next day after he arrived in the island. On the next day, March 31, he received a messenger wishing to know when it would be convenient for him to receive a committee from the mass meeting, which desired to present these resolutions. If this was not corresponding with, putting himself into communication with private persons, subjects of another power, within the prohibition of the statute which I have read, will some one tell me what would be? He avows that this raised a question whether such action would consist with a "recognition of existing authority and the policy of noninterference." (Page 6.) But he does not avow any intention of consulting President Dole on this point, nor did he consult him.

But something had to be done to smooth away the road for the audience which he proposed to give in his court to the committee of the mass meeting which was about to invoke him to aid in restoring the fallen monarchy. The American flag was floating over the government building at Hawaii at that time. It was invited to float over there by Mr. Dole's government, which we had recognized. There was no question of forcible intervention or intrusion there at all. It was properly there by the invitation of the government of President Dole, which was the only government that had any right to complain.

To make the way smooth and easy to receive this petition for the restoration of the royal power, with the inevitable effect of its raising hopes which were in direct contradiction to the assurances he had given to President Dole two days before, or one day before, on the 31st day of March, 1893, he called on Mr. Dole and notified him that he, Mr. Blount, should cause the ensign of the United States to be lowered and the troops ordered on board their ships; and he ordered Admiral Skerrett to execute such order on the 1st day of April at 11 o'clock. The flag was rightfully there. The annexation of the islands was thought to be imminent. The flag was a coming event which cast its shadow before. It was there by invitation of the Provisional Government itself. It was there under the stress of urgent and imminent danger, as appeared both to President Dole and Mr. Stevens when such request was made.

Mr. FRYE. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Minnesota yield?

Mr. FRYE. I desire to put in here the remarkable order which Mr. Blount gave an admiral of the United States Navy.

Mr. DAVIS. Will my friend please read it? I will adopt it as a part of my remarks.

Mr. FRYE. It is as follows:

HONOLULU, March 31, 1893.

SIR: You are directed to haul down the United States ensign from the Government building, and to embark the troops now on shore to the ships to which they belong.

This will be executed at 11 o'clock on the 1st day of April.

I am, sir, your obedient servant,

JAMES H. BLOUNT,

Special Commissioner of the United States.

Rear-Admiral J. S. SKERRETT,
Commanding Pacific Squadron.

The history of this country may be hunted over and no other instance can be found where a civil officer or a citizen of one of our States ordered an admiral of the American Navy to haul down the flag of our Government.

Mr. DAVIS. But it is said that Mr. Blount was not an officer!

Mr. DOLPH. Will the Senator allow me to add that the instructions of the Secretary of the Navy to Admiral Skerrett directed him to obey the orders of Mr. Blount and placed the naval forces in those islands under the command of Mr. Blount?

Mr. DAVIS. And yet Mr. Blount was not a diplomatic officer, and did not need to have the consent of the Senate to his nomination!

Mr. FRYE. But, if the Senator will allow me, no diplomatic officer, no ambassador, no minister plenipotentiary, no officer whatever outside of the President of the United States and the Secretary of the Navy and the regular officers of the Navy, ever made any such order, nor was ever clothed with power to make any such order; and this, I am happy to say, is the only instance ever to be found.

Mr. HOAR. Or that ever will be found.

Mr. DAVIS. I have no doubt of the exact historical truth of that statement and of the verity of that prediction.

Mr. President, this is the first time in nearly thirty years that the American flag has been lowered by an American hand under circumstances which have brought a feeling of dishonor and shame to an American heart. It is the last time in many years, I predict, that that act will be done. Although the stars thus disappeared from the Hawaiian sky, that ensign will in due time, though lowered in dishonor, eventually be raised in power.

After these orders were delivered to Admiral Skerrett, and when everything was made easy for aspiring royalism by the announcement that it was to be done (for it went out that the American flag was to be lowered and the military recalled on board the ship) Mr. Blount, in the afternoon of that day, March 31, notified the committee of the league that he would receive them at 4 o'clock, April 1, five hours after the American flag was to be lowered. What was the effect of that? All that Stevens is charged with doing by way of inciting rebellion and revolution or tumult is not the title of a thousandth part of that which can be inferred from the action of Mr. Blount.

When Mr. Blount came to that island everything was serene and peaceful. Everybody had acquiesced, the Queen included, in the situation. He had not been there two days before by an act a thousand times more significant than anything even Stevens is charged with, he incited all of the trouble, the rebellious feeling, the insurrectionary disposition, which for a time seemed to have been laid at rest; and then under those circumstances he notified the committee of the league (which, I think, he says somewhere in his report comprised 8,000 native Hawaiians), that the flag being out of the way, the troops off the island, I here, a special commissioner, am ready to receive you; and he says in regard to lowering the flag:

This was done in order that, when the committee called, the ensign would have been hauled down and the troops ordered aboard of their vessels, and I could state freely to the committee that it was not my purpose to interfere in their domestic concerns; that the United States troops would not be used to maintain or restore any form of government, but simply to protect the persons and property of American citizens.

* But the flag that he struck was there at the request of the Provisional Government, which our Government had recognized and to which he had been accredited. He met this committee, nineteen members. They presented to him the resolutions, desiring that they be transmitted to the President of the United States.

Mr. MORGAN. Will the Senator from Minnesota allow me to ask him a question? If he has it before him, I wish he would point out the request made by the Provisional Government for the putting up of the flag.

Mr. DAVIS. It is in one of the documents submitted by the President to the Senate within a few days. It is in a dispatch from Mr. Stevens to Mr. Gresham, wherein he goes on at length reciting the apprehended intrigue of the British commissioner,

the presence of an additional Japanese man-of-war, a translation of declarations of the Japanese captain, the wish and desire of President Dole that the marines should be landed—in short, giving a full and explicit reason for their presence there. Now, I can not give the page, and it is asking too much in the manner in which I am speaking to request it.

Mr. MORGAN. I beg leave to say that the act of raising the flag was in conjunction with the act declaring the protectorate of the United States Government over Hawaii. I was not quite certain whether the raising of the flag and the declaration or assertion of a protectorate were contemporaneous acts.

Mr. DAVIS. I hear the Senator imperfectly. The history of that protectorate was this, to go back to the beginning. In the first place, Mr. Stevens established a protectorate there, general in its character, while the treaty should be under consideration.

Mr. MORGAN. Now, was that point of time—

Mr. DAVIS. I do not propose to be cross-examined.

Mr. MORGAN. No; I am asking—

Mr. DAVIS. That is just the amount of the interruption.

Mr. MORGAN. I am asking for information and seeking for information strictly.

Mr. DAVIS. The idea of the Senator from Alabama asking me for information!

Mr. MORGAN. Of course.

Mr. DAVIS. He is the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations, and his memory and capacity to assimilate and store away all subjects are marvelous to contemplate.

Mr. MORGAN. I am asking for information, and in perfect good faith. I want to know whether the flag was raised at the time the protectorate was established?

Mr. DAVIS. Which protectorate does the Senator refer to?

Mr. MORGAN. The one that Stevens asserted over the island.

Mr. DAVIS. I can not say as to that matter of detail.

Mr. MORGAN. That is the point about which I am uncertain. I wish, however, to remind the Senator of the fact that Mr. Foster distinctly disavowed the protectorate over the island in his dispatch to Mr. Stevens, and I do not know what the flag could be doing there without the protectorate, or what the protectorate could be doing there without the flag.

Mr. DAVIS. So much for the interview which Mr. Blount had with the members of the league within two days after he landed on the island, praying for the restoration of the monarchy and the deposition of the Government to which he was accredited. Shortly afterward he received a long petition from the Hawaiian political league, another affair it seems, numerous signed, which states:

Therefore, we submit to you our humble petition and statements, as you are in possession of vast powers in your mission to do justice to the Hawaiian people, our independence, the throne, and the Hawaiian flag; we beg you to restore our beloved Queen Liliuokalani to the throne with the independence of the Hawaiian people, as you have restored the Hawaiian flag.

That no United States minister should correspond with any private citizen is the plainest dictate of international law if it were not against the plain provision of our statute. About the 26th of April (in this case he notified Commissioner Dole of his intention) he called upon Queen Liliuokalani and took her statement, negotiated with her upon the subject, took her version of the transaction and her claims. But, as I have said, he made no attempt to take the version of Mr. Stevens or Mr. Dole. On the 31st of May he did another extraordinary act. Accredited to the Provisional Government as the lord paramount in all matters concerning the political relations between the two countries, he placed himself in correspondence with the Queen in her royal character, and with her cabinet in their official capacity; received petitions in that character and in that capacity from the Queen as Queen, from Samuel Parker, as minister of foreign affairs; W. H. Cornwell, as minister of finance; John F. Colburn, as minister of the interior, and A. P. Peterson, as attorney-general. It thus concludes:

In view of the facts stated above, which can not be controverted, and in view of the fact that your investigations concerning the matter are shortly likely to terminate, we, Liliuokalani and her cabinet, who formed the Government of the Hawaiian Islands on the 17th of January last having surrendered that Government to the superior force of the United States of America, now most respectfully ask that you use your good offices in undoing the acts of a representative of your great country and place the Government of the Hawaiian Islands as Mr. Stevens found them. Believing that the principle of justice which has ever dominated American action will prevail in this instance, we remain,

Yours, respectfully

LILIUOKALANI, R.
SAMUEL PARKER,
Minister of Foreign Affairs.
WM. H. CORNWELL,
Minister of Finance.
JOHN F. COLBURN,
Minister of Interior.
A. P. PETERSON,
Attorney-General.

Accredited to President Dole, with letters which bore assurances of good faith, and, if I construe the language correctly, an implied wish for the stability and perpetuity of the Government over which Mr. Dole presided, Commissioner Blount entered into diplomatic relations with a deposed Queen, she signing her name in royal form and in her royal capacity and her former ministers countersigning in their official character, received a petition from her and them in her royal capacity and their official capacity, requesting him to use his good offices to overthrow the Government to which he had been accredited, a government of Americans, of Englishmen, of our own blood, presided over by a man of American birth or derivation, and to turn those vast interests, these our kith and kin, over to the barbarous and revengeful administration of a government which had been successfully rebelled against and overthrown. A more glaring diplomatic malversation never was committed; and that it is plainly in violation of the statute which I have read in the hearing of the Senate can not, I think, be controverted for a moment.

And upon this testimony, this history, these transactions, the President of the United States in his annual message states that Mr. Blount's report shows his conclusions to be true beyond all question. He states that the constitutional government of Hawaii had been subverted through the active aid of the representative of our Government, and through the intimidation caused by the presence of an armed naval force of the United States, which was landed for the purpose at the instance of our minister. His conclusion is:

Upon the facts developed it seemed to me the only honorable course for our Government to pursue was to undo the wrong that had been done by those representing us and to restore as far as practicable the status existing at the time of our forcible intervention. With a view of accomplishing this result within the constitutional limits of executive power, and recognizing all our obligations and responsibilities growing out of any changed conditions brought about by our unjustifiable interference, our present minister at Honolulu has received appropriate instructions to that end. Thus far no information of the accomplishment of any definite results has been received from him.

Now, Mr. President, I desire to ascertain and to discuss for a moment from what source the President of the United States derived his authority to arbitrate this great question. Who made him and by what processes did he become the judge of the case between an overthrown monarchy and a republic which took its place? Much has been said about the terms of Queen Liliuokalani's abdication, but when did any falling monarch ever fail to file a caveat with contemporaries and posterity to that effect? It is addressed to no person. It was never formally accepted by anybody, and no convention has ever been made between the Hawaiian Government which Mr. Cleveland, following the example of President Harrison, has recognized or the former government of the Queen and ourselves that such an arbitration should take place.

But there is a consideration back of all this, and back of anything I have said upon this subject, which to me is decisive. What the Queen of the Hawaiian Kingdom meant and understood to be meant in the letter of abdication, was that the question of recognition was to be submitted to the United States; and I assert it as a sound legal proposition, in view and in the light of all the circumstances of this transaction, that the very question which the President of the United States has reopened here was settled when President Harrison recognized the Provisional Government. The act of recognition is all-comprehending so far as bringing a nation into existence. It is a deliberate judgment by the recognizing nation that the recognized government has a valid right to be, has come into being rightfully, and has the right to continue. It is in its very nature an irrevocable act. Who ever heard of any civilized country retracting any recognition which it had given to a foreign country? Like an executed grant, it is incapable of revocation because the right has vested and can not be taken away.

Queen Liliuokalani's protest was received at the State Department on the 3d day of February, 1893, and the treaty, I think, was not concluded until the 13th day of that month. Her representatives were here at the time. The case was heard and determined, and wisely determined by President Harrison, and it does not lie in the capacity of any succeeding Administration to open it for readjudication. And the Queen passively acquiesced in that construction of her act of abdication, and in the conclusive effect of President Harrison's recognition of the Provisional Government, until she was enticed to renew her claims by the action of the present Administration.

Mr. President, it has seemed to become a propensity to restore royalty, ignorant, savage, alien royalty, over American people. But in these days of restoring monarchies, suppose the President of the United States should conceive that President Harrison has been imposed upon, misled, by the recognition of President Peixoto, who succeeded to the fallen Empire of Dom Pedro in Brazil. The recognition in that case was prompt. Suppose the President should determine to reopen the question and to send a minister

there to stand before President Peixoto and say, "I have become satisfied that my predecessor was misled, that your Government was not established with the consent of the Brazilian people, and therefore you are required to relinquish your power to the lineal descendant and heir of Dom Pedro, whoever he may be."

If this power exists in the President of the United States, it exists in the successive Presidents to undo the act of a President who has recognized another government. The same thing might be done to President Carnot; it might have been done to President Thiers, who was the first President of the now existing French Republic. Suppose the President of the United States should take it into his head that the French Republic was wrongfully established and not with the consent of the French people, and a paramount emissary, emissary at once and ambassador, should be sent to France accredited to "his great and good friend," President Carnot, with authority over our Army and Navy, and that France were in distress, and that as an emissary he should consort with Bourbons, with Orleanists, with Bonapartists, with anarchists, with every political element of which French political complexion is composed. Suppose that then, having so consorted as an emissary, without giving those to whom he was accredited a chance to be heard, he should stand forth as an ambassador before the French President and say "the President of the United States is convinced that the French Republic was not established with the consent of the French people; a great wrong has been done. Therefore, you are required to relinquish the republican power which you now hold to the emperor of the Bonaparte family, or the king of the French, whoever he may be, of the other royal houses in the line of lineal descent."

Mr. President, many questions and illustrations of this kind press upon the mind while one is speaking, but the limitations of time do not warrant more extended remarks. They suggest themselves.

It is said we do not want colonies and that we do not need the Hawaiian Islands. I am not in favor of a colonial system such as Great Britain has, and such as France is striving for, but I want to see my country well defended, and her hold upon the enormous commerce of the future in the Pacific Ocean assured. That the Sandwich Islands were in time to be an indispensable element of the prosperity, protection, and defense of our country has been a cardinal theory with every statesman who ever sat in the chair of Secretary of State from the beginning of the question down to the present time, the present occupant excepted.

Humboldt predicted seventy years ago that the greatest maritime commerce of the planet would be carried on on the Pacific. If you take the globe and look north of the equator and then to the south of it you will see that the islands of the Pacific Ocean, except the Sandwich Islands and the Alaskan group, are south of the equator. Germany, France, and England have partitioned that archipelago south of the equator. They have hitherto kept their hands off the Hawaiian Islands. Those are the only islands of any importance north of the equator until we almost touch the coast of Asia, except the Alaskan group. They stand where commerce from the Nicaragua Canal, if it shall ever be constructed, must touch. They stand where ships from Callao and Valparaiso must touch. They stand where every ship that goes from San Francisco or Victoria to New Zealand or Australia must touch. They are 2,100 miles from the city of San Francisco. They are 2,100 miles from the midway island of the Alaskan group, an island with capacious harbors fit for a naval station. The Russian Government, our ancient and immemorial friend, is building a railway across the continent of Asia destined for a port near by; and her relations and ours have always been such that, under those circumstances, from the Hawaiian Islands, from the Alaskan islands, from San Francisco, we can make our commerce safe and dominate that waste of waters. That is the kind of acquisition and the kind of protection I want for my country, its future and its commerce.

Mr. President, this is a great question—great in its facts, great in its constitutional aspect. The American people will be the judges in this controversy. They are adjudicating it now. In the midst of distress, of financial disorder which the panacea of legislative action has not cured; with the mine sterile, the shuttle motionless, the wheel still, the factory sending up neither pillar of cloud by day nor pillar of fire by night; with hunger and cold in thousands of homes; with the fear of a relentless party policy respecting financial and economic legislation which threatens to intensify all this distress into a deeper agony, the American people have paused to consider this subject, and they will settle it in the sublime tribunal of the nation's judgment. [Applause.]

Mr. TURPIE. I ask that the resolution heretofore submitted by me in relation to the policy respecting Hawaii be laid before the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CHANDLER in the chair). The resolution will be read.

The Secretary read the resolution submitted by Mr. TURPIE on the 8th instant, as follows:

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. Mr. President, the Sandwich Islands, the site of the Hawaiian people, were discovered by Capt. Cook in 1778. They are thirteen in number, four of considerable size; the rest are smaller, some of them are mere dots on the surface of the deep. They lie near together in the form of a curve or crescent, in a genial climate within the tropics, about halfway between the two continents whose opposite shores bound the North Pacific.

At the time of their discovery the inhabitants of each were under the separate government of independent native chiefs, having a tribal polity somewhat akin to that of the North American Indians. This political condition obtained until 1790, when Kamehameha the First, who seems to have been the Caesar of this distant island group, reduced the inhabitants of all the islands to his rule. He achieved the sovereignty of the whole, united them under one government, took and maintained the title of king, and was the founder of the Hawaiian monarchy. He died in 1824 and was succeeded by his son Kamehameha the Second, and the crown afterward descended in the regular line of inheritance until 1891, when the late queen, a lineal descendant of the first conqueror, became the sovereign by the death of her brother, King Kalakaua.

During the period from 1840 to 1845 the Hawaiian Kingdom was recognized by the United States, France, England, and other foreign powers as an independent nation; its capital became the residence of a diplomatic corps more or less numerous, and has ever since continued to be such. Much progress was made by this people under the monarchy.

The natives abandoned idolatry, adopted the Christian religion and worship, discarded the costume and customs of their former life, engaged in commerce and agriculture, gradually acquired many of the traits and usages of European civilization. At the same time the islands received a large accession of population by migration from Asia, from Europe, and especially from the United States.

The Hawaiian monarchy, absolute at first, was much modified by these internal changes. It became in later years constitutional in form, with a legislative body of two chambers, one of which is chosen by the votes of the people, a cabinet, and organized departments, with a seat of government located at Honolulu, where the first King had fixed his residence.

The personnel of the monarchy had meanwhile somewhat declined. The descendants of the race of Kamehameha did not retain its old prowess, prudence, or vigor. Dissatisfaction with the administration of public affairs was rife in 1892, especially among the foreign element of the population, which had become numerous, wealthy, and influential, and at last culminated in open revolt against the royal authority.

On the 17th of January last the Hawaiian Republic was proclaimed, the Provisional Government was organized, took possession of the public buildings, archives, and other property without resistance, and has held undisturbed possession ever since. The revolution was as bloodless and peaceable as that which deposed the Emperor Dom Pedro in Brazil, or that which brought about the fall of Louis Philippe in France and the republic of Lamartine.

Nevertheless, as it was in the instances mentioned, so in this it is a fact accomplished. This Provisional Government thus established was recognized by the American minister resident a very short time after it had been proclaimed, and the same action has been taken by the representatives of other foreign governments who maintain legations at Honolulu.

The recognition of a government *de facto* has always been accounted an act of the gravest moment.

It is an act of one power, supreme and sovereign, respecting the existence of another of a like character. It can not be revised except upon the supposition of a power paramount, which is contrary to the postulate of sovereignty itself.

It follows, then, that although recognition may be deferred, although it may be withheld for further advisement or it may be altogether denied, yet once granted it is a finality; like the word spoken, like the arrow sped, like the shot fired, it is beyond recall. Recognition may cease after it has been given, but it ceases only when another government arises and displaces the one which had before been acknowledged.

The force of the act of recognition is not at all affected by the form of the new government, or by the means which may have been used to establish it. Who has forgotten what Victor Hugo called "The crime of December," the *coup d'état* of Louis Napoleon in 1851, by which the republic was destroyed and the empire built upon its ruin? Yet the United States recognized the empire so constructed, and for almost twenty years continued to deal with it as the Government of France.

By the events of last January President Dole became the head of the Provisional Government. He is the recognized chief magistrate of the Hawaiian people. He is one among the rulers of the earth. He ranks in degree with the President of this Union, with the daughter of a hundred kings who sits enthroned at Windsor.

It is true the territorial extent of the new republic is not great, but its arable area is as large as that of Switzerland—the most ancient of existing commonwealths.

It very much exceeds that of Attica, the most famous republic of antiquity. Honolulu with its adjacent territory is much larger than any of the free cities with their appendant lands, which toward the close of the feudal era gave to the Teutonic race its first lessons in civil, political, and commercial liberty.

These free cities were within their own limits independent—cosmopolitan also in their population. Strangers and foreigners were welcomed to the various guilds, were admitted to the civic franchises, enrolled in the military force, lived and labored in all respects as natives. Honolulu is just such a capital, composed of many nationalities, containing an element well versed in all the arts and interests of civilization.

The adjacent lands are inhabited by a native race—docile, tractable, very amenable to law, not averse to labor, tilling a fertile soil, worthy and capable of yet greater progress. Why may not this metropolis with its adjacent lands continue to be, and rejoice in being, the free city of the Pacific; the site of a republic truly ocean-bound?

The independence of the Hawaiian nation was guaranteed by France and England as early as the treaty of 1843 in these terms:

Her Majesty the Queen of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland and His Majesty the King of the French, taking into consideration the existence in the Sandwich Islands of a government capable of providing for the regularity of its relations with foreign nations, have thought it right to engage reciprocally to consider the Sandwich Islands as an independent state, and never to take possession, either directly or under the title of a protectorate or under any other form, of any part of the territory of which they are composed.

The signatory powers have always observed and the United States has carefully respected it, though not a party to it, declaring at the same time that it constantly preferred Hawaiian independence. Thus Mr. Webster, Secretary of State, says in 1842, the year before the conclusion of the treaty which I have quoted:

The United States, therefore, is more interested in the fate of the islands and of their Government than any other nation can be; and this consideration induces the President to be quite willing to declare, as the sense of the Government of the United States, that the Government of the Sandwich Islands ought to be respected; that no power ought either to take possession of the islands as a conquest or for the purpose of colonization, and that no power ought to seek for any undue control over the existing Government, or any exclusive privileges or preferences with it in matters of commerce.

And Mr. Bayard took the same ground in 1885, in his note to the British Government, explaining the concession of Pearl Harbor, "that this contained in its terms nothing to impair the political sovereignty of Hawaii."

Mr. Blaine made the following statement in 1891 on behalf of the Government of the United States:

It firmly believes that the position of the Hawaiian Islands, as the key to the dominion of the American Pacific, demands their benevolent neutrality, to which end it will earnestly cooperate with the native Government.

These relations, mutual and general, between the United States, other countries, and Hawaii have been of long standing, recognized by all nations, and are in full force to-day, and they are as applicable to the new republic as to the old monarchy. Hawaiian sovereignty may have been somewhat protected by international jealousy, but it is protected yet more by international indifference. Foreign governments have shown no desire at any time to acquire the sovereignty of the islands or the corresponding duties and responsibilities which would accompany such dominion.

A very formal and elaborate protectorate on paper was established during the reign of the first Kamehameha by personal negotiation it is said between that King and George III, the King of the Hawaiian monarchy being then in London. The British Government never approved of it and never took any possession or exercised any rights under it whatever, disclaiming what they stated would be the difficulties which would meet a

European power stationed there as sovereign, or even in the capacity of a protectorate.

For many months—I speak now in respect of the protection afforded by international indifference—a treaty of annexation has been pending here before this body and in this Capitol. No word of objection or dissent by any foreign power has been made thereto, and no foreign power has done so much as to ask a word of explanation. When we bought Pearl Harbor, in the Sandwich Islands, the British Government addressed a note to the Secretary of State, then Mr. Bayard, asking an explanation of the transaction; but here is a treaty pending for months, having in view the absolute annexation of the whole group to this Union, and not a foreign government has said a word or addressed a note to any officer of this Government with respect to such acquisition.

Indeed it is very clear from this unanimous attitude of silence that the civilized powers interested would, if we were content with its propriety or justice, be gratified if we should assume the sovereignty of the Sandwich Islands. They would then have, what they have not always had—a tribunal permanent and responsible, to whom might be submitted the very difficult and delicate commercial and maritime differences which often arise at the ports of these islands.

Let us believe that the same stability and permanency may be realized from the rise of the new government. The autonomy of the Hawaiian country is not only secured by treaty, guaranteed by general acquiescence, but is at this time supported by the good will and friendly offices of the whole society of nations.

There is nothing in the way of Hawaiian national advancement, there is nothing of obstruction to their peaceful and prosperous progress, except those difficulties which ordinarily make the problems of statesmanship which time and patience may solve, which a wise and just ruler may compose or overcome. No protectorate can add anything to the prestige of the new government. Annexation would erase and destroy it.

The annexation of one nationality to another necessarily destroys the nationality of that annexed—it is merged into another, it henceforth disappears from among the list of nations.

Those great writers, the international statesmen of the world who have from age to age recorded and compiled the practice and usages of nations, and have so formed that code called the law of the nations, have always represented the extinction of a nation as a misfortune, a great catastrophe, to be regretted and deplored.

Public opinion among all peoples has justified this sentiment. The extinction of Poland, though long ago accomplished, is still keenly felt. The prolonged subjugation and disappearance of Greece was for many centuries the subject of regret and sorrow, and how gladly the governments and peoples of the whole civilized world have welcomed the restoration of Grecian nationality to which we were all so much indebted, and the return of this ancient people to their former place in the circle of the family of nations. This family is not large: it only embraces now within the cycle of ordinary international intercourse about forty in number. One of the number, even the least, is missed from this illustrious society.

Hence what is called annexation, according to the usages of governments, civilized and enlightened, has been at all times accompanied not only by treaty, but by some precedent action of popular national assent and approval on the part of those to be affected by it.

Of course, one nation may lawfully acquire territory from another without such assent or action, as by purchase or by absolute right of conquest, as we ourselves acquired it from France and Mexico. But these acquisitions did not touch in any way the national life or existence of the nations from which they were made. They only changed the condition and allegiance of the portion of the countries ceded.

The peaceable or voluntary merging of one nation into another is a thing of rare occurrence. In modern Europe perhaps the instance most nearly approaching our idea of annexation was the addition of Savoy and Nice to France in 1860. At the close of the war jointly conducted by the Emperor Napoleon and the King of Sardinia against the Austrian possession and dominion in Italy, the joint victors in that contest, at perfect amity with each other and having the absolute right of conquerors, desired to readjust national boundaries and to change in some degree the map of Southern Europe; in the language of the time, "to rectify the frontier." It was therefore proposed that Savoy and Nice, provinces theretofore of the Italian Kingdom, should be ceded to France, but this was made conditional expressly upon the prior assent of the people concerned.

A plebiscite was ordered, and on the 15th day of April, 1860, an election was held in each of these provinces, the question being submitted for or against annexation to France. A very full

vote was polled, and a very large majority of the electors voted in each of the two for annexation, which was accordingly consummated, and these countries have ever since been and to-day are a part of the French domain.

The very celebrated instance in our own annals has a similar history, and is perhaps the only example of the annexation, pure and simple, of one nation by another in modern times. Texas was an independent republic. Its people by their vote—their ballots, expressed in due form through the legislative and executive departments of their government—tendered with entire unanimity the offer of annexation to the United States. I have been told that there were not fifty persons living within the vast dominion of the Republic of Texas who were opposed to annexation either during the pendency of the treaty or at the time that the fact was consummated.

The people of this country voted on the same question in its favor, determining one Presidential election upon that issue; so that the annexation of Texas received, as may be said, a double ratification and assent.

Thus, in accordance with these historic precedents, the first step, the imperative condition precedent to the consideration of the proposition of annexation, is the expressed desire and previous assent of the people of Hawaii.

Whatever may be the powers of the Provisional Government—and I grant that they are full and plenary, as those of the oldest and best established forms of polity—it can not be assumed that any government *per se*, without legislative and popular action, is authorized to conclude a treaty for its own destruction, and for the extinction of the nationality which it represents. There should be concurrent with such treaty offer an explicit prior expression of the popular will before it can rightfully become even the subject of negotiation.

The fact that this island country is weak, that they are a feeble folk, neither rich nor numerous, is only an additional reason why the Government of this nation should exhibit toward it the deference and delicacy of treatment demanded by the highest principles of justice and fair dealing.

The question is not whether Hawaii is weak or strong, whether it be powerful or otherwise; but whether its people have so lost their attachment to their own nationality as to be ready and willing to abandon their national life and being and to merge the same into ours. Let this be first determined by a free ballot of that population under their own laws. They instituted the ballot many years ago and they are accustomed to its use.

There is a native population in the islands of about 40,000. They are not illiterate; they are not ignorant. A very large majority can read and write both languages, English and Hawaiian, and they take a very lively and intelligent interest in the affairs of their own country. This is an element which on the proposition of annexation is to be consulted prior to any other; it must accompany any treaty; and any treaty which had been made without consulting this element was properly withdrawn and ought never to have been entertained.

There is another reason of the gravest character why consideration at this time of the proposal of annexation is inopportune and premature. It is believed by many, it has been extensively bruited and widely credited, that the late minister of this country at Honolulu, Mr. Stevens, was a participant in the Hawaiian revolution, aided and abetted its promoters in the formation of the new government and in the subsequent proffer of annexation.

It is quite clear that this opinion is entertained, and that it has been expressed in the most public and official manner by the present Chief Magistrate of the United States and by the Secretary of State, specially in charge of our foreign affairs and relations. Proper respect for the opinion of those in administration of the executive department of this Government must give us pause in this transaction, when it is charged that the public representative of the United States in a foreign country became the accomplice of those engaged in the design of overthrowing the government to which he had been commissioned. Such an offense is a high crime and misdemeanor against the law of nations, against the confidences and intercourse of the civilized world.

No nation, whatever may be its greatness and authority, can create an ambassador or minister. Two must concur therein. One government may send a person duly appointed and commissioned, but the government to which he is sent must receive him before he becomes such.

The act of receiving is as free and independent as the act of sending. If the government to which he is sent declines to receive him, this is no breach of amity nor cause of quarrel. The act of refusal may be with or without reasons given.

The act of reception alone fully attests and recognizes his diplomatic character. This dual condition of his creation implies obligations upon his part of a similar character. His most

important and active duties are due to the country which he represents, yet he has duties more passive and negative in their kind, though of as binding obligation, to the government whereto he is sent. He owes to the government to which he is accredited, to its laws, customs, and course of administration, respectful acquiescence, deference, and assent. It is because of his presumed sense of obligation to these requirements that he is received.

Upon this subject the Nestor and father of international law holds the following language—and all writers upon that topic concur:

The inviolability of a public minister, or the protection to which he has a more sacred and particular claim than any other person, whether native or foreigner, is not the only privilege he enjoys. The universal practice of nations allows him moreover an entire independence of the jurisdiction and authority of the state in which he resides. * * * This independency of a foreign minister is not to be converted into licentiousness.

It does not excuse him from conforming to the customs and laws of the country in all his external actions; so far as they are unconnected with the object of his mission and character he is independent, but he has not a right to do whatever he pleases. * * * He must not avail himself of his independency for the purpose of violating these laws and customs. He should rather punctually conform to them although the magistrate has no compulsory power over him, and he is especially bound to a religious observance of the rules of justice. As to what concerns the prince to whom he is sent the ambassador should remember that his ministry is a ministry of peace and that it is only on that footing that he is received.

This reason forbids his engaging in any evil machinations. Let him serve his own master without injuring the prince who receives him. It is a base treachery to take advantage of the inviolability of the ambassadorial character for the purpose of plotting in security the ruin of those who respect that character; of clandestinely injuring them, or of embroiling or ruining their affairs. What would be infamous and abominable in a private guest, shall that be allowable and becoming in the representative of a sovereign?—*Vattel*, chapter 6, title Am.

It will be observed, Mr. President, how felicitously the analogy is drawn between the position of a visitor at a private house and a public representative residing in a foreign country. They stand on the same footing, as they should; for, sir, when you approach a man's house, it may be the humblest home, and knock at the door, and are bidden to come in and enter in that manner, there is a tacit obligation, known of all men, that in coming you bring and in departing you leave your peace upon that house and upon all them that dwell therein. Persons acting differently are not counted as true men. "As spies, to see the nakedness of the land are ye come."

The minister should be a careful observer of, but not at all an actor in, the public affairs of the country where he is temporarily residing. Especially does this rule of conduct obtain in times of political commotion, in periods of revolution, either threatened or actual. He must observe thorough impartiality between hostile parties in the country of his residence. He can not rightfully take sides, much less can he take arms or use the same for or against either party. These are elementary principles of the law regulating diplomatic intercourse.

Now, it is clear from the tenor of the very curious account which Mr. Stevens has given of his official conduct in Hawaii during the recent revolution there, to be found on pages 177 to 181 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of date 14th of December last, that he fully understood this law laid down by Vattel and was well acquainted with these principles.

The relation which he gives of the events of the Hawaiian revolution is manifestly not that of an enemy. He speaks in the highest terms of eulogy of the conduct of its promoters, and glows in the account of its result as having given them the best government which these islands have ever enjoyed; yet he earnestly disclaims having taken any part in this action of others which he so much commends. He is convinced, he is well persuaded, that certain persons in a foreign country may do some things, with greatest credit to themselves, which an American minister could not do and could not lawfully be concerned in.

The minister claims to have acted only as the neutral representative of a foreign friendly power. Do the facts in the case place and keep him in this position?

The first document, as far as known, ever issued by the founders of the Hawaiian revolutionary government was a letter directed to the American minister by name, signed by the members of the committee of safety, and dated January 16, 1893, before the first public step had been taken in their proceedings. I will ask my friend from Georgia to read it for me.

Mr. GORDON read as follows:

HAWAIIAN ISLANDS, HONOLULU, January 16, 1893.

SIR: We, the undersigned, citizens and residents of Honolulu, respectfully represent that, in view of recent public events in this Kingdom, culminating in the revolutionary acts of Queen Liliuokalani on Saturday last, the public safety is menaced and lives and property are in peril, and we appeal to you and the United States forces at your command for assistance.

The Queen, with the aid of armed force and accompanied by threats of violence and bloodshed from those with whom she was acting, attempted to proclaim a new constitution; and while prevented for the time from accomplishing her object, declared publicly that she would only defer her action.

This conduct and action was upon an occasion and under circumstances which have created general alarm and terror.

We are unable to protect ourselves without aid, and therefore pray for the protection of the United States forces.

HENRY E. COOPER,
F. W. MCCHESENEY,
W. C. WILDER,
C. BOLTE,
A. BROWN,
WILLIAM O. SMITH,
HENRY WATERHOUSE,
THEO. F. LANSING,
ED. SUHR,
L. A. THURSTON,
JOHN EMMELUTH,
WM. R. CASTLE,
J. A. McCANDLESS,
Citizens' Committee of Safety.

His Excellency JOHN L. STEVENS,
American Minister Resident.

Mr. TURPIE. I am very much obliged to the Senator from Georgia.

Was ever a revolution before begun with such a patent, open, notorious acknowledgment of its want of power to sustain itself? "We appeal to you, to the United States forces, for assistance. We are unable to protect ourselves. We therefore pray for the protection of the United States forces."

Why was such a message sent at all, and why was it sent to the American minister? A committee of public safety inaugurated the government of the national defense in Paris after Sedan and the fall of Napoleon, but they sent no such message to Minister Washburne.

Those who attacked the Government of Balmaceda in Chile were surrounded by armed enemies, by life and property endangered, wholly without police or legal forces. Did they send such a message as this to Minister Egan? Did Admiral Mello begin his attack upon the Government of the Republic in Brazil with such a letter to the American or any other foreign minister?

The very philosophy of revolutions is that the promoters thereof do not lack, but do have and hold, the power to protect themselves and their adherents, to discharge all the ordinary functions of government for the security of life and property, and to place the administration of affairs upon new lines of right and justice better than those of the old régime.

There is only one explanation possible of this very singular missive. The men who sent it knew beforehand that it would be received, and that their request for assistance, the assistance of the United States forces, would be granted. Minister Stevens says he received and read this letter, and that he made no response.

But in this he is mistaken. He ordered the United States marines from the man-of-war Boston, then in the harbor, to land. They landed fully armed and equipped for active service, and with a train of two pieces of artillery they were marched under the direction of the minister to Arion Hall, a strategic point near the Hawaiian capitol, the same Government building which this committee entered and took possession of the next day, and from the front steps of which they read the proclamation establishing the Provisional Government.

I have called Arion Hall a strategic point. I do so upon the authority of a very brave and skillful officer of the Navy, having long experience in the service and especially in those seas. I will take the liberty of asking my friend from Georgia to read the letter of Admiral Skerrett.

Mr. GORDON read as follows:

UNITED STATES STEAMSHIP BOSTON,
FLAGSHIP OF THE PACIFIC STATION,
Honolulu, Hawaiian Islands, May 20, 1893.

SIR: I have examined, with a view of inspection, the premises first occupied by the force landed from the United States steamer Boston, and known as Arion Hall, situated on the west side of the Government building. The position of this location is in the rear of a large brick building known as Music Hall. The street it faces is comparatively a narrow one, the building itself facing the Government building. In my opinion, it was unadvisable to locate the troops there, if they were landed for the protection of the United States citizens, being distantly removed from the business portion of the town, and generally far away from the United States legation and consulate-general, as well as being distant from the houses and residences of United States citizens. It will be seen from the accompanying sketch that had the Provisional Government troops been attacked from the east, such attack would have placed them in the line of fire.

Had Music Hall been seized by the Queen's troops, they would have been under their fire, had such been their desire. It is for these reasons that I consider the position occupied as illy selected. Naturally, if they were landed with a view to support the Provisional Government troops, then occupying the Government building, it was a wise choice, as they could enfilade any troops attacking them from the palace grounds in front. There is nothing further for me to state with reference to this matter, and as has been called by you to my attention—all of which is submitted for your consideration.

Very respectfully,

J. S. SKERRETT,
Rear-Admiral, United States Navy,
Commanding United States Naval Force, Pacific Station.

Col. J. H. BLOUNT,
United States Minister Plenipotentiary
and Envoy Extraordinary, Honolulu, Hawaiian Islands.

Mr. TURPIE. Minister Stevens, in that dispatch to which I

have alluded, which is placed in the record, gives a very long picturesque detail as to why Arion Hall was selected as the place for posting the troops on the evening of the disembarkation. He would have us believe that it was an accident. Mr. President, it was accident very curious: it was an accident of extreme ductility, much prolonged. This accident lasted quite a while. It continued to occur for two days and two nights, until the Provisional Government had been proclaimed, recognized, and established. Not until after that did the accident happen to cease.

These troops were landed fully armed and equipped. The committee had asked of the minister the assistance of the United States forces. This was the response. Action is stronger than ink. Mr. Stevens says he ordered the troops to land for the purpose of protecting life and property. Whose life and whose property? The life and property of those of the committee of public safety, who had engaged in the design of overthrowing the Government to which he had been accredited?

Mr. Stevens says there was for two days no government in Honolulu. If this were true it did not destroy the sovereignty of the Hawaiian people; it did not abrogate the treaty relations between Hawaii and the United States. The government is neither the people nor the nation of a country. It is only the representative of such people and of such nation. Supposing there had been no government in Honolulu for two days, did that authorize the American minister to make one, or to be concerned in its formation?

Then Mr. Stevens goes on with very lengthy magniloquence to have us infer that these two days of interregnum was a very extraordinary and unexampled thing. It is the most common, the most ordinary occurrence. Whenever revolutionary conditions obtain, it is usually much longer than two days. Within the memory of living men it has been many days in Paris, the capital of one of the chief nations in the world. I allude now to the time of the flight of Louis Philippe and his deposition, and to the fall of Napoleon after his captivity, after he was taken by the enemy.

Two days is a very short interregnum. There is always this period of political oscillation between the parties, one of whom is striving to enter and the other is striving to resist ouster from the seat of authority. It is a well-known signal of revolutionary crises. But what principle is there in international law, or what precedent is there in the action of any ambassador from any civilized country at any time for taking such a period for interference with the domestic affairs of the government where he resides? On the contrary, the law is plainly laid down that at such a period his attitude should be one of absolute, impartial indifference.

Why, sir, this interregnum is a period when that official class who hold the offices under all governments and all forms of government with elastic allegiance—even this class is at a loss. They do not find the men to report to, they do not know to whom to direct their correspondence, and the official files are lumbered with unconsidered matter until a master appears at the head of the new government, the government *de facto*. This interregnum is that period made sacred by the right of revolution, defined in the great Declaration, the right of the people at any time to alter or abolish their form of government, and to adopt another better calculated, as they may deem, to secure their safety and happiness.

Such was the right of the people of Hawaii during that very period. It was a right not to be questioned, not to be denied, not to be defeated, not to be interfered with by any American, and, above all, not to be interfered with by an American minister or ambassador.

Mr. Stevens says he disembarked these forces "to preserve the peace and public order." Is the United States charged with the duty of keeping the peace and preserving public order in all the countries to which we send diplomatic representatives by preventing civil war therein, by a display of overwhelming military force in aid of the combatants on one side or the other of such contest?

There is no rule of the law of nations which justifies or requires such an intervention by any foreign minister, or which recognizes the existence of such an international police. This interpretation of the law would involve this Government in a perpetual military crusade around the planet.

Much as I admire and confide in the skill and valor of our military and naval forces, I doubt if they would be equal to such an enormous service. Great as are the pecuniary resources of our country, they would soon be exhausted by the expenditures of such an extended campaign. The protection afforded by our ministers under such circumstances in a foreign country relates only to the life and property of American citizens—neutral, non-combatant—who may claim or be entitled thereto, or to the public property of the United States at the consulate or legation.

The maintenance of peace and order relates to the same persons, places, premises, and subject-matter. Mr. Stevens made a landing and disposition of the troops at a long distance from, and with no reference to, such persons or premises, or to any such object as their protection. Mr. Stevens said nothing about the protection of life and property of our citizens at Honolulu at the time of the disembarkation of the troops. I am not speaking now of official orders. Official orders under such circumstances are always and everywhere in the same language, in the same words. I am not speaking about that. They have forms for this. I am speaking of his conference with the members of the revolutionary committee. He said nothing at the time of that conference about the protection of the life and property of American citizens; he said nothing at that time about the Japanese invasion, the English invasion, or the urban perils by night or day in the city, to which he devotes so much space in a subsequent account of these events.

It is evident that all these are merely afterpieces of wretched pretense and of feigned profession, used as a mask to hide the grosser and more indelicate features of his official malfeasance. The troops were landed and posted with their arms and artillery within easy supporting distance of the armed followers of the revolutionary committee because the minister of the United States had previously engaged and undertaken to render this assistance.

I quote now the testimony of a witness, F. W. Wundenburg, from the report of the special commissioner of the President, which Mr. Stevens had evidently read when he sent his dispatch to the Senate. He controverts, or undertakes to controvert, a great deal in the report of the special commissioner; but he does not controvert one word of the statement which I shall read.

Mr. F. W. Wundenburg, a citizen of Honolulu, was an earnest enemy of the monarchy, a steadfast supporter of the revolution from the beginning. After the establishment of the Provisional Government of Hawaii he was tendered the lucrative position of collector-general of customs. During the early days of the republic he held for it a post of great responsibility.

This is his statement concerning the action of Mr. Stevens. I will ask my friend from Tennessee to read the part in print.

Mr. BATE read as follows:

The committee met at Mr. Waterhouse's residence, according to adjournment, at 7:30 o'clock p. m. of the same day, January 16. The formation of some sort of government was under discussion, and it was decided that a commander-in-chief of the forces supporting the proposed new government should be appointed. The position was offered to Mr. John H. Soper, who demurred, as he did not see any backing whatever to support the movement. Mr. Soper was answered by members of the committee that the American minister would support the move with the troops of the Boston.

Mr. Soper still doubted, so a couple of the committee escorted him over to the legation, which, by the way, was in the adjoining premises, and the three came back after a time, reporting that Mr. Stevens had given them the full assurance that any proclamation of the government put forward at the government building, or any other building in Honolulu for that matter, would receive his immediate recognition and the support of the Boston's men. This assurance seemed to satisfy Mr. Soper, and he accepted the position.

On Tuesday afternoon, January 17, the committee of thirteen, or committee of safety, proceeded from the office of W. O. Smith, up Merchant street, to the Government building, and read the proclamation of a new government at 2:40 o'clock, there being practically no audience whatever. As the reading proceeded a dozen or so loungers gathered, and near the close of the ceremony about thirty supporters, variously armed, came running into the side and back entrances of the yard and gathered about the committee.

At this moment the United States troops, in the temporary quarters in the rear of the Music Hall (less than 100 yards from where the committee stood), appeared to be under arms, and were evidently prepared for any emergency.

Mr. FRYE. Can the Senator give the page where that statement will be found in the report?

Mr. TURPIE. I will cite the page. It is Executive Document No. 10, page 21. I will cite the page, and it will be found in the record, of every extract I read.

Any one, especially a public officer, who engages to support a movement before it is made or accomplished must necessarily have known the time and place and persons concerned in it, and the general object and purpose of the movement.

The assurance was given by Mr. Stevens that he would support the proclamation of the Government. It was given to the commander of the revolutionary forces. This proclamation of the Government is the instant turning moment of the rebellion, since called a revolution; it is the decisive crisis of action; it is the time when the old régime is crumbling and the new one is coming forth; it is the time when every motive of public propriety and every principle of international justice required and demanded of Mr. Stevens and of every other foreign representative in Honolulu that they should not interfere one way or the other: yet Mr. Stevens selects this very moment, the proclamation of the Government before it was proclaimed, before it was established—selects that time, saying that he will recognize it and that he will support it with troops from the ship Boston.

It would have been a very incautious thing, a very undiplomatic thing, a very perilous thing, for Mr. Stevens to have made such a statement even to an attaché of his own legation, or to an officer in the service of the United States; but for an American minister, on the one hand, to make this statement to a revolutionary officer on the other, is more than incautious, more than careless, more than reckless. It was an act criminative, with no example, fortunately having no model hitherto in the history of the United States. We shall have to go back to the middle of the fifteenth century, amongst the worst men of the worst times, to find where a public ambassador in a foreign country has made such an absolute betrayal of his trust.

It appears from the testimony of Mr. Damon, vice-president of the Provisional Government, that the officer named, Col. Soper, appeared in command of the military forces of the committee next day, and that they acted under his supervision—those are the words of the witness—that he massed them, armed, in front of the steps of the capitol, where the Provisional Government was being proclaimed. (Ex. Doc. 10, page 31.)

The American minister was thus in communication with the revolutionary commander, Col. Soper, as with the commander of the United States marines, and he thus assumed joint direction of the two forces.

The Hawaiian monarchy in the one hundred and third year of its existence ceased to be, among other causes, for the reason that the American minister resident had engaged to support and did support the revolt against it with the military forces of the United States.

The inquiry as to whether the new government would have succeeded without this aid is beside the question. This interference without any authority did occur. The best disclaimer, the most absolute disavowal of it, is the rejection of the proposal for any further or closer connection with Hawaii. Let the new government, however formed, proceed in its career. Intervention against it would be at this time as unlawful as intervention in its favor was when it occurred.

It may be well to examine the statement of Mr. Stevens himself upon the point of his action in the premises.

In a great crime there is an awful power of illumination. It lights up the conscience of the offender with a glare, showing the full proportions of the offense.

Here was one in a great public office, in what Vattel calls a ministry of peace. He had without a word of warrant or of warning made and levied war upon the soil of a friendly power. He had sought to embroil the people of two nations long bound together in closest amity. He was loath, very loath, to make confession of a wrong so grievous. Yet the truth will break bounds and silence; it will not be disowned.

In his account of what occurred at the time of his proclamation of a protectorate in the name of the United States, which he asserts was done "at the request of the Provisional Government of Hawaii," he says, in speaking of the flag, "It remained up seventy-five days. During that time all had been accomplished which had been promised and expected when it was raised." (Record, December 14, page 178.)

Now, here is an instance where the heart and soul of verity is unconsciously expressed—discloses itself in the tense or time of the verb used. It is not said "All had been accomplished which was promised and expected," but "which had been promised and expected." This form of words necessarily refers to promises which had already been made before the time referred to. And who had been the promiser in this compact? Clearly he who could perform—the United States minister. And who was the promisee? The revolutionary committee and its adherents. Mr. Stevens takes this method of declaring that he had kept faith with the revolution, that no promises were broken; that none of their expectations were disappointed. What, then, had been these promises and expectations? The answer is: "All that had been accomplished." What, then, had been accomplished?

United States troops had been landed, armed, and with artillery in support of the anticipated movement on the day before the revolt. This is one of the things which had been promised and expected. The Provisional Government had been recognized by the American minister within an hour after its proclamation. This also had been promised and expected. Within two days after recognition the commissioners appointed by the Provisional Government had sailed by steamer en route for Washington, bearing with them a treaty providing for the annexation of Hawaii to the United States. A protectorate had been proclaimed, wholly without authority, to hold possession until the annexation could be consummated.

Minister Stevens says it is a very dull diplomatist who is not aware of the importance of retaining actual possession; and Mr. President, it is a very dull, unlettered, illiterate pillager who is not well informed upon the same point.

The military force, posted first near the Hawaiian capitol, remained on shore under arms during the whole period of these transactions. All these things had been accomplished, and according to the terms of Mr. Stevens's own statement they "had been promised and expected."

Mr. Stevens says he was distant two thousand miles from the United States; that there was no ocean telegraph for communication with his Government, and that he had no instructions. He had Vattel, he had the Constitution of the United States; they were lying open before him in the legation library at Honolulu.

The Constitution of his own country, which he was bound at least to respect, provided that Congress should have the power to declare war; that the President should by and with advice of the Senate make and conclude treaties. Yet this minister, without any action of Congress, or of the Senate, or of the President, made and levied war by an armed invasion of Hawaiian soil—an armed occupancy of the same for three months, made and concluded a treaty of protection, and proclaimed a protectorate, and maintained the same until it was disavowed by the home Government of his own Administration.

The military invasion and occupancy of the territory of Hawaii, the self-assumed protectorate, these insolent and lawless acts of violence, mark the man. They do very plainly show the man, but they disguise the minister in strange attire. They exploit the mission, but they expose the means of annexation—a gruesome plot, wherein illicit craft, a worse than puny faith, infidelity to the most sacred trust in the most exalted station, fill the whole drama with the pollution of their guilty presence.

In his relation of these events placed in the record of Congress before referred to, Mr. Stevens, alluding to the late sovereign of the Hawaiian Kingdom, uses, ten times, the expression, "The fallen Queen;" and again he says, "The justly dethroned Queen," and anon he mentions her as "The late immoral occupant of the throne," and yet again he speaks of "The Queen and her paramour."

Are these the choice phrases of official correspondence, or is this the polished language of diplomacy? It may be said indeed, in answer, that at the time he used these expressions he had returned from his mission and had ceased to be a diplomatist. But did this place him beyond the pale of manly civility and those amenities becoming one who had been in such a high and gracious station?

Was it necessary for any purposes of state, was it needed for the maintenance of the Hawaiian Republic or for the success of the Provisional Government, that he should recur with coarse and callous iteration to the misfortunes of the dethroned Queen, or that he should assail the listening ears of Christendom with his story of the frailty of a fallen woman? For years he had been the representative of the United States near the court of the Hawaiian Kingdom.

How well we may recollect—how well he may recall—that day when he was escorted to the palace, ushered with all courteous ceremonial into the throne room and made his bow of presentation, receiving and returning congratulations upon the renewal of diplomatic intercourse between the two countries so long bound together by closest ties of friendship. That day he saw for the first time her who was for many months to be his hostess, dispensing the social courtesies and attentions due to his high position as a privileged and favored guest.

Was no voice borne inward to him from afar, no whisper of remonstrance touching these cruel reproaches against the perchance erring daughter, descendant of a once mighty race, saying, "Oh, not from you—not from you should come this vilest of accusations against woman!"

We need not resort to inference for a just estimation of the minister who indites dispatches of this tenor and fashion. The official character is self-depicted, self-described. Who would attempt to touch, to mar, or to amend this full-length, faultless, perfect portrait of the international spy, ingrate, and outlaw, drawn in all the dark profusion of its native hues.

Ages ago, Mr. President, the great Grecian moralist had written the story of the inhospitable visitor. How a husbandman, one bitter cold winter day, found in his field a serpent stark and frozen. Kindly he took it up in his hands, carried it to his home, laid it upon the hearth before the blazing fire. The wife and children gathered piteously around the stranger. They watched it slowly revive in the genial warmth. They saw it move and turn and fold and twine till, fully coiled, it sprang with poisoned fangs upon the throat of the husbandman, who fell down dead and swollen. Stunned with the sudden horror of the scene, the survivors looked eagerly about them to descry the author of this fatal mischief. The reptile guest had crept away.

Wherefore, upon candid judgment of the facts set forth in the

papers submitted to us on this subject, it will be concluded that at this time we can not favorably consider either the treaty or the project of annexation.

That decent respect for the opinions of mankind which we have cherished from the beginning of our history forbids it, warns us to stand afar off from this temptation. The United States can not afford to incur the suspicion of profiting by a public wrong so abhorrent to the principles of national justice.

Granting that the acquisition of the Hawaiian Islands may be ever so desirable, it must be attained in a different manner. It does not become the character or dignity of the great Republic that we should wrest from a comparatively weak and defenseless people their place and name among the nations of the earth by stealth, by means of diplomatic finesse, or by any process of furtive legerdemain or gilded larceny sprung from the bandit maxim, misnamed the policy of success.

No success can attend such a scheme of spoliation. When we desire to enlarge our national domain by the acquisition of territory in the Hawaiian Islands or elsewhere, it must come to us in the open hand, with the palm clean, pure, untainted, or if it do not come and is taken, it will be taken by the strong arm, with sword drawn in the eye of day, as lawful prize of war against a public enemy. Then shall the flag, our flag of the Republic, float as oft before, in pride and glory over many a stricken field, won in battle for the just—for the just, the free, and the brave.

REPEAL OF ELECTION LAWS.

Mr. CHANDLER. I present the views of the minority of the Committee on Privileges and Elections on the bill (H. R. 2331) to repeal all statutes relating to supervisors of elections and special deputy marshals, and for other purposes, and ask that they may be printed. An order of the Senate was made that the views of the minority should be printed in connection with the majority report. I find, however, that the majority report has already been printed, and to avoid delay I request that the views of the minority be printed separately as Views of the Minority, Part 2 of Report No. 13.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. DOLPH in the chair). The Senate has already ordered that the views of the minority shall be printed with the majority report, but the majority report having been printed, the Senator from New Hampshire now asks that the Senate order that the views of the minority be printed separately as part 2 of the report. Is there objection to the request? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

KANSAS AND ARKANSAS VALLEY RAILWAY.

Mr. JONES of Arkansas. I am directed by the Committee on Indian Affairs, to whom was referred the bill (S. 1266) to extend and amend an act entitled "An act to authorize the Kansas and Arkansas Valley Railway to construct and operate additional lines of railway through the Indian Territory, and for other purposes," approved February 24, A. D. 1891, to report it without amendment. I ask unanimous consent that the bill may be now considered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Arkansas?

Mr. HARRIS. Let the bill be read at length for information. The bill was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the provisions of an act entitled "An act to authorize the Kansas and Arkansas Valley Railway to construct and operate additional lines of railway through the Indian Territory, and for other purposes," approved February 24, 1891, be, and the same are hereby, extended for a period of three years from February 24, 1894, so that said Kansas and Arkansas Valley Railway shall have until February 24, 1897, to build the first 100 miles of its said additional lines of railway in said Territory.

There being no objection, the bill was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

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

INVESTIGATION OF HAWAIIAN AFFAIRS.

Mr. WHITE of Louisiana, from the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate, to whom was referred the resolution submitted by Mr. MORGAN on the 10th instant, reported it without amendment, and it was considered by unanimous consent and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Senate be, and he hereby is, authorized and directed to pay the necessary expenses of the investigation by the Committee on Foreign Relations, including mileage and lawful fees for attendance of witnesses, and the employment of a stenographer, in pursuance of Senate resolution of December 20, 1893, out of the contingent fund of the Senate.

EXECUTIVE SESSION.

Mr. GORMAN. 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 thirty-five minutes spent in executive session the doors were reopened, and (at 4 o'clock and 55 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until tomorrow, Friday, January 12, 1894, at 12 o'clock meridian.

CONFIRMATIONS.

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate January 9, 1894.

DISTRICT COMMISSIONER.

John W. Ross, of the District of Columbia, to be a Commissioner of the District of Columbia.

POSTMASTERS.

Henry J. Connell, to be postmaster at Belding, in the county of Ionia and State of Michigan.

John Johnson, jr., to be postmaster at Bedford, in the county of Lawrence and State of Indiana.

Flavius A. Hart, to be postmaster at Oberlin, in the county of Lorain and State of Ohio.

Frisby B. Logan, to be postmaster at Yuma, in the county of Yuma and Territory of Arizona.

Arthur F. Watson, to be postmaster at Cheboygan, in the county of Cheboygan and State of Michigan.

Eugene E. Douville, to be postmaster at Manistee, in the county of Manistee and State of Michigan.

Adam R. Ebert, to be postmaster at Hammond, in the county of Lake and State of Indiana.

Ossian H. Cook, to be postmaster at Pendleton, in the county of Madison and State of Indiana.

Thomas J. Davis, to be postmaster at Springdale, in the county of Washington and State of Arkansas.

William D. Covington, to be postmaster at Lehigh, in the county of Choctaw, Ind. T.

Edgar A. Smith, to be postmaster at Converse, in the county of Miami and State of Indiana.

David A. Fawcett, to be postmaster at Lagrange, in the county of Lagrange and State of Indiana.

Charles A. Downer, to be postmaster at Northville, in the county of Wayne and State of Michigan.

George M. Deady, to be postmaster at Bad Axe, in the county of Huron and State of Michigan.

Jacob Baar, to be postmaster at Grand Haven, in the county of Ottawa and State of Michigan.

Arthur J. Flynn, to be postmaster at Caledonia, in the county of Houston and State of Minnesota.

George S. Stout, to be postmaster at Lake City, in the county of Missaukee and State of Michigan.

John Fanning, to be postmaster at Albion, in the county of Calhoun and State of Michigan.

James Elliott, to be postmaster at Chatham, in the county of Columbia and State of New York.

Edward W. Renkin, to be postmaster at Hooper, in the county of Dodge and State of Nebraska.

Charles E. Hill, to be postmaster at Malden, in the county of Dunklin and State of Missouri.

Charles E. Critchfield, to be postmaster at Mount Vernon, in the county of Knox and State of Ohio.

Allen T. Cowen, to be postmaster at Batavia, in the county of Clermont and State of Ohio.

William Bleckner, to be postmaster at Oak Harbor, in the county of Ottawa and State of Ohio.

Charles A. Wyckoff, to be postmaster at Celina, in the county of Mercer and State of Ohio.

Proctor E. Seas, to be postmaster at Orrville, in the county of Wayne and State of Ohio.

James E. Montgomery, to be postmaster at Van Wert, in the county of Van Wert and State of Ohio.

John M. Carroll, to be postmaster at Hubbard, in the county of Hill and State of Texas.

Albertis E. Parmenter, to be postmaster at Scotland, in the county of Bonhomme and State of South Dakota.

Edward M. Young, to be postmaster at Gambier, in the county of Knox and State of Ohio.

Henry G. Ellsworth, to be postmaster at Barron, in the county of Barron and State of Wisconsin.

Dollie F. Thompson, to be postmaster at Pittsburg, in the county of Camp and State of Texas.

William H. Dickson, to be postmaster at Clarksville, in the county of Red River and State of Texas.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

THURSDAY, January 11, 1894.

The House met at 11 o'clock a. m. Prayer by the Chaplain, Rev. E. B. BAGBY.

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

SCHOOLS IN UTAH.

The SPEAKER laid before the House a letter from the Secretary of the Interior transmitting the annual report of the commissioner of schools for Utah; which was referred to the Committee on Education, and ordered to be printed.

WAR CLAIMS.

The SPEAKER also laid before the House a communication from the Court of Claims, transmitting a copy of findings in the cases of the following-named persons against the United States: J. S. Hays, John Higgins, W. G. Saxson, deceased; John Stafford, deceased; which was referred to the Committee on War Claims, and ordered to be printed.

SENATE BILLS REFERRED.

The SPEAKER also laid before the House Senate bills of the following titles; which were read twice and referred as stated: A bill (S. 411) for the relief of Samuel Collins—to the Committee on Claims.

A bill (S. 335) to provide for the disposal of the abandoned Fort Maginnis military reservation in Montana under the homestead and mining laws for national and other purposes—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

SCHOONER HENRY R. TILTON.

The SPEAKER also laid before the House the bill (S. 901) for the relief of the owners of the schooner Henry R. Tilton and of personal effects thereon.

Mr. FIELDER. I ask unanimous consent that this bill be allowed to lie on the Speaker's table temporarily, a bill of similar purport having been favorably considered by a committee of this House.

The SPEAKER. In the absence of objection, this bill will lie temporarily on the Speaker's table.

There was no objection.

REPORT OF COAST AND GEODETIC SURVEY.

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

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring). That there be printed of the Report of the Superintendent of the Coast and Geodetic Survey for the fiscal year 1892, 1,500 copies of Part I in quarto form; 200 copies for the use of the Senate, 400 copies for the use of the House of Representatives, and 900 copies for distribution by the Superintendent of the Coast and Geodetic Survey; and 2,800 copies of Part II in octavo form; 200 copies for the use of the Senate, 400 copies for the use of the House of Representatives, and 2,200 copies for distribution by the Superintendent of the Coast and Geodetic Survey.

Mr. RICHARDSON of Tennessee. This resolution is identical with one which has been reported by the House Committee on Printing. It is the usual resolution for the printing of the report of this bureau. I ask that the resolution be now considered by unanimous consent.

There being no objection, the House proceeded to the consideration of the resolution; and it was adopted.

PERSONNEL OF THE NAVY.

The SPEAKER also laid before the House the House resolution (with Senate amendment) relative to the appointment of a committee of the House and Senate to consider the personnel of the Navy.

Mr. MEYER. I ask unanimous consent that this resolution be permitted to lie on the Speaker's table.

Mr. KILGORE. Has the resolution been amended by the Senate?

The SPEAKER. It has been. If there be no objection, it will remain temporarily on the Speaker's table.

There was no objection.

SUBURBAN STREET IMPROVEMENTS, DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA.

Mr. COMPTON. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill (H. R. 5102) making appropriations to provide for the construction of county roads and suburban streets in the District of Columbia.

The bill was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That there be, and hereby is, appropriated out of any funds in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, one-half to be charged against the revenues of the District of Columbia, the sum of \$43,000, to be used by the Commissioners of the District of Columbia in the construction of country roads and suburban streets, as follows:

For grading and regulating Sixteenth street northwest extended, Prospect street, Crescent street, Central street, and Meridian and Ontario avenues, Meridian Hill, \$10,000;

For grading and graveling Twelfth street extended, from University Heights to Austin street, \$8,000.

For grading and graveling Pennsylvania avenue extended and Branch avenue, \$10,000.

For grading and graveling Sherman avenue from Grant avenue northward, \$10,000.

For grading and macadamizing M street extended, between Twelfth street and Trinidad avenue, \$5,000: *Provided*, That the money hereby appropriated shall be expended by contract, or otherwise, as said Commissioners may deem most advantageous to the public interests.

Sec. 2. That the money hereby appropriated shall be immediately available.

The following proposed amendment was read:

In line 11, strike out the words "Meridian and Ontario avenues" and insert "Meridian avenue north of Morris street, and Ontario avenue."

Mr. KILGORE. I would like to make an inquiry in regard to this matter.

The SPEAKER. Without objection the gentleman will proceed, the right to object being reserved.

Mr. KILGORE. Are the improvements provided for in this bill within the limits of the city of Washington or outside of those limits? Most of them, I understand, are outside.

Mr. COMPTON. They are outside the limit of the city proper.

Mr. KILGORE. So I understand. Then, in addition to that, the prime motive which inspires this bill is that disposition to have the Government dispense charity. This appropriation is to be made as a matter of charity, and that people out of employment may be able to find work in carrying out the provisions of the bill. Is not that the inspiration?

Mr. COMPTON. Well, Mr. Speaker, conditionally I will answer yes.

Mr. KILGORE. And the proposition is to limit the day's labor to six hours a day, in order that the appropriation may be spread out among a larger number?

Mr. COMPTON. That is a question for the Commissioners to determine.

Mr. KILGORE. Yes; and they ask that authority and will have it under the bill. Now, I object to the consideration of the resolution, because the House adopted in the last Congress a general policy about the improvements of streets and highways in this District and outside of the city limits which was to operate in the future, and that policy was to charge the expense one-half to the District of Columbia and the other half to the owners of the abutting property. This resolution does not provide for that. It is a reversal of the general policy adopted by the law; and the further objection that it is an appropriation for charitable purposes. No question of charity ought to enter into such legislation.

I object to its consideration.

Mr. GROSVENOR. I rise to a question of order.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. GROSVENOR. Is this proposition before the House for general debate?

The SPEAKER. It is not. The gentleman from Maryland asks unanimous consent to consider the bill.

Mr. HENDERSON of Iowa. Will the gentleman from Maryland allow me a moment?

Mr. COMPTON. I respectfully submit to my friend from Texas that he is absolutely unfair in making a statement here touching this matter on its merits and then refusing to hear a statement in support of it.

Mr. KILGORE. I have stated my objections, but I did not refuse to hear any statement the gentleman desired to make in support of it. I have no objection to that.

Mr. HENDERSON of Iowa. Perhaps the gentleman from Texas will waive the objection he makes, subject to the action of the Speaker on the point of order.

Mr. KILGORE. What point of order?

Mr. HENDERSON of Iowa. If the gentleman will consent that we take the proposition up subject to the point of order to be determined by the Chair.

Mr. KILGORE. What is the point of order?

Mr. HENDERSON of Iowa. As I understand it, that it comes within the provisions of the act providing that the property owners of the District of Columbia, owners of property abutting on the proposed improvement, shall pay half of the expenses.

Mr. KILGORE. But the point of order would not prevent the House from reversing that principle if it saw proper. I merely suggested that that was the condition of affairs, but did not make the point of order.

Mr. COMPTON. The gentleman from Texas has seen fit to present certain reasons to the House why this should not be considered, and I ask leave to have an opportunity to reply to what the gentleman suggested.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Maryland asks unanimous consent to be permitted to say something in response to

the suggestion of the gentleman from Texas upon this proposition. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. COMPTON. In the first place, Mr. Speaker, this is not an act of charity in any sense of the word. It is not a bounty. This bill simply proposes to make available at once an amount for certain purposes, which amount, to be used for said purposes, will be provided for in the regular appropriation bill for the service of the District of Columbia.

Now, the gentleman from Texas talks about charity. Mr. Speaker, he knows, this House knows, everybody knows, that an extraordinary condition of things exists to-day. Business depression exists not only here, but all over the country, and I might say throughout the civilized world. And the gentleman knows, and every other gentleman of this House knows, that it is the part of wisdom, justice, and true statesmanship, by legislation, to relieve that condition as far as possible whenever it is within the power of the legislative branch of the Government to do so.

This is no new proposition. I have on my desk six or eight precedents for just exactly the same appropriations under exactly the same conditions as that we propose to make to-day.

Now, in reply to the gentleman as to the assertion that the policy of the Government has been changed by virtue of the act approved March 2, 1892, I beg to say that if the gentleman will turn to that act he will find that every provision of it looks to future acts of Congress in appropriations for the improvement of outlying streets. I hold in my hand a communication from the President of the Board of Commissioners in this District, which, if the gentleman will allow me to read, will show him that every street or road which we propose by this appropriation to repair has already been laid out long ago under different acts previous to that adopted in 1892.

Mr. KILGORE. What is the date of the laying out of these streets?

Mr. COMPTON. I can answer that by reading from a letter which I have received from President Ross, of the Board of Commissioners.

Sixteenth street NW. extended, from Florida avenue to the north line of Morris street, in 1871. This street was widened in 1892, in pursuance of special authority granted by Congress (volume 26, page 1068).

Prospect street, Crescent street, Central street, Meridian and Ontario avenues, in 1867.

Twelfth street extended, from University Heights to Austin street, in 1887.

Pennsylvania avenue and Branch avenue, in 1891.

Sherman avenue, in 1888.

M street extended, between Twelfth street and Trinidad avenue, 1888.

None of these highways were laid out under the provisions of the act approved March 2, 1893, to provide for a permanent system of highways in the District of Columbia outside of cities.

Very respectfully,

JOHN W. ROSS,

President Board of Commissioners, District of Columbia.

The gentleman will see that this was done from 1871 down to 1891.

Mr. KILGORE. My statement was that it was only in the last Congress that the policy of legislation on this subject was changed.

Mr. COGSWELL. That policy applied to new streets.

Mr. COMPTON. That policy refers to streets hereafter to be laid out.

Mr. KILGORE. Outside of the city limits, as I understand, and there is no more reason why it should apply to the extension of old streets than to the laying out of new ones.

Mr. COMPTON. But the act to which you refer expressly provides that it shall apply to streets hereafter to be laid out.

Mr. KILGORE. Have you the act before you?

Mr. COMPTON. I have not, but I have read it two or three times, and read the estimates very carefully. It has no reference whatever to streets already laid out.

Mr. FUNK. Mr. Speaker, I want to suggest that if this bill passes, I desire to introduce a resolution instructing the chief architect to at once take measures to commence the public building at Bloomington, Ill., for which there was an appropriation made two years ago, in order to give employment to the unemployed workmen there who are now in destitute circumstances.

The SPEAKER. The Chair understands the gentleman from Texas [Mr. KILGORE] to object to the consideration of the bill, so that it is not before the House. The Clerk will call the committees for reports.

The committees were called for reports, but no reports of a public character were presented.

LEAVE TO SIT DURING THE SESSION.

On motion of Mr. MARTIN, by unanimous consent, leave was granted to the Committee on Invalid Pensions to sit during the sessions of the House.

ENROLLED JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED.

Mr. PEARSON, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that they had examined and found truly enrolled joint resolution (H. Res. 93) authorizing the Secretary of the Treasury to permit the owners of cattle and horses transporting them into Mexico to reimport same into the United States at any time within twelve months from date of the passage of this resolution, and for other purposes; when the Speaker signed the same.

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. 4414) to amend an act approved September 4, 1890, authorizing the New Orleans, Natchez and Fort Scott Railroad Company to construct two bridges across Boeuf River in Louisiana.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed with amendment the bill (H. R. 1920) to amend section 4430, Title XLII, of the Revised Statutes of the United States; in which the concurrence of the House was requested.

A further message from the Senate, by Mr. PLATT, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed bills of the following titles; in which the concurrence of the House was requested:

A bill (S. 432) to provide an American register for the steamer El Callao; and

A bill (S. 1378) to amend an act of Congress approved May 12, 1890, granting to the Aransas Pass Harbor Company the right to improve Aransas Pass.

THE TARIFF.

And then, pursuant to the order heretofore adopted, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H. R. 4864) "To reduce taxation, to provide revenue for the Government, and for other purposes," with Mr. RICHARDSON of Tennessee in the chair.

Mr. PENDLETON of West Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I want to give notice that as there are a great many members who desire to speak upon this question, in order not to be invidious in regard to anyone, I propose, if I am present, to object in the future to any extension of time to anyone.

A further message from the Senate, by Mr. PLATT, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed bills of the following titles; in which the concurrence of the House was requested:

A bill (S. 432) to provide an American register for the steamer El Callao; and

A bill (S. 1378) to amend an act of Congress approved May 12, 1890, granting to the Aransas Pass Harbor Company the right to improve Aransas Pass.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman has that right without giving notice.

Mr. PENDLETON of West Virginia. I just want to give that notice.

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE of Kentucky. Mr. Chairman, this Congress is the first Congress, and this year is the first year for thirty-five years, when the Democratic party has had the power to put on the statute book any statute, or to take from it any statute put thereon; and it comes to the discussion and legislation of these great questions under the most adverse circumstances.

Thirty-five years are more than a generation. The education of so many years is inwrought into the very mental structure of a nation; and during those years every form of paternalism has been adopted and approved, defended and advocated in the press, on the stump, in the halls of colleges, and at the fireside; so that the generation which is now about to take command has been raised and educated unconsciously to the belief that in some way, under some power, the General Government must lead in all enterprises, must aid in all industrial activities, must be the great banking institution of the country. To it must all turn who are desirous of doing anything in even the most circumscribed locality. From it must all persons who enter into enterprises seek aid, and on it must men rely for support and assistance.

The theory of the Democratic party is precisely the converse. We believe that governments came after men solely to protect them in their rights of liberty, in their enjoyment of property, for the due administration of the law, so that justice might be done, a closer union accomplished, and each, according to his thrift, his intelligence, his capacity, and his advantages, obtain the reward which he deserved.

And yet when we come to make practical these principles we are met with all sorts of aphorisms, and into our teeth is thrown the account of the growth which during these past thirty-five years has been so marvelous in this rich and new country of ours; and we are put upon the proof that such a revolution as we favor could accomplish any good.

And then underneath this, which is probably the most adverse

circumstance, there are incidental, and possibly I may call them accidental circumstances, that render every step more troublesome. We are met with a depleted Treasury. Taxation is necessary to supply the deficit in that Treasury. The sources of supply have been dried up by adverse legislation. Our legislation upon the currency question has given to the country a profound and widespread uncertainty, which is always followed by business instability. Paralysis of private enterprise accompanies emptiness of the public Treasury; and every reform is met by the plea that we need the money, that we must find some other source of taxation; and the sneers of our opponents are probably the most effective argument which we have to meet, that in raising revenue under a bill designed for that purpose we are actually creating a deficit; and yet, in spite of these disadvantages, we have some very great advantages. The very prostration of industry gives us an opportunity to look at this whole question with somewhat wiser and calmer eyes than if all wheels were in motion and all furnaces were aglow.

We see around us some of the results of the opposite policy. I do not mean to say that high tariff has produced this paralysis in and of itself; but for some reason the country is in distress, and for ten months or more that distress has been growing. I am usually an optimist; but I do not see any sunshine for to-morrow in our industrial horizon. I see no reason why the distress of to-day shall not continue through the winter and spring months, until harvest comes again, when kindly nature furnishes something that we may sell abroad. When public confidence is likewise restored and our manufacturers begin operations more fully we will, of course, come back again to prosperous days. But, now in these unprosperous days, we in Congress have the opportunity of studying American industries in distress, American labor paralyzed, and we can better understand why this is and what is the remedy therefor.

There never was a time when the American people could turn their attention with more acute and painful interest to these great economical questions. In every household men embarrassed by debt and unoccupied by labor can turn to wives whose tomorrow is full of gloom and discuss from the heart rather than the head what is the matter and whence shall come relief. These debates may be dry and prosy here, the statistical tables may lengthen themselves out into weary figures, but in the home of the poor and unemployed all over America, aye, even in the parlors of the well-to-do and comfortable, they assume shapes which are full of life and pathos, and enchain attention; and to-day all over America they are asking at our hands to do something. What that something shall be is not so important in the extent to which it goes as it is the direction in which it goes.

In the Forty-eighth Congress, that great tribune of the people, my friend and leader, William R. Morrison, of Illinois, whose name I never speak without affection and a certain degree of reverence, began this fight over again, by that tariff bill which has been sneered at by the capitalists and unlearned, but which was modeled after the tariff reform measure of the great Robert Peel. A division in the Democratic party prevented its adoption. In the Forty-ninth Congress he changed front, with a courage that was equal to his patriotism and with a knowledge of the subject which has not been surpassed, came to the conclusion that the foundation of all tariff reform was free raw material, so that the manufacturers of America could find a permanent market wherever their fabrics might be needed; and he introduced through the report of the committee a bill based on free raw wool.

Under the lead of that vigorous and stalwart Democrat, Samuel J. Randall, the Republican party and a minority of the Democratic party prevented consideration of that bill; and it looked as if tariff reform had been blocked. It was predicted in this House by one of its most obscure members that the vote against consideration by this House was a vote of intense consideration in the country; that when we abdicated our right of consideration of the question of taxation the people, in their sovereignty and individual capacity, would take up the question and consider it for themselves. At the beginning of the Fiftieth Congress, the President of the United States, who had not known much of these questions, but who had become educated under the great responsibilities of that august office, sent in his celebrated tariff message, and under the lead of the Senator from Texas [Mr. MILLS], then chairman of the Ways and Means Committee, this House did pass a tariff bill insufficient, inadequate, but in the right direction. Those who prepared it were the most willing to admit that it was not all that it ought to be, but it was a continuance and a further attempt to carry out the purposes of the Morrison bill.

It was based upon simple principles of untaxed raw material, untaxed necessities of life, lower duties on finished fabrics, and an attempt to restore to Congress the right to tax and take it away from the manufacturers outside of this Hall. We lost the

election in 1888, and then immediately there was a sublime spectacle presented to the world. The defeated party became the aggressor. The victors were put upon the defense. Our antagonists saw that the current of popular opinion had not stopped, and this House, under the lead of the Republican party and with the aid of the Senate and the President, for the purpose of settling this question against popular opinion, of preventing popular judgment from undertaking to enact tariff legislation, not only passed the McKinley act, but admitted new States and undertook to settle this question. Thank God, no question is ever settled wrongly!

In the development of human history and human civilization there is no settlement that is wrong; and in 1890 the Democratic party again took possession of this House. Whether we may not have been as determined as we ought to have been is a question that has now passed into history. We kept alive the agitation. We went to the people upon the principles involved and we won at the last election and won for the first time in thirty-five years a President, a Senate, and a House. And in accordance with the general popular judgment, my friend, Mr. WILSON of West Virginia, whom I love much as a younger brother, was put at the head of the Ways and Means Committee. That committee was enlarged. It was made to represent every section of the country. Five of its members had helped to frame the Mills bill. The others had been active and prominent in legislation. They have presented us a bill in which they have gone farther than the Mills bill, farther than the attempt of the Fifty-second Congress, not so far perhaps as I would have gone, for until yesterday I considered myself the most ultra free trader in this House. [Laughter.]

My friend and kinsman, Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio, who was born in my district, and is worthy of his parentage, who spoke here yesterday, perhaps goes one step farther than I would go, but that may be because he is some years younger than I, and the conservative influence of twenty years has not had its effect upon him. [Laughter.] Until yesterday I considered myself on the outpost of the free-trade Democracy, and therefore I can afford to say that I am not satisfied with the Wilson bill. It does not represent all of my views. There are things in it that I would have been glad had been omitted. There are omissions from it that I am sorry were not supplied. I would like to have seen the bounty on sugar repealed. I would have given almost anything to have seen tin plate put upon the free list.

Even if we had to put a little more tax on whisky, or a little larger tax on income, or something more on matches, I would like to have seen tin plate, which is the very foundation of so many industries, which is that particular material that turns the waste of the farm, of the sea, and of the rivers into the rich products upon which people feed during the winter, and gives assistance to men in more different vocations than any other material. I would have been glad to have seen no duty in that bill higher than 30 per cent. But, take it all in all, it is a step in the progressive advance by which such reformation has to be made. It is not for the advance guard—not even for the great body of the army, that we are to frame our legislation. The timid, the halting, the doubtful, the uncertain, are our brethren. The conservative is our colleague; those who feel a divided duty deserve our consideration. They represent constituencies. We depend upon voting. We can not reverse the decisions of thirty-five years immediately.

Great interests clamor at our doors; they have influence. Great industries think they will be hurt; they have friends. Therefore it is not so much a question of how much we ought to do in the end as it is a question of how much we can do with the assistance of our friends, with the support of our party, with the approval of the conservatives. [Applause on the Democratic side.] And for one I am willing to remit that question to this committee, composed of eleven gentlemen from every section of the country, who for five months have given it their earnest and undivided attention. For myself I am willing to keep, as I have kept in every speech that I have made upon this floor, my own personal record clear. I am for ultimate free trade. I am for the possession of the oceans by free ships, freed from all the navigation laws which now hamper and embarrass us.

I am for taking possession of the great, long seacoast and making it fruitful by annexing thereto the billows which unite and do not divide us from other countries. There is no extent to which men can go to which I am not willing to go with them. But, on the other hand, I am willing to lag side by side with my brethren who agree with me on general principles. We are a country of sections, and I am willing to let Louisiana, with her sugar cane, and the Northwest, with her attempt at sorghum and beet sugar, come and be heard, and to be tender with them, so that they may not feel that we have slaughtered them.

I am willing that Connecticut, with her tobacco and various districts with their peculiar interests, be heard in our councils—

that we try by mutual concessions to keep together our party; for it is by our union that we are to carry this reform to its termination. And when I look at what we have done in eight years, when I look back and see how we were in 1884, and how we are to-day—when I see a Democratic Senate at the other end of the Capitol, a Democratic House here, a Democratic President in the White House—when I stand on the very eve of the day when the election laws are to be wiped from our statute books—when I see sectional animosities obliterated and the lines which divided us wiped out—I am willing to be more conservative than I otherwise might be, as I recall that it is for one country composed of diverse sections that a national party, compact and consolidated, is to govern in the coming years. [Applause on the Democratic side.] And therefore, I say to those Democratic friends of mine who do not agree with all the provisions of this bill, we can either heartily and cordially sustain it or frankly point out our objections, and thus by mutual concession and patriotism reach an agreement. For myself, it would obtain my earnest advocacy if it had nothing else in it than free raw wool.

I have heard it sneered that this bill does not raise revenue. Mr. Chairman, no bill for taxation can have for its single object the entire amount of revenue that is needed. We need \$460,000,000 per annum. Where shall we get it? When we come to answer that question practically, other and most important considerations come in. Industries must not be unduly taxed; activities must not be improperly encumbered with burdens. There must be other considerations than the mere amount of money that can be raised on any particular subject of taxation. We must have a prosperous community. That lies at the foundation of all inquiry. The community which is prosperous can pay taxes easily. That community which has paralyzed industry can pay no taxes easily. What, therefore, is the amount of burden that any particular section or any particular industry can bear, is a more important question than the amount of money that can be squeezed out of it.

We are a nation divided, roughly speaking, into two great classes of laborers—those who are engaged in manufacture, and those engaged in agriculture. We must, therefore, in laying our taxes see to it that both of these great classes are made prosperous. Our factories are purchasers from our agriculturists; they are sellers to our farmers. We must, therefore, devise a system by which the farmer gets a fair price, and by which he gives a fair price. He must have a market in which to sell; he must have a prosperous man from whom he can buy at a fair price. There must be an interchange by which the material men sell to a prosperous manufacturer from whom they can readily and profitably purchase. So that at the very foundation of all inquiry about taxation is the question, what is that system of taxation which will make our manufacturing enterprises successful? How can our fires be lighted? How can our wheels be put in motion? How can our products find a market? And I believe that the committee has found the true answer—untaxed material for the laborer to put his sweat into.

I need not go over the argument so admirably put by the chairman of our committee [Mr. WILSON of West Virginia], that the higher wage necessarily accompanies the lower price. The very progress of civilization may possibly be put into the apothegm that it has been a series of lowering prices and increasing wages. It is the paradox of economical truth that the lower the product sells for in times of prosperity the higher is the wage of the man who makes the product. Cobden never said a wiser thing than that prosperity based upon plenty is permanent prosperity; based upon scarcity it is always precarious. The amount and quality make the true test of the wage. The quantity and quality of the product give the amount that the laborer gets. The higher the skill, the higher the intelligence; the higher the capacity, necessarily the higher the wage and the greater the quantity and the finer the quality.

Mr. MARSH. Will the gentleman allow me to ask him a question?

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE of Kentucky. Yes, sir.

Mr. MARSH. Is the converse of the gentleman's proposition true, that the lower the wages the higher the product?

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE of Kentucky. As a rule, it is not so in our day, because the lower the wages the meaner is the product; and the want of good quality gives to it a certain lowness of price. And therefore—

Mr. MARSH rose.

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE of Kentucky. Let me answer. Therefore, the low-priced labor is itself incapable of making a high-priced article; for he who has to buy that fabric of low-priced labor buys an article that is necessarily inferior.

Mr. MARSH. What does my friend think about the costly and magnificent shawls which are made in India? Does he call them a mean and low product?

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE of Kentucky. As a rule what I have

stated is true. The gentleman forgets that comparison of price of wage is an element which is of course to be taken into consideration. As a rule the very labor which is put upon those fabrics is the highest priced labor in the community in which they are produced, and as to other labor is its superior. What I do mean to say in the light of the nineteenth century (and he who denies it is simply lagging in the past) is that the skilled laborer receives a larger share of the price of the product than ever before; that his labor is cheaper to his employer than ever before, and his product is, in comparison, lower in price than it ever was before. To the employer cheaper labor, to the toiler better wages, to the consumer lower prices. This is the necessary result where the bases of supply and demand have untrammelled play. This must be true, in the nature of the case, if unwise and selfish legislation does not obstruct. It is so in spite of our foolish legislation to an extent that has given much comfort and happiness. I care not what you call it. You can now go from Portland, Me., to California on the best-equipped railroads, with every appliance, for a mere song compared with what it once cost. The comforts of life are in ordinary times everywhere in the hands of the skilled laborer; and to him no tariffs give anything. Take the locomotive of Baldwin, the sewing-machine of Singer, the implements and instruments of Rhode Island, the watches of Waltham; wherever brain and skill enter into the necessity of the fabric, it goes everywhere without regard to tariff. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Wherever there are skill and intelligence, there is a constant cheapening of the article and a constant rise in the price of wages. And this is a truth now so well established that no gentleman who prides himself on any learning or intelligence will undertake to dispute or deny. Vanderbilt discovered it when he bought a railroad run down, and which could not make money at 6 cents a mile on its passenger traffic. He put millions of dollars in it, charged 2 cents a mile for passenger traffic, and by this means made a great fortune. Stewart discovered it when he made a multiplicity of sales at small profits, gaining a great fortune, instead of large profits on small sales. The mills at Lawrence understand it, when on millions of yards of calico one-third of a cent a yard gives them a profit, an amount so small that it seems to be scarcely appreciable, but when counted by the millions it makes enormous dividends for the men who understand that intelligence and skill combined with quantity and quality are the representatives of fortune. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Let us understand, therefore, Mr. Chairman, that when we give to these men untaxed material, we are giving them what is necessary to conquer the world. [Applause on the Democratic side.] Gentlemen, we forget that we are legislating for seventy or seventy-five millions of people, soon to be one hundred and fifty millions. We forget that we have the richest, the most fertile land, and the finest advantages nearly in the world. Our rivers run silently to the sea, when they ought to be melodious with the sound of commerce-bearing steamers. Our forests are mere solitudes, when they ought to be rich with factories to-day; and the reason that they have not been established is because we have chained American labor to the wheel of high tariff, and have given the commerce of the world to the British Government. [Applause.]

To-day 12 per cent only of our carrying trade is under our own flag. Do as England did forty years ago, free our shipbuilders from the embarrassments of tariffs, turn the ores of the world and the forests of the world over to the enterprise of our people, and you will find that Cramp with his genius will soon be making ships that will carry our flag, without subsidy or deadheadism, to every part of the world. The principle that lies at the foundation of this bill, as it is at the foundation of all our enterprises, is: No man has a right to avoid paying his share of our burdens, and no one has the right to confiscate from the poor man's pocket a single cent for the purpose of helping him to bear his burdens. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Let us for once understand that principle and practice bracketed together bring wealth in their train. These will give us safe markets; and this, Mr. Chairman, is not theory. We have seen it tried. We have free raw material in certain things, and they have always prospered. Ninety per cent of our industries are untouched by the tariff and have always prospered. It is only when we come to those things which are burdened with tariff exactions that we find they can not carry themselves with the same degree of success. I do not mean to say that it does not give a certain market. Indubitably inside of the circle, within the barrier, the shark can fatten himself on the smaller fish. But if you give the same shark the wider market, being an American shark, my judgment is that soon he will feed as well or better on the foreign fish than he now does on the home fish in the American market. [Applause on the Democratic side.] I have not the slightest prejudice—

Mr. WALKER. Will the gentleman allow a question?

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE of Kentucky. Yes.

Mr. WALKER. I would like to ask the gentleman who he alludes to when he speaks of the "American shark."

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE of Kentucky. I beg the gentleman's pardon. I did not mean to hurt his feelings, at any rate. [Laughter and applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. WALKER. I ask the gentleman from Kentucky if he considers that a proper answer to an entirely candid question?

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE of Kentucky. Well, the gentleman and I will not quarrel about whether it is or not, as I have but little time.

What I call the American shark is the representative of those gentlemen who took advantage of the peril and distress arising from a great war; who solemnly came into this Congress and in the name of patriotism burdened American labor; who, when things began to assume their ordinary shape and substance, repealed such laws as created internal-revenue taxes, and increased the burdens of tariff taxation; those gentlemen who, in the secrecy of the conference committee chamber in 1883, passed a bill that had not received the approval of either House of Congress; those gentlemen who, in the Fifty-first Congress, by modes and methods I care not to describe, wrote a new bill, writing into it the provisions that would enrich themselves; those gentlemen who have purchased ballot boxes, who took the seat from William R. Morrison by bribery—those are the gentlemen of whom I speak. [Applause on the Democratic side.] And I do not mean to include therein my venerable friend from Massachusetts [Mr. WALKER].

Mr. WALKER. Will the gentleman now allow me one further question?

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE of Kentucky. I have not time to yield for a speech.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman can not be interrupted without his consent.

Mr. WALKER. I understand the gentleman from Kentucky to yield.

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE of Kentucky. Does the gentleman desire to ask me a question?

Mr. WALKER. I do.

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE of Kentucky. I will listen to it.

Mr. WALKER. Being an American manufacturer, and being one of the gentlemen who helped make these tariffs, I ask the gentleman from Kentucky if he includes me in the number?

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE of Kentucky. If you are within the description that I gave, it is with exceeding great regret that you have drawn your own picture. I did not do it. [Applause and laughter on the Democratic side.] I have said nothing, Mr. Chairman, that was personally offensive to anybody. I trust that nothing I shall say will be held personally offensive. If I have overstepped what would seem to be the bounds of the kindest discussion of these questions, no man regrets it more than I, and surely my sensitive colleague from Massachusetts [Mr. WALKER] has no reason to be offended at what I said.

But, Mr. Chairman, when you go through that great city of Boston, when you see her great buildings, when you see even her schools of charity, and when you go deeper and find that they are based on the tariff on copper, the tariff on this article and on that, you can not help having in your heart a certain feeling of regret that those princely fortunes did not rest upon the golden rule of doing unto others as you would have them do unto you, instead of upon the principle of getting out of others something for which you gave nothing in return. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. Chairman, regretting this episode in this economic discussion, I resume.

I represent a district largely agricultural. It is to the interest of my district that taxation should be so laid that labor should be profitable; for it is only when labor is profitable that the agriculturist can sell his product at a good price. I represent a section, nearly all of whose products have their price fixed in a free-trade market. The 9,000,000 bales of cotton which are below me do not represent so much money, my colleagues from the Northern States, I beg you to remember. In each bale of cotton is written the peace of the white and the black race, is written the friendship of those two races. In it is enwrapped the education of their children, the development of that country, the hope of its future. The price of that bale is fixed at Liverpool.

Is it unjust for those people to ask that when they come to commute that price, when they want clothing for their children and food in their houses, when they want homes and education, that the price of the things they buy shall not be fixed in a high-tariff market, but that they may commute their labor, which is represented in the cotton bale, into the comforts of life, which are represented by various materials that shall not be taxed 46 to

190 per cent out of the cotton on the one hand, to pay for what they need on the other hand? Can you not give us better than that? Our tobacco, enough of it exported abroad for some of certain qualities to have their prices fixed abroad. Our wheat has its price fixed in Liverpool. Is it asking too much that you give to the grower of wheat, cotton, and tobacco, the same market in which to buy as that in which he sells? When I use the words "The same market" I do not mean the same locality, the same walls, I mean it in the higher sense of a market in which the same prices are to be given.

Where is a man's market, my colleagues? Is it where he buys or where he sells? I sell cotton at Liverpool, and I buy at New York. Which is my market? That in which I have sold my product or that in which I spend my money? If they be precisely alike, with the same laws, the same burdens, the same taxation, it makes no difference; but if in the one I am tolled on my purchases, and in the other I am burdened on my sales, I have the loss of both markets and the advantages of neither.

Now, I plead for a home market in its true sense. I plead that the sweat which is necessary to make a home comfortable shall buy where it sells, on the same basis and under the same advantages. [Applause on the Democratic side.] And that is what this bill does.

There is another provision in this bill which, if it was left alone and everything else in it met with my disapproval, I would cordially vote for it. It is the change from the specific to the ad valorem mode of assessing taxation. I know that it is now considered scientific for a specific duty to be laid, for in the present vocabulary of our friends scientific taxation means that under the cover of which there can be a large profit diverted from the Treasury into the pockets of the manufacturer; but the ad valorem system, with certain defects incapable of being applied to everything, is a just, reasonable, and impartial mode of taxation, and I would be inclined as a legislator to tax nothing that could not be taxed according to the ad valorem system.

The answer to the question as to how it can be done without difficulty is one that presupposes that the legislative will can not be intelligently expressed, and official duty can not be intelligently performed. There is no mode of taxation that an honest and intelligent official can not carry out, and that a legislature with brains can not formulate into a statute. It is a mere sham, a pretext for obtaining fraudulent undervaluation; this whole idea is conceived that specific taxation is necessary. The enemy of high tariff is undervaluation in the dishonest importer, substitution and adulteration in the dishonest manufacturer. I do not mean to say that all American manufacturers do adulterate their goods, but I do mean to say—and I think I proved it in the last House in the little speech which it did me the honor to listen to on the wool question—that the shoddy and adulterating manufacturers of the North had always made money when the real wool manufacturers had not.

I am not going into that question again to-day; but the ad valorem mode tends to the discovery of false valuation, and therefore aids the honest importer, and secures better chance for fair competition by the honest manufacturer.

I find my time slipping away, and the question has been put to me, If you pass this bill, where shall we get our revenue? For one, I am glad that it makes a deficit. It is no obstacle to my support that the expenses of the Government outrun a reasonable tariff taxation. I am glad we have reached the point when we have to assort our taxation under the necessities of a deficit. Where can we raise them? How can they be made lighter? From what sources shall we find them with least burden to the community?

These are questions for the country to take up and answer. These are questions that the Democratic party should solemnly, seriously, and intelligently consider. Where shall we find our revenue? With 70,000,000 people, with so rich a country, with so many sources of wealth, where shall we find it? Left to me, I would probably have found it not where this committee has found it. I would have repealed the bounty on sugar. I would have temporarily restored a part of the duty on sugar. I would have increased the duty on spirits, on cigarettes, on cosmetics, and on various other luxuries; but I am ready to go with them in the experiment of an income tax; I am ready to try those systems of taxation that build up no industry at the expense of another; that burdens no man for the benefit of a rival; that can be taken off without anybody crying that it destroys industries; where it shall be a tax, and nothing but a tax; where it shall not be obscured with the glamor of activities; where it shall not be confused with the cry of laborer's wages.

I want to reach the day when taxes are taxes which, laid by the American Congress, can be relieved when there is no further necessity for the revenues derived from them; when we shall have burdens as burdens, contemplated as burdens, lightened when our revenues allow them to be lightened. Call it income or succession tax, or tax on spirits, or tax on any other thing, I

want it to come, as far as possible, as well considered taxes of themselves, isolated from embarrassing relation to industries; when they will be nothing but taxes, and will have no other consideration than the amount of revenue necessary for the support of the Government.

Now, Mr. Chairman, having taken more time than I expected, I have only to add, I came to Congress eight years ago with the hope that the time had come when economic questions could be discussed dispassionately. I have avoided as far as possible, altogether I hope, a discussion of sectional questions. Whatever may have been my past, I look solely to the future, unto a country in which my children and your children are to work out the destinies of the greatest people in the world. I believe in the success of federated republicanism. I saw the confederation of Canada formed from separate provinces, and I hope to live to see the day when it and we will be united in some organic union that will wipe out customs lines from the mouth of the St. Lawrence to the mouth of the Columbia. [Applause.]

I hope to live to see the day when the continent will be one for freedom, and in that day our children will look back upon these discussions as we look back upon some of the old discussions about the relations of the union of church and state, or the question of slavery. We have free speech, free thought, free locomotion, and beyond that, we will have free trade. We will recognize that the primal curse "by the sweat of thy face thou shalt eat thy bread," is the primary right of mankind; that the right to labor, the right to work, the right to support his family, carries with it the right to spend the fruits of his labor wherever he wants to, for whatever he pleases, according to his own will. This is freedom; that he who works has the freedom to work for whom he pleases without burden, to spend its recompense where he pleases, for what he pleases. And this is the mission of the Democratic party. We are the friends of the laboring men; aye, we are the artisans of toil, in whose name we have taken possession of sovereignty, for whose benefit we labor, whose freedom we will secure, and when the end shall come, in humble homes that name will be the sweetest that can be uttered. [Loud applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. RICHARDS Mr. Chairman, when the bill under present discussion was first reported I expected to remain silent and leave the arguments upon it to other gentlemen of this House, but I am one of those who believe that in this greatest of legislative bodies there should be no shrinking; that every member should be a man of decided opinions with the courage to express them, and having carefully studied the economic questions now before us, I believe it to be my duty to myself and to the people of the great district which I have the honor to represent upon this floor, to give the reasons which will direct my votes upon the pending measure.

The measure before us has long agitated the country and is bounded by party lines. One's convictions on the tariff question determines to a great degree the party to which he belongs. If a man believes in a high tariff he is a Republican, while if a man believes in levying only an amount sufficient to defray the expenses of the Government "economically administered" he is, on that point at least, a Democrat.

But we must not forget the main question before us. It is not one of protection or free trade. It is that of tariff reform. That was the battle-cry of the Democratic party in 1892. That was the demand of the people as expressed at the polls that year, and that is the doctrine that this Congress is called upon to enforce by appropriate legislation.

Believing in an economic administration of the Government, and that only an amount of revenue should be taken from the people necessary to that end, having a majority in both branches of the National Legislature, and an Executive of correct opinions on this question who has so forcibly shown that he has the courage to assert his convictions, now is the time to act.

The people of this country for many years have been unnecessarily burdened with taxation, especially indirect taxation, and seeing the Republican party in virtual control of the tariff barons they turned to that great party for relief whose wards have ever been the common people—the great masses who form the great bone and sinew of a nation.

Working with that due caution and deliberation becoming this great body, aiming not merely to change the tariff, but to reform it, bringing to bear the learning of those who by special study have come to be considered authority on the subject, studying the effects of high and low tariff in other countries as well as in our own, comparing the conditions under different tariff acts, not losing sight of other modifying factors, we will not be justly subjected to the appellation of "tariff tinkers," and the act we shall pass while not, perhaps, perfect, will stand the test of time, and insure to the people a measure of prosperity that can not exist either with a very high or a constantly changing tariff.

THE QUESTION STATED.

A revenue tariff is constructed with the object of raising the required amount of revenue at the minimum cost to the people, but with no reference to reducing importation. A protective tariff has for its primary object a reduction or prohibition of importation for the purpose of favoring the home producer, thus lessening, and in some cases entirely cutting off, revenue.

To accomplish the object of a protective tariff only such articles as are produced both in our own as well as in foreign countries are assessed, and in this way the consumer is forced to pay more for any given article, for he will either be obliged to buy the foreign article at a price enhanced by the duty or buy the home article at about the same price. The price of the protected article being raised to correspond with that at which the imported article is sold, the home manufacturers thus receive the benefit of the protective tariff.

But a strictly revenue tariff being raised principally from articles that are only produced abroad, the increase of price by tariff goes into the national Treasury and not to individuals or corporations. None of our revenue tariffs have, however, been strictly confined to this class of articles. The best example of a purely revenue tariff has existed in Great Britain for thirty years; £100,000,000 annually being collected from sixteen articles, five of which yield 98 per cent of the whole.

THE HISTORY OF THE SUBJECT.

Before the Declaration of Independence it was resolved by a vote of Congress, April 6, 1776, to throw open the ports of the thirteen colonies to the trade of the world. In the language of Bancroft, "absolute free trade took the place of hoary restrictions." After the Declaration of Independence, during the war, and time of the Confederation, there was little restriction placed upon foreign exchange. A treaty of alliance and commerce was made between France and the United States in 1778, the basis of which was "the most perfect equality and reciprocity." Our Government endeavored to have some provision concerning commerce embodied in the treaty of 1783 with England, but failed to accomplish it.

During the revolutionary war many industries were started for the purpose of furnishing our people with articles formerly obtained from England, whence our supply was cut off. When the war closed these manufactories feared that they could not endure the competition of England, and if ever protection was needed it was at this time. Yet we find that in 1789 we had manufactories of iron, glass, paper, leather, flax, hemp, copper, hats, sugar, and cloth, which had become strong and prosperous, notwithstanding ten years of English competition, and entirely without protection or legislative assistance.

When the first Congress convened the first question brought to its consideration was how to raise money for the payment of the public debt. The necessity of levying duties on imported goods was conceded, but protection was the controverted point. Some thought it better to pay direct bounties or premiums from the Treasury rather than make the duties protective or prohibitory, and thus the idea of a revenue tariff preceded that of a protective tariff. However, when this our first tariff bill was passed it had an avowed protective principle. It intended to secure a prosperous start to our infant industries. It was a very mild bill, the duties on the whole list averaging about 8 per cent, and it was to end in 1796; but instead of ending in seven years it lasted twenty-seven years and underwent seventeen modifications.

This brings us to 1816. During the latter part of this period, the nonintercourse act and the war of 1812, by shutting our ports to foreign goods, greatly stimulated domestic manufactures, and to perpetuate these industries the tariff of 1816, sometimes called "the Calhoun tariff," and which is generally said to mark the beginning of a distinctly protective policy, was passed. Its highest rate of duty was 20 per cent, and this increase over previous acts was caused by the heavy interest on the public debt incurred by the war.

After the crash of 1819, a stronger popular movement for protection set in than had been known before. This demonstrates a disposition, always prevalent in the popular mind after a financial crisis, to seek in legislation a remedy for its consequences.

At this time the interests of the different sections began to be manifest, and the protective movement was strongest in New York, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, Ohio, and Kentucky. These were the great agricultural States and felt most keenly the loss of a foreign market for their products and were desirous of a home market. New England was divided, and the South having changed its views since 1816, was now strongly against protection. The clashing of the different sections caused the failure of the bill for increased duties of 1820.

A protective tariff was passed in 1824, carried mainly by the Western and Middle States, party lines having nothing to do with the question. At this time the manufactures of cotton goods were in such prosperous condition that they did not de-

sire increased protection. John Randolph said in the debate upon this bill, "The merchants and manufacturers of Massachusetts and New Hampshire repel this bill, while men in hunting-shirts and deer-skin leggings and moccasins on their feet want protection for home manufactures." And this prosperity and firm establishment of cotton manufactures was due more to the introduction of the power loom than to protection, for notwithstanding the continued protection, they were never in so prosperous a condition before.

Although the encouragement given the woolen manufactures was very moderate, yet, after the crisis of 1819, this industry also developed, and the introduction of machinery had about the same effect upon it as upon the cotton manufactures, and during the period from 1821 the number of woolen factories greatly increased, especially in New England. Thus we find that both the cotton and woolen manufactures were firmly established and in no need of protection some years before 1828. Yet in that year the strongest and most complicated protective tariff bill so far framed was passed.

What was accomplished for cotton and woolen manufactures by the introduction of machinery, including the power loom, was, some years later, accomplished for iron manufactures by the discovery that anthracite coal could be used in the blast furnace. A patent for this process was taken out in 1833, and was in extensive use before 1836, leading to a rapid increase in the production of iron.

Thus in the development of these three great industries we see that other factors besides tariff enter into the question of their growth. The tariff of 1823, called the "tariff of abominations," did not long continue in operation. Some of its provisions were changed in 1830, and another tariff act was passed in 1832 doing away with the objectionable features of the "abomination tariff," making the protection about the same as in 1824. But public opinion was adverse to even so modified a form of protection, and in 1833 the compromise tariff act was passed. This bill provided for a gradual reduction of duties to 20 per cent. It went into effect, popular sentiment in favor of protection disappeared, and the compromise tariff lasted for nine years.

The tariff of 1842, called the "Walker tariff," was strongly protective, and was a purely political measure. It lasted but four years, when the tariff of 1846 was passed by the Democrats. This tariff, called the "Walker tariff," from the fact of its having been framed by Robert J. Walker, Secretary of the Treasury under Polk, is often spoken of as a free-trade measure. It was not, although it discriminated between articles that could and those that could not be produced in our own country. It was a revenue tariff with incidental protection. In this tariff the theory was proved to be true that moderate duties yield large revenues. It produced so large a revenue that in 1857 there was found to be a surplus in the Treasury; and for this reason all parties were agreed to a further reduction of the tariff. This is said to be the first tariff legislation since 1816 that was not affected by politics.

The Walker tariff lasted fifteen years—longer than any tariff in the whole history of the country—long enough to demonstrate the effect of a revenue tariff upon the condition of the country. Though new tariff acts were passed frequently, they all, from 1816, had been protective in principle. And in making a comparison of the condition of the country under the two kinds of tariff we may consider the time from 1816 to 1833 as one continued period of protection. That the result of the comparison is in favor of the period under revenue tariff can not be denied. That this was the most prosperous period of our history has been acknowledged by both parties from that time to the present.

The tariff of 1846 produced such good results that, as we have seen, by 1857 the Whigs were willing to unite with the Democrats and vote for a still further reduction. They saw the great prosperity of the country and were honest enough to acknowledge the low tariff as its main cause. That other factors also entered into this condition, we do not deny; but that they were only secondary is abundantly proved by the fact that both parties acknowledged the tariff as the cause. Let me quote from some prominent men on the other side. Senator (afterwards Vice-President) Wilson, in a speech in the Senate in 1857, when the proposition to reduce the tariff of 1846 was pending, said:

I wish to say to the Senate and the country, that the Commonwealth I represent has a deep interest in the modification of the tariff of 1846 by this Congress. They are for the reduction of the revenue to the actual wants of an economical administration of the Government; for a free list embracing articles of prime necessity we do not produce; for mere nominal duties on articles which make up a large portion of our domestic industry, and for such an adjustment of the duties on the products of other nations that come in direct competition with the products of American capital, labor, and skill, as shall impose the least burdens upon that capital, labor, and skill.

And in the same speech he said:

We of New England believe that wool, especially the cheap wools, manilla, hemp, flax, raw silk, lead, tin, brass, hides, linseed, and many other articles used in our manufactures can be admitted duty free, or at a mere nominal

duty, without injuring to any extent any considerable productive interests of the country.

Mr. ALLISON, in this House, March 24, 1870, said:

The tariff of 1846, although confessedly and professedly a tariff for revenue, was, so far as regards all the great interests of the country, as perfect as any that we have ever had.

Mr. Garfield said in this House in 1878, in answer to the charge that the year of 1860 had not been one of prosperity:

The fact is, Mr. Chairman, the decade from 1850 to 1860 was one of peace and general prosperity. Yet, to suit a theory of finance, we are told that 1860 was a year of great distress and depression of business, equaled only by the distress of the present year. I hold that the facts I have recited establish, in so far as anything can be established by statistics, that the year 1860 was a year not only of general peace, but of very general prosperity in the United States.

Mr. Blaine, in his Twenty Years in Congress, says:

The tariff of 1846 was yielding abundant revenue, and the business of the country was in a flourishing condition.

Money became more abundant after the year 1849. Large enterprises were undertaken, speculation was prevalent, and for a considerable period the prosperity of the country was general and apparently genuine. The principles embodied in the tariff of 1846 seemed for a time to be so entirely vindicated and approved that resistance to it ceased, not only among the people, but among protective economists, and even among manufacturers to a large extent. So general was this acquiescence that in 1856 a protective tariff was not suggested or even hinted by any one of the three parties which presented Presidential candidates. Much more testimony of the same kind might be adduced, but I deem this sufficient for the present.

But this prosperous condition was not to last. A Presidential election was coming on, and the Republican party, wishing to curry favor and obtain votes from States where the protective principle was strong, introduced a bill increasing import duties. This, known as the "Morrill tariff act," passed the House in the session of 1859 and 1860, but did not pass the Senate until the next session. The most important changes made by the Morrill bill were increased duties on wool and iron, and a substitution of specific for ad valorem duties. In 1861 the civil war began, and immediately were the import duties again increased. We need not follow the various steps of tariff legislation; suffice it to say that it taxed our resources to the utmost to furnish funds to carry on that war.

In 1862 two important acts were passed. The first of these was an internal-revenue act, by which specific taxes were imposed upon the production of iron, steel, leather, paper, coal, oil, etc., and an ad valorem duty upon manufactured articles; a general income tax upon railroads, express companies, and licenses were required for many kinds of business. On July 14 of the same year a tariff act was passed for the avowed purpose of compensating the manufacturers and producers for the internal revenue they were forced to pay. This was a protective measure, and levied heavier duties than was necessary even to offset the heavy internal taxes. As the war continued more money had to be raised and more internal-revenue and tariff taxes were consequently levied.

The most important of these acts were passed in 1864. Three revenue acts were passed at the same time. The first provided for an "enormous extension of the internal tax system." The second for an increase of duties on imports corresponding to and compensatory for those of the first act, and the third authorized a loan of \$400,000,000. Everything was taxed and to the utmost. The average rate on all dutiable wares was 47.6 per cent, and on some articles 50, 60, and 100 per cent.

The passage of these acts was made possible only by the state of the public mind regarding the war, and that the protectionist element had control of the Legislature. It would be supposed that the country would have been relieved of such enormous burdens as soon as possible after the war, but such, unfortunately, was not the case. The internal taxes were gradually reduced, and by 1872 all those for which compensatory duties had been enacted were abolished. No one but the Government had any interest in their continuance. But the import duties which were mainly, it was claimed, to compensate for the internal taxes were continued. Not only so, they were increased, and are to-day the foundation of our present tariff system.

The protected interests had derived so much wealth from this measure that they would not willingly let it go. On the other hand the reconstruction problem, as well as the great suffering and sorrow brought to many homes, made the people less alive to these abuses than they should have been; and very unfortunately so for, at so early a period, they might have been corrected. When the matter was agitated in a mild way the demand was appeased by reducing the duties on what are called revenue articles; that is, such goods as are imported but are not produced in our own country; thus reducing the Government's income while not interfering with the gains of the manufacturer who it is plain is only interested in the duties on the protected articles that he produces.

In 1871 and 1872, when the surplus revenue, after paying all appropriations and the interest on the public debt, amounted to a hundred million dollars annually, the people became more earnest in their demands for a reduction of import duties. Consequently, a bill was introduced in this House by the Ways and Means Committee, which, in the words of the chairman, was intended merely "to divest some industries of the superabundant protection which smells of monopoly, and which it was never intended they should enjoy after the war." This bill provided for a reduction on wool, woolsens, and cottons of 20 per cent, pig iron \$1 a ton; coal, salt, and lumber, tea and coffee, and in fact almost all dutiable articles, were to pay less.

This bill, it is hardly necessary to say, was bitterly opposed by monopolists; but finding that the tariff reformers were much in earnest, it was deemed expedient to yield a little rather than to arouse too much opposition; consequently, a bill was passed which had been introduced in the Senate, providing for a 10 per cent horizontal reduction. Mr. John L. Hays, secretary for many years of the Wool Manufacturers' Association and president of the tariff commission of 1882, was here at the time of the passage of this act as agent for the wool manufacturers. He claims, in a speech delivered shortly after, to have been the author of "this wise and foresighted policy." The tariff reformers, not so "wise in their generation," thought they had gained the victory if they had not received all they asked for, and were quiet for a time.

Without following up this history in detail, we will say: the act of 1872 was repealed in 1875, thus putting us back to the war tariff again, and as no tariff act was passed in the next eight years, we find the war tariff of 1864 in operation in 1883. After the resumption of specie payments in 1879 there was a general revival of business and an increase of imports causing a corresponding increase of revenue. After 1879 the surplus revenue averaged over \$100,000,000 annually. This state of affairs caused another demand for revenue reform. The Government being in the hands of protectionists, a tariff commission of their own ilk was appointed to examine into and report upon the subject.

This was like a jury trying a case in which each juror had great financial interest—and all the interests being on the same side. You all know how the tariff bill based upon the report of this commission was put through. It is not necessary to enter into the details of this bill; it is a part of our current history.

Its general character may be inferred from a letter written by the president of the tariff commission, John L. Hays, shortly after the passage of the act.

This letter was published in the Wool Manufacturers' Bulletin. He says:

Reduction in itself was by no means desirable to us; it was a concession to public sentiment, a bending of the top and branches to the wind of public opinion, to save the trunk of the protected system. In a word, the object was protection through reduction. * * * We wanted the tariff to be made by our friends.

In this act the tariff on some things, as wheat, corn, oats, beef, pork, hams, bacon, lard, cheese, and butter, was not changed. On barley it was lowered at the request of the brewers. On silks there was a reduction from 60 to 50 per cent, pig iron from \$7 to \$6.72 a ton. On cheap cotton goods, which we export in large quantities, there was a reduction. On those we import the duty was increased. The same may be substantially said of woollen goods. On the finer qualities, as dress goods, the duty was increased; on coarser qualities, which we did not import because the duty was prohibitory, it was slightly lowered, but still left high enough to be prohibitory. On wool the reduction was so slight as to amount to nothing.

Thus we see that the tariff of 1883 was still a high protective tariff; in fact, it was substantially a continuation of the war tariff. It was just such a piece of legislation we would expect under the circumstances then existing. To reduce the average per cent upon the whole schedule, the duty was lowered on some articles, but, as we have seen, in doing this the class of goods and rate of reduction were so selected as to accrue to the advantage of no one; further, though the condition of the Treasury and the sentiment of the people demanded a general reduction, yet the duty was increased on many articles where, from a protectionist standpoint, such increase "would do the most good."

As was foreseen, this farce reform bill, neither relieved the people of the burden of indirect taxes nor prevented the accumulation in the Treasury. Consequently, the very next year, 1884, a bill was introduced looking to a real reform of the tariff; but the same element that passed the bill of 1883 was still dominant in Congress, and this attempt at reform was a failure. The same may be said of the bills of 1886 and 1887. The constant agitation of the subject, however, showed how alive were the people to the existing wrong. Had the act of 1883 even in part corrected the conditions which it proposed to correct, the country would have settled down to quiet, and to a measure of prosperity commensurate with the relief so given.

In 1890 the protectionists assumed a bold front and passed the most radical protectionist tariff in the history of the country.

For it there was neither the pretext that the country needed revenue nor that an overtaxed people needed compensatory duties. Yet the rates were as high and in some cases higher than when both these conditions obtained. This law is still in force and working great injury to the country, first, by restricting commerce and diverting revenue from the public Treasury into the coffers of corporations; second, it fosters monopolies and trusts, and these, by limiting production, work the double injury of depriving the laborer of work and heaping up high prices to the consumer. That a high protective tariff is a boon to some classes we can not deny; but laws should be enacted for the people of the whole country and not for a class. It is a benefit to the manufacturer of protected articles. It enables him to amass millions, and by combines and trusts to control the commerce and business of the country like an autocrat.

MONOPOLIES AND TRUSTS.

This bill will sound the death knell of monopolies and trusts, monster evils begotten by protection and organized to prevent competition in furnishing the people the necessities of life, thus making those articles decrease, and robbing the people by enhanced prices for the benefit of a few. The agitation of this bill began at once to affect the stocks of these infamous concerns, whose organization was against the best interests of the people, whose existence was against public policy, and which under the fostering influence of a high protective tariff grew and flourished, defying the people, defying legislation, and defying the courts.

A trust has been defined as "a combination to restrain competition among producers, formed by placing the various producing properties (mills, factories, etc.) in the hands of a board of trustees, who are empowered to direct the operations of production and sale as if the properties were all under a single ownership and management."

Active foreign competition being shut out by a high protective tariff, the different firms and companies who had heretofore competed with each other, by this cunningly devised scheme, kill competition, arrange prices to suit themselves, and regulate production according to demands at their extortionate price.

The first was the Standard Oil Trust, formed in 1869 by a combination of refiners of crude petroleum in Ohio and Pennsylvania. Next, branches of the iron and steel trade combined and formed a trust, and next came the great "American Cotton-Oil Trust." So closely had this hydra-headed monster wrapped his slimy folds around the industries of the American people, that by 1888 it had almost completely in the hands of trusts, petroleum, cottonseed oil, and cake, sugar, oatmeal, pearl barley, straw, board, castor oil, linseed oil, school slates, oilcloth, whisky, rubber, steel, steel rails, steel and iron beams, nails, wrought-iron pipe, iron nuts, stoves, lead, copper, envelopes, paper bags, paving pitch, cordage, reaping and binding and mowing machines, thrashing machines, plows, glass, and shortly whitelead, jute bagging, lumber, shingles, friction matches, felt, lead pencils, cartridges and cartridge shells, watches and watch cases, clothes-wringers, carpets, coffins and undertakers' supplies, dental tools, wall-paper, sandstone, patent leather, and other articles.

The very purpose of these organizations has been to advance prices and check competition, thus placing the people at the mercy of these combinations, which have reaped enormous profits at their expense. A burning iniquity, a tax for the benefit of the few upon the whole people; a wrong which would be impossible of consummation save under a high protective tariff. Take, for example, the linseed oil trust formed in January, 1887. The price per gallon of linseed oil rose from 38 cents to 52 cents, and was kept up during 1888. Thus every person having painting done paid to the members of this trust for every gallon they used 14 cents over and above the sum he would have paid if competition had been freely allowed; and estimating the consumption of linseed oil at 30,000,000 gallons a year, the trust so increased the price that it took from the people four and half million of dollars per annum.

One of the most noted, also, of these concerns is the sugar trust, whose very life will be taken by this bill.

It was supported by a duty of one-half per cent per pound on fine sugar, which practically prohibited importation.

During the year 1892 the total amount of revenue from this source was \$76,000, showing that the American trust controlled the market by the aid of the McKinley tariff, and had an absolute monopoly. As a result the various refineries were put into the trust at inflated valuations and the price of sugar increased, so as to compel the people to pay dividends upon fictitious property. The protective duty levied upon refined sugar was used to increase the price, hence making the consumer pay this tax, none of which was received by the Government, but all of which went into the coffers of the holders of trust stock.

Sugar can be refined more cheaply here than in England and needs no protection. The refiners can therefore control the

American market without any protective duty whatever, but under this system, which lays tribute upon the great body of the people for the benefit of the few, this wrong was brought into existence and it is now demanded by the Republican party that it be perpetuated. It was not until 1887 that public attention was completely aroused concerning these organizations, but they have gone on defiantly believing that by working upon passion and prejudice they can continue their work of reaping ill-gotten gains.

Only a little while ago, in the face of the fact that the Wilson bill would become a law, the Bethlehem, the Carnegie, and the Illinois companies, manufacturers of steel rails, agreed to pay the Pennsylvania Steel Company \$400,000 as the estimated profits of one year if it would close and keep closed during the twelve months of 1894 the great works at Sparrows Point, Md.

What for the laborers in the mills at Sparrows Point, the interests of whom these gentlemen ostensibly desire to guard so well? It is enough for them that in the face of this contemplated legislation these three mills can afford to pay the profits of another's works if it remains idle and noncompetitive an amount equal to the total earnings of a large number of employes. The railroads will pay for the rails, the people will pay the railroads. The 4,000 employes of the Maryland Company can go, while the wealthy members of the steel trust who have amassed their fortunes under the cry of protection to American labor will add to their ill-gotten wealth. And now these trusts—the white-lead trust, the whisky trust, the sugar trust, the coal trust, and all the others of this infamous band of plunderers of the people, are opposing this bill and endeavoring to prevent its passage unless it shall be so tinkered as to still permit these leeches to feed upon the public. There should be no wavering in the Democratic line. Now is to be struck the first real blow at the life of monopolies, which will not yield without a struggle, but to whom the people must no longer be compelled to pay tribute in order that the wealth of the nation may be accumulated in the hands of a few. [Applause.]

WOOL.

It is claimed that this product of the farmer especially needs protection; that unless a heavy import duty is levied on foreign wools the article can not be profitably grown in this country. This subject demands careful examination at our hands, to the end that we may determine whether or not this assertion is supported by facts. I deem it my duty to stand with my party and to vote in accordance with the views of the majority; for if each of us insisted that some particular view of his own must be incorporated in this bill ere it received our votes, it could never become a law. But let us examine the subject.

If protection benefits the wool-growing industry, then it must follow: First, that the higher the duty levied upon foreign wool the higher will be the price received by the farmer for the home-grown wool. Second, that wool-growing becoming more profitable under a high protective tariff, the number of sheep would be increased not only absolutely, but relatively to the increased population. If wool-growing were a more profitable business under a high tariff than under a low tariff, each flock master would increase his number of sheep, and persons not before in the business would enter it. That the first of these propositions is not borne out by facts, and that the price of wool has constantly increased under a low tariff and decreased constantly under a higher tariff, is shown by the following table taken from the special report on "History and present condition of the sheep industry of the United States," published by authority of the Secretary of Agriculture. To this table, showing the price of wool from 1824 to 1890, I have added the price for the last three years, bringing it up to date.

| Year. | Price. | Year. | Price. | Year. | Price. | Year. | Price. |
|-----------|--------|-----------|--------|-----------|--------|-----------|--------|
| 1824..... | \$0.53 | 1842..... | \$0.42 | 1860..... | \$0.50 | 1878..... | .45 |
| 1825..... | .43 | 1843..... | .30 | 1861..... | .40 | 1879..... | .35 |
| 1826..... | .43 | 1844..... | .30 | 1862..... | .50 | 1880..... | .55 |
| 1827..... | .32 | 1845..... | .40 | 1863..... | .68 | 1881..... | .49 |
| 1828..... | .30 | 1846..... | .35 | 1864..... | .78 | 1882..... | .46 |
| 1829..... | .45 | 1847..... | .40 | 1865..... | 1.00 | 1883..... | .43 |
| 1830..... | .35 | 1848..... | .38 | 1866..... | .65 | 1884..... | .40 |
| 1831..... | .60 | 1849..... | .30 | 1867..... | .53 | 1885..... | .33 |
| 1832..... | .55 | 1850..... | .40 | 1868..... | .43 | 1886..... | .36 |
| 1833..... | .41 | 1851..... | .40 | 1869..... | .50 | 1887..... | .38 |
| 1834..... | .60 | 1852..... | .38 | 1870..... | .46 | 1888..... | .35 |
| 1835..... | .50 | 1853..... | .56 | 1871..... | .46 | 1889..... | .38 |
| 1836..... | .60 | 1854..... | .47 | 1872..... | .72 | 1890..... | .37 |
| 1837..... | .63 | 1855..... | .35 | 1873..... | .68 | 1891..... | .35 |
| 1838..... | .42 | 1856..... | .38 | 1874..... | .54 | 1892..... | .25 |
| 1839..... | .40 | 1857..... | .50 | 1875..... | .56 | 1893..... | .22 |
| 1840..... | .45 | 1858..... | .33 | 1876..... | .52 | | |
| 1841..... | .45 | 1859..... | .52 | 1877..... | .43 | | |

From 1846 to 1860 we had the lowest wool tariff in the history of the country. And during the last three years of this period wool was practically on the free list, all but the higher grades

being admitted free. Although in this period there was one bad year (1858), arising from a panic in the money, market which brings down the average, yet during these fifteen years medium wool brought an average of 41 $\frac{7}{8}$ cents per pound. And during the three years that I have mentioned, omitting the panic year, wool was 50 cents, and in 1859 52 cents per pound. This is more than the average price for the last fifteen years, and much higher than any year since the McKinley tariff has been in operation. Would not the wool-grower be willing to exchange the prices under the McKinley tariff for the average of 41 $\frac{7}{8}$ cents per pound, under a low tariff, or even for the 50 and 52 cents per pound when wool was practically on the free list?

In a letter from the Manufacturers' Club, Philadelphia, to the Ways and Means Committee, under date of September 4, 1893, we find this acknowledged in the following sentence:

Wool, for example, is much lower now than it was in 1890, or than it was even so recently as one year ago.

What magnanimity on the part of these manufacturers! They claim that the duty on woolen goods is to compensate them for the higher price they are obliged to pay for wool on account of the duty upon it. Yet this very letter from which I have quoted is written to persuade the Committee on Ways and Means to continue the present duty on manufactures, while at the same time it acknowledges that they get this raw material cheaper than when it was on the free list; asking that the duty on imported wools be kept up in order that they may keep up higher prices.

Verily, the manufacturer is not extravagantly bedecked with the jewel consistency. But if he were, perhaps he would not live in a luxuriant mansion, surrounded by servants, and ride in his beautiful carriage driven by liveried coachmen, while the wages of the toiling laborer whom he pretends to love so well are from time to time cut down even to starvation point. And the farmer, whose prejudices he endeavors to enkindle against the party which is his best and truest friend, gets lower prices for his products and pays higher prices for the wares of the manufacturer.

One would hardly expect that under any circumstances, in peace, wool would reach the high prices of war times, when the demand was so great to supply our immense armies with clothing and blankets. Yet, in 1867, the duty on wool was so far increased above that of the war as to be 50 per cent on clothing and combing wool. Yet the price continued to fall, until 1872, when a 10 per cent horizontal reduction was made in the tariff. And as will be seen by the table wool immediately went up and remained high until 1875. In that year the tariff act of 1872 was repealed, putting us back to the high tariff of 1867. Again wool fell and has decreased to the present time. The slight reduction of 1883 can not be responsible for this. For the decrease, with the exception of one year, 1880, was as steady before as after that date; nor did the increased duty of 1890 put any check to the steady fall.

I therefore say, Mr. Speaker, that a clear examination will furnish conclusive proof to the unbiased mind of the correctness of this proposition, that a protective tariff does not increase the price of wool.

In examining my second proposition we must consider the sections of country east and west of the Mississippi separately, as entirely different conditions are found in regard to the wool-growing industry. West of the Mississippi are great tracts of land that can be had at little cost, and Government land that can be used free.

In many sections whole flocks live out of doors all winter without other food than the pasture provided by nature. And where shelter and food are provided for the most severe weather, it is done at a comparatively small cost. Consequently, very large flocks can be kept and wool grown at a profit when the price is so low as to be ruinous to the industry where different conditions obtained. That the number of sheep has increased in this section is natural. East of the Mississippi, however, the number of sheep has greatly diminished.

In the work on Sheep Industry, from which I have already quoted, we find on page 696 that in this section, notwithstanding the enormous increase in population, there were two million less sheep in 1890 than in 1860. And in my own State, Ohio, one of the most important wool-growing States in the Union, there has been a falling off of one-third the number of sheep during the high-tariff period, although the population has increased during that time over 1,000,000. This falling off can not in any way be due to overproduction. It is estimated that we consume annually about 6,000,000 pounds of wool, while we produce less than 3,000,000. In 1878, after ten years of high tariff, Ohio, Michigan, and all the great wool-growing States, had only about half as many sheep as they had in 1867. Before 1867 the number of sheep had been increasing more rapidly than our population. Since then the reverse has taken place.

Again, we are told by manufacturers that some of the best

grades of goods can not be made from wool produced in this country, and some not from any one grade of wool; and if the manufacture of such articles should be attempted in disregard of this fact the result would be a mere imitation, something we all despise, and needing no expert to detect. In a reprint from the American Wool and Cotton Reporter of an article by Edward D. Page, of New York, I find this subject discussed. Mr. Page, speaking of woolen manufacturers, says:

I fear that many of them do not fully realize even now how improvement and economy can be accomplished by making these goods from a mixture of the stocks, most exactly suited to the qualities the goods are to possess, instead of the makeshifts which our meager market has hitherto afforded.

He further says:

I have been shown in an English manufacturer's wool house a mixture or blend of no less than fourteen distinct and different varieties of wool, from which he made a simple fabric in which at home not more than two or three qualities are used. Each of these fourteen varieties was found to lend some desirable peculiarity to the fabric, perceptible only in the finished piece, or else to economize the cost. And I was told that the blend used had been substantially the same for thirty years. The goods manufactured from it were perceptibly superior, in selling qualities, to our own.

Some of these qualities are durability of color, fineness, and softness of finish—all very desirable qualities. Although the import duties are very high on these fine qualities of woolen goods, those who can pay high prices will have them. And we can easily understand that if we could import wool free we could buy as much of these fine wools as we desire, thereby making these beautiful fine goods in our own country, and being able to sell them at such prices that many if not all could afford to wear them. This would be a great advantage and great saving to the consumer. And as our home-grown wools could be mixed with the imported wools be used in a greater variety of fabrics, a home market would be created for more than is now produced, and "the flocks would increase on a thousand hills."

An increased demand would increase the price, and the farmer would be benefited in a twofold manner. Nor would the manufacturer be left to suffer. True, he would not be able to charge such high prices, but he would sell more goods at home and could export them and find an abundant market where he would not have to pay duty. He would not make money so fast, but he would make it honestly. A great weight would be lifted from his conscience that has rested there for 30, these many years. And we certainly would be doing the greatest good to the greatest number.

Here leaving this subject, let me quote from a few authorities. Senator SHERMAN said in 1883:

In the table which I have now before me, it is shown that in 1867 the price of wool was 51 cents a pound; in 1870 it was 46 cents a pound; in 1876 it was 43 cents a pound; in 1880, which was an abnormal year, 48 cents a pound. But to-day I am told that these wools are sold in Ohio at from 35 to 40 cents a pound. So the result of protecting the wool-growers has been, as it has been in all industries, to gradually reduce the price of domestic wools.

Again he said:

Under the operation of the tariff of 1867 the price of wool has gradually gone down. This was the result of the policy of protecting (?) the wool-grower—to gradually reduce the price.

Senator FRYE, of Maine, a protectionist, said:

Domestic wools have come down in price from the time the tariff of 1867 was enacted until to-day.

In short, foreign wools are imported not to compete but to combine with ours, and unless the manufacturer can get a higher price for his product he will pay less for our wool, and when foreign wool is purchased to be mixed with our wool, if foreign wools cost more, ours will bring less.

CLEVELAND, OHIO, September 13, 1893.

SIR: If you want to suit this mill, kindly put wool and all raw materials on the free list. Should this be done, we are willing to have the tariff on manufactured goods gradually reduced 25 per cent, which is sufficient. This country can never compete successfully with European manufacturers until it gets free wool.

The proper thing for your committee to do is to act quickly and settle the matter for a year or two, and whether or not you reduce the tariff the mills will start up, as they will know what they have to figure on.

Yours, respectfully,

BECKMAN & CO.

And, as showing the methods of some gentlemen, I incorporate in my remarks the following letter from one of my constituents:

CHILL, OHIO, January 6, 1894.

DEAR SIR: Inclosed you will find a copy of a petition sent me by Messrs. Justice, Bateman & Co. No doubt the House of Representatives will be flooded with such by signers. I concluded to send you it in blank. This house is doing a wool commission business, but of late years have connected politics with it. They are well known by all shippers of wool. They have made a fortune in wool, but mostly at the expense of shippers. They contributed heavily to the election of Ben. Harrison in the campaign of 1888, and were connected with John Wanamaker in raising the \$600,000 campaign fund, and when confronted with the foregoing statement never denied the same. It appears they desire to control the Democratic party as well as the Republican party, only through other means. It is my earnest wish and desire that the Democratic Representatives in the House, as well as the Senators in the Senate, will not go back on the Democratic platforms, which are for reform of the tariff, and have been so ever since 1876, when Samuel J. Tilden was elected on a tariff-reform platform. It is my opinion that all this howl now made about the revision of the tariff and the lying idle of woolen manufacturers is to intimidate the Representatives of the people in

order to continue the mulcting of the masses for the privilege of classes. Although you have been steadfast in your past action, and supported the Administration in the repeal bill, and we have not the least doubt you will support and vote for tariff reform, I did not think it amiss to express the sentiments which I did, and believe every true Democrat around this neck of the woods will indorse.

Yours, respectfully,

HON. J. A. D. RICHARDS.

JOHN LORENZ.

SHODDY.

But there is a wicked, insidious enemy that interferes with the price of wool, while at the same time it deprives the American people of the substantial woolen clothing which they are entitled to, and that is shoddy. The manufacturers of woolen goods gave some very interesting testimony—I do not say spontaneous and voluntary—on this subject before the Ways and Means Committee last fall. Among other things they disclosed the fact that under the high protective tariff, before the McKinley bill was passed, there was 1 pound of shoddy used in so-called woolen goods to every 4 pounds of wool; since the passage of the McKinley bill there is 1 pound of shoddy to every pound of wool, four times as much as before.

Thus the McKinley tariff, while it compels the manufacturer to pay higher prices for foreign wools necessary to blend with our domestic wools to make the better grade of cloths, and by its duty on woolen goods enhances the price of proper clothing, it invites the manufacturer of shoddy to the field. And instead of placing upon the backs of the people the pure, healthy product of the sheep, clothes them with shoddy made from the ground-up rags of the slums of the earth. These makers of bogus wool stand in mortal fear of the era of free wool.

From 1870 to 1890, under the protecting care of Republican legislation, they enjoyed prosperity, but since 1890, when, under the McKinley act, foreign wools necessary to mix with our own were driven away and our people compelled to wear such kinds of dear clothing as could be contrived from our wools, or from old rags ground up and wove and stuck together in the form of shoddy. The business of these gentlemen has been a bonanza. Need I say to the American farmer that if clothing is made from wool instead of shoddy it is better for the wearer, and also for the wool-grower? Cheap real woolen goods would destroy this iniquitous business, and the maker of this spurious stuff would rather hear the rolling of thunder or the sound of cannon than the bleating of a lamb.

It has even been said that one of these conscienceless mortals once actually blushed when he discovered a sheep looking him in the face. Yet, as showing which policy is aider and abettor of their business, we find in 1888 seventeen rag and shoddy dealers issuing a circular, which was distributed by the Republican national committee, asserting that free wool would entirely ruin their business, declaring against the "free-trade" party of Grover Cleveland and for Harrison and Morton. Their election was declared "to be indispensable to the maintenance of our business;" and now, in a petition to this Congress, wherein they protest against the placing of wools on the free list, they have the effrontery to declare that the number of plants engaged in the shoddy business "is nearly one hundred, with a combined capital of millions."

I say to this House, "choose you this day whom ye will serve," the maker of shoddy, who deprives the American farmer of a proper price for his wool by manufacturing cloth from ground-up and woven rags, and who cheats the people by placing upon the market this stuff now constituting a large part of our clothing, or will you serve the cause of common honesty, call a halt in this iniquitous business, and by proper tariff legislation give our farmer a better price for his wool and our people a better kind of cheap, warm, woolen clothing. If there be one of the children of this Republican system more unlikely than the others, Shoddy is the ugliest brat begotten by that foul parent, High Tariff. View the offspring of your pet: monopolies, combines, trusts, pools—Shoddy. [Applause.]

COAL.

Coal is a necessity to our domestic and manufacturing uses, and great is the store of this fuel laid up for our use in bygone ages, and yet this boon to civilization, this needed article, is virtually in the hands of monopolies.

Each year there is used in the United States about 120,000,000 tons of coal, which, at an average price of \$4 per ton, is nearly \$500,000,000 or more than \$8 per annum for every man, woman, and child in the country.

The enormous coal fields are widely distributed, productive mines being in operation in many of our States. Anthracite coal, however, only occurs in a limited area in Pennsylvania, but the deposit is of wonderful richness. The total area of these fields is about 300,000 acres, of which about 200,000 acres are owned by a few (seven) railway corporations. These companies directly, or through subsidiary companies, control the market, carry on mining operations, carry the coal to market and sell it.

Many years ago these seven companies formed the famous anthracite coal pool by which they agreed to maintain a uniform selling price at all important distributing points where two or more of the companies carried competition—cities within an hour's ride of the miners were compelled to pay as much as those hundreds of miles distant, and while this pool is a thing of the past on account of the passage of a law in Pennsylvania making their acts illegal and punishable, there is a secret agreement between these companies to-day, and where two or more roads meet the same prices for coal are quoted. Hundreds of thousands of people of the North and Northwest must pay for coal, this necessity of life, whatever the managers of a single corporation demand.

We have seen the Missouri Pacific Railway Company working through subsidiary companies, encircling the coal fields of Missouri, Colorado, and the Indian Territory, and compelling private operators to sell coal at the company's prices in the market; the Atchison, Topeka and Santa Fe; the Chicago, Burlington and Quincy; the Denver and New Orleans; the Union Pacific, and the Denver and Rio Grande Railway Companies reaching out for the Colorado, and the Union Pacific, the Chicago and Northwestern, and the Chicago, Burlington and Quincy, reaching out for the Wyoming coal fields. While the Oregon Railway and Navigation Company, having a monopoly on the Pacific coast, from time to time kept prices at San Francisco just below the point at which it was profitable to import Australian coal.

We have seen the Hocking Valley and Toledo Railway Company in Ohio grasping the great Hocking Valley coal fields of the State. The coal of Alabama seized by the Louisville and Nashville, and the Norfolk and Western Railroad Company and Chesapeake and Ohio seizing the coal fields of West Virginia.

These facts go to show that the consumers of coal are at the mercy of corporations.

Let me quote from an article by Henry D. Lloyd in the North American Review, June, 1886:

Last July Messrs. Vanderbilt, Sloan, and one or two others out of several hundred owners of coal lands and coal railroads, met in the pleasant shadows of Saratoga to make a binding arrangement for the control of the coal trade. "Binding arrangement," the sensitive coal presidents say, they prefer to the word "combination."

The gratuitous warmth of summer suggested to these men the need the public would have of artificial heat at artificial prices the coming winter. It was agreed to fix prices, and to prevent the production of too much of the raw material of warmth by suspensions of mining. In anticipation of the arrival of the cold wave from Manitoba, a cold wave was sent out all over the United States from their parlors in New York, in an order for half-time work by the miners during the first three months of this year, and for an increase of prices. These are the means this combination uses to keep down wages—the price of men, and keep up the price of coal—the wages of capital. Prices of coal in the West are fixed by the Western Anthracite Coal Association, controlled entirely by the large railroads and mine owners of Pennsylvania. The association regulates the price west of Buffalo and Pittsburg and in Canada.

Our annual consumption of anthracite is now between 31,000,000 and 32,000,000 tons. The West takes between 5,000,000 and 6,000,000 tons. The companies which compose the combination mine, transport, and sell their own coal. They are obliterating other mine-owners and the retailer. The Chicago and New York dealer has almost nothing to say about what he shall pay or what he shall charge, or what his profits shall be. The great companies do not let the little man make too much. Year by year the coal retailers are sinking into the status of mere agents of the combination, with as little freedom as the consumer.

Combination is busy in those soft-coal districts, whose production is so large that it must be sent to competitive markets. A pool has just been formed covering the annual product of 6,000,000 tons of the mines of Ohio. Indiana and Illinois are to be brought in, and it is planned to extend it to all the bituminous coal districts that compete with each other. The appearance of Mr. Vanderbilt last December in the Clearfield district of Pennsylvania at the head of a company capitalized for \$5,000,000 was the first entry of a metropolitan man into this field.

Mr. Vanderbilt's rôle is to be that of producer, carrier, dealer, and consumer all in one. Until he came the district was occupied by a number of small companies and small operators, as used to be the case in the anthracite fields in the old days. But the man who works himself, with his sons, in a small mine, cutting perhaps from 20 to 40 tons a day, can not expect to survive the approach of the Manhattan capitalists. The small Clearfield producers, looking at the fate of their kind in the anthracite country, greeted Mr. Vanderbilt's arrival with the question, "What is to become of us?" "If the small operator," said one of the great man's lieutenants, "goes to the wall, that is his misfortune, not our fault."

And this kind of misfortune has, alas, overtaken many poor

men that the supply might be kept down, even to the extent of creating a coal famine, with all its concomitant horrors for the poor; for a coal famine is always so managed as to happen in the severest winter weather, and when added to insufficient shelter and insufficient clothing it brings untold suffering. We have heard each party arraign the other for closing public works and putting out the fires of the furnaces, thus depriving the laborer of work.

But what shall be said of the man who "puts the fire out" on the poor man's hearth in the dead of winter regardless of the half-clad sufferer, who perhaps has crawled from her bed of rags to hover over the few scanty coals? And all that the price of coal may be raised in the interests of a Vanderbilt, thus taking the few pennies that should have bought a loaf of bread as the additional price of a pail of coal. Anyone who has visited the poor quarters of our large cities during a coal famine, and I hope many of you have, and seen the wretched, starved creatures buying coal by the pail or half pail know that the picture of their sufferings can not be overdrawn. And in the interest of such, I ask you to do away with a tax that makes possible a monopoly, which is the most grievous of burdens to the already overburdened poor.

The testimony taken before the Ways and Means Committee shows that it is only the operators of the Eastern coal mines that fear competition in case the duty is removed from coal. And the only coal dealers they mention as competitors are those of Nova Scotia and Canada. Yet it is brought out in the testimony of these men that their mines supply coal to Canada in face of the duty of 67 cents per ton we pay for selling coal in that Dominion. Also, that these same coal dealers, who are so afraid of competition with Nova Scotia coal, claiming that they can barely hold their own with the duty of 75 cents per ton, and if this duty were removed the competition would be ruinous to their business—these same coal dealers were forced to admit in their testimony that they ship their coal all the way to Cuba, where it comes into direct competition with Nova Scotia coal, where it pays no duty. And that this competition is successful and the trade profitable to American dealers is evidenced by the vast amount they ship to Cuba every year.

If this can be done, after paying freight for such a long distance, as a matter of course it can be done at home. And the claim that the wages of the miners will have to be reduced is all buncombe, calculated to excite the sympathy of the uninformed. They claim that the cost of coal is mainly labor; that being the case, Canada and Nova Scotia coals cost as much as ours, for their miners, it is acknowledged in the testimony of these operators, receive the same wages as do our miners. These being the facts in the case, free coal can work no injury to the miners and laboring men. The extensive operator of the Eastern coal fields will not reap such large profits, and will not be able to limit the output and increase the price and deprive the miner of work at his own sweet will.

I append a report of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce made to this House on June 10, 1892, which is as follows:

[House Report No. 1630, Fifty-second Congress, first session].

INVESTIGATION OF RAILROADS COMBINATIONS.

June 10, 1892.—Ordered to be printed.

Mr. WISE, from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, submitted the following report (to accompany Mss. Doc. —):

The Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce have considered a resolution, a copy of which is hereto subjoined, offered by Mr. Stout, in the House of Representatives, on the 12th of February last, and referred to them, and respectfully report:

That while that resolution may be inaccurate in some of its statements, it furnishes sufficient grounds for an inquiry by Congress into a transaction which probably vitally affects the interests of the people of the United States. It is very generally and confidently alleged throughout the country; it is asserted in suits at law and bills in equity pending in the courts; it is currently believed on the exchanges, in which such things are most narrowly watched, that a combination of the three leading anthracite coal roads, the Philadelphia and Reading Railroad Company, the Central Railroad Company of New Jersey, and the Lehigh Valley Railroad Company, together with the companies which these several roads control, and a combination of this combination with the Port Reading Railroad Company and other transportation and producing companies have been effected; and that these combinations are for the purpose of creating a monopoly in the production and transportation of anthracite coal and to control its price in the market; that the market price has already been advanced without any other excuse than to further the interests of the monopoly (and this at a season of the year when the consumption of anthracite coal is at its minimum), and that said combinations propose to advance the price still further from time to time.

And as it is apparent that State legislation or action is insufficient to cope with these combinations, extending as they do, if they exist, over several States, and constituting a menace to all the people of the United States, it is of vital importance to ascertain (1) whether the alleged combinations, or any similar combinations exist; (2) whether any law of Congress and particularly whether "An act to protect trade and commerce against unlawful restraints and monopolies" (chapter 647 of the Supplement to the Revised Statutes) have been violated by the companies and collateral companies said to form, or which may be found to form, the said combinations; (3) what additional legislation in such case, on the part of Congress, may be necessary, expedient, and proper: Therefore,

Resolved, That the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, or

such portion of them as they may specially designate for the purpose, be empowered and directed to investigate, at the earliest practicable moment, whether the alleged combinations of the Philadelphia and Reading Railroad Company, the Lehigh Valley Railroad Company, the Central Railroad Company of New Jersey, and the Port Reading Railroad Company, or any combination between any of these roads and any other roads or canals or producers of coal, for any illegal or improper purpose, exist, and, if such combinations do exist, the effect thereof on the production, transportation, distribution, and price of anthracite coal, and upon commerce among the several States, and to report to the House any and all facts in relation to the subject-matter of the investigation which the committee of investigation herein provided for may ascertain, and to make such recommendations as the said committee may agree upon; and that said committee be authorized to sit during the session of the House or during the recess of Congress, and at such place or places as it may find necessary; to employ a clerk or stenographer, to administer oaths, issue subpoenas, compel the attendance of witnesses and examine them, and compel the production of books and papers; and that a sum, not to exceed \$10,000, sufficient to pay the expenses of the committee herein provided for shall be immediately available and payable out of the contingent fund of the House on the order of the chairman of said investigating committee; and all vouchers for any such expenditures shall be likewise certified to by the chairman of said investigating committee.

The subjoined is a copy of a resolution offered in the House of Representatives on the 12th of February, 1892, by Mr. Stout, and referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

"FEBRUARY 12, 1892.

"Mr. Stout submitted the following; which was referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce:

"Whereas the Reading, Lehigh Valley, the Jersey Central, Delaware, Lackawanna and Western Railways, operating lines in different States, and representing a nominal capital of \$600,000,000, the plant of which could be duplicated at one-half the sum, have combined their capital: Therefore,

"Resolved, That the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce be requested to investigate the facts of the case and report whether such consolidation should not be prohibited by national law; and whether a bureau of interstate transportation should not be organized, headed by a Cabinet officer, known as the Secretary of Commerce.

"Attest:

"JAMES KERR, Clerk."

The subjoined is a letter from the Interstate Commerce Commission in reply to an inquiry addressed to that Commission by the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, as to whether the Commission has entered upon any such investigation as is contemplated in the resolution of Mr. Stout, printed herewith:

"INTERSTATE COMMERCE COMMISSION,
"OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY,
"Washington, March 31, 1892.

"The Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce,
House of Representatives:

"SIR: Your communication of the 29th instant, inclosing copy of proposed resolution directing your committee to investigate and report concerning the recent consolidation of the Philadelphia and Reading with other railroads, and requesting to be informed whether this Commission has entered upon any investigation of such consolidation, is received.

"The act to regulate commerce does not give the Interstate Commerce Commission jurisdiction of matters which relate only to dealings between railroad companies and have no bearing upon the rights of the public to impartial treatment and reasonable and equal charges in the transportation of interstate commerce. The magnitude of the railroad deal referred to is calculated to arouse grave apprehensions of resultant injuries to the public welfare, but until the attention of the Commission is called to some contravention of the interstate-commerce law, caused or made possible by the combination of railroad interests, no grounds appear to exist upon which an investigation of the consolidation could properly be instituted by the Commission under that law."

IRON.

At the beginning of the war, we find iron ore among unclassified articles, upon which a duty of 10 per cent was assessed. But as no ore was imported either then or during the war, we find the rate remained the same up to 1870, when it was raised to 20 per cent. As soon as it began to be imported to some extent, it attracted the attention of the protectionists; who were looking for new fields, and the duty was raised in 1883 to 75 cents per ton, which was about 35 per cent ad valorem. But to present this branch of the subject clearly and concisely, I can not do better than to quote from the testimony of the president of the Pennsylvania Steel Company before the Ways and Means Committee, when Mr. McKinley was chairman of that committee, and they were taking testimony with a view to reform the tariff:

The demand for free ore, in my judgment, can now be presented from a commercial standpoint, which can not fail to convince all fair-minded persons that innumerable benefits to our country would follow, without working harm to a single interest which is legitimately connected with the production of American ore, iron, or the products proceeding therefrom. To systematize this permit me to present the following facts:

First. That only ore which is suitable for the manufacture of steel is ever imported; and if competing at all, can only compete with the like quantity of domestic production.

Second. The whole quantity of ore suitable for Bessemer pig iron which it will be possible to produce in this country during the year 1890 will not exceed 5,000,000 tons. This estimate includes every ton of ore that can be raised by hook or crook. Three and one-half millions tons of pig iron, it is estimated, will be required to supply the wants of the steel manufacturers in this country during the present year. To manufacture this amount of pig iron, 6,500,000 tons of iron ore of suitable quality will be required. One and one-half millions tons of Bessemer steel ore must therefore be imported into this country by our steel manufacturers, or their works will remain idle one-fourth of the year.

He further says that one-half million tons will come from Cuba, where the mines are owned by an American company; and that the importation of this ore is the direct means of securing the exportation to the West Indies and South America of

American coal, as return cargo in the steamers which bring the ore to this country:

In 1899 the export of American coal has been almost equal ton for ton to the importation of iron ore. There is no reason why, by using these steamers, this country cannot so develop her coal business in the West Indies and South America that she will absolutely drive English coal out of those markets. One million tons will be imported from the Mediterranean and the three hundred and fifty steamers that will be required to bring that quantity of ore to this country will leave our shores laden with wheat, cotton, and corn, carrying this outward cargo more cheaply on account of the freight received for bringing the iron ore.

He says further:

Practically the whole of the imported iron ore is used in the furnaces located at or near tidewater. Seventy-five cents per ton on these ores represents the cost of hauling one ton of ore 100 miles. Removing this duty, therefore, only enables iron ore to enter 100 miles farther into the interior than it does to-day. On the other hand, it will enable my company as exporters to go 800 or 1,000 miles by sea to compete with our competitors abroad.

The condition of the supply and demand for Bessemer steel raw material has not materially changed in this country for the past five years. This country has never since the introduction of the manufacture of Bessemer steel imported less than 25 per cent of the material consumed in the manufacture of the steel output, and the prospect for the future, judging by the past, is that the national growth of the country will keep pace with and probably more than absorb the increased output of native steel raw material arising from the new developments that are and have been constantly projected. It used to come here in the form of pig iron, but as this country increased her furnace capacity the steel manufacturer now seeks to bring it here more and more in the form of ore.

That is, all the ore we import is of a kind of which we do not produce enough to supply the demand of our immense iron and steel trade. Not only so, but being brought here as ore and made into pig iron by our furnaces, is thus supplying more work for the American laborer. And Joseph G. Butler, of Youngstown, Ohio, in his testimony before the same committee, says that if it were not for the great development of the pig-iron industry in this country he does not know where we could get our pig iron. "We could not import a ton." Yet at the same sitting, in answer to a question, he says:

I say the present tariff does not cut any figure.

And again:

We want this tariff on everything we can produce in this country. We do not want to import anything.

Yes; and wants the tariff on pig iron, of which he says we can not import a ton. What does he want tariff to protect in this case? Very evidently he wants the tariff to protect high prices. As to steel rails, none are now imported: the duty is as prohibitory as when it was \$17 and \$28 a ton. The cost of transportation of steel rails is from \$2 to \$4 a ton. All the difference above this transportation cost is caused by the tariff tax. In 1891 the price was \$8 higher in this country; last year the price was \$12 higher. If steel rails were admitted free of duty they would not, owing to the cost of railroad transportation, be used, excepting near tidewater.

WAGES.

One of the most important, if not the most important, question of the tariff controversy is that of wages. The great majority of the population in all countries belong to some branch of the laboring class. That the prosperity of a country largely depends upon the condition of this class is a self-evident fact. Were all of this great class employed at remunerative wages, this one fact would conduce more to the prosperity and happiness of the world than all other conditions combined. There would be no poverty, and, best of all, no strikes and no lockouts. But to this Utopian condition we never can expect to attain. Of all the factors entering into the wage question I believe the most potent factor is supply and demand. Where there is more work to be done than there are laborers to do it, there will wages be extremely high, as in the case of the opening up of some new field in a distant part of a country, as in the early history of our Western mines.

When the supply equals the demand, a normal condition, then wages will become lower; and when the supply exceeds the demand then there will be fierce competition and wages will be reduced. We find that in our own country wages have always been high. This is owing to our vast domain and to the fact that there have always been new enterprises developing, such as the opening of mines, building of canals and railroads, reducing vast tracts of wild lands to agricultural purposes, building new towns and cities, etc. Lately the advocates of protection have claimed that we owe it to their policy that wages are higher in this than in some other countries.

This assertion would not be worth noticing were it not for the fact that many persons will believe a bare statement without proper proof to back it up. But high wages have existed in our country regardless of the rate of the tariff. Whether it was high or low has made no difference, with the exception that in the protected industries the owners of such works will sometimes lock out their workmen because, not that they refuse the higher wages protection makes, but because they refuse to sub-

mit to reductions—they lock them out and employ the so-called pauper labor imported from other countries. If protection caused wages to be higher, then in those countries where protection exists we would always find wages to be higher than in those countries having a low tariff or free trade. But that this is not the case is shown by the following table, taken from the report of the United States Tariff Commission, volume 2, page 2388:

| Occupation. | Protection. | | Free trade. | |
|------------------------------|-------------|---------|-------------|----------|
| | Germany. | France. | Belgium. | England. |
| Bricklayers..... | \$3.45 | \$4.00 | \$6.00 | \$8.12 |
| Masons..... | 4.00 | 5.00 | 6.00 | 8.16 |
| Carpenters..... | 4.18 | 5.42 | 5.40 | 8.25 |
| Painters..... | 4.60 | 4.90 | 4.20 | 7.25 |
| Plasterers..... | 4.35 | | 5.40 | 8.10 |
| Blacksmiths..... | 3.90 | | 5.40 | 8.12 |
| Cabinetmakers..... | 4.95 | | 4.80 | 7.70 |
| Dyers..... | 3.30 | | | 7.00 |
| Weavers..... | 3.00 | | | 5.49 |
| Grinders in glass works..... | 4.87 | | | 10.92 |
| Common laborers..... | 2.60 | | 3.00 | 5.00 |

This table shows that the weekly wages paid by free-trade European countries is much above the wages paid by European countries in which a protective tariff exists. But it is neither fair nor honest to say that because of protection the wages in this country are higher than in a free-trade European country, and when the statement is made that wages are higher here than in England, where free trade exists, it ought also to be stated that they are still further above the wages of France and Germany, where protection exists. Mr. Powderly says that one good labor organization does more to keep up wages than all the protective tariffs in existence, and Mr. Frick, in his testimony before the tariff commission, acknowledged that tariff has nothing to do with the question of wages.

It was the boast of the Republican party that the passage of the McKinley bill would increase the wages of the laborer. Where and when have they been increased? Has not the manufacturer, instead of the workman, derived all the benefit to be had from this law? Now, Republican speakers and Republican writers, during the campaign of 1888, proclaimed their love for the laborer. They loved him with a love passing that of David and Jonathan, and their chief desire in keeping the Democratic party from power was, that they might do something for him. All that they asked for their guardian-angel duties was, that the workingman might be benefited. The workmen flocked to the polls and voted for Harrison and Morton, and having performed what they considered their part of the arrangement they sat down and waited for the Republican bosses to throw open the gates of the Garden of Eden and invite them to walk in.

Harrison and Morton were elected, and the McKinley bill, increasing duties to so high a figure that every wage-earner in the land was taxed, was enacted. The manufacturer counted his increased profits by thousands, but no increased benefits came to the laborer. In 1892 these same wage-earners arose in their might and rebuked the party that had thus betrayed them. The cry of tariff reform was in the air, but these nabobs were not to be so easily defeated. Jacob when hungry sold his birthright for a mess of pottage, and how easy to crush out the very life of the laborer by pinching hunger. To-day, under the pretence that if the tariff is interfered with they can not compete with foreign markets, they send the honest workman, from whose toil they have grown rich, to tramp the streets for employment and to want for food. Meanwhile, American manufactured goods, made by these same workmen, are sold in Europe cheaper than in America.

An instance of the love of these gentlemen for the workingman was illustrated not long since at the Havemeyer Sugar Refinery in Brooklyn. A committee of the firemen requested that during the heated term of three or four months they might be allowed to work eight hours a day instead of twelve. The heat is so unbearable that last year in that refinery over 500 men were overcome by it and about 100 died. It is a veritable slaughter house, and the only way to save the men from death is to allow them shorter hours during the hot weather. But how was their request met? By a refusal. What if eight hours were enough in that seething hell of heat to exhaust the stoutest man; what cared these protected gentlemen for the long line of funerals, and the widows and orphans they were making. These men must work and die while the American people protect the trust and put millions each year into its coffers.

The McKinley bill abolished the duty on raw sugar, and thus gave the trust free raw material, but, at the same time left a protection of one-half cent per pound on refined sugar, which enabled it to extort just so much from the pockets of the people.

When it is remembered that a difference of one-sixth of a cent per pound in favor of the trust takes \$2,500,000 from the pockets of the people each year, we can form some estimate of its power for evil.

The McKinley tariff does not protect labor. It enters from foreign lands without restriction. Its importation is free, and is a menace to the standard of wages and to the continuance of employment. The manufacturer protests against the introduction of any goods from abroad to compete with his, or which might be bought by his laborers at a lower price; but he demands that the laborers from all the earth may be brought in free and dumped at American factories and mines, and in front of workingmen's homes, so that when increased wages are demanded or reductions resisted these raw recruits may step in and fill the places of the old hands. This importation of labor forces wages downward while a high tariff, combines, and trusts produced thereby, force the price of goods upward. In this way wage-earners are deprived of the recompense they would otherwise receive, and from their hard-wrought earnings are compelled to pay extortionate rates for articles of everyday consumption.

The protection of labor is in organization, and every workingman well knows that throughout the country there has been a systematic effort to throttle labor organizations in order to effect the diminution of wages at the pleasure of the employer, whose alleged love for the wage-earner is a sham and a fraud. Have wage-earners already forgotten that at the time of the passage of the McKinley tariff act they were told it would bring them higher wages; that after it became a law, while the manufacturer profited immensely, determined effort was made to take the life of labor organizations: how wages were cut down, and how the earth of Homestead drank up the lifeblood of the laborer who resisted the attempt to crush out the right of American laborers to protect themselves?

AD VALOREM AND SPECIFIC DUTIES.

The champions of monopoly and high taxes attack us because we are friendly to the levying of ad valorem duties, and to hear them shout in horror one would suppose that it was a new device of the present Congress. Specific duties group a number of articles together and charge upon the cheaper as much as upon the more costly, thereby taxing the poor man upon his cheap article as much as the rich man upon his luxury. They tax by the yard, pound, or gallon, compelling the poor who use cheap goods to pay as much taxes as the rich who use dear goods. They tax cloth that costs 50 cents per yard the same as cloth that costs \$5 per yard. It is equivalent to taxing land the same price per acre whether located in the heart of New York or Chicago or on the Western prairie.

When the same specific duty is collected on a low-priced as on a high-priced yard, pound, bushel, or gallon, it is self-evident that the consumers of the low-priced goods are paying an undue amount of taxes. Tariff should be charged on what a thing is worth. Those who are able to pay a higher duty and purchase the higher-priced goods, should pay more than the poor man upon his low-priced goods.

Upon this subject, Henry Clay, in a speech made by him in 1842, after nine years' experience under the compromise tariff of 1833, said:

What are the other principles of the act? First, there is the principle that a fixed ad valorem duty shall prevail and be in force at all times. For one, I am willing to abide by that principle. There are certain vague notions afloat as to the utility and necessity of specific duties and discrimination, which I am persuaded arise from a want of a right understanding of the subject. We have had the ad valorem principle practically in force ever since the compromise act was passed, and there has been no difficulty in administering the duties of the Treasury on that principle.

It was necessary first to ascertain the value of the goods and then to impose the duty upon them, and from the commencement of the act to this day the ad valorem principle has been substantially in operation. Compare the difference between specific and the ad valorem system of duties, and I maintain that the latter is justly entitled to the preference. The one principle declares that the duty shall be paid upon the real value of the article taxed; the specific principle imposes an equal duty on articles greatly unequal in value.

Coffee, for example (and it is an article which always suggests itself to my thoughts), is one of the articles on which a specific duty has been levied. Now, it is perfectly well known that the Mocha coffee is worth at least twice as much as the coffee of St. Domingo or Cuba; yet both pay the same duty. The tax has no respect to the value, but it is arbitrarily levied on all articles of a specific kind alike, however various and unequal may be their values. I say that in theory, and according to every sound principle of justice, the ad valorem mode of taxation is entitled to the preference. There is, I admit, one objection to it: as the value of an article is a matter subject to opinion, and as opinions will vary, either honestly or fraudulently, there is some difficulty in preventing frauds. But, with the home valuation proposed by my friend from Rhode Island [Mr. SIMMONS], the ad valorem system can be adopted with all practical safety, and will be liable to those chances only of fraud which are inevitable under any and every system. What has been the fact from the origin of the Government until now?

The articles from which the greatest amount of revenue has been drawn, such as woollens, linens, silks, cottons, worsteds, and a few others, have all been taxed on the ad valorem principle, and there has been no difficulty in the operation. I believe, upon the whole, that it is the best mode. I believe that if we adopt a fixed rate ad valorem wherever it can be done, the revenue

will be subjected to fewer frauds than the injustice and frauds incident to specific duties. One of the most prolific sources of the violation of our revenue laws has been, as everybody knows, the effort to get goods of a finer quality and higher value admitted under the lower rate of duty required for those of a lower value. But if the duty were laid ad valorem, there could be no motive for such an effort, and the fraud, in its present form, would have no place.

But even under the McKinley bill more than two hundred and fifty ad valorem duties are levied. In the schedules of "Miscellaneous manufactures of leather," "Leather and manufactures of," in the button industry, in the wood-pulp industry, in Schedule L, pertaining to the silk industry, in Schedule K, relating to wool and manufactures thereof, we find the levying of ad valorem duties.

THE AMERICAN FARMER.

Goldsmith wrote long ago:

Ill fares the land, to hastening ills a prey,
Where wealth accumulates, and men decay.
Princes and lords may flourish or may fade—
A breath can make them, as a breath has made;
But a bold peasantry, their country's pride,
When once destroy'd, can never be supplied.

It is admitted by all economists that the prosperity of the agricultural class is essential to the welfare of a country; and history teaches that neglect of agriculture has been the cause of the decay of the most powerful nations. That it has been the foundation of our own prosperity is proven by a glance at our early history, and in all the stages of our growth we need only to inquire into the condition of our farmers to ascertain if the nation is in a prosperous condition.

This is illustrated by what occurred in 1880 and 1881. There was a complete stagnation in manufacturing and commercial industries, and more than one million mechanics and laborers were thrown out of employment, and in their destitution and consequent misery they took to tramping in search of work.

But crops were good, although prices were not what they should have been, yet the farmers were enabled to relieve the depressed condition of the whole country. Can as much be said of the prosperity of any other class? Manufacturers have had many years of prosperity; so have the owners of extensive mines; but can we say that the prosperity of either of these classes has assured the prosperity of the whole country, much less rescued it from such conditions as existed in 1880 and 1881? The prosperity of these only redounds to the interest of the few.

For the prosperity of the farmer two things are necessary—good crops and good prices. For the first, a bountiful Providence has done all that is necessary. With our vast acreage, each one who desires it can have an abundance of land to till, and the diversity of climate allows of such variety of products that each may choose the line of agriculture he prefers, and be sure that in most years, if he does his part, he will have abundant harvests. But the prices are not so assured; they belong neither to the domain of Providence nor do they depend upon the ability and industry of the farmer. But that something exerts an influence over prices is conceded by all; and by a very large majority, if not by all, that something is believed to be legislation.

True, the Government can not fix a price for any certain articles; but by proper legislation it can remove such restrictions as hinder their regulation by the natural law of supply and demand, and repeal or reform such laws as require the farmer to bear the burden of or be taxed for the interest of other classes. But that such burdens are a great impediment to the prosperity of the farmer is illustrated by comparing the statistics of a manufacturing with those of an agricultural State, taken from the United State census report:

These will show that the aggregate wealth of the State of Pennsylvania in 1850 was \$313 per capita and that of Illinois was much less. During the low-tariff decade from 1850 to 1890 the State of Pennsylvania increased her aggregate wealth to \$487 per capita, while the State of Illinois increased hers to \$509 per capita. From 1860 to 1870, under the high protective tariff, when by action of Government the exchangeable values of her main product were enhanced from 40 to 50 per cent, the State of Pennsylvania increased her wealth to \$1,081 per capita; while the State of Illinois, whose exchangeable value of products was regulated in foreign markets, increased hers only to \$835 per capita, and during the following decade of high protection for the Pennsylvania product that State increased her wealth to \$1,253 per capita, while that of the tributary State of Illinois increased to only \$1,008 per capita.

Let me call your attention to the opinion on this subject of some leading men of both parties. Joseph Medill, editor of the Chicago Tribune, the leading Republican paper of the Northwest, says:

Where, then, is the remedy from the heavy burden of a 50 per cent tax on the necessities of life, both imported and domestic? There is only one element or class able to remove it, and that Samson is sleeping in the lap of Deilah and will not awaken. I, of course, mean the farmers—the plundered, unprotected twenty-five million of geese-like farmers who permit themselves to be plucked of almost every feather by a hundred thousand "protected" monopolists.

While the plowmen act like Issachar's ass and crouch between two

burdens, both will be kept on their backs. The fabricants live focalized in the cities and plot and scheme for the promotion of their selfish interests and bring their united lobby influence to bear on members of Congress; whereas the farmers live isolated and scattered and can not or do not combine in defense of their interests. Hence they are unprotected, unrepresented, and unconscious of what keeps them poor. They are captivated by the specious cry of "protection to American industry," though they get none of it, and of the value of the "protected" home markets to them, as if protected monopolists eat any more than other men.

The president of the National Farmers' Alliance, Mr. L. L. Polk, said before the United States Senate Committee on Agriculture, April 22, 1890:

We protest, and with all reverence, that it is not God's fault. We protest that it is not the farmer's fault. We believe, and so charge, solemnly and deliberately, that it is the fault of the financial system of the Government—a system that has placed on agriculture an undue, unjust, and intolerable proportion of the burdens of taxation.

It is the present system of taxation that has been cheapening not only farm products, but the price of land itself. If it exists much longer is there not danger that the prediction of the New York State assessors will come true? And—

In a few years you will see the present owners of farms in many instances tenants on them. The cities are prospering, though. New York City has added \$50,000,000 property to its real value the past year; Brooklyn, between \$20,000,000 and \$30,000,000; Buffalo, \$5,000,000; Rochester, between \$2,000,000 and \$3,000,000.

The following is taken from the United States census reports:

Of the total wealth of the country in 1850 the farmers owned nearly \$4,000,000,000, or more than one-half. In 1860 the farmer's share was still one-half. In 1880, though half the population was still on farms, his share of the total wealth was \$12,000,000,000, or a little more than one-fourth. That is, while the agricultural half of our population increased their wealth \$4,000,000,000 the other half increased theirs \$23,600,000,000; and this immense amount is mainly in the hands of a few millionaires and not distributed among the many, as is the amount belonging to the agricultural class.

Every farmer knows that he is more prosperous when he has enough products of his farm to exchange for all the clothing, groceries, and other necessities his family may need for the year than when he has to draw the money out of the bank to pay for them, or give his note in case he has no money in the bank. Now, our country has to buy many things from other countries that we do not produce, and when we pay for them "in trade," as the farmer would say, we are more prosperous than when we have to pay for them with money. That is, it is a mark of national prosperity when, instead of paying for our imports with gold, we pay for them in exports of agricultural products, manufactured articles, etc. It follows that the commercial policy that admits of the most exports is the most conducive to the prosperity of the country. History shows that our exports are always larger under a low tariff than they are under a high or protective tariff.

Between 1850 and 1860, under low tariff, our agricultural exports increased 25 per cent yearly. Since then, under protective tariff, they have increased only 3 per cent yearly. In the same low-tariff decade manufactured articles increased 171 per cent; and only 20 per cent in the next twenty years under protective tariff.

The exports of the manufacturers have largely increased, while the exports of the farmers have largely decreased.

These "infant industries," receiving from 40 to 250 per cent protection in the home market, are willing to sell abroad without any protection whatever, and at a lower price. They furnish their agricultural machinery and carriages and other articles to Europe and Australia at prices competing with the nations of the world, underselling them at a fair profit, while they charge the American farmer as much more for their goods as they charge the foreigners as the tariff will permit.

England exported to American countries south of us in 1880 \$51,235,000, while our exports to the same countries were \$3,899,400. Let us reflect what prosperity the reverse of these figures would bring us.

Not only is there a greater demand for our products under a low tariff, but better prices. We have shown that wool was made higher under a low tariff. From 1842-1846, under protection, wheat was \$2 and corn 48 cents; 1846-1850, low tariff, wheat \$1.10, corn 57 cents. After twenty-five years high protection, in 1887, wheat was 70 and corn 39 cents; the price has become lower and lower every year until the present time, under the McKinley tariff, it has reached the bottom.

But the duty being removed or reduced on manufactured articles the farmer would buy them much cheaper. In the following tables the articles are taken that would be needed by a farmer commencing on a farm with everything to buy. These tables were compiled by Mr. Lieb in 1888 from market reports and merchants' price lists, and particular pains has been taken to avoid

exaggeration, the amount of tax being rather under than over estimated.

Table showing prices of commodities with protection, without protection, and manufacturers' tax.

| | Prices with protection. | Prices without protection. | Manufacturers' tax. |
|---------------------------------------|-------------------------|----------------------------|---------------------|
| MATERIALS FOR FARMHOUSE. | | | |
| <i>Domestic manufactures.</i> | | | |
| 6,000 feet joists and scantling..... | \$78.00 | \$63.00 | \$12.00 |
| 5,000 feet flooring..... | 80.00 | 60.00 | 20.00 |
| 1,300 feet common boards..... | 15.80 | 13.20 | 2.40 |
| 3,500 feet siding..... | 77.00 | 70.00 | 7.00 |
| 12,000 shingles..... | 30.00 | 25.80 | 4.20 |
| 25 doors and windows..... | 150.00 | 130.00 | 20.00 |
| 450 feet base-boards..... | 12.60 | 11.60 | 1.00 |
| Front stairs..... | 45.00 | 35.00 | 10.00 |
| Plaster, lime, hair, and lath..... | 161.00 | 131.00 | 30.00 |
| 182 feet cornice..... | 92.00 | 85.64 | 6.36 |
| Paint..... | 50.00 | 30.00 | 20.00 |
| Glass..... | 25.00 | 18.00 | 7.00 |
| Total..... | 815.20 | 676.24 | 139.96 |
| MATERIALS FOR BARN. | | | |
| 3,000 feet siding..... | 75.00 | 69.00 | 6.00 |
| 1,500 feet rafters..... | 22.50 | 21.00 | 1.50 |
| 300 feet sills..... | 4.00 | 3.40 | .60 |
| 300 feet stringers..... | 4.00 | 3.40 | .60 |
| 150 plates..... | 2.00 | 1.70 | .30 |
| 400 posts..... | 7.00 | 6.20 | .80 |
| 2,000 feet sheeting..... | 35.00 | 31.00 | 4.00 |
| 1,300 feet upper floor..... | 23.00 | 20.40 | 2.60 |
| 2,500 feet lower floor..... | 25.00 | 20.00 | 5.00 |
| 1,600 feet lower joists..... | 20.00 | 16.80 | 3.20 |
| 1,300 feet upper joists..... | 16.00 | 13.40 | 2.60 |
| 2,000 feet bin lumber..... | 50.00 | 46.00 | 4.00 |
| 16,000 shingles..... | 48.00 | 42.00 | 6.00 |
| 200 pounds nails..... | 6.00 | 3.50 | 2.50 |
| Hardware..... | 5.00 | 3.00 | 2.00 |
| Total..... | 352.50 | 310.80 | 41.70 |
| FENCING. | | | |
| <i>Outside.</i> | | | |
| 22,000 feet fencing lumber..... | 440.00 | 396.00 | 44.00 |
| 2,000 fence posts..... | 200.00 | 160.00 | 40.00 |
| 200 pounds fencing nails..... | 6.00 | 3.50 | 2.50 |
| 2 pairs hinges..... | 2.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| <i>Inside.</i> | | | |
| 5,000 feet fencing lumber..... | 100.00 | 90.00 | 10.00 |
| 1,000 fence posts..... | 100.00 | 80.00 | 20.00 |
| 100 pounds fencing nails..... | 3.00 | 1.80 | 1.20 |
| 2 pairs small hinges..... | 1.50 | 1.00 | .50 |
| 2,000 pounds barbed wire..... | 12.00 | 6.00 | 6.00 |
| 500 pickets..... | 5.00 | 4.00 | 1.00 |
| 300 feet, planed 2 by 4..... | 7.00 | 5.60 | 1.40 |
| 150 feet, planed, 12-inch lumber..... | 2.50 | 2.00 | .50 |
| 20 sawed posts..... | 5.00 | 3.50 | 1.50 |
| Total..... | 884.00 | 754.40 | 129.60 |
| FARM MACHINERY. | | | |
| 1 wagon..... | 75.00 | 60.00 | 15.00 |
| 1 reaper..... | 350.00 | 275.00 | 75.00 |
| 1 mower..... | 150.00 | 130.00 | 20.00 |
| 3 breaking plows..... | 45.00 | 35.00 | 10.00 |
| 3 double cultivators..... | 45.00 | 30.00 | 15.00 |
| 1 harrow..... | 10.00 | 8.00 | 2.00 |
| 1 hay rake..... | 25.00 | 20.00 | 5.00 |
| 1 wheel drill..... | 50.00 | 35.00 | 15.00 |
| 1 corn planter..... | 25.00 | 20.00 | 5.00 |
| 1 fanning mill..... | 25.00 | 20.00 | 5.00 |
| 1 feed cutter..... | 15.00 | 12.00 | 3.00 |
| 1 wheelbarrow..... | 5.00 | 4.00 | 1.00 |
| 1 grindstone..... | 3.00 | 2.50 | .50 |
| Total..... | 823.00 | 651.50 | 171.50 |
| FARM IMPLEMENTS AND SUPPLIES. | | | |
| 3 sets double harness..... | 100.00 | 75.00 | 25.00 |
| 2 halters..... | 2.00 | 1.50 | .50 |
| 2 bridles..... | 3.00 | 2.25 | .75 |
| 2 saddles..... | 20.00 | 14.55 | 5.45 |
| 2 hoes..... | 1.50 | 1.20 | .30 |
| 1 spade..... | 1.00 | .70 | .30 |
| 1 garden rake..... | .50 | .30 | .20 |
| 3 pitchforks..... | 4.00 | 3.00 | 1.00 |
| 1 scythe..... | 3.00 | 2.25 | .75 |
| 1 hatchet..... | .50 | .35 | .15 |
| 2 saws..... | 2.00 | 1.25 | .75 |
| 1 drawingknife..... | 1.00 | .65 | .35 |
| 2 pumps..... | 20.00 | 16.00 | 4.00 |
| 1 ax..... | 1.00 | .75 | .25 |
| 1 log chain..... | 5.00 | 3.00 | 2.00 |
| 6 pairs trace chains..... | 6.00 | 3.00 | 3.00 |
| 3 doubletrees and whiffletrees..... | 2.50 | 2.00 | .50 |
| 1 brush..... | .50 | .38 | .12 |
| 1 currycomb..... | .20 | .15 | .05 |
| 2 files..... | .50 | .36 | .14 |

Table showing prices of commodities, etc.—Continued.

| | Prices with pro- tection. | Prices without protec- tion. | Manufac- turers' tax. |
|--|---------------------------------|---------------------------------------|-----------------------------|
| FARM IMPLEMENTS AND SUPPLIES—CON- tinued. | | | |
| 20 seamless bags..... | 5.00 | 3.75 | \$1.25 |
| 1 scoop shovel..... | 1.50 | 1.00 | .50 |
| 1 basket..... | 1.00 | .70 | .30 |
| Total..... | 181.70 | 134.09 | 47.61 |
| HOUSEHOLD FURNITURE. | | | |
| 1 heating stove..... | 15.00 | 10.35 | 4.65 |
| 1 zinc..... | 1.00 | .60 | .40 |
| 6 joints pipe..... | .60 | .34 | .26 |
| 2 glass lamps..... | 1.50 | 1.03 | .47 |
| 2 rattan rockers..... | 7.00 | 5.18 | 1.82 |
| 6 wooden chairs..... | 3.00 | 2.22 | .78 |
| 50 yards carpet..... | 40.00 | 30.00 | 10.00 |
| 10 square yards oilcloth..... | 5.00 | 3.56 | 1.44 |
| 3 bedroom sets..... | 75.00 | 55.55 | 19.45 |
| 1 clock..... | 4.00 | 2.96 | 1.04 |
| 6 window shades..... | 3.00 | 2.07 | .93 |
| 12 towels..... | 4.00 | 2.96 | 1.04 |
| 1 pair scissors..... | .50 | .37 | .13 |
| 3 spring beds..... | 15.00 | 10.00 | 5.00 |
| 3 wool mattresses..... | 15.00 | 9.09 | 5.91 |
| 6 pairs wool blankets..... | 18.00 | 11.25 | 6.75 |
| 50 yards sheeting..... | 10.00 | 7.50 | 2.50 |
| 1 dozen comforts..... | 12.00 | 10.00 | 2.00 |
| 2 looking-glasses..... | 5.00 | 3.12 | 1.88 |
| 3 coverlets..... | 3.00 | 2.25 | .75 |
| 2 comforts..... | 2.00 | 1.54 | .46 |
| Total..... | 239.00 | 171.94 | 67.06 |
| KITCHEN FURNITURE. | | | |
| 1 cook stove..... | 30.00 | 18.00 | 12.00 |
| 1 lot cooking utensils..... | 3.00 | 2.07 | .93 |
| 2 iron kettles..... | 2.00 | 1.30 | .70 |
| 1 copper kettle..... | 3.00 | 2.07 | .93 |
| 6 sheet-iron pans..... | 6.00 | 3.52 | 2.48 |
| 1 lot iron cooking utensils..... | 2.00 | 1.30 | .70 |
| 6 ash buckets..... | .75 | .44 | .31 |
| 1 joint stovepipe..... | .60 | .35 | .25 |
| 1 table..... | 5.00 | 3.70 | 1.30 |
| 6 chairs..... | 3.00 | 2.22 | .78 |
| 1 dozen knives and forks..... | 3.00 | 2.22 | .78 |
| 2 dozen spoons..... | 2.00 | 1.48 | .52 |
| 1 butcher knife..... | .50 | .37 | .13 |
| 1 coal-oil can..... | .50 | .34 | .16 |
| 6 flatirons..... | 1.50 | 1.00 | .50 |
| 1 wash boiler..... | 1.25 | .73 | .52 |
| 2 tubs..... | 1.50 | 1.11 | .39 |
| 2 pails..... | .60 | .44 | .16 |
| 1 churn..... | 1.00 | .74 | .26 |
| 6 crocks..... | 1.20 | .96 | .24 |
| 2 washboards (zinc)..... | .70 | .42 | .28 |
| 2 dozen dishes, assorted..... | 10.00 | 6.45 | 3.55 |
| 2 tablecloths..... | 3.00 | 2.22 | .78 |
| 2 lots glassware..... | 3.00 | 2.07 | .93 |
| 1 glass lamp..... | .50 | .34 | .16 |
| Total..... | 85.60 | 55.86 | 29.74 |
| HOUSEHOLDER'S WARDROBE. | | | |
| 1 work suit..... | 7.00 | 4.73 | 2.27 |
| 1 good suit..... | 20.00 | 13.52 | 6.48 |
| 1 overcoat..... | 15.00 | 10.15 | 4.85 |
| 2 flannel shirts..... | 1.50 | .86 | .64 |
| 2 flannel drawers..... | 1.50 | .86 | .64 |
| 1 wool hat..... | 3.00 | 1.71 | 1.29 |
| 6 wool socks..... | 2.00 | 1.14 | .86 |
| 1 wool cap..... | 1.00 | .57 | .43 |
| 1 pair boots..... | 5.00 | 4.00 | 1.00 |
| 1 pair shoes..... | 3.50 | 2.80 | 0.70 |
| 1 pair rubber boots..... | 3.00 | 2.40 | .60 |
| 1 pair suspenders..... | .50 | .36 | .14 |
| 1 pair buck gloves..... | 1.00 | .63 | .37 |
| 1 pair wool gloves..... | .50 | .29 | .21 |
| 1 wool scarf..... | .50 | .29 | .21 |
| 1 rubber coat..... | 3.50 | 2.69 | .81 |
| 1 umbrella..... | 1.00 | .66 | .34 |
| 3 linen handkerchiefs..... | 1.00 | .74 | .26 |
| 1 silk tie..... | .50 | .33 | .17 |
| 1 razor..... | 1.25 | .83 | .42 |
| 1 pocketknife..... | 1.25 | .83 | .42 |
| 1 shaving brush..... | .35 | .26 | .09 |
| 1 case shaving soap..... | .15 | .11 | .04 |
| 1 neck comfort..... | .50 | .29 | .21 |
| 4 cotton shirts..... | 3.00 | 2.25 | .75 |
| 2 pair cotton drawers..... | 1.00 | .69 | .31 |
| Total..... | 78.70 | 53.99 | 24.71 |
| HOUSEWIFE'S WARDROBE. | | | |
| 3 calico dresses..... | 2.25 | 1.75 | .50 |
| 3 calico aprons..... | .50 | .40 | .10 |
| 2 woolen dresses..... | 16.00 | 9.40 | 6.60 |
| 2 balmoral skirts..... | 3.00 | 1.90 | 1.10 |
| 2 cotton skirts..... | 1.50 | 1.25 | .25 |
| 2 suits flannels..... | 3.00 | 1.71 | 1.29 |
| 2 suits cotton underwear..... | 2.00 | 1.42 | .58 |

Table showing prices of commodities, etc.—Continued.

| | Prices with pro- tection. | Prices without protec- tion. | Manu- facturers' tax. |
|--|---------------------------------|---------------------------------------|-----------------------------|
| HOUSEWIFE'S WARDROBE—continued. | | | |
| 3 pairs cotton hose..... | 1.00 | .71 | \$0.29 |
| 3 pairs wool hose..... | 1.50 | .90 | .60 |
| 1 woolen cloak..... | 12.00 | 8.11 | 3.89 |
| 1 woolen shawl..... | 6.00 | 3.21 | 2.79 |
| 1 woolen hood..... | 1.25 | .71 | .54 |
| 1 straw bonnet..... | 1.00 | .77 | .23 |
| 2 pairs shoes..... | 4.00 | 3.20 | .80 |
| 1 pair rubbers..... | .50 | .40 | .10 |
| 1 parasol..... | 2.00 | 1.60 | .40 |
| 1 veil..... | .70 | .46 | .24 |
| 5 yards ribbons..... | .50 | .33 | .17 |
| 3 linen collars..... | .50 | .38 | .12 |
| 3 pairs linen cuffs..... | .60 | .46 | .14 |
| 3 linen handkerchiefs..... | .75 | .55 | .20 |
| 1 tuck comb..... | .25 | .18 | .07 |
| 1 tooth brush..... | .35 | .27 | .08 |
| 1 pair wool mitts..... | .50 | .29 | .21 |
| 1 pair gloves..... | 1.25 | .78 | .47 |
| Total..... | 61.90 | 40.14 | 21.76 |
| TWO BOYS' WARDROBES. | | | |
| 2 work suits..... | 10.00 | 6.76 | 3.24 |
| 2 good suits..... | 30.00 | 20.70 | 9.30 |
| 2 overcoats..... | 30.00 | 20.70 | 9.30 |
| 6 flannel shirts..... | 6.00 | 3.42 | 2.58 |
| 6 white shirts..... | 4.00 | 3.25 | .75 |
| 4 pairs wool drawers..... | 4.00 | 2.28 | 1.72 |
| 6 pairs wool socks..... | 2.00 | 1.14 | .86 |
| 2 wool hats..... | 4.00 | 2.28 | 1.72 |
| 2 wool caps..... | 2.00 | 1.14 | .86 |
| 2 pairs boots..... | 8.00 | 6.40 | 1.60 |
| 2 pairs suspenders..... | 1.00 | .72 | .28 |
| 2 pairs rubber boots..... | 7.00 | 5.60 | 1.40 |
| 2 pairs rubber shoes..... | 4.00 | 3.20 | .80 |
| 2 pairs wool mitts..... | 1.00 | 0.67 | .33 |
| 2 pairs buck gloves..... | 2.00 | 1.25 | .75 |
| 2 silk neckties..... | .50 | .33 | .17 |
| 4 linen handkerchiefs..... | 1.00 | .74 | .26 |
| 2 neck comforters..... | 1.00 | .67 | .33 |
| Total..... | 117.50 | 81.25 | 36.25 |
| TWO GIRLS' WARDROBE. | | | |
| 4 calico dresses..... | 3.00 | 2.50 | .50 |
| 4 calico aprons..... | 1.00 | .85 | .15 |
| 2 alpaca dresses..... | 18.00 | 10.60 | 7.40 |
| 2 wool dresses..... | 8.00 | 5.00 | 3.00 |
| 2 balmoral skirts..... | 3.00 | 1.90 | 1.10 |
| 4 cotton skirts..... | 3.00 | 2.00 | 1.00 |
| 4 suits flannels..... | 5.00 | 2.86 | 2.14 |
| 4 suits cotton underwear..... | 4.00 | 2.13 | 1.87 |
| 6 pairs cotton hose..... | 2.00 | 1.42 | .58 |
| 6 pairs wool hose..... | 3.00 | 1.80 | 1.20 |
| 2 woolen cloaks..... | 30.00 | 20.28 | 9.72 |
| 2 woolen shawls..... | 10.00 | 5.33 | 4.67 |
| 2 woolen hoods..... | 2.00 | 1.20 | .80 |
| 2 straw hats..... | 2.00 | 1.54 | .46 |
| 4 pairs shoes..... | 8.00 | 6.40 | 1.60 |
| 2 pairs rubbers..... | 1.00 | .80 | .20 |
| 2 parasols..... | 3.50 | 2.80 | .70 |
| 2 veils..... | 1.50 | 1.00 | .50 |
| 12 yards ribbon..... | 1.20 | .80 | .40 |
| 6 linen collars..... | 1.00 | .77 | .23 |
| 6 pair linen cuffs..... | 1.20 | .92 | .28 |
| 2 round combs..... | .30 | .22 | .08 |
| 6 handkerchiefs..... | 2.00 | 1.48 | .52 |
| 2 pairs wool mitts..... | 1.00 | .57 | .43 |
| 2 pairs gloves..... | 2.00 | 1.25 | .75 |
| 2 toothbrushes..... | .50 | .39 | .11 |
| Total..... | 117.20 | 76.81 | 40.39 |
| DOMESTIC SUPPLIES. | | | |
| Sugar..... | 1.00 | .68 | .32 |
| Tea..... | .50 | .50 | — |
| Coffee..... | .50 | .50 | — |
| Molasses..... | .50 | .40 | .10 |
| Salt..... | 1.00 | .74 | .26 |
| Vinegar..... | .50 | .37 | .13 |
| Rice..... | 1.00 | .43 | .57 |
| Soda..... | .25 | .14 | .11 |
| Soap—castile..... | .25 | .16 | .09 |
| Wire clothesline..... | 2.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Starch..... | .25 | .13 | .12 |
| Carpet tacks..... | .25 | .14 | .11 |
| Nails..... | .50 | .37 | .13 |
| Thread..... | 1.00 | .65 | .35 |
| Needles..... | .25 | .20 | .05 |
| Pens..... | .10 | .07 | .03 |
| Ink..... | .10 | .07 | .03 |
| Paper..... | .10 | .08 | .02 |
| Pins..... | .10 | .08 | .02 |
| Hairpins..... | .10 | .07 | .03 |
| Glycerine..... | .50 | .30 | .20 |
| Total..... | 10.75 | 7.08 | 3.67 |

Table showing prices of commodities, etc.—Continued.

SUMMARY.

| | Total amount without manufacturer's tax. | Manufacturer's tax. | Amount paid on account of the tax. |
|--|--|---------------------|------------------------------------|
| MATERIALS FOR PERMANENT IMPROVEMENTS.^a | | | |
| Materials for house..... | \$676.24 | \$139.96 | \$816.20 |
| Materials for barn..... | 310.80 | 41.70 | 352.50 |
| Materials for fence..... | 754.40 | 129.60 | 884.00 |
| Total..... | 1,741.44 | 311.26 | 2,052.70 |
| FARM MACHINERY AND SUPPLIES.^b | | | |
| Farm machinery..... | 651.50 | 171.50 | 823.00 |
| Implement and supplies..... | 134.09 | 47.61 | 181.70 |
| Total..... | 785.59 | 219.11 | 1,004.70 |
| FURNITURE.^c | | | |
| Household furniture..... | 171.94 | 67.66 | 239.60 |
| Kitchen furniture..... | 55.86 | 29.74 | 85.60 |
| Total..... | 227.80 | 97.40 | 325.20 |
| ARTICLES OF DOMESTIC CONSUMPTION.^d | | | |
| Householder's wardrobe..... | 53.99 | 24.71 | 78.70 |
| Housewife's wardrobe..... | 40.14 | 21.76 | 61.90 |
| Two boys' wardrobe..... | 81.25 | 36.35 | 117.60 |
| Two girls' wardrobe..... | 76.81 | 40.39 | 117.20 |
| Domestic supplies..... | 7.08 | 3.67 | 10.75 |
| Total..... | 259.27 | 126.78 | 386.05 |

^a Increased cost on account of manufacturer's tax, 18 per cent.

^b Increased cost on account of manufacturer's tax, 28 per cent.

^c Increased cost on account of manufacturer's tax, 43 per cent.

^d Increased cost on account of manufacturer's tax, 49 per cent.

A careful study of these tables and a comparison of them by the farmer with his own account books will serve to enlighten him why the manufacturer has constantly grown richer, although his works were often idle on account of strikes and lockouts, while he, though toiling early and late and living very frugally, has constantly grown poorer, and was perhaps driven by dire necessity to put a mortgage upon his farm.

THE LATE ELECTIONS.

But it has been said by gentlemen on the other side of this House that at the elections last fall the Democratic party was overwhelmingly defeated, and hence that the people at the polls have repudiated that reform of the tariff which they so earnestly demanded in 1892. That the Democratic party was defeated in 1893, I admit; that the people have abandoned their demands for tariff reform, I deny.

Mr. Chairman, let us as Democrats look the situation squarely in the face and inquire the cause of that defeat.

The first reason was the continuance of Republicans in office who all their lives had worked for the destruction of the Democratic party. All over this land there are townships where the sole boon asked by the sturdy Democrats is that they be permitted to receive their mail from a Democratic postmaster; but this boon is denied and the Republican appointee, who has cursed and attempted to destroy from year to year the party which they loved so well, still holds rule at the post-office where he keeps hanging on the walls pictures of his party leaders. Look around you; a year has nearly past since the present Administration came to power, and a Republican who found especial delight in removing hundreds upon hundreds of the brightest and most active Democrats from office, solely because they were Democrats, is still the General Superintendent of the Railway Mail Service. When we remember that within 30 days after the inauguration of President Harrison on March 4, 1889, every division superintendent of the Railway Mail Service in the United States was a Republican; that between March 4 and August 30, 1889, more than two thousand Democratic postal clerks were removed for purely partisan reasons, while most of those who remained in service during the Harrison Administration were reduced in grade to make room for Republican clerks of inferior qualifications, can you wonder at the apathy of Democrats?

Another reason for the result of those elections was an ill-advised order of the Commissioner of Pensions whereby pensioners were suspended without notice. This can not occur again owing to legislation of the present Congress, and were it in our power the first cause of trouble which I have stated would be speedily remedied.

Again, a financial crisis had been brought about by evil legislation at the hands of the Republican party, and the dire effects of which had been predicted by Democratic leaders. A hungry man has no heart to reason from cause to effect, and many blamed the Democratic party for the calamity which had been brought upon the country by the Republicans.

No general can win a victory with troops in sympathy with the enemy, and an administration to win complete success should have officers and men desirous of its welfare.

THE CIVIL SERVICE

may be defined to be a piece of legislation which enables Republicans to oust Democrats from office during a Republican Administration, and to retain Republicans in office during a Democratic Administration. Looking to the Pension Office we find 1,300 Republicans to 247 Democrats, and 412 ladies. Four-fifths of the members of the board of review are Republicans, and two-thirds of the board of revision are Republicans. In the medical division we find 85 Republicans to 26 Democrats, and 30 ladies, and as these Republican bodies move along with a snail's pace in the adjustment of claims, while the old veterans who followed their country's flag to the battlefield, ready to die if need be for the Stars and Stripes they love so well, many of them war-scarred, broken in health, diseased, in actual want, watch and wait in great anxiety for the pensions due them.

Mr. Chairman, the Democratic majority in this House was sent here upon the issue of tariff reform, and every Democrat who deserts his party now relinquishes the chief principle of Democracy. The Democratic party must not fail the people. Four years of the prior administration of our party placed in the Treasury an available surplus of over \$60,000,000. The annual revenues were nearly \$100,000,000 in excess of the Government's needs. We had accumulated \$98,000,000 of gold above the reserve of \$100,000,000. Business flourished and labor was well employed. The Republican party came to power. It passed the bullion-purchasing act of 1890, which in one year sent \$68,000,000 of our gold to Europe, decreased the free gold in our Treasury at the end of Mr. Harrison's term to \$970,000, and the evil effects of which have almost bankrupted the country.

These are fearful, turbulent, angry streams into which the Republican party has carried our National Government, but if we act as faithful pilots and steer the Ship of State free from the dangers that surround her, the threatening rocks and shoals will be passed in triumph, and we shall glide with renewed vigor upon the ocean of happiness and prosperity. Then may we sing the song of an American poet:

Sail on, O Ship of State!
Sail on, O Union, strong and great!
Humanity with all its fears,
With all the hopes of future years,
Is hanging breathless on thy fate!
Our hearts, our hopes, our prayers, our tears,
Our faith triumphant o'er our fears,
Are all with thee—are all with thee.

[Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. DINGLEY Mr. Chairman, the title of the pending tariff bill is a misnomer. It purports to be a bill to provide revenue. It is in fact, however, a bill to abolish revenue. It proposes to surrender seventy-six millions, more than one-third of the revenue derived from customs.

The party which is responsible for it has, in season and out of season, denounced the Republican tariff policy which has been in force for thirty-two years, as one which sacrifices revenue in order to maintain protection of home industries. The Democratic party, now in possession of full power for the first time since 1860, proposes as a substitute a so-called revenue tariff which sacrifices revenue in order to overthrow protection.

Moreover, this surrender of seventy-six millions of revenue from customs is proposed at a time when the Secretary of the Treasury, representing the party in power, officially informs Congress that for the next fiscal year nearly every dollar of revenue that might be expected from customs duties, without change of existing laws, will be required to meet the ordinary expenditures of the National Government,—the internal-revenue tax on tobacco, cigars, and whisky being substantially sufficient to pay pension obligations,—and when any reduction of revenue from customs will assuredly leave a deficit. Instead of a tariff for revenue only, what is proposed is in fact a tariff for a deficiency only.

Such a wholesale reduction of revenue from customs duties is proposed, indeed, in the face of the official report of the Secretary of the Treasury that in the first six months of the present fiscal year there has been an actual deficit of more than thirty-seven millions, to be increased to more than sixty millions in the balance of the year, brought about, in my judgment, by the industrial and business depression caused mainly by the distrust and disturbance induced by the anticipation of just such revolutionary tariff legislation as this bill seeks to enact into law.

Six years ago a distinguished Democratic leader, then and now occupying the exalted position of the Presidency of the United States, justified far less sweeping and revolutionary tariff legislation than this (which was most emphatically condemned in the national elections of 1888) on the ground that "a condition," to wit, the necessity of reducing the revenue, "and not a theory, confronts us." It might have been supposed that the reduction of the revenue sixty millions in 1890 by removing the duty on sugar so that revenue and expenditure became substantially equal—every dollar of the surplus created before the reduction of the revenue having been devoted to the payment of the interest-bearing debt—would have satisfied such a yearning for tariff revision. But it is evident from the recent message of the same distinguished Democratic leader indorsing the pending bill, as well as from the defense which its advocates make on this floor and in the majority report, that the argument which did duty so vociferously in 1888 is reversed for the present exigency. It is no longer the actual "condition," but only the "theory" often formulated in Democratic platforms that is allowed to confront the Democratic vision.

If the actual "condition" of the national finances and not a blind pursuit of a partisan "theory" controlled the course of the Democratic majority, they would hesitate long before disturbing the admirable balance between national outgo and income which existed in 1892 and 1893, under existing laws, which would have existed the present fiscal year if industries and business had not been paralyzed by the distrust caused by the anticipation of revolutionary tariff changes, and which, according to the Secretary of the Treasury, would exist in the next fiscal year and the years subsequent, in case there should be no change in our existing revenue system.

WHERE REVENUE IS SURRENDERED.

Mr. Chairman, the friends of the proposed tariff revision defend it on the ground that it reduces the taxation of the masses of the people.

This claim invites an inquiry into the character of the imported articles said to be used by the masses, on which it is proposed to reduce duties and surrender revenue. I read from the comparative tables presented by the Democratic majority of the committee, which show how much revenue has been remitted on each imported article, on the basis of the importations of last year:

| | |
|--|-------------|
| On Havana and other foreign cigars and leaf tobacco | \$3,303,207 |
| On liquors | 1,276,990 |
| On laces and embroideries | 3,075,779 |
| On silks and silk plushes | 3,196,631 |
| On kid gloves and jewelry | 1,238,797 |
| On ostrich feathers, downs, artificial flowers, etc. | 230,165 |
| On opium for smoking | 400,073 |
| On plate glass and chinaware | 690,240 |
| On paintings and statuary | 339,263 |
| On perfumery, cosmetics, and fancy articles for smokers .. | 101,250 |

On the assumption of the majority of the committee that all of the duty is added to make the price here, the toiling masses must be greatly relieved by the surrender of \$14,112,397 of duties on these articles! [Laughter.]

But these are by no means the only imported luxuries or articles of voluntary use (on which all statesmen have heretofore thought it wise to impose the heaviest duties), where reductions have been made by this bill.

It will be observed that more than half of the woolen goods imported last year were goods of fine quality used by the well-to-do, indeed generally demanded by a class of our people of liberal means who are not content with equally good American goods at a lower price, but will have foreign goods—they are English, you know—and who are entirely willing to pay the highest duties to obtain them. Of the \$21,723,788 of revenue surrendered by the reduction of duties on manufactures of wool, not less than \$11,000,000 is on fine woollens of this character, which, under the circumstances of their importation and use, are practically articles of luxury or of voluntary use, and are therefore articles on which the highest duties should be retained.

A very large proportion of the imports of manufactures of cotton, on which the bill proposes to remit \$3,448,020 of revenue by a reduction of duties, is fine and fancy cottons in the nature of articles of voluntary use; and the same may be said of many imported articles in other schedules on which duties are reduced by this bill.

Not far from \$20,000,000 of the \$76,000,000 of revenue surrendered by this bill comes from articles of luxury or voluntary use.

This bill also proposes to surrender \$6,284,259 of the revenue received last year from the duty on imported tin plates, nearly all of which is practically now paid by the foreign manufacturer and exporter, notwithstanding the ridicule which the free-trade theorist heaps on the contention of the friends of protection that where the foreigner finds that he is in danger of losing a foreign

market in consequence of the encouragement given home industries by protection, he invariably reduces his prices and thereby practically pays in part or in whole the protective duty, in order to hold his position in such foreign market.

From 1883 to 1891, during which time there was a revenue-only duty of 1 cent per pound on imported tin plate, under which no tin plates could be made in this country, the average price, including the duty of \$1.08 per box, was \$4.86 per box. July 1, 1891, the duty was increased 1.2 cents per pound, or \$1.35 per box. Yet it is stated by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DALZELL], who has investigated the subject, that the average price of tin plate to the consumer in this country has not been raised by the increase of duty. No one claims that the increase has been over 25 cents per box. The Welsh manufacturers, finding that under the new protective duty tin plate was being successfully made in the United States, lowered their price, which had been previously fixed as they pleased, in order to meet the new competition in this country and hold their American markets, thus practically paying into the Treasury of the United States about \$3,000,000. In their zeal to overthrow the protection which has already established between forty and fifty tin-plate manufacturing in this country, producing tin plate at the rate of many million pounds per annum, and which within five years would have furnished all the tin plate we require at reduced prices, the framers of this so called revenue tariff propose not only to cripple our own tin-plate industry, but also to surrender six and a quarter millions of revenue to the Welsh tin-plate manufacturers.

While it is more difficult to show so definitely in other schedules in which the duties have been reduced, as the circumstances enable us to do in the case of the reduction of the duty on tin plate, that there is a large class of imported articles similar to those that we are enabled to make here on account of protective duties, on which the foreign manufacturer pays a part of the duty in order to meet the new competition here and hold our markets as far as possible, yet there can be no doubt of the fact. The increase of from 10 to 15 per cent made by the tariff act of 1890 in the duty on certain kinds of fine cottons and woollens did not increase their price to consumers here. The foreign manufacturers simply reduced their prices to the extent of the increase of duty, and thus practically themselves paid all the increase of duty. No wonder they are rejoiced at the proposal of the majority of the Ways and Means Committee to remit so much of their contribution toward our revenue, not only in the woollen, but also in the cotton, metal, agricultural, and lumber schedules, and give them a better opportunity to send their goods to our markets to take the place of domestic goods.

There is remitted to Canada \$1,445,983 in abolished or reduced duties on lumber and over \$2,000,000 in reduced duties on Canadian animals and farm products competing with our farm products, not to mention over \$3,000,000 of revenue remitted on imported wool—over \$11,000,000 remissions of revenue now paid into our Treasury by foreign farmers and wool-growers seeking our markets.

Indeed, so far as I have observed, the only rejoicing over the prospect of the substitution of the pending tariff bill for the protective tariffs of the past thirty years, has been in Canada and Europe. In this country up to date the public expressions have been mainly those of condemnation.

INCREASED IMPORTATIONS EXPECTED.

Mr. Chairman, the President in his recent message and the report of the majority remark that notwithstanding the pending tariff bill would result in a loss of revenue to the extent of \$76,000,000 and a deficiency even larger, on the basis of the imports of last year, yet that this would only be temporary, as the reduction of duties would, in their judgment, increase the importations, and the lower duties on increased importations would soon offset in part, and ultimately all, the apparent loss of revenue.

It is well for Congress and the people to face the results which the Democratic majority who have framed this bill avow they are laboring to bring about. They defend their policy on the ground that it is intended to so increase importations of foreign products to take the place of domestic products—for it must be remembered that duties are reduced mainly only on articles that can be produced or made here—as to make the reduced duties yield as much revenue as the higher duties which they supplant.

Have gentlemen considered fully what this means? The value of the dutiable merchandise imported last year was about \$400,000,000, which paid a duty of only a million and a half less than \$200,000,000, the remaining importations (\$444,000,000) having been free of duty. (Parenthetically, I may remark that the fact we now import nearly \$400,000,000 of dutiable goods, three-fourths of which we can and ought to make for ourselves, does not seem

to sustain the free-trade assumption that we are now manufacturing far more than our people can consume.)

The same dutiable merchandise imported under the pending bill would yield \$76,000,000 less revenue. Now, in order to offset this loss, there would have to be an increase in the importations of about \$250,000,000, foreign valuation, as the average duty of the pending bill on dutiable merchandise is about 30 per cent. This would be a sudden increase of 60 per cent in the importations of foreign goods which we can make here, and would necessarily suddenly diminish the demand for domestic goods and for labor to produce or make them to this extent. Do our friends on the other side—I mean the other side of this House, not on the other side of the Atlantic; they understand it and are chuckling over it—do our Democratic friends appreciate fully what disasters to all our American industries would follow such a wholesale loss of American markets?

For example, the imports of woolen goods last year were about \$37,000,000, on which it is proposed to surrender a revenue of nearly \$22,000,000 by a reduction of duties. Now, in order to offset that loss there must be an increase of importations of woolens to the extent of about \$60,000,000, foreign valuation, which would suddenly raise the importations of woolen goods to nearly \$100,000,000 instead of \$36,000,000. Imagine what a wreck of American woolen mills there would be with such a loss of their home markets.

"But what of that?" exclaims the free-trade disciple. "Do you object to having \$250,000,000 more wealth come into this country?" I reply, if it is wealth that we can not produce at all, or only with an expenditure of a larger amount of labor than elsewhere, and we want such products for consumption, we do not object, but on the contrary desire it. But if it is products which we must pay for and which we can and ought to produce for ourselves, and whose coming here will deprive our own industries and labor of the opportunity to produce or make here, then we do not want them to come into our market because their coming diminishes to that extent the productive opportunities of our own people.

I am aware that the free-trade school of economists affirm that it is better for us to import \$250,000,000 in goods which we can make here in exchange for our exports, than it is to import a similar amount of gold or money. It is sufficient to say in reply that when gold is imported it does not take the place of goods which we ought to make here and thus injure our own industries and productive capacity, as is the result when we import such goods; but on the contrary, not only permits our industries to go on without disturbance, but also increases the capital on which production depends and adds to the basis on which our currency rests.

"But these \$250,000,000 additional of imported goods will not come here unless we have an equal amount of products to exchange for them," says the free-trader, "and this implies that the labor formerly employed in manufacturing industries have gone to producing something else that they can produce to better advantage." I reply, that for a time, or until our consumptive capacity was impaired, the goods would come in excess of exports, as they did for thirteen or fifteen years before the war, in return for our gold or for our evidences of indebtedness, which would in the end lead to a collapse as it did in 1857-'58 and '59. It would be impossible also for us to all go to the farm or into the crude industries, as the free-trade programme contemplates without lowering the prices of products of these industries, diminishing the value of our production and consequently our earning and consumptive capacity. In other words, the free-trade policy would lead to disaster.

THE "MARKETS OF THE WORLD."

But ah! listen to the siren song of the President's message and the majority report! They comfort our industries with the promise, as did one of old, not perhaps of possession of the kingdoms of the world, but of the capture of the markets of the world, as compensation for the loss of so much of the markets at home.

Markets for manufactured goods? Where? How? The whole world outside of the United States imports only ninety millions of woolens, which, even if we could capture every dollar of these imports, would not compensate for the woolens that would have to be imported to supplant our own goods in our own markets in order to prevent a loss of revenue by the reductions of duty proposed by this bill. What chance do we stand to capture these markets more rapidly than we have already been doing, in the face of the fierce competition of Great Britain, France, Germany, Italy, Austria, Switzerland, and other machine-using nations with cheaper labor? [Applause on the Republican side.]

Why surrender our own markets in order to capture other markets? How could this help us in competing for the markets of the world? It must be remembered that the chief reliance of

every nation is its own home market. Even the United Kingdom, which on account of its contracted insular position is compelled even to wage war to capture foreign markets, sells \$136 of its production of \$172 per inhabitant in its home market, and only \$36 in the markets of the world. And the United States, which produces \$200 per inhabitant, sells \$183 of this immense production, more than Great Britain exports and consumes at home, in our home markets, the best in the world.

Experience shows that under protection, which maintains our home market for our own industries, and thus increases the prosperity and consuming power of the masses, we are able to buy and import more of articles which we do not produce than we otherwise could, as well as produce more; so that the net result is a larger foreign trade and larger exports, brought about by the increase of consumption and importation of free goods which we do not produce, and the increased production caused by the encouragement of home industries. Our foreign trade has been 50 per cent more per inhabitant in the last fifteen years than in the fifteen years of revenue only tariff from 1846 to 1860. On the other hand, the increased importation of articles which we can and ought to produce for ourselves, as proposed by the pending bill, even if far less than contemplated, would result in depleting us of our gold and piling up a mountain of debt.

Undoubtedly the increase of importations, although large enough to cripple our industries and business, would not be large enough to offset the revenue lost by reduction of duties, for the reason that existing industries would struggle to meet the new foreign competition and retain the home market by a reduction of wages, and would to a certain extent succeed, thus leaving a permanent loss of revenue from customs; and, worse still, permanently diminishing the ability of our people to consume products, and permanently impairing the value of our home market, as well as the prosperity of the people.

TAXATION OF DOMESTIC INTERESTS PROPOSED.

I am aware, Mr. Chairman, that it is proposed to add to this bill to abolish revenue from customs another measure which, it is estimated, will raise by an income tax thirty millions, and by an increase of excise and internal taxes fifteen millions, yet all together less than two-thirds as much revenue as is surrendered by the reduction or abolition of the duties on foreign imports.

This of itself would be a complete revolution in the revenue system which has prevailed in time of peace since the foundation of the Government. The duplex nature of our Government—federal machinery for national affairs and State machinery for local affairs—unlike the British system under which Parliament legislates and authorizes taxation for local as well as national ends, which the framers of this bill are feebly imitating, demands that there should be a sharp and well-defined line of demarcation between objects of Federal and of State taxation, especially in time of peace.

The Constitution of the United States reserves exclusively to the Federal Government the right to raise revenue by the imposition of duties on imports; and up to the present hour, except in time of war or to meet expenditures like pensions made necessary by war, when excise and other internal taxes have been added, all the expenditures of the National Government have been met by duties on imports and miscellaneous receipts. So strenuous on this point was Jefferson, whom our Democratic friends claim as their political father, that when he came into power in 1801 he insisted on the repeal of the excise tax on liquors, which had been imposed by the Adams Administration to pay the expenses of the anticipated war with France, and maintained the doctrine that in time of peace Federal expenses should be met by duties on imports, and other objects of taxation left to the States. However, our modern Democrats follow Jefferson by indulging in eulogiums of him on the stump and in party organs, and ignoring his teachings everywhere else.

Thus far there has been a large number of voters of protection instincts retained in the Democratic ranks because they believed it impracticable to raise from duties on imports two hundred or more millions of revenue required annually for current expenditures of Government outside of pensions without incidentally protecting home industries, as if it made any difference whether protection was called incidental, intentional or accidental, provided protection was there. The framers of this bill propose to cut the ground from under any such lodgment for protection by deliberately changing the policy of the Government. They propose to raise only one hundred and twenty-one millions from duties on imports, and transfer seventy-six millions from external to internal taxation. The incidental protection Democrats have had their guns spiked by this bill.

Our brief experience with the income tax as a war measure showed conclusively that it is not suited to our situation, because of its inquisitorial character, the expense and difficulty of ad-

ministration, and its practical tendency to encourage perjury. If resorted to at all, it should be used by the States for State purposes, so limited as not to result in double taxation, and not for Federal purposes for peace expenditures.

The difficulties which the Democratic majority have had in devising sources of taxation of our own people to take the place of the legitimate revenue from duties on imports which they have surrendered in their warfare on protection of home industries, have been such that, so far as known, they are still thirty millions short on their own uncertain estimates, and undoubtedly much more in fact.

It is proposed to increase the internal tax on whisky from 90 cents to \$1 per gallon, which it is estimated will yield \$10,000,000 for the next fiscal year; but, as the syndicate that own the whisky in bond will undoubtedly withdraw substantially the entire amount that will enter into consumption in that period before the increased tax goes into effect, the practical effect of it will be to put \$10,000,000 into the pockets of the syndicate instead of into the Treasury.

And as the increased tax is coupled with a most extraordinary privilege, extending the bonded period from three years to eight, its practical effect will be to grant extension of time to the whisky syndicate to that unprecedented extent for the payment of the tax on whisky—practically a loan for five years without interest,—while the whisky is aging and improving in value. Instead of being a proposition in the interest of the Government, it is in fact one to postpone the payment of the whole tax and in the interest of the whisky syndicate.

REASONS FOR HESITATION.

It would seem, Mr. Chairman, as if in the present condition of the Treasury, with such difficulty of supplying the revenue which it is proposed to surrender by a reduction of duties on imports—a difficulty which can not be overcome except by most doubtful internal taxation,—the Democratic majority, even in pursuit of the "theory" which has for some years haunted them, would hesitate to overthrow an economic policy under which the country has so signally prospered for more than thirty years, especially in view of the fact that an apprehension of such revolutionary tariff changes as are proposed has already paralyzed industries and business to such an extent as to entirely or partially shut down thousands of manufacturing establishments, reduce wages, deprive millions of workmen of employment, and bring distress and want into every community. When the Democratic national platform of 1892, in the face of the unexampled prosperity then prevailing, for partisan ends falsely declared that protection fosters no business so much as that of the sheriff, it unwittingly forecasted with accuracy what has already proved to be a sad result of the anticipation of the tariff policy which the pending bill proposes.

It might be supposed that the overwhelming Democratic losses and Republican gains in the recent elections, after six months' experience of the results of the efforts of the country to anticipate the practical application of the Democratic tariff theory to our industries—a change so extraordinary that if those elections had been for Representatives to this Chamber and had extended to all the States with corresponding results, a Democratic majority of over 90 in this House would have been converted into a Republican majority of over 50,—would raise more than a suspicion even in the minds of our friends on the other side, that the verdict of the people in 1892 was not intended to be a condemnation of the protective policy, as they have supposed, or at least was given under a grave misapprehension, of which the people have already repented.

THE DEMOCRATIC "THEORY."

Mr. Chairman, the tariff "theory" which the Democratic majority of the Ways and Means Committee, under instructions of the Democratic national convention, have undertaken to embody in the pending bill is that a protective duty on an imported article—i. e., a duty which covers the difference of money cost of production and distribution here and abroad of an article which can be produced or made here substantially to the extent of our wants without natural disadvantage—is "unconstitutional" and "robbery."

This theory rests on the assumption, which runs through the report of the majority of the Ways and Means Committee and every speech which has been made in defense of this bill, that such a duty is a tax which increases the cost of every article to which protection is applied, whether made at home or abroad, to the extent of the duty without compensating benefit to any one but the producer or manufacturer of such article.

Now if I believed this theory to be sound—which I do not—no consideration on earth would induce me to support any protective duty. If I believed that protection was "robbery," as the Democratic majority who have framed the pending bill say they do, the only tariff measure which I could support would be one

which imposed duties mainly on articles which we can not produce, like tea, coffee, etc., and which therefore must be entirely imported without possibility of any home production; and which so far as it imposed duties on articles that can be produced or made here, would place these duties so low as to give the foreigner the advantage over our home producers, and thus insure the importation mainly of such articles from abroad rather than their production or manufacture here; because the theory maintains that whenever the duty is large enough to restrict the importation of such articles and thus encourage their production here, the Government loses the revenue and the private producer practically pockets it, and much more.

And yet professing to sincerely believe that protection is "unconstitutional" and "robbery," the Democratic majority who have framed this bill, in their report, say:

The bill on which the committee has expended much patient and anxious labor is not offered as a complete response to the mandate of the American people. It no more professes to be purged of all protection than to be free of all error in its complex and manifold details. * * * We are forced to consider that great interests do exist whose existence and prosperity it is no part of our reform either to imperil or to curtail.

Does this great tariff reform bill, then, propose to spare "great interests," gigantic "monopolies," as we have been told, "robber barons," as I have so many times heard manufacturers styled by the other side of the House, that are engaged in the "unconstitutional" employment of "robbing" the people? Are we to understand that the Democratic members of the Ways and Means Committee, who have been for years singly and in pairs here and elsewhere denouncing protection as "unconstitutional" and "robbery," now that they are in full power take the ground that "it is no part of our [the Democratic] reform either to imperil or curtail" "robbery" of the people by some "great interests?" [Laughter.]

This astonishing suggestion can not fail to raise more than a suspicion that the gentlemen who have been denouncing protection as "robbery" can not really believe what they have been saying, for if they do they would not make themselves accessories in so grave a crime as "robbery." They have been making these reckless charges for partisan ends—in a Pickwickian sense that they did not suppose anyone, except the poorly informed, whose votes they sought, would believe.

The majority of the committee evidently appreciate the contradictory position in which they are placed, for they add:

In dealing with the tariff, as with every other long-standing abuse that has interwoven itself with our social or industrial system, the legislator must always remember that in the beginning temperate reform is safest, having in itself the principle of growth.

The idea which runs through this defense is that the framers of this bill have begun their work of extirpating protection or "robbery," as they style it, by somewhat reducing the amount of the "swag," and that other limitations on this policy of "robbery" will come hereafter. For example, they say to the cotton-manufacturers of the United States: "You have heretofore been permitted to 'rob' the people to the enormous extent of 55 per cent of the entire consumption of domestic cottons in this country, according to our theory of the effect of a protective duty. Hereafter you must be content to 'rob' them only to the extent of 38½ per cent." And this is what is styled by the Democratic majority of the committee as "temperate reform, having in itself the principle of growth." [Laughter.]

What astonishes me is that gentlemen claiming to sincerely believe that a protective duty on an imported article similar to that produced or made here without natural disadvantage, is a tax on like domestic articles to the extent of the duty, should stultify themselves by paltering with any such measure or any such defense.

UNJUST DISCRIMINATIONS.

Mr. Chairman, an examination of the schedules of the bill shows that the objections to it go much farther than this. If it had uniformly reduced protection, or as the majority style it "robbery," all along the line, while it would have been open to serious criticism from the standpoint of the revenue-only theory, that it had only reduced what ought to have been abolished, yet it would have had the merit of treating all alike. But the bill in fact makes discriminations which are not explicable on any economic or other just basis. It preserves certain industries by abundant protection; it cuts up by the roots certain other industries from which all protection has been withdrawn. Such unequal and unfair discrimination is unjust and reprehensible, whether a tariff measure is framed on the protective or the revenue-only basis, and all the more reprehensible when it is evident that partisan, local, or personal reasons must have dictated such favors.

The marble quarries of Tennessee are by this bill protected by a certain specific duty equivalent to 24 per cent ad valorem on imported marble in rough blocks, and 41 per cent on marble paving blocks and marble sawed or dressed; while the granite

quarries of New England and the freestone, sandstone, and limestone quarries of the Middle States and the West are deprived of all protection against similar products of the cheaper labor of Canada and Scotland by having imported granite and other kinds of stone in blocks placed on the free list, and an uncertain ad valorem revenue-only duty of but 20 per cent placed on dressed or polished granite or other stone, and even finished monumental work.

Cleaned rice is protected by a certain specific duty equivalent to 83 per cent, notwithstanding it is an important article of food, while the farm products of the States adjacent to Canada are left to compete with similar products of Canadian farms cultivated by cheaper labor, with uncertain revenue-only ad valorem duties varying from 15 per cent on imported vegetables to 25 per cent on beans and peas and 23 per cent on hay, while all kinds of imported Canadian dressed meats, bacon, hams, pork, lard, tallow, eggs, and apples are placed on the free list.

Hoop iron made into cotton ties for the cotton-planter are placed on the free list, but on hoop-iron wire made into ties for Northern hay a duty of 30 per cent is imposed.

The manufacturer of so crude an article as common building brick is protected by a duty of 20 per cent on competing imported brick, and the manufacturer of hydraulic cement by a certain specific protective duty equivalent to 24 per cent, while the manufacturer of lime, who with the present duty of 29 per cent—13½ cents per barrel, which is only the difference of money cost of production—is subjected to severe Canadian competition, is practically denied all protection by having the duty on imported lime reduced to 10 per cent ad valorem, which is not over 4 cents per barrel. And the only suggestion for this reduction and consequent destruction of the lime manufacturing industry in this country which appears in the published hearings of the Ways and Means Committee is contained in a memorial of Hon. Frank Jones, the Democratic member of the national Democratic committee of New Hampshire, who informed the committee that he and his associates had invested capital in Canadian lime quarries instead of in the numerous unworked quarries of this country—presumably because the wages of labor are lower in Canada than here (\$1 to \$1.25 in Canada and \$2 to \$2.25 here)—and desired freer access to our markets.

The following paragraphs from the memorial of Mr. Jones and his associates read as though the petitioners thought they were addressing the Canadian Parliament instead of the Congress of the United States:

The above petitioners represent that, with possibly one or two exceptions, they are all citizens and most of them residents of the United States; that they have a large amount of American capital invested in lime properties across the line at Dudswell, near Sherbrook, Province of Quebec, and at St. John, New Brunswick, consisting of lime quarries, lime kilns for the manufacture of lime, and vessels for its transportation. * * *

They would call attention to the fact that after the erection of the kilns most of the expense of the production of a barrel of lime is the cost of the labor and the cordwood consumed in the burning of the lime rock. * * *

Your petitioners therefore respectfully pray your honorable committee to recommend the complete remission of this duty, so that they may light up their (Canada) kilns and set to work the capital now locked up since the enactment of the McKinley law. * * *

As a matter of fact, lime on the market went lower after the passage of the McKinley bill than it was before. Your petitioners will not deny the truth of this statement, but it is easily explained. * * * Your petitioners aver that they themselves have still been manufacturing some lime in a small way, running some four to six kilns out of thirty, and putting said lime on to the market at a loss, for the purpose of making a price.

It seems strange to see an American citizen asking the Congress of the United States to legislate so as to encourage industries in Canada and discourage them in the United States; but this is just what this bill does, not only in this respect, but in its treatment of the lumber manufacturing industry, farm products, coal, the fisheries, etc. Indeed, what this bill grants Canada without asking any return could have been made the basis of a reciprocal agreement that would have secured the admission of many manufactured articles into Canada either free of duty or at favored rates.

THE RAW MATERIAL THEORY.

Mr. Chairman, great stress is laid in the majority report on the fact that this bill places on the free list imported articles like coal, iron ore, wool, flax, sawed lumber, granite and other stones in blocks, which are designated raw materials. This policy is defended on two grounds—first, that it will enable our advanced industries which use these articles as their materials to successfully compete with foreign producers of manufactured articles in foreign markets; and, secondly, that it will cheapen such articles to our own consumers.

By the use of the term "raw materials" it is sought to convey the impression that the articles thus designated are material objects which have sprung into existence like Jonah's gourd or been stored away by nature in the recesses of the mountains, without the use of human labor, instead of being the completed manufacture of one industry ready for a new transformation by a more advanced industry. Timber in the forest, and coal, iron

ore, and stone in the hills, the actual "raw materials," are as cheap and abundant here as anywhere in the world, and the only reason they cost more here in money, not as estimated in labor, after the hand of man has transformed them into lumber, coal, iron ore, granite or sandstone blocks, is not because it requires more labor here than elsewhere to so transform them, but because that labor here receives higher wages for doing this work. This is indeed the chief reason why anything costs more in money here than abroad.

Now, what the so-called raw-material theory embodied in this bill does is to apply one principle, that of free trade, to the laborers who produce the articles thus designated, and another principle to the laborers who take the completed product of the so-called "raw materials" industry, and further advance it. This is a discrimination utterly indefensible, provided it costs more in money to produce the so-called raw materials here than abroad, on account of our higher wages for labor, as the authors of this bill assume that it does when they declare that by importing iron ore, coal, sawed lumber, wool, granite blocks, etc., free of duty, it will cheapen the articles made from them or by their use. But if this argument is sound for one class of products then it is sound for all others.

The gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. WILSON], in his opening speech in this discussion, undertook the dangerous feat of making an argument for the latitude of the Virginians and Maryland, that placing these so-called raw materials on the free list would not be a discrimination against these industries, because these articles are produced and sold in this country as low as in any other competing country. He evidently overlooked the fact that in his majority report, as well as in another part of his speech, he had contended that all these raw materials would be made cheaper to our advanced industries if they could be imported free of duty from Canada and other countries where labor is paid less wages. One or the other of his arguments needs revision.

The effort of the majority report to create the impression that free raw materials will enable our industries to secure foreign markets and thus give a larger employment to labor here, ignores the fact that their policy proposes to surrender to foreigners a large part of our own market—the best in the world—in order to engage in the chase after foreign markets already gorged; ignores the further fact that under the existing tariff any manufacturer may import, almost free of duty, materials however advanced for making articles for export; and also ignores the additional fact that even where we have the materials, as for example cotton, as cheap and even cheaper than our foreign competitors, we are able to export but comparatively few goods, in competition with foreigners—only twenty-four millions, against an export of four hundred and twenty-five millions by England—for the reason that our labor employed in making the advanced manufactures receives from 50 to 100 per cent more pay for a given amount of human effort than the foreign competitor pays.

PROGRESSIVE WAR ON PROTECTION.

Mr. Chairman, notwithstanding some industries have been wholly or partly protected by this bill, as well as some sent at once to the wall, yet the rule has been to so far reduce duties as to increase foreign competition and importations, leaving the domestic industries affected an opportunity to make the reduced duties protective by lowering wages, until another reduction of duties foreshadowed shall follow.

There runs through the report of the majority, and through the indorsements of it by the tariff reform or free trade clubs, the idea that this bill is only one step in the process of reduction, although made with unfair discrimination, to be followed by other steps, until all the duties shall be absolutely for revenue only, and every chance of possible protection removed. The gentleman from West Virginia was frank enough to tell us in his opening speech that, while he had treated many industries tenderly in this bill, he believed that the time would soon come when any remains of protection would be uprooted.

Indeed, the woollens schedule puts these steps into law by providing that there shall be an annual 1 per cent ad valorem reduction of the low duties provided by the bill for five years, thus at the end of that period bringing down the duties on woollen goods—the most difficult of all the textiles to manufacture—to rates varying on the face from 20 to 25 per cent for flannels and blankets and to 35 per cent for cloths and dress goods. Although no other schedule has this downward sliding scale, and woollens are therefore specially discriminated against, yet it is not to be supposed that it would have been applied in this case, where the highest duties are needed, if the purpose had not been in the early future to apply it all along the line. In this light it is amusing, if it were not so serious, to have some of the advocates of this bill arguing that it has the merit of offering stability to our industries, especially when it is remembered that for thirty-two

years there has been one continuous, stable tariff policy, that of protection.

AD VALOREM DUTIES.

But, Mr. Chairman, the reduction of duties which appears on the face of this bill has been in fact largely increased by the general adoption, except in some conspicuous instances where favors have been extended to particular industries, of ad valorem duties in lieu of the specific or mixed duties of the present tariff. An ad valorem duty, as the name indicates, is levied on the foreign price of an imported article, and as that price is in most cases practically determined by the foreign manufacturer in his invoice, as a rule such article is undervalued, and the duty thus reduced below what was intended by the law. A specific duty, on the other hand, is a fixed charge levied on each pound, yard, or other unit, and can not be avoided.

The art of undervaluation so as to reduce ad valorem duties has been carried to such an extent that honest importers have been largely driven out of the business, and imported goods are largely sold duty paid by the agent of the manufacturer in this country.

When I was in Europe last summer, an English manufacturer, who exports largely to this country, said to me that he did not care what our duties might be made if we would only make them ad valorem.

It is the judgment of well-informed manufacturers that the actual duties which will be realized by the Government in case the pending bill should become a law, so far as woollen goods, fancy cottons, and many other goods of a varied character which are made especially for our markets, would be at least 10 per cent if not 15 per cent ad valorem less than would be realized with equivalent specific duties, because of undervaluations. In other words, ad valorem duties of 40 per cent or 35 per cent, will be found no more valuable for protection or revenue than specific duties equivalent to 30 per cent or 25 per cent, respectively.

The only argument presented by the majority for the substitution of ad valorem for specific or mixed duties is that specific duties impose relatively higher duties on cheap grades of an article than on more valuable grades. There is little real force in this argument, certainly none comparable with the objections, because there is no difficulty in adjusting a specific rate to each grade which will largely overcome even the apparent discrimination when expressed in percentages. Moreover, this apparent discrimination is only seeming, not real. Percentages afford no just basis of comparison when the bases are widely different. For example, 1 is 50 per cent of 2, and only 10 per cent of 10, but notwithstanding it appears ten times as large in the latter case as in the former when expressed in percentages, yet it is exactly the same 1 in both cases.

Take the illustration given in the majority report of the duty on so-called woollen cloth invoiced at 27 cents per pound and cloth invoiced at 97 cents. The majority report states that the tariff of 1890 imposes 162 per cent duty on the cheap cloth "for poor people" and only 93 per cent on the fine cloth for the well to do, etc. Yet as a matter of fact the duty on the so-called "cheap woollen cloth" is 44 cents per pound and on the fine cloth 93 cents—less than half as much on the cheap as on the fine, instead of nearly twice as much.

But inasmuch as the majority report has made use of one exceptional import of what the majority call "cheap woollen cloth for poor people," valued at 27 cents per pound, to prop up the vicious change to ad valorem duties, it may be well to examine it more fully.

It is evident on the face that there was something peculiar about this small import of woollen cloths under 30 cents per pound, valued at only \$9,000 in 1892, and only \$13,000 in 1893. For if there are any wool cloths suitable for even "poor people" to wear that can be bought abroad at 27 cents per pound, it is certain that even with 44 cents per pound duty they would be imported in immense quantities. If the chairman of the committee had inquired he would have ascertained that even in England, with her low wages, a pound of woollen cloth can not be made for less than about 20 cents. That leaves only 7 cents, or not over 12 cents, for the wool; and clothing wool, even of the cheapest variety, sufficient to make a pound of wool cloth, can not be purchased in London for less than 35 cents before it goes to the mill. Certainly a pound of real wool cloth can not be purchased in England for less than 55 cents.

Yet it seems that a small quantity of so-called wool cloth was invoiced at 27 cents per pound. Certainly if this was really wool cloth the undervaluation must have been most remarkable. It does not seem to have succeeded to any extent—only once each year to give the majority of the committee a shining example. It is evident that the specific duty of 33 cents per pound was found in the way of a repetition of the job. If the cloth had been imported under the pending bill the ad valorem duty would have made the duty only 10½ cents, and this cut would have af-

forded a big premium for the continuation of such undervaluation.

The example cited by the majority is really an argument for instead of against specific duties.

Indeed, every Democratic Secretary of the Treasury, from Gallatin, who served in this capacity under Jefferson, to Secretary Manning (Walker alone excepted), has maintained that specific duties are essential to prevent frauds against the Government and discriminations against honest importers. The fact, however, that an ad valorem duty opens the door for a reduction of duties beyond what the law provides, and diminishes protection as prices go down in unfavorable times when protection is most needed, seems to have commended it to the framers of this bill.

Nothing can be more misleading than percentage duties on invoice value, especially in comparing duties at different periods and under different tariffs. Where the duty is specific, percentages rise with decline in values, although in fact the duties are unchanged. Indeed, I notice that the protective specific duty of 1½ cents per pound on rice, imposed by this bill, gives an equivalent ad valorem of 71 per cent duty on the imports of 1892, and 83 per cent on the imports of 1893; an apparent advance of 12 per cent ad valorem in duty by percentages when there is no change in fact. This shows the misleading character of ad valorems.

The gentleman from New York [Mr. COOMBS] called attention to the duty of 1 cent per pound in the tariff of 1890 on hoop iron, and informed us that hoop iron is selling for 1.2 cents per pound; pretty good evidence that the protective duty is not a tax which increases the price to the extent of the duty. Yet that duty, which appears to be 80 or more per cent in the tariff of 1890, is less than one-third the specific duty on hoop iron imposed by the tariffs of 1828 and 1830, when it was said to be only 40 per cent. I repeat, in order to show the misleading nature of ad valorem figures, that the duty on imported hoop iron under the tariff of 1828 and 1830 was 3½ cents per pound. The tariff of 1890 reduced it to 1 cent, and yet it is made to appear by ad valorem percentages that a reduction of two-thirds has largely increased the duty. Thus notwithstanding duties expressed in specific terms have been largely reduced in the tariff of 1890 below even the earlier tariffs, yet the reductions are made to appear as increases by the use of per centage ad valorem equivalents.

EFFECT OF A PROTECTIVE DUTY.

Mr. Chairman, the real issue between the advocates of a protective tariff and the advocates of a tariff for revenue only, or British free trade (for both terms mean the same thing in tariff discussion), is as to the effect of a protective duty on the cost to the consumer of a domestic article, i. e., a duty imposed on a like imported foreign article equivalent to the difference of the money cost of production and distribution here and abroad, where such article can be produced or made here substantially to the extent of our wants without natural disadvantage.

The majority report and free-trade advocates generally affirm that such a duty is a tax which increases the cost to the consumer of such domestic article substantially to the extent of the duty. The advocates of protection deny this.

Of course, there is no controversy over the effect of a duty on an imported article not produced or made here, to any considerable extent. In that case there is comparatively little or no domestic production to affect the price; and as the article must all or for the most part be purchased abroad, the cost to the consumer must be the foreign price plus the duty. The issue is entirely as to the effect of a duty on the price or cost of the domestic article which can be produced or made here substantially to the extent of our wants without natural disadvantage.

The usual course of the free trade or anti-protection "disputant" is to assume that such a duty is a tax on the domestic article, and without meeting the counter facts and arguments adduced by the advocates of protection, to go on from that point as if it were conceded. That has been the course pursued in this discussion by the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. WILSON]. Sometimes the assumption is fortified by such an argument as this:

"You protectionists say that you want duties on certain imported articles which it is desired to produce or make here, because they cost more to make here on account of our higher wages, and the articles can not be made here and sold in competition with similar foreign articles admitted free of duty. If, then, the duties on foreign articles do not enable the domestic producers or manufacturers to make the prices of the domestic articles substantially that of the foreign articles abroad, plus the duty, then they fail to protect. If they do so raise the price, then they are in effect a tax on the domestic article, which does not go into the Treasury."

The fundamental fallacy of this argument is that it uses the term "cost" in its money and not its economic sense, and thus

deals with the problem as if man were only a consumer and not a producer also.

It is evident that when there is no natural disadvantage in producing or making an article here—and protection does not properly apply if there be such—then it requires no more labor to produce or make an article here than abroad; and if so, then measured in labor or service, which is the true economic measure of cost, it costs no more to produce or make any such article here than elsewhere. There can be no economic loss, therefore, in the production of such article or articles here rather than abroad.

When it is said, therefore, that it costs more to produce or make an article here than abroad because of our higher wages, it is only meant that it costs more in money—not more in labor or service, in which nearly all men ultimately pay for everything they buy. Money is only the medium of making the exchange of labor for products.

Thus, the true test of the cost or price of an article in any country is not money cost, but labor cost. When it is said that a workingman in England can buy a coat for \$9 in money and that a similar coat costs \$10 here, you can not determine which is relatively cheaper to the workingman or other person who ultimately pays in his labor or service, or product of his labor or efforts, until you know how much money either receives for his labor or earns by his service. When you have both sides of the equation, then you can determine which money price is relatively cheaper, and not before. If it turns out that the laborer receives \$1 per day wages in England and \$2 here, then the cost of the coat to the workingman in England is nine days' work, and to the workingman in the United States five days' work. In spite of the assumption of the doctrinaire who looks only at money price, that the workingman in England can buy his coat a dollar cheaper than the workingman in the United States, the fact is that the cost of the workingman's coat here in the only commodity he has to pay is only five-ninths of the cost to the workingman in England. [Applause on the Republican side.]

It may be said that if such a workingman here could buy his coat abroad and import it free of duty, then he would save \$1. I reply that while this would be true if only one or a few persons should be granted this privilege for the reason that a few cases like this would not disturb our economic system under which higher wages are paid here than abroad; but if everybody in this country could send the money received for wages or service or their products to England and buy such goods as are cheaper in money there and import them free of duty, instead of having them made here, then, first, American wages would soon fall to the British standard, because of want of diversification of industries and dearth of employment outside of agriculture, which would be glutted; and secondly, with such an increased demand for goods abroad and withdrawal of American competition, prices of goods there would rise. No one can have his cake and eat it at the same time. Whether the economic system of a country is free trade or protection, it must be an entirety.

Measured in labor, there is not a single article made here under protection—no matter whether the duty on a similar imported article is 30 per cent, 50 per cent, or 100 per cent—which is not cheaper here than in any other country in the world. Our free-trade friends have much to say of cheap prices of products measured in money, and never anything of cheap prices measured in labor. Products cheapened by labor-saving devices are a boon. Products cheapened by reducing the compensation of labor and by depriving the laborer of opportunities to work are a curse. [Applause.] We are having now the free-trade paradise of cheapness, and the workingman's gehenna of dearth. Prices measured in money are abnormally cheap; prices measured in labor are exceptionally dear.

These observations have paved the way for a closer examination of the workings of protective duties, which are simply duties on imports equivalent to the difference of money wages of labor production and distribution here and abroad. Such duties simply equalize the basis of competition here and abroad. The money prices of domestic products are determined by the cost of production or manufacture under competition paying American wages, and when they cost more in money than abroad it is simply because labor receives higher wages. Even if the duties are more than such actual difference of cost of production and distribution here and abroad, competition inevitably brings the money prices down to the lowest possible standard. The object of protection is not, as the free-trader insists, to increase prices, but to encourage production here by making it possible for us to compete, and the competition thus induced tends to lower prices everywhere, not by reducing wages, but by stimulating the use of labor-saving devices.

The money prices may be more here than abroad at the same time, but these money prices will be gradually reduced by the competition here, made possible only by protection, below what

they were before the industries were established here, and frequently as low as abroad. But the prices estimated in labor or service, as I have already said, will always be lower than anywhere else in the world. Applause.]

Every instance in which we have applied protective duties to secure the manufacture of articles here, which had been previously imported, has thus resulted. In 1883, when we applied a protective duty to wire nails, the price was 8 cents per pound, and nearly all were imported. We were charged with a purpose to tax the people 4 cents per pound for all their wire nails, because the proposed duty was 4 cents. Yet wire nails never advanced; but as soon as we had firmly established the industry they began to decline—our competition affecting the foreign price,—and even before the tariff-reform cyclone struck the country some months ago the price had declined to less than 2 cents. And this is only one out of thousands of similar examples.

This means that our policy of providing by protective duties that competition here shall be on the basis of our higher standard of wages and higher standard of living rather than on the lower European standard, as it would necessarily be under free trade or duties lower than the difference of wages here and abroad, results in higher prosperity of the masses of our people than is found anywhere else in the world.

PROTECTION, NOT PATERNALISM.

Mr. Chairman, this policy is not "paternalism" nor "partnership of the Government in private industries," nor "class legislation," as charged by the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. WILSON], unless indeed the establishment of colleges of agriculture and the mechanic arts by the Government in the several States for the purpose of increasing the industrial efficiency of the rising generation, which the gentleman and his associates advocate, is "paternalism;" or unless the improvement of the rivers of West Virginia and the harbors of the Great Lakes and of the ocean, in order to enable private citizens to navigate their boats and ships with greater efficiency, for which the gentleman and most of the members of his party voted, is "class legislation" and "partnership of the Government in private industries." [Applause on the Republican side.]

The distinction between "paternalism" and protection is as wide as the difference between giving a man an opportunity to work and doing his work for him. Paternalism dwarfs men; protection gives them the best opportunities to develop themselves. The function of good government should never be paternal, but always protective. The "let alone" theory of government, on which free-trade ideas are based, has been abandoned for the most part by practical statesmen everywhere, and there has come to be general acceptance of the view that it is the proper function, ay, the duty of government to so protect and enlarge the opportunities of its individual citizens as to enable them to use their own powers more efficiently, whether by education, restriction of temptations to vice, building highways, improving rivers and harbors, erecting light-houses, or restricting undesirable immigration which would tend to reduce wages and lower the standard of living. [Applause.]

And the protective-tariff policy, which imposes duties equivalent to the difference of wages in production and distribution here and abroad on such imported articles as can be produced or made here without natural disadvantage, in order to maintain competition here on the basis of our high wage and high living standard, and thus secure the highest prosperity of the masses of our people, is exactly in the same line.

Our protective policy simply says to the foreign manufacturer: "Before you can place the products of your cheaper labor in our markets in competition with the products of our higher wage labor you must pay into our Treasury and thus contribute to our revenue substantially the sum which you withhold from your workingmen, but which we pay our workingmen."

It will be remembered that when the tariff act of 1890 increased the average duty on woollens so as to make it more protective on the finer grades, it was assailed all along the line by the free-trade theorists as an increase of \$30 tax on every hundred dollars' worth of the woollens and the clothing of the people. The gentleman from West Virginia has repeated this assertion, entirely in line with the theory on which this bill is framed, as if facts which could have been ascertained by a study of markets rather than maxims, had not already disproved it. And yet the report of the Senate Finance Committee, based on statistics collected by Labor Commissioner Wright, showed that the effect of this increase of duty was not to advance the price of woollens—indeed the price was 5 per cent lower in 1891 than in 1890—but to reduce importations about twenty millions, and thus increase the demand for domestic goods and for labor. And the manufacturers state that, notwithstanding they received 5 per cent less per yard

for their goods in 1891 than in 1890, yet they did a more prosperous business, for the reason that it cost them less to make their goods in 1891 than in 1890, because of the larger demand, which enabled them to make more effective use of their machinery.

In other words, the increased duty which restricted foreign imports gave our own manufacturers a larger home market, made it possible for them to make their goods at a lower cost, and competition compelled them to sell them at a lower price. Yet all the gentlemen on the other side who have spoken, in the face of such facts, keep right on asserting that a protective duty is a tax which increases the burdens of the American consumer.

Ex-Senator Eaton, of Connecticut, himself a Democrat, although he would be ruled out of the new Democratic party by the framers of this bill, when a member of the House told an anecdote of a scholastic free trader that illustrates the tendency of men whose whole training has been outside of practical life, to blindly follow theories and shut their eyes to the facts of life all about them.

"A certain professor, a theorist of the first water," said ex-Senator Eaton, "came up into a large manufacturing village in my country to address the people on the tariff question. There was a farmer standing by a post in the lecture room, and the professor thought he might be a good subject to operate upon. So he said to him 'My friend, you are a farmer?' 'Yes.' 'You live here?' 'Yes.' 'Do you know these manufacturers in this village are robbing you?' 'Why, no; I do not know it. How have they robbed me?' I came here ten years ago with only \$500 and bought a farm for \$2,500, and run in debt for the balance. I went to raising truck and selling to the mill hands. I have paid off my debt and now own my farm, free of debt. How have they robbed me?' The professor, not at all taken back, went on. 'Well, I suppose you have been a hard-working man and have lived through it. But you pay 6 cents a yard tax for the very cloth your shirt is made of.' 'Well,' replied the farmer, 'you may think so, but you can not prove it unless by Æsop's fables, for 5 cents a yard was all I gave for the cloth.'"

THE WAGES QUESTION.

Mr. Chairman, there are two answers which the free-trade or revenue-only advocates make to this contention of the friends of protection. First, they affirm that wages are no higher here than in machine-using nations abroad when efficiency is considered. They admit that money wages per day or week are 67 per cent higher on an average here than in England as shown by Labor Commissioner Wright's reports; but they claim that workmen here do enough more to offset this difference.

It is sufficient to say that there is no evidence of the truth of this assumption. The only evidence ever adduced in this direction was some statistics of the relative labor cost of making low-grade cottons, in which the labor cost is very slight, at a particular time when we had introduced some improvements in machinery not then adopted abroad. In other words, they were statistics of the superior inventive genius of Americans when protection gives us the opportunity to compete on an equal plane, and not evidence of the superior efficiency of our labor. Indeed, in many industries, particularly textiles, our best skilled labor comes from Europe.

The fact that the gates of Castle Garden always swing inward and never outward is an absolute demonstration that a given amount of labor receives not only larger money wages but also larger wages estimated in purchasing power than abroad, even if Labor Commissioner Wright's statistics of piece work had not removed this fact beyond the pale of dispute. Indeed, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. BLACK] charges that our protective policy has induced excessive immigration by making our wages and opportunities for poor men so attractive; leaving it to be inferred that he advocates this bill because it will diminish these wages and opportunities.

Even if other evidence were not conclusive, the fact that even with duties of 40 per cent or more on imported manufactured goods, foreign manufacturers find themselves able to pay that duty and still sell three hundred millions of dollars' worth of their products in our markets, and the further fact that our exports of manufactured goods are mainly coarse cottons and specialties, demonstrate beyond doubt that the latter pay much less for a given amount of labor in such industries than we do.

"American workingmen are the smartest in the world, and not afraid to compete with the products of the workmen of Europe," exclaims the theorist. It is not a question of "smartness," but a question of compensation for "smartness." The American workman receives 67 per cent more for a given amount of "smartness" than the workman in Europe receives. What the American objects to is competition with products produced or made abroad by labor that receives 67 per cent less than he does until the beneficiary of that cheaper labor has paid our Government enough duty to even up the basis of competition. When the foreign laborer comes here, provided

he comes to be an American and to gradually adopt the American standard of living—and no other immigrant should be permitted to come—he demands and receives American (not foreign) wages; and as he brings as much or more demand for products for the consumption of his family as he adds to the labor supply, his coming does not reduce wages nor injure our own labor.

THE "NATURAL CHANNEL" ARGUMENT.

The second answer of the free-trade theorists is that we should not undertake to carry on industries in which foreign producers or manufacturers have an advantage over us, but should confine ourselves to industries in which we have advantage over other countries. This is the free-trade contention of the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. WILSON] and the contention of the majority report.

Now, if this free-trade contention referred simply to a natural advantage; if the argument of the majority report, insisting that we should not attempt to extend our industries and business to "artificial channels," referred to disadvantages of climate, soil, or other natural conditions, it would be accepted as sound. No protectionist holds that the protective policy should be applied to any industry which must be carried on here under natural disadvantages, that is, where a larger amount of labor is permanently required to make or produce a given article here than is required elsewhere, except as there may be cases where national defense demands it.

What is meant by opponents of protection, however, is not this. It is that we should not carry on any industry here in which our higher wages of labor make the product cost more in money, although no more in labor or service than elsewhere where the laborer receives less pay—this, the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. WILSON] tells us would be an "artificial channel,"—but should confine ourselves to "natural channels," or such crude industries, mainly agriculture, in which we have sufficient natural advantage to offset the difference of wages.

Indeed, the free-trade contention—and it is noticeable that nearly all the speeches for this bill on the other side have adopted free-trade arguments to their logical conclusion, and as such have been most enthusiastically applauded by nearly all our Democratic friends, thus showing that the Democratic party no longer disguises its free-trade policy—the free-trade contention is that where we find industries in which our higher wages of labor makes the product cost more in money (although not more in labor or service) than they cost abroad because we pay higher wages for a certain amount of labor, we should drop such industries, notwithstanding they comprise nearly all our manufacturing industries, and import such goods instead of making them here, and turn the labor which has been employed in such manufacturing industries into agriculture or the production of crude materials in which we have natural advantages. This is the policy which has been again and again enthusiastically applauded on the Democratic side. And it is seriously contended by the free-trade theorist, that this policy—which in fact would be going back where we were a hundred years ago—would give us the largest production of wealth, highest wages, and greatest consuming capacity. Perhaps the gentlemen who advocate this theory will be able to tell us what any of our farm products would be worth with such a multiplication of farmers and such an annihilation of nonagricultural consumers.

This is the free-trade idea, pure and simple; this is the advice which the British Cobdenites give us—to confine ourselves to producing raw materials and let England do our manufacturing.

It is sufficient to say in reply that any economic theory which, put into practice, would prevent a diversification of industries, and especially the establishment of advanced manufactures, is fundamentally wrong. For nothing is clearer in the light of reason or in the teachings of experience, than that people who so far multiply their pursuits as to give an opportunity for every variety of talent, and especially the highest skill, to do most effective work, take the lead in agriculture, manufacturing, and commerce. A nation with advanced industries, placed alongside the farm, produces far more per inhabitant than one which confines its industries to what free traders call "natural channels." [Applause.]

It can not be too often pressed upon the attention of the thoughtful citizen who listens to the free-trade argument that it is a loss of productive power for us to carry on industries in which the cost of production is greater than the cost elsewhere; that no protectionist proposes to do this, if by "cost" is meant cost in labor or service. What the free trader means is that we should not carry on industries here in which, while they require no more labor for production here than is required abroad, we pay higher wages for such labor. The fact that other countries pay lower wages than we do is not a natural advantage on their part; it is an "artificial" advantage, created by crowding labor to the wall, and as a result of a system in which man is left out of consideration; and the only way in which we can prevent competition through

the products of such a system coming into our markets and forcing us down to the low-wage and low-living standard of other machine-using nations, is by placing protective duties on their products, so as to place competition here on our high-wage and high-living standard basis.

PROTECTION HISTORICALLY CONSIDERED.

Mr. Chairman, it is a matter of history that the most prominent incentive to the adoption of the Constitution and the establishment of a truly national government in 1789 was the necessity which was felt for such uniform regulations of commerce as would provide revenue, promote trade, and encourage new industries, and thus free us from our industrial and commercial subjection to England, arising mainly from the fact that we raised the raw materials and she developed them into manufactured products.

One of the first acts passed by the first Congress under the Constitution, in response to the popular demand, was a tariff, whose title was an act to raise revenue "and encourage manufactures."

The act received the warm approval of Washington, Madison, and Jefferson. The same Jefferson whom our Democratic friends claim to be politically descended from, was one of the fathers of protection, one of the original advocates of the policy of so adjusting duties as to "encourage manufactures," a policy which the framers of this bill now tell us is "unconstitutional," as well as "robbery."

The idea of the fathers who framed the Constitution, and passed the first protective tariff to encourage manufactures as well as raise revenue, was that the prosperity of the country, of all classes, demanded that we should not confine our labor to what the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. WILSON] calls "natural channels," the crude industries and agriculture to which the people of a new country first address themselves, but should apply protective duties with a view of diversifying our industries and establishing manufacturing industries—"artificial channels," as the free trader thinks.

To be sure, the average duties on all imports (as there were few free goods then) of the various tariffs enacted up to the close of the first term of Jefferson were only 22½ per cent, but at that time the slow and expensive means of transportation across the Atlantic afforded a large measure of protection in itself, and the industries to be introduced in those early days were only those for the manufacture of the coarser articles adapted to a new country. These duties were subsequently increased as experience showed necessary. In 1821 the average duty was 36 per cent, and in 1830 it was nearly 49 per cent on dutiable goods. The important fact to be considered is that the framers of the Constitution, who may be supposed to have had some knowledge of the scope of that instrument, not only held that protective duties are constitutional, but that they are a wise measure of public policy.

WHAT THE FATHERS THOUGHT.

The fathers did not consider the objection, even then urged, that the adoption of protective duties to secure the establishment and maintenance of manufacturing industries would be "class legislation," or the "partnership of the Government in business," to be anything but chaff, unworthy of a moment's consideration.

They argued that the introduction of manufacturing industries in this country and the diversification of pursuits would be, as it has proved, a benefit to the industries already existing, and especially a benefit to agriculture, and to all our people.

They regarded the whole people as an industrial unit. They held that manufacturing industries would benefit the farmer by preventing so large a concentration of labor in agriculture as would greatly increase the surplus for export, and thus reduce the foreign price, and by giving him a larger home market and better prices; for whatever the farmer sells at home escapes the heavy charges of transportation. They saw by faith what those who will open their eyes can to day see by actual vision, that farming pays much better when manufacturing communities are set down by the side of the farms.

They knew, what some of their descendants are blind to, that the carpenter and mason, as well as some other industries, are protected by natural conditions which forbid the importation of what they work on, but that their wages and their prosperity, as well as that of the farmer, could not rise above the wages and prosperity of the workingmen and consumers in other industries that would be open to competition with the products of the cheaper labor of Europe, without protective duties. Hence they reasoned, and reasoned correctly, that protection concerned all.

PROTECTIVE PERIODS ERAS OF GREATEST PROSPERITY.

And our experiences since have only demonstrated the wisdom of the judgment of the fathers. Our periods of highest prosperity have always been those in which the protective policy has been maintained.

The contention made now and then by opponents of protection, and repeated in the report of the majority, that the revenue-tariff period from 1846 to 1860 witnessed the greatest progress of our manufacturing industries and was the golden era of the nation, has no basis except rhetoric, and even more deceptive percentages, to stand upon.

The simple fact told by the census is that in the decade between 1850 and 1860 the value of our manufactured products increased \$765,000,000, or \$16 per inhabitant; and in the decade between 1880 and 1890, under protection, \$3,146,000,000, or \$29 per inhabitant, or nearly twice as fast in the latter as in the former. The value of our manufactured products rose from \$1,885,750,000 in 1860 to \$3,515,500,000 in 1890. And the growth in volume was much greater than this, because the price of manufactured goods has been reduced 25 per cent since 1860.

The majority report speaks of the revenue tariff period between 1846 and 1860 as one in which our woolen industry signally flourished. The figures of the census, however, show that at the close of this period in 1860 the value of our manufactures of wool was only \$88,750,000, or \$2.10 per inhabitant, against \$344,250,000, or \$5.50 per inhabitant, in 1890. In other words, the increase per capita in value of our woolen industry under protection was one and a half times as much as the entire growth from the first settlement of the country.

The value of the wealth accumulated by the people of this country in the thirty years between 1860 and 1890 under protection was nearly four times as much as was that accumulated in the two hundred and forty years from the landing of the Pilgrims to the election of Lincoln. The wealth of this country in 1860 was only \$514 per inhabitant; in 1890 it was \$1,000 per inhabitant. The contention that the wealth in the possession of the workingmen is no greater than thirty years ago is disproved by the returns of the savings banks, which show a large increase in average deposits, as well as by the increase of 68 per cent in the purchase power of wages.

In the thirty years from 1830 to 1860 there were built in this country only 30,603 miles of railway. In the thirty years from 1860 to 1890 there were built 106,512 miles of railway. In the decade between 1880 and 1890 there was built in the United States nearly four times the mileage of railway that was built in the decade between 1850 and 1860.

A better test still of the wisdom of any economic policy is its effect on the welfare of the masses of the people.

It has been said that the consumption of iron in any country is the infallible test of its material progress. Apply this test to the revenue and protective eras of the United States and to Great Britain. In 1860 the United States consumed only 61½ pounds of iron per inhabitant, the most of which was imported, while Great Britain consumed 173 pounds per inhabitant.

In 1892 the United States consumed 335 pounds of iron per inhabitant, five times as much as in 1860, nearly all of which was made in this country, while Great Britain consumed only 275 pounds per inhabitant.

Wages increased 60 per cent in money and 68 per cent in purchase power between 1860 and 1890 under our protective policy, and less than one-third as much in Great Britain.

In 1850 one day's work of a weaver in this country would buy 8½ yards of standard sheeting; in 1860 it would buy 10 yards, and in 1891, 27 yards. But in 1891 one day's work would buy only 20 yards in Great Britain.

In the revenue decade between 1850 and 1860 one day's work of an ironworker would buy 50 pounds of bar iron; in the protective decade between 1880 and 1890 100 pounds, while in the latter decade in Great Britain one day's work would buy only 75 pounds.

The gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. WILSON] and others who are now trying to revise history by affirming that the revenue tariff period between 1846 and 1860 was the most prosperous era of the United States, overlook the fact that there are gentlemen living, some of them in this Chamber, whose memory goes back to those days, and who themselves experienced some of the evil results of that tariff policy, which were deferred for a time by the Mexican war, the gold discoveries in California, and the Crimean war, but finally burst with tornado force upon our country in 1857-'58-'59. I suggest to these gentlemen that they take down the musty volumes which contain President Buchanan's messages to Congress in December, 1857 and 1858, and reread his pictures of the sad condition of our industrial and financial interests in those years, which our free-trade friends tell us were the "golden era" of our history. And the tarnished character of this "golden era" will be made strikingly apparent if they will also reread the official reports of the almost ineffectual efforts of the National Government in 1860 to borrow money to meet a deficiency in the Federal Treasury even at 12 per cent interest.

It is sometimes charged that protection is selfish and unchristian.

tian and antagonistic to the dictates of a broad philanthropy. If so, then the family relation, ordained by God, in which the head is admonished to care first of all for those placed in his charge, is selfish and unchristian. If so, the nation, also divinely ordained, whose primary duty it is to make the most of its own people, and in that way do the most for mankind, is selfish and unchristian. No family and no nation may do injustice to others. Protection does no injustice to others. It is no injustice to anyone for this nation to say to others, "For the highest well-being of our people we maintain a high wage and a high standard of living, and in order to maintain this competition for our markets must proceed on the basis of our wage and living standard. If you choose to maintain a lower wage and a lower standard of living you can do so for yourselves, but when you seek our markets, we ask that you pay into our Treasury as a duty a sum which shall place your competition on the basis of our high wage and high standard of living." This is not only just, but eminently Christian and philanthropic. Indeed, we hope that the influence of our example may lead other countries to adopt our high wage and high standard of living, under which the masses of our people have become the most prosperous on the face of the earth.

LABOR COST OF PRODUCTION AND DISTRIBUTION.

Mr. Chairman, there is one defense of the pending bill which I must not pass by. "After all," say its advocates, "there is enough average duty left by this bill—30 per cent—to fully cover the difference of wages of labor here and abroad in production and distribution."

This is an after thought, and entirely inconsistent with every other argument that has been put forth in antagonism to protection. More than this, the fact is not as claimed. If it be true, then this bill is open to the same objections from the other side that are made against our protective tariffs. No; the authors of this bill well know that they have not been as inconsistent as that.

In the first place, of course the claim is not true as to the products of industries which have been placed on the free list. And no one will contend it is true as to the large number of industries whose competing foreign products are to be admitted with a duty of only 10 to 15 per cent.

Even as to those industries whose competing foreign products are to be admitted ultimately at from 25 to 35, and in a few cases 40 per cent ad valorem, which will not exceed a specific duty equivalent to more than 25 to 30 per cent in the case of textiles, the duty will not be equal to the difference of wages in production and distribution here and abroad.

While the labor cost of manufacturing textiles, for example, averages about 25 per cent of the domestic valuation and 33 per cent of the foreign valuation on which duties are imposed, yet this 33 per cent only includes the manufacture after mill and machinery are completed and the supplies and materials furnished. It does not include the labor in building mill, machinery, and harnessing power, nor the labor on materials and supplies, nor the labor in transportation, selling, etc. Ex-Congressman Abram S. Hewitt, a practical manufacturer, stated to the Committee on Ways and Means a few years ago that 90 per cent of the cost of every manufactured article (not simply 25 per cent) is labor; and when this labor receives nearly double here for a given amount of effort than is paid in England, it is absurd to talk about a duty that will practically be only 30 per cent, placing on an even basis an English and an American industry manufacturing an advanced article.

When it is borne in mind that \$32,000,000 of fine cotton goods were imported last year in the face of a duty of 15 per cent ad valorem higher than is proposed by this bill; \$37,000,000 of woollens in the face of a duty 20 per cent ad valorem higher; not to mention more than \$200,000,000 of other manufactured goods in the face of a duty 15 per cent higher, it is clear that even those higher duties could not have been much, if any, in excess of the actual difference of money cost of production and distribution here and abroad.

REDUCED DUTIES MEAN REDUCED WAGES.

As a matter of fact, with the exception of certain instances in which some industries have had special and exceptional favor, the duties fixed by this bill will in practical administration prove not to be protective on the basis of the wages that existed in this country one year ago. They are not intended to be protective. They will necessitate a reduction of wages in order that our industries may compete with foreign industries whose products are to be admitted to our markets at lower rates of duty.

What has already taken place in the reduction of wages throughout this country in consequence of the necessity imposed on industries to anticipate the large reduction of the duties on competing foreign imports, ought to be a complete answer to the contention of the free-trade theorists that protective duties have had nothing to do with increasing wages 60 per cent estimated in money and 68 per cent estimated in purchasing

power since 1860, as shown by Labor Commissioner Wright's statistics; or that duties may be reduced below the protective point without lowering wages. An ounce of experience is worth more than a ton of theory. But in this case our sad experience since it became evident that there is to be a revolutionary tariff change, weighs many tons.

"Wages are made by demand and supply and not by protective duties," exclaim the opponents of protection. In one sense wages are made by supply and demand if all the elements affecting supply and demand are taken into consideration; but supply is affected by the standard of living and many other conditions, and demand by the extent of the diversification of industries and the consumptive capacity of the people. Where the industries of a country are confined to agriculture and a few crude industries, as they were everywhere in this country seventy years ago, and as they would be now if we should give up manufacturing industries and import our goods from abroad, the demand for labor is restricted and wages comparatively low. But when under the policy of protection we began to send less and less of our raw materials to Europe to be manufactured for us there, and to establish manufacturing industries here, the demand for labor increased, our productive and consumptive power multiplied, and wages began to increase as estimated in money, and even more as estimated in purchasing power. In other words, our protective policy has maintained and increased wages by enlarging the demand for labor and so multiplying pursuits as to give each man the opportunity best adapted to his tastes and capacity, and by increasing the consumptive power of the people.

There ought to be nothing clearer to any thinking man than that when thousands of industries are being carried on here and employing labor which is paid from 50 to 100 per cent more than in England for the same amount of service, and the duties on the competing goods are lowered so as to not fully cover the difference of money cost of production or manufacture and distribution here and abroad, then one of two things must take place here; either such industries must stop here or wages must be reduced to offset the new competition caused by a reduction of duties. As a matter of fact, both of these results are taking place all around us in anticipation of the reduction of duties. Labor organizations are valuable in maintaining uniform wages in the same industries within our own borders; but when competition comes in in the shape of the products of cheaper labor abroad, admitted free of duty or at a lower rate than the difference of wages here and abroad, such organizations are powerless for the reason that they can not control foreign wages.

And it is not simply the laborers and owners of so-called protected industries that are feeling the evil results of this threatened change, but every class of our people. All of our industries are interlinked; and under our economic policy, as it existed for more than thirty years, all were under our protective system—some protected by natural conditions, some by protective duties. And when it became evident that this policy was to be overthrown, and business and industries began to prepare for the revolutionary change, then all classes felt the blow.

Our sad experience the past six months contrasted with our prosperity for thirty years previous demonstrates that the policy of maintaining protective duties is not "robbery," nor a tax which increases the burdens of the people, as the Democratic majority of the committee reporting this bill affirm, but just, wise, statesmanlike, and promotive of the welfare of all our people, in that it tends to diversify our industries, develop our natural resources, gives wider employment suited to the differing aptitudes of our people, develops healthy competition on the basis of our high wages, stimulates our inventive genius, encourages agriculture by opening up large near-by home markets to the products of the farm, increases the production of wealth, and greatly contributes to the prosperity of the nation. [Loud applause.]

Mr. HENDERSON of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Maine be allowed a few minutes. I understand that he can conclude in a very few minutes.

Mr. PENDLETON of West Virginia. Regular order.

Mr. DINGLEY. Mr. Chairman, I think, on reflection, I will stop right here.

[Mr. SPRINGER addressed the committee. See Appendix.]

Mr. DOLLIVER. Mr. Chairman, I have often thought during the progress of this debate that if we on the Republican side were charged with the responsibility of defending a bill open to as many objections as my friend from Illinois [Mr. SPRINGER] has just pointed out, we would not begin the argument by a reference to the present condition of the country. Everybody knows what the state of our financial and industrial affairs was a year ago. The last report of Dun's Commercial Agency for last year showed the

highest level of business activity ever known in the history of our people, an activity in which all occupations of the people shared. Agriculture had its part in that prosperity.

In my own State which I love to think of as the great agricultural area of the earth, the people in every department of business enjoyed a full measure of the general prosperity. In his message of 1892 the chief executive of Iowa, the first Democratic governor in a generation and probably the last we shall ever have, began his address to the Legislature with a general congratulation to our people that never before since the State was organized had everybody enjoyed so universal and widespread prosperity. From the pinnacle of the temple of national fortune the American people deliberately cast themselves down, trusting that Divine Providence would in some peculiar way give His angels charge concerning them to keep them. [Laughter.]

Within one year we find the country in a situation as has baffled the eloquence of my friend from Michigan [Mr. BURROWS] and my friend from Illinois [Mr. SPRINGER] to describe it. The Democratic party came forward at once with a remedy for the panic which followed the accession of Mr. Cleveland. After having attributed all of our misfortunes for thirty years to the protective tariff, after having gone through the campaign of 1892 without mentioning any other subject, they discovered about the first month of last summer that it was the silver policy of 1890 that had wrecked the industries of the United States; and though pledged to the American people to make a speedy and fatal attack upon the protective tariff, nearly a year elapsed before that subject was mentioned at all.

I have never heard anything more perfectly illustrative of the reluctance of the Democratic party to begin their assault on the tariff than the case of a gentleman who was riding in a sleeping car from Chicago to Rockford. He gave the porter a dollar, charging him under no circumstances to fail to put him off, saying that even if he resisted the porter must at all hazards put him off the car. He woke up at Galena without the assistance of the porter and went into the smoking room where that functionary was asleep. He found the porter's clothes torn, his face scratched, and his entire make-up in a state of dilapidation. "Didn't I pay you a dollar," said the indignant traveler, "to wake me up at Rockford?" "Fo de Lawd, Massa," said the mystified darkey, "who on earth do you suppose that man was I I done put off?" [Laughter.] So now we find the Democratic party here, dilapidated, torn with dissensions, wounded in the house of its friends, having disposed of the comparatively harmless question of silver, now at last reluctantly falling into conversation with the main question that has occupied their attention for so many years.

I like to talk about the tariff as well as anybody, but I confess that I sometimes get confused in the mists and fog banks of theory through which we are called to pass in conducting such a discussion. To my mind the tariff question is a question of fact. So that when we find a man in the clouds, in the upper air of speculation, the first thing I try to do is to bring him down to the earth where people live and labor and do business. That I propose to do to-day with the kind attention of the House. The act of 1892, tried by the evidence accessible to everybody, thoroughly justified itself even in the brief time before it was overturned. It had specific objects; and it is historically certain that even in the brief space of two years before the election of 1892 it accomplished these objects in a measure hardly expected even by its friends.

There is no slavery in the world which deludes a man's judgment and binds his faculties like a long devotion to the theory of free trade. It seems to destroy the most useful faculties men have. Common sense is the most splendid possession of the human mind. It is the only absolutely reliable human faculty. If this world were full of philosophers, of statesmen, of orators, of political economists, it would hardly be possible for a plain man to live in it at all. They would talk him to death; or if he escaped that, they would argue him, after the manner of Edward Atkinson's recent address to the workingmen of Boston, into the belief that by some new principle of cookery the shin bone of a beef can be so prepared as not to be distinguished from a sirloin steak. [Laughter.] Fortunately we have had in the history of the country at least four resplendent types of American common sense—Benjamin Franklin, Andrew Jackson, Horace Greeley, and Abraham Lincoln. [Applause.]

If the young men of the United States can find a doctrine of practical politics upon which that little group of statesmen are agreed, it is a waste of time to hang around the lecture rooms of a free-trade university in the hope of getting a patentable improvement on their wisdom. [Applause.] The doctrine of the protective tariff, vindicated by the united judgment of these men, may be attacked, may even be for a time discredited, but can not be permanently dislodged from the sober judgment of the people. The storm of clamor and hearsay and interest may threaten it, but in the end it will find an anchorage in the pub-

lic judgment that is sure and steadfast. Can any sane man believe that God gave to our fathers the far-sighted prudence of Benjamin Franklin if he had intended this country to be guided by the advice of John Randolph, who used to say that he would go a mile out of his way to kick a sheep? [Laughter and applause.]

Can it be believed that Andrew Jackson made the 8th day of January notable and famous only to give the Democratic orators of our own times an opportunity to exploit the free-trade notions upon which the ordinance of nullification in South Carolina was predicated in 1832? [Applause.] Is it credible that Horace Greeley, faithful journalist that he was, made a daily record of the free-trade famine, in the midst of which the people celebrated the Christmas of 1854, if the chairman of the Ways and Means Committee is now to persuade us that the starving multitudes of that afflicted winter were really enjoying the blessings of a "symmetrical industrial development"? [Laughter.]

Can any man in his senses suppose that Abraham Lincoln was called to think, to labor, to suffer, and at last to die, that through his martyrdom the struggling millions of the earth might be free, if, after all, his countrymen are to cast away his counsel and reorganize their affairs on the lines laid down in the Confederate constitution? [Loud applause.] So that I for one am not discouraged, even if this Congress should enact the proposed bill into law without substantial modification, because I know that the people of the United States, having learned their lesson in the midst of broken fortunes and impoverished industries, will come back speedily to the historic standards of American common sense. [Applause.]

But I started to say that the web of the free-trade theory once wound about a man's judgment absolutely deludes his faculties and leaves him helpless and worthless in the arena of practical affairs; and I want to comment upon that by a few illustrations. None of us wish to disparage any member of Congress; in fact, we would not dare to do it. Between ourselves it will never do for us to assume that anybody could get into this body without having shown symptoms of being a great man. [Laughter.] So I do not wish to disparage the membership of the House. But in East Liverpool, Ohio, last fall they elected a Democrat to represent their interests in Congress [Mr. IKIRT]. I have not the pleasure of his personal acquaintance, but I am told that he is an excellent man. He ran for Congress on the theory that the protective tariff is a fraud, a violation of law, and ought to be immediately displaced by a tariff for revenue only.

Now, you would suppose that a man like that would have been sitting up in the night after his arrival here trying to kill off the protection idea. Yet early in the contest we find our friend before the Ways and Means Committee pleading like a condemned anarchist for the life of the industries that have been built up on the ruins of the Constitution in the neighborhood where he resides. [Laughter and applause on the Republican side.] I will read from his testimony before the Ways and Means Committee to illustrate what I mean. Let us first read the questions propounded to him by that serene philosopher from Maine [Mr. REED]. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. REED. How much does that duty—

That is, the 68 per cent on the crockery schedule—
increase the price to the consumer?

Mr. IKIRT. That is a question I can not answer.

Mr. REED. It does increase the price to the consumer, does it not?

Mr. IKIRT. I can not answer the question.

Mr. REED. You think the tariff is a tax added to the price of the article?

Mr. IKIRT. Yes, sir; undoubtedly it is.

Here we have a man wedded to Democratic phrases in the act of receiving his sight, but unable as yet to see men even as trees walking. And so our friend, enslaved by the language of Democratic politics, was absolutely unable to apply it to the practical phases even of the industry he represented. [Laughter and applause on the Republican side.]

Let us take another illustration, selected by chance from some of the proceedings in which my amiable friend from Nebraska [Mr. BRYAN] participated. Now, our friend is a man solid and fixed in the conviction that the tariff is a tax. He may lose his grip on every other question, but that cherished conviction of his soul can not be shaken. It would appear that such is his fanaticism that if he went into a store and bought an article for less than the tariff amounts to, he would still be able to, by a perfect process of reasoning, to convince himself and possibly to convince the people of his district, that in some mysterious way, visible to the mind's eye, though to flesh and sense unknown, he had been compelled to work one day to pay for the article and another to pay the tariff on it. [Laughter on the Republican side.]

The only man that I have ever heard of who was able to make any impression on the mind of my friend was a witness who came here by authority of Queen Victoria to plead the cause of Bermuda potatoes and to bring tears to the eyes of the Ways and Means Committee by reciting the sad experience of Bermuda onions. [Laughter.] Now, my friend, full of his theory, was amazed at this witness. The man actually said that the tax was

very burdensome to Bermuda. He went so far as to observe that the farmers of Bermuda paid that tax. This aroused the interest of the gentleman from Nebraska, and he began to suspect that the witness had come to Washington by way of Columbus, and had stopped off between trains for a little talk with McKinley. [Laughter on the Republican side.] So he roused himself and demanded to know what the price of Bermuda vegetables was prior to the McKinley bill. The witness was unable to say. He then asked what the price of those vegetables was after the McKinley bill. The witness could not tell, since the price varied from time to time. And now comes my friend from Nebraska, armed with his theory, and undertakes to make war against the facts in the case.

Mr. BRYAN. How can you tell without knowing the price before the McKinley bill was enacted whether the consumer pays the tariff?

Mr. MASTERS. Well, I was treasurer of the Farmers' Alliance and I know that during the latter part of the present season the shipment of some 10,000 boxes or cases to New York paid 38 cents a box and the freight was 16 cents. They sold for about 60 cents. There was clearly a loss and they brought us in debt. If we did not pay the duty, who did?

[Laughter and applause on the Republican side.]

I have no doubt that my friend from Nebraska is figuring on that yet. He has not so far appeared in this debate, though we trust he may. I have sometimes thought, however, that he would not, for the reason that last summer he found occasion in this House to account for all the calamities that surround us and all the misfortunes we are heir to by charging them to the demonetization of silver; and it is possible that after having put the workingmen of the country and the farmers of the country at the head of the free-coinage parade he might feel a certain hesitation in overworking them by placing them in a prominent position in the free-trade procession. [Applause and laughter on the Republican side.]

But we will not rest on particular instances. We will enlarge the field of observation a little. I was very much interested the other day when my friend from West Virginia [Mr. WILSON], a few years ago president of my old college in West Virginia—I loved him as Tam O'Shanter loved the landlord, like a very brother, though for an entirely different reason [laughter]—opened this debate. I was interested in what he said. I admired his eloquence and wondered how a man could conjure up a scheme of argument like that to contradict the experience of mankind. I was especially interested in his discussion about woolen cloth, how the tariff had been raised to 300 per cent, and how the poor working girl of the United States looked longingly across the sea upon her sister on the other side who was wearing a cloak she could not have without working one day for the garment and four days more to pay the duty on it; and I asked myself whether it would not have been a substantial improvement on the intellectual equipment of my old college president if there had been left in his head room for a few practical ideas. [Laughter on the Republican side.]

My friend talked as if his countrymen were beggars waiting for the cast-off clothing of Europe, and as if the more cow's hair it contained the more ardent ought our expressions of gratitude to be. He dwelt with a solicitude, evidently sincere, upon what happens in the custom-house; but that is not the question. The question is what happens in the homes of the American people. The question is, How are the American people dressed? how have thirty years of protection left the great masses of the people of our country in the matter of clothes? And every man whose mouth is on speaking terms with his mental faculties knows perfectly well that this is the only well-dressed country in the world. [Laughter and applause on the Republican side.]

You may be able to deceive yourselves in this matter, but you can not deceive even a casual traveler from abroad. Here is a little volume just printed by Daniel Owen & Co. (limited), Cardiff, Wales. It contains the letters written from the United States last summer by Lascelles Carr and printed in the Western Mail, the most influential Tory newspaper of Wales, of which he is the editor. The book is entitled "Yankee Land and the Yankees." On page 23 he says:

The more I see of this wonderful country and the further my inquiries reach, the more satisfied I am that it is the paradise of the workingman and especially of the working women. Wages are high and for the workman the cost of living is comparatively low. Except in the matter of house accommodation their circumstances are in every respect better than those of their English brethren. They eat better and more varied food, they dress better, they have at least as good means of education and other sources of intellectual and social recreation. Yesterday evening I stood at a ferry in Jersey City and saw the work girls trooping over in the boat from New York.

The crowd was composed of much the same social elements as those of which the crowd passing over Black Mars bridge consists. But, ah, what a difference in the appearance of these two sets of girls. These New Jersey girls were neatly and appropriately dressed, and not one of them but wore decent, well-fitting, and in some cases, quite elegant boots and shoes. They walked and spoke, and in every way behaved themselves as ladies. Mind you, this is no reflection on our English girls; it is only a reflection on the system under which the working classes are fain to accept such a rate of wages as puts neat clothes and good boots, and the elegance and propriety of behavior which accompany well-paid labor beyond their reach.

The workingwomen of the United States, for whose safety our

friend awakened our interest, are not looking in anxious enthusiasm at the cloaks that are on the backs of their sisters in Europe; the workingwomen of America are sending their money to Europe to enable their sisters to get out of the countries where cloaks are so very cheap. [Applause on the Republican side.] Neither are the men, for on page 36 of the same volume Mr. Carr says:

I have several times alluded—once more I change the subject—to the condition of the workingman in this country. The further my inquiries extend the more convinced I become that the real truth of the matter is that in this country a workman earns nearly twice as much as he would in England, and the cost of his living, except in the matter of rent and clothing, is about the same. Even in the matter of clothing the difference is not great, except in so far as it is brought about by the general use of much better clothing by the artisan in this country than in England.

Now, if my friend from West Virginia by some miracle of Divine grace could enlarge his vision to take in that fact, the speech which he delivered here the other day, and which my friend from Massachusetts [Mr. WALKER] was so desirous of seeing in print, would never appear in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at all. [Laughter.] I wish to say another thing. I have remarked that common sense is the only reliable guide in men's affairs; and the chief guardian and enlightener of common sense is experience. We have had in the United States a good deal of experience with this matter of the tariff; and if I thought you gentlemen would listen to me I would read from the New York Tribune of January 6, 1855, from the pen of grand old Horace Greeley, a few lines which condense the tariff history of the United States into a single paragraph. They are full of truth and wisdom.

A MEMBER. Let us have them:

Mr. DOLLIVER. I will read them:

Protection died in 1818, bequeathing to British free trade a trade that gave us an excess import of specie, a people among whom there existed great prosperity, a large public revenue, and a rapidly diminishing public debt.

British free trade died in 1824, bequeathing to protection a trade that gave an excess export of specie, an impoverished people, a declining public revenue, and a stationary public debt.

Protection died in 1834-'35, bequeathing to British free trade a trade that gave an excess import of specie, a people more prosperous than any that had ever been known, a revenue so that it had been rendered necessary to emancipate from duty tea, coffee, and many other articles which we did not produce, and a treasury free from all charge on account of public debt.

British free trade died in 1842 bequeathing to protection a trade that gave an excess export of specie, a people ruined, and their government in a state of repudiation, a public treasury bankrupt and begging everywhere for loans at the highest rate of interest, a revenue collected and disbursed in irredeemable paper money, and a very large foreign debt.

Protection died in 1847 bequeathing to British free trade a trade that gave an excess import of specie, a highly prosperous people, their government restored to credit, a rapidly growing commerce, a large public revenue, and a declining foreign debt.

British free trade has next to make its will, having nothing to bequeath but a trade that drains us of our specie, a people rapidly passing toward ruin, a declining commerce, and a foreign debt requiring for the payment of its mere interest at least twenty millions of dollars a year.

Now, my friend the chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means, both in his speech and in the report which was submitted to this House, tells us that the period of the Walker tariff, 1847 to 1857, was the golden age of our industrial prosperity; and there are in existence some statistics, always open to suspicion, that would lead even a careful student to that opinion. I have made it my business during this debate to go down into the daily record of events preserved in the newspaper files in the Library of Congress in order to find out how the people lived in those days, what they did, and what they thought; and I stand here to say that, notwithstanding the discovery of gold in California, notwithstanding that magnificent stream of wealth poured into the channels of American trade, the Walker tariff, going into effect in 1847, had impoverished and bankrupted this people long before the middle of 1854; and I intend to prove that statement to the satisfaction of every unprejudiced man.

I had occasion in the last Congress in a speech made here to cite the daily record made by the New York Tribune; and somebody who was evidently unable to appreciate a man like Horace Greeley, said that he was a protectionist, and therefore, like the wage-earners in their protests against this bill, entirely unreliable and probably intimidated. [Laughter.] I go now into the columns of the free-trade press, and will read a few lines from the New York Herald editorial of January 1, 1855, a free-trade editor's farewell address to one of those years of "symmetrical" prosperity, about which the gentleman from West Virginia told us:

Seldom indeed within our recollection has there been a year so darkly overshadowed by general calamities, national misfortune and local disasters and suffering as the eventful and gloomy year which has just expired. The great financial and commercial panic of 1837 did not bring to us, with all its train of bankruptcies, explosion, and general ruin, so much of positive suffering to the working classes of our great cities, the combined causes which have brought about the existing lamentable financial and commercial depression.

I present here also the memorial of the unemployed working men of the city of New York to the mayor and common council at that time, a memorial which, taken in connection with the speech of the chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means, is to me very interesting. We had the pleasure yesterday of

hearing the eloquent observations made by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. JOHNSON], who seemed to think that he had discovered a remedy for the evils of our times, or that if he had not, the apostle whose follower he is had discovered it; but I call his attention to the fact that the humble working people of New York in 1854, in the midst of the poverty which surrounded them in that city, made a logical, square, and persuasive presentation of the theory which proposes to relieve the people of their distress, by putting the burdens of the Government upon the landed property of the country.

I will print a portion of this memorial, which appears in full in the New York Herald of January 4, 1855:

To the mayor and common council of the city of New York:

The memorial of the undersigned respectfully shows that at a meeting of more than 2,000 unemployed laborers and mechanics of the city of New York commenced in the Park on Tuesday afternoon of the 26th day of December and adjourned from there to Hope Chapel, in Broadway, on the evening of Friday, the 29th of December, for the purpose of providing not merely temporary but permanent relief to the unemployed poor of the city who are now, in addition to their inability to obtain work, threatened with famine, your memorialists were appointed a committee in behalf of the meeting to draw up and cause to be presented to you for your immediate action this memorial.

In an editorial in the New York Herald of January 4, 1855, you will find these words:

The past four months have witnessed a series of disasters affecting most gravely corporation and individual credit, and tending to take away from moneyed institutions and merchants the means on which they have traded for the last year or two. Stocks of various kinds have ceased to exist altogether. Railroad shares have fallen to the verge of bankruptcy, and individual paper has ceased to be negotiable.

That seems to be a fac simile of the condition that has prevailed this year. Here is another editorial from the New York Herald of January 6, 1855, showing that the depression to which the newspaper referred was not confined to the city of New York:

Elsewhere will be found some mention of large failures at Boston and New Orleans. The epidemic is traveling over the whole country. No city of any note can expect to escape. All followed the example of New York when flush times began. All must now follow her as closely in adversity.

You will find in the Herald of January 6, 1855, an address of the unemployed workingmen's committee to the mayor of the city of New York. It was read by Mr. West. He said:

We do not come before the committee as beggars, but we ask what we deem right. We ask not alms, but work. We don't want a little soup now and some cast-off clothing to-morrow. But we do want work and the means of making an honest livelihood. The condition of the working classes is most piteous. They want bread. Is there not enough in the city? They want clothes. Is there none made nowadays?

In the same column appears an appeal of the Five Points Mission House for the multitudes, victims of starvation in that portion of the city. It exhibits a picture that even now would touch the heart with pity if it were not in the midst of surroundings substantially the same, and surroundings, in my judgment, depending in main part upon the same causes.

It is well known—

Says the appeal—

to those who are acquainted with that locality, that hundreds of families have sold or pawned the last article of furniture or apparel to procure food, and are now left on the bare floor without bedding or fuel, and not knowing where they may get the next mouthful to eat. Persons in these circumstances (many of them sober, industrious people) are thronging the Mission House daily.

Mr. TERRY. What year do those quotations refer to?

Mr. DOLLIVER. The close of 1854 and January, 1855.

Mr. TERRY. How long did that depressed condition continue?

Mr. DOLLIVER. The next thing we hear of it is the message of James Buchanan of December 8, 1857, stating that it had become epidemic, universal, and chronic in the United States.

Mr. TERRY. I will ask the gentleman whether the condition of the country did not improve afterwards—

Mr. DOLLIVER. There is little evidence of it. So far as I can find the condition of the country during that period was such that few of us would have been able to live in it.

Mr. TERRY. In that statement the gentleman differs from a very distinguished member of his party (Mr. Blaine), who shows that after that there was a revival of business.

Mr. DOLLIVER. I have gone to the sources of information; I do not care with whom I may differ, even if he be our most distinguished leader.

I will read also an editorial article from Hunt's Merchants' Magazine, a free-trade journal of trade, and the only one that is preserved from that period:

The commercial embarrassments noticed in our last have been continued, and in many sections of the country the pressure has increased, while confidence is shaken everywhere and all classes are made to realize the insecurity of worldly possessions. The causes which led to this have been a long time at work. The prosperity which prevailed almost universally up to the middle of last year had made our business men so confident in their own strength that all classes had expanded their engagements far beyond the protection of their own resources, and were exposed to the storm which began to gather on every side. Goods which had accumulated abroad when the demand had almost ceased were crowded upon our shores at whatever advance could be obtained, thus aggravating the evil.—*Hunt's Merchants' Magazine*, volume 31, page 716, December, 1854.

This article shows that the depression to which I have been referring visibly began in the middle of the year 1853, a thing which it will be important to students of this situation to bear in mind. It may be worth while, also, to call the attention of the committee to the fact that during all this depression the antics of the Democratic party were very similar to their behavior in the present Congress. I read from a Washington letter to the New York Herald of January 6, 1855. It is a ray of calcium light thrown on the background of the situation:

Next Tuesday is the day fixed upon by the Committee on Ways and Means to call up the bill for the reduction of the tariff.

And here is a letter from Washington to the North American, quoted in the New York Herald of 1855:

The conspiracy of the Democratic members to break down the tariff of 1846, and to deprive the country of the little protection which it affords was considerably advanced last evening by a secret meeting or caucus held at the Capitol sometime between dark and midnight.

It was supposed that the present Congress had furnished us with the first example in our history of a secret caucus without deliberation, publicity, or discussion, agreeing upon an industrial programme for the American people. We are glad to relieve the members of the Ways and Means Committee of to-day by citing the example of their predecessors. Then, as now, the secret Democratic caucus and the public soup house went together.

Our city reporters—

Says the New York Herald editorial of January 14, 1855—

note that Mr. A. T. Stewart supplies from nine to twelve hundred people daily with soup. Mr. Lindenmüller does the same in Chatham street, and charitable committees discharge a like duty in each of the populous wards of the city.

If this had been read without giving the date of the paper everybody would have said that it was from the New York Herald of to-day. Here is a workingman's procession described in the New York Herald of January 11, 1855. To-day is the thirtieth anniversary of that great demonstration of unemployed workmen. Its banners will serve to illustrate the situation that now prevails:

We want work and must have it.

Hunger is a sharp thorn.

This is our last resource.

Live and let live.

I call the attention of the Democratic managers to the fact that these starving multitudes were not asking for a reduction of the tariff, they were not even asking for cheap clothes and cheap food. They were asking for the privilege of being employed. The country can gain no advantage through cheap goods that can at all compare in its ministrations of good to the community which comes from the universal employment of the people. There is no burden levied at the custom-house, whether it is 100 per cent or 500 per cent, that can compare at all with the incalculable burden of three millions of willing workers without anything for their hands to do. [Applause.]

A MEMBER. Did you say three millions of unemployed persons?

Mr. DOLLIVER. I saw that number stated in a great newspaper. I have no doubt there are more of them. This matter long since ceased to be a mere question of politics with me. The saddest sight I ever witnessed in this Capitol was that delegation from Philadelphia, intelligent, well-dressed, manly young workingmen, standing before the Ways and Means Committee pleading, as they said, not for their employers, but for their employment, for their wives and their children. These men stated that the working people of Philadelphia are without occupation, and in many cases without food. They said that they represented 200,000 people, one-fifth of the population of the greatest industrial city on this continent.

Now it is a libel upon our common manhood and a slander against human nature itself, to say that these men were intimidated except as their actions were influenced by the facts and circumstances that surround them. And so when the chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means stood here and undertook to tell us the other day that the hundreds of thousands of workingmen of the United States who have protested by petition and in great public meetings against this bill have done so under duress from their employers and had been bullied and driven here by brutal threats, I could not keep out of my heart a sense of indignation at the disparagement of the workingmen of the United States implied by that reproach against their manhood. [Applause.]

The chairman went further, and in the same breath illustrated the attitude of our greatest and most thoughtful trades unions and the mass of our laboring people in looking with a protest of alarm upon this bill by the bogus petitions of John Quincy Adams's time, in which slaves were brought into this House by petition asking that their slavery might be made perpetual. Horace Greeley once said that the man who pretends to be in favor of high wages and a low tariff is either a knave or a fool.

Has it come to this that the doctrine of free trade, the favorite article in the creed of slavery, can not be resisted by the working people of the United States, enlightened as they are both by experience and by the wisdom of faithful and approved statesmen, without inviting from a leader of the Democratic party an odious and infamous comparison with slaves. [Applause on Republican side.]

A great deal has been said in the course of this tariff controversy from time to time about the working people of the United States and about the farmers. If there is anything that stirs up pathetic sentiment in the heart of the Democratic politician more than the distress of the workingman it is the distress of the farmer. As I said, I live in the greatest agricultural community in the world. It is true, as the gentleman from Illinois observed, that we have some mortgage indebtedness, because wherever you find wealth and prosperity accompanied by a business integrity that never repudiated a debt or dodged the fulfillment of a contract, you will find the credit which lies at the basis of investment and enterprise.

The States that are freest of individual debts in the United States are shown by the census to be the poorest and by the record to be given over to questionable business methods and in many cases to the open repudiation of their obligations. These States are comparatively free from mortgages, not on account of the thrift of their people, but by reason of the well-grounded caution of people who have money to loan. I know something personally of mortgages, having contributed at least one to the census of 1890. It represented the amount I paid for my homestead when I was without a dollar in the world and had to convert credit into a mortgage. I do not believe that it increased my poverty; on the contrary I have always suspected that it increased my wealth. And it does not take a very high order of intelligence to discern that that simple case represents the situation of nine-tenths of those who are in debt in the State of Iowa.

That is not a matter of speculation. It was made a matter of investigation and record in the county of Crawford, in my own Congressional district, where the census showed that 90 per cent of the indebtedness of the people represented the purchase price of land and only an insignificant fraction of the people's debts represented either their misfortune or their poverty. It is true that our people have suffered from time to time through the depression of business and the decline of market values; but we have been bombarded for a generation with humbug arguments for free trade; and the grand Commonwealth stands to-day first in the column of Republican States with the doctrine of protection made secure by the intelligence of the farmers of Iowa. [Applause on the Republican side.]

My friend [Mr. WILSON] in closing his address to the House took occasion to set up the standard of free trade; that is to say, the standard of plantation politics before the war in the United States; and as he called the Democratic party to rally around it in the name of the workingman and of the farmer, I made up my mind at the first opportunity to tell him that the farmers of the State of Iowa want none of the theories any less of the sympathy of the Democratic managers in this House. [Applause on the Republican side.] They talk about their affection for the farmer! Yet even the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SPRINGER] who has just taken his seat has just stated that if wisdom such as his could have left its impress on the proposed legislation he would have framed the bill in respect to the schedule of agricultural products exactly as the McKinley bill was framed.

What have these demonstrative friends of the farmers done? I recall very well the day when somebody introduced me to our friend from Massachusetts [Mr. STEVENS]. I took up the Congressional Directory and found that he was the largest individual woolen mill proprietor in the United States. When I saw him go over to the Democratic side and sit down my heart came into my mouth and I said, "Those fellows will murder that man." [Laughter and applause on the Republican side.] I was young in this business then. I had at that time a tendency to believe everything I heard in speeches, and used to sit here listening as the precious truths fell from the lips of the orators. I heard these woolen manufacturers denounced as thieves, as burglars, as cutthroats, as pirates, and as pickpockets, fastening their smooth fingers upon the pockets of the American farmer, and I said, "If that woolen manufacturer goes over there, BRYAN and SPRINGER or some of those brethren will get around him, draw him into ambush, and murder him in cold blood." [Laughter on the Republican side.]

But the next thing I heard of it was that the Democratic managers had placed him on the Ways and Means Committee of the House to help lift the burdens from American agriculture; and how did they lift them? Exactly as this House is about to do. They take the seventh agricultural industry of the American people, wool-growing, and put it into helpless and hopeless competition with those latitudes of the world where the business

can be conducted almost without cost, all in order that the "thieves and burglars" of New England may have cheaper material out of which to manufacture cloth. Now, we do not take the view that the managers of industrial enterprise in New England or elsewhere are thieves and burglars. We have sense enough to know that these great centers of production are managed by men of affairs with economy and integrity, and if the people of New England prosper the people of our country have never had any quarrel with them on that account, because we have things to sell and we wish our customers to have money with which to buy them.

So the Republican party has never encouraged a quarrel with New England on that account; but when I find this masquerade of reform sacrificing the seventh agricultural industry of the country in order to increase the advantages of the woolen manufacturers of New England, I say to myself that nothing can compare to the thrift of New England, except the stupidity and the hypocrisy of the Democratic party. [Applause on the Republican side.] What else have they done? They have taken every article that the farmers of the United States produce and either put it on the free list or so greatly reduced the duty as to invite an immediate increase of importation; and in order that I may not be suspected of partisan bias in that judgment, I want to read what the greatest Democratic newspaper in the United States has to say this morning of their treatment of the American farmer. I quote from the New York Sun of to-day:

Prof. WILSON's service to the great silent masses, the farmers, is the putting of a lot of agricultural products on the free list for the benefit of their Canadian competitors, and the increasing of the farmers' taxes for the benefit of manufacturers. The great silent masses must bear additional burdens in order that the manufacturers, protected and favored by the remission of duties on raw materials and by the continuation of protective duties on the manufactured products, may wax fat while the silent masses are plodding their way with WILSON taxation weighing them down.

I wish also to say a word about the wages of the working people of the United States. This country will find out within the next five years that Mr. Blaine was right in stating that the tariff question is essentially a question of wages. The lesson will come through experience; and for one I am not sorry for it, because the Ruler of the Universe has only one way in which to teach men and nations, and that is to send them along the pathway of experience.

The trouble with this country to-day is that a whole generation has grown up in the United States since we have had any practical experience on the other side of the tariff question; and so dreams and visions and mysteries and speculations, drawn mostly from the text-books of foreign political economists, have taken the place of the knowledge which would have saved the American people from the folly of 1892. And even now we are regaled in this debate with long extracts from Adam Smith, brought into this House as novelties, as if the American people had never heard of Mr. Smith. Adam Smith printed his book the same year that our fathers declared their independence; and if the people of the United States had desired to govern themselves by the wisdom of the father of English political economy they have had more than a century to read his book and apply his philosophy to their affairs.

It is an interesting fact that while our Ways and Means Committee is enlightening this debate by bringing into it the precepts of English political economists, old and new, great English statesmen like Lord Salisbury, speaking to the English silk-weavers and observing the almost total destruction of that great English industry, looked upon the maxims of his own school and mournfully declared that their application might be sound philosophy, but it was poor business. Nor is it remarkable that the editor of the Cardiff Mail, recently returned from an extended tour with a party of friends through the United States, takes the trouble to print the little book, of which I have already quoted freely, in which the sturdy Welsh good sense candidly admits that the situation and experience of the United States have contradicted the economical speculations in which his judgment had always yielded a ready acquiescence. He says:

I am, as you know, a convinced free trader. Protection is to mean economical heresy, the fraud and folly of which are capable of mathematical demonstration—a demonstration as absolutely convincing as that by which the solution of a problem in Euclid is arrived at. And yet throughout the length and breadth of this vast continent one is almost daily brought face to face with solid, indisputable facts that seem to give the lie to the soundest and most universally accepted axioms of political economy. Let me give you just one example: Under the shadow of a stringent protective tariff the manufacture of paper was commenced in the United States. Paper is still subject to a heavy import duty. According to our theories that ought to enhance its price to the consumer in this country.

As a matter of fact, the New York newspaper proprietors buy their "news" at a less price than that at which it could be supplied to them in London, and some of the paper mills in New Jersey are actually exporting paper to the old country. Unless it can be shown that this paper industry would have grown up without the aid of a protective tariff, it is futile—nay, it is an impertinence—for an outsider to say that the Americans have acted unwisely in taxing themselves for a few years in order to establish in their midst a great industry, giving occupation to a great quantity of highly paid labor. And it seems to me that this set of facts and the arguments based on

It apply to many other industries which are assuming such colossal proportions throughout the length and breadth of the land.—*Yankee Land and the Yankees*, page 53.

Now, I like the English. They have never in any emergency failed to take care of themselves. I hope we have not lost our inheritance in that serviceable turn of mind. I can easily see how the problem of cheap production has driven English statesmanship to ignore every other element that enters into the life of man, resisting even that reduction in the hours of labor which is the hope of the working people of the world. So that I never tried to convince an Englishman that his countrymen have not had sagacity enough to look after their own interests. All I object to is that the leaders of English opinion should feel called upon, having taken care of their own people, to propose a plan for taking care of us.

I have an old friend at home, a farmer, who comes in occasionally to see me, a great talker, especially on the tariff. He likes to argue with the Democrats. Every time they make an argument in favor of the free-trade theory the old man always begins his reply with these words, "I recollect." If the Republican party in 1892 had had to do with men and women able to recollect what had happened in the experience of the United States we would have avoided the folly of that election.

Now, what of the labor condition in the United States? I believe that if our civilization is ever destroyed it will be by the degradation of American wages. This Government has no facility, for any length of time, to take care of universal popular discontent. In other countries it may be done with armies. In this country it may be done for months with soup-houses and with the bread of charity; but in the long run the idleness will destroy the fabric of our institutions and produce the irresponsible and uncontrollable forces that may shake the structure of modern society to its foundation.

I heard my friend from Illinois [Gen. BLACK] the other day, and who of us could express the amazement with which we heard him, deliberately advising the degradation of American labor in order to discourage immigration? Why, gentlemen, it is a great thing for a nation to be able to take care of itself. It is more than any nation in Europe has been able to do; but the glory of the Republican party is that for thirty years we have not only taken care of our own, but we have opened the doors of hospitality to the struggling people of the world, and they have come, ten millions of them, and instead of bearing down the level of our civilization they have helped us to lift it up, until to-day the American workingman has within his reach a larger share of the comforts of life than could have been secured by a day's work in any nation of the world or in any age in the history of the human race. [Applause.] That statement does not depend upon my testimony alone, for we recall that in the midst of the eloquent remarks of my friend from New York [Mr. COCKRAN], last summer in the silver debate, he made that notable admission in the cause of truth and political integrity, that a day's work in the United States goes further to provide a family with the necessities of life than ever before since society was organized. [Applause.]

Where did the idea come from that the American workingman ought to take his place on the level of the civilization of the Old World? My countrymen, it came from the plantations of the slave power, where labor received no wages, and where the leaders of politics openly maintained that proposition in express words. Gen. McDuffie, chairman of the Ways and Means Committee in 1832, without quibble or equivocation, admitted on this floor that the wages of American labor under free trade would fall to the level of the wages paid in other countries, and boldly declared that it ought to be so. That idea lies historically at the bottom of the free-trade agitation in the United States, and I denounce it here in the name of every American family that buys the comforts of life with the wages of daily labor. [Applause.]

The Republican party, whatever may be the discipline of its defeat, will never consent to take away from the firesides of American labor the shield of American law. My friend from West Virginia [Mr. WILSON] speaks of the lordly and almost kingly tone in which the employers of labor describe the unfortunate strikes which prevailed in some of the departments of industry in 1892. He emphasizes what the organ of the iron and steel industry describes as "the rebellion of labor." I do not undertake to apologize for the phrase; but I stand here to say that if there was a rebellion of labor it was a rebellion against organized capital and not an active hostility against the protective tariff, and if any proof was necessary I need only call the attention of this House to the fact that the "rebellious" Association of Iron and Steel Workers came before the Ways and Means Committee at this session pleading for the maintenance of the tariff of 1890 while Andrew Carnegie, departing for the Valley of the Nile for a winter's vacation, made a farewell address to his fellow-citizens by advising them to support the Wilson tariff bill.

There is one case in which the protests of labor were not the result of intimidation for it would almost seem that the arguments which have brought American labor to this Capitol with its protests have secured for the Wilson bill from the most repulsive syndicate of capital the benediction of approval. I am content if the indorsement of Andrew Carnegie costs the Democratic party as many votes in times to come as it has caused us in times past. We gladly exchange the support of the syndicate of iron and steel employers for the good will of the Amalgamated Association of Iron and Steel Workers.

A great many people talk as if in the general decline of values the American farmer had been left behind. I intend to put into the body of my remarks a few observations made by my friend, once a member of this House, Senator MILLS, of Texas, a man whose tariff bill in the light of the present seems like the work of a statesman. [Laughter on the Republican side.] It is a profound study of the relation of American agriculture to the decline of values in recent times, a study which enabled the Senator to prove upon the floor of the Senate that while the products of the American farmer have declined in value in thirty years their fall has come far short in the fall of the value of every article that is essential to the comfort of farm life of the United States.

Prices of certain products from 1873 to 1891.

| Years. | Silver, per fine ounce. | Gold value of silver dollar. | Articles that farmers sell. | | | | | | | | | |
|------------------|-------------------------|------------------------------|-----------------------------|-------------------|--------------------|----------------------------|------------------|------------------|------------------|--------------------|--------------------|---------------------|
| | | | Cotton, per pound. | Corn, per bushel. | Wheat, per bushel. | Bacon and hams, per pound. | Lard, per pound. | Pork, per pound. | Beef, per pound. | Butter, per pound. | Cheese, per pound. | Tobacco, per pound. |
| | | | Cents. | Cents. | Cents. | Cents. | Cents. | Cents. | Cents. | Cents. | Cents. | Cents. |
| 1873 | \$1.33 | \$1.004 | 18.8 | 61 | \$1.31 | 8.8 | 9.2 | 7.6 | 7.7 | 21.1 | 13.1 | 10.7 |
| 1874 | 1.30 | .988 | 15.4 | 71 | 1.43 | 9.6 | 9.4 | 8.2 | 8.2 | 25.0 | 13.1 | 9.6 |
| 1875 | 1.23 | .964 | 15.0 | 84 | 1.12 | 11.4 | 13.8 | 10.1 | 8.7 | 23.7 | 13.5 | 11.3 |
| 1876 | 1.17 | .894 | 12.9 | 67 | 1.24 | 12.1 | 13.3 | 10.6 | 8.7 | 23.9 | 12.6 | 10.4 |
| 1877 | 1.18 | .929 | 11.8 | 58 | 1.17 | 10.8 | 10.9 | 9.0 | 7.5 | 20.6 | 11.8 | 10.2 |
| 1878 | 1.16 | .891 | 11.1 | 56 | 1.34 | 8.7 | 8.8 | 6.8 | 7.7 | 18.0 | 11.4 | 8.7 |
| 1879 | 1.12 | .868 | 9.9 | 47 | 1.07 | 6.9 | 7.0 | 5.7 | 6.3 | 14.2 | 8.4 | 7.8 |
| 1880 | 1.13 | .886 | 11.5 | 54 | 1.25 | 6.7 | 7.4 | 6.1 | 6.4 | 17.1 | 9.5 | 7.7 |
| 1881 | 1.12 | .881 | 11.4 | 55 | 1.11 | 8.2 | 9.3 | 7.7 | 6.5 | 19.8 | 11.1 | 8.3 |
| 1882 | 1.13 | .878 | 11.4 | 66 | 1.19 | 9.9 | 11.6 | 9.0 | 8.5 | 19.3 | 11.0 | 8.5 |
| 1883 | 1.10 | .858 | 10.8 | 68 | 1.13 | 11.2 | 11.9 | 9.9 | 8.9 | 18.6 | 11.2 | 8.3 |
| 1884 | 1.10 | .861 | 10.5 | 61 | 1.07 | 10.2 | 9.5 | 7.9 | 7.6 | 18.2 | 10.3 | 9.1 |
| 1885 | 1.06 | .823 | 10.6 | 54 | .86 | 9.2 | 7.9 | 7.2 | 7.5 | 16.8 | 9.3 | 9.9 |
| 1886 | .99 | .769 | 9.9 | 49 | .87 | 7.5 | 6.9 | 5.9 | 6.0 | 15.6 | 8.3 | 9.6 |
| 1887 | .97 | .758 | 9.5 | 47 | .89 | 7.9 | 7.1 | 6.6 | 5.4 | 15.8 | 9.3 | 8.7 |
| 1888 | .97 | .727 | 9.8 | 55 | .85 | 8.6 | 7.7 | 7.4 | 5.3 | 18.3 | 9.9 | 8.3 |
| 1889 | .93 | .724 | 9.9 | 47 | .90 | 8.6 | 8.6 | 7.4 | 5.5 | 16.5 | 9.3 | 8.8 |
| 1890 | 1.06 | .809 | 10.1 | 41 | .83 | 7.7 | 7.1 | 6.0 | 5.4 | 14.4 | 9.0 | 8.6 |
| 1891 | .98 | .764 | 10.0 | 57 | .93 | 7.6 | 6.9 | 5.9 | 5.6 | 14.5 | 9.0 | 8.7 |
| Average decrease | 26 | 26 | 53 | 6 | 30 | 14 | 25 | 24 | 27 | 32 | 31 | 19 |

Prices of certain products from 1873 to 1891—Continued.

| Years. | Articles that farmers buy. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | Freight rate, per ton per mile. |
|------------------|----------------------------|-----------------------|--------------------|-----------------------|------------------------|-----------------|---------------------|---------------------|---------------------|----------------------------|------------------------|---------------------|---------------------|------------------------|--------------|---------------------|-----------------------------------|--------------------------|-----------------------|---------------------------------|
| | Refined sugar, per pound. | Cut nails, per pound. | Bar iron, per ton. | Steel rails, per ton. | Rio coffee, per pound. | Tea, per pound. | Sheeting, per yard. | Drilling, per yard. | Shirting, per yard. | Standard prints, per yard. | Print cloth, per yard. | Quinine, per ounce. | Goblets, per dozen. | 10 by 14 window glass. | Undershirts. | Ginghams, per yard. | Carpets, 2-ply Ingrain, per yard. | Black pepper, per pound. | Molasses, per gallon. | |
| 1873. | 11.6 | 4.90 | \$86.00 | \$120.50 | 18 | 95 | 13.31 | 14.13 | 19.41 | 11.37 | 6.69 | \$2.65 | 85 | \$3.40 | \$1.41 | 13 | \$1.14 | 19 | 69 | 2.00 |
| 1874. | 10.5 | 3.99 | 67.00 | 94.25 | 20 | 100 | 11.42 | 11.75 | 18.04 | 9.75 | 5.57 | 2.50 | 80 | 2.97 | 1.25 | 11 | 1.02 | 20 | 71 | |
| 1875. | 10.8 | 3.42 | 60.00 | 88.75 | 18 | 60 | 10.41 | 11.12 | 15.12 | 8.71 | 5.33 | 2.25 | 70 | 3.18 | 1.12 | 10 | .92 | 17 | 70 | |
| 1876. | 10.7 | 2.98 | 52.00 | 59.25 | 17 | 55 | 8.85 | 8.71 | 13.58 | 7.08 | 4.10 | 2.00 | 65 | 3.08 | 1.00 | 10 | .82 | 14 | 55 | |
| 1877. | 11.6 | 2.57 | 45.00 | 45.50 | 20 | 55 | 8.46 | 8.46 | 12.45 | 6.77 | 4.38 | 3.00 | 50 | 2.97 | .91 | 8 | .81 | 14 | 54 | |
| 1878. | 10.2 | 2.31 | 44.00 | 42.25 | 17 | 45 | 7.80 | 7.65 | 11.00 | 6.09 | 3.44 | 3.50 | 45 | 2.42 | .87 | 8 | .75 | 12 | 40 | |
| 1879. | 8.5 | 2.69 | 51.00 | 48.25 | 14 | 40 | 7.97 | 7.57 | 11.62 | 6.25 | 3.93 | 3.60 | 40 | 2.42 | .83 | 8 | .67 | 12 | 36 | |
| 1880. | 9.0 | 3.68 | 60.00 | 67.50 | 15 | 40 | 8.51 | 8.51 | 12.74 | 7.41 | 4.51 | 3.00 | 40 | 2.42 | .83 | 9 | .85 | 14 | 53 | 1.26 |
| 1881. | 9.2 | 3.09 | 58.00 | 61.13 | 13 | 35 | 8.51 | 8.03 | 12.74 | 7.00 | 3.5 | 2.60 | 35 | 2.12 | .83 | 8 | .75 | 14 | 43 | 1.23 |
| 1882. | 9.7 | 3.47 | 61.00 | 43.50 | 10 | 35 | 8.45 | 8.25 | 12.95 | 6.50 | 3.76 | 2.45 | 35 | 2.12 | .79 | 9 | .78 | 17 | 50 | 1.23 |
| 1883. | 9.2 | 3.06 | 50.00 | 37.75 | 8 | 33 | 8.23 | 7.11 | 12.93 | 6.00 | 3.60 | 1.80 | 35 | 2.29 | .79 | 8 | .74 | 16 | 52 | 1.23 |
| 1884. | 7.1 | 2.39 | 44.00 | 30.75 | 11 | 33 | 7.28 | 6.86 | 10.46 | 6.00 | 3.36 | 1.43 | 33 | 2.16 | .75 | 7 | .66 | 15 | 50 | 1.12 |
| 1885. | 5.4 | 2.33 | 40.00 | 28.50 | 9 | 33 | 6.75 | 6.36 | 10.37 | 6.00 | 3.12 | .83 | 30 | 1.91 | .70 | 6 | .58 | 14 | 45 | 1.04 |
| 1886. | 6.7 | 2.27 | 43.00 | 34.50 | 9 | 33 | 6.75 | 6.25 | 10.65 | 6.00 | 3.31 | .70 | 28 | 2.04 | .70 | 6 | .58 | 14 | 44 | 1.04 |
| 1887. | 6.0 | 2.39 | 49.00 | 37.08 | 15 | 28 | 7.15 | 6.58 | 10.88 | 6.00 | 3.33 | .53 | 28 | 1.70 | .66 | 7 | .60 | 15 | 40 | 1.03 |
| 1888. | 6.3 | 2.03 | 44.00 | 29.83 | 15 | 23 | 7.25 | 6.75 | 10.94 | 6.50 | 3.81 | .49 | 27 | 1.76 | .66 | 6 | .53 | 15 | 38 | 0.97 |
| 1889. | 7.6 | 2.00 | 43.00 | 29.25 | 16 | 23 | 7.00 | 6.75 | 10.50 | 6.50 | 3.81 | .28 | 26 | 1.70 | .66 | 6 | .52 | 13 | 39 | 0.97 |
| 1890. | 7.0 | 2.00 | 45.00 | 31.75 | 19 | 25 | 7.00 | 6.75 | 10.90 | 6.00 | 3.34 | .35 | 26 | 1.70 | .64 | 6 | .48 | 10 | 40 | 0.93 |
| 1891. | 5.7 | 1.86 | 42.00 | 29.92 | 16 | 25 | 6.83 | 6.41 | 10.64 | 6.00 | 2.95 | .30 | 26 | 1.70 | .62 | 6 | .50 | 9 | 32 | 0.92 |
| Average decrease | 50 | 62 | 51 | 75 | 11 | 73 | 48 | 55 | 45 | 47 | 56 | 89 | 70 | 50 | 56 | 54 | 56 | 52 | 53 | 54 |

Average reduction in ten farm products, 26.1.

Average reduction in nineteen other products, 55.4.

This table shows that from 1873 to 1891 silver fell 26 per cent, cotton 53, corn 6, wheat 30, bacon and hams 14, lard 25, pork 24, beef 27, butter 32, cheese 31, and tobacco 19. These are the articles which farmers sell. The average decline of the ten articles is 26.1 per cent between 1873 and 1891. During the same time refined sugar declined 50 per cent, nails 62, bar iron 51, steel rails 75, Rio coffee 11, tea 73, sheeting 48, drilling 55, shirting 45, standard prints 47, print cloth 56, quinine 89, glass goblets 70, 10 by 14 window glass 50, undershirts 56, ginghams 54, carpets 56, pepper 52, molasses 53.

These are the articles the farmer buys. Now, if what he buys declines at an equal ratio with what he sells he is just as well off at one time as another. But if what he buys falls more in price than what he sells he is benefited. When we average the articles he buys we find that the decline is 55.4 per cent.

What is our situation to-day? I do not intend to say even a word about the industrial depression that surrounds us. God knows that it is bad enough, and God knows that it is plain enough, without the necessity of a description and without the need of an argument. Mr. Blaine very truly says, in his discussion of the tariff in Twenty Years in Congress, that in all the industrial depressions of the past the American people have never failed to turn from low duties to the standard of protection. He says that never once was a financial or industrial panic in the United States relieved by turning from protection toward free trade. In the disturbance of 1857, while possibly the panic was mixed with financial complications, the remedy proposed by the Democratic President was an adjustment of our affairs along the lines of a protective tariff.

I used to think that Mr. Buchanan was a weak and practically useless public man, and that he failed in yielding to the events which surrounded him at the outbreak of the rebellion. I have lived long enough to revise that impression. He was a man of culture, of large faculties, and of approved statesmanship, and if he fell short in the crisis of the civil war it was because he was dealing with a situation in which the Supreme Governor of the Universe had put his hand upon American society to revolutionize and reform it; and I believe the human race never produced a man strong enough to stand erect in that storm and come between Providence and the Divine purpose to create a nation strong enough to resist disintegration, and grand enough to cast off the barbarism of slavery. [Applause.]

And so I have quite revised my idea of James Buchanan. The remedy which he proposed was not a new one. It had already been suggested in his annual message of January 2, 1855, by Myron H. Clarke, governor of the State of New York, before the Republican party was born, in these words:

Many branches of domestic industry are languishing for lack of that protection which proper tariff regulations would have afforded, which, had they been seasonably adopted, would have averted much of the distress consequent upon the paralysis of business which now pervades the country.

The remedy was to return to the protective tariff, and when my friend, the chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means, described the tariff then enacted as a war tariff, I answer him that it was a tariff enacted for economical and commercial purposes before the war began and signed by the last Democratic President save one.

Mr. Chairman, what is the remedy for the evils that now surround us? Our people are without work. Is it possible that the human mind is capable of the folly of seeking to correct that situation by sending the people's work to be done in other countries? The remedy for the evils that surround us is the employment of our people. That makes for the general prosperity. In the year that followed the enactment of the tariff law of 1890, no willing hand from one end of the country to the other was without occupation.

Every woolen mill and factory was in motion. More than a hundred new industries had been established and the American people, as President Harrison showed in his last message, had touched the highest level of prosperity. That seems now as if it were a generation away. Yet it was a condition to which we may go back if we do not blindly despise the wisdom of our fathers. The opportunity to work measures the ability to buy. The ability to buy creates the American market place. Destroy that or discourage it and the American farm goes back to the open prairie from which it came. Out West we long ago went through the experience of having nobody in the United States to buy what we had to sell.

In 1892 we thought we were beyond that experience. We had found the bread-producing power of the world at last overtaken by the bread-consuming power of the world and we believed that the permanent prosperity of American agriculture had at last come. To-day we are confronted with the spectacle of two or three millions of our customers deprived of their ability to buy, whereby the American market place is degraded and the welfare of the American farm threatened. I beg of you, gentlemen, by the counsel of every great statesman this country has produced, from Washington to Lincoln, to save the American people from reenacting the folly which has already four times in our history destroyed our industrial and commercial prosperity. [Prolonged applause on the floor and in the galleries.]

Mr. HARTER. Mr. Chairman, it seems to me that possibly the discussion of the theory upon which this whole question rests may be supposed to have been exhausted, and yet perhaps a small portion of my time applied to that branch of the subject may not be wholly wasted.

In the first place the justice of a system which professedly, as protection does, aims to benefit one class of the community at the expense of another is certainly open to question on its very face. For instance, it would be manifestly unjust if this Congress were to pass laws reducing the selling value of manufactured articles in order that the consumer might be benefited.

I say it would be unjust to me as a manufacturer if this Congress by legislation should arbitrarily put down the price of the goods that I put upon the market; yet that would be a proposition (comparatively) easy to defend. Why? Because I am but a single individual and have hundreds, or possibly thousands, of customers, and it might be contended with some plausibility that the good done to the greater number was a justification for

the injury done to me. I am sure, however, that as an ethical proposition, it would be difficult to maintain.

But when you turn to the opposite side of this proposition and contend that it is the duty of this body to make laws to put up the price of my goods, then the wrong is manifest to all creation, because then the injury which in the other case fell upon one in order that good might come to many, now falls upon many in order that good may come to one. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Then examine briefly the economic principle which is involved, i. e., the idea that protective tariffs increase national wealth. Let us, if you please, go the whole length with gentlemen on the other side, and admit, as was contended by my eloquent and learned friend from Pennsylvania [Mr. DALZELL] yesterday, that it is within the constitutional power of Congress to impose taxes upon one class of the people in order that the proceeds of such taxes may be poured into the pockets of another class; let us, I say, admit for an instant that the gentleman from Pennsylvania is right, and that the principle he endeavored to establish is correct. I do not admit it in fact, but for the purpose of this argument I do admit for the moment what most men here believe to be untrue, that Congress has a constitutional right to put burdens upon a portion of the people in order to enrich another; and then, I ask, can you justify the act?

Let us see whether your plan would produce a large increase of national wealth, whether it would increase the fund out of which wages are paid; and if it would not, then it would be unwise, even if you had the Constitution upon your side, as you have not. On what grounds can a man appear before an intelligent committee of this body and ask protection on his line of manufacture? What are his claims for protection? His first claim is that he can not pay as large wages as his neighbor; his next plea must be that capital is too high in this country for him to employ it in his line of industry. These two claims are the sole grounds upon which he can ask for protection.

Now, what does it mean? We are a practical kind of people, and we ought to be able to get to the bottom of a question no more intricate than this. What does this mean, I say? It simply means that capital and labor employed in the ordinary industries of the United States are more profitably employed than they would be in the industry in which he proposes to use them. Now follow me if you please. When does a man grow rich fastest? When he employs all his capital and talents in the form of business or the calling which is profitable. All will admit this. It is not when he employs a portion of his time and a part of his capital in a profitable industry, and the balance in a business which loses him money every day. No sensible man continues long to carry on business in that way. Sooner or later he discovers that he can make no money in the unprofitable enterprise. What does he do? He takes the capital and labor which he employed in the unprofitable line of business and carries them over into the one that is profitable.

This ought to be the policy of a great country, for what is a nation but an aggregation of individuals? But, on the contrary, what do we find? We find gentlemen claiming that it is unprofitable to put capital into certain manufactures. They come before the Ways and Means Committee (and I have wondered why that committee did not always put these men who appear before them under oath. The habit of allowing Tom, Dick, and Harry to come before a great committee and tell that committee any fairy tale they choose should be terminated)—

Mr. REED. I think that has been reduced to a minimum before the present committee.

Mr. HARTER. The House is always glad to hear from the gentleman from Maine [Mr. REED]; and I confess I am never sorry.

Mr. REED. Thank you.

Mr. HARTER. If the gentleman desires to ask me a question—

Mr. REED. I merely remarked that the thing you are complaining of—the committee listening to Thomas, Richard, and Henry—has been reduced to a minimum by the present Committee on Ways and Means.

Mr. HARTER. I give the committee credit for the possession of good sense; but if I were chairman of that committee, or had any influence in the committee, any manufacturer, or anybody else coming before it and proposing to give testimony upon which he hoped to obtain legislation in this House, taking away from the earnings of his fellow-citizens for his private gain, if he refused to give his testimony under oath so that he might be indictable for perjury if he lied, I would ask the doorkeeper of the committee, if I were not able to do it myself, to kick him away from the door of the committee room. The failure to require such statements to be made under oath in all cases is, in my view, one of the prime causes of the mistakes which have been made in our tariff system from 1792 down to the present hour.

But allow me to follow up the argument I was making. A man comes saying, "Because the employment of capital in my business is unprofitable, because I can not afford to pay for labor what my neighbors can, therefore the balance of the country should be taxed in order that I may withdraw labor and capital from where they are properly and profitably employed and put them into a sink-hole which you are to fill up afterward with taxes wrung from the people." Why, gentlemen, any man who would pursue such a system as that in his private business would become a bankrupt. The mystery to me is that the able, intelligent, accomplished, oratorical men upon my right, when they discover a great industry built up in this way by taxing profitable enterprise, say that all the people of the country ought to fall down and worship this ruinous policy, bless the industry itself, and thank God that they have had a body of legislators so wise as to build it up.

Any man looking at this matter as he looks at the things of everyday life, as the merchant and the manufacturer regard their business affairs, as our wives in the kitchen or in the parlor look at questions of domestic economy, must say at once that this is the worst kind of economic waste; for so long as it is conceded that protection is necessary for any industry, just so long it is admitted that that industry is unprofitable; and the higher you build it, the more men you employ in carrying it on, the more injury it is to the country.

You can not create capital; you can not manufacture labor by act of Congress. Hence the capital and the labor which go into these protected, unprofitable industries must come from where? From the profitable industries of the country which require no protection. Is it not easy, then, to see that by such a policy not only do you not help the industries of the country, not only do you not build up the wealth of the country, but you injure the nation in two ways; you strike it two blows. By your laws you build up unprofitable enterprises, and at the same time in doing so you tear down the profitable industries of the country by compelling the withdrawal of a portion of the labor and capital employed in them. Therefore, I say, from any point of view it is a mistake, an economic blunder.

But the next proposition, Mr. Chairman, ordinarily brought in by these gentlemen is that labor has been benefited by this system. The positive, natural, logical answer to this, an answer so plain that in my judgment a blind man could read it, is that after you have adopted a system and carried it on thus constantly, which retards the growth and increase of the capital of the country, you simply reduce the fund out of which the wages of labor are paid, and as a consequence wages are reduced.

It is not necessary, Mr. Chairman, to go further than this plain and indeed self-evident proposition to answer the unfounded claim that high taxes make high wages. You injure the workman in two different ways, however. Under your plan, which increases the cost of the goods, or rather the selling value of the goods made by the protected manufacturer, you diminish the purchasing power of the wages of the laborer, while by reducing the fund out of which the wages of the laborer are to be paid you have already reduced the compensation he receives for his labor. A protective tariff is simply a plan for taking money out of the workman's pocket; and to suggest that it would have the effect of enriching him is about as sensible as to propose to make him a millionaire by taking gold out of his pockets and filling them up again with lead, ashes, gravel, or sand. [Laughter.]

But speaking of the labor proposition. There are many things about it which are worthy of consideration. Before we had tariff taxes at all in this country, the difference in wages between the United States and Europe was much greater than it is now. It seems to me that there has been too much silence even on our side on this branch of the subject, and it is a suggestive omission, it strikes me, in the speech of my good friend from Iowa who has just taken his seat, that he did not mention the fact that under our low tariffs wages were higher as compared with the wages of European mechanics and laborers than they are now or ever have been under high-tariff taxation when gold is used to measure them. It is the fact, and you need not go any further than the argument I have made to show the cause of it. How could in any way a protective tariff benefit the workingman? Is there any method by which you can pour prosperity into his pocket, except by freeing him from the clutches of the high-tariff taxers? When you increase the cost of the clothing of himself and his family and of those things that he consumes you must necessarily injure him.

Now, these gentlemen who argue on the high-tax side of this question ought to be able to give us an object lesson on this point. They ought to show us, as water runs over a mill wheel, how protection runs into the home and blesses the habitation of the workman. But they can not, unfortunately for these eloquent people. The less "protection" he has the higher are his

wages. This is not only true of the United States, but it is equally so of every other country in the world.

Why, Mr. Chairman, when long before the time of the Revolution our manufactures were being established, not only under freedom of trade, but under restrictive legislation by Great Britain directed against our prosperity, what were the wages of the working people as compared to the present time? Again, early in this century Mr. William Cobbett, who spent a very large part of his time in this country in Philadelphia, and who then returned to Great Britain and afterwards to Parliament, speaking of wages in the United States, as compared with those of the English market, particularly of wages in Pennsylvania, as compared with the English wages, said that they were three times as great, and that was, as you all know, when you had a low tariff.

Mr. BOWERS of California. What time was that?

Mr. HARTER. Early in the century. You will, however, find the exact date in any life of Mr. Cobbett.

Mr. BOWERS of California. Can the gentleman give us a statement as to its condition in 1879 and 1880, and back of that?

Mr. HARTER. I should be infinitely pleased to go into the discussion of that question with my friend from California or anybody else if I had the time. If the opportunity occurs before I conclude my remarks I shall be very glad to do so. I only speak of one thing, and that is the hallucination which has led our high-tarixing Republican friends on this floor to imagine that wages depend on the amount of the tariff, that is, that the higher the tariff is the higher are the wages.

If it was not for a want of respect to the Chair, I would turn my back and ask him to select any country in Europe, and I would tell him, without knowing the name of the country, whether the wages are high there or not. I am not a mind reader, either; but the Chairman of this body can take any country in Europe, keeping it in his mind, and if he will ask me whether the wages in that country are high or not (or he may take half a dozen countries and do the same thing), I will simply ask one question, "Is the tariff high in that country?" If he answer that the tariff is high, I will reply, "Mr. Chairman, the wages are low," and without any exception you will find I am right.

If a nation has a high tariff, even if it produces two or possibly three crops to the acre annually, as do some portions of Italy, even then, with a high tariff, all the advantages of God and nature will fritter away under high taxes, the steady belief in which makes the American Republic, economically speaking, the laughingstock of every intelligent country in the world. I repeat so-called protection wastes the advantages of any nation.

Let me illustrate. These gentlemen here have been talking about high tariffs and low tariffs, and the blessings of high taxation for the workingman. Let us take two conspicuous examples. Our good friends, the amiable and able gentlemen on the other side of the House, are talking to us about England and America; and they say, "Why, gentlemen, the wages in England are much lower than they are in America." After awhile, if I have the time, I will show you the fact as discovered by the Harrison Administration, that labor cost (not wages) is lower in the United States than in England. But they say that the wages are much higher in this country than they are in Great Britain. Well, to start with, we have about twenty times as much land and about a hundred times as many advantages for each inhabitant, as they have over there. Now, it is pleading the baby act for the American people in a manner that the Democratic party never will have occasion to do, when you say that the nominal rate of wages is higher in this country than it is in Great Britain. It ought to be.

Why, bless your soul, if I lived upon a farm of 200 acres of fertile land, which would produce more to the acre than my neighbor's land, with mines under it, when my neighbor had not any mines under his land; if under my 200 acres I had a gold mine in one corner, a silver mine in another, iron ore in another corner, and coal in another, with stone in the center, and timber all around, if the land was so fertile that when I tickled it with a hoe it would laugh with a harvest, and if my poor neighbor instead of having 200 acres of land had but 20 acres of land, if I could not prosper under such circumstances in a greater degree than he whom Providence had placed so unfortunately, indeed, gentlemen, I would ask to have the probate judge appoint a receiver for my estate and a guardian for my person. [Laughter and applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. BOWERS of California. Will the gentleman allow me to ask him one question?

Mr. HARTER. I am one of the most obliging men in the world, but let me say that I am unexpectedly on my feet, and with no set speech prepared, and my remarks of necessity must be rather disconnected and if you put questions to me they will be still more so. At the close of what I have to say I will be

glad to try to answer any question that any gentleman desires to ask me.

Mr. BOWERS of California. It would not have taken you half so long to have answered my question.

Mr. HARTER. So far so good. With what nation should we compare Great Britain. You are intelligent men, and some might call you ingenious in your arguments, but I prefer to say that you are ingenuous. You are simple minded on this question. You do not conceal your views at all. You want to be as open as the day, do you not? Therefore, I suggest, gentlemen, that you need not travel 3,000 miles across the Atlantic for an illustration and a comparison between low-tax countries and high-tariff countries. You need not launch your frail bark on the Atlantic and travel over the stormy and tempest-tossed ocean for 3,000 miles for an unfair comparison, because you can have a fair one within 25 miles.

Come with me and you shall have a free pass and, if you are seasick, a physician. We will go across from England to France, about 22 miles. Here you may find in all its beauty a comparison that is fair and just. You have two countries within twenty-odd miles of each other. Both of them are old civilizations, not new ones. In both countries you have to a great extent a homogeneous population, instead of the magnificent and varied population we have in this country, made up of the best, not the worst, as many men would say, of the whole earth. There you have homogeneous populations. Both England and France are densely populous. They both have large standing armies, both have large expenses, and, ordinarily speaking, the rates of wages should be the same in these two countries. Here, then, you may find a perfectly fair comparison to start with.

Now, bring the tariff question in. What effect does the tariff have? England has what we call freedom of trade, and France has the blessing of a high protective tariff. Now, gentlemen, if there is any virtue in your medicine; if there is any truth in your argument, starting out with an equality, with a parity of population and advantages, if there is anything in your argument France should pay the highest wages. Should it not? If there is any flaw in my proposition I will yield to any man in the House to state where the flaw exists.

Mr. BLAIR. I will make the suggestion to the gentleman, then.

Mr. HARTER. How much time does the gentleman desire?

Mr. BLAIR. If it would interrupt the gentleman I will take occasion at a subsequent period to offer my criticism.

Mr. HARTER. I yield now.

Mr. BLAIR. I would say this to the gentleman, that I do not understand it to be the contention of the Republican theory or the Republican party that necessarily the highest wages in all cases must give the greatest return to the individual. That depends upon the civilization or the grade of civilization of which he happens to be part. But this is the point, that when you allow the producer of France and the producer of Great Britain, or the producer of any country where the cost of the article is much less than the same article in the United States and give freedom of access to our markets, then, of course, you deprive us of our work, and the more dangerously so just in proportion to the lesser cost of the article produced.

Mr. HARTER. I will answer the gentleman. Our object in demanding lower taxes is not to deprive a workman of labor, but to reduce his occasion for it. I would be very glad indeed if the gentleman could arrange to keep my income in 1894 up by giving me only one-half the labor to do. It may be easily done, but not by doubling the cost of what I consume, by cutting off my salary and telling me I am "protected."

The facts are that the difference between English wages and the wages of France is greater than the difference between the wages of America and the wages of Great Britain; and yet Great Britain, within about 22 miles of her high taxed (protected?) competitor and paying very much higher wages, does not ask for a protective tariff. Yet, gentlemen speaking for American manhood, ask for protection from competition 3,000 miles distant, begging for a dishonest system which taxes all their neighbors for the benefit of industries which ought to grow as the acorns grow into oak trees, out in the open, and not because they are kept in hothouses or coddled like orchids, but because the winds of heaven, the blasts of winter, and the storms of the summer sweep through them and strengthen them.

Mr. BLAIR. But is not English agriculture dying, and do not the agriculturists of England cry for protection against the competition of American agricultural products?

Mr. HARTER. I would be very glad to yield to questions, but I have not the time. A fair question and an honest answer often throw a flood of light upon a subject.

Mr. BLAIR. The gentleman seems to be asking questions, and yet declining to have them answered.

Mr. HARTER. I said before that I would be glad to answer all questions at the conclusion of my remarks. The gentleman from New Hampshire suggests the idea that there is another condition. Here it is. When the free-trade mechanic in Great Britain, after earning higher wages than his French neighbor, goes to the market and the storehouse he finds he can supply his wants and needs better and cheaper than in any nation in the world. How is it with the protected and therefore underpaid mechanic in France? When he goes to spend his wages he finds he must pay far more for what he buys than his untaxed English cousin. You see so far as the workingman is concerned, the application of the principle of so-called protection simply cuts down his wages and increases his living expenses at the same time.

You may as well say you help a man support his family by first cutting off his right arm, then give him another boost toward fortune by cutting off his left arm, leaving him armless, but protected. [Laughter.] Where men disagree it is well to arbitrate. I am one of those people who like arbitration in all its forms. While sometimes compelled to go to the lawyer, still I prefer the arbitrator. There is one infallible arbitrator for all questions like this, and one that can always be appealed to, and that arbitrator is history.

My eloquent and intellectual friend from Iowa [Mr. DOLLIVER] said that he was fond of facts. I think he intimated that a quart of facts were better than a bushel of theory. Now, I am going to pour in the quart of facts and wash away, drown out, and smother a bushel of my friend's theory, for perhaps gentlemen will have noticed that on this subject I am a practical sort of a fellow and not much of a theorizer. [Laughter.] Let us have a little history. Would you like to go back as far as the experience of the children of Israel? [Laughter.] If the House will give me time enough it will be easy to take them almost back to Adam.

Mr. LOUD. You might get lost on the way. [Laughter.]

Mr. HARTER. Well, the men who support this bill, and by its early passage hasten the time when the working people of this country can get employment, even if they do lose their way on earth, will never miss the path to Heaven [laughter]; for it has been most truly said: "Inasmuch as ye do it to the least of these little ones, ye do it unto me." But, Mr. Chairman, as my time is so limited, and as many of the gentlemen on the Republican side are unfamiliar with sacred history, it will be better to confine myself to history which they know something about. Take Great Britain. Great Britain which is held up to gentlemen on the other side like a jumping jack, and painted in every color that the average Republican statesman or orator fancies. They tell us that formerly Great Britain had protection.

Yes, Great Britain had protection down to about 1842, but what was the condition of England's trade under it? How did her commerce flourish? Did her manufactures prosper? What were the wages in Great Britain under protection? These, and questions like these, will throw much needed light upon this subject, which so utterly befogs the average Republican intellect. I beg, therefore, to say to the House that at the time tariff-reform measures were first introduced in Great Britain the chronic condition of her working people was one of hunger. One of hunger, I repeat. Her manufactures were languishing. At the end of a period of many hundreds of years of protection her trade was dormant, her shipping was small in extent, wages on land and sea were low, and occupation was about as uncertain as it has been in the United States of America, especially in Pennsylvania, during the past few years, a period in which we have suffered most from a so-called protective tariff. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

It was proposed to throw down the barriers, and even such a man as Mr. Gladstone, who was then a member of the Government, opposed the proposition. Some of the ablest, most conservative, and most conscientious men in Great Britain—men who, I am proud to say have their equals on the Republican side of this House, for no man is more willing than I am to accord intelligence, to account fairness, to acknowledge honesty of purpose to most of those who are opposed to us on this question—some of the ablest, and most conservative and most conscientious men in Great Britain, I say, opposed it, among them Mr. Gladstone. They said: "As surely as you reduce the tariff, so surely will ruinous competition come upon us from France and from Germany."

But what was the result? All the dismal predictions that were made, predictions like those which have been made here so eloquently by my able friend from Michigan [Mr. BURROWS], made still more dexterously by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DALZELL], made more specifically in the speech of the gentleman from Maine [Mr. DINGLEY], and finally echoed and added to by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. DOLLIVER], came to naught. You say that if we reduce the taxes of this country we will thereby bring paralysis upon our manufactures, destroy

our commerce, reduce the wages of our working people, and supply no compensating advantage for this great blight which the Democratic party would put upon the country. Gentlemen, there is nothing new in this world, as you have probably discovered; and if you will go back to the records of Parliament from 1838 to 1842 I will show you that the speech which the senior Republican member of the Ways and Means Committee will make to-morrow or the day after on the floor of this House was made there long ago.

Mr. REED. Do not be too prophetic. [Laughter.]

Mr. HARTER. Well, I venture to make the prediction with absolute certainty that it will be fulfilled. [Laughter.] I have read the speech. [Laughter.] It will be the same speech, only that the gentleman from Maine will make it better. He will add to and improve it, but that is all. All your speeches have been made in England. You are only thrashing over old straw. You are making the predictions here that were made just as earnestly, just as honestly, in 1838 and in 1842 in Great Britain, and facts in the United States as in Great Britain will prove you wholly and fortunately wrong in them all.

Mr. BOUTELLE rose.

Mr. HARTER. My friend can ask me a question at the close of my remarks and I shall be very glad to answer it. Not being a Rollin, a Gibbon, or even an Heroditus, I fear I may not get through with this bit of history within my time—

Mr. BOUTELLE. I was not going to ask the gentleman a question. I was merely going to suggest—

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Ohio yield?

Mr. HARTER. Mr. Chairman, as the House has so frequently refused to yield to the gentleman from Maine in the Hawaiian matter, I will show him the courtesy, on behalf of the House generally, of yielding to him on this occasion. [Laughter.]

Mr. BOUTELLE. I was simply going to suggest that the gentleman seemed to be making a confession that he was himself engaged in thrashing over Mr. Frank Hurd's old straw.

Mr. HARTER. Well, if Mr. Hurd ever used these arguments the better for Mr. Hurd. [Laughter.]

Mr. SPRINGER. But you never "hurd" of it. [Laughter.]

Mr. HARTER. Wit will never die out in this House as long as the gentleman from Illinois remains in it.

The people of England did not listen to the croakers. The calamity howlers were disregarded and she passed the reform measure. What happened? I think even my friend from Massachusetts [Mr. WALKER], who is always so particular about authorities, will admit that Mr. Robert Giffen, president of the British Statistical Society, is probably the best authority on this subject in the known world, and if he had made any misstatements about it they would certainly have been called in question before this.

I am about to show to you the wretched, the miserable, the heartrending results of tariff reform in Great Britain, so that you may be prepared for the calamity which is to come upon the United States after the Wilson bill becomes a law. [Laughter.]

Forty years after the reform came, nearly a half century after they had deprived themselves of the blessings of protection, leaving nothing that could interfere with the horrible havoc of free trade in that little insular kingdom which was to drive the inhabitants into the sea and consign their industries to Hades, what do we find happened to them? Of course mourning and lamentation must have been heard in the land.

The heavens must have been draped in crape, in order to fulfill the predictions of the protectionists of that day, as will be necessary here in order to carry out the programme which gentlemen have presented so eloquently and picturesquely from time to time. I am sorry to shatter this dream of gentlemen on the other side; but here is the exhibit. Here is a statement of the wages of carpenters, bricklayers, masons, miners, cotton and woolen workers. We would have supposed that they would not get any wages after that bill had passed; that every industry of Great Britain would have been stricken to the ground. But, on the contrary, wages increased 73 per cent.

Mr. SPRINGER. Good.

Mr. HARTER. The gentleman may well say "good;" but it is not equal to what we can do with our unrivaled advantages in the United States under low-tariff taxes.

English seamen's wages in competition with all parts of the earth increased from 25 to 70 per cent. But here is another object lesson: The net earnings of the people also increased—how much? Eighty-six dollars and fifty cents a year. Why, sir, many a poor fellow in my Congressional district does not make under this protective tariff \$135 a year, with all the advantages of a free government and the great opportunities of American life and citizenship. Yet the average increase of wages among the workmen of Great Britain, over and above what they got under a high tariff, was \$86.50 a year.

Pauperism: This is another index, and I think a fair one, of

the condition of a country. Did pauperism increase? Why, if you had heard Mr. Gladstone and his coadjutors in that Parliament you would have supposed that it would become necessary to build almshouses to take the place of all the factories and public buildings of the country. But what was the fact? Although the population increased enormously in Great Britain, yet after forty-odd years of "free trade" there were but two paupers where, under a protective tariff and with a very much smaller population, there had been three.

Savings deposits: The number of depositors increased ten times over, and the sum of the savings deposits increased five-fold.

Another thing. Under a protective tariff in our country, unless a workingman is tolerably fortunate, he never leaves any estate whatever behind him. In Pennsylvania, in the ore mines (a protected industry), and at some of her "protected" coal mines, when a protected Pennsylvanian is carried to his burial place he is taken to the potter's field at the expense of the public. But what was the effect in England upon estates—the final test of prosperity in any man's life? Did estates in Great Britain go down to zero under free trade? On the contrary, they rose on an average \$1,700. Why, gentlemen, it will take seventeen hundred years of protective tariff taxation in this great country of ours before the average workingman will have even a \$1,700 estate to leave behind him.

Mr. SPRINGER. What is the showing as to the cost of living?

Mr. HARTER. Oh, necessarily, the showing is in the same line. That accounts for the increase in the net profits. Not only did wages go up, but living expenses went down.

Mr. SIMPSON. It practically doubled the pay of the workingman.

Mr. HARTER. Exactly, but here is another exhibit. There were 106,000 taxable incomes in Great Britain at the end of fourteen hundred years of a protective tariff. After forty years of free trade the number of taxable incomes had increased to 320,000. This tells a significant story.

I look forward to seeing in the future my friend from Maine [Mr. BOUTELLE] and these other eloquent gentlemen who have spoken for high taxes as being better for the people than low taxes—I expect to see them flocking to our side of the House in a few years—why? Because I find that the statesmen of Great Britain, men who were your peers, but not your superiors—the men who had opposed this measure were within two years after the statute reducing taxes had passed Parliament the advocates of still larger reductions. Mr. Gladstone, from having been an opponent of free trade and low taxes, grew up to the point where he was the champion who a few years ago unhorsed and threw into the dust the premier of your last Republican Administration on this question.

One thing further. The manufacturers of England were opposed to this measure; many of them said "under free trade we can not compete with the manufacturers of other countries;" but the very men who made that opposition and who sent to Parliament petition after petition, even larger, broader, thicker, heavier, and more numerous signed perhaps than the one that came in here from the overprotected manufacturers of Troy—even that class of people within two years confessed their mistake in the most practical manner by asking that the taxes which they had objected to having lowered should be taken off altogether.

Mr. BOWERS of California. Our manufacturers do not ask any such thing.

Mr. HARTER. They will within two years after the Wilson bill becomes law.

Having referred to the experience of England, let me follow history back to our own shores. And here I hope to show, especially from the experience of the State of Pennsylvania, one of the most impressive object-lessons that has ever been exhibited in this House.

Mr. PAYNE. Will you not please tell us—

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Ohio yield?

Mr. HARTER. I can not yield. I have only about ten minutes of my time remaining, and I am under the impression that I might ask in vain for an extension of it.

Mr. PAYNE. I wanted you to tell us why these working people from England came over here?

Mr. HARTER. Let me say to you, gentlemen, that in 1846 we proposed to revise the tariff by a reduction, and the same hue and cry which you make now was made then. What was the result? I said I would use Pennsylvania as an object-lesson in this connection. Listen, you sons of the great Keystone State. In 1846 you only had two Representatives at Washington who were intelligent enough to vote for a reduction of tariff taxation. One was David Wilmot, who then sat in this very Chamber,

and the other was the Pennsylvanian who was Vice-President of the United States at that time, George M. Dallas.

Mr. Dallas gave the casting vote for the reduction of the tariff in the Senate. What happened? The skies of Pennsylvania were lurid with the fires with which you burned Mr. Wilmot and the Vice-President of the United States in effigy because they voted, forsooth, to reduce the tariff and thus lightened the burdens of the poor. But mark the result.

Mr. HEINER of Pennsylvania. Will the gentleman allow an interruption?

Mr. HARTER. I can not yield the few moments I have. My obliging friend from New Hampshire intimates that I can not have an extension of time.

Mr. BLAIR. Mr. Chairman, I will not be put in that attitude—

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Ohio yield?

Mr. HARTER. I can not yield for any more interruptions.

Mr. BLAIR. Then I give notice to the gentleman now that I will object to an extension.

Mr. HARTER. Two years after that reduction of the tariff what occurred? The results were so magnificently beneficial to the Keystone State that the low-tax people of Pennsylvania nominated Mr. Shunk for governor and actually carried Pennsylvania for the Democratic party and what is here called "free trade" by a majority of 15,000.

I am sorry the time is so short, for I would like to go a little further into similar historical facts.

Mr. HEINER of Pennsylvania. I hope the gentleman will now allow me a moment.

Mr. HARTER. Very well.

Mr. HEINER of Pennsylvania. You spoke of the prosperity of the country under the tariff of 1846.

Mr. HARTER. Yes, sir.

Mr. HEINER of Pennsylvania. I want to say right here that right in my district, including that of my colleague, Mr. KRIBBS, from Western Pennsylvania, thirty-three furnaces were closed in two years, and every one of them went into bankruptcy, with one or two exceptions. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. HARTER. Yes; and each of those little two-penny, seven-by-nine protection furnaces were replaced by the magnificent Democratic furnaces erected under the low-tariff period between 1846 and 1860.

Mr. KRIBBS. Will my colleague allow me to ask him one question?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Ohio is entitled to the floor.

Mr. KRIBBS. I hope the gentleman will yield to me for a moment.

Mr. HARTER. Oh, yes; I will yield to all the Pennsylvanians.

Mr. KRIBBS. I wish to ask my colleague how many of these furnaces started up again under the high protective tariff?

Mr. HARTER. The final effect of this was that after the lapse of a few years the manufacturers of the United States came here to Washington and made a tariff for themselves; and I may say in reference to the "manufacturers' tariff" of 1857, that it was a great reduction even on the so-called "free-trade" tariff act of 1846. Pennsylvania and Massachusetts voted for that reduction.

I wish I had time to take you through the "manufacturers' tariff" bill of 1857, schedule after schedule, and compare it with this Wilson bill that you object to, and show you that the bill which we are offering to the House and to the country is to-day putting a higher tariff tax on the great mass of these schedules than did even the manufacturers of the country who sat on the floor of this House and voted for the tariff act of 1857. And since that time we have had a constantly mounting stream of protection and spoliation, tax after tax. When, therefore, you say that the tariff tax, which is higher yet, even under this bill, than it was in 1857, must be made higher after thirty years of tariff protection, it is a confession on your part that the result of protection has been damaging to the interests of the manufacturers, and that after all of these years they are less able to compete with foreign manufacturers than they were in 1857.

I had a number of these schedules that I had intended to have the Clerk read for the benefit of the House, but will, because of lack of time, have to confine myself to a very few.

Will the Clerk be kind enough to read from the bill the tax on chemicals—the average tax upon chemicals, paints, and oils?

The Clerk read as follows:

Average tax, 20 to 30 per cent.

Mr. HARTER. It will be found to be about 30 per cent. In 1846 this tax was 20 per cent, and the tax on these articles was still further reduced by the manufacturers themselves in 1857.

I ask the Clerk to read from the bill the tax on varnishes—the average tax under the Wilson bill.

The Clerk read as follows:

Average rate, 25 per cent.

Mr. HARTER. Varnishes were free under the tariff act of 1846. I will not ask about earthenware and china, for my time is too short to treat the subject properly; however, let it now suffice to say that we made earthenware and china under a lower tax in those days than the Ways and Means Committee bill proposes now, after we have burdened the people for thirty years to build up that industry. What is the tax upon cutlery?

The Clerk read as follows:

Cutlery, 35 to 45 per cent.

Mr. HARTER. In 1846, as I recollect the figures, the tariff was about 30 per cent, and it was still further reduced by the manufacturers themselves in 1847. Now I will ask the Clerk to give the tariff on cotton manufactures.

The Clerk read as follows:

Cotton manufactures, 40 per cent.

Mr. HARTER. Listen! The cry has gone over the country that 40 per cent is not enough. Let me go back to the childhood of your cotton manufactures. Samuel Slater established cotton-manufacturing in Rhode Island in 1790, under a tariff tax of about 5 per cent, and he imported most of his cotton, paying, I think, 3 cents a pound tariff tax on his raw material, and then he competed successfully with Great Britain, and you, sons of New England, you degenerate descendants of Samuel Slater, a century later come before this House and say you have fallen so contemptibly low that you can not protect yourselves with practically eight times the protection your great grandfathers had in 1790.

I have in my possession a letter I received to-day from one of the great cotton-manufacturers of New England, in which he condemns our bill because, as he knows from long experience, the tariff on cotton goods is made too high, not too low; and thus practical manufacturers put to shame their hobbyhorse representatives on the floor of this House, members who prate about manufacturing as if they knew all about it and who nevertheless, in the simplicity of their souls, think the mule they use in factories walks on two legs, is kept in a barn, and has ears as long as their own.

Why, my good friends here from Maine, I would like to know when your cotton industries were established? Of course the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. DOLLIVER] is excusably ignorant, because he comes from the boundless and trackless prairie where they do not know anything about cotton mills or cotton-mill machinery [laughter]; but you gentlemen from Maine are not excusable on that ground. When did you establish your cotton industries? When were those magnificent industries, the pride of New England and the glory of the United States, established? They were established under what was called the free-trade tariff of 1846. If you look over the census reports you will find that nearly every blessing that has fallen upon this country came down upon it in richest profusion immediately after the introduction in 1846 by the Democratic party of this miserable, horrible, damnable system of free trade that we want again to fasten upon the country.

By the way, I will say to the gentleman from Maine [Mr. REED] that cotton manufacturing was established on the American continent before Columbus discovered it. I do not think they had a high-taxing protective tariff at that time, because the leaf of history from which I quote does not refer to any such blessing.

Mr. REED. If America was not discovered, it was very well protected from Europe up to that time. [Laughter on the Republican side.]

Mr. SPRINGER. The industries did not flourish very much under that protection, though.

Mr. HARTER. My good friend [Mr. SPRINGER] reminds me that the industries did not flourish much up to that time; and I would like to remark that this industry did not fairly begin to flourish until Samuel Slater, in spite of the laws passed by England at that time against the exportation of skilled labor in cotton manufacturing, came across here and established cotton mills in Rhode Island.

Mr. REED. If the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HARTER] is satisfied with offering a second-hand answer from the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SPRINGER], I am satisfied.

Mr. HARTER. I have known the gentlemen from Illinois [Mr. SPRINGER] for a long time, and I have rarely heard him make an answer that was not well worth attention, and also of quotation, either in this House or elsewhere.

Now as to the woolen manufacture, gentlemen, perhaps you think that must have been established under the McKinley bill.

On the contrary the woolen-manufacturing industry of the United States was established in 1643 or thereabouts. Let me see, when did the Mayflower land?

Several MEMBERS. In 1620.

Mr. HARTER. Well, we were not on the Mayflower, and I am excusable for not remembering the exact date. My ancestors were able to remain in Europe a little longer than yours were. [Laughter.] But I want to speak a little while about the iron trade, for it is at the bottom of all our industries, at the very foundation, indeed, of our civilization. We give iron, I think, 22½ per cent under the Wilson bill, and steel 25 per cent.

I took pains last week, when over in Philadelphia, to get a copy of the London Iron and Steel Traders' Journal, and also a copy of the (American) Iron Age. I took the English paper of December 16 and the American paper of December 14. In looking over the English paper I found that in Staffordshire, England, certain grades of bar iron were selling for \$37.56 a ton; and I found I could buy the same grade of bar iron in the United States of America for \$26 a ton, leaving the difference between the English price and the American price \$11.56 a ton, the price in England being that much higher than it is in the United States. The average freights are \$1.25 to \$2 a ton for crossing the ocean.

Mr. DOLLIVER. Are you complaining of that?

Mr. HARTER. I say that there is no need of 22½ per cent or any tariff tax whatever to "protect" iron manufacturers, yet with the 22½ per cent given them by the Wilson bill you are still a "calamity howler," and if you had 2,200 per cent I think your cry would be the same.

Steel billets are the foundation of the whole steel trade of the United States. I discover that steel billets were worth, on the 16th of December, in Great Britain, \$23.42, while I could buy them at Pittsburg for \$16.75.

Mr. BOUTELLE. Then, where is the tax?

Mr. HARTER. There is no need of any tax, and yet you shriek and cry as if you were crippled for life while our bill feeds you with 22½ to 25 per cent of tax. I am just showing you that we are able to compete not only under the Wilson bill, but that with absolute free trade we could have all Europe within five years kneeling at our feet and the world buying and consuming American goods, made by untaxed Americans.

[Here the hammer fell.]

Mr. BOUTELLE. What is the tariff on steel billets?

Mr. HARTER. I regret that the expiration of my time prevents me giving to the gentleman the attention he would otherwise have at my hands.

Mr. BROSIUS. Mr. Chairman, I am very sensible indeed that this is not the hour for a serious discussion of this measure, and remembering the generous indulgence of the House to me on other and indeed on every occasion heretofore, I am reluctant to detain you to a later hour for the purpose of hearing anything I may say.

If the reapers in the field of Boaz had been as diligent and thorough in their work as have been the gentlemen who have preceded me in this discussion, it is not possible that the fair Maobitess gleaner could have gathered enough grain to reward her labor. In this debate, at this time, the gleaner is absolutely without hope. Still I must ask the indulgence of the House while I go over portions of the field of discussion, if only to emphasize some arguments already many times made.

I want to say to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HARTER], and I hope he has tarried, that there is a great diversion of opinion among us upon the tariff question, a great confusion of tongues. I do not see him in his seat.

Mr. HOOKER of New York. He has just gone out.

Mr. BROSIUS. Well, he is not here. Those who are here can tell him what I say about Pennsylvania and the tariff.

As a prologue to what I shall say I desire to submit a sentiment from a departed statesman, whose memory the people of Pennsylvania will not willingly let die:

Every highly cultivated nation has made the protection of domestic industry the special care of government. It has been found by the experience of more than twenty centuries that the protection of domestic manufactures by prohibitions, discriminating duties, and commercial regulations has been and is the true, natural, and wise policy of nations, or all history lies.

These are the words of the "Old Commoner" of Pennsylvania, who a generation ago sat in this Chamber, and with his imperial intellect and superb statesmanship guided the deliberations and determinations of this body in the stormiest seasons of its history. I can not withhold the homage due to greatness by omitting to say that I reproduce the words of Mr. Stevens to-day with undisguised satisfaction. They accentuate the statement made by my distinguished colleague [Mr. DALZELL] in his exhaustive argument yesterday, that Pennsylvania has never wavered in her loyalty to protection.

Horace White, in the preface to his translation of Frederick

Bastiat's Sophisms of Protection, says that the national Republican convention of 1860 offered a bribe to the State of Pennsylvania for its vote in the Presidential election, which bribe was set forth in the following resolution of the platform adopted by that memorable convention:

Resolved, That while providing revenue for the support of the General Government by duties upon imports, sound policy requires such an adjustment of these imposts as to encourage the development of the industrial interests of the whole country; and we commend that policy of national exchanges which secures to the workman liberal wages, to agriculture remunerative prices, to mechanics and manufactories an adequate reward for their skill, labor, and enterprise, and to the nation commercial prosperity and independence.

I do not bring this antique and somewhat unique observation of Horace White into public notice for the purpose of resenting the apparent insult to Pennsylvania, for he distinctly disclaimed any intention to charge unworthy motives for the political action of that State in giving her support to the nominee of the Republican party. I use the incident as a pleader would use the name of John Doe or Richard Roe, to bring the cause into court; the cause of *The People vs. the Wilson Tariff Bill* on an indictment for assault with intent to kill the industries of the United States [laughter and applause], the intent, as in similar cases in our criminal jurisprudence, being presumed from the nature of the weapons used. [Laughter and applause on the Republican side.]

I have never known the distinct ends had in view by those who have cherished the protective system in vogue in the United States in almost unbroken continuity for a hundred years to be more clearly and strongly stated than in the resolution to which Pennsylvania gave the honor of her support a third of a century ago. Nor were these sentiments the exclusive possession of the Republicans of Pennsylvania—they were shared by the Democrats as well.

In the very year that the representatives of the Republican party in the Republican national convention at Chicago were giving their adhesion to the principles of the resolution I have just read, a Pennsylvania Democrat, the late lamented Hon. John Cessna, a delegate to the Democratic national convention at Charleston, introduced on the floor of that convention the following resolution:

Resolved, That the convictions of the Democratic party of the country remain unshaken in the wisdom and justice of the adequate protection of iron, coal, wool, and the other great staples of our country, based upon the necessities of a reasonable revenue system of the General Government; and approving the views of President Buchanan upon the subject of specific duties, we earnestly desire our representatives in Congress to produce such modifications of existing laws as the unwise legislation of the Republican party in 1857 renders absolutely necessary to the prosperity of the great interests of the country.

When the principles of these two declarations of Pennsylvania sentiment on the tariff question were embodied in the tariff act of 1861 and passed by both Houses of Congress, it was promptly approved by another great Pennsylvania Democrat, President Buchanan.

To-day that great State waits in the attitude of expectancy to see her Democratic representatives in this Congress align themselves on these long-established Pennsylvania principles and take the touch of elbow with their distinguished predecessors, who in earlier days shed luster upon the Keystone Democracy. [Applause.]

These events, however, marked no departure, denoted no epoch in Pennsylvania sentiment on the tariff question. They were in consonance with the views held by the people and the statesmen of that State of both parties for more than a century. In her infancy she lisped the same accents; in her vigorous youth she shouted the same notes, in her mature manhood she utters the same glorious voice in favor of such defensive duties as will promote the remuneration and elevation of labor, adequate rewards for enterprise and capital, and the prosperity and happiness of all our people. [Applause on the Republican side.] In 1860 her convictions were uttered in the perfectly articulate and distinctly audible tone of 60,000 majority. In 1893, after an experience of a third of a century, she reaffirmed them in the detonating and reverberant thunder of 135,000 majority. [Applause on the Republican side.] My friend from Pennsylvania [Mr. DALZELL] is right. She has never wavered in her loyalty to protection.

I hazard nothing in saying that the best developed and most scientific conception of defensive duties existing when the foundations of our Government were laid was a Pennsylvania notion. One hundred and eight years ago on the 20th of last September the Assembly of that State passed a tariff act, the preamble of which stated the grounds upon which it proceeded. It declared that—

Whereas divers useful and beneficial arts and manufactures have been gradually introduced into Pennsylvania, and the same have at length risen to a very considerable extent and perfection, inasmuch that during the late war between the United States and Great Britain, when the importation of European goods was much interrupted, and often very difficult and uncertain, the artisans and mechanics of this State were able to supply in the hours of need not only large quantities of weapons and other implements,

but also ammunition and clothing, without which the war would not have been carried on, whereby their oppressed country was greatly assisted and relieved; and

Whereas, although the fabrics and manufactures of Europe and other foreign parts imported into this country in times of peace may be afforded at cheaper rates than they can be made here, yet good policy and a regard to the well-being of divers useful and industrious citizens who are employed in the making of like goods in this State demand of us that moderate duties be laid on certain fabrics and manufactures imported which do most interfere with, and which, if no relief be given, will undermine and destroy, the useful manufactures of the like kind in this country.

That was the germ of our protective system. It contained the power and potency of all that has been evolved out of it, or developed from it. It was the infant, grown now to a giant, which like a faithful sentinel stands guard over factory, forge, field, and every fold of American labor and industry.

Hamilton, with his prescient intellect and mighty reach of statesmanship, scarcely saw beyond the lines marked out by the Pennsylvania Assembly. Clay elaborated the scheme, broadened the field of vision, and furnished some arguments in support of the system. He gave its data classification, polished it and labeled it for popular study, and did more perhaps than any other American statesman to relieve the subject of its abstruseness and bring it within easy range of popular comprehension. In later years the contributions of economists and statesmen, the lessons of experience, and the more scientific study of its principles have demonstrated more clearly its superior utility and deepened the American conviction of its necessity to the welfare and prosperity of our industries, and established its title to the veneration and affection of every patriotic American citizen, until the feeling widely prevalent among all ranks of our people may be tersely and truthfully expressed in the words of Grattan, speaking of the Irish Parliament: "It is our very existence; nay, more, it is our life to come."

It has been through the century a leading agency in nourishing infant industries and in maintaining mature ones, in diversifying employments, and promoting the conditions of mutually advantageous intercourse between them; in utilizing all our powers and capabilities by employing them upon the totality of our native resources, giving employment to our labor and applying our own capital to our own industrial pursuits, thus meeting our own wants with our own supplies, our satisfactions with our sacrifices, and mutually serving each other to the greatest extent compatible with the conditions under which we are working out the problem of our industrial development, and in opening the way to results of such unrivaled splendor in the production and acquisition of wealth and the growth of trade and commerce as to extort from the greatest living Englishman the handsome tribute—and now where is the gentleman from Ohio [laughter]—that splendid tribute, "That so rapid has been our growth, and so swiftly are we forging ahead that our commercial supremacy is only a question of time." [Applause on the Republican side.]

So much for our past. What is our present situation in the shadow of an impending peril? It beggars description. In our factories you can hear a pin drop. In our forges a whisper reverberates. In our furnaces a friction match illumines the darkness, and in many American homes a piece of corn bread would be a feast. A few rough-hewn lines of some doggerel rhymes feebly portray the clouds and darkness round about us:

From forges where no fires burn,
From mills where wheels no longer turn,
From looms o'er which no shuttles leap,
From merchants' shops—which sheriffs keep,
From banks gone up, from stocks gone down,
From God-made country, man-made town,
From Wall street men, from sons of toil,
From the bronzed tillers of the soil,
From North, from South, from East, from West,
Business is crying with a zest—
"Don't monkey with the tariff."

[Laughter.]

THE WILSON BILL.

And yet we have before us a bill which proposes, in relation to a number of our leading and most necessary industries, to strike down those defensive duties in some instances and reduce them in others, and thereby diminish that protection under which they have prospered in the past, and without which they will not only be unable to prosper in the future, but must languish, and if not succored at an early day by wiser legislation, must perish by starvation or strangulation, unless they continue a precarious existence by reducing the wages of American labor to the foreign level. It is the fourth bill that has been written over the name of a Democratic statesman in thirty years. We have seen a Wood bill, a Morrison bill, a Mills bill, and now we have a Wilson bill. Which is the worst bill I am not able to say. When all are so bad it would be invidious to discriminate.

It is not a free-trade bill, for it admits protection to a limited extent. It is not a protective bill, for it contains too little protection to be of any use. It is like a dike too low to keep the water out. It is not a revenue bill, for it fails to produce reve-

nue. It embodies all the vices and none of the virtues of commercial restriction. It entails all the cost and vexation of maintaining custom-houses, while it brings none of the benefits the system was designed to secure.

THE BASIS OF SOUND LEGISLATION.

All sound and beneficial legislation on lines of commercial regulation must proceed upon these fundamental postulates:

First. Our own laboring people must be employed at remunerative wages.

Second. We have no advantageous industries which can employ all our labor in the production of commodities whose excess over and above our own consumption can find a market elsewhere at prices commensurate with such a ratio of result to exertion or of satisfaction to sacrifice as would justify the cumulation of our labor in them.

Third. That under these conditions the best results are attainable by the employment of our labor and all our productive forces on our own raw materials to meet our own consumption as far as is compatible with the nature and extent of our resources. In other words, under existing conditions of production, distribution, and consumption the world over, the American market is the best one, not only for the products of American soil, but as well those of American mines, factories, forges, furnaces, and the whole round of American production.

These propositions derive support not only from the deductions of reason applied to the facts of our situation, but from the lessons of our actual experience as well. If a shoemaker has a market for all the shoes he can make at a price which pays him more for a day's work than he can make at any other employment, he puts in all his time at making shoes; but if his market fails him, if he can not sell all his shoes at a price that constitutes that his advantageous industry he must either be idle a portion of his time or accumulate a surplus of shoes without exchangeable value. He is driven, therefore, to give a portion of his time to some other employment to eke out a living. Or, if he finds a market for all his shoes, but can not find a supply of some necessary article of consumption, say stockings, at such price as would pay him better to buy than to make, then he must employ a part of his time in making his own stockings. This would be an economic necessity.

Similarly, the people of the United States, having no single industry or limited number of industries in which their labor and exertion would be more efficient than in others, because there is no market to take all they could produce in them at a price that would give their labor superior efficiency, must do other things to make a living. And moreover, if they had a superiority in one or more industries they could not find an adequate supply of their remaining wants at a price which would pay them better to buy than to make. So that the economic limitations of the situation in which we find ourselves, and from which we have no means of escape, compel us to the course we have chosen to pursue, that of producing to a large extent our own consumption.

But if the necessities of our situation compel us, as the solicitation of our manifest interest moves us, to employ ourselves in the miscellaneous and manifold industries, with the resources and aptitudes for which our country and our people have been so richly endowed, and we are already established in these industries with fabulous amounts of capital invested in numerous plants equipped for business, under a scale of defensive duties, which secures to us so generous a share of our own markets as to give employment to our own labor in production at remunerative wages commensurate with the high general level of character and intelligence which distinguishes American labor, should we by withdrawing that protection, by the reduction or total removal of those duties, relinquish a portion of our own markets to foreign producers, displace our own labor for foreign, impair our own fixed capital, and voluntarily abdicate our sovereignty over our industrial realm.

The answer of the advocates of this measure doubtless is that the bill has no tendency to the production of the results named, but on the contrary it will tend to lighten the burdens of taxation, promote the activity of our industries, better the conditions of labor, and secure a progressively increasing efficiency in all our productive agencies.

But for the indisputable presumption of your sincerity in this contention I would say it is in vain you protest that you are practical economists working out the problem of your country's interests, while the agencies you propose are calculated to paralyze the industries they are meant to help, unless indeed it be economists of the class of whom Napoleon said: "If the empire were made of adamant they would grind it to powder;" in vain that you declare your solicitude for workingmen while you are legislating bread out of their mouths; in vain that you insist that their condition will be bettered while you are closing the mills in which they earned the highest wages ever paid to labor; in vain that you pretend to be seeking access to the markets of the

world for American manufactures when England's factories are crowded with an accumulation of products for which the double advantage of free raw material and low wages does not enable her to find a market, but subjects her to the mortification of witnessing her foreign commerce in a progressive decline; in vain that you insist that you are cheapening commodities for the people's consumption while you are curtailing their means of buying the satisfactions of life at any price. But for the constraint I am under to believe you serious, the irony of your declarations and protestations is so apparent that I would be reminded of the hypocrite who protested his love for his Savior, his veneration for his Bible, and his devotion to his religion, while he daily broke every commandment in the decalogue.

THE REPUBLICAN DOCTRINE OF PROTECTION.

Conformably to the principles I have indicated, the Republican doctrine of protection is that imposts are to be levied for two purposes, both distinctly declared by the founders of the Republic, and to secure which was one of the chief reasons for the adoption of the Constitution of 1787, namely, to raise revenue for the support of the Government and to encourage our domestic industries; and a constitutional duty is one that has for its object this twofold purpose: A duty which yields sufficient revenue and at the same time guarantees our own producers the first chance in our own markets is a protective and constitutional duty; while a duty which aims to raise revenue while it injures home enterprise and discourages domestic industries by inviting importations is a destructive duty, and, if not an unconstitutional one, is maintained by an abuse of constitutional power.

Duties in the two instances are imposed on totally different principles. A duty regulated by the revenue principle alone proceeds upon the assumption that the point on the scale of rates at which a duty should be fixed is the lowest figure that will yield the requisite amount of revenue without regard to protection, on the theory that the less the duties the lighter the burdens. It is easily seen that this results in largely increasing importations, for as the duty falls the imports swell—to the injury of our home producers.

The principle of the maximum revenue from the maximum importations is the one that the industries of this country can not survive, for it means the minimum of home productions. It substitutes foreign for home products and foreign for home industries, and is to that extent unpatriotic and un-American, if not treason to the welfare of the country.

On the contrary, a duty regulated upon the twofold principle of revenue and protection proceeds upon the assumption that the true point on the scale of rates at which a duty should be fixed is the highest figure consistent with sufficient revenue and adequate protection.

By the Democratic method the revenue is to be collected with as much incidental injury to the people as possible. By the Republican method the revenue is collected with as much incidental benefit to the people as possible.

We believe that if the collector of customs can dispense benefits while he is gathering revenue it is a relief and not a distress to the people. A revenue that carries a double blessing upon its wings is none the worse on that account.

Daniel Webster, the great expounder of the Constitution, said on this very point:

Can it be that we have only a revenue power in this matter? That is, we have the clear and undoubted power to take so much money out of your pockets and apply it to our public purposes; but God forbid that in doing so we should do you any good at the same time.

Now, let us give some attention to the contentions in support of the bill. The proponents of the measure rely upon a course of deductive reasoning totally invalid when tested by the economic facts of our history. The only verification by actual experience which they have ever thought worth while to attempt is found in the period between 1846 and 1860. As the devout Mussulmen in prayer turn their faces toward the Caaba as their point of adoration, so do our devout tariff reformers when they bend their exertions to the rescue of their country from the robber barons of protection turn their faces to the Mecca of 1846 to 1860 as their point of adoration.

FREE-TRADE PERIOD.

A characteristic mode of depicting the unspeakable charms of that idyllic season after the winter of their discontent had been made glad summer by the glorious sun of free trade in the tariff of 1846 may be found in an address of the present Vice-President at Bloomington, Ill., just before his election. These are his words:

The decade and a half extending from the passage of the low-tariff law of 1846 to the beginning of our civil war has been truly called the golden period of our history. The cost of the necessities of life had reached the minimum, and at no time in our history was it easier for the wage-earner to support his family. The farmer, the mechanic, the day laborer alike realized the benefit of low taxation. A benefit, why? Simply for the reason that it lessened the cost of food, of clothing, of every article that conduced to his comfort. Our manufactories did not languish. The fires did not go

out in our furnaces. The wheels and spindles were not idle in our great fires of industry. The demand for labor was not lessened, nor was its value depreciated.

Mr. Chairman, an effective answer to the Vice-President, as well as to the fairy tales given us yesterday by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HARTER] concerning this long-to-be-remembered period when the industries of Pennsylvania languished, and languishing, died by the scores, with none to succor, may be found in the work of Robert Ellis Thompson on Social Science and National Economy. Mr. Thompson says:

Thus during the years 1846-'49 English iron was cheap, selling in New York at \$40 a ton, and largely driving the home producer out of the market. One-third of the furnaces and iron mills ceased operations soon after the tariff was enacted, many being sold out by the sheriff, the rest were sorely crippled, and the amount of their production greatly diminished. In 1851-'54, when home competition was virtually out of the way, iron sold for \$80 a ton, whereas native iron had been sold for \$60.

A CONTRAST AND CONTRADICTION.

But further, Mr. Chairman, for the sake of the contrast, and in the interest of truth, I submit without note or comment the dispassionate statement of President Fillmore in his annual message to Congress in December, 1851. This is what he said:

The value of our exports of breadstuffs and provisions, which it was supposed the incentive of a low tariff and large importations from abroad would have greatly augmented, has fallen from \$68,791,921 in 1817, to \$26,651,373 in 1850, and to \$21,848,653 in 1851, with a strong probability, amounting almost to a certainty, of a still further reduction in the current year.

The aggregate value of rice exported during the last fiscal year as compared with the previous year also exhibits a decrease amounting to \$460,917, which with a decline in the value of the exports of tobacco for the same period make an aggregate decrease in these two articles of \$1,156,751.

The policy which dictated a low rate of duties on foreign merchandise it was thought by those who promoted and established it would tend to benefit the farming population of the country by increasing the demand and raising the price of agricultural products in foreign markets. The foregoing facts, however, seem to show incontestably that no such result has followed the adoption of this policy.

BUCHANAN'S TESTIMONY.

To make confirmation strong as proof of Holy Writ I will place on the record of this discussion the statement of President Buchanan at a later period, when the evils of a revenue tariff had culminated in the overthrow of our industries and the impoverishment of our people. President Buchanan, in his annual message to Congress December 8, 1857, said:

We have possessed all of the elements of national wealth in rich abundance, and yet, notwithstanding all these advantages, our country in its monetary interests is at the present moment in a deplorable condition. In the midst of unsurpassed plenty in all the productions of agriculture and in all the elements of national wealth, we find our manufactures suspended, our public works retarded, our private enterprises of different kinds abandoned, and thousands of useful laborers thrown out of employment and reduced to want.

In the same message, after describing the distress and want to which the people had been reduced, President Buchanan enlarged upon the inability of the people to purchase manufactured articles for lack of means, and that goods therefore ceased to be produced. The decay of our own industries so lessened the people's means of purchasing imported goods that imports fell off to such an extent that the revenue declined so that it was inadequate to meet the necessary expenses of the Government. To supply this deficiency Congress, by act of December 23, 1857, authorized the issue of \$20,000,000 of Treasury notes. This proving inadequate, in June, 1858, a loan of \$20,000,000 was authorized to meet the expenditures of the Government.

The conditions progressed from bad to worse until March 3, 1859, when the situation was so appalling that the President issued a special message to Congress, appealing in tones of touching pathos to preserve the credit of the country.

The Treasury was bankrupt, the credit of the nation was reduced to its lowest terms, and no provision was made for the necessary expenses of the Government.

Thus—

Says the message—

the country, which is full of resources, will be dishonored before the world, and the American people, who are a debt-paying people, will be disgraced by the omission on our part to do our duty.

And these calamitous results ensued, it must not be forgotten, coincidentally with an unparalleled succession of fortuitous circumstances, calculated in the highest degree to counteract the depressing influences exerted by the mistaken tariff policy of that unhappy period. These circumstances, as all will remember, were a succession of famines in Ireland, a crop shortage in Germany and other European countries, European wars, and the discovery of gold in California. But all these aids to prosperity could not overcome the noxious effects of the Walker tariff, and the country sank deeper and deeper in the slough of despond until the Morrill tariff brought succor to a demoralized and distressed country.

TARIFF FOR REVENUE.

One of the numerous contentions upon which the advocates of a tariff for revenue rely is the assumption that free raw material cheapens production, enlarges consumption, multiplies markets, promotes manufactures, and secures remunerative employment

to labor. Precisely what mode of imposing duties is required by a tariff for revenue only may be a question not free from difficulty.

There is credible Democratic authority for holding that such a tariff excludes entirely the idea of free imports of any kind, that the Democratic doctrine of the unconstitutionality of a protective duty carries the necessary implication that revenue being the supreme and only purpose of the impost, it must be exacted from the whole field of importations without omission and without favor. In every quarter in which this view meets with acceptance, free raw materials must be condemned as repugnant to the principle of a revenue tariff and in derogation of the latest distinct tenet of the Democratic party. For a fuller exposition of this incongruity in the bill I refer to the following observations from the New York Sun:

FREE RAW MATERIAL.

We have had the honor to receive from the attorney-general of Mississippi, the Hon. Frank Johnston, a communication containing the following request:

"I have written to ask the Sun to give its readers elaborately its views on the subject of free raw material, with a protective duty on the manufactured product."

As any and all discussion upon this subject can be theoretical and academic only, and of no possible application to the practical transactions of the Democratic Congress, we must respectfully call Mr. Johnston's attention to the fact. Debate on free raw material is closed. Such a feature of the tariff was presented for approval to the last great court of the Democratic party, the National Democratic Convention of 1892, and it was repudiated, not merely by the negative of deliberate and categorical rejection, but by the added declaration of a principle that made the notion of free raw materials a constitutional impossibility.

The Chicago convention, which put forward Mr. Cleveland for the Presidency, decided that there should be a "tariff for revenue only," and in so saying it double locked the door on further argument as to the expediency of other policies, or as to national prosperity by other methods, or the inevitable changes in manufacture and commerce, or sectional advantages, or individual interests, or personal opinions, or discrimination of any sort or shade in customs duties. Each became thereafter an absolutely forbidden factor in the tariff, as prescribed by the Constitution. Each and all must be eliminated from the Federal system and barred out.

Free raw material, or free anything, is out of the question in a constitutional revenue tariff. A free list is as impossible under the Democratic platform as a prohibitory tax. Revenue is the supreme principle, and revenue only, to be exacted from the whole field of importation, without omission and without favor. The reformers have been proclaiming earnestly for years past that any other than a revenue tariff robs some one, and now the Democratic platform says the same thing. What any Democratic journal or Democratic statesman, therefore, thinks individually of the free-raw-material principle can have no more standing before a Democratic Congress or a Democratic Administration than advocacy of highway robbery, direct and simple. The Sun would have to attach as much importance to elaborating an essay on the multiplication table as to a renewed discussion on the merits of a free list.

In assuring Mr. Johnston of our most distinguished consideration, we must justify this somewhat blunt response to his courteous note by the fact that the Democratic pledge, solemnly offered and publicly accepted, tolerates no other. The tariff must be for revenue only, without humping, backsliding, or delusion. Otherwise people will say the Democracy is a fraud.

Mr. Chairman, I indulge the hope that the humbug, backsliding, and delusion of "free raw material," so pungently referred to by Mr. Dana, may be eliminated from the bill before it reaches its passage.

HENRY WATTERSON.

Another father in Israel of the Democratic faith, from the opposite section of our country, Henry Watterson, says this bill is an attempt to steer between wind and water, to serve two masters. A tariff for revenue and a tariff for protection are the opposites of each other, and the conflict between them is irrepressible. If the party did not mean this in 1876, then the platform lied. If Mr. Cleveland did not mean it by his message of 1887, then he misled the people and is at this moment the custodian of stolen goods. At least the convention of 1892 meant it, because the issue was therein made so decisive and incisive that nobody could mistake it. The people voted distinctly to displace the protective system with a revenue system.

The safe course to pursue was to make a tariff for revenue only in consonance with the pledges of the party. The imperfection of the bill is its complications. It admits the smug face of protection in some parts and half its body in other parts. So says Henry Watterson in the Louisville Courier-Journal.

So firm is Mr. Watterson's conviction that the Democratic party has been guilty of a base betrayal of the people's trust in undertaking to foist upon the country the Wilson bill for a tariff-for-revenue measure that he has deliberately declared that "his party is marching through a slaughterhouse to an open grave." I do not quarrel with him on that point, but am happy to be in unity with him. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Andrew Jackson Steinman, as broad-gauged, clear-headed, and conservative a Democratic journalist as can be found in Eastern Pennsylvania, in the Lancaster Intelligencer says:

Mr. OATES furthermore believes that the free list in the Wilson bill is too large in view of the need of revenue. We are entirely in sympathy with this opinion. We are unable to understand how a Democratic committee, instructed by a Democratic convention in favor of a tariff for revenue, has been able to formulate a tariff bill which is not expected to raise anything like the revenue needed by the Treasury; which makes a large free list that yields no revenue at all, and continues a Republican bounty on sugar which not only fails to produce, but actually dissipates revenue.

It seems to us to be really silly to establish a free list, when we need the revenue it can be readily made to yield without complaint and without particular burden upon anyone. A tariff for revenue really prohibits a free list; though it would be a good policy, as to articles of prime necessity, provided the revenue was superabundant. It is a good way to release revenue, to establish a free list; but when we do not want to release revenue, it is a foolish establishment.

There should be a light duty levied upon all articles on the free list in the Democratic bill; a duty so light as not to hinder their importation, but enough to raise the revenue they can be made to yield without checking their importation. And certainly there should be no bounty on sugar. That is a question too clear for long discussion. No such proposition could have appeared in a Democratic tariff bill, if a proper hand had been kept upon the Democratic pulse of the country, which thoroughly and undoubtedly repudiates the idea of a bounty; and especially when the revenues are short, will it forbid the passage of such a measure.

The honest truth is that the Wilson tariff bill needs to be promptly recommended to the committee with instruction to cause it to provide sufficient revenue; and the sooner this is understood and done, the better it will be for the party and the country.

FREE RAW MATERIAL.

I beg now to observe that if the theory of Mr. Dana and Mr. Watterson is not sound, and protective duties are after all compatible with the principle of a tariff for revenue only, then the "free raw material" clauses of the bill come under equal condemnation on another ground. If protection is admitted into the bill to any extent, however limited, as a direct object, it is a distinct concession to the principle of protection, and we may well insist that its application shall not be arbitrary but conformable to the reason of the case and the requirements of our industrial situation.

We do not want a tariff bill like that of 1846, which a distinguished economic writer characterized as "neither fish, flesh, fowl, nor good salt herring." We ought to have a bill consistent with itself—without repugnancy—that stands by the logic of its principle and does not quail before its sequences.

The President says in his recent annual message that restrictions must be removed from the importation of the raw materials of our manufactures to enable the latter to compete on equal terms for the markets.

Of course a full and complete answer to that contention is that under existing law there is practically no duty on raw material manufactured for export. Ninety per cent of the duty is refunded. But supposing it was not. What is the philosophy of this proposition? It must be clear that if our manufacturers are barred from the world's markets it is because of some obstacles that are not in the way of other competing nations. In an economic sense what are the obstacles to free commerce on equal terms? Anything which prevents equality of facilities is an obstacle. Higher wages is an obstacle. Greater cost of material is an obstacle. There may be others, but these are all that concern us in this discussion. An equalization of facilities can be secured by the removal of one or both of these obstacles.

I do not believe the people of the United States can afford to secure a foreign market at the cost of foregoing any part of our wages or of any part of our protection to raw material. The President, however, thinks we can, and advises us to forego the defensive duty on raw material. On what principle is this selection made? In either case an injury is done to labor. Those employed in the collection and preparation and transportation of raw material can no more compete with the cheap labor abroad employed in similar work than can American manufacturers, and the result must be a cut in wages or a cessation of business.

The protective principle being admitted, then every industry in which American labor comes in competition with cheaper foreign labor ought to have its share of protection if it needs it. The production of raw material is as much an industry as its elaboration into manufactured articles. Those employed in it are as much workmen as any other laborers. They have the same wants, the same aspirations, the same need for protection against the corresponding labor abroad at lower wages. It is labor that is the object of protection, and any commodity representing labor is within the principle. If there is a raw material that is untouched by labor let that go on the free list.

Even Bastiat, who was a free trader *par excellence*, made that concession to the protective theory. He held that if protection is admissible at all, all labor should be protected: "No labor, no protection."

If it is the wish of the House, Mr. Chairman, I shall not detain it further this evening if I can have about twenty minutes in the morning.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman has occupied forty minutes of his time. He will be entitled to twenty minutes again when this matter is resumed.

Mr. BROSIUS. Then I will yield the floor, Mr. Chairman, at this time.

The CHAIRMAN. If there be no objection the committee will now rise.

The committee accordingly rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. RICHARDSON of Tennessee reported that the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union,

having had under consideration the tariff bill, had come to no resolution thereon.

PRINTING COAST AND GEODETIC REPORT.

Mr. RICHARDSON of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, this morning the House agreed to a Senate resolution to print the annual report of the Coast and Geodetic Survey for 1892. There was an error in the resolution. It should have been 1893. I move to reconsider, or ask unanimous consent to reconsider, the action of the House in order to ask its return from the Senate and correction. I submit a resolution, on which I ask immediate action.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the resolution of the gentleman from Tennessee.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That the Senate be requested to return to the House the Senate concurrent resolution to print the report of the Superintendent of the Coast and Geodetic Survey for the fiscal year 1892.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the consideration of this resolution?

Mr. DALZELL. What is the suggestion? Should it be 1893?

Mr. RICHARDSON of Tennessee. That is the correction which should be made in the resolution.

There being no objection, the resolution was considered and agreed to.

The SPEAKER. As it wants now only three minutes of the time for taking the recess, if there be no objection the Chair will declare the House in recess until 8 o'clock. The gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BROOKSHIRE] will preside and perform the duties of the Chair at the evening session, which will be devoted to debate only upon the pending bill.

EVENING SESSION.

The recess having expired, the House, at 8 o'clock p. m., was called to order by Mr. BROOKSHIRE as Speaker *pro tempore*.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. The House is now in session for debate only on the tariff bill, and will resolve itself into Committee of the Whole under the special order.

The House accordingly resolved itself into Committee of the Whole, Mr. RICHARDSON of Tennessee in the chair.

[Mr. MAGUIRE withholds his remarks for revision. See Appendix.]

[Mr. COCKRELL addressed the committee. See Appendix.]

Mr. SIMPSON. I move that the committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

The committee accordingly rose; and Mr. BROOKSHIRE having taken the chair as Speaker *pro tempore*, Mr. KILGORE, 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 conclusion thereon.

And then, on motion of Mr. KILGORE (at 9 o'clock and 46 minutes p. m.), the House adjourned until to-morrow, Friday, January 12, 1894, at 11 o'clock a. m.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS.

Under clause 6 of Rule XIII, Mr. TAWNEY, from the Committee on Pensions, reported the bill (H. R. 3195) granting a pension to Lovica Hall, a widow of a soldier of the war of 1812; which, with the accompanying report (No. 257), was ordered to be printed, and referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

CHANGE OF REFERENCE.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXII, the Committee on Invalid Pensions was discharged from the consideration of the bill (H. R. 5142) to increase the pension of H. S. Mayhill, and the same was referred to the Committee on Pensions.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, bills and a resolution of the following titles were introduced, and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. CURTIS of New York: A bill (H. R. 5166) to regulate enlistments in the Army of the United States—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. HUDSON: A bill (H. R. 5167) to grant the right of way to the Indian Pacific Coal and Railway Company through the Indian and Oklahoma Territories, and for other purposes—to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. OUTHWAITE: A joint resolution (H. Res. 108) authorizing Maj. Gen. Oliver Otis Howard, United States Army, to accept from the President of the French Republic a diploma conferring the decoration of Commander of the National Order of the Legion of Honor—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

PRIVATE BILLS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills of the following titles were presented and referred as follows:

By Mr. BOATNER: A bill (H. R. 5168) for the relief of the estate of Alfred W. Green, late of Carroll Parish, La.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5169) for the relief of Washington West, Madison Parish, La.—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. BANKHEAD: A bill (H. R. 5170) for the relief of Dr. John B. Read—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. BUNDY: A bill (H. R. 5171) for the relief of John McNaughton, second lieutenant Company G, First Regiment West Virginia Cavalry Volunteers—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5172) to authorize the Court of Claims to hear and determine the claim of the heirs of Dudley D. Smith—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. CRISP: A bill (H. R. 5173) granting a pension to Sarah L. Maxwell—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. DAVEY: A bill (H. R. 5174) for the relief of the heirs of John Innerarity—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. HOOKER of Mississippi: A bill (H. R. 5175) for the relief of Mrs. Ann M. Brown, Claiborne County, Miss.—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. HULL: A bill (H. R. 5176) granting an increase of pension to Milton Iseman—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5177) granting a pension to Arra Vander Sinden—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HOUK of Tennessee: A bill (H. R. 5178) for the allowance of certain claims reported by the accounting officers of the United States Treasury Department—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5179) for the allowance of certain claims for stores and supplies reported by the Court of Claims under the provisions of the act of March 3, 1883, known as the Bowman act, and for other purposes—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Indiana: A bill (H. R. 5180) to remove the charge of desertion against the record of William J. McFalls—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. MARTIN of Indiana: A bill (H. R. 5181) to correct the military record of John Smith—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. OATES: A bill (H. R. 5182) for the relief of the heirs of S. H. Hill, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. POST: A bill (H. R. 5183) for the relief of Joseph W. Parish—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. FIELDER: A bill (H. R. 5184) for the relief of Maria T. Karge—to the Committee on Pensions.

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. ALDRICH: Petition of George E. Andronette & Co. and 6 other firms of glass-manufacturers of Chicago, protesting against the passage of the Wilson tariff bill—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of Henry W. King & Co. and 41 other manufacturers of clothing of the city of Chicago, protesting against the passage of the Wilson tariff bill—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of E. Johansen and 14 other cigar-manufacturers of Chicago, for a uniform duty on all unstemmed leaf tobacco—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, resolutions of the Chicago Board of Trade, favoring the adoption of House bill 4182, providing for an international maritime conference for the better protection and care of animals in transit—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. BAKER of New Hampshire: Memorial of the Board of Trade of the city of Nashua, N. H., in favor of the early completion of the Sandy Bay breakwater and harbor of refuge—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Also, memorial of the farmers engaged in the tobacco culture and cigar manufacturers of Hinsdale, N. H., protesting against the tobacco schedules of the Wilson bill—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BANKHEAD: Petition of 280 miners of Brookside, Ala., protesting against placing coal and iron on the free list—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BRANCH: Petition of citizens of Carteret County, N. C., to open Darien Inlet between Portsmouth and Cape Lookout—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Also, petition of W. F. Willis, of Plymouth, N. C., for relief for property destroyed by United States Government in the

town of Plymouth, N. C., during the late war—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, petition of Greenville Tobacco Board of Trade, protesting against the increased duty on cigarettes—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BROSIUS: Resolutions of Cigar-makers' Union, No. 126, Ephratah, Pa., against the Wilson bill—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CRISP (by request): Memorial from the Legislature of Idaho, praying that certain waters in that State be drained—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. DALZELL: Resolutions of the Board of Trade of McKeesport, Pa., against the Wilson bill—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DEFOREST: Petition of sundry citizens of Danbury, Conn., against proposed change of duty on manufactured hats—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, remonstrance of sundry citizens of Connecticut, against reduction of duty on imported leaf tobacco—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DINSMORE: Petition of James Fanning for his relief—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, petition of George Glenn, of Madison County, Ark., for his relief—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. ELLIS of Oregon: Petition of 31 citizens of Hardman, Oregon, protesting against the passage of the Wilson tariff bill—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GILLET of Massachusetts: Protests of 240 citizens of Hadley; 153 of Amherst; 123 of Agawam; 97 of Northfield, and 63 more of Westfield, all in the State of Massachusetts, interested in the cultivation of tobacco, against the Wilson bill—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, protest of 777 employés of the Otis Mills, Ware, Mass., irrespective of party affiliations, against the Wilson tariff bill—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, protest of 83 citizens of Winchendon, Mass., against the Wilson bill, especially as it affects manufacturing of toys—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, protest of 44 employés of the Swift River Company, Enfield, Mass., irrespective of party affiliations, against the Wilson bill—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, protest of 21 employés of the Excelsior Woolen Company, Wales, Mass., irrespective of party affiliations, against the Wilson tariff bill—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GROUT: Protest of the lithographers of the cities of New York, Brooklyn, and Jersey City, against the passage of the Wilson tariff bill—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, protest of the All Tobacco Cigarettes Manufacturers' Association of the United States, against the passage of the Wilson tariff bill—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, remonstrance of H. C. Battey, Proctorsville, Vt., and 194 other farmers, laborers, and employés of the Taft, Burbank & Murdock Woolen Mills, against the passage of the Wilson tariff bill—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HAINES: Petition of James A. Hover and other citizens of Columbiaville, N. Y., against the passage of the Wilson bill—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, protest of Doty & Scrimgeour, of New York (manufacturers of surface-coated paper), against the passage of the Wilson bill—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, remonstrance against the passage of the Wilson bill from employés of the Valatie (N. Y.) Cotton Mills—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of A. B. Knowlson and other citizens of Sand Lake, N. Y., against the passage of the Wilson bill—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, protest of the employés of the Valatie Cotton Mills, the Wild Manufacturing Company, and the Valatie Paper Mill Company, against the passage of the Wilson bill—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, protest of Gilbert Sherwood and other persons of Valatie, N. Y., against the Wilson bill—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HAUGEN: Resolution of the Chamber of Commerce of West Superior, Wis., against placing iron ore on the free list as proposed in the Wilson bill—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HENDERSON of Illinois: Petition of Mrs. Mathilda S. Lawler, widow of Nicholas Lawler, late a soldier in the Fourth United States Artillery, praying for a pension—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. HENDERSON of Iowa: Petition of J. E. B. Hudson and 402 other citizens and old soldiers of Iowa, praying for legislation to prevent suspension of pensions until after due notice of proof of fraud, and for restoration of suspended pensions until such proofs are secured—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HOOKER of New York: Petition of 35 farmers of Cattaraugus County, N. Y., against the Wilson tariff bill—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KEM: Petition of citizens of O'Neill, Nebr., asking for a uniform rate of duty of 35 cents on all unstemmed leaf tobacco—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LOUDENSLAGER: Petition and resolutions passed and signed by the Philadelphia Board of Trade, against the passage of the Wilson bill—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition signed by W. A. Williams and 135 others, citizens of Clayton, N. J., against the passage of the Wilson bill—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition signed by Abram Simmerman and 20 others, against the passage of the Wilson bill—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition signed by John Campbell and 179 others of Glassboro, N. J., against the passage of the Wilson bill—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MALLORY: Petition of levee men to dredge Charlotte Harbor, Fla., asking an appropriation of \$150,000—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Also (by request), petition of citizens of Crystal River, Fla., praying retention of existing tariff on lead pencils—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MARVIN of New York: Remonstrance of Howard Greenleaf and 37 other citizens of Hampton, Orange County, N. Y., against reduction of tariff rates on tissue papers of all kinds—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MARTIN of Indiana: Petition of sundry citizens of Peru, Ind., for the defeat of the Wilson tariff bill—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of Local Union, No. 73, American Flint Glass Workers' Union, of Marion, Ind., against the Wilson tariff bill—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of Maj. H. B. Sayler and 64 other ex-Union soldiers, for the passage of the bill (H. R. 1109) to correct the military record of Charles A. Larkin—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. McDEARMON: Petition of Mrs. Melissa Gill, for passage of a bill to authorize the Secretary of War to place the name of George W. Gill on the rolls and records of Company I, Seventh Tennessee Cavalry, to accompany House bill 5149—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. MEIKELJOHN: Protest of miners of lead ores in Missouri and other Western States, against the provisions in the tariff bill which prescribes 15 per cent ad valorem on lead ores and admits duty free all ores in which the value in silver is greater than that of lead—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. O'NEIL: Petition of Boston Fruit and Produce Exchange for completion of Harbor of Refuge at Cape Ann, Mass.—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. ROBINSON of Pennsylvania: Petition of the employés of Irvington Woolen Mills, Delaware County, Pa., protesting against the passage of the Wilson bill—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of the employés of Wolfender, Shaw & Co., Limited, of Cardington, Delaware County, Pa., protesting against the passage of the Wilson bill—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of the cigarette manufacturers, protesting against the passage of the Wilson tariff bill—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, two petitions of the manufacturers and employés in the manufacture of gold, silver, aluminum, and metal leaf, protesting against the passage of the Wilson bill—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of the employers of labor, workingmen, citizens, and others of Parkersburg, Chester County, Pa., protesting against the passage of the Wilson bill—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of thread workers and spinners of fine cotton of New Jersey, protesting against the passage of the Wilson bill—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of lead miners of Southwest Missouri and Southeast Kansas, protesting against the passage of the Wilson bill as now framed—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of the Philadelphia Board of Trade, protesting against the passage of the Wilson bill—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of the employés of I. & I. Eastwood, Lyndell, Pa., protesting against the passage of the Wilson bill—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. RUSSELL of Connecticut: Protest of farmers of Westchester, town of Colchester, Conn., against the tobacco schedule of the Wilson tariff bill—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SPERRY: Petition of farmers, growers of cigar leaf tobacco, and their employés, protesting against the proposed reduction of duty on foreign wrappers—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. STEPHENSON: Memorial of workingmen, employers of labor, and others, citizens of Gogebic County, Mich., protesting against the proposed free admission of iron ore and declaring that such action by Congress would bring suffering and distress to all those engaged in the iron industry—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. STRONG: Petition of Martin Hazzard and 37 other members of Lodge No. 41 of Amalgamated Association of Iron and Steel Workers, of Findlay, Ohio, against the passage of the so-called Wilson tariff bill—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. VAN VOORHIS of New York: Protest by 531 employés of the Bausch & Lomb Optical Company, against the passage of the Wilson bill—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WHEELER of Alabama: Papers in the claim of John D. Tanner, of Madison County, Ala.—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. WOOMER: Petition of Martin Good and 20 employés engaged in the manufacture of woolen goods, of Highspire, Pa., against the Wilson tariff bill—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WRIGHT of Pennsylvania: Petition of Adam Smith and other farmers of Bradford County, Pa., against the reduction of duty on leaf tobacco—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

SENATE.

FRIDAY, January 12, 1894.

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

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

EULOGIES ON THE LATE REPRESENTATIVE CHIPMAN.

Mr. MCMILLAN. Mr. President, I desire to give notice that on next Friday at 3 o'clock I shall call up the resolutions of the House of Representatives in reference to the death of Hon. John Logan Chipman, a member of that body from the State of Michigan.

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 amendments of the Senate to the concurrent resolution of the House providing for the appointment of a special joint committee of the House and Senate to investigate and consider the rank, pay, and other matters relating to the personnel of the Navy.

The message also communicated a request to return to the House the concurrent resolution of the Senate to print the report of the Superintendent of the Coast and Geodetic Survey for the year 1892.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS.

Mr. STOCKBRIDGE presented the memorial of John S. Krier and other citizens of Michigan, remonstrating against the passage of the Wilson tariff bill; which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented the petition of Daniel Scotten & Co., of Detroit, Mich., praying for an amendment of the present tariff law so as to permit the sale of leaf tobacco in its natural state free of tax; which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. HOAR. I present a petition of the Central Labor Union of Worcester, Mass., indorsing the Wilson bill in its own behalf and that of twenty-four labor organizations which it represents. I suppose these gentlemen are very much interested in the reduction of the hours of labor, as the passage of the Wilson bill, in accordance with the view of the petitioners, carried to an extreme, would prevent there being any hours of labor at all to a very large number of workingmen. I move that the petition be referred to the Committee on Finance.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. HOAR presented a petition of the Rubber Garment Workers' Local Union, No. 51, of Boston, Mass., praying for the governmental control of the telegraph service; which was referred to the Committee on Post-Offices and Post-Roads.

Mr. SHERMAN presented the petition of Local Assembly, No. 7954, Knights of Labor, of Cincinnati, Ohio, praying for the passage of the Wilson tariff bill and for the imposition of an income tax; which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented the memorial of Hayes Young and 24 other citizens of Champaign County, Ohio, remonstrating against the