

attentive hearing made more voluntary by his uniform courtesy and genial disposition.

"Mild in manner, resolute in conviction," his name is permanently written in the annals of our nation as an exemplary type of citizen—a benefactor to his fellows, a lover of his country, an honest man.

The legions of heaven had watched him perform, day after day, year after year, the work laid to his hands, with never a shirking of responsibility nor a diminution of fidelity. At last they cried: "This man is unimpeachable; we have tried him well and found him not wanting;" and, as he was again about to put his shoulder to the wheel, yet unbent by the weight of more than his allotted three score and ten years, they called to him: "Rest, thou good and faithful servant."

Mr. REYBURN. Mr. Speaker, before the House adjourns I desire to ask leave that all gentlemen who desire to do so may print remarks upon this subject. I have received telegrams from my colleagues [Mr. DALZELL and Mr. BINGHAM] who were to be here to-day, but who are sick and unable to be present. I ask leave to print, not only for these gentlemen, but for such other members of the House as may desire it.

Mr. HENDERSON of Illinois. I hope that request will be granted. I myself had intended to submit some remarks on this occasion, but on account of sickness have been unable to prepare any. I desire to pay some tribute to the memory of our departed friend.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. The request will be granted in the absence of objection.

There was no objection.

And then, in accordance with the terms of the resolutions (at 2 o'clock and 43 minutes p. m.), the House adjourned until Monday, April 2, at 12 o'clock noon.

#### PUBLIC BILLS, MEMORIALS, AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced, and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. COFFEEN: A bill (H. R. 6517) to provide for the free and unlimited coinage of silver—to the Committee on Coinage, Weights, and Measures.

By Mr. COGSWELL: A bill (H. R. 6521) to provide for the support of bastard children in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes—to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6522) to provide for the support of wives and minor children in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes—to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. HOLMAN: A resolution authorizing the payment of \$200 to Isaac F. Smith for services as messenger of the House—to the Committee on Accounts.

By Mr. BAILEY: A resolution inquiring of the Secretary of the Treasury regarding certain interest-bearing Treasury notes—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

#### PRIVATE BILLS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills of the following titles were presented and referred as follows:

By Mr. COX: A bill (H. R. 6519) for the relief of Shields and H. Bryant, executors of J. Youngblood, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6520) for the relief of Thomas J. Lawson, sr.—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. GROSVENOR: A bill (H. R. 6523) authorizing the President to appoint and retire John B. Turchin as a brigadier-general in the United States Army—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6524) to place the name of John B. Turchin on the pension rolls at the rate of \$100 per month—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6525) for the relief of Josiah R. Allen—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6526) for the relief of Robert Coombes, of Harrisonville, Ohio—to the Committee on War Claims.

#### PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, the following petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

By Mr. AITKEN: Petition of C. H. Taylor and 18 others, of New Hudson, and A. J. Beller and 40 others, of Orion, Mich., asking for the passage of the Manderson-Hainer bill—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. BURROWS: Resolutions of the Forestry Congress, favoring the policy of national protection to the public forests—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. COGSWELL: Letter of S. T. Thomas, in favor of a

law to provide for the support of wives and minor children, and for other purposes—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. COUSINS: Petition of 15 citizens of Mason City, Iowa, favoring the passage of the Manderson-Hainer bill—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. CURTIS of New York: Resolution in favor of a Christian amendment to the Constitution of the United States—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CUMMINGS: Petition of 5,000 citizens, residents of the city of New York, N. Y., in favor of the passage of House bill 4457, to provide for a new grade of letter-carriers in cities whose postal revenues shall exceed the sum of \$500,000—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. DURBOROW (by request): Petition of Charles William Zarembo, praying for reimbursement for voluntary expenses incurred in connection with the World's Fair—to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. HENDRIX: Petition of T. T. Williams and others, citizens of Rock Falls, Ill., and P. H. Smith and others, citizens of Harmon, Ill., for the passage of the Manderson-Hainer bill—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

Also, petition of New York Tobacco Exchange, in respect to sale of untaxed leaf tobacco—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MILLIKEN: Petition of Walden Otis and others, for a law to enable States to enforce laws regulating the sale of substitutes for dairy products—to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. PICKLER: Petition of J. L. Flynn and 22 others, of Sioux Falls, S. Dak., protesting against the raising of the internal-revenue tax on cigars—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. RICHARDSON of Michigan: Petition of Paul J. Averill and 47 others, of Grand Rapids, Mich., asking for the passage of the Manderson-Hainer bill—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

Also, resolutions of the Iron Molders' Protective Association of Detroit, and of Goldsmith Lodge, No. 167, Ancient Order of United Workmen, of Grand Rapids, in favor of the Government control of telegraph systems—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. SPERRY: Petition against Louisiana lotteries—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. TAWNEY: Petition of the Rev. Carleton F. Brown and 90 others, citizens of St. Charles, Minn., in favor of the passage of antilobby legislation—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. WHEELER of Alabama: Letter from J. C. Jamison relative to House bill 6021, regulating representation of Oklahoma Legislature—to the Committee on the Territories.

By Mr. WILLIAMS of Illinois: Petition of Sarah C. Gibson for pension (House bill 6513)—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WILSON of Washington: Petition of 68 citizens of Port Townsend, 44 of Port Angeles, and 20 of South Bend, Snohomish, and of the State of Washington, favoring the passage of the Manderson-Hainer bill—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

#### SENATE.

Monday, April 2, 1894.

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

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

#### MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE.

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. T. O. TOWLES, its Chief Clerk, announced that the House had agreed to the conference asked by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (S. 69) prescribing limitations of time for completion of title to certain lands disposed of under the act of Congress approved September 27, 1850, and the acts amendatory and supplemental thereto, and commonly known as the "Donation act," and for the protection of purchasers and occupants of said lands, and had appointed Mr. McRAE, Mr. HARE, and Mr. LACEY managers at the conference on the part of the House.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 1919) authorizing the Texarkana and Fort Smith Railway Company to bridge Caddo Lake at or near Mooringsport, La., and Cross Bayou, near Shreveport, La.

The message further announced that the House had passed the following bills; in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:



A bill (H. R. 4328) for the relief of William B. Chapman, George W. Street, John W. Hoes, Emmet C. Tuthill, and Joseph H. Curtis;

A bill (H. R. 4954) relative to recognizances, stipulations, bonds, and undertakings, and to allow certain corporations to be accepted as surety thereon;

A bill (H. R. 6042) to authorize sale of lot 8, block 3, city of Hot Springs, by school directors thereof, and use of proceeds for school purposes; and

A bill (H. R. 6110) to authorize the construction of a bridge across the Mississippi River at Red Wing, Minn.

#### ENROLLED BILL SIGNED.

The message also announced that the Speaker of the House had signed the enrolled joint resolution (H. Res. 146) providing for the payment of salaries and expenses of additional deputy collectors of internal revenue to carry out the provisions of the Chinese exclusion act of May 5, 1892, as amended by the act of November 3, 1893; and it was thereupon signed by the Vice-President.

#### PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS.

Mr. HAWLEY presented the petition of E. A. Hopkins and 14 other citizens of Litchfield County, Conn., and the petition of M. Falrey and 25 other citizens of Litchfield County, Conn., praying for the enactment of legislation to enable the States to enforce State laws regulating the sale of substitutes for dairy products; which were referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

Mr. DAVIS presented a memorial of Capital City Lodge, No. 3, Brotherhood of Boilermakers and Iron Shipbuilders, of St. Paul, Minn., remonstrating against the passage of House bill 2655, granting American registry to foreign-built ships; which was referred to the Committee on Commerce.

He also presented a petition of the Woman's National Indian Association, of St. Paul, Minn., praying that an increased appropriation be made for the better education of Indian children; which was referred to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

He also presented petitions of St. Croix Lodge, No. 14, Ancient Order of United Workmen, of Stillwater; of Invincible Union, No. 785, of Winona, and of Lodge No. 63, Ancient Order of United Workmen, of Worthington, all in the State of Minnesota, praying that fraternal college and society journals be admitted to the mails as second class matter; which were referred to the Committee on Post-Offices and Post-Roads.

Mr. QUAY. The fact that I am a resident during the winter of the pineapple district of Florida is my apology to the Florida Senators for presenting a memorial of the Legislature of that State; which I send to the desk and ask to have it read.

The memorial of the Legislature of Florida was read, and ordered to lie on the table, as follows:

House joint resolution relating to duty on foreign pineapples.

Whereas the production of the pineapples is rapidly assuming proportions of magnitude in the semitropical portions of the United States; and

Whereas the large territory adapted to the growth of this fruit which is now being provided with transportation facilities is sufficient to supply the demands of our own country, if put under cultivation; and

Whereas our people can not successfully compete with foreign producers who have the advantage of more fertile soils, much cheaper labor and less transportation rates; and

Whereas this industry, by being husbanded, will rapidly multiply, affording rich fields for investing capital, and giving profitable employment to a large class of our citizens: Therefore

Be it resolved by the Legislature of the State of Florida, That our Senators and Representatives in the Congress of the United States be requested to use every effort to secure the passage of a law imposing a duty of \$2 per barrel crate of 4 cubic feet, or, when shipped in bulk, \$3 per 100, on all foreign pineapples imported into the United States; and that the secretary of state be requested to furnish a copy of this resolution to our Senators and Representatives in Congress.

Approved May 11, 1893.

Mr. QUAY presented a petition of sundry citizens of Indiana County, Pa., praying for the enactment of legislation granting arrears of pension to Henry Schnetberg, a veteran of the Mexican war; which was referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. WILSON presented a petition of the United Presbyterian Church, of Castorville, Cal., praying that the preamble to the Constitution of the United States be so amended as to recognize the Deity; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also presented a memorial of the Trade and Labor Congress of Dubuque, Iowa, remonstrating against an increase of the internal-revenue tax on cigars; which was ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented a petition of the Burlington (Iowa) Division, Order of Railway Conductors, praying for the adoption of an amendment to the interstate-commerce law, prohibiting the sale of transportation tickets by brokers, scalpers, or any unauthorized agent; which was referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

He also presented petitions of 97 citizens of Keokuk; of 77 cit-

izens of State Center, and of Root Camp, No. 282, Modern Woodmen of America, of Monticello, all in the State of Iowa, praying that fraternal society and college journals be admitted to the mails as second-class matter; which were referred to the Committee on Post-Offices and Post-Roads.

Mr. PEPPER presented a memorial of sundry citizens of Shawnee County, Kans., remonstrating against an increase of the internal-revenue tax on cigars; which was ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented a petition of sundry citizens of Pittsburg, Pa., praying for the enactment of legislation providing for the improvement of the public roads throughout the country; which was referred to the Committee on Education and Labor.

Mr. McMILLAN presented a petition of Standard Lodge No. 138, Brotherhood of Locomotive Firemen, of Detroit, Mich., and a petition of the Operative Plasterers' Union, of Detroit, Mich., praying for the governmental control of the telegraph service; which were referred to the Committee on Post-Offices and Post-Roads.

He also presented the petition of Edmund F. Auger, and sundry other citizens of Detroit, Mich., praying for the enactment of legislation to suppress the lottery traffic; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also presented the petition of J. S. Roberts and sundry other citizens of Richmond; of Tent No. 217, Knights of the Maccabees, of Durand; of Arcade Tent No. 155, Knights of the Maccabees, of Richmond, all in the State of Michigan, praying that fraternal college and society journals be admitted to the mails as second-class matter; which were referred to the Committee on Post-Offices and Post-Roads.

Mr. PERKINS presented sundry petitions of citizens of Los Angeles, Biggs, Fowler, San Francisco, Ione, Forest City, and Golden Gate, all in the State of California, praying that fraternal college journals be admitted to the mails as second-class matter; which were referred to the Committee on Post-Offices and Post-Roads.

Mr. PLATT presented a petition of sundry citizens of Dummerston, Vt., and a petition of sundry citizens of Sharon, Conn., praying for the enactment of legislation to enable the States to enforce State laws regulating the sale of substitutes for dairy products; which were referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

He also presented sundry petitions of citizens of New Haven, Conn., praying for the enactment of legislation to suppress the lottery traffic; which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also presented a petition of sundry citizens of Ansonia, Conn., praying that fraternal society and college journals be admitted to the mails as second-class matter; which was referred to the Committee on Post-Offices and Post-Roads.

Mr. VEST presented a petition of Lodge No. 46, Ancient Order of United Workmen, of Hopkins, Mo., and a petition of Founders' Lodge, No. 224, Ancient Order of United Workmen, of Steelville, Mo., praying that fraternal society and college journals be admitted to the mails as second-class matter; which were referred to the Committee on Post-Offices and Post-Roads.

Mr. VILAS presented a memorial of the Elliott-Loeffler Company and sundry other wholesale liquor dealers, of Lacrosse, Wis., remonstrating against an increase of the tax on distilled spirits; which was ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented the memorial of Metzler, Sacks & Co. and sundry other importers and dealers in leaf tobacco, of Milwaukee, Wis., remonstrating against an increase of the internal-revenue tax on cigars; which was ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. TURPIE presented the petition of Catharine Clark, of Indianapolis, Ind., praying that she be granted a pension as one of the heirs of Louis Glass, late quartermaster sergeant, Company C, Thirtieth Regiment Indiana Cavalry Volunteers; which was referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. ALLEN presented a petition of sundry citizens of Rising City, Nebr., praying for the enactment of legislation to suppress the lottery traffic; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also presented a memorial of 74 citizens of Philadelphia, Pa., remonstrating against the adoption of an amendment to the preamble of the Constitution of the United States, recognizing the Deity; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. LODGE. I present a memorial of wool merchants of Boston, Mass., signed by nearly all the merchants engaged in that business in Boston, without distinction of party, remonstrating against the passage of the Wilson tariff bill, and especially against the woolen schedule of that bill, and praying that a duty be placed on wool. I move that the memorial be printed as a document with other memorials on the same subject which have already been ordered printed, and that it lie on the table.

The motion was agreed to.



Mr. LODGE presented the petition of B. H. Welsh and 24 other citizens of Somerville, Mass., and the petition of Charles S. Gibbs and 23 other citizens of Lawrence, Mass., praying that fraternal society and college journals be admitted to the mails as second-class matter; which were referred to the Committee on Post-Offices and Post-Roads.

Mr. COCKRELL. I present resolutions adopted by Sub-Lodge No. 32, of the Brotherhood of Boilermakers and Iron Shipbuilders of America, and indorsed by the Industrial Council, of Kansas City, Mo., remonstrating against the passage of the bill pending in the House of Representatives providing for freeships. I move that the memorial be referred to the Committee on Commerce.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. PASCO presented the petition of B. F. Hall and 22 other orange and lemon-growers of Florida, praying that such provision be made in the pending tariff bill as will enable them to overcome the difference in the values of labor between the old country and the new, and which will preserve their industry from destruction; which was ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. DOLPH. I have received a communication from a constituent of mine, residing at Bly, Klamath County, Oregon, inclosing a resolution favoring a reform in spelling, and for the calling of an international convention to effect that end. I do not like to introduce a bill to be printed, but I should like to have the matter go before the Committee on Education and Labor. I present the communication and accompanying resolution, and move that they be referred to the Committee on Education and Labor.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. PROCTOR presented the petition of R. M. Pratt and 29 other citizens of Dummerston, Vt., praying for the enactment of legislation to enable the States to enforce State laws regulating the sale of substitutes for dairy products; which was referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

#### REPORTS OF COMMITTEES.

Mr. COCKRELL, from the Committee on Appropriations, to whom was referred the petition of Dr. Philip S. Wales, late medical director, United States Navy, praying that he be granted certain relief by Congress, asked to be discharged from its further consideration and that it be referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs; which was agreed to.

He also, from the Joint Commission of Congress to Inquire into the Status of Laws Organizing the Executive Departments, to whom was referred the bill (S. 1831) to improve the methods of accounting in the Department of the Treasury, and for other purposes, reported it without amendment and submitted a report thereon, and moved that the bill and report be referred to the Committee on the Organization, Conduct, and Expenditures of the Executive Departments; which was agreed to.

Mr. BERRY. I am instructed by the Committee on Public Lands, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. 3135) granting to the University of Utah a site off the public domain, to report it back and recommend that it be referred to the Committee on Military Affairs. The bill relates to a reservation which has not been abandoned and properly belongs to the Committee on Military Affairs.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Without objection, the Committee on Public Lands will be discharged from the further consideration of the bill, and it will be referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. BERRY, from the Committee on Public Lands, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. 1127) for the relief of Francis M. Tomlin, reported it without amendment.

Mr. ALLEN, from the Committee on Public Lands, to whom was referred an amendment submitted by himself on the 19th ultimo, intended to be proposed to the sundry civil appropriation bill, relating to the resurvey of the lands of Grant and Hooker Counties, Nebr., reported it favorably with amendments, and moved that it be referred to the Committee on Appropriations and printed; which was agreed to.

He also, from the same committee, to whom was referred the bill (S. 1583) for the relief of Wesley Montgomery, reported it without amendment, and submitted a report thereon.

Mr. PUGH, from the Committee on the Judiciary, to whom was referred an amendment submitted by Mr. KYLE on the 28th ultimo, intended to be proposed to the sundry civil appropriation bill, asked to be discharged from its further consideration and that it be referred to the Committee on Public Lands; which was agreed to.

Mr. PASCO, from the Committee on Public Lands, to whom was referred the bill (S. 680) conveying to Rafael Seguro, of Iberia Parish, La., the right, title, and interest of the United States in and to certain lands in said parish of Iberia, asked to be discharged from its further consideration and that it be re-

ferred to the Committee on Private Land Claims; which was agreed to.

He also, from the Committee on Claims, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. 684) for the relief of the heirs of the late Mrs. Catherine P. Culver, reported it with amendments and submitted a report thereon.

Mr. DOLPH. I report, by direction of the Committee on Public Lands, the bill (S. 76) for the relief of William P. Keady, which may be indefinitely postponed, as such action has been taken in the Interior Department as renders the passage of the bill unnecessary.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The bill will be indefinitely postponed.

Mr. DOLPH. Also, by direction of the Committee on Public Lands, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. 889) for the relief of William P. Keady, I report it back, and for the same reason I move that the bill be postponed indefinitely.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. DUBOIS, from the Committee on Public Lands, to whom was referred the amendment submitted by him on the 28th ultimo, intended to be proposed to the sundry civil appropriation bill, providing for an appropriation for surveys and resurveys of public lands, reported it favorably, and moved that it be referred to the Committee on Appropriations and printed; which was agreed to.

Mr. HANSBROUGH. I am directed by the Committee on the District of Columbia to report a substitute for the bill (H. R. 3740) to amend an act entitled "An act regulating the sale of intoxicating liquors in the District of Columbia," heretofore reported from that committee and now on the Calendar.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The amendment will be printed, under the rule.

Mr. VEST, from the Committee on Commerce, to whom was referred the bill (S. 1772) extending the time for the completion of a railroad bridge over the Columbia River at or near Vancouver, in the State of Washington, reported it with amendments.

He also, from the same committee, to whom was referred the bill (S. 1898) to amend the act of June 22, 1892, entitled "An act to authorize the construction of a bridge across the Missouri River at the city of Yankton, S. Dak.," reported it without amendment.

He also, from the same committee, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. 5041) to extend the time authorizing the St. Louis and Birmingham Railroad to build a bridge across the Tennessee River at Clifton, Tenn., reported it with an amendment.

Mr. VILAS, from the Committee on Public Lands, to whom was referred the amendment submitted by Mr. POWER on the 28th ultimo, intended to be proposed to the sundry civil appropriation bill, reported it favorably and moved that it be referred to the Committee on Appropriations and printed; which was agreed to.

#### BOOK-MAKING IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA.

Mr. McMILLAN. I am directed by the Committee on the District of Columbia to report an amendment in the nature of a substitute for the bill (S. 1680) to more effectually suppress gambling in the District of Columbia, heretofore reported by the committee. I ask for the present consideration of the bill.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Senator from Michigan reports an amendment in the nature of a substitute. The proposed amendment will be read for information.

The SECRETARY. The Committee on the District of Columbia report to strike out all after the enacting clause of the bill and insert:

That the provisions of the act of Congress approved the 31st day of January, 1883, entitled "An act to more effectually suppress gambling in the District of Columbia," and also the provisions of the act of Congress approved the 21 day of March, 1891, entitled "An act to prevent book-making and pool-selling in the District of Columbia," shall not apply to book-making at the spring and fall meetings, at the Benning and Ivy City race tracks when such meetings are held by organizations duly incorporated under the laws of the District of Columbia: *Provided*, That such meetings shall be held only between the 1st day of March and the 15th day of December in any year, and shall not exceed a period of eighteen days each: *And provided further*, That there shall be but one spring meeting and but one fall meeting at each of the above-named tracks in any one year.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Senator from Michigan asks for the present consideration of the bill.

Mr. PEPPER. I object to the consideration of the bill.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. There is objection to the request of the Senator from Michigan.

#### AGRICULTURAL REPORT FOR 1893.

Mr. GORMAN. I am directed by the Committee on Printing, to whom was referred the joint resolution (H. Res. 139) to print the Agricultural Report for 1893, to report it without amendment; and I ask for its present consideration.

By unanimous consent, the Senate, as in Committee of the



Whole, proceeded to consider the joint resolution. It proposes to appropriate \$300,000 to print 500,000 copies of the Annual Report of the Secretary of Agriculture for the year 1893; 110,000 copies for the use of the Senate, 360,000 copies for the use of the House of Representatives, and 30,000 copies for the use of the Department of Agriculture.

Mr. HARRIS. I should like to ask the Senator from Maryland why it is that only 110,000 copies are appropriated for the Senate and there are 360,000 copies provided for the House of Representatives? My recollection is that with respect to the printing of documents generally, one-half of the number usually given to the other House is given to the Senate.

Mr. GORMAN. The Senator from Tennessee is quite correct in his statement as to the usual order, but in the matter of the agricultural report, after a very long controversy in both Houses in years past, this proportion was finally determined upon, and it was so fixed in the printing bill which passed the Senate in the last Congress and is now pending in the other House. The joint resolution is in exact conformity with the numbers ordered printed in the last two or three years.

Mr. HARRIS. I shall raise no question in regard to the matter.

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

#### NATIONAL WOOLGROWERS' ASSOCIATION.

Mr. GORMAN, from the Committee on Printing, reported the following resolution; which was considered by unanimous consent, and agreed to:

*Resolved*, That there be printed for the use of the Senate 2,500 copies of Senate Miscellaneous Document No. 124, Fifty-third Congress, second session, being an "Appeal of the National Woolgrowers' Association, etc."

Mr. GORMAN, from the Committee on Printing, to whom was referred a concurrent resolution submitted by Mr. POWER, March 6, 1894, providing for the printing of 500 copies of Senate Miscellaneous Document No. 77, a memorial of the National Woolgrowers' Association, reported adversely thereon, and moved its indefinite postponement; which was agreed to.

Mr. GORMAN. I present reports to accompany the joint resolution and the resolution just passed, and ask that they be printed in the usual form.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. It will be so ordered.

#### BILLS INTRODUCED.

Mr. CULLOM introduced a bill (S. 1837) providing for an international humane conference; which was read twice by its title.

Mr. CULLOM. The bill is accompanied by a number of petitions of boards of trades in its behalf. I introduce the bill without knowing whether it is right in every particular, and therefore do not care to be entirely responsible for it. I move that the bill, with the accompanying papers, be referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. PLATT introduced a bill (S. 1838) to increase the pension of Caroline B. Andrews; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. McPHERSON (by request) introduced a bill (S. 1839) to incorporate the American College of Musicians; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Education and Labor.

Mr. GRAY introduced a bill (S. 1840) to establish a department of public health; which was read twice by its title.

Mr. GRAY. I ask that the bill, with the accompanying papers, be referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. HARRIS. It is a bill proposing to create a department of public health. Every bill or petition upon that general subject since the winter of 1878-'79 has been referred to the Committee on Epidemic Diseases, and I move that this bill take the same direction. That is the committee which has had jurisdiction of the subject-matter for a number of years, and there is no other committee of the body which can legitimately take charge of the bill.

Mr. GRAY. I wish merely to state my reasons for asking the reference of the bill to the Committee on the Judiciary. I, of course, know there is such a standing committee as the Committee on Epidemic Diseases, and certainly intended no disrespect to that committee, but it occurred to me and to those who are interested in the bill, that inasmuch as it has no reference to any of those subjects which are generally supposed to occupy the attention of that committee, and does contemplate the creation of a new department in the Government, to wit, a secretary of public health, making a new department, just as the Department of Agriculture, it ought to be considered gravely by the committee to which we refer all bills that propose to make any

material or serious change in the organization of our Government. I introduce the bill at the request of respectable medical authorities and societies and not as my own bill or as in all respects representing my own views; and for the reasons I have stated I think it ought to have the consideration of the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. HARRIS. Will the Senator from Delaware allow me to suggest to him that there are two bills already introduced upon the same subject and for the same purpose that have gone to the Committee on Epidemic Diseases? That committee has charge of the subject-matter now by the introduction and reference of two bills during the present session of Congress.

Mr. CHANDLER. I am not now a member of the Committee on Epidemic Diseases, but I certainly think the Senator from Delaware ought to consent to have the bill go in the first instance to that committee. If it should turn out in the consideration of the question that there are grave legal matters or matters so connected with the organization of the Departments of the Government that it ought to go to the Committee on the Judiciary, I know the Senator from Tennessee well enough to believe that when he reports the bill to the Senate he will himself ask that it shall have further consideration before the Committee on the Judiciary.

If the Senator from Delaware were to introduce a bill to create a Department of Agriculture, he would not think of sending that bill in the first instance to the Committee on the Judiciary. It would necessarily first go to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry for consideration by that committee, and if it were thought advisable it could be further considered by the Committee on the Judiciary or any other committee of this body. The bill for the creation of the Department of Agriculture was considered and reported by the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry. If the Senator from Delaware makes objection to the reference I will move that the bill be referred to the Committee on Epidemic Diseases.

Mr. GRAY. That motion has already been made. I will state that I have no personal feeling in regard to the reference of the bill to the Committee on the Judiciary rather than the Committee on Epidemic Diseases. I am inclined to believe that the sense of the Senate is that it ought to go to the latter committee, in the first instance, and therefore I will accede to the proposition made by the Senator from Tennessee.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Tennessee that the bill be referred to the Committee on Epidemic Diseases? The Chair hears none, and the bill is so referred.

Mr. McMILLAN introduced a bill (S. 1841) to provide that all persons employing female help in stores, shops, offices, or manufacturing shall provide seats for the same when not actively employed; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Mr. QUAY introduced a bill (S. 1842) granting a pension to Eliza E. Reed; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also (by request) introduced a bill (S. 1843) to authorize the Philadelphia and Camden Bridge Company to construct a bridge across the Delaware River, and for other purposes; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Commerce.

Mr. WOLCOTT introduced a bill (S. 1844) granting an honorable discharge to Jacob L. Neighbarger; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. ALLEN introduced a bill (S. 1845) granting a pension to Isaac D. Gregg; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. DOLPH introduced a bill (S. 1846) granting a pension to J. M. Swift; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying paper, referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also introduced a bill (S. 1847) for improving the Yamhill River; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying paper, referred to the Committee on Commerce.

Mr. CHANDLER introduced a bill (S. 1848) granting a pension to Julia Weeks; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. PERKINS introduced a bill (S. 1849) for the relief of H. A. Eldred; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

Mr. HIGGINS introduced a bill (S. 1850) making an appropriation to complete the appraisal of improvements of intruders in the Cherokee Nation and to ascertain and adjudicate their rights therein, and for other purposes; which was read twice by its title.

Mr. HIGGINS. I desire to say that I have not prepared the bill and do not wish to be held responsible for all its provisions. But it is a subject that needs consideration and I have consented



to introduce the bill. I move that it be referred to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. HIGGINS introduced a bill (S. 1851) for the relief of Samuel V. B. Strider; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

Mr. LODGE introduced a joint resolution (S. R. 72) to permit Capt. T. O. Selfridge, United States Navy, to receive a decoration conferred upon him by the President of the Republic of France; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying paper, referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

#### AMENDMENTS TO APPROPRIATION BILLS.

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

Mr. GRAY submitted sundry amendments intended to be proposed by him to the river and harbor appropriation bill; which were referred to the Committee on Commerce, and ordered to be printed.

#### HOWARD'S PAPER ON THE LABOR PROBLEM.

Mr. KYLE submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Printing:

*Resolved*, That there be printed for the use of the Committee on Education and Labor 1,000 copies of Miscellaneous Document No. 95, entitled, A Solution of the Labor Problem.

#### COINAGE OF STANDARD MEXICAN DOLLARS.

Mr. WOLCOTT submitted the following resolution; which was read:

*Resolved*, That the President of the United States with a view to encourage and extend our commercial relations with China and other Asiatic countries, be requested to enter into negotiations with the Republic of Mexico, looking to the coinage by the United States, at its mints, of standard Mexican dollars, under some proper agreement with the said Republic of Mexico as to seigniorage, method and amount of said coinage; and that he be further requested to report the result of his negotiations to the Senate.

Mr. WOLCOTT. The resolution may lie over until to-morrow, when I shall call it up at the proper time.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The resolution will lie over.

#### EXTRADITION TREATY WITH RUSSIA.

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

*Resolved*, That the Committee on Foreign Relations be requested to consider the expediency of considering the undertaking of further negotiations upon the subject of procuring certain modifications of the existing extradition treaty with the Russian Empire concerning the arrest and extradition of persons charged with offenses designated in said treaty as not political.

Mr. TURPIE. I ask that the resolution lie on the table and be printed.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

#### HOUSE BILLS REFERRED.

The bill (H. R. 4328) for the relief of William B. Chapman, George W. Street, John W. Hoes, Emmet C. Tuthill, and Joseph H. Curtis was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

The bill (H. R. 4954) relative to recognizances, stipulations, bonds, and undertakings, and to allow certain corporations to be accepted as surety thereon, was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

The bill (H. R. 6042) to authorize sale of lot 8, block 3, city of Hot Springs, by school directors thereof, and use of proceeds for school purposes, was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Public Lands.

The bill (H. R. 6110) to authorize the construction of a bridge across the Mississippi River at Red Wing, Minn., was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Commerce.

#### ISSUE OF BONDS.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Chair lays before the Senate a resolution coming over from a previous day, submitted by the Senator from Kansas [Mr. PEPPER], which will be read.

The resolution submitted by Mr. PEPPER March 28, 1894, was read, as follows:

*Resolved*, That the Committee on Finance be, and it is hereby, instructed to prepare and report as soon as practicable a bill to repeal all laws authorizing or permitting the Secretary of the Treasury to issue bonds or other interest-bearing obligations of the Government, and to prohibit any and all such issues in future without express authority by act of Congress first had and obtained.

Mr. MORGAN. I am directed by the Committee on Foreign Relations to make a report, which I ask leave to submit at this time.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Chair recognizes the Senator from Alabama to make a report.

#### BERING SEA AWARD.

Mr. MORGAN. I am instructed by the Committee on Foreign Relations to report a bill, which originated with the committee, to give effect to the award rendered by the Tribunal of

Arbitration at Paris, under the treaty between the United States and Great Britain concluded at Washington, February 29, 1892, for the purpose of submitting to arbitration certain questions concerning the preservation of fur seals.

I ask that the bill may now receive its first reading in the Senate at length.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The bill will be read the first time at length.

The bill (S. 1836) to give effect to the award rendered by the Tribunal of Arbitration at Paris, under the treaty between the United States and Great Britain concluded at Washington February 29, 1892, for the purpose of submitting to arbitration certain questions concerning the preservation of the fur seals, was read the first time at length, as follows:

Whereas the following articles of the award of the Tribunal of Arbitration constituted under the treaty concluded at Washington the 29th of February, 1892, between the United States of America and Her Majesty the Queen of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland, were delivered to the agents of the respective Governments on the 15th day of August, 1893:

#### ARTICLE 1.

The Governments of the United States and Great Britain shall forbid their citizens and subjects respectively to kill, capture, or pursue, at any time and in any manner whatever, the animals commonly called fur seals within a zone of 60 miles around the Pribilof Islands, inclusive of the territorial waters.

The miles mentioned in the preceding paragraph are geographical miles, of 60 to a degree of latitude.

#### ARTICLE 2.

The two Governments shall forbid their citizens and subjects respectively to kill, capture, or pursue, in any manner whatever, during the season extending, each year, from the 1st of May to the 31st of July, both inclusive, the fur seals on the high sea, in the part of the Pacific Ocean, inclusive of the Behring Sea, which is situated to the north of the thirty-fifth degree of north latitude, and eastward of the one hundred and eightieth degree of longitude from Greenwich till it strikes the water boundary described in article 1 of the treaty of 1867 between the United States and Russia, and following that line up to Behrings Straits.

#### ARTICLE 3.

During the period of time and in the waters in which the fur-seal fishing is allowed, only sailing vessels shall be permitted to carry on or take part in fur-seal fishing operations. They will, however, be at liberty to avail themselves of the use of such canoes or undecked boats, propelled by paddles, oars, or sails, as are in common use as fishing boats.

#### ARTICLE 4.

Each sailing vessel authorized to fish for fur seals must be provided with a special license issued for that purpose by its Government, and shall be required to carry a distinguishing flag to be prescribed by its Government.

#### ARTICLE 5.

The masters of the vessels engaged in fur-seal fishing shall enter accurately in their official log book the date and place of each fur-seal fishing operation, and also the number and sex of the seals captured upon each day. These entries shall be communicated by each of the two governments to the other at the end of each fishing season.

#### ARTICLE 6.

The use of nets, firearms, and explosives shall be forbidden in the fur-seal fishing. This restriction shall not apply to shotguns when such fishing takes place outside of Behring Sea, during the season when it may be lawfully carried on.

#### ARTICLE 7.

The two governments shall take measures to control the fitness of the men authorized to engage in fur-seal fishing; these men shall have been proved fit to handle with sufficient skill the weapons by means of which this fishing may be carried on.

#### ARTICLE 8.

The regulations contained in the preceding articles shall not apply to Indians dwelling on the coast of the territory of the United States or of Great Britain, and carrying on fur-seal fishing in canoes or undecked boats not transported by or used in connection with other vessels and propelled wholly by paddles, oars or sails and manned by not more than five persons each in the way hitherto practiced by the Indians, provided such Indians are not in the employment of other persons, and provided that when so hunting in canoes or undecked boats, they shall not hunt fur seals outside of territorial waters under contract for the delivery of the skins to any person.

This exemption shall not be construed to affect the municipal law of either country, nor shall it extend to the waters of Behring Sea or the waters of the Aleutian Passes.

Nothing herein contained is intended to interfere with the employment of Indians as hunters or otherwise in connection with fur-sealing vessels as heretofore.

#### ARTICLE 9.

The concurrent regulations hereby determined with a view to the protection and preservation of the fur seals, shall remain in force until they have been, in whole or in part, abolished or modified by common agreement between the Governments of the United States and of Great Britain.

The said concurrent regulations shall be submitted every five years to a new examination, so as to enable both interested governments to consider whether, in the light of past experience, there is occasion for any modification thereof.

Now, therefore, be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That no citizen of the United States, or person owing the duty of obedience to the laws or the treaties of the United States, nor any person belonging to or on board of a vessel of the United States, shall kill, capture, or pursue, at any time, or in any manner whatever, outside of territorial waters, any fur seal in the waters surrounding the Pribilof Islands within a zone of 60 geographical miles (60 to a degree of latitude) around said islands, exclusive of the territorial waters.

SEC. 2. That no citizen of the United States, or person above described in section 1 of this act, nor any person belonging to or on board of a vessel of the United States, shall kill, capture, or pursue, in any manner whatever, during the season extending from the 1st day of May to the 31st day of July, both inclusive, in each year, any fur seal on the high seas outside of the zone mentioned in section 1, and in that part of the Pacific Ocean, including Behring Sea, which is situated to the north of the thirty-fifth degree of



north latitude and to the east of the one hundred and eightieth degree of longitude from Greenwich till it strikes the water boundary described in Article 1 of the treaty of 1857, between the United States and Russia, and following that line up to Behring Straits.

SEC. 3. No citizen of the United States or person above described in the first section of this act shall, during the period and in the waters in which by section 2 of this act the killing of fur seals is not prohibited, use or employ any vessel, nor shall any vessel of the United States be used or employed, in carrying on or taking part in fur-seal fishing operations, other than a sailing vessel propelled by sails exclusively, and such canoes or undecked boats, propelled by paddles, oars, or sails as may belong to and be used in connection with such sailing vessel; nor shall any sailing vessel carry on or take part in such operations without a special license obtained from the Government for that purpose, and without carrying a distinctive flag prescribed by the Government for the same purpose.

SEC. 4. That every master of a vessel licensed under this act to engage in fur-seal fishing operations shall accurately enter in his official log book the date and place of every such operation, and also the number and sex of the seals captured each day; and on coming into port, and before landing cargo, the master shall verify, on oath, such official log books containing a full and true statement of the number and character of his fur-seal fishing operations, including the number and sex of seals captured; and for any false statement willfully made by a person so licensed by the United States in this behalf he shall be subject to the penalties of perjury; and any seal skins found in excess of the statement in the official log book shall be forfeited to the United States.

SEC. 5. That no person or vessel engaging in fur-seal fishing operations under this act shall use or employ in any such operations, any net, firearm, argum, or explosive: *Provided, however,* That this prohibition shall not apply to the use of shotguns in such operations outside of Behring Sea during the season when the killing of fur seals is not there prohibited by this act.

SEC. 6. That the foregoing sections of this act shall not apply to Indians dwelling on the coast of the United States, and taking fur seals in canoes or undecked boats propelled wholly by paddles, oars, or sails, and not transported by or used in connection with other vessels, or manned by more than five persons, in the manner heretofore practiced by the said Indians: *Provided, however,* That the exception made in this section shall not apply to Indians in the employment of other persons, or who shall kill, capture, or pursue fur seals outside of territorial waters under contract to deliver the skins to other persons, nor to the waters of Behring Sea or of the passes between the Aleutian Islands.

SEC. 7. That the President shall have power to make regulations respecting the special license and the distinctive flag mentioned in this act and regulations otherwise suitable to secure the due execution of the provisions of this act, and from time to time to add to, modify, amend, or revoke such regulations, as in his judgment may seem expedient.

SEC. 8. That, except in the case of a master making a false statement under oath in violation of the provisions of the fourth section of this act, every person guilty of a violation of the provisions of this act, or of the regulations made thereunder, shall for each offense be fined not less than \$200, or imprisoned not more than six months, or both; and all vessels, their tackle, apparel, furniture, and cargo, at any time used or employed in violation of this act, or of the regulations made thereunder, shall be forfeited to the United States.

SEC. 9. That any violation of this act, or of the regulations made thereunder, may be prosecuted either in the district court of Alaska or in any district court of the United States in California, Oregon, or Washington.

SEC. 10. That if any unlicensed vessel of the United States shall be found within the waters to which this act applies, and at a time when the killing of fur seals is by this act there prohibited, having on board seal skins or bodies of seals, or apparatus or implements suitable for killing or taking seals; or if any licensed vessel shall be found in the waters to which this act applies, having on board apparatus or implements suitable for taking seals, but forbidden then and there to be used, it shall be presumed that the vessel in the one case and the apparatus or implements in the other was or were used in violation of this act until it is otherwise sufficiently proved.

SEC. 11. That it shall be the duty of the President to cause a sufficient naval force to cruise in the waters to which this act is applicable to enforce its provisions, and it shall be the duty of the commanding officer of any vessel belonging to the naval or revenue service of the United States, when so instructed by the President, to seize and arrest all vessels of the United States found by him to be engaged, used, or employed in the waters last aforesaid in violation of any of the prohibitions of this act, or of any regulations made thereunder, and to take the same, with all persons on board thereof, to the most convenient port in any district of the United States mentioned in this act, there to be dealt with according to law.

SEC. 12. That any vessel or citizen of the United States, or person described in the first section of this act, offending against the prohibitions of this act or the regulations thereunder, may be seized and detained by the naval or other duly commissioned officers of Her Majesty the Queen of Great Britain, but when so seized and detained they shall be delivered as soon as practicable, with any witnesses and proofs on board, to any naval or revenue officer or other authorities of the United States, whose courts alone shall have jurisdiction to try the offense and impose the penalties for the same: *Provided, however,* That British officers shall arrest and detain vessels and persons as in this section specified only after, by appropriate legislation, Great Britain shall have authorized officers of the United States duly commissioned and instructed by the President to that end to arrest, detain, and deliver to the authorities of Great Britain vessels and subjects of that Government offending against any statutes or regulations of Great Britain enacted or made to enforce the award of the treaty mentioned in the title of this act.

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. President, this bill is reported by the unanimous vote of all of the members of the Committee on Foreign Relations who were present at the meeting this morning. It is important, and it is so considered by the Government, that action on the bill should be taken at a very early period of time. I ask that the bill may lie on the table and be printed, and I give notice that, after the conclusion of the remarks of the Senator from Indiana [Mr. VOORHEES] upon the tariff bill, I shall ask unanimous consent of the Senate to take the bill up for consideration to-day.

Mr. HARRIS. Has the bill been read the second time?

Mr. MORGAN. It has not been read the second time.

Mr. SHERMAN. As the bill simply proposes to carry into effect the conditions prescribed in the award, it seems to me that there will be no controversy about it; there was none whatever in the committee, and I hope the Senator from Alabama will al-

low the bill to be considered and the vote taken now, unless he desires to make some remarks upon it.

Mr. DOLPH. There is no objection.

Mr. MORGAN. If there be no objection to that course on the part of any Senator, I shall be very glad indeed to have the Senate consider and pass the bill now.

Mr. SHERMAN. Every Senator has been provided with a copy of this bill substantially as it is now reported, with some slight amendments in harmony with its general purpose.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Will the Senator from Alabama indicate the course he desires the bill to take?

Mr. MORGAN. I ask unanimous consent that the bill be read a second time by title, and that the Senate then proceed to its consideration.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Alabama for the second reading and consideration of the bill?

Mr. PEPPER. I have no objection to that if the resolution which I offered a few days ago is permitted to retain its place, so that it will be laid before the Senate to-morrow morning.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Kansas that the resolution referred to by him shall retain its place and be laid before the Senate to-morrow morning? The Chair hears no objection, and it is so ordered.

Mr. MORGAN. Now I ask that my request may be stated by the Chair.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Alabama, that the bill reported by him be now read the second time and considered as in Committee of the Whole.

There being no objection, the bill was read the second time by its title, and the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to its consideration.

Mr. HARRIS. The bill having been read at length, there is no use in having it again read as in Committee of the Whole.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The bill has been read at length and is now before the Senate as in Committee of the Whole.

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

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

Mr. HOAR. I should like to ask the Senator from Alabama what would be the condition of an American vessel seized by a British vessel for violation of this proposed act and handed over to the authorities of the United States? Section 12 provides that the seized vessel—

Shall be handed over as soon as practicable, with any witnesses and proofs on board, to any naval or revenue officer or other authorities of the United States.

Is there at present an existing law which authorizes a naval officer—this would be done at sea ordinarily—to receive such a vessel and to bring it home for trial? Should there not be a clause making it the duty of the proper officer to whom the vessel was delivered to bring the seized vessel into port?

Mr. MORGAN. I will say to the Senator that the bill, as I understand it, carefully provides for the case which he mentions. The seizure, of course, is an act of the executive department of the Government in the execution of law, and that gives to the court of admiralty, or the court designated in this bill, the jurisdiction of the ship, tackle, apparel, and furniture, and also of the persons found upon it, and the court can proceed under the general laws for the confiscation and condemnation of vessels which violate the laws of the United States to the condemnation and sale of such ship.

I will say further to the Senator that, of course, this legislation is expected to be supplemented by corresponding legislation on the part of Great Britain in her Parliament, and that that subject is to day to be considered in the Parliament of Great Britain. We take it for granted, of course, that the Parliament will enact laws of equal stringency, and conferring upon the courts of Great Britain equal jurisdiction with that conferred by the provisions of this bill. If in any respect that confidence should be disappointed, the Government of the United States will find itself amply provided with laws for the purpose of executing this award; but we have no expectation that Great Britain will in any respect recede from the execution of this award, especially in view of the high example which the Congress of the United States is now about to set, of its willingness in good faith to execute every part and parcel of the award of that tribunal.

Mr. HOAR. Mr. President, I do not wish to indicate any over-refinement in this matter, but at the same time I want to be quite sure that the committee, who are primarily responsible for this bill, see the point.

The bill provides in section 11, in the first instance, for the seizure and bringing into port of any offender caught red-



handed, found in the commission of the offense. It provides that "The commanding officer of any vessel belonging to the naval or revenue service of the United States" may "seize and arrest all vessels of the United States found by him to be engaged, used, or employed in the waters last aforesaid in violation of any of the prohibitions of this act," and take it "to the most convenient port in any district of the United States mentioned in this act, there to be dealt with according to law."

That is all plain sailing. Then, the provision is for the detention in certain cases by the officers of Her Majesty, the Queen of Great Britain, and they are authorized to seize the vessel and to deliver it "to any naval or revenue officer or other authorities of the United States."

That would be done frequently, and perhaps ordinarily, on the high seas. Most nations have cruisers on the sealing grounds. Now, where does the naval officer of the United States in this proceeding, which is a criminal one, and therefore to be construed pretty strictly, get authority to detain until he can bring into port a vessel which he has not seized, which he has not found in the commission of the offense, but which has only been delivered to him by a British officer? Should not section 12 repeat the language of section 11 where it provides that it shall be the duty of such officer to take the vessel "with all persons on board thereof to the most convenient port \* \* \* to be dealt with according to law?"

It seems to me those words should be inserted unless there is some existing provision of law I do not know of which covers it.

Mr. GRAY. I should like to call the attention of the Senator from Massachusetts a little more closely to the language of the two sections which he has just read. Section 11 provides that—

All vessels of the United States found by him—

That is, by any officer of the United States—

to be engaged, used, or employed in the waters last aforesaid in violation of any of the prohibitions of this act—

Shall be dealt with in a certain way. Section 12 says that—

Any vessel or citizen of the United States offending against the prohibitions of this act—

That is, a vessel in precisely the same circumstances which are described in section 11 taken by a British officer shall be handed over to a United States cruiser, and when handed over the vessel, having been taken in violation of the provisions of this act, will be in precisely the same situation, it seems to me, that she would have been in the case of an original seizure by the officer of the United States, and that the duty devolved upon them—which is the important thing—will be the same that is prescribed in section 11.

Mr. HOAR. That is undoubtedly the meaning of the bill, but the question is whether that meaning is expressed.

Mr. GRAY. It seems to me it necessarily is so.

Mr. HOAR. My difficulty is—if it be a difficulty—that neither officer has the right to seize any person for a past offense. That can only be done when he finds the offender "engaged, used, or employed in the waters." If the commander of a British cruiser finds such a thing, he seizes the vessel; but suppose he meets an American cruiser on the high seas afterwards, there is no authority to take possession given to the American ship if it has not found the vessel engaged in the criminal and prohibited acts. So it seems to me there should be an express authority.

Mr. MORGAN. I think I can point out to the Senator from Massachusetts that the express authority is this: Section 7 of the bill provides—and that language is also followed up in other subsequent sections:

That the President shall have power to make regulations respecting the special license and the distinctive flag mentioned in this act and regulations otherwise suitable to secure the due execution of the provisions of this act, and from time to time to add to, modify, amend, or revoke such regulations as in his judgment may seem expedient.

That is a power given under the laws of the United States in a great many instances to correspond with the powers which are conferred by the acts of Parliament really upon the privy council, the power to establish regulation. If there is any difficulty at all in the interpretation of this act, if there should be the slightest hesitancy in its execution, it is quite easy for the Secretary of the Treasury to make a regulation to cover the precise state of case which the Senator from Massachusetts supposes.

Moreover, I should like to say that the committee in considering this bill and all those who have had conferences about it—and they have been very numerous and very close, including some of the ablest lawyers in the United States, and one of the gentlemen who was most eminent in conducting the case before the Tribunal of Arbitration has been consulted about this matter, and he has passed a very critical judgment upon every word in this bill—have found it necessary to leave open several matters that might be suggested in the way of administration under this bill for regulations to be adopted by the Secretary of the Treas-

ury. The bill must have, of course, that degree of flexibility, so that the regulations can be accommodated to a number of questions and a number of persons who are included within the purview of its provisions; for instance, in regard to the Indians on the coast of North America, both in the British Possessions and in the United States, who have rights guaranteed to them under this award of hunting for fur seal under certain specific conditions and at certain times and places, regulations are very essential, of course, to accommodate this bill to the peculiarities of these different tribes, and also to provide in respect of our own laws such changes as may be found necessary in the nature of restrictions upon the different tribes of Indians, so as to permit them to go out and exercise the privileges which they enjoy under this bill. So that we have left included quite a number of matters which fell within the power of regulation to the discretion of the President and the Secretary of the Treasury.

Mr. HOAR. Mr. President, I have observed in my humble professional experience when one good lawyer, like the honorable Senator from Alabama [Mr. MORGAN], is responsible for the drafting of an instrument it is always more thoroughly done; but when ten of the best lawyers that can be found put their heads together, there is almost always some defect in the instrument, each of them abating a good deal of his own circumspection because of his reliance on the others. I therefore am not in the least impressed by the suggestion of the honorable Senator from Alabama, that a good many other gentlemen whom he has consulted think this bill is all right. If he had said he had examined it himself, or drawn it himself, and was responsible for its being all right, I should take it almost without criticism, but as it is, I think I shall venture to move an amendment at the end of line 5, of section 12, which certainly can not do any harm, and can not be objected to. I move, after the words "on board," to insert "to be dealt with as hereinbefore provided."

Mr. MORGAN. I have not the slightest objection to that amendment, but I think it is included in the language of the bill.

Mr. HOAR. It may be.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the amendment proposed by the Senator from Massachusetts?

Mr. ALLISON. I thought the bill had passed beyond the third reading.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The amendment can be made only by unanimous consent.

Mr. HOAR. I understood the Chair to announce that the bill was in the Senate. I did not understand that it had been passed to a third reading.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Chair has so announced.

Mr. HOAR. Then I move to reconsider.

Mr. FRYE. That can be done by unanimous consent.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Chair had announced the third reading of the bill. The amendment of the Senator from Massachusetts can be considered only by unanimous consent.

Mr. MORGAN. I ask unanimous consent for that purpose.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Is there objection?

Mr. SHERMAN. I should like the amendment to be again stated.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The amendment will be read.

The SECRETARY. In section 12, line 5, after the words "on board," it is proposed to insert "to be dealt with as hereinbefore provided."

Mr. MORGAN. And a comma to be inserted after the word "provided."

Mr. HOAR. Yes.

Mr. CHANDLER. I have been waiting for an opportunity to interpose an objection to the passage of so important a bill as this to-day. I have not been able to hear the colloquy between the learned chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations [Mr. MORGAN] and the Senator from Delaware [Mr. GRAY], also a member of that committee, and the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. HOAR]. No doubt that colloquy was interesting to them, but it could not be heard in this part of the Chamber. I inquired for a copy of the bill in order that I might acquire a knowledge by reading which I was unable to get by the ear, but I find the bill has not been printed for the use of the Senate.

I suggest to the Senator from Alabama, the chairman of the committee, after such amendments as Senators choose to offer and find acceptance with the committee are adopted, it will be more satisfactory to the whole Senate. I doubt not, if the bill can be printed and allowed to go over until to-morrow, when a final vote can be taken thereon. It does not seem to me that so utterly unprecedented action ought to be taken by the Senate in reference to a bill which contains penal clauses of the most stringent character applicable to citizens of the United States. It is a bill making regulations in connection with the fisheries,



creating crime, and declaring statutory penalties against American citizens.

I do not wish to unduly delay a body which is so noted as the Senate is for the celerity with which it transacts business, but I do feel that I should like to see a copy of the bill before the final vote is taken thereon. Therefore, if at this time an objection can be interposed to the request for unanimous consent, I wish to interpose an objection.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Chair will state the condition of the bill. The bill has been read the third time and the question now is upon its passage. The Senator from Massachusetts asks unanimous consent for the consideration of the amendment proposed by him.

Mr. CHANDLER. I shall not object to that amendment, but I shall ask that the bill go over.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Is there objection?

Mr. MANDERSON. I do not desire to object, but it seems to me a better form for the request for unanimous consent would be, that the vote by which the bill was ordered to a third reading be reconsidered, so that the bill may be open to amendment.

Mr. FAULKNER. That is right.

Mr. MANDERSON. I ask unanimous consent that the vote whereby the bill was passed to a third reading be reconsidered, and that the bill be open to amendment.

Mr. FRYE. I object.

Mr. CHANDLER. It is barely possible some other Senators may desire to offer amendments.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. MANDERSON]?

Mr. FRYE. I object.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. There is objection.

Mr. MORGAN. When I had the honor to report the bill this morning, I found myself upon a sort of tidal wave of Senatorial anxiety to have the bill immediately considered. It was not my purpose when I brought the bill in here to have it considered at this hour of to-day, but to ask the unanimous consent of the Senate that it might be considered at some time during the day. All Senators, I think, have been provided with copies of the substantial parts of the bill and have had an opportunity to consider it. The case, as I have stated, is in an international sense an emergency case, and therefore I have very quietly gone along with the Senate in permitting the consideration of a measure all the features of which and the necessity for the enactment of which are perfectly understood by this body.

Mr. CULLOM. Will the Senator from Alabama allow me to interrupt him?

Mr. MORGAN. Certainly.

Mr. CULLOM. I wish simply to make an inquiry. I see in the beginning of the twelfth section these words:

Any vessel or citizen of the United States offending against the prohibitions of this act or the regulations thereunder may be seized and detained by the naval or other duly commissioned officers of Her Majesty the Queen of Great Britain.

I desire to inquire whether that is an authority usually given to a foreign country, to arrest and detain American citizens. It seems to me it is rather an unusual provision of law.

Mr. GRAY. Let me refer—if the Senator will allow me—

Mr. CULLOM. I make the inquiry merely for the purpose of ascertaining whether it is a character of legislation such as is usually enacted by Congress.

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. President, this is a very unusual proceeding, through and through. Some great publicists have styled it as an epoch in the history of diplomatic association or relation between foreign governments, having for its object the substitution of methods of settlement of great international controversies that will be peaceable and satisfactory and will not lead to war. A very similar condition existed about the time of the establishment of the Constitution, when the slavery question was taken up in the Constitution itself and a provision was made against bringing slaves into this country after the year 1808. The Governments of Great Britain and the United States entered into treaties with each other for the suppression of the slave trade, and they went on with a series of treaties. In the course of their diplomatic agreements they made provisions very similar to the one which is contained in the pending bill—provisions which are necessary in all cases where concurrent action, whether by convention or by legislation between two governments, is found to be necessary in order to execute a common purpose.

It will be seen by the third article of the treaty with Great Britain as late as 1870, that before that time this same thing had occurred at various times:

It is agreed that in case of an American merchant vessel searched by a British cruiser, being detained as having been engaged in the African slave trade, or as having been fitted out for the purposes thereof, she shall be sent to New York or Key West, whichever shall be most accessible for adjudica-

tion, or shall be handed over to an United States cruiser, if one should be available in the neighborhood of the capture; and that in the corresponding case of a British merchant vessel searched by an United States cruiser, being detained as having been engaged in the African slave trade, or as having been fitted out for the purposes thereof, she shall be sent for adjudication to the nearest or most accessible British colony, or shall be handed over to a British cruiser, if one should be available in the neighborhood of the capture.

Now, in this particular section of the proposed act in execution of the general purposes of this award, which are the protection and preservation of the fur seal (that is the great purpose of this treaty and of the award; in fact, it is the only purpose), this method of arrest has been adopted corresponding to those provisions which attended the effort of these two great governments to suppress the slave trade. The bill, however, contains a provision that this part of the proposed act shall not be in force until Great Britain shall have authorized the seizure by American ships of British vessels, to be carried into British ports. We, of course, expect that that will be done. If it is not done this provision of section 12 will be null and nugatory. I hope that is a satisfactory explanation, both upon principle and upon precedent, of the question asked me by the Senator from Illinois.

I wish to state what I understand to be the status of the bill. The bill passed its third reading. Thereupon the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. HOAR] asked unanimous consent that he might move an amendment to the bill. That consent was granted, and the amendment was made without objection. That is what I understand to be the situation.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Chair will state that when the Chair inquired if there was objection, the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. CHANDLER] obtained the floor and, without stating that he objected, addressed the Senate. That left the matter somewhat undetermined in the mind of the Chair. The Chair has not yet announced that the amendment has been agreed to.

Mr. SHERMAN. I know the importance of passing the bill, and I suggest to my friend from Alabama, that I do not believe any Senator here, when he reads the bill as it stands, will object to it. It was reported unanimously by the Committee on Foreign Relations, and I may say it meets the entire approval of the Secretary of State. Still, there is a little feeling on this side of the Chamber that Senators have not yet had an opportunity to read the bill. I think, under the circumstances, he had better consent, whether the rule requires it or not, that the bill go over until to-morrow, to be taken up immediately after the Journal is read, because I think every Senator must feel the importance of acting upon these regulations under the award which has been made.

Mr. MORGAN. In the course of four hours, at any rate, I can have the bill printed and back on the desks of Senators.

Mr. GEORGE. That will do.

Mr. MORGAN. It is very important, as we all understand, that the bill should be passed to-day.

Mr. SHERMAN. Then let it go over.

Mr. TELLER. Why not pass it this afternoon?

Mr. CHANDLER. I ask the Senator from Alabama to allow me to say a word. I did not intend to criticize him for urging the consideration of the bill at this hour, because the suggestion that he should proceed with it at this time came from the Senator from Ohio. I do not see any reason why the bill can not be considered later in the afternoon, or even this evening, but I do protest against the passage of a penal statute of this kind without an opportunity on the part of Senators to read the bill.

Mr. MANDERSON. Will the Senator from Alabama permit an interruption for a moment? I do not know what was done with the request for unanimous consent made by myself a few minutes ago, that the vote by which the bill was passed to a third reading be reconsidered.

Mr. GRAY. It was objected to.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Chair will state that an objection was interposed to the request of the Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. MANDERSON. I desire simply to state that in my brief experience in this body I have known but two instances where, a bill having passed to a third reading without a yea-and-nay vote, a request for unanimous consent for the reconsideration of the vote made instantly afterwards was refused. One instance occurred a few days ago with reference to what is termed the seigniorage bill, and the effort there I need not refer to except to say that the purpose of the motion to reconsider was that the bill might be rid of some of its ambiguities, which certainly was desirable in view of the veto message which has been lately received. This is the second effort in that regard.

The pending bill was called up without many Senators upon the floor realizing its full import, its effect, its great importance. It is, as the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. CHANDLER] has stated, a statute with penal clauses, designed undoubtedly to carry out an existing treaty; I am in accord with the general



purposes of the bill. I see the necessity for dispatch in its passage; but I knew nothing of the bill until this morning, and then I received in the usual envelope of the State Department a copy of the bill marked "confidential, subject to amendment." The bill, I understand, has received certain amendments, but what their character is I do not know. There was a colloquy here almost in an undertone that certainly those who were within easy distance did not appreciate or understand.

It seems to me it is no more than fair that the bill shall be placed where it may yet be open to amendment, back to the amendment stage of all bills, and that it be passed over until a later hour in the day, that we may have a chance to examine it and see whether amendments should be proposed. I do not think the Senator from New Hampshire or myself can be charged with any desire to cause a delay that is unnecessary, but we do desire on legislation so important as that proposed in the pending bill that we may have an opportunity to consider it and not take the mere word of the Secretary of State that it is desirable, or even the word, without report, of the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. HARRIS. Will the Senator from Alabama allow me to make a suggestion?

Mr. MORGAN. Certainly.

Mr. HARRIS. I understand the Senator from Alabama is willing to allow the bill to go over for the present and be printed with the hope of getting it up later this evening. The Senate having given unanimous consent for its consideration, however, I think relieves it from any objection to going on with it. I need not suggest to my friend from Nebraska that he has no occasion to ask unanimous consent to reconsider the vote by which the bill was ordered to be read a third time.

Mr. MANDERSON. Of course I can move to reconsider the vote.

Mr. HARRIS. A motion by the Senator to that effect will be in order, as he knows very well.

Mr. MANDERSON. Of course.

Mr. HARRIS. The Senator knows that quite as well as I. But it seems to me all the trouble is obviated by the consent of the Senator from Alabama to allow the bill to go over until a later hour this evening, and be printed.

Mr. MORGAN. I was going to make that suggestion, Mr. President. The Senate has seen of course that I have not been pressing the bill with this very remarkable haste, as it is termed, to its passage, nor has any Senator pressed it without due consideration and without there being a great public necessity, as is conceived, for the early action of the Senate upon the bill.

I ask unanimous consent that at the conclusion of the remarks of the Senator from Indiana [Mr. VOORHEES] upon the tariff bill, and after the Senator from Iowa [Mr. ALLISON] shall have taken the floor, as I believe he intends to do, the Senate proceed to the further consideration of the bill, leaving it precisely in the attitude it is now until that time shall have arrived.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Chair will first inquire if there is objection to the amendment to the bill proposed by the Senator from Massachusetts?

Mr. ALDRICH. It seems to me, Mr. President, that that is a question which ought to be considered on a little broader plane than just one single amendment. I suggest that the bill be understood as being open to amendment.

Mr. MORGAN. I shall not consent to that. I have been forced into an attitude that I can not recede from.

Mr. ALDRICH. Then I move to reconsider the vote by which the third reading of the bill was ordered.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The question is on the motion of the Senator from Rhode Island.

Mr. HOAR. I should like to understand whether the amendment I proposed has been acceded to?

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the amendment proposed by the Senator from Massachusetts?

Mr. CHANDLER. I ask that it be read, so that we may have some idea of it.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The amendment will be stated.

The SECRETARY. It is proposed to amend the bill by adding after the words "on board," in the fifth line of section 12, the following:

To be dealt with as hereinbefore provided.

Mr. CHANDLER. Now I object. I have no bill before me, and I can not tell what is the effect of the amendment.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. There is objection. The question is on the motion of the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. ALDRICH] to reconsider the vote by which the bill was ordered to a third reading.

Mr. HOAR. I suggest, as the Senator from Alabama proposes to have the bill printed and go over, that the question on the motion to reconsider had better be taken after the bill is printed and again called up, and not now.

Mr. ALDRICH. My motion will be pending then.

Mr. HOAR. With the Senator's motion pending. I understand that is agreeable to everybody.

Mr. ALDRICH. I have no objection to the bill going over with the motion to reconsider pending.

Mr. MORGAN. I have no objection to that course.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. CHANDLER. When do I understand the Senator from Alabama intends to have the bill taken up?

Mr. MORGAN. At the conclusion of the remarks of the Senator from Indiana on the tariff bill and after the Senator from Iowa [Mr. ALLISON] shall have taken the floor.

#### THE REVENUE BILL.

Mr. QUAY. Before the Senator from Indiana proceeds with his remarks, I desire to inquire of him whether the bill upon which he is about to address the Senate has been printed in the form in which it was promised it should be printed before the bill came up for discussion?

Mr. VOORHEES. Yes. I will state to the Senator from Pennsylvania and to the Senate that the bill has been printed in comparison with existing law and with the bill as it came from the other House. The bill in that form is now in the room of the Committee on Finance and can be supplied to any Senator who wishes a copy. I presume it is on the desk of every Senator.

Mr. ALDRICH. If the chairman of the committee will permit me, I do not think the comparison has yet been printed. At least, I have not seen it.

Mr. VOORHEES. I beg pardon, I think the Senator from Rhode Island will find it.

Mr. MILLS. I have it here.

Mr. ALDRICH. That is not the comparison; it is simply the bill itself.

Mr. VOORHEES. I myself am in error, then, as to the information which the Senator will find in the Finance Committee room. I think the messenger of the committee will inform him that it is there.

Mr. ALDRICH. It may be in the Finance Committee room, but I have never seen it, and it has not been laid on the desks of Senators.

Mr. VOORHEES. As the Senator from Rhode Island is a member of the Finance Committee, he can very easily see it if he goes to the committee room.

Mr. HOAR. What is this copy?

Mr. ALDRICH. That is not a comparison with existing law. It is merely a comparison of the rates of the bill, not a comparison of the text with existing law.

Mr. ALLISON. If I may have the attention of the Senator from Indiana, the chairman of the committee, I will state that I think the comparison contemplated last week has not yet been printed. I understand it requires some little time to prepare it.

Mr. VOORHEES. Then I have been misinformed.

Mr. ALLISON. I understand that within a day, probably, the original text of the present law, with the bill as it came from the other House and the Senate amendments, will be printed in form.

Mr. VEST. That is right.

Mr. ALLISON. I think that has not been prepared and will not be perhaps for a day.

Mr. VOORHEES. Will the Senator from Iowa be kind enough to call a page and send him to the room of the Committee on Finance and ask for the publication which arrived there this morning? I have not examined it myself, but I am under the impression that it is the comparison referred to.

Mr. ALLISON. Is this to what the Senator from Indiana refers? [Exhibiting].

Mr. VOORHEES. It is not that.

Mr. HOAR. Here it is. I have just sent to the committee room for it, and this is the publication brought me.

Mr. ALLISON. I was about to state to the Senator in charge of the bill that I called at the Finance Committee room and found this is the only document printed. So I think the Senator is mistaken as to the comparative text.

Mr. VOORHEES. Very well; I have been misinformed, then. I do not wish to interfere with the matter which the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. HANSBROUGH] has in hand, although I do desire to go on with the discussion of the tariff bill at 2 o'clock.

Mr. HANSBROUGH. All I desire is that the unfinished business, the bill to provide for the destruction and extermination of the Russian thistle, shall not lose its place on the Calendar as the unfinished business.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Chair will at the proper time lay before the Senate the unfinished business. The hour has not yet arrived. The Calendar, under Rule VIII, is in order, and the first bill on the Calendar will be announced.



## VOLUNTEERS IN INDIAN WAR.

The bill (S. 743) for the relief of the citizens of the States of Oregon, Idaho, and Washington who served with the United States troops in the war against the Nez Perces and Bannock and Shoshone Indians, and for the relief of the heirs of those killed in such service, and for other purposes, was announced as the first in order on the Calendar.

Mr. DUBOIS. In the absence of the Senator from Oregon [Mr. DOLPH] I ask that the bill go over, retaining its place on the Calendar.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The bill will go over without prejudice.

## SEALER OF WEIGHTS AND MEASURES.

The bill (H. R. 3246) for the appointment of a sealer and assistant sealer of weights and measures in the District of Columbia, was announced as next in order.

Mr. PROCTOR. In the absence of the Senator from Michigan [Mr. McMILLAN], who reported the bill, I suggest that it go over, retaining its place on the Calendar.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. It is so ordered.

## ALLEYS IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA.

The bill (S. 971) to open, widen, and extend alleys in the District of Columbia was announced as next in order.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The bill has heretofore been read at length. It has been amended, and it is now before the Senate as in Committee of the Whole.

Mr. HALE. Let it be read again for the information of the Senate.

Mr. QUAY. I ask that the bill may go over without prejudice.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The bill goes over, retaining its place on the Calendar.

## FORMS OF DEEDS IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA.

The bill (S. 832) to simplify the form of deeds of conveyance, trust, and releases of land in the District of Columbia was announced as next in order.

Mr. FAULKNER. Let the bill go over without prejudice.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The bill will be passed over without prejudice.

## PRESIDENTIAL APPROVAL.

A message from the President of the United States, by Mr. O. L. PRUDEN, one of his secretaries, announced that the President had on this day approved and signed the joint resolution (S. R. 37) to provide for the printing of the history and digest of international arbitrations to which the United States was a party, and for other purposes.

## THE RUSSIAN THISTLE.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The hour of 2 o'clock having arrived, the Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business, which will be read by title.

The SECRETARY. A bill (S. 1545) to provide for the destruction and extermination of the noxious plant or weed known as Russian thistle or Russian cactus, technically *Salsola kali tragus*.

Mr. HANSBROUGH. I ask unanimous consent that the unfinished business may be temporarily laid aside in order that the Senator from Indiana [Mr. VOORHEES] may address the Senate.

Mr. HARRIS. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the bill (H. R. 4834) to reduce taxation, to provide revenue for the Government, and for other purposes.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The question is on the motion of the Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. ALLISON. I know the motion is not debatable, but I wish to make a suggestion to the Senator from Tennessee. The bill which has been the unfinished business for some days will probably not take a very great length of time, and I hope the Senator from North Dakota and the Senator from Tennessee will make some reasonable adjustment about it, so that it may be understood that the bill can be reached at an early day.

Mr. HARRIS. I am unalterably opposed to the bill the Senator from North Dakota has in charge, but if there shall be a gap at any time during the consideration of the tariff bill where the bill for the destruction of the Russian thistle can be considered and disposed of, I will cooperate with the Senator from North Dakota to give him his day in court. My object, however, is to make the tariff bill the unfinished business.

Mr. ALLISON. I understand the Senator's object.

Mr. HARRIS. It is my object to hold it as such, and that whatever other bills may be considered shall be considered by consent of the Senate. I will cooperate with the Senator from North Dakota at any moment that can be conveniently spared to complete the consideration of the bill in his charge.

Mr. HANSBROUGH. I suggest to the Senator from Tennessee that the unfinished business be allowed to remain upon the

Calendar as the unfinished business, so that I may ask unanimous consent at the conclusion of the routine business to-morrow morning, before 2 o'clock, to take it up and consider it.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. President, I can not afford to allow the great tariff bill to play second fiddle to the thistle bill. I shall interpose no objection if the Senator from North Dakota will get the floor during the morning hour to-morrow and ask for the consideration of the bill. I will cooperate with him to secure its consideration at that time.

Mr. VOORHEES. So will I.

Mr. MILLS (to Mr. HANSBROUGH). You will have no trouble about it.

Mr. HARRIS. But the tariff bill must become the unfinished business now or a majority of the Senate must decide that it shall not so become.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The debate is proceeding by unanimous consent.

Mr. ALDRICH. I suggest to the Senator from North Dakota, if he will permit me, that he ask unanimous consent that the thistle bill be taken up to-morrow morning at the conclusion of the routine business.

Mr. BLACKBURN. Not to-morrow morning.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The question is upon the motion of the Senator from Tennessee that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the bill, the title of which will be stated.

The SECRETARY. A bill (H. R. 4834) to reduce taxation, to provide revenue for the Government, and for other purposes.

Mr. HANSBROUGH. Mr. President, in view of the fact that the Russian thistle bill is a measure intended to preserve and foster the institution of agriculture in this country, and that the bill the Senator from Tennessee refers to, the tariff bill, is a measure which, in my judgment at least, is intended to destroy it, I yield to superior force.

## THE REVENUE BILL.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Senator from Tennessee moves that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the bill (H. R. 4834) to reduce taxation, to provide revenue for the Government, and for other purposes.

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

Mr. VOORHEES. Mr. President—

Mr. ALDRICH. Will the Senator from Indiana allow me a single second?

Mr. VOORHEES. Certainly.

Mr. ALDRICH. In accordance with his suggestion, I have inquired at the Finance Committee room and I there found that the bill printed in the form suggested by the Senator the other day, that is, a comparison of the text of the bill as reported from the committee with the existing law, has not yet been received by the committee and they do not know when it will be received.

Mr. HARRIS. In this connection, if the Senator from Indiana will allow me, I will state that I was informed by one of the experts who is engaged on this particular matter, that within the next day or two the work will be completed and the print upon our desks.

Mr. VOORHEES. I think that is very well understood.

Mr. HOAR. I think the pending bill should be read in full.

Mr. ALDRICH and others. Oh, no.

Mr. MILLS. I hope we may have order in the Chamber.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Chair requests Senators to refrain from conversation. The Chair was unable to hear the request of the Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. COCKRELL. The Senator from Massachusetts requested the reading of the bill at length.

Mr. HOAR. I made no request. I called for the enforcement of the ordinary rule of the Senate, that when a bill is taken up it shall be read. If the Senator from Indiana desires to proceed with his remarks at this time I shall make no objection to a request for unanimous consent that the reading be postponed until he shall have concluded; but after what we have heard I think we are entitled to proceed in an orderly way.

Mr. HARRIS. I ask consent that the first formal reading of the bill be dispensed with, which is very often done.

Mr. HOAR. I object.

Mr. HARRIS. Very well.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. There is objection.

Mr. HARRIS. Then let the Senator from Indiana proceed, and afterwards the bill may be read line by line and word by word.

Mr. HOAR. That is what I proposed, if the Senator from Indiana prefers that course. He has not stated whether that course will be more agreeable to him.

Mr. VOORHEES. Of course I prefer to go on now.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request



that the Senator from Indiana shall proceed with his remarks and that the bill shall be read at length after he has concluded?

Mr. ALDRICH and Mr. TELLER. Or at some other time.  
The VICE-PRESIDENT. Or at some other time. Is there objection? The Chair hears none; and the Senator from Indiana will proceed.

Mr. VOORHEES. Mr. President, great abuses in government, strong by the sanction and growth of years, embedded in the powerful interests of privileged classes, created, fostered, encouraged, and protected by the laws themselves, have rarely, if ever in any age, been promptly and totally eradicated except by forcible revolution and bloodshed. Such is the concurrent and unbroken testimony of history. The spirit of peaceful and practical reform, on the other hand, is a reasoning and progressive spirit, moving forward, step by step, no matter how radical and thorough its ends and aims may be, and overcoming the most gigantic evils with patient wisdom and courage, rather than by violent and wholesale assault.

The protective system of tariff taxation as developed and fastened upon the business and labor of the American people, especially during the third of a century past, growing worse at every stage, is a system of indescribable injustice and oppression; and yet who will contend that all its vicious principles and workings, ramified as they are through every branch of trade and commerce, can be annihilated by a single blow, or totally wiped out by a single legislative enactment? For the bill now under consideration no such claim is made, but in its behalf can be truthfully asserted, and will be successfully maintained, that it accomplishes a vast work in the field of tariff reform, embodies a great relief to the people from iniquitous existing burdens, and constitutes a long stride, though not a final one, towards the approaching day of a full and perfect deliverance.

Sir, I challenge the attention of the Senate and the country to the great and commanding fact that by the provisions of this bill the seeming paradox of a reduction of taxes and at the same time an increase of public revenues will be reconciled when it becomes a law. I will not stop to consider at this point the vast individual robberies committed in protected markets, the untold and incalculable millions of blackmail levied by American manufacturers for their own pockets on their enforced customers when cut off from all outside competition; it is enough for my present purpose to say that we have liberalized American markets, made them more accessible to the traffic of the world, and, while not establishing free trade, we have made trade freer and more even-handed between the manufacturer and the consumer. But over and above and beyond this wide and well-known field of extortion and injustice, it will be found from the schedules of this bill that tariff taxes now officially ascertained and paid under existing law on the wants, necessities, and daily consumption of the laboring men, women, and children of the United States, have been reduced more than seventy-six millions per annum. These reductions are as follows:

On chemicals	\$1,000,000
On pottery	1,900,000
On glass	1,500,000
On metals	12,500,000
On wood	300,000
On tobacco	3,300,000
On agricultural products	3,300,000
On spirits, wines, etc.	1,500,000
On cotton manufactures	3,450,000
On flax, hemp, and jute manufactures	6,000,000
On woolen manufactures	23,500,000
On silk manufactures	3,500,000
On paper and pulp	300,000
On sundries	2,450,000
Transferred to the free list	12,170,000
<b>Total</b>	<b>76,670,000</b>

To this must be added the further imposing fact that the bill provides for a full and ample revenue, largely in excess of present supplies, with which to meet all the requirements of the public credit. Such a consummation as this, so full of relief to the people and of strength, safety, and honor to the Government, may well atone for the imperfections and shortcomings alleged against the pending measure, and will constitute the rock on which the temple of tariff reform will be built, and against which, in the ameliorated future, the gates of avarice, oppression, and fraud shall not prevail. With such a beneficent and stupendous result now plainly within the reach of the American people, and almost ready for their eager enjoyment, I envy not the fate of the party, nor the man, nor the set of men who shall constitute themselves a hindrance and an obstruction to its speedy fulfillment.

Faults and imperfections can, of course, be alleged and pointed

out; concessions are apparent which have been unwillingly made, and only when found absolutely necessary, in order to secure its passage; articles on the free list as they came from the House have been made dutiable under the duress of a small majority here, yet, deeply as I regret the necessity for these changes, and earnestly as I opposed them, I do not hesitate to say that the bill, taken as a whole as it now stands, with its combination of lower taxes on the necessities of life, and at the same time increased revenues for the Government, will be hailed as a substantial measure of reform and relief by the great producing masses of the American people.

In fact, the average rate of duty, ad valorem, on all articles made dutiable in the pending Senate bill, and in spite of all changes made by the Senate Committee on Finance, is lower than in the Wilson bill when it left the House and came to this body. This officially ascertained fact is overwhelming in its character and shall not be lost sight of.

At this point I submit an estimate of the expenses of the Government for the fiscal year 1895, made in official quarters from the best data obtainable up to date. It may be stated as follows:

Civil and miscellaneous	\$90,000,000.00
War	55,000,000.00
Navy	33,000,000.00
Indians	9,000,000.00
Pensions	145,000,000.00
Interest	29,000,000.00
Postal service, including \$5,971,736.89 deficiency in postal revenues	90,399,485.33

Making a total of.....451,399,485.33

To meet the appropriations made necessary by the foregoing estimates, I here place before the Senate the estimated revenues which are expected to accrue under the provisions of the bill now before us:

Internal revenue under present law	\$160,000,000
Additions made by the pending bill:	
Income tax	30,000,000
Spirits	20,000,000
Cards	3,000,000
Customs	163,361,000
Miscellaneous	20,000,000
Postal service	84,427,766
<b>Total</b>	<b>480,788,766</b>

Sir, it will here be seen that the Committee on Finance of this body has taken a bond of fate, as it were, that no harm shall come to the credit and financial honor of the Government. The criticisms which assailed the bill as it came from the House because it created a deficiency in the Treasury no longer apply. We present a measure full freighted with revenue for every call that can be made on the Republic at home and abroad, and with a surplus besides of \$23,389,245. Sir, there is no terror to me in a surplus like this. On the contrary, it is a source of safety, and can at any time be wisely and honorably devoted to the best purposes of good government, the payment of debts, and the stoppage of interest. It can also be reduced by a revision of tariff rates whenever found necessary. My greatest apprehension in public affairs is a deficiency in the finances and consequently in the power of the Government to maintain its honor and to hold its head high among the nations of the earth. On this point we feel that we have made the future secure, while at the same time we have made lighter the burdens of the people. Nor do we disguise from ourselves the fact that we are under very positive instructions in regard to the reform of tariff taxation.

The appalling legislation of 1890, known as the McKinley law, unlimited in its scope and purposes of spoliation and plunder, created a necessity for relief more immediate and absolute than was ever before known in American history, and the people issued their instructions at the ballot box accordingly. At the same time the riotous extravagance of the party then in power, taking an overflowing Treasury from an outgoing Democratic Administration in March, 1889, and leaving it practically bankrupt four years later, imposed upon those who are now responsible for the support of the Government the imperious duty of providing against ugly deficiencies and impending national dishonor. In reaching results of such magnitude and importance as these, and in carrying out the interests and declared wishes of toiling millions as contradistinguished from powerful and favored classes, obstacles have of course been encountered gigantic in size, arrogant, insolent, dictatorial, and in some instances sinister, perfidious, and dishonest in character. This fact could not be otherwise under the protective system which has for so many years prevailed in this country. The natural selfishness of the human heart, prone to avarice and greed as



sparks to fly upward, has been educated, developed, fed, nourished, pampered here on American soil by the Government itself, until it now stands not only revealed, but confessed as a giant robber, a predatory monster, obstructing the highways of legislation, and challenging legislators themselves to stand and deliver.

Manufacturing interests, which a hundred years ago were indeed and in fact in their infancy, and were nursed and fostered while yet in the cradle of their birth, are now the colossal taskmasters of the whole people, commanding tribute from every day's labor beneath the sun, haughtily striding the corridors of this Capitol, and issuing their edicts in the tones of dictators for or against the enactment of pending measures in the Halls of Congress. Those who own and represent these swollen and arrogant interests do not hesitate to declare on what terms a bill vitally affecting 70,000,000 of people will be permitted to become a law, and in default of what provisions for financial profits to themselves they will insure its defeat. In the hard-working days of attempted tariff reform they are met everywhere, and, as a rule, bear themselves as favorites of power generally do.

A great specialty is their persistent and imperious demand to be heard. It is true they and their predecessors have been heard on the same monotonous topic of monopoly in trade for more than a century; they themselves have said at this session and at the other end of the Capitol all they could possibly say in behalf of their huge gains, and it is printed for public use. The old stereotyped theme of Government protection for the lust of riches has long since been exhausted; not a new word or thought on the subject from their standpoint is now possible; time is precious and delay ruinous on the subject of tariff legislation to the business of the whole country; yet in spite of all these things they assume an injured air, and raise a dismal clamor because they have not been allowed to occupy from January to November of the present year in giving dictatorial instructions and edicts to the Senate Committee on Finance in behalf of their own unworthy, unmanly, unchristian desires to commit extortion in markets protected from free and open competition. They are also wholly and absolutely unmindful of the fact that every laboring man and woman in the United States, numbering millions while the protected few number only by thousands, has a vastly higher right and interest to be heard in his or her self-defense against iniquitous taxation than any manufacturer can possibly have in favor of the right to plunder by law.

The farmer, the mechanic, the wage-worker, and the manifold producers of every kind come not here; they have neither time nor money to spare from their busy, overworked lives; they can not visit the lobbies of Congress to argue their side of the case; their careworn, sunburnt faces have never been seen in the purlieus or in the hurried, heated, anxious haunts of unhalloved avarice; their hard, toil-worn hands are not grasped or felt in salutation as we struggle through waylaying crowds from committee room to the door of the Senate; the labor element, on which protected monopoly preys ravenously and unceasingly, is absent from the precincts of this Capitol, and well the millionaire beneficiaries of protection know that their victims on farm, field, and ranch; in workshop, mine, and furnace; on railroads, rivers, and in every toiling pursuit in which bread is honestly earned, can never confront them here and demand a division of time in discussion before the committee. The favorites of fortune, pets of vicious legislation; those to whom the Government has farmed out the power of oppression over others, take no heed of the rights, the protests, the sufferings, or the servitude of the mighty masses who constitute the nation's strength and glory.

To the thoroughly protected and self-complacent American manufacturer, sole master of his own market and incarnation of human selfishness, his enforced customers, those to whom he sells at his own protected price, have a value, as slaves once had to their owners. Not more than four days in the week belong to the laborer himself under tariff laws as they now stand; every hour of the other two days are absorbed in paying the manufacturer's increased prices on the necessities of life which a protective tariff guarantees.

Sir, can there be any wonder that protected classes, and protected individuals, who have been, as it were, taken into partnership by the Government, every one of them, should break out into vehement protest and angry outcry when touched and disturbed by the spirit of reform and equitable legislation? The only policy, the only request of a practical protectionist is to be let alone in the enjoyment of the highest duty and the fattest bounty the Government can give. He makes himself an obstacle to change from no other or higher consideration than sordid, brutal selfishness.

Whatever may be his line of manufacture, from hooks and eyes to machinery for ships, from pins and needles to the wearing apparel of the human race, he cries out against all competition or interference with his prices, not that his love of country

or of humanity is shocked or offended, but simply that his lust for riches takes alarm. Nothing in the condition of his fellow-men, or even in the laws of nature, ever deters or diverts him from his intense pursuit of worldly gain. It is told by an old chronicler as an incident of the great fire which swept London almost out of existence in 1666, that when the flames were in their fiercest wrath, carrying consternation and ruin into every quarter and every home, and the people, pale-faced and panic-stricken, were struggling to and fro in the crowded streets, a thrifty, economical-looking huckster was seen with his basket, diligently inquiring the price of kidney beans, which he had to sell. The only fault he found with the fire was that it interfered with his trade. This is the only fault which a protected manufacturer ever finds with anything. He must sell his kidney beans at a high price whatever else may happen.

It is perhaps no more than just, however, to state in this connection that there is one circumstance which mitigates, to some extent at least, the obstructive avarice, at all times and everywhere so vehemently displayed by the protected manufacturer. The Government itself, or rather the party leaders who have administered it during the past generation, are more to blame than he is. By bad laws they have tempted him beyond his power to resist and by an elaborate and skillful system for the benefit of the few at the expense of the many, they have opened the way for him to commit crime with impunity every day and hour of his existence by robbing his fellow beings under the forms of law. He has the license of the Government for monopoly and extortion—a license issued and reissued, multiplied and supplemented in a thousand ways, authorizing him to rule markets, oppress labor, and get enormously rich.

The enactment of the McKinley law in 1890 was a gigantic crime, not only against every working man and working woman in the United States, but also against every individual manufacturer, and against all manufacturing interests. It was not so designed by its authors, but such was its real and inevitable character. It declared a policy so flagitious in principle, so rotten in morality, and so ravenous in its exactions on the absolute wants of life, that its possible duration was only a question of time when the next election by the people should occur, and yet the vast manufacturing interests of the country were tempted and seduced into accepting its delusive bribes, and into an eager adjustment of themselves to its alluring, though evanescent, and short-lived provisions.

The most needed feature of tariff taxation is permanency, at reasonable rates for revenue, and with a due regard to the business and commerce of the country. The McKinley law was necessarily an unstable, unsafe measure; it was a reckless, fool-hardy experiment on the forbearance of the American people; it had no precedent in American history for its rash and insolent assault on the toiling masses; it dealt in dizzy heights and in profound depths, and placed tariff duties on foreign goods, seeking our markets for sale to our people, at prohibitory rates; it provoked the wrath of the people, and the condemnation of Divine justice. And now that we are compelled to repeal and tear down this odious structure of evil legislation, it is some compensation for intense labor and anxiety to hear it often bitterly cursed by the most intelligent business men we meet as having been to them a delusion and a snare. Our purpose is to replace the law of 1890 with a measure of reform, safe, conservative, and harmonious in itself, and to which all the wholesome and legitimate industries of the country will speedily adapt themselves, and tenaciously cling for secure development and undisturbed growth in the future. If this can be done without needless delay, an era of prosperity will dawn upon all the diversified interests of the country such as has never been surpassed in our history.

In considering, however, the obstacles which assail every effort at tariff reform, the specious plea made by the manufacturer for the alleged protection of his employed labor can not be ignored or overlooked. Brazen as the manufacturing classes have become, after a hundred years of Government caress, endearment, and unstinted bounty, they are at last ashamed to plead infancy any longer or to ask further protection and Government alms as minors in the manufacturing manhood of the world. Like the Greek soothsayers of old, who laughed in each other's faces when they met, American manufacturers can not keep straight countenances when talking together of infant industries. They have, in the main, abandoned that old, stale, worn-out plea, and adopted another more enticing in sound but equally deceptive and false in substance. They are now masquerading here and all over the United States as missionaries in the cause of labor; they make most earnest appeals to Congress to protect them in a monopoly of trade and in amassing great riches in order, as they declare, that they can, and will, pay increased wages, and give a more generous care to those who work in their employment.

Nothing could be more sublime than benevolent professions



like these, if they were found to be sincere and true; but on the other hand, the lowest depths of human depravity may be raked in vain for a baser or more infamous scheme by which to obtain money dishonestly, when it is found after thorough investigation and long experience that the pretense of benevolence, or even of justice to labor, is absolutely and corruptly false.

Sir, I stand here to deny that it can be shown anywhere since the Republican party came into power thirty-three years ago, that the wages of a working man or woman, in furnace, factory, or delving mine, has ever kept pace with increased tariff rates, or indeed had any increase at all, on account of high protective tariff legislation. I challenge any Senator, or any workingman, or any assumed representative of workmen, to show a single instance in the history of a protective tariff, where labor was ever recognized in a division of profits, where it was recognized in proportion to increased tariff duties, or where it was ever taken into consideration at all on pay day on account of the highest protective tariff legislation ever known.

Millionaire manufacturers now profess a deep concern for the wages and the welfare of their employes, but will anyone in their behalf point out what law or provision of law, during a century's experience, they have ever suggested for the protection of their employed people in the duration of their contracts, their right to living wages, or even for the certain payment of what they earn? We are asked here to enable the manufacturer to amass money unjustly from farmers and their families in order that he can pay another class of workers better wages. On the contrary, all history shows that not a dollar extorted by the tariff ever goes beyond the pocket of the protected manufacturer, or reaches the cheerless home and stunted income of his employed wage-worker.

If the reward of labor had ever been increased as an incident or consequence of increased tariff duties on foreign imports, nothing would be easier or more gracious to the advocates and beneficiaries of protection than to show that fact. The very reverse, however, is true. It can never be forgotten that the enactment of the McKinley law in October, 1890, was followed almost immediately by a reduction of the wages of all workers in iron and steel, beginning at Homestead, in Pennsylvania, under Carnegie, resulting in bloodshed and wholesale murder, and extending to all parts of the country and to almost every branch of manufacturing industry.

Manufacturers of iron and steel were especially favored by the law of 1890, and they talked then, as they do now, about the necessity of high protection for themselves in order to enable them to better pay their hired labor. They plead then, as they do now, for more money for themselves on the pretense that they would divide with the men and women who toiled in their service. The whole world has taken notice, not only of their falsehood and perfidy, but also of the ghastly results which followed. Wage reductions, strikes, lockouts, and labor strifes of all kinds contending for fair treatment at the hands of capital in every branch of manufacturing, have never been so prevalent in American history as since October 4, 1890, when the McKinley bill became a law.

A compilation of facts on this subject, of the most remarkable and startling character, has been made by the Hon. JOHN DE WITT WARNER, an able and distinguished member of the House of Representatives from the State of New York. It is shown by him in chronological order, beginning in October, 1890, that within the next two years, the McKinley law all the while prevailing, more than five hundred strikes and violent contentions between labor and capital on the subject of wages took place in various States in the Union; almost an average of one strike or collision for each and every working day during that entire period.

Such have been the hideous fruits borne for labor by the highest protective tariff ever known in this country. Uproar and strife, from day to day, have marked the relations between protected capital and unprotected labor, while the homes of the industrious poor have been filled with distress, often with actual want, and sometimes with murder. The most needed legislation in our statute books now is a strong and carefully prepared chapter giving legal security in the courts and before boards of arbitration, to helpless, oppressed, and outraged labor in its dealings with capital; capital made oppressive, insolent, intolerant, and intolerable by the protection it receives from the Government. An enactment like this, by reason of its overshadowing importance, must be a separate work, and can not be long delayed. In the meantime, I arraign those who hinder and obstruct tariff reform in the name of protection to labor, as shams and betrayers of the people and of the truth.

Of the more than six millions of people employed in the manufacturing establishments of the entire country from ocean to ocean, not one has ever appeared before Congress, or any committee of Congress, or made response in any public meeting,

stating that his employer, upon the enactment of higher rates of duty on imports, ever gave or suggested to give him a farthing's increase of pay for his work. What the wage-worker wants, and of right should have, is not the false promise and false pretense of manufacturers pleading in his name for their own enrichment, but the solid protection of law against the instability of his contracts, the uncertain duration of his employment, and the fluctuating rates of his wages.

#### SHALL DUTIES BE MADE SPECIFIC OR AD VALOREM?

Another objection, however, persistently urged against the pending bill as it has been reported from the Finance Committee of the Senate claims attention at this point. There are two directly opposing policies in regard to the proper method of levying import duties which fall as a tax on purchasers and consumers. One policy demands that specific rates, as they are known shall be levied on importations without reference to their value, but according to quantity or mere description. This is the favorite device of high protection. It completely covers from the plain tax paying people the actual amount they have to pay. For instance, who except a tariff expert with pencil in hand can tell how much per cent on actual value the purchaser pays when he buys matting made of cocoa fiber or rattan, with a duty on it of 12 cents per square yard, or mats made of the same material with a duty of 8 cents per square foot?

How much light does it throw on the subject of equitable taxation to inform the day laborer as he smokes his pipe in the evening that there is a duty of 15 cents per gross on all common tobacco pipes of clay? What kind of an idea does the purchaser obtain of the amount of tariff tax he pays on cotton cloth when he finds that on one kind of cotton cloth, not exceeding 50 threads to the square inch, counting the warp and filling, the duty assessed is 2 cents per square yard; or another kind exceeding 50, and not exceeding 100 threads to the square inch, counting the warp and filling, the duty is 2½ cents per square yard; if bleached, 3 cents per square yard; if dyed, colored, stained, painted, or printed, 4 cents per square yard?

These illustrations, taken from the McKinley law as it now exists, might be continued indefinitely. The object in laying specific duties like these and others is plainly manifest. It is not desirable on the part of protected wealth that the people should know how much tribute they pay, or to what extent they are plundered. Specific duties are therefore assessed, not according to the well-known methods of purchase and estimate of values in daily practice by the plain, laboring people, but by arbitrary rules which have no intelligent meaning except to expert manufacturers who profit by them. When the farmer goes to town and amongst other things for his household gets a supply of pearl buttons for their home-made shirts, he is informed, if the subject is mentioned at all, that the tariff tax on them is only 2½ cents per line. It sounds like a very small thing, and though he does not understand how it is done, yet he is not startled or indignant as he would be if he knew the real facts in the case.

Under that little clause of 2½ cents per line there is concealed from view a tax of more than 143 per cent on those buttons according to their actual value. The farmer has paid for them at the rate of \$2.43 for a dollar's worth of buttons for his wife and children, and he returns home as unconscious and contented a victim of robbery as one who has had his pocket picked by a thief and has not yet found it out. Under such a system as this duties as high as 400 per cent on the value of the goods assessed have been successfully hidden from ordinary observation by a small, harmless-looking specific duty; and such is the case now in the McKinley law on our statute books.

I turn, however, from this dangerous policy, this chief instrument of high protection and unbridled extortion, to another policy of tariff assessment which a schoolboy can comprehend. An ad valorem system of duties on imports was never a delusion or a snare to even the humblest and most uneducated in the land. A given per cent on the value of goods bought can never deceive or cheat the consumer. With a piece of chalk on a board he can figure out for himself what he pays for the goods, and what in addition he pays as a tax. Light and instruction for the people are to be found in every line of an ad valorem tariff, while darkness and deception lurk in the very principle of specific rates of duty. It is true that exceptional instances sometimes compel the use of specific duties, but it may be stated as a rule that tariff reform never adopts them if it can be avoided, and that the protectionist, on the other hand, shuns ad valorem rates as guilt shuns discovery.

#### THE WALKER TARIFF.

In the history of tariff legislation in this Government, from the first act in 1789 to the present day, there is one enactment which stands out in its wisdom, its success, and its glory over all others. The Democratic tariff of 1846, devised by Robert J. Walker, ad valorem in its rates from beginning to end, with not



a specific duty in it, has had no peer, no rival even, in the prosperity it secured for the American people during its existence as a law. The protective tariff of 1842, enacted during the ascendancy of the Whig party, was in force when the Administration of James K. Polk came into power and Robert J. Walker took the portfolio of the Treasury. The friends and beneficiaries of protection were deeply enamored of the law of 1842, and claimed for it a greater degree of prosperity, confidence, and happiness throughout the country than had been known since 1828; but the new Secretary of the Treasury assailed it at once and in unsparring terms. Mr. Blaine, in his brilliant book entitled *Twenty Years of Congress*, speaking of the tariff of 1842, and Mr. Walker's course in regard to it, says:

Robert J. Walker was a Senator from Mississippi when the act was passed and was bitterly opposed to it. He was a man of great originality, somewhat speculative in his views, and willing to experiment on questions of revenue to the point of rashness. He was not a believer in the doctrine of protection, was persuaded that protective duties bore unjustly and severely upon the planting section with which he was identified; and he came to his office determined to overthrow the tariff act which he had been unable to defeat in the Senate. Mr. Walker was excessively ambitious to make his term in the Treasury an era in the history of the country. He had a difficult task before him—one from which a conservative man would have shrunk. The tariff was undoubtedly producing a valuable revenue, and as the Administration of Mr. Polk was about to engage in war, revenue was what they most needed. Being about to enter on a war, every dictate of prudence suggested that aggressive issues should not be multiplied in the country. \* \* \*

Mr. Walker made an elaborate report on the question of revenue, and attacked the tariff of 1842 in a manner which might well be termed savage. He arraigned the manufacturers as enjoying unfair advantages—advantages held, as he endeavored to demonstrate, at the expense and to the detriment of the agriculturist, the mechanic, the merchant, the shipowner, the sailor, and, indeed, of almost every industrial class. In reading Mr. Walker's report a third of a century after it was made, one might imagine that the supporters of the tariff of 1842 were engaged in a conspiracy to commit fraud, and that the manufacturers who profited by its duties were guilty of some crime against the people. But extremes as were his declarations and difficult as were the obstructions in his path, he was able to carry his point.

Sir, the glowing tribute here paid by the most distinguished aristocrat of protection to the great Democratic Secretary is amply justified by the results which followed and the work accomplished by Mr. Walker. With the courage and daring of a self-reliant, creative genius, he followed a financial chart and compass of his own, and did indeed "make his term in the Treasury an era in the history of the country." The law of 1846, which bears his name and immortalizes his memory, is a most interesting and instructive piece of legislation for examination at the present time. Brief, condensed, and comprehensive, containing less than 5,000 words in all; terse, vigorous, and explicit in language; bold, fearless, and commanding in tone, this old act of Congress will never cease to be an object of admiration to the student of American legislation. But the policy which it embodies, still more than its mere structure, will remain throughout distant years for the study of the statesman and the historian.

All the goods, wares, and merchandise of the world liable to be imported from foreign countries to our shores are classified under the Walker tariff in eight short schedules, each schedule being marked by an ad valorem rate of duty, which applies alike to every article it contains. The whole field is covered by a system which lays taxes according to the value of the article taxed, and enables the purchaser to know how much he is paying for the article and how much he is paying as a tax. The ad valorem rates fixed in the law of 1846, the Walker law, range from 100 per cent, the highest, down to 5 per cent, the lowest, and they were all imposed for revenue only and in no instance for protection. Not a single specific duty is to be found in the entire law; every ambuscade wherein protection and indefinite taxation lie hidden together under specific duties was destroyed, and the burdens which toiling millions have to bear for the support of their Government were made easy of comprehension.

The opposition to such a daring and sweeping measure of reform was necessarily most vehement and resentful. Its attack on existing abuses was bold and peremptory, and the strongholds of avarice were startled to their foundations. Indeed the circumstances and proceedings connected with the enactment of the tariff of 1846 have a peculiar interest for tariff reformers now. The bill was reported to the Senate from the House on Monday, the 6th day of July, whereupon a motion was made that it be printed and made the special order of the day for Monday, the 13th, at 12 o'clock. There ensued at once a most strenuous demand for its reference to the Committee on Finance, but the motion to make it a special order with only seven days' delay and without any reference at all, prevailed after an earnest discussion. The bill was taken up for consideration July 13, and the debate in the Senate closed on the 28th by its passage through this body. It was approved by the President and became a law July 30, 1846.

Sir, it must have been a rich compensation for hard work in the discharge of public duty to have lived in a day of such prompt and wholesome action in a good cause. The public men

of fifty years ago were not controlled or embarrassed by entangling alliances with great riches and giant monopolies; they moved forward in their work, not as men wearing manacles and subject to masters, but with the free gait of conscious rectitude and absolute liberty of thought and action. The coercive power of consolidated and organized millions did not obstruct their patriotic efforts at every step nor impede their achievement of speedy and glorious results. The debate which took place in the Senate on the Walker tariff, although lasting but fifteen days, was of the most powerful and commanding character.

This was more especially true of the opponents of the measure, since its supporters, to a great extent, refrained from taking part in the discussion. The opposition was led by Daniel Webster, Reverdy Johnson, John M. Clayton, George Evans of Maine, Willie P. Mangum, and others of great note in the councils of the Government at that time. Their speeches were characterized by impassioned eloquence, powerful argument from their standpoint, bitter assault on the proposed measure, and the most intense predictions of ruin by wholesale and in detail of the business interests of the entire country in the event of its passage.

The speech made by Mr. Webster, occupying two days in its delivery, was one of the ablest and most remarkable of his great intellectual career. In the full prime of his majestic powers, he lunched them all against the pending bill. As an enactment for revenue, the object for which it was devised, he said it would fail, declaring it would "deceive the hopes of those who expect to derive from it that measure of abundant revenue which has been stated." He was unsparing, inflammatory, and as it would seem now, unparliamentary in his language towards those who supported it. At one point in his speech he was so carried away as to exclaim:

I must say, sir, that the notions which prevail in the Treasury Department, and in the Executive Government appear to me to be almost insane. We were told at the early part of the session that the taxed portion of the community paid fifty millions to the manufacturers; it has now got up to ninety-four millions! Mr. President, if intelligent men, of patriotic purposes, good intentions, and great respectability, in many walks of life, private and public, ever were seized with a monomania, that disease has taken a strong hold on those who come to us with such statements and sentiments as these. How else can we account for such a zeal for overimportation, a zeal which looks for a paradise on earth, if we can only be surrounded by British manufacturers without stint and without count. The love of importation has become a sort of passion with those at the head of affairs—an unthinking, headlong passion.

Mr. Webster then proceeded to a very elaborate discussion of the bill under four propositions: First, as a measure for making all duties on imported goods ad valorem duties; secondly, its effects on certain interests, supposed to be protected by former and then existing laws; thirdly, its effects on the navigation and commercial interests of the country; and fourthly, its effects on the great industrial employments and labor of the people. In every aspect presented by the bill to his mind he saw nothing but disaster and ruin. In its enactment he beheld widespread bankruptcy and national dishonor; paralyzed industries at home, and our armies in Mexico at that time put in peril by the loss of revenue which its provisions were certain, in his judgment, to entail on the Treasury. There was not a gleam of light to his eye in a single word or line it contained. The woes and afflictions foretold by Isaiah and Jeremiah of the guilty city of Jerusalem were hardly more dismal or terrible than the evils prophesied of his own country by the great New England orator in the event the bill he was discussing should become a law.

Sir, I have thus dwelt on the ad valorem tariff law of 1846, and in some detail on the remarkable speech of Mr. Webster, in order, at this point, to say that not a single word of evil prophesy uttered by him or his able associates ever came true—not one. Their arguments were reduced to absurdity by swift-coming results, their frantic predictions of ruin became a scoff and a byword in the midst of the swelling and unparalleled prosperity which immediately followed and remained so long after the law went into force. So overwhelming was the success of the new law, and so absolute and universal was the satisfaction of the people with its workings, that the subject of the tariff ceased to be an issue between parties during the next four Presidential elections. Controversy ceased in the presence of demonstration, peace and contentment between labor and capital prevailed throughout the country, strikes and disturbances such as have since been the last resort of oppressed labor were unknown, the homes of working men and women were not darkened by the presence of armed force in the employment of monopoly and brutal avarice, no one was shot down in the presence of his wife and children in a dispute over his wages, nor on the other hand did millionaires multiply so rapidly or wax so fat and insolent as they have in later years. Indeed, the doctrine of Government protection, gratuity, and gain for one class of citizens at the expense of all other classes would never again have been asserted, had not the war between the sections fifteen years



later given it another and a tremendous opportunity to curse the land.

The political campaigns of 1843, 1852, 1856, and 1860 were devoid of tariff issues and tariff debates, because of the great and general business prosperity which then existed under the ad valorem, revenue, Democratic tariff law then in operation. The only tariff discussion to be found from 1846 to 1861 occurred in 1857. At that time more revenue was being obtained under the Walker tariff than was necessary for the economical administration of the Government, and duties on imports were therefore again reduced, and made lower than they had been at any time during forty-five years of our previous history. Mr. Blaine, in commenting on the enactment of the Walker tariff and the extraordinary results which followed, says:

The Whig victory of 1848 was not sufficiently decisive to warrant any attempt, even had there been desire, to change the tariff. Gen. Taylor had been elected without subscribing to a platform or pledging himself to a specific measure, and he was therefore in a position to resist and reject appeals of the ordinary partisan character. Moreover, the tariff of 1846 was yielding a brilliant revenue, and the business of the country was in a flourishing condition at the time his Administration was organized. Money became very abundant after the year 1843; large enterprises were undertaken, speculation was prevalent, and for a considerable period the prosperity of the country was general and apparently genuine. After 1851 the Democrats had almost undisputed control of the Government, and had gradually become a free-trade party.

The principles embodied in the tariff of 1846 seemed for the time to be so entirely vindicated and approved that resistance to it ceased not only among the people, but among the protective economists, and even among the 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. It was not surprising, therefore, that with a plethoric condition of the National Treasury for two or three consecutive years, the Democratic Congress, in the closing session of Pierce's Administration, enacted what has since been known as the tariff of 1857. By this law the duties were placed lower than they had been at any time since the war of 1812. The act was well received by the people, and was, indeed, concurred in by a considerable proportion of the Republican party.

Sir, a higher, stronger tribute to the triumph of a tariff composed solely of ad valorem rates of duty, imposed for revenue only, can nowhere be found in the entire range of economic literature than is here presented by the most brilliant antagonist that system has encountered in the last forty years. It is true Mr. Blaine does not in words surrender the doctrine of protection and embrace the principles of the Walker tariff, but as a historian he states facts which not only justify, but demand such a course on the part of all impartial readers and thinkers. I commend this notable chapter of his writings, together with the jeremiads of Mr. Webster in 1846, to those dismal croakers who are now in our midst, and every day and hour are shedding pretended tears over the anticipated ruin that will befall the country when the bill now before the Senate shall become a law. It is to be regretted that this bill is not more nearly an exact counterpart of the Walker tariff than it is, but it has the great merit of being framed on the same principles and devoted to the same end as far as possible under existing circumstances. We therefore invoke the confidence of the American people, and ask them to believe, in the light of history, that its enactment as a law will be followed by a full share of those national blessings which so signally immortalized its great prototype, the tariff of 1846.

#### SUGAR.

And now, Mr. President, coming to a closer look into the details of the pending bill, I propose to briefly discuss a few of its provisions which have in certain quarters provoked comment and attack. On the subject of sugar the McKinley law is a juggle and a fraud, and was intended as such; it was framed to deceive, and in thoughtless minds it has succeeded. Its authors had the hardihood, the audacity to mention it as an article on the free list and unthinking people have dreamed of free sugar ever since, while in point of fact the meanest, the most odious, unjust, unequal, un-American, and unconstitutional tax ever known in our history is the sugar-bounty tax now paid by the American people. It is not necessary for me to say that I would rejoice to make sugar free from taxation had I alone the power; but the provisions of the bill now before us on that subject, in comparison with the vicious principles and vicious results of the McKinley law, are as equity is to corruption, and as integrity is to crime.

Absolute free trade in sugar is an attractive theme, but no such thing has ever existed for a single hour since the organization of this Government. A moderate duty has always been imposed on sugar, and it has always been a staunch revenue support to the Government. In that great model of a Democratic tariff for revenue only—the tariff of 1846—it was declared in short and simple phrase that "sugar of all kinds" and "sirup of the sugar" were subject to a duty-laid tax of 30 per cent ad valorem. The fact that the duty tax on sugar has inured more to the benefit of the revenues of the Government and less to the profits of private parties than any other tax known to tariff legislation may be stated as the main reason why the Democratic

party has never made an issue against it. Every dollar collected from a tariff tax on sugar and paid into the Treasury relieves some other article of even higher necessity in the economy of life from the imposition of tariff taxation.

It is conceded by all parties that the duty paid on imported sugar goes more fairly and squarely into the Treasury than any other duty provided by law, and it follows, as light follows darkness, that tariff taxation can therefore be reduced in proportion on other things which the people have to buy and use. The McKinley bill, on the contrary, by pretending to take sugar off the dutiable list, was intended to reduce the revenues of the Government, and thus make an apparent necessity, a fraudulent excuse for higher rates of duty on woollens, on iron, on tin plate, on salt, on binding twine, on cotton ties, and on all other articles of prime necessity in agricultural life. It must be remembered, too, that the chief outrage of the sugar-bounty tax consists in the fact that not a dollar of it ever goes to the assistance of the Government. It is taken from the pockets of one class of people and paid directly, without anything in return, to another class.

During the present fiscal year, ending June 30, there will be paid by the Treasury \$12,300,000 as bounty to the producers of sugar, and every dollar of this vast sum is first collected from those who plant corn, raise wheat, and engage in all the various pursuits of labor. Nearly thirty millions of bounty money have been handed over to the sugar-makers of the United States since the law went into operation, and each year the sum is rapidly increasing. It was thought when the law was under discussion that the bounty would not exceed \$3,000,000 per year, but the stimulating influence of such an enormous donation to the manufacturers of sugar was greatly underrated. If the law is to remain unrepealed the time is near at hand when it will confer as a mere gratuity more than \$20,000,000 per year on a small fraction of our population, engaged in no public service, but in their own private enterprises.

That such an enactment is in harmony with the Constitution can not, of course, be maintained for a moment. The speech of the present Secretary of the Treasury, then a Senator, on the unconstitutionality of the sugar bounty was not answered at the time of its delivery, and it never will be. No further argument is now needed, and yet I can not forego the pleasure of reading one of the many decisions cited by Mr. Carlisle. It is the case of *The People vs. Salem*, decided by that great jurist Judge Cooley. Amongst other things he said:

But it is not in the power of the State, in my opinion, under the name of a bounty, or under any other cover or subterfuge, to furnish the capital to set private parties up in any kind of business, or to subsidize their business after they have entered upon it. A bounty law of which this is the real nature is void, whatever may be the pretense on which it may be enacted. The right to hold out pecuniary inducements to the faithful performance of public duty in dangerous or responsible positions stands upon a different footing altogether; nor have I any occasion to question the right to pay rewards for the destruction of wild beasts and other public pests, a provision of this character being a mere police regulation. But the discrimination by the State between different classes of occupations, and the favoring of one at the expense of the rest, whether that one be farming or banking, merchandising or milling, printing or railroading, is not legitimate legislation, and it is an invasion of that equality of right and privilege which is a maxim in State government. When the door is once opened to it there is no line at which we can stop and say with confidence that thus far we may go with safety and propriety, but no further.

Every honest employment is honorable; it is beneficial to the public; it deserves encouragement. The more successful we can make it the more does it generally subserve the public good. But it is not the business of the State to make discriminations in favor of one class against another, or in favor of one employment against another. The State can have no favorites. Its business is to protect the industry of all, and to give all the benefits of equal laws. It can not compel an unwilling minority to submit to taxation in order that it may keep upon its feet any business that can not stand alone.

Here in this brief but glorious decision is contained the whole doctrine of free government in its exercise of the taxing powers granted to it in the Constitution. How like an oracle of truth and justice the last sentence rings out on an atmosphere impregnated with the odor of protective tariff jobs, trusts, monopolies, bounties, and all manner of ill-gotten gains! I repeat:

It can not compel an unwilling minority to submit to taxation in order that it may keep upon its feet any business that can not stand alone.

This great declaration of constitutional law and of Democratic principle ought to be repeated whenever and wherever the policy of protection and bounty is asserted; and over the portals of every department of this Government—legislative, executive, and judicial—it ought to be engraven in letters of everlasting light as a fundamental maxim of liberty and equality in the enjoyment of individual rights, public and private.

Sir, in the light of the Constitution as judicially interpreted by the wisest minds of the country, it may be safely asserted that worse legislation, on principle and in practice, than the bounty tax now being paid on sugar never before cursed the people of a government calling itself free, upright, and enlightened. In this connection, however, arises a very proper demand to know the exact nature and effect of the measure pro-



posed in its place and stead. I propose to the best of my ability to meet that demand. The duty on sugar as placed in the bill now pending before the Senate may be stated at 1 cent per pound on raw sugar, and one-eighth of 1 cent per pound additional on refined sugar. If this specific duty should be changed to an ad valorem rate, as I think would have been better, it will be found to be about 35 per cent on the value of the goods assessed.

I have already pointed out the fact that under the Walker tariff all sugars were made dutiable at 30 per cent ad valorem, but it must also be borne in mind that forty-eight years ago the consumer paid 12 cents a pound for sugar, while at the present time he pays only 4 or 5 cents per pound at the most. It may be estimated that 8 pounds of sugar, when the Walker tariff was enacted, cost the purchaser \$1, while that amount of money will now buy 24 pounds. In 1846 the consumer of sugar paid 30 cents tax on 8 pounds; by the provisions of the pending bill he will now pay 35 cents tax on 24 pounds; showing a reduction in favor of the bill before us of nearly 60 per cent even when compared with the great Democratic tariff of nearly a half century ago. In other words, owing to the difference in the value of sugar then and now, the duty proposed by the Committee on Finance is but slightly more than one-third the amount imposed by the Walker tariff, of blessed and glorious memory.

On the subject of refined sugar, the committee courts the closest scrutiny into its methods and its motives, and into everything it has done. Under the McKinley law the duty on all refined sugars above No. 16 Dutch standard in color is one-half of 1 cent per pound. In the pending bill we have reduced that duty to one-eighth of 1 cent per pound, thus wiping out three-fourths of the entire amount and would gladly have wiped it all out. If to some peculiar minds this action of the committee appears to be a compliance with the demands of the sugar trust, it must also be apparent that the demands of that institution were of the most extraordinary character—demands for a very deep cut in its rates of duty, for a strong downward slope in its profits, and for an almost total annihilation of all the protection it ever had.

Let the sugar question be not misunderstood or misstated. The issue here and before the country is between the McKinley law, with its unconstitutional individual bounty plunder, already amounting to over twelve millions a year, and rapidly increasing, together with its high protection for the trust, on the one hand, and an old-fashioned tariff duty, two-thirds less than the duty on sugar in the tariff of 1846, every dollar raised for revenue, and going into the Treasury as revenue, together with its sweeping reduction against the trust, on the other hand. Nor must the reciprocity features of the McKinley law be overlooked in connection with this issue. The so-called reciprocity contained in that law may much more properly be styled an act for the punishment of our own people by retaliating on them the offenses committed by foreign countries in keeping our goods out of their markets by the imposition of high tariff duties. That unparalleled and clearly unconstitutional piece of legislation reads as follows:

Sec. 3. That with a view to secure reciprocal trade with countries producing the following articles, and for this purpose, on and after the 1st day of January, 1892, whenever, and so often as the President shall be satisfied that the government of any country producing and exporting sugars, molasses, coffee, tea, and hides, raw and uncured, or any of such articles, imposes duties or other exactions upon the agricultural or other products of the United States, which, in view of the free introduction of such sugar, molasses, coffee, tea, and hides into the United States, he may deem to be reciprocally unequal and unreasonable, he shall have the power and it shall be his duty to suspend, by proclamation to that effect, the provisions of this act relating to the free introduction of such sugar, molasses, coffee, tea, and hides, the production of such country, for such time as he shall deem just, and in such case and during such suspension duties shall be levied, collected, and paid upon sugar, molasses, coffee, tea, and hides, the product of or exported from such designated country, as follows, namely:

All sugars not above No. 13 Dutch standard in color shall pay duty on their polariscopic tests, as follows, namely:

All sugars not above No. 13 Dutch standard in color, all tank bottoms, syrups of cane juice or of beet juice, melada, concentrated melada, concrete and concentrated molasses, testing by the polariscope not above 75° seven-tenths of 1 cent per pound; and for every additional degree or fraction of a degree shown by the polariscopic test, two-hundredths of 1 cent per pound additional.

All sugars above No. 13 Dutch standard in color shall be classified by the Dutch standard of color, and pay duty as follows, namely: All sugar above No. 13 and not above No. 16 Dutch standard of color, 13 cents per pound.

All sugar, above No. 16, and not above No. 20, Dutch standard of color, 11 cents per pound.

All sugars above No. 20, Dutch standard of color, 2 cents per pound.

Molasses testing above 50°, 4 cents per gallon.

Sugar drainings and sugar sweepings shall be subject to duty either as molasses or sugar, as the case may be, according to polariscopic test.

On coffee, 3 cents per pound.

On tea, 10 cents per pound.

Hides, raw or uncured, whether dry, salted, or pickled; Angora goat skins, raw, without the wool, unmanufactured, asses' skins, raw or unmanufactured, and skins, except sheepskins, with the wool on, 1½ cents per pound.

Sir, here is a tariff schedule containing five articles of prime necessity to the American people which are to be heavily taxed, and their cost to the consumer largely increased, at the mere will and pleasure of the President of the United States, whoever he may happen to be, and as often as he pleases. The Executive

can not, in my judgment, be clothed with the power thus to legislate by proclamation, and I regard this entire enactment as an unconstitutional freak in our statutes. I cite it now, however, in order to show that under the McKinley law an average duty of at least 1½ cents per pound, or over 60 per cent ad valorem, is authorized to be placed on sugar by the edict of the Executive alone, and at his individual discretion.

With the same stroke of his pen he can, by virtue of this law, put a tariff tax of 3 cents per pound on coffee, 10 cents per pound on tea, and 1½ cents per pound on raw and uncured hides of nearly every description known to the uses of civilized people. These burdens, when imposed as they are authorized, will have to be borne by the American consumer and taxpayer, and by no one else. The inhabitants of the offending country against whom proclamation is made are indifferent or perhaps amused spectators of our retaliatory proceedings against our own citizens. I commend this pernicious and unconstitutional section of a bad enactment to the careful consideration of such, if any there be, who, claiming to be tariff reformers, have declared their preference for the McKinley law over the bill now under discussion.

Sir, I fear not the day when I shall be called to answer on this subject before the people of that great State which has so long honored me with a seat on this floor. The people of Indiana, at least, will be slow to believe that I have been guided in my conduct by any other thought than a supreme and sincere devotion to their interests, and to the interests of the laboring people of every State in the Union. I have had their confidence during the average lifetime of man; I have never had their distrust.

#### THE TAX ON DISTILLED SPIRITS AND THE EXTENSION OF THE BONDED PERIOD.

In turning to another subject on which much ignorant and some malevolent criticism has expended itself, my task is easy and the way smooth. In securing a sufficient revenue for the support of the Government with as light a tax as possible on the necessities of life, I have at all times earnestly favored an increased tax on whisky. I would be glad to day if the pending bill provided for a tax of \$1.20 per gallon, instead of \$1.10, as it does. Revenue raised from distilled spirits, the purchase and consumption of which is never a necessity of life, is a deep gratification to me, and the fact that twenty millions of the surplus accruing under this bill will be furnished by the tax on whisky is a genuine joy to my mind. My sincere regret is that more money for the Government was not obtained from the same source, and consequently less from other sources of a different character.

As to the extension of the period during which distilled spirits may remain in bond before being required to pay the Government tax, it is proper to say that there is no new privilege given by such a provision in the bill before us. The owner of distilled spirits has the right now, and at all times, to export his goods to foreign countries for an indefinite period, hold them there as long as he pleases and until they acquire the age he wants them to have, or until a profitable market revives here at home, then import them back to his own country for sale, paying a customs duty equal to the revenue tax, and securing a still further delay in making payment if he so desires by placing his spirits in a customs bonded warehouse on their return.

The customs duty on such reimported spirits is, of course, collected only on the quantity actually contained in the casks or packages when they start back, the owner being subjected to loss on account of the inevitable leakage and waste of an ocean voyage and storage in a foreign warehouse and the Government being at considerable expense in connection with the exportation of that portion of the spirits which is never returned to this country and consequently never tax-paid. Here is a loss to the Government which I am authorized by the Commissioner of Internal Revenue to say will not occur under the extension provided for in the pending bill, and that such extension, with the safeguards provided for in this bill, will not increase the cost of collecting the revenue from distilled spirits.

The claim that certain classes of spirits require more time than others in which to pass through all the necessary manufacturing processes, and thereby to become marketable, is admitted to be true and just in all quarters where this question is dealt with. It is but just also to the officials and to the owners of distilled spirits, as well as to those who framed the extension clause of the pending bill, to say that the privilege of completing the process of manufacture before payment of tax is accorded to the producers of all other articles, tobacco and the like, which are subject to tax under the internal-revenue laws, including spirits other than the classes needing the aging process; and that the tax on each of said articles becomes due and payable only upon the removal of the article from the place of manufacture for consumption or sale.

Under existing laws there is a discrimination against distillers on this point for which there is no reason whatever. Those



who produce the finer grades of spirits are required not only to remove their spirits before their manufacture is finished, before the aging process is perfected, but frequently at a time when the market is broken down, and no sale is possible except at a heavy loss. An order for the compulsory removal of spirits out of bond under circumstances like these, especially during seasons of financial depression, not only works great hardships, but in very many cases compels the distiller to export his spirits, as I have already stated, in order to get time for the aging and maturing of his goods and for the recurrence of a market at home which will enable him to sell and pay his tax.

If I am reminded that speculation by private parties is made possible by the pending legislation, my answer is, that no increase of tax on any article known to man can ever be made without a temporary benefit to the holders of the article at the time the increase is made, who manufactured or purchased it while the lower tax prevailed. All the benefit, however, which the distillers can secure in this instance must be by paying their taxes and removing their spirits from bond prior to the 30th of June next, when the increased rate of tax is to take effect. All remaining in bond after that date, of course, pays the increase. It is a fact also to be considered that the bulk of the spirits now in distillery warehouses is not owned by the distillers, but by persons in business in all parts of the country, many, I am officially informed, owning from 1 to 5 barrels only; others, with more capital, such as bankers, owning or controlling much larger quantities. As the tax which is imposed on the manufacturer is really paid by the consumer so also the benefit which the tax confers is equally widespread.

Sir, I have no hesitation in declaring, upheld as I am by the Secretary of the Treasury and by the Commissioner of Internal Revenue, who have both recommended every step taken on this subject, that one of the wisest, safest, most useful, and necessary provisions in the pending bill is that increasing the tax on distilled spirits and granting an extension of the time they may remain in bond without being driven out of the country.

On this point I quote from the report of the present very able and efficient Commissioner of Internal Revenue made in November, 1886, under a former Administration. It will be seen that he held then, as he does now, that the same "principle of taxation which applies to all other articles taxed under the internal-revenue laws should be made to apply to distilled spirits; and that, as in the case of tobacco and beer, and of the new subject of taxation, oleomargarine, the tax be levied upon the spirits which shall be manufactured and sold or removed for consumption or use." His full statement on the point is as follows:

The above table and other statements heretofore made show that, although the tax was paid during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1886, on more than 1,000,000 gallons of bourbon and rye whiskies in excess of the quantity on which tax was paid during the next preceding fiscal year, the production in 1886 was so much greater than the withdrawals as to leave a net balance in warehouse June 30, 1886, of 4,000,000 gallons greater than was on hand July 1, 1885. It will also be seen from a table on a following page that the production of all kinds of spirits was 2,000,000 gallons greater during the months of July, August, and September, 1886, than during the corresponding months of 1885, while the tax-paid withdrawals were half a million gallons less.

A glance at the table of exportations to foreign ports shows that the bulk of the bourbon and rye whiskies in 1886 went to swell the stocks in the warehouses of Bremen, Hamburg, and Bermuda. The tendency since June 30, 1885, has been, up to the present time, to increase the stock of bourbon and rye whiskies in distillery warehouses. The bulk of the assessments made in 1886 was to enforce the collection of the overdue gallon-tax on spirits of these classes, and the increased production indicates that heavy assessments of this character, which empower the collector to distrain for the tax with 5 per cent penalty and 1 per cent per month interest, must be made during the present and future years.

It has come to my notice that many distillers have organized themselves into associations, each member of which has agreed to limit his production so that the entire product of all will be not greater than that demanded by the communities supplied by them. But it is evident that unless all distillers of one kind of spirits, say bourbon whisky, were associated, such distillers would be liable to find themselves unable to sell their spirits when the taxes become due, and therefore unable to pay the tax at that time. From the nature of things it is hardly to be expected that such a union will occur. Nor am I sure that even if all were so united the combined wisdom of the association would be sufficient to foretell the state of the markets three years hence. I am therefore constrained to again recommend to Congress that the principle of taxation which applies to all other articles taxed under internal-revenue laws be made to apply to distilled spirits; and that, as in the case of tobacco and beer, and of the new subject of taxation, oleomargarine, the tax be levied upon the spirits which shall be manufactured and sold or removed for consumption or use.

In connection with the foregoing I submit also another most important communication written by the Hon. Hugh McCulloch when Secretary of the Treasury for the last time in his long and able career in the service of his Government, and recommending the passage of a bill "to amend the laws relating to the entry of distilled spirits in distillery and special bonded warehouses and the withdrawal of the same therefrom." It will be seen that he earnestly concurs with the Commissioner of Internal Revenue, and indorses in forcible terms the policy of the pending bill. His communication is as follows:

TREASURY DEPARTMENT, January 12, 1885.

SIR: Herewith I hand you a bill, prepared by the Commissioner of Internal Revenue, to amend the laws relating to the entry of distilled spirits in

distilleries in special bonded warehouses, and the withdrawal of the same therefrom, which I will thank you to present for the favorable consideration of the House.

The manufacture of whisky is one of the largest and most important branches of domestic industry in the United States, and is at the present time, like other manufacturing interests, greatly suffering from overproduction. A legitimate business from which large revenues are derived, it is not only depressed by overproduction, but by being burdened by heavy taxes the payment of which, as is the case with no other article, is required within a fixed period, whatever may be the condition of the market. In other words, the present whisky tax is a tax upon production, and is thus in contravention of the general policy of our own Government, and of the policy of other enlightened nations which derive large revenues from articles of a similar character.

Under existing laws the manufacturers or holders of whisky are compelled to pay a tax amounting to nearly five times its cost upon an article before it is withdrawn from warehouse for consumption, or to export it, at great expense, to be held in foreign countries until there is a home demand for it, or to be sold in such countries, to the prejudice of our public revenues. Some nations have been unwise enough to resort for revenue to export duties upon their own productions. The United States stands alone in enforcing the payment of tax upon one of its chief productions before there is a demand for it for consumption.

These considerations, in my judgment, should be sufficient to warrant such a change in existing laws as is contemplated by the bill herewith presented; but I should not feel at liberty at the present time to recommend the subject to the consideration of Congress if the general trade of the country were in a healthy condition. There are now in bond about 48,000,000 gallons of whisky, on about 20,000,000 gallons of which a tax of 90 cents a gallon must be paid, under the existing laws, before the next session of Congress, unless the payment is avoided by exportation. On a large part of this whisky the banking institutions of the Western States hold liens which stand in the way of its export, and the indications now are that unless the laws are changed the general distress which prevails throughout the country will be greatly aggravated by forced sales, which might not even cover the taxes.

On the other hand, the relief proposed by this bill would, in my judgment, tend to remove the dependency which so generally prevails, and open the way for the gradual improvement of other languishing industries. The relief can be granted without detriment to the public revenues by merely putting whisky on the same footing with tobacco and beer; by an exaction of duties upon consumption instead of production—the only policy which is consistent with justice and sound economic principles. Whisky is manufactured for sale, and it will always be sold as soon as there is demand for it. There would be no gain to the Government by compulsory sales, while the revenues would suffer by its exportation. It is securely held, and every gallon will contribute 90 cents to the public revenues if it is left subject to the laws of trade. Ought anything more to be required?

The question thus briefly presented is a very important one in its bearings upon public revenues and business generally. In the consideration of it the cause of temperance (worthy as that cause is of hearty approval) ought not to be involved. It will neither be aided nor retarded by the proposed change in existing laws. As long as the manufacture of whisky is lawful, it should be treated with even-handed justice. It can not be otherwise treated without detriment to the public welfare.

I recommend the passage of this bill as a measure of simple justice to the manufacturers and holders of whisky, which could hardly fail to be beneficial to general trade, and, consequently, to the Treasury.

Very respectfully,

H. MCCULLOCH, Secretary.

The SPEAKER of the House of Representatives.

THE INCOME TAX.

Mr. President, the proposition contained in the pending bill to levy a tax of 2 per cent on all net incomes of corporations and of individuals in excess of \$4,000 per annum is so just and equitable towards the hard-working taxpayers of meager resources throughout the entire country that not a word in its defense or explanation would seem necessary here or anywhere else. But the narrow and corroding selfishness of riches has been aroused by this simple measure of justice into fierce resentment and contention. We hear on all hands the dictatorial voice of individual and corporate wealth demanding that it shall not be disturbed by the slightest touch of the taxgatherer, whatever may be the demands of the Government, or the oppression of the toiling masses.

On all the wants and necessities of life the man of wealth, with a heavy income, pays less rates of tariff tax under existing laws than the laboring man or laboring woman whose wearing apparel is of coarser material, and whose household living is supplied with cheaper goods bearing higher rates of duty. His bonds, his accumulated riches of all kinds, and all incomes arising from them, are exempt from all Government burdens, remaining not only undiminished and unmolested amidst darkened homes and flagrant distress, but growing fatter, stronger, and more defiant as the days and the years go by. He who has spent his life in making an amassment of wealth looks out upon the poor, tired, toiling world as if from a fortified castle. He feels himself sumptuously provisioned against all wants, and amply protected against all contact or concern with the labor-stained millions who struggle from one ocean to the other for the means of existence.

Sir, for no earthly consideration would I paint an unjust or overwrought picture of the dangerous pretensions and intolerable arrogance of accumulated wealth now manifest in this country, but, speaking in the fear of my Maker, I devoutly believe that the limit of endurance has been reached; that the time has come for a test to be made between the power of hoarded money and the power of productive labor; that the people from this time forward, more than ever before, will organize and take rapid and heroic measures against the continued and brutal dictation of the plutocracy, against the paramount



influence of wealth, against the rule and supremacy of the rich in shaping the financial policy of this Government in their own interests.

Let no man imagine, or lay the flattering unction to his soul, that party names or party ties will bind the American people on this question, or compel their submission to the financial servitude sought to be fastened on them by the power of colossal wealth. And when the contest comes, as it will speedily, and in many ways and forms, the bankers, money-changers, usurers, and possessors of millions who have provoked it will stand aghast at the consequences of their own folly: they will figuratively, if not literally, cry out for the rocks and hills to hide them from the wrath of an outraged people. A 2 per cent tax on a portion of their incomes will appear, in the hour of reckoning, a very small and trifling matter compared to others more serious. But unto that day, now near at hand, I remit the further discussion of what it may bring forth, and proceed with the point immediately in hand.

In considering an income tax the most extraordinary and startling fact we discover, is the very small number of people to whom it applies. I well remember when the able Senator from Colorado [Mr. TELLER] in 1890 declared on this floor that while the population of the United States would at that time reach 65,000,000, yet at least one-half of the entire wealth "of this, the richest country on the globe," was owned by not more than 100,000 of its inhabitants. The wealth of the world has in all ages been condensed into the hands of the privileged and favored few, who thereby seek to become the governing class; and this has been more especially true and striking during the last thirty years in this country than in any other known to history.

The Commissioner of Internal Revenue in a recent communication to the Ways and Means Committee of the House estimates the present population of the United States at not less than 65,000,000 and the wealth of the country at \$65,000,000,000, or an average of \$1,000 per capita, if there was an equal distribution. His further estimate, however, is that so great has been the condensation of capital into the ownership of a small and powerful class that the tax here proposed on incomes of over \$4,000 will reach only about 85,000 individuals and corporations out of the more than 65,000,000 who now inhabit this land of boasted liberty and equality.

Sir, these figures may well give the country pause. They recall the worst days of Rome, and of other governments, both ancient and modern, whose liberties were lost by the accumulation and power of wealth in the hands of patrician aristocracies. How small in number is the income class in the United States, yet how potent! How few in comparison with the great body of the people, but little more than one in a thousand, yet how aggressive and strong! How pretentious, how presumptuous in dictation to the Government in regard to all its policies, yet how unpatriotic in the hour of peril, how mean in the face of danger to the country! The income class, based upon the principal ownership of the entire wealth of the country, is mainly the illegitimate offspring of Government paternalism and Government support, yet neither gratitude nor love of country has ever moved it to respond in aid of the Government in an hour of emergency and need. From no other class could the payment of the whole pension roll be required so justly.

Sir, I am loth to say these things, but so destructive to human happiness, so unjust, relentless, unsparing, insolent, and brutal has been the money power in these later days, and indeed for years past that rather than leave them undid I would cheerfully leave my seat on this floor to be occupied by someone else.

What shall be said of one of the leading arguments always urged against the enactment of an income tax? We are gravely informed that such a tax can not be collected because of the wholesale perjury which income owners will commit in order to evade the law. I was a member of the House when the income-tax law of 1862 was repealed. I listened to this plea of infamy at that time, and it increased the pleasure with which I voted to keep the law on our statute books, as it will now to vote to put it back again. If the criminal classes of the country or those of assumed respectability can defeat the enactment of laws by threatening to commit crime in their violation, then, indeed, have we reached a depth of degradation far beyond the hand or the power of resurrection.

I will believe nothing so infamous of the Congress of the United States as its submission to a threat so atrocious, or an argument so revolting. It is also seemingly incredible that the owners of taxable incomes should allow such an argument to be made in their behalf; and yet all is silent, and no word of protest is heard when in their very presence it is declared and urged that they will commit felony, general and widespread, and for which the convict stripes of a penitentiary are the only

punishment, in order to defeat the execution of a law taxing incomes, if one should be enacted. What a spectacle is here presented! I mourn and lament to look upon it. In the course of a life, now no longer a short one, I have believed in the predominating good, rather than the predominating evil of the human race.

I have looked with a hopeful, trustful eye upon the efforts of my fellow-beings to become better, wiser, kinder, purer; and with a helping hand, though feeble it has been, I have tried to aid them forward. I confess that I am shocked, inexpressibly shocked, to be assured now by gentlemen of great ability and high position that the principal property holders and income owners of the United States are ready, for the sake of defrauding the Government out of a small pittance, to blacken their souls with the detestable crime of false swearing; to render themselves fit associates for thieves, housebreakers, forgers, and cut-throats in the prison houses of this world, and to become everlasting inhabitants of hell in the world to come.

My great and only consolation is in the fact that the income class, thus stigmatized and depicted by its friends, in colors so dark, foul, and hideous, is so few in number and bears so small a proportion to the mighty mass of glorious men and women who live under the flag and uphold its honor. Judas Iscariot could not discredit the apostles of the blessed Master; Benedict Arnold failed to tarnish the honor of the Revolution, and those who are willing to perjure themselves to escape taxes can not shake my faith in the integrity of my countrymen, or in the predominating virtue, goodness, and purity of the human race.

But I deny that an income-tax law, properly adjusted and guarded, can be rendered incapable of execution by the most expert villainy that may be threatened or practiced against it. The experience of the Government is the other way. Under a law of this kind, the records in the Treasury show that the collections from 1862 to 1870, for the support of the Government, amounted to the sum of \$346,000,000, an average of \$43,250,000 per annum during the eight years of its existence. This does not look like a general escape from the operations of the law had been at all successful. It was a large and gratifying sum of money, paid no doubt amidst cursings and gnashing of teeth, but with a wholesome regard for the open doors of Sing Sing and other convenient criminal resorts.

We hear also the unmeaning, senseless, inane cry that an income tax is undemocratic, un-American. This argument is based on the noisy and resounding charge that an income tax is inquisitorial in its character and operations. Permit me to ask what tax was ever collected without inquiry and inquisition into the nature or value of the article taxed? Without such inquiry no tax, whether in Federal or State government could ever be collected. If there is to be no inquiry or inquisition into property interests subject to taxation, the taxgatherer can be entirely at once and forever dispensed with. The Ways and Means Committee of the House in reporting on this point very justly said:

In the collection of our customs duties the packages, boxes, and baggage of the citizens are taken, opened, and inspected. The citizen, whether male or female, is often taken into a room and searched. In the collection of State, county, and municipal taxes in most of the States of the Union the citizen is required to make sworn returns concerning his property—its value, nature, and whereabouts. Nothing in this bill is more inquisitorial than the provisions of law now enforced every day. To guard against improper disclosures of the taxpayers' business the bill provides that no officer is allowed to disclose any fact he ascertains concerning the property or business of the taxpayer. If he does so he is liable to removal, and is fined and imprisoned.

If all other classes of men and women in the United States can submit to the laws of their country on the subject of taxation, there is no reason to my mind why the owner of a net income of over \$4,000 a year should fail to obey. A man with a large fortune has more need of protection by law than his impoverished neighbor; hence, he owes more to the support and the enforcement of the law. It is pure and simple equity that he should pay a tax on his realized wealth in return for the Government care and protection against lawlessness, which he incessantly claims, and which is incessantly bestowed. Why should such a system be stigmatized as un-American, undemocratic? What is there in our system of government, or in the democratic principles on which it is founded, that exempts the rich from contributing to its support according to their means? Those in poverty have to do this: why not those who have a net surplus of wealth at the end of every year? Is justice un-American? Is equality before the law, and in the enjoyment of natural rights, undemocratic?

Sir, the first income tax known to history was of a higher origin "than aught assigned to earth," nor was it a feather-weight enactment such as we now propose. For the support of his own government among the children of men in the beginning, the Supreme Ruler of the universe tithed His whole people—taxed them one-tenth of their entire possessions: nor did statesmen



and lawgivers of the school of Moses, Aaron, and Joshua, and of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob denounce its principles, or threaten it with criminal violation. From that high and ancient day to the present time a tax on incomes has been no novelty or mere experiment in the history of governments. Such a tax has always been regarded as a measure of relief to the working classes, while at the same time inflicting no injustice on those best able to pay it, and having the greatest interest in the stability of government and the supremacy of law.

Mr. HILL. Will the Senator from Indiana allow me to ask him a question?

Mr. VOORHEES. I decline to yield. I will say to the Senator from New York with the utmost possible respect. Before beginning my remarks, I went to the Presiding Officer and told him I was not feeling at all well to-day and begged to be excused from interruptions. I will answer any question hereafter.

Mr. HILL. I simply desired to ask the Senator a question that I might understand his position on the subject of the income tax.

Mr. VOORHEES. I should be very glad to yield to the Senator under other circumstances.

#### WOOL AND MANUFACTURES OF WOOL.

Sir, I come next to talk for a few moments to woolgrowers and to the wearers of wool. This is an old theme, but one that will never lose its interest for civilized people. In the higher and colder latitudes of the earth's surface, sunlight, air, fire, salt, and water are hardly of more prime necessity to human existence than wearing apparel made of wool. A tax on the breath of life would not more surely exact its own payment or be of more universal application. A tax on the only spring in a wide desert of burning sand or on the only salt well in a wilderness would hardly be a worse monopoly, or lead to extortions more oppressive in the hands of a private protected individual, than a tax on woolen goods in use by the human family.

How vividly every stage of human life appears to the reflective mind, and how absolutely and universally this one great article is interwoven with them all! From the new-born babe in soft, warm flannel, on through all the years, until the gray-haired grandfather or grandmother sinks to rest in the grave, the fabric made of wool is never absent from the domestic uses of men, women, and children. Duties on manufactures of wool, their enormous rates often obscured and hidden by the specific system, have always constituted the very Gibraltar of high protection in this country.

With this fortress of greed and gain, dedicated now to the plunder and spoliation of the people, once overthrown the whole system of tariff protection will receive its death blow and totter to its earthly fall. A mighty advance towards such a result is made by the bill now before the Senate. In the list of reductions proposed by the bill it is most gratifying to be able to announce that the reduction of duties on woolen wear leads all others, and that wool itself is transferred to the free list. The reductions on iron, steel, lead, copper, zinc, and other metals are placed at \$12,500,000, while a reduction of \$23,500,000 is placed to the credit of the people on their woolen clothing and woolen household supplies.

Sir, we are traveling in the right direction, and though we may not finish our journey in a single day, as some eager and inexperienced guides think we might, still we are in the right road and far on the way, in spite of all the obstacles and dangers by which we have been beset. By the passage of the pending bill many millions of hard-earned money will be saved to the pockets of the people. We hear much in these days about pledges which were made to the people by the Democratic party in 1892. We promised a reduction of tariff taxation, and we are making it in no stinted measure. Edmund Burke defined statesmanship as the science of circumstances, and when this bill becomes a law all I shall ask is that it shall be judged by the fruits it will bear for the homes and happiness of the people, as well as by the circumstances under which it was brought forth.

But another point in connection with wool remains to be noticed. While making a heavy reduction on manufactures of wool, the raw material, or wools on the skin as they are described, have in the pending bill been put on the free list, and we are informed that thereby serious injury has been inflicted on the farmer and sheep-raiser. If I believed so I would not vote for the bill. My heart is very tender toward the farmer. I was born in one of his humble pioneer homes, near the edge of the wilderness. I engaged in all his daily work until I approached the estate of manhood, and my hand has not now lost its cunning. I can yet go into the field, and sometimes do with some comrade of my youth, and plow and sow, and reap, and mow, for a brief spell, in memory of working days long ago. I love the farmer, and am more at home with him than with any other class

of people the sun shines on. I love to wander over old homesteads, and hear him talk of his horses, his cows, his oxen, his sheep, his hogs, his barnyard poultry, his swarming bees, and of his growing corn, his ripening wheat, his meadow lands, his orchards, and his gardens, and indeed of everything that pertains to farm life.

Sir, I repeat that if I believed wool on the free list would hurt the farmer I would not vote for the pending bill. It is a matter of actual demonstration, however, which has been often made, that free wool, accompanied by such reduced rates as can then be placed on manufactures of wool, and which are placed on them in this bill, is one of the greatest blessings that can befall the farmer. If the farmer should get an increased price for his wool by reason of a tariff for its protection, he will pay it all out, and much more, to the manufacturer as a duty on woolen goods when he next buys a flannel shirt, an overcoat, or a pair of trousers. Some years ago I stated my views on this point, and I may be pardoned for repeating a few lines of what I then said.

Take the case of a farmer with fifty head of sheep which at shearing time yield him 250 pounds of wool. The duty proposed by the bill before us on imported wool of the same grade is 11 cents per pound. If that wool can be sold for 35 cents per pound, it will bring the farmer \$87.50 all told, \$27.50 of which sum will constitute the protection afforded by the 11 cents per pound tariff duty on foreign wool. But when the farmer in the fall or winter purchases back \$87.50 worth of the wool he sold, and of his neighbors' protected wool, now manufactured into blankets, flannels, and clothing of all kinds, he will find himself not only refunding the \$27.50 which he swallowed as a most alluring bait, but he will pay in addition all the way from 33 to 238 per cent ad valorem on every article of woolen goods he is compelled to have, and this enormous plunder of his hard earnings he is coolly informed is for the protection of the manufacturer who has worked his 250 pounds of wool into cloth.

A bill of untaxed goods which he could buy for \$87.50, the amount received originally for his wool, will be rendered to him over the protected counter where he trades at from \$125 to \$200, according to the articles he calls for. While he is interested and entertained with the so-called protection he receives on his wool he is at the same time robbed of five times the amount for the benefit of a far different class from himself. While this bill seeks to tickle the farmer's fancy and divert his attention by putting \$10 into one of his pockets, the privileged and adroit monopolist will be taking \$50 out of his other pocket.

But I deny that a high tariff on wool has ever even temporarily been a benefit to the woolgrower, or the sheep-raiser. Twenty-seven years ago the woolgrowers and the manufacturers of wool throughout the United States formed a sort of mutual benefit association and secured the passage of the act of 1867, putting an all-round, ironclad, high-protective tariff on wool. The mutual benefit, however, of the scheme totally failed. There was no mutuality about it. The manufacturer's class in general has grown rich; the farmer's class in general has remained poor. The price of wool has in the main steadily declined ever since the act of 1867. In 1867 the price of wool was 68 cents per pound; in 1888, twenty-one years later, it had made a decline of just one-half, and stood at 34 cents per pound; all this time under high Republican tariff protection.

Under the operations of the McKinley law the condition of the farmer is infinitely and indescribably worse. How can the advocate of protection explain that with a tariff of 11 cents per pound wool is selling now not only lower than ever before in the markets of the United States, but at less than one-half the amount of the duty paid for its protection, the outside price to the manufacturer in New York being 74 cents per pound. This is the most miserable and disgraceful showing to be found in all the wretched history of tariff protection! What farmer does not feel its shame and humiliation?

But what has also been the effect on the sheep-raiser as well as on the woolgrower? Have the flocks increased on a thousand hills by virtue of the combination between wool producers and manufacturers of wool in behalf of a high tariff so many years ago? On the contrary, in 1867 the farmers of the four States of Pennsylvania, Ohio, Illinois, and Michigan owned 16,846,750 head of sheep. Twenty-one years afterwards, in 1888, the people of these same four great States owned but 6,018,784 head of sheep, a loss of 10,827,966, and were selling their wool at exactly one-half the price it formerly realized. I have not examined the census returns for 1890 on this subject, but the whole world knows that the situation has not been improved but deeply degraded by Republican high-tariff legislation, so far as the farmer is concerned, during the last seven years and during many years prior thereto. His fortunes have been downward, and with every tariff law now in existence of Republican design and origin they will continue in the same direction.

It seems to be out of the eternal fitness of things for the farmer, the tiller of the soil, the inhabitant of the fields, canopied by the free open heavens, and the intimate associate of nature, to prosper by the artificial and unfair processes of protection, whether the protection is aimed in his favor or against him. He belongs to a wholly different system; he is the offspring of more natural and more upright influences than were ever known to dwell in the scheming schedules of a protective tariff. The principle of tariff protection, come in what shape it may, is to him a poison



and a curse. He sells his produce in the unprotected markets of the world, and it is his right to buy in the same. What he most needs is the lowest taxation possible on everything he touches, and the nearest approach to an absolute freedom of trade consistent with a proper revenue for the support of his government.

When the day shall dawn in which the farmer, the mechanic, and the wage-worker shall alike have the right and the privilege to go into the open, liberated markets of the land and buy where their hard-earned money will buy most for their wants, with none to molest, to assess, to levy, to take toll, or to tax, then indeed will the millenium of labor have come, and all the sons and daughters of toil shall rise up and call their Government blessed.

Sir, this is the birthday of Thomas Jefferson. One hundred and fifty-one years ago to-day he came into the world the greatest emancipator of thought, philosopher of liberty, and teacher of the natural rights of man ever known in human history. The blows he struck for freedom, justice, and equality in government are yet resounding throughout the earth, and they will never cease to be heard until the last shackle of privilege and tyranny is broken. Ten days before his soul took flight from his mountain home he wrote his parting words to his own countrymen and to all the races of mankind. With this great dying message before us, and in its spirit, we take new courage and go on with our work. "All eyes are open, or opening," he said, "to the rights of man. The general spread of the light of science has already laid open to every view the palpable truth, that the mass of mankind has not been born with saddles on their backs, nor a favored few bootied and spurred, ready to ride them legitimately by the grace of God." Hail, mighty message, and hail its speedy and certain fulfillment! All hail the counsels of Thomas Jefferson in this hour of caste based on wealth, of privilege granted by law, and of monopoly fastened on the slavery of labor! [Applause in the galleries.]

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Chair desires to remind the occupants of the galleries that any demonstrations of approbation or disapprobation are in violation of the rules of the Senate and will not be permitted. If the offense is repeated the Chair will feel compelled to order the galleries to be cleared.

Mr. ALLISON obtained the floor.

Mr. CALL. I ask the Senator from Iowa if it will be agreeable to him to give way to me that I may move an executive session?

Mr. ALLISON. It will be agreeable to me to yield to the Senator for that purpose.

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

Mr. GRAY. Before that motion is put, I should like unanimous consent to remind the Senator from Florida that the Senator from Alabama [Mr. MORGAN], who is not now in his seat, had asked unanimous consent to bring to the attention of the Senate an important matter at this hour.

Mr. MORGAN entered the Chamber.

Mr. GRAY. The Senator from Alabama is now here.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Florida withdraw his motion?

Mr. CALL. I will withdraw the motion if the Senator from Alabama desires me to do so.

Mr. MORGAN. I am informed by the clerks that the bill which was reported this morning by me from the Committee on Foreign Relations, and partly acted upon, will be printed and delivered here in the course of probably ten minutes. If the executive session desired by the Senator from Florida is to be a brief one, of course it will make no difference.

I understand that the order of the Senate this morning, by unanimous consent, was that the Bering Sea bill should be taken up at this hour. I am willing to yield, however, for a few moments of executive session if that will answer the purposes of the Senator from Florida. How much time will the Senator desire?

Mr. CALL. I can not tell how long the executive session will last, but I suppose there will be time enough after its conclusion for the Senator's bill to come up and be disposed of.

Mr. MORGAN. I am ready to go on with the bill, and I ask that it be laid before the Senate.

Mr. HOAR. Has the bill come from the Printer?

Mr. MORGAN. I understand it will be here in a few moments.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Chair will state to the Senator from Alabama that the bill was sent to the Printing Office to be printed and has not yet been returned.

Mr. MORGAN. I suppose we shall be compelled to await the arrival of the bill, and so I yield to the Senator from Florida for an executive session.

#### EXECUTIVE SESSION.

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

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The question is on the motion of the Senator from Florida.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business. After one hour and twenty-one minutes spent in executive session the doors were reopened, and (at 5 o'clock and 24 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until to-morrow, Tuesday, April 3, 1894, at 12 o'clock m.

#### NOMINATIONS.

*Executive nominations received by the Senate April 2, 1894.*

##### UNITED STATES ATTORNEY.

Andrew Jackson Sawyer, of Nebraska, to be attorney of the United States for the district of Nebraska, vice Benjamin S. Baker, whose term expired January 20, 1894.

##### PUBLIC PRINTER.

Thomas E. Benedict, of New York, to be Public Printer, vice Frank W. Palmer, resigned.

##### INTERSTATE COMMERCE COMMISSIONER.

James D. Yeomans, of Iowa, to be an Interstate Commerce Commissioner, for the term ending December 31, 1898, vice James W. McDill, deceased.

##### RECORDER OF DEEDS.

Charles H. J. Taylor, of Kansas, to be recorder of deeds in the District of Columbia, vice Blanche K. Bruce, resigned.

##### COLLECTORS OF CUSTOMS.

Charles R. Bisbee, of Florida, to be collector of customs for the district of St. Johns, in the State of Florida, to succeed Joseph E. Lee, whose term of office has expired by limitation.

Emil Olund, of Minnesota, to be collector of customs for the district of Duluth, in the State of Minnesota, to succeed Charles F. Johnson, whose term of office has expired by limitation.

John A. Wilson, of New Jersey, to be collector of customs for the district of Burlington, in the State of New Jersey, to succeed Alfred C. Barwis, whose term of office has expired by limitation.

John D. Davis, of North Carolina, to be collector of customs for the district of Beaufort, in the State of North Carolina, to succeed Edward C. Duncan, whose term of office has expired by limitation.

##### CONSULS.

John Bidlake, of North Dakota, to be consul of the United States at Barranquilla, to fill a vacancy.

Richard M. Burke, of Illinois, to be consul of the United States at Chihuahua, to fill a vacancy.

James H. Dinsmore, of Texas, to be consul of the United States at Cienfuegos, Cuba, vice Henry A. Ehninger, recalled.

George R. Ernst, of Wisconsin, to be consul of the United States at Reichenberg, Bohemia, vice C. Hugo Jacobi, resigned.

William C. Foster, of Arizona, to be consul of the United States at Trinidad, West Indies, vice William P. Pierce, recalled.

Walter R. Henry, of North Carolina, to be consul of the United States at Curacao, West Indies, vice Leonard B. Smith, recalled.

Clifford Smyth, of New York, to be consul of the United States at Cartagena, Colombia, vice Clayton I. Croft, recalled.

##### REGISTER OF LAND OFFICE.

Joseph F. Heiner, of Gunnison, Colo., to be register of the land office at Gunnison, Colo., vice Henry C. Olney, whose term of office will expire April 14, 1894.

##### RECEIVERS OF PUBLIC MONEYS.

Louis Grasmuck, of Gunnison, Colo., to be receiver of public moneys at Gunnison, Colo., vice Henry F. Lake, term expired.

James A. Munday, of Vancouver, Wash., to be receiver of public moneys at Vancouver, Wash., vice Scott Swetland, term expired.

##### POSTMASTERS.

John H. Dyer, to be postmaster at Winchester, in the county of Scott and State of Illinois, in the place of Harry Sanderson, whose commission expired December 21, 1893.

Edward L. Simpson, to be postmaster at Carrollton, in the county of Greene and State of Illinois, in the place of James Lynn, whose commission expired December 21, 1893.

Charles F. Duncombe, to be postmaster at Fort Dodge, in the county of Webster and State of Iowa, in the place of Cyrus C. Carpenter, whose commission expired January 8, 1894.

Richard B. Hall, to be postmaster at Red Oak, in the county of Montgomery and State of Iowa, in the place of Henry H. Palmer, whose commission expired December 21, 1893.

Patrick Morrissey, to be postmaster at Alta, in the county of Buena Vista and State of Iowa, in the place of John E. Pickering, whose commission expired January 8, 1894.

George A. Collett, to be postmaster at Ellsworth, in the county



of Elsworth and State of Kansas, in the place of George Huycke, whose commission expired February 19, 1894.

A. J. Davis, to be postmaster at Wa Keeney, in the county of Trego and State of Kansas, in the place of Andrew J. Harlan, whose commission expired March 4, 1894.

George W. Farrelly, to be postmaster at Chanute, in the county of Neosho and State of Kansas, in the place of Cyrus T. Nixon, removed.

George Hill, to be postmaster at Independence, in the county of Montgomery and State of Kansas, in the place of Ebenezer E. Wilson, whose commission expired January 9, 1894.

George Innes, to be postmaster at Lawrence, in the county of Douglas and State of Kansas, in the place of E. F. Goodrich, whose commission expired January 9, 1894.

Ebenezer M. Lockwood, to be postmaster at Burlington, in the county of Coffey and State of Kansas, in the place of Squire M. Lane, whose commission expired December 19, 1893.

Frank B. Ober, to be postmaster at Washington, in the county of Washington and State of Kansas, in the place of Hardy C. Robinson, whose commission expired January 9, 1894.

Will E. Stoke, to be postmaster at Great Bend, in the county of Barton and State of Kansas, in the place of Morgan Caraway, whose commission expired February 12, 1894.

Christina D. Fosdick, to be postmaster at Groton, in the county of Middlesex and State of Massachusetts, in the place of Christina D. Fosdick, whose commission expired January 20, 1894.

James Ingalls, to be postmaster at Methuen, in the county of Essex and State of Massachusetts, in the place of John E. Sawyer, whose commission expired February 23, 1894.

Frank E. Nichols, to be postmaster at Warren, in the county of Worcester and State of Massachusetts, in the place of Frank E. Nichols, whose commission expired January 16, 1894.

Reuben K. Lawyer, to be postmaster at Wellesley, in the county of Norfolk and State of Massachusetts, in the place of Reuben K. Lawyer, whose commission expired January 28, 1894.

James S. Wallace, to be postmaster at Rockport, in the county of Essex and State of Massachusetts, in the place of Andrew F. Clark, whose commission expired February 14, 1894.

William J. Wallace, to be postmaster at Norwood, in the county of Norfolk and State of Massachusetts, in the place of William J. Wallace, whose commission expired March 7, 1894.

Theron L. Arnold, to be postmaster at Three Rivers, in the county of St. Joseph and State of Michigan, in the place of George A. Cook, whose commission expires April 11, 1894.

Hiram W. George, to be postmaster at Pipestone, in the county of Pipestone and State of Minnesota, in the place of Ebenezer A. Rice, whose commission expired December 21, 1893.

Otto A. Kohler, to be postmaster at Hutchinson, in the county of McLeod and State of Minnesota, in the place of Oliver D. Hutchinson, whose commission expired March 7, 1894.

Dennis McLaughlin, to be postmaster at Waseca, in the county of Waseca and State of Minnesota, in the place of James A. Claghorn, whose commission expired March 29, 1894.

Thomas Keenan, to be postmaster at Brookhaven, in the county of Lincoln and State of Mississippi, in the place of Jennie R. Tyler, whose commission expired December 21, 1893.

Emerson S. Beeman, to be postmaster at Miles City, in the county of Custer and State of Montana, in the place of Charles W. Syde, whose commission expired March 20, 1894.

Robert J. Coles, to be postmaster at York, in the county of York and State of Nebraska, in the place of Horton M. Detrick, whose commission expired December 21, 1893.

Emma J. Grafft, to be postmaster at Orleans, in the county of Harlan and State of Nebraska, in the place of Patrick W. Fennessey, whose commission expired February 12, 1894.

A. T. Hill, to be postmaster at Lyons, in the county of Burt and State of Nebraska, in the place of Walter D. Smith, resigned.

Frank H. Daniell, to be postmaster at Franklin Falls, in the county of Merrimack and State of New Hampshire, whose commission expired January 28, 1894.

Edward Finerty, to be postmaster at Milford, in the county of Hillsboro and State of New Hampshire, in the place of John W. Crosby, whose commission expired February 25, 1894.

Thomas E. Fletcher, to be postmaster at Tilton, in the county of Belknap and State of New Hampshire, in the place of Otis C. Wyatt, whose commission expired February 4, 1894.

Thomas L. Wadleigh, to be postmaster at Meredith, in the county of Belknap and State of New Hampshire, in the place of Francis H. Cram, whose commission expired February 4, 1894.

John G. Smith, sr., to be postmaster at Boundbrook, in the county of Somerset and State of New Jersey, in the place of William B. R. Mason, whose commission expired December 20, 1893.

John W. Thompson, to be postmaster at Cape May, in the county of Cape May and State of New Jersey, in the place of F. L. Richardson, whose commission expired December 20, 1893.

Frederick G. Wiese, to be postmaster at Bordentown, in the county of Burlington and State of New Jersey, in the place of J. W. Allen, whose commission expired March 4, 1894.

Horatio Judah, to be postmaster at Port Richmond, in the county of Richmond and State of New York, in the place of Frank Foggin, whose commission expired December 19, 1893.

Clarence S. McClellan, to be postmaster at Mount Vernon, in the county of Westchester and State of New York, in the place of Henry Huss, whose commission expired December 21, 1893.

George H. Perkins, to be postmaster at Rochester, in the county of Monroe and State of New York, in the place of John A. Reynolds, whose commission expired March 20, 1894.

George F. Van Dam, to be postmaster at Tompkinsville, in the county of Richmond and State of New York, in the place of Andrew H. Bowman, whose commission expired March 13, 1894.

William E. Harrison, to be postmaster at Rockingham, in the county of Richmond and State of North Carolina, in the place of Daniel M. Morrison, removed.

Enoch F. Lamb, to be postmaster at Elizabeth City, in the county of Pasquotank and State of North Carolina, in the place of Charles Guirkin, whose commission expired February 6, 1894.

Lebbers Belford, to be postmaster at Caldwell, in the county of Noble and State of Ohio, in the place of Azariah C. Cooper, whose commission expired December 19, 1893.

John L. Davis, to be postmaster at Shawnee, in the county of Perry and State of Ohio, in the place of Roger Richards, deceased.

William T. Haviland, to be postmaster at Bellefontaine, in the county of Logan and State of Ohio, in the place of Isaac N. Zearing, whose commission expired January 16, 1894.

Oscar N. Marihugh, to be postmaster at Middleport, in the county of Meigs and State of Ohio, in the place of William A. Barringer, whose commission expired February 14, 1894.

George H. Moody, to be postmaster at Mechanicsburg, in the county of Champaign and State of Ohio, in the place of Charles T. Baxter, whose commission expired February 25, 1894.

John W. Morrow, to be postmaster at Ada, in the county of Hardin and State of Ohio, in the place of John M. Bentley, resigned.

Patrick H. Murphy, to be postmaster at Ashland, in the county of Ashland and State of Ohio, in the place of Milton B. De Shong, whose commission expired March 24, 1894.

Ulrich B. Newman, to be postmaster at Greenfield, in the county of Highland and State of Ohio, in the place of Jeremiah Kerr, whose commission expired March 20, 1894.

Oscar D. Pocock, to be postmaster at Camden, in the county of Preble and State of Ohio, in the place of Oliver P. Brown, resigned.

G. Frew Pollock, to be postmaster at Cardington, in the county of Morrow and State of Ohio, in the place of Charles S. Warren, whose commission expired February 28, 1894.

C. L. Russell, to be postmaster at Mount Gilead, in the county of Morrow and State of Ohio, in the place of Alfred H. Breese, whose commission expired March 20, 1894.

James Trotter, to be postmaster at Steubenville, in the county of Jefferson and State of Ohio, in the place of James F. Sarratt, whose commission expired March 4, 1894.

Harry E. Bonsall, to be postmaster at Mifflintown, in the county of Juniata and State of Pennsylvania, in the place of James McCauley, whose commission expired December 21, 1893.

Enoch Enochs, to be postmaster at Ardmore, in the county of Montgomery and State of Pennsylvania, in the place of Henry Andrews, resigned.

John L. Garrett, to be postmaster at Chester, in the county of Delaware and State of Pennsylvania, in the place of Robert Chadwick, whose commission expired December 20, 1893.

James M. Goodhart, to be postmaster at Lewistown, in the county of Mifflin and State of Pennsylvania, in the place of Joseph L. McKinney, whose commission expired December 20, 1893.

Lewis C. Moses, to be postmaster at West Chester, in the county of Chester and State of Pennsylvania, in the place of Herbert P. Worth, whose commission expired January 21, 1894.

George W. Semans, to be postmaster at Uniontown, in the county of Fayette and State of Pennsylvania, in the place of Robert J. Patterson, whose commission expired February 27, 1894.

William K. Wright, to be postmaster at Renovo, in the county of Clinton and State of Pennsylvania, in the place of W. Kipp Chestnut, whose commission will expire April 16, 1894.

Joseph S. McKenzie, to be postmaster at Florence, in the county of Florence and State of South Carolina, in the place of Joshua E. Wilson, whose commission expired March 24, 1894.

Lewis M. Moore, to be postmaster at Greenwood, in the county of Abbeville and State of South Carolina, in the place of Robert R. Tolbert, removed.

Alfred D. Tinsley, to be postmaster at Sioux Falls, in the



county of Minnehaha and State of South Dakota, in the place of B. F. Campbell, whose commission expired December 21, 1893.

James R. Neely, to be postmaster at Franklin, in the county of Williamson and State of Tennessee, in the place of C. S. Moss, whose commission expired March 20, 1894.

J. D. Bates, to be postmaster at Denton, in the county of Denton and State of Texas, in the place of Charles H. Clement, whose commission expired February 11, 1894.

John H. Crinford, to be postmaster at Alvarado, in the county of Johnson and State of Texas, in the place of George W. Cotter, whose commission expires April 11, 1894.

J. W. Ramsay, to be postmaster at Gonzales, in the county of Gonzales and State of Texas, in the place of William C. Baquet, whose commission expires April 11, 1894.

William J. Russell, to be postmaster at Brownsville, in the county of Cameron and State of Texas, in the place of John W. Hoyt, whose commission expired February 10, 1894.

Richard C. Cordell, to be postmaster at Park City, in the county of Summit and Territory of Utah, in the place of Frank E. Harding, whose commission expired December 21, 1893.

L. P. Carr, to be postmaster at Fairmont, in the county of Marion and State of West Virginia, in the place of Thomas Reed, whose commission expired March 20, 1894.

George H. Flagg, to be postmaster at Charlestown, in the county of Jefferson and State of West Virginia, in the place of Samuel H. Higinbotham, whose commission expired February 25, 1894.

William Mearns, to be postmaster at Buckhannon, in the county of Upshur and State of West Virginia, in the place of Clark W. Heavener, whose commission expires April 11, 1894.

J. E. B. Badlong, to be postmaster at Clinton, in the county of Rock and State of Wisconsin, in the place of Ralph W. Cheever, whose commission expired January 27, 1894.

Moses J. Downey, to be postmaster at Portage, in the county of Columbia and State of Wisconsin, in the place of George W. Morrison, whose commission expired December 20, 1893.

Gottfried H. Ely, to be postmaster at Mauston, in the county of Juneau and State of Wisconsin, in the place of Daniel C. Remington, whose commission expired March 29, 1894.

Arnold Wagener, to be postmaster at Sturgeon Bay, in the county of Door and State of Wisconsin, in the place of Joseph Harris, jr., whose commission expired March 20, 1894.

Thomas J. Dayton, to be postmaster at Laramie, in the county of Albany and State of Wyoming, in the place of Richard Butler, whose commission expired April 17, 1891.

#### WITHDRAWAL.

*Executive nomination withdrawn from the Senate April 2, 1894.*

Oney Carstarphen, of Denver, Colo., to be receiver of public moneys at Leadville, Colo., vice Willis L. Thompson, to be removed, which was sent to the Senate March 21, 1894, he having declined.

#### CONFIRMATIONS.

*Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate March 23, 1894.*

##### RECEIVERS OF PUBLIC MONEYS.

Aaron W. Elbeschutz, of Independence, Cal., to be receiver of public moneys at Independence, Cal.

John C. Neher, of Eau Claire, Wis., to be receiver of public moneys at Eau Claire, Wis.

##### REGISTERS OF THE LAND OFFICE.

Charles P. Blakeley, of Bozeman, Mont., to be register of the land office at Bozeman, Mont.

James Graham, of Coeur d'Alene, Idaho, to be register of the land office at Coeur d'Alene, Idaho.

Oliver H. Gallup, of Nevada, to be register of the land office at Carson City, Nev.

##### POSTMASTERS.

Jonah T. Howe, to be postmaster at Trumansburg, in the county of Tompkins and State of New York.

William R. Turney, to be postmaster at Greensburg, in the county of Westmoreland and State of Pennsylvania.

Creed F. Middlecoff, to be postmaster at Akron, in the county of Washington and State of Colorado.

Walter T. Lyon, to be postmaster at Selma, in the county of Fresno and State of California.

*Executive nomination confirmed by the Senate April 2, 1894.*

##### POSTMASTER.

Thomas Keenan, to be postmaster at Brookhaven, Lincoln County, Miss.

#### HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

MONDAY, April 2, 1894.

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

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

#### ELECTION CONTEST—O'NEILL VS. JOY.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the Chair will submit several executive communications.

Mr. PATTERSON. I call for the regular order.

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman object to the putting in of these executive communications?

Mr. PATTERSON. No, sir.

Mr. REED. If we are going to have the regular order, we may as well have it regularly.

Mr. PATTERSON. Very well.

The SPEAKER. The regular order is the further consideration of the contested election case of O'Neill against Joy. The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BURROWS] moved to reconsider the vote by which the House disagreed to the first substitute resolution. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SPRINGER] moved to lay the motion on the table; and on that the yeas and nays were ordered. The question now before the House is on the motion to lay on the table the motion to reconsider entered by the gentleman from Michigan. The Clerk will call the roll.

Mr. BURROWS. A parliamentary inquiry before the roll call commences. Is it in order for members to have their names entered on this roll call or any roll call, unless they actually answer during the call, or unless, being present, they fail to hear their names called?

The SPEAKER. It is not. The rule is very clear that no gentleman can have his name entered as voting upon a pending proposition unless he votes in the open House. Under a call of the House members, in accordance with the rule, may have their names entered by the Clerk after the roll call. But that is an entirely different case from this. Sometimes, perhaps, there has been some want of distinction in the minds of some members in regard to these two cases. But on a roll call on a pending proposition a member is only entitled to have his name recorded when he votes in the House at the time his name is called, or when, after the roll call, he states that he was present during the call and failed to hear his name. The Chair has given direction to the clerks that they shall not in any instance violate this rule, because it is a rule that every member is entitled to have strictly observed. The Clerk will call the roll.

Mr. REED. If I may say so without disrespect, such has not been the custom of the clerks at the desk; and it was precisely that which I was trying to prevent when the Speaker acted as he did.

The SPEAKER. The Chair was not informed of any violation of this rule. The Clerk will call the roll.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 147, nays 12 not voting 193; as follows:

#### YEAS—147.

Abbott,	Cooper, Tex.	Kribbs,	Richardson, Tenn.
Alderson,	Cox,	Kyle,	Ritchie,
Alexander,	Crawford,	Lane,	Robbins,
Allen,	Culberson,	Latimer,	Russell, Ga.
Bailey,	Cummings,	Lawson,	Sayers,
Baker, Kans.	Davey,	Layton,	Schermerhorn,
Baldwin,	Davis,	Lester,	Shell,
Bankhead,	Denson,	Lockwood,	Sickles,
Barwig,	Dinsmore,	Lynch,	Sperry,
Bell, Tex.	Dockery,	Mallory,	Springer,
Berry,	Dunn,	Martin, Ind.	Stallings,
Black, Ga.	Dunphy,	McCreary, Ky.	Stevens,
Bland,	Durbin,	McCulloch,	Strait,
Boatner,	Edmunds,	McDannold,	Straus,
Bower, N. C.	English,	McDermott,	Swanson,
Breckinridge, Ark.	Epes,	McEttrick,	Talbot, S. C.
Bretz,	Erdmat,	McGann,	Talbot, Md.
Brickner,	Fielder,	McKaig,	Tate,
Brookshire,	Geary,	McLaurin,	Taylor, Ind.
Brown,	Geissenhainer,	McNagay,	Terry,
Brynum,	Goldzier,	McRae,	Tracey,
Cadmus,	Gorman,	Meredith,	Tucker,
Caminetti,	Grady,	Meyer,	Turner, Ga.
Cannon, Cal.	Gresham,	Money,	Turner, Va.
Capehart,	Haines,	Montgomery,	Turpin,
Caruth,	Hall, Minn.	Moses,	Tyler,
Catchings,	Hammond,	Oates,	Warner,
Causey,	Hare,	O'Neill,	Weadock,
Clark, Mo.	Hatch,	Outwaite,	Wells,
Clarke, Ala.	Henderson, N. C.	Patterson,	Wheeler, Ala.
Cobb, Ala.	Hendrix,	Paynter,	Whiting,
Cobb, Mo.	Hines,	Pendleton, Tex.	Williams, Ill.
Cockrell,	Holman,	Pendleton, W. Va.	Williams, Miss.
Coffeen,	Hunter,	Piggott,	Wise,
Conn,	Hutcheson,	Reilly,	Wolverton,
Coombs,	Idrt,	Richards, Ohio	Woodard.
Cooper, Fla.	Jones,	Richardson, Minn.	



## NAYS—12.

Bryan,  
De Armond,  
Everett,

Hall, Mo.  
Harris,  
Hudson,

Kem,  
Marshall,  
McKeighan,

Morgan,  
Ryan,  
Sibley,

## NOT VOTING—193.

Adams, Ky.  
Adams, Pa.  
Aitken,  
Aldrich,  
Apsley,  
Arnold,  
Avery,  
Babeock,  
Baker, N. H.  
Barnes,  
Bartholdt,  
Bartlett,  
Belden,  
Bell, Colo.  
Beltzhoover,  
Bingham,  
Black, Ill.  
Blair,  
Boen,  
Bouelle,  
Bowers, Cal.  
Branch,  
Brattan,  
Breckinridge, Ky.  
Broderick,  
Brosius,  
Bundy,  
Bunn,  
Burnes,  
Burrows,  
Cabaniss,  
Caldwell,  
Campbell,  
Cannon, Ill.  
Chickering,  
Childs,  
Clancy,  
Cockran,  
Coggswell,  
Compton,  
Cooper, Ind.  
Cooper, Wis.  
Cornish,  
Cousins,  
Covert,  
Crain,  
Curtis, Kans.  
Curtis, N. Y.  
Dalzell,

Daniels,  
De Forest,  
Dingley,  
Dolliver,  
Donovan,  
Doolittle,  
Draper,  
Ellis, Ky.  
Ellis, Oregon  
Enloe,  
Fitchian,  
Fletcher,  
Forman,  
Funk,  
Funston,  
Graham,  
Gardner,  
Gear,  
Gillet, N. Y.  
Gillet, Mass.  
Goodnight,  
Graham,  
Griffin,  
Grosvenor,  
Groat,  
Grow,  
Hager,  
Hainer,  
Harner,  
Harter,  
Hartman,  
Haugen,  
Hayes,  
Heard,  
Heiner,  
Henderson, Ill.  
Henderson, Iowa  
Heppburn,  
Hermann,  
Hicks,  
Hilborn,  
Hitt,  
Hooker, Miss.  
Hooker, N. Y.  
Hopkins, Ill.  
Hopkins, Pa.  
Houk,  
Hulick,  
Hull,

Johnson, Ind.  
Johnson, N. Dak.  
Johnson, Ohio  
Joy,  
Kiefer,  
Kilgore,  
Lacey,  
Lapham,  
Lefever,  
Linton,  
Lisle,  
Livingston,  
Loud,  
Loudenslager,  
Lucas,  
Maddox,  
Magner,  
Magnife,  
Mahon,  
Marsh,  
Marvin, N. Y.  
McAleer,  
McCall,  
McCleary, Minn.  
McDowell,  
McMillin,  
McMillin,  
Mercer,  
Merger,  
Moon,  
Morse,  
Murray,  
Mutchler,  
Neill,  
Newlands,  
Northway,  
Page,  
Paschal,  
Payne,  
Pearson,  
Pence,  
Perkins,  
Phillips,  
Pickler,  
Post,  
Powers,  
Price,  
Quigg,  
Randall,

Ray,  
Rayner,  
Reed,  
Robertson, La.  
Robinson, Pa.  
Rusk,  
Russell, Conn.  
Scranton,  
Settle,  
Shaw,  
Sherman,  
Simpson,  
Sipe,  
Smith,  
Snodgrass,  
Somers,  
Stephenson,  
Stockdale,  
Stone, C. W.  
Stone, W. A.  
Stone, Ky.  
Storer,  
Strong,  
Sweet,  
Tarsney,  
Tawney,  
Taylor, Tenn.  
Thomas,  
Updegraff,  
Van Voorhis, N. Y.  
Van Voorhis, Ohio  
Wadsworth,  
Walker,  
Wanger,  
Washington,  
Waugh,  
Weaver,  
Wheeler, Ill.  
White,  
Wilson, Ohio  
Wilson, Wash.  
Wilson, W. Va.  
Woomer,  
Wright, Mass.  
Wright, Pa.

No quorum voting.

The following pairs were announced:

Mr. WILSON of West Virginia with Mr. DALZELL.

Mr. GOODNIGHT with Mr. CALDWELL.

Mr. COBB of Alabama with Mr. MCCALL.

Mr. BRATTAN with Mr. ADAMS of Kentucky.

Mr. ARNOLD with Mr. HOOKER of New York.

Mr. PAGE with Mr. MORSE.

Mr. LIVINGSTON with Mr. STORER.

Mr. HEARD with Mr. TAYLOR of Tennessee.

Mr. MADDOX with Mr. GROUT.

Mr. FORMAN with Mr. LUCAS.

Mr. ELLIS of Kentucky with Mr. HAUGEN.

Mr. BARNES with Mr. MCCLEARY of Minnesota.

Mr. GRAHAM with Mr. STRONG.

Mr. TARSNEY with Mr. GEAR.

Mr. STEVENS with Mr. VAN VOORHIS of New York.

Mr. COMPTON with Mr. LEFEVER.

Mr. SNODGRASS with Mr. HOUK.

Mr. BLACK of Illinois with Mr. ALDRICH.

Mr. Lisle with Mr. RANDALL.

Mr. VAN VOORHIS of Ohio, with Mr. PEARSON.

Mr. BARTLETT with Mr. DANIELS.

Mr. SOMERS with Mr. HARMER.

Mr. FYAN with Mr. LINTON.

Mr. BELTZHOOVER with Mr. WRIGHT of Massachusetts.

Mr. MUTCHLER with Mr. WRIGHT of Pennsylvania.

Mr. CRAIN with Mr. SCRANTON.

Mr. FITHIAN with Mr. BINGHAM.

Mr. CABANISS with Mr. POWERS.

Mr. RUSK with Mr. GILLET of New York.

Mr. COBB of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I am paired, but with the distinct understanding that I have the right to vote to make a quorum. I have accordingly voted on this question with that understanding.

Mr. STEVENS. I am also paired under the same circumstances.

Mr. ENLOE. I was detained at the Department and did not get into the Hall in time to vote on this question.

Mr. RICHARDSON of Tennessee. My colleague, Mr. WASHINGTON, is detained from the Hall by reason of sickness, and asks indefinite leave of absence.

The SPEAKER. The Chair has several requests for leaves

of absence, and before the announcement of this vote will submit them to the House.

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted accordingly as follows:

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

To Mr. TARSNEY, indefinitely, on account of sickness in his family.

To Mr. GILLET of New York, for three days, on account of sickness.

To Mr. HOOKER of New York, indefinitely, on account of sickness in his family.

The result of the vote was then announced as above recorded. Mr. PATTERSON. I move that the House do now adjourn, and on that I demand the yeas and nays.

Mr. LACEY. I make the point of order on that motion.

The SPEAKER. What is the point of order the gentleman makes?

Mr. LACEY. That the motion is not in order.

The SPEAKER. Why?

Mr. LACEY. Because the Speaker has heretofore held, under similar circumstances, that the motion could not be received.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman does not seem to understand the distinction in the rules of the House. A House for the transaction of business means a quorum of the House. If a quorum of the House is not present on any question, there are only two things that the House can do. One is to adjourn, and the other to order a call of the House for the purpose of securing the attendance of absent members. The fact that a quorum was not present has been developed on this roll call.

There is no difficulty about the matter whatever.

Mr. PAYNE. The Speaker will remember that I undertook to submit the same motion under similar circumstances, and was refused.

The SPEAKER. The Speaker does not remember. The Speaker remembers that there was a repetition of the motion, or an attempted repetition of it, at a time when there had been no intervening business to justify it.

Mr. PAYNE. If the Speaker will remember all that occurred, he will remember that there had been intervening business.

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

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. BOUTELLE. I desire to call the attention of the Chair to the fact, which is clearly disclosed in the RECORD, that the Chair declined to entertain a motion to adjourn when there was less than a quorum present—declining to entertain the motion the gentleman from New York [Mr. PAYNE].

The SPEAKER. Has the gentleman accomplished his purpose?

Mr. BOUTELLE. I have, in calling the attention of the Chair to the fact that this motion was refused under similar circumstances.

The SPEAKER. Then the business of the House will proceed. The question is on ordering the yeas and nays on the motion of the gentleman from Tennessee, that the House do now adjourn.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 1, nays 163, not voting 183; as follows:

## YEAS—1.

Mallory.

## NAYS—163.

Abbott,  
Alderson,  
Alexander,  
Allen,  
Bailey,  
Baker, Kans.  
Baldwin,  
Bankhead,  
Barwig,  
Bell, Tex.  
Berry,  
Black, Ga.  
Bland,  
Boatner,  
Boen,  
Bower, N. C.  
Branch,  
Breckinridge, Ark.  
Bretz,  
Brickner,  
Brookshire,  
Brown,  
Bryan,  
Bynum,  
Cadmus,  
Caminetti,  
Camon, Cal.  
Caruth,  
Catchings,  
Causey,  
Clark, Mo.

Clarke, Ala.  
Cobb, Ala.  
Cobb, Mo.  
Cockrell,  
Coffee,  
Conn.,  
Coombs,  
Cooper, Fla.  
Cooper, Tex.  
Covert,  
Cox,  
Crawford,  
Culbertson,  
Cummings,  
Davey,  
Davis,  
De Armond,  
Denson,  
Dinsmore,  
Dockery,  
Dunn,  
Dunphy,  
Durborow,  
Edmunds,  
English,  
Enloe,  
Epes,  
Erdman,  
Everett,  
Fleider,  
Geary,

Geissenhainer,  
Goldzier,  
Gorman,  
Grady,  
Gresham,  
Griffin,  
Haines,  
Hall, Minn.  
Hall, Mo.  
Hammond,  
Hare,  
Harris,  
Hatch,  
Hayes,  
Henderson, N. C.  
Hendrix,  
Hines,  
Hudson,  
Hunter,  
Hutcheson,  
Ikert,  
Jones,  
Kilgore,  
Kribbs,  
Kyle,  
Lane,  
Latimer,  
Lawson,  
Layton,  
Lester,  
Lockwood,

Lynch,  
Marshall,  
Martin, Ind.  
McAleer,  
McCreary, Ky.  
McCulloch,  
McDannold,  
McDearmon,  
McEtrick,  
McGann,  
McKaig,  
McLaurin,  
McMillin,  
McNaggy,  
McRae,  
Meredith,  
Meyer,  
Money,  
Montgomery,  
Morgan,  
Mo-es,  
Mutchler,  
Oates,  
O'Neil,  
Outhwaite,  
Paschal,  
Patterson,  
Paynter,  
Pendleton, Tex.  
Pendleton, W. Va.  
Pigott,



Price,	Schermerhorn,	Swanson,	Tyler,
Reilly,	Shell,	Talbert, S. C.	Warner,
Richards, Ohio	Sibley,	Tate,	Weadock,
Richardson, Mich.	Sickles,	Tawney,	Wells,
Richardson, Tenn.	Sperry,	Taylor, Ind.	Wheeler, Ala.
Ritchie,	Spranger,	Whiting,	Williams, Ill.
Robbins,	Stallings,	Tracey,	Williams, Miss.
Robertson, La.	Stockdale,	Tucker,	Wise,
Russell, Ga.	Stone, Ky.	Turner, Ga.	Wolverton,
Ryan,	Strait,	Turpin,	Woodard,
Sayers,	Straus,		

NOT VOTING—183.

Adams, Ky.	Dalzell,	Hulick,	Randall,
Adams, Pa.	Daniels,	Hull,	Ray,
Aitken,	De Forest,	Johnson, Ind.	Rayner,
Aldrich,	Dingley,	Johnson, N. Dak.	Reed,
Apsley,	Dolliver,	Johnson, Ohio	Reyburn,
Arnold,	Donovan,	Joy,	Robinson, Pa.
Avery,	Doolittle,	Kem,	Rusk,
Babcock,	Draper,	Kiefer,	Russell, Conn.
Baker, N. H.	Ellis, Ky.	Lacey,	Scranton,
Barnes,	Ellis, Oregon	Lapham,	Settle,
Bartholdt,	Fithian,	Lefever,	Shaw,
Bartlett,	Fletcher,	Linton,	Sherman,
Belden,	Forman,	Lisle,	Simpson,
Bell, Colo.	Funk,	Livingston,	Sipe,
Beltzhoover,	Funston,	Loud,	Smith,
Bingham,	Fyan,	Loudenslager,	Snodgrass,
Black, Ill.	Gardner,	Lucas,	Somers,
Blair,	Gear,	Maddox,	Stephenson,
Boutelle,	Gillet, N. Y.	Magner,	Stevens,
Bowers, Cal.	Gillet, Mass.	Maguire,	Stone, C. W.
Brattan,	Goodnight,	Mahon,	Stone, W. A.
Breckinridge, Ky.	Graham,	Marion, N. Y.	Storer,
Broderick,	Grosvenor,	McCall,	Strong,
Brosius,	Grout,	McCleary, Minn.	Sweet,
Bundy,	Grow,	McDowell,	Talbot, Md.
Bunn,	Hager,	McKeighan,	Tarsney,
Burnes,	Hainer,	McKlejohn,	Taylor, Tenn.
Burrows,	Harmer,	Mercer,	Thomas,
Cabaniss,	Harter,	Milliken,	Updegraff,
Caldwell,	Hartman,	Moon,	Van Voorhis, N. Y.
Campbell,	Haugen,	Morse,	Van Voorhis, Ohio
Cannon, Ill.	Heard,	Murray,	Wadsworth,
Capehart,	Heiner,	Neill,	Walker,
Chickering,	Henderson, Ill.	Newlands,	Wanger,
Childs,	Hepburn, Iowa	Page,	Washington,
Clancy,	Hermann,	Payne,	Waugh,
Cockran,	Hicks,	Pearson,	Wever,
Cogswell,	Hilborn,	Pence,	Wheeler, Ill.
Compton,	Hitt,	Perkins,	White,
Cooper, Ind.	Holman,	Phillips,	Wilson, Ohio
Cooper, Wis.	Hooker, Miss.	Pickler,	Wilson, Wash.
Cornish,	Hooker, N. Y.	Post,	Wilson, W. Va.
Cousins,	Hopkins, Ill.	Powers,	Woomer,
Crain,	Hopkins, Pa.	Quigg,	Wright, Mass.
Curtis, Kans.	Houk,		Wright, Pa.

So the motion to adjourn was rejected,  
The result of the vote was then announced as above recorded.  
Mr. PATTERSON. I move a call of the House.  
The question was taken on ordering a call of the House, and the Speaker announced that the ayes seemed to have it.  
Mr. REED. Division.  
The House divided; and there were—ayes 70, noes 52.  
Mr. REED. Tellers, Mr. Speaker.  
Mr. PATTERSON. Yeas and nays, Mr. Speaker.  
The yeas and nays were ordered.  
The question was taken; and there were—yeas 171, nays 1, not voting 180; as follows:

YEAS—171.

Abbott,	Coffeen,	Hall, Mo.	McKeighan,
Alderson,	Conn,	Hammond,	McLaurin,
Alexander,	Coombs,	Hare,	McMillin,
Allen,	Cooper, Fla.	Harris,	McNagy,
Bailey,	Cooper, Tex.	Hatch,	McRae,
Baker, Kans.	Covert,	Hayes,	Meredith,
Baldwin,	Cox,	Henderson, N. C.	Meyer,
Bankhead,	Crain,	Hendrix,	Money,
Barwig,	Crawford,	Hines,	Montgomery,
Bell, Tex.	Culberson,	Hudson,	Morgan,
Berry,	Cummings,	Hunter,	Moses,
Black, Ga.	Davey,	Hutcheson,	Newlands,
Bland,	De Armond,	Ikert,	Oates,
Boatner,	Denson,	Jones,	O'Neil,
Boen,	Dinsmore,	Kem,	Paschal,
Bower, N. C.	Dockery,	Kilgore,	Patterson,
Branch,	Donovan,	Kribbs,	Payne,
Breckinridge, Ark.	Dunn,	Kyle,	Pendleton, Tex.
Bretz,	Dunphy,	Lane,	Pendleton, W. Va.
Brickner,	Durborow,	Latimer,	Pigott,
Brookshire,	Edmunds,	Lawson,	Price,
Brown,	English,	Layton,	Reilly,
Bryan,	Enloe,	Lester,	Richards, Ohio
Burnes,	Epes,	Lockwood,	Richardson, Mich.
Bynum,	Erdman,	Lynch,	Riche,
Cadmus,	Everett,	Maguire,	Robbins,
Caminetti,	Felder,	Mallory,	Robertson, La.
Cannon, Cal.	Geary,	Martin, Ind.	Russell, Ga.
Capehart,	Geissenhainer,	McAleer,	Ryan,
Caruth,	Goldzier,	McCreary, Ky.	Sayers,
Catchings,	Gorman,	McCulloch,	Schermerhorn,
Cansey,	Grady,	McDannold,	Shell,
Clark, Mo.	Gresham,	McDearmon,	Sibley,
Clarke, Ala.	Griffin,	McEttrick,	Sickles,
Cobb, Mo.	Haines,	McGann,	Sperry,
Cockrell,	Hall, Minn.	McKaig,	Springer,

Stallings,	Talbot, Md.	Turner, Va.	Whiting,
Stockdale,	Tate,	Turpin,	Williams, Ill.
Stone, Ky.	Taylor, Ind.	Tyler,	Williams, Miss.
Strait,	Terry,	Warner,	Wise,
Straus,	Tracey,	Weadock,	Wolverton,
Swanson,	Tucker,	Wells,	Woodard,
Talbert, S. C.	Turner, Ga.	Wheeler, Ala.	

NAYS—1.

Marshall.

NOT VOTING—180.

Adams, Ky.	Daniels,	Hulick,	Ray,
Adams, Pa.	Davis,	Hull,	Rayner,
Aitken,	De Forest,	Johnson, Ind.	Reed,
Aldrich,	Dingley,	Johnson, N. Dak.	Reyburn,
Apsley,	Dolliver,	Johnson, Ohio	Richardson, Tenn.
Arnold,	Doolittle,	Joy,	Robinson, Pa.
Avery,	Draper,	Kiefer,	Rusk,
Babcock,	Ellis, Ky.	Lacey,	Russell, Conn.
Baker, N. H.	Ellis, Oregon	Lapham,	Scranton,
Barnes,	Fithian,	Lefever,	Settle,
Bartholdt,	Fletcher,	Linton,	Shaw,
Bartlett,	Forman,	Lisle,	Sherman,
Belden,	Funk,	Livingston,	Simpson,
Bell, Colo.	Funston,	Loud,	Sipe,
Beltzhoover,	Fyan,	Loudenslager,	Smith,
Bingham,	Gardner,	Lucas,	Snodgrass,
Black, Ill.	Gear,	Maddox,	Somers,
Blair,	Gillet, N. Y.	Magner,	Stephenson,
Boutelle,	Gillet, Mass.	Mahon,	Stevens,
Bowers, Cal.	Goodnight,	Marsh,	Stone, C. W.
Brattan,	Graham,	Marvin, N. Y.	Stone, W. A.
Breckinridge, Ky.	Grosvenor,	McCall,	Storer,
Broderick,	Grout,	McCleary, Minn.	Strong,
Brosius,	Grow,	McDowell,	Sweet,
Bundy,	Hager,	McKlejohn,	Tarsney,
Bunn,	Hainer,	Mercer,	Tawney,
Burrows,	Harmer,	Milliken,	Taylor, Tenn.
Cabaniss,	Harter,	Moon,	Thomas,
Caldwell,	Hartman,	Morse,	Updegraff,
Campbell,	Haugen,	Murray,	Van Voorhis, N. Y.
Cannon, Ill.	Heard,	Mutchler,	Van Voorhis, Ohio
Chickering,	Heiner,	Neill,	Wadsworth,
Childs,	Henderson, Ill.	Northway,	Walker,
Clancy,	Henderson, Iowa	Outhwaite,	Wanger,
Cobb, Ala.	Hepburn,	Page,	Washington,
Cogswell,	Hermann,	Paynter,	Waugh,
Compton,	Hicks,	Pearson,	Wever,
Cooper, Ind.	Hilborn,	Pence,	Wheeler, Ill.
Cooper, Wis.	Hitt,	Perkins,	White,
Cornish,	Holman,	Phillips,	Wilson, Ohio
Cousins,	Hooker, Miss.	Pickler,	Wilson, Wash.
Curtis, Kans.	Hooker, N. Y.	Post,	Wilson, W. Va.
Curtis, N. Y.	Hopkins, Ill.	Powers,	Woomer,
Dalzell,	Hopkins, Pa.	Quigg,	Wright, Mass.
	Houk,	Randall,	Wright, Pa.

So a call of the House was ordered.  
The result of the vote was then announced as above recorded.  
Mr. PAYNE. I move to reconsider the vote by which a call of the House was ordered.  
Mr. PATTERSON. I move to lay that motion on the table, and upon that I demand the yeas and nays.  
The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New York [Mr. PAYNE] moves to reconsider the vote by which a call of the House was ordered, and the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. PATTERSON] moves to lay that motion on the table.  
Mr. CATCHINGS. Mr. Speaker, I rise to a point of order.  
The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.  
Mr. CATCHINGS. Is the motion of the gentleman from New York [Mr. PAYNE] in order, under the special order under which we are proceeding? Is not that an "intervening motion"?  
The SPEAKER. But we are now without a quorum.  
Mr. CATCHINGS. Still is not that an intervening motion? We have voted to have a call of the House, have we not?  
The SPEAKER. That has been the vote.  
Mr. CATCHINGS. Now the proposition is to reconsider that. Does not that come within the terms of the order? It is true the House is without a quorum, but this is an intervening motion. Why shall we not have a call of the House without this intervening motion?  
The SPEAKER. The Chair does not see that the order would affect it. Unless there is some—  
Mr. PATTERSON. I withdraw my motion to lay on the table, and I call for the yeas and nays on the motion of the gentleman from New York [Mr. PAYNE] to reconsider.  
Mr. PAYNE. Pending that I move that the House do now adjourn.  
The SPEAKER. Pending that the gentleman from New York [Mr. PAYNE] moves that the House do now adjourn. The vote will be taken on the latter motion.  
The question being taken, the Speaker announced that the yeas seemed to have it.  
Mr. PAYNE demanded a division.  
The House divided; and there were—ayes 8, noes 50.  
Mr. PATTERSON. I demand the yeas and nays.  
The yeas and nays were ordered.



The question was taken; and there were—yeas 1, nays 165, not voting 186; as follows:

## YEAS—1.

Mallory,

## NAYS—165.

Abbott,	Crain,	Kyle,	Richardson, Mich.
Alderson,	Crawford,	Lane,	Richardson, Tenn.
Alexander,	Culberson,	Latimer,	Ritchie,
Allen,	Davey,	Lawson,	Robbins,
Bailey,	Davis,	Layton,	Robertson, La.
Baker, Kans.	De Armond,	Lester,	Russell, Ga.
Baldwin,	Denson,	Lockwood,	Ryan,
Barwig,	Dinsmore,	Lynch,	Sayers,
Bell, Tex.	Dockery,	Maguire,	Schermerhorn,
Berry,	Donovan,	Marshall,	Shell,
Black, Ga.	Dunn,	Martin, Ind.	Sibley,
Bland,	Dunphy,	McAleer,	Sickles,
Boatner,	Durbin,	McCreary, Ky.	Sperry,
Boen,	Edmunds,	McCulloch,	Springer,
Bower, N. C.	English,	McDannold,	Stallings,
Branch,	Epes,	McDearmon,	Stockdale,
Bretz,	Erdman,	McEttrick,	Stone, Ky.
Brickner,	Everett,	McGann,	Strait,
Brookshire,	Felder,	McKaig,	Swanson,
Brown,	Geary,	McKelghan,	Talbert, S. C.
Bryan,	Geissenhainer,	McLaurin,	Talbot, Md.
Burnes,	Goldzier,	McMillin,	Tate,
Bynum,	Gorman,	McRae,	Taylor, Ind.
Cadmus,	Grady,	Meredith,	Terry,
Caminetti,	Gresham,	Meyer,	Tracey,
Cannon, Cal.	Haines,	Money,	Tucker,
Capehart,	Hall, Minn.	Montgomery,	Turner, Ga.
Caruth,	Hall, Mo.	Morgan,	Turner, Va.
Catchings,	Hammond,	Moses,	Turpin,
Causey,	Hare,	Neill,	Tyler,
Clark, Mo.	Harris,	O'Neill,	Weadock,
Clarke, Ala.	Henderson, N. C.	Outhwaite,	Wells,
Cobb, Mo.	Hendrix,	Page,	Wheeler, Ala.
Cockrell,	Holman,	Paschal,	Whiting,
Coffeen,	Hudson,	Patterson,	Williams, Ill.
Conn,	Hunter,	Paynter,	Williams, Miss.
Coombs,	Hutcheson,	Pendleton, Tex.	Wise,
Cooper, Fla.	Ikirt,	Pendleton, W. Va.	Wolverton,
Cooper, Ind.	Jones,	Pigott,	Woodard.
Cooper, Tex.	Kam,	Price,	
Covert,	Kilgore,	Reilly,	
Cox,	Kribbs,	Richards, Ohio	

## NOT VOTING—186.

Adams, Ky.	Daniels,	Houk,	Rayner,
Adams, Pa.	De Forest,	Hulick,	Reed,
Aitken,	Dingley,	Hull,	Reynburn,
Aldrich,	Dolliver,	Johnson, Ind.	Robinson, Pa.
Apsley,	Doolittle,	Johnson, N. Dak.	Rusk,
Arnold,	Draper,	Johnson, Ohio	Russell, Conn.
Avery,	Ellis, Ky.	Joy,	Scranton,
Babcock,	Ellis, Oregon	Kiefer,	Settle,
Baker, N. H.	Enloe,	Lacey,	Shaw,
Bankhead,	Fithian,	Lapham,	Sherman,
Barnes,	Fletcher,	Lefever,	Simpson,
Bartholdt,	Forman,	Linton,	Sipe,
Bartlett,	Funk,	Lisle,	Smith,
Belden,	Funston,	Livingston,	Snodgrass,
Bell, Colo.	Fyan,	Loud,	Somers,
Beltzhoover,	Gardner,	Loudenslager,	Stephenson,
Bingham,	Gear,	Lucas,	Stevens,
Black, Ill.	Gillet, N. Y.	Maddox,	Stone, C. W.
Blair,	Gillet, Mass.	Magner,	Stone, W. A.
Boutelle,	Goodnight,	Mahon,	Storer,
Bowers, Cal.	Graham,	Marsh,	Straus,
Brattan,	Griffin,	Marvin, N. Y.	Strong,
Breckinridge, Ark.	Grosvenor,	McCall,	Sweet,
Breckinridge, Ky.	Grout,	McCleary, Minn.	Tarsney,
Broderick,	Grow,	McDowell,	Tawney,
Brosius,	Hager,	McNaghy,	Taylor, Tenn.
Bundy,	Hainer,	Melklejohn,	Thomas,
Bunn,	Harmer,	Mercer,	Updegraff,
Burrows,	Hartman,	Milliken,	Van Voorhis, N. Y.
Cabaniss,	Hatch,	Moon,	Van Voorhis, Ohio
Caldwell,	Haugen,	Morse,	Wadsworth,
Campbell,	Hayes,	Murray,	Walker,
Cannon, Ill.	Heard,	Mutchler,	Wanger,
Chickering,	Heiner,	Newlands,	Washington,
Childs,	Henderson, Ill.	Northway,	Waugh,
Clancy,	Henderson, Iowa	Oates,	Weaver,
Cobb, Ala.	Hepburn,	Payne,	Wheeler, Ill.
Cockran,	Hermann,	Pearson,	Wilson, Ohio
Cogswell,	Hicks,	Pence,	Wilson, Wash.
Compton,	Hilborn,	Perkins,	Wilson, W. Va.
Cooper, Wis.	Hines,	Phillips,	Woomer,
Cornish,	Hitt,	Pickler,	Wright, Mass.
Cousins,	Hooker, Miss.	Post,	Wright, Pa.
Cummings,	Hooker, N. Y.	Powers,	
Curtis, Kans.	Hopkins, Ill.	Quigg,	
Curtis, N. Y.	Hopkins, Pa.	Randall,	
Dalzell,		Ray,	

The SPEAKER *pro tempore* (Mr. RICHARDSON of Tennessee). On this question the yeas are 1, the nays 165. The nays have it, and the motion to adjourn is not agreed to. The question now is on the motion to reconsider the vote by which a call of the House was ordered.

Mr. REED. I move to lay that motion on the table.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. Speaker, I desire to know how I am recorded?

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. On the last call?

Mr. REED. Regular order.

Mr. HATCH. Yes.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. The gentleman is not recorded. The question is on the motion to lay on the table the motion to reconsider the vote by which a call of the House was ordered.

The question was taken; and the Speaker *pro tempore* announced that the yeas seemed to have it.

Mr. REED. Division.

Mr. PATTERSON. The yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. A motion was made to reconsider the vote by which a call of the House was ordered. The gentleman from Maine [Mr. REED] moves to lay that motion on the table, and on that the yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 147, nays 3, not voting 202; as follows:

## YEAS—147.

Abbott,	Davis,	Kyle,	Richardson, Mich.
Alexander,	De Armond,	Lane,	Richardson, Tenn.
Allen,	Denson,	Latimer,	Ritchie,
Bailey,	Dinsmore,	Lawson,	Robbins,
Baker, Kans.	Dockery,	Layton,	Robertson, La.
Baldwin,	Donovan,	Lester,	Russell, Ga.
Bankhead,	Dunn,	Lynch,	Ryan,
Bertz,	Dunphy,	Maguire,	Sayers,
Brickner,	Durbin,	Mallory,	Schermerhorn,
Brookshire,	Edmunds,	Marshall,	Shell,
Bryan,	English,	Martin, Ind.	Sperry,
Burnes,	Enloe,	McAleer,	Springer,
Bynum,	Epes,	McCreary, Ky.	Stallings,
Cadmus,	Erdman,	McCulloch,	Stockdale,
Caminetti,	Breckinridge, Ark.	McDannold,	Stone, Ky.
Cannon, Cal.	Bretz,	McDearmon,	Strait,
Capehart,	Geary,	McEttrick,	Straus,
Caruth,	Geissenhainer,	McKaig,	Talbert, S. C.
Clark, Mo.	Gorman,	McKelghan,	Talbot, Md.
Cobb, Mo.	Graham,	McLaurin,	Tate,
Cockrell,	Griffin,	McMillin,	Terry,
Coffeen,	Haines,	McRae,	Tracey,
Coombs,	Hall, Minn.	Meredith,	Tucker,
Cooper, Fla.	Hall, Mo.	Money,	Turner, Ga.
Cooper, Ind.	Hare,	Montgomery,	Turner, Va.
Cooper, Tex.	Harris,	Morgan,	Turpin,
Covert,	Hatch,	Moses,	Warner,
Cox,	Hayes,	Neill,	Weadock,
	Henderson, N. C.	Oates,	Wells,
	Hines,	O'Neill,	Wheeler, Ala.
	Holman,	Paschal,	Whiting,
	Hudson,	Patterson,	Williams, Ill.
	Hunter,	Paynter,	Williams, Miss.
	Hutcheson,	Pendleton, Tex.	Wise,
	Ikirt,	Pendleton, W. Va.	Wolverton,
	Kilgore,	Pigott,	Woodard.
		Richards, Ohio	

## NAYS—3.

Crawford.

## NOT VOTING—202.

Adams, Ky.	Dalzell,	Johnson, N. Dak.	Rayner,
Adams, Pa.	Daniels,	Johnson, Ohio	Reed,
Aitken,	Davey,	Jones,	Reilly,
Aldrich,	De Forest,	Joy,	Reynburn,
Apsley,	Dingley,	Kem,	Robinson, Pa.
Arnold,	Dolliver,	Kiefer,	Rusk,
Avery,	Doolittle,	Kibbs,	Russell, Conn.
Babcock,	Draper,	Lacey,	Scranton,
Baker, N. H.	Ellis, Ky.	Lapham,	Settle,
Barnes,	Ellis, Oregon	Lefever,	Shaw,
Bartholdt,	Fithian,	Linton,	Sherman,
Bartlett,	Fletcher,	Lisle,	Sibley,
Belden,	Forman,	Livingston,	Sickles,
Bell, Colo.	Funk,	Lockwood,	Simpson,
Beltzhoover,	Funston,	Loud,	Sipe,
Bingham,	Fyan,	Loudenslager,	Smith,
Black, Ill.	Gardner,	Lucas,	Snodgrass,
Blair,	Gear,	Maddox,	Somers,
Boen,	Gillet, N. Y.	Magner,	Stephenson,
Boutelle,	Gillet, Mass.	Mahon,	Stevens,
Bower, N. C.	Goldzier,	Marsh,	Stone, C. W.
Bowers, Cal.	Goodnight,	Marvin, N. Y.	Stone, W. A.
Brattan,	Graham,	McCall,	Storer,
Brosius,	Grosvenor,	McCleary, Minn.	Strong,
Brown,	Grout,	McDowell,	Swanson,
Bundy,	Grow,	McGann,	Sweet,
Bunn,	Hager,	McNaghy,	Tarsney,
Burrows,	Hainer,	Meiklejohn,	Tawney,
Cabaniss,	Hammond,	Mercer,	Taylor, Ind.
Caldwell,	Harmer,	Meyer,	Taylor, Tenn.
Campbell,	Harter,	Milliken,	Thomas,
Cannon, Ill.	Hartman,	Moon,	Tyler,
Catchings,	Haugen,	Morse,	Updegraff,
Causey,	Heard,	Murray,	Van Voorhis, N. Y.
Chickering,	Heiner,	Mutchler,	Van Voorhis, Ohio
Childs,	Henderson, Ill.	Newlands,	Wadsworth,
Clancy,	Henderson, Iowa	Northway,	Walker,
Cobb, Ala.	Hepburn,	Outhwaite,	Wanger,
Cockran,	Hermann,	Page,	Washington,
Cogswell,	Hicks,	Payne,	Waugh,
Compton,	Hilborn,	Pearson,	Weaver,
Cooper, Wis.	Hitt,	Pence,	Wheeler, Ill.
Cornish,	Hooker, Miss.	Perkins,	White,
Cousins,	Hooker, N. Y.	Phillips,	Wilson, Ohio
Cummings,	Hopkins, Ill.	Pickler,	Wilson, Wash.
Curtis, Kans.	Hopkins, Pa.	Post,	Wilson, W. Va.
Curtis, N. Y.	Houk,	Powers,	Woomer,
	Hulick,	Quigg,	Wright, Mass.
	Hull,	Randall,	Wright, Pa.
	Johnson, Ind.	Ray,	



The following additional pair was announced:

Mr. CLARKE of Alabama with Mr. HENDERSON of Illinois, on this vote.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. On this question the yeas are 147; the nays are 3; the ayes have it; the motion to reconsider is laid on the table, and a call of the House is ordered.

The roll was called, when the following-named members failed to respond:

Adams, Pa.	Cooper, Fla.	Hines,	Rayner,
Aitken,	Cooper, Wis.	Hitt,	Reynolds,
Aldrich,	Cornish,	Hooker, Miss.	Robinson, Pa.
Alexander,	Covert,	Hooker, N. Y.	Rusk,
Apsley,	Dalzell,	Hopkins, Ill.	Scranton,
Arnold,	Davey,	Hopkins, Pa.	Settle,
Baker, Kans.	De Forest,	Houk,	Shell,
Barnes,	Denson,	Johnson, Ohio	Sherman,
Bartholdt,	Dingley,	Joy,	Simpson,
Bartlett,	Dinsmore,	Kem,	Sipe,
Belden,	Dolliver,	Kiefer,	Snodgrass,
Bell, Colo.	Donovan,	Lapham,	Somers,
Beltzhoover,	Durbin,	Lefever,	Sperry,
Bingham,	Ellis, Ky.	Linton,	Stevens,
Black, Ill.	Fithian,	Lisle,	Stockdale,
Boatner,	Fletcher,	Livingston,	Stone, C. W.
Bower, N. C.	Forman,	Loudenslager,	Storer,
Branch,	Fyan,	Lucas,	Strait,
Brattan,	Geissenhainer,	Maddox,	Strong,
Breckinridge, Ky.	Gillet, N. Y.	Magner,	Tarsney,
Brookshire,	Goodnight,	Manon,	Tawney,
Brosius,	Graham,	McCall,	Taylor, Tenn.
Brown,	Gresham,	McCleary, Minn.	Updegraff,
Bundy,	Griffin,	McDowell,	Van Voorhis, N. Y.
Bunn,	Grosvenor,	McKaign,	Van Voorhis, Ohio
Burrows,	Hager,	McNaghy,	Wadsworth,
Cabaniss,	Hainer,	Milliken,	Washington,
Caldwell,	Hammond,	Mitchler,	White,
Campbell,	Harmer,	Newlands,	Williams, Miss.
Catchings,	Harter,	Oates,	Wilson, W. Va.
Causey,	Hayes,	Page,	Woomer,
Childs,	Heard,	Paynter,	Wright, Mass.
Clancey,	Heiner,	Pence,	Wright, Pa.
Cockran,	Henderson, Ill.	Powers,	
Cockrell,	Henderson, Iowa	Randall,	
Compton,	Hicks,		

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. On this call 210 gentlemen have answered to their names. The doors will now be closed, and the Clerk will call the names of members who failed to respond on the first call. On this call excuses for absentees may be offered.

Mr. REED (when the name of Mr. ADAMS of Pennsylvania was called). Mr. Speaker, I ask that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. ADAMS] be excused.

Mr. BROWN. I object, unless some good reason is given.

Mr. REED. Objection is made. I now move that he be excused.

The question was taken on the motion of Mr. REED, and the Speaker *pro tempore* declared that the ayes seemed to have it.

Mr. REED. I ask for a division.

The House divided; and there were—ayes 104, noes 0.

Mr. REED. I ask for tellers.

Mr. BROWN. Mr. Speaker, having assisted my friend from Maine as much as I desire, I withdraw the objection.

Mr. REED. But there has been a vote on the question.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. It has not been completed; but if the gentleman from Maine makes the point—

Mr. REED. Oh, I leave it to the decision of the Chair. The gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BROWN] is very kind, and I am very much obliged to him.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. The gentleman from Maine asks that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. ADAMS] be excused, and if there be no objection the gentleman will be excused.

There was no objection, and it was so ordered.

Mr. PATTERSON. Mr. Speaker, I move that further proceedings under the call be dispensed with.

Mr. REED. Why? I suggest to the gentleman from Tennessee that we have not gone very far yet. [Laughter.]

The question being taken on the motion of Mr. PATTERSON, the Speaker *pro tempore* declared that the ayes seemed to have it.

Mr. REED. I ask for a division.

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 162, nays 4, not voting 186; as follows:

## YEAS—162.

Abbott,	Bland,	Cannon, Cal.	Cooper, Fla.
Alderson,	Boatner,	Capehart,	Cooper, Tex.
Alexander,	Bower, N. C.	Caruth,	Covert,
Allen,	Branch,	Catchings,	Cox,
Ballay,	Breckinridge, Ark.	Causey,	Crain,
Baker, Kans.	Bretz,	Clark, Mo.	Crawford,
Baldwin,	Brookshire,	Clarke, Ala.	Cuberson,
Bankhead,	Brown,	Cobb, Mo.	Cummings,
Barwig,	Bryan,	Cockran,	Davey,
Bell, Colo.	Burnes,	Cockrell,	Davis,
Bell, Tex.	Bynum,	Coffeen,	De Armond,
Berry,	Cadmus,	Conn,	Denson,
Black, Ga.	Caminetti,	Coombs,	Dinsmore,

Dockery,	Hunter,	Money,	Stallings,
Donovan,	Hutcheson,	Montgomery,	Stockdale,
Dunn,	Ikert,	Morgan,	Stone, Ky.
Dunphy,	Jones,	Moses,	Storer,
Durbin,	Kyle,	Neill,	Strait,
Edmonds,	Lane,	Oates,	Straus,
Enloe,	Latimer,	O'Neil,	Swanson,
Epes,	Lawson,	Paschal,	Talbert, S. C.
Erdman,	Layton,	Patterson,	Talbot, Md.
Felder,	Lester,	Paynter,	Tate,
Geary,	Lockwood,	Pendleton, Tex.	Taylor, Ind.
Geissenhainer,	Lynch,	Pendleton, W. Va.	Terry,
Goldier,	Maguire,	Pigott,	Tracey,
Gorman,	Mallory,	Price,	Tucker,
Grady,	Marshall,	Reilly,	Turner, Ga.
Gresham,	McAieer,	Richards, Ohio	Turner, Va.
Haines,	McCreary, Ky.	Richardson, Mich.	Turpin,
Hall, Minn.	McCulloch,	Richardson, Tenn.	Tyler,
Hall, Mo.	McDannold,	Ritchie,	Warner,
Hammond,	McDearmon,	Robbins,	Weadock,
Hare,	McEtrick,	Robertson, La.	Wheeler, Ala.
Harris,	McGann,	Russell, Ga.	Whiting,
Hatch,	McKaign,	Sayers,	Williams, Ill.
Hayes,	McMillin,	Schermerhorn,	Williams, Miss.
Henderson, N. C.	McNaghy,	Sibley,	Wise,
Hendrix,	McRae,	Sickles,	Woodard,
Hines,	Meredith,	Sperry,	
Holman,	Meyer,	Springer,	

## NAYS—4.

Brickner,	Kribbs,	Ryan,	Wanger.
-----------	---------	-------	---------

## NOT VOTING 186.

Adams, Ky.	Dolliver,	Johnson, N. Dak.	Ray,
Adams, Pa.	Doolittle,	Johnson, Ohio	Rayner,
Aitken,	Draper,	Joy,	Reed,
Aldrich,	Ellis, Ky.	Kem,	Reynolds,
Apsley,	Ellis, Oregon	Kiefer,	Robinson, Pa.
Arnold,	English,	Kilgore,	Rusk,
Avery,	Everett,	Lacey,	Russell, Conn.
Babcock,	Fithian,	Lapham,	Scranton,
Baker, N. H.	Fletcher,	Lefever,	Settle,
Barnes,	Forman,	Linton,	Shaw,
Bartholdt,	Funk,	Lisle,	Shell,
Bartlett,	Funston,	Livingston,	Sherman,
Belden,	Fyan,	Loud,	Simpson,
Beltzhoover,	Gardner,	Loudenslager,	Sipe,
Bingham,	Gear,	Lucas,	Smith,
Black, Ill.	Gillet, N. Y.	Maddox,	Snodgrass,
Blair,	Gillet, Mass.	Magner,	Somers,
Boen,	Goodnight,	Mahon,	Stehenson,
Boutelle,	Graham,	Marsh,	Stevens,
Bowers, Cal.	Griffin,	Martin, Ind.	Stone, C. W.
Brattan,	Grosvenor,	Marvin, N. Y.	Stone, W. A.
Broderick,	Grout,	McCall,	Strong,
Brosius,	Grow,	McCleary, Minn.	Sweet,
Bundy,	Hager,	McDowell,	Tarsney,
Bunn,	Hainer,	McKeighan,	Tawney,
Burrows,	Harmer,	McLaurin,	Taylor, Tenn.
Cabaniss,	Harter,	Meklejohn,	Thomas,
Caldwell,	Hartman,	Mercer,	Updegraff,
Campbell,	Haugen,	Milliken,	Van Voorhis, N. Y.
Cannon, Ill.	Heard,	Moon,	Van Voorhis, Ohio
Chickering,	Heiner,	Morse,	Wadsworth,
Childs,	Henderson, Ill.	Murray,	Walker,
Clancey,	Henderson, Iowa	Mutchler,	Washington,
Cobb, Ala.	Hepburn,	Newlands,	Waugh,
Cogswell,	Hermann,	Northway,	Wells,
Compton,	Hicks,	Outhwaite,	Wever,
Cooper, Ind.	Hilborn,	Page,	Wheeler, Ill.
Cooper, Wis.	Hitt,	Payne,	White,
Cornish,	Hooker, Miss.	Pearson,	Wilson, Ohio
Cousins,	Hooker, N. Y.	Pence,	Wilson, Wash.
Curtis, Kans.	Hopkins, Ill.	Perkins,	Wilson, W. Va.
Curtis, N. Y.	Hopkins, Pa.	Phillips,	Wolverton,
Dalzell,	Houk,	Pickler,	Woomer,
Daniels,	Hudson,	Post,	Wright, Mass.
De Forest,	Hulick,	Powers,	Wright, Pa.
Dingley,	Hull,	Quigg,	
	Johnson, Ind.	Randall,	

Mr. COBB of Alabama voted, but, being paired, withdrew his vote.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. Upon this question the yeas are 162 and the nays are 4. The ayes have it, and all further proceedings under the call are dispensed with.

Mr. PATTERSON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn, and ask that that motion be voted down. [Laughter.]

Mr. REED. I ask for a division. I am surprised at the conduct of the gentleman from Tennessee. [Laughter.]

Mr. PATTERSON. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. The gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. PATTERSON] moves that the House do now adjourn, and upon that question the yeas and nays are demanded.

Mr. BOUTELLE. I do not think it is generally understood in the House that the gentleman from Tennessee has asked to have his motion voted down. [Laughter.]

The question being taken on ordering the yeas and nays, the Speaker *pro tempore* declared that the ayes seemed to have it.

Mr. REED. I ask for tellers on ordering the yeas and nays. Tellers were ordered, and the Speaker *pro tempore* appointed Mr. PATTERSON and Mr. REED.

The House divided; and the tellers reported—ayes 88, noes 57. So the yeas and nays were ordered.



Mr. REED. I move to reconsider the vote by which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. The Chair has some doubt—  
Mr. REED. The Chair must not make any mistake. That motion is correct.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. The Chair will hear the gentleman upon that question.

Mr. REED. Well, if the Chair wants to go wrong I shall not undertake to prevent him, but the motion to reconsider is certainly admissible.

Mr. DOCKERY. I think that motion is in order, Mr. Speaker.  
The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. The gentleman from Tennessee moved that the House adjourn, and upon that the yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. REED. Tellers were requested on ordering the yeas and nays, and the yeas and nays were ordered. I voted in favor of the yeas and nays, but, having thought the matter over, I now move to reconsider the vote by which they were ordered. [Laughter.]

Mr. SPRINGER. That motion can be made, but we can not take the yeas and nays upon it.

Mr. REED. I have no desire to embarrass the Chair, and in order to allow him full opportunity for an examination of the question I will withdraw the motion.

A MEMBER. That motion is sound.

Mr. REED. Entirely sound, but unless the Chair is quite satisfied of that I will not insist on the motion.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. The Chair would, of course, be willing to entertain the motion if it be in order, but there is some doubt in the mind of the Chair on that point.

Mr. REED. In my opinion the motion to reconsider is admissible.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. The Chair understands the gentleman to withdraw the motion.

Mr. REED. Well, I will not withdraw it.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. The question then is on the motion to reconsider, if the gentleman insists upon it.

Mr. BURROWS. There is no question that the motion is in order.

Mr. REED. None whatever.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore* (having put the question on the motion to reconsider). The yeas seem to have it.

Mr. REED. Division.

The question being again taken, there were—ayes 37, noes 114.

So the motion to reconsider was rejected.

The SPEAKER. The question is now upon the motion of the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. PATTERSON] that the House adjourn, upon which the yeas and nays have been ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 4, nays 161, not voting 187; as follows:

## YEAS—4.

Kribbs.	Lockwood.	Mallory.	McGann.
NAYS—161.			
Abbott,	Cooper, Tex.	Latimer,	Ritchie,
Alderson,	Covett,	Lawson,	Robbins,
Alexander,	Cox,	Layton,	Robertson, La.
Allen,	Culbertson,	Lester,	Russell, Ga.
Bailey,	Cummings,	Lynch,	Ryan,
Baker, Kans.	De Armond,	Marshall,	Sayers,
Baldwin,	Denson,	Martin, Ind.	Schermerhorn,
Bankhead,	Dinsmore,	McAleer,	Shell,
Barwig,	Dockery,	McCleary, Minn.	Sibley,
Belden,	Donovan,	McCreary, Ky.	Sickles,
Bell, Colo.	Dunbar,	McCulloch,	Sperry,
Bell, Tex.	Edmunds,	McDannold,	Springer,
Berry,	Enloe,	McDearmon,	Stockdale,
Black, Ga.	Epes,	McErick,	Stoue, Ky.
Bland,	Erdman,	McKeighan,	Strait,
Boatner,	Everett,	McLaurin,	Straus,
Bower, N. C.	Felder,	McMillin,	Swanson,
Branch,	Geissenhafer,	McNagy,	Talbot, S. C.
Breckinridge, Ark.	Goldzier,	McRae,	Talbot, Md.
Bretz,	Gorman,	Meredith,	Tate,
Brickner,	Grady,	Money,	Taylor, Ind.
Brookshire,	Gresham,	Montgomery,	Terry,
Brown,	Haines,	Morgan,	Tracey,
Bryan,	Hall, Minn.	Moses,	Tucker,
Burnes,	Hall, Mo.	Neill,	Turner, Ga.
Bynum,	Harris,	Oates,	Turner, Va.
Cabaniss,	Hatch,	O'Neil,	Turpin,
Cadmus,	Hayes,	Outwaite,	Tyler,
Cammetti,	Henderson, N. C.	Paschal,	Warner,
Cannon, Cal.	Hendrix,	Patterson,	Weadock,
Capehart,	Hines,	Paynter,	Wells,
Caruth,	Holman,	Pendleton, Tex.	Wheeler, Ala.
Catchings,	Hudson,	Pendleton, W. Va.	Whiting,
Causey,	Hunter,	Pigott,	Williams, Ill.
Clark, Mo.	Hutcheson,	Price,	Williams, Miss.
Clarke, Ala.	Ikert,	Reilly,	Wise,
Cockrell,	Jones,	Richards, Ohio.	Wolverton,
Coffeen,	Kyle,	Richardson, Mich.	Woodard,
Conn.	Lane.	Richardson, Tenn.	
Coombs,			
Cooper, Fla.			

## NOT VOTING—187.

Adams, Ky.	Davey,	Hopkins, Pa.	Randall,
Adams, Pa.	Davis,	Houk,	Ray,
Aitken,	De Forest,	Hullek,	Rayner,
Aldrich,	Dingley,	Hull,	Reed,
Apsey,	Dolliver,	Johnson, Ind.	Rayburn,
Arnold,	Doolittle,	Johnson, N. Dak.	Robinson, Pa.
Avery,	Draper,	Johnson, Ohio	Rusk,
Babcock,	Dunphy,	Joy,	Russell, Conn.
Baker, N. H.	Ellis, Ky.	Kem,	Scranton,
Barnes,	Ellis, Oregon	Kiefer,	Settle,
Bartholdt,	English,	Kilgore,	Shaw,
Bartlett,	Fithian,	Lacey,	Sherman,
Beitzhoever,	Fletcher,	Lapham,	Simpson,
Bingham,	Forman,	Lefever,	Sipe,
Black, Ill.	Funk,	Linton,	Smith,
Blair,	Funston,	Lisle,	Snodgrass,
Boen,	Fyan,	Livingston,	Somers,
Boutelle,	Gardner,	Lond,	Stallings,
Bowers, Cal.	Gear,	Londenslager,	Stephenson,
Brattan,	Geary,	Lucas,	Stevens,
Breckinridge, Ky.	Gillet, N. Y.	Maddox,	Stone, C. W.
Broderick,	Gillett, Mass.	Magner,	Stone, W. A.
Brosius,	Goodnight,	Maruire,	Storer,
Bundy,	Graham,	Mahon,	Strong,
Bunn,	Griffin,	Marsh,	Sweet,
Burrows,	Grosvenor,	Marvin, N. Y.	Tarsney,
Caldwell,	Grout,	McCall,	Tawney,
Campbell,	Grow,	McDowell,	Taylor, Tenn.
Cannon, Ill.	Hager,	Meiklejohn,	Thomas,
Chickering,	Hainer,	Mercer,	Updegraff,
Childs,	Hammond,	Milliken,	Van Voorhis, N. Y.
Clancy,	Harmer,	Moon,	Van Voorhis, Ohio
Cobb, Ala.	Harter,	Morse,	Wadsworth,
Cobb, Mo.	Hartman,	Murray,	Walker,
Cockran,	Haugen,	Mutchler,	Wanger,
Cogswell,	Heard,	Newlands,	Washington,
Compton,	Heiner,	Northway,	Waugh,
Cooper, Ind.	Henderson, Ill.	Page,	Wever,
Cooper, Wis.	Henderson, Iowa	Payne,	Wheeler, Ill.
Cornish,	Hepburn,	Pearson,	White,
Cousins,	Hermann,	Pence,	Wills, Ohio
Crain,	Hicks,	Perkins,	Wilson, Wash.
Crawford,	Hilborn,	Phillips,	Wilson, W. Va.
Curtis, Kans.	Hitt,	Pickler,	Woomer,
Curtis, N. Y.	Hooker, Miss.	Post,	Wright, Mass.
Dalzell,	Hooker, N. Y.	Powers,	Wright, Pa.
Daniels,	Hopkins, Ill.	Quigg,	

So the motion to adjourn was rejected.

Mr. PATTERSON. I move a call of the House.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore* (having put the question on the motion for a call). The yeas seem to have it.

Mr. REED. Division.

The question being again taken, there were—ayes 96, noes 2.

Mr. REED. I shall have to ask for tellers.

Mr. PATTERSON. Yeas and nays.

The question being taken on ordering the yeas and nays, there were—ayes 86.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. A sufficient number.

Mr. REED. I call for tellers on the yeas and nays.

Tellers were ordered, 38 voting in favor thereof; and Mr. REED and Mr. PATTERSON were appointed.

The House again divided; and the tellers reported—ayes 79, noes 42.

So the yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. REED. I move a reconsideration.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. The gentleman from Maine moves to reconsider the vote by which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The question being taken, there were on a division (called for by Mr. REED)—ayes 32, noes 94.

Mr. REED. Tellers.

Tellers were ordered, 39 voting in favor thereof; and Mr. PATTERSON and Mr. REED were appointed.

The House again divided; and the tellers reported—ayes 109, noes 0.

So the motion to reconsider the vote ordering the yeas and nays was agreed to.

The question recurring on ordering the yeas and nays, there were—ayes 46, noes 123.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. A sufficient number having voted in the affirmative, the yeas and nays are ordered.

Mr. PAYNE. I demand tellers on ordering the yeas and nays. Several MEMBERS. Too late.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. The Chair thinks the gentleman is not too late.

Tellers were ordered, 46 voting in favor thereof; and Mr. PATTERSON and Mr. REED were appointed.

The House again divided, and the tellers reported—yeas 57, noes none.

So the yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 168, nays 1, not voting 183; as follows:

## YEAS—168.

Abbott,	Allen,	Bankhead,	Black, Ga.
Alderson,	Bailey,	Barwig,	Bland,
Aldrich,	Baker, Kans.	Bell, Tex.	Boatner,
Alexander,	Baldwin,	Berry,	Boen,



Boutelle, Bower, N. C. Branch, Breckinridge, Ark. Bretz, Brickner, Brookshire, Bryan, Bynum, Cabanis, Cadmus, Caminetti, Cannon, Cal. Capehart, Caruth, Catching, Clark, Mo. Clarke, Ala. Cobb, Mo. Cockrell, Coffee, Conn, Coombs, Cooper, Fla. Cooper, Tex. Covert, Cox, Crain, Crawford, Culberson, Davey, Davis, De Armond, Dinsmore, Dockery, Donovan, Dunn, Duphy,	Durborow, Edmunds, English, Enloe, Epes, Erdman, Everett, Fielder, Geary, Geissenhainer, Goldzier, Gorman, Grady, Gresham, Haines, Hall, Minn. Hall, Mo. Hammond, Hare, Harris, Hatch, Hayes, Henderson, N. C. Hendrix, Hines, Holman, Hudson, Hunter, Hutchinson, Ikert, Jones, Kilgore, Kribbs, Kyle, Lane, Latimer, Lawson, Layton,	Lester, Lockwood, Lynch, Maguire, Mallory, Marshall, Martin, Ind. McAleer, McCreary, Ky. McCulloch, McDannold, McDearmon, McEttrick, McGann, McKaig, McLaurin, McMillin, McNagy, McRae, Meredit, Meyer, Milliken, Money, Montgomery, Morgan, Moses, Neill, Oates, O'Neil, Outhwaite, Paschal, Patterson, Paynter, Pendleton, Tex. Pendleton, W. Va. Pigott, Price, Reilly,	Richards, Ohio Richardson, Mich. Richardson, Tenn. Richie, Robbins, Robertson, La. Russell, Ga. Ryan, Sayers, Schermerhorn, Shell, Sibley, Springer, Stallings, Stone, Ky. Strait, Straus, Swanson, Talbert, S. C. Talbot, Md. Tate, Taylor, Ind. Terry, Tracey, Tucker, Turner, Ga. Turner, Va. Turpin, Tyler, Warner, Wells, Wheeler, Ala. Whiting, Williams, Ill. Williams, Miss. Wise, Wolverton, Woodard.
---	---	---	---

## NAYS—1.

Weadock.

## NOT VOTING—183.

Adams, Ky. Adams, Pa. Aitkins, Apsley, Arnold, Avery, Babcock, Baker, N. H. Barnes, Bartholdt, Bartlett, Belden, Bell, Colo. Belthoover, Bingham, Black, Ill. Blair, Bowers, Cal. Brattan, Breckinridge, Ky. Broderick, Broslus, Brown, Bundy, Bunn, Burnes, Burrows, Caldwell, Campbell, Cannon, Ill. Causey, Chickering, Childs, Clancy, Cobb, Ala. Cockran, Cogswell, Compton, Cooper, Ind. Cooper, Wis. Cornish, Cousins, Cummings, Curtis, Kans. Curtis, N. Y. Daizell,	Daniels, De Forest, Denson, Dingley, Dolliver, Doollittle, Draper, Ellis, Ky. Ellis, Oregon, Fithian, Fletcher, Forman, Funk, Funston, Fyan, Gardner, Gear, Gillet, N. Y. Gillet, Mass. Goodnight, Graham, Griffin, Grosvenor, Grout, Grow, Hager, Hainer, Harmer, Harter, Hartman, Haugen, Heard, Heiner, Henderson, Ill. Henderson, Iowa, Hepburn, Hermann, Hicks, Hilborn, Hitt, Hooker, Miss. Hooker, N. Y. Hopkins, Ill. Hopkins, Pa. Houk, Hulick,	Hull, Johnson, Ind. Johnson, N. Dak. Johnson, Ohio Joy, Kem, Kiefer, Lacey, Lapham, Lefever, Linton, Lisle, Livingston, Loud, Loudenslager, Lucas, Maddox, Magner, Mahon, Marsh, Marvin, N. Y. McCall, McCleary, Minn. McDowell, McKeighan, Melkejohn, Mercer, Moon, Morse, Murray, Mutchler, Newlands, Northway, Page, Payne, Pearson, Pence, Perkins, Phillips, Pickler, Post, Powers, Quigg, Randall, Ray, Rayner,	Reed, Reyburn, Robinson, Pa. Rusk, Russell, Conn. Scranton, Settle, Shaw, Sherman, Sickles, Simpson, Sipe, Smith, Snodgrass, Somers, Sperry, Stephenson, Stevens, Stockdale, Stone, C. W. Stone, W. A. Storer, Strong, Sweet, Tarsney, Tawney, Taylor, Tenn. Thomas, Updegraff, Van Voorhis, N. Y. Van Voorhis, Ohio. Wadsworth, Walker, Wanger, Washington, Waugh, Wever, Wheeler, Ill. White, Wilson, Ohio Wilson, Wash. Wilson, W. Va. Woomer, Wright, Mass. Wright, Pa.
---	---	--	---

So a call of the House was ordered.

The result of the vote was then announced as above recorded.

Mr. BOUTELLE. Mr. Speaker, I move to reconsider the vote by which the call of the House was ordered.

Mr. SPRINGER. Did the gentleman from Maine vote with the majority on that question?

Mr. BOUTELLE. The "gentleman from Maine" did. He knows enough to do that, strange as it may appear to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. PATTERSON. Mr. Speaker, it is evident we can not get a quorum this afternoon, and I wish to give notice that this case will be called up to-morrow—

Mr. BOUTELLE. Regular order.

Mr. PATTERSON (continuing). At the opening of the session of the House—

Mr. BURROWS. Let us have the regular order.

Mr. PATTERSON (continuing). And will be pressed to a conclusion, the House being asked to remain in continuous session for that purpose.

Mr. BOUTELLE. Mr. Speaker, I have demanded the regular order.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. What motion does the gentleman from Tennessee submit?

Mr. PATTERSON. I move that the House do now adjourn.

Mr. BOUTELLE. I have no objection to that.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. The Chair, if there be no objection, will direct the Clerk to announce a committee appointment of the Speaker before submitting the motion to adjourn.

The Clerk read as follows:

The Speaker appoints Mr. STALLINGS of Alabama on the Committee on Pensions.

## ENROLLED BILL SIGNED.

Mr. PEARSON, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that they had examined and found truly enrolled the bill (H. R. 1919) authorizing the Texarkana and Fort Smith Railway Company to bridge Caddo Lake at or near Mooringsport, La., and Cross Bayou, near Shreveport, La.; when the Speaker signed the same.

## MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE.

A message from the Senate, by Mr. PLATT, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment joint resolution (H. Res. 139) to print the Agricultural Report for 1893.

The motion of Mr. PATTERSON was then agreed to; and accordingly (at 4 o'clock and 35 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned.

## REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII, Mr. STONE of Kentucky, from the Committee on War Claims, reported with amendment the bill (H. R. 2288) for the relief of W. H. Dupre; which, with the accompanying report (No. 644), was ordered to be printed and referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

## PUBLIC BILLS, MEMORIALS, AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, bills of the following titles were introduced, and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. CATCHINGS: A bill (H. R. 6527) to incorporate the National Rapid Transit Company—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TUCKER (by request): A bill (H. R. 6528) to amend the jurisdiction act of 1887 so as to abrogate Federal jurisdiction in State corporations—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HAUGEN: A bill (H. R. 6529) to authorize the construction of a bridge across the St. Croix River between Wisconsin and Minnesota—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. MEYER: A bill (H. R. 6533) donating the United States Marine Hospital in the city of New Orleans, La., to the corporation of said city—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

## PRIVATE BILLS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills of the following titles were presented and referred as follows:

By Mr. BLAIR: A bill (H. R. 6530) to remove the charge of desertion from the record of Charles T. Hurd, formerly a landsman in the United States Navy—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. BRODERICK: A bill (H. R. 6531) to pension Nancy Gabriella Anderson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LACEY: A bill (H. R. 6532) granting an honorable discharge to William B. Barnes—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. MEREDITH (by request): A bill (H. R. 6534) granting a pension to Thomas J. O'Roark—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6535) for the relief of Sarah A. Skinner—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. MILLIKEN: A bill (H. R. 6536) to remove the charge of desertion against James E. Gray—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. NORTHWAY: A bill (H. R. 6537) to remove the charge of dishonorable dismissal of W. H. Castle from the military service of the United States—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. ROBERTSON of Louisiana: A bill (H. R. 6538) for the relief of Mary C. Daigre, East Baton Rouge, La.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6539) for the relief of Mary C. Daiges, of East Baton Rouge, La.—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. SWANSON: A bill (H. R. 6540) for the relief of W. B. Scales—to the Committee on Claims.



## PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, the following petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

By Mr. CAPEHART: Evidence to accompany H. R. 6453, for relief of J. S. Henson—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, evidence to accompany H. R. 6455, for relief of Taply Beckwith—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, evidence to accompany H. R. 6456, for the relief of William Seicks—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, evidence to accompany H. R. 6454, granting a pension to Cynthia Powell—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. COUSINS: Petition of members of Center Camp, No. 892, Modern Woodmen of America, of Center Junction, Iowa, favoring the Manderson-Hainer bill—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. COX: Petition of Thomas J. Lawson, sr., Wayne County, Tenn., asking that his claim be referred to the Court of Claims—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, petition of Shield Simms and Harmon Bryant, estate of Josiah Youngblood, deceased, of Wayne County, Tenn., to accompany House bill 6519—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. FUNK: Petition of the faculty of Illinois Wesleyan University and of W. B. Merrill and others, students of said university, praying for the passage of the Manderson-Hainer bill, H. R. 4897—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. GEAR: Resolution and petition of Lee Lodge, No. 38, of Iowa Legion of Honor, signed by 100 persons, asking for the passage of the Manderson-Hainer bill, admitting to the mails as second-class matter college and fraternal papers—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. GILLET: Petition of A. J. McIntosh, Alfred Rowe, Bradley Gilman, and 41 other citizens of Springfield, Mass., in behalf of the Indians—to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

Also, petition for the suppression of lotteries—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. GORMAN: Petition by resolution of the Michigan Knights of the Grip, asking for the passage of the bill for the issuance of 5,000-mile tickets or books interchangeable on all railroads and giving special privileges to baggage—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of 28 citizens of York, Mich., asking for the passage of the Manderson-Hainer bill, for admitting fraternal society publications to the mails as second-class matter—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

Also, petition of 33 citizens of Saline, Mich., asking for the passage of the Manderson-Hainer bill, in favor of admitting fraternal society publications to the mails as second-class matter—to the Committee on the Post Office and Post-Roads.

Also, petition of Detroit Steam Fitter's Union, No. 8; of Marine Engineers' Benevolent Association; of the Machine Woodworkers' Union; of the Shoe Cutters' Union; of the Iron-Workers' Protective Union; of the Bricklayers and Stonemasons' Union, and of the Journeymen Stonecutters' Union, all of Detroit, Mich., asking for Government ownership and control of the telegraph systems of the country—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. HAGER: Resolutions of the Iowa State Veterinary Medical Association, recommending that appointment of veterinarians in the Bureau of Animal Industry be made on the merit system, etc.—to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. HENDERSON of Iowa: Petition of Alba Miller and 15 others, of Mason City, Iowa, favoring the passage of the Manderson-Hainer bills, S. 1353, H. R. 4897—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

Also, paper from the Iowa State Veterinary Medical Association, Oskaloosa, Iowa, favoring the recommendation of the Secretary of Agriculture that the appointment of veterinarians in the Bureau of Animal Industry be made in the merit system and under the control of the Civil Service Commission—to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. HULL: Petition of I. H. Merrill and 59 other citizens of Des Moines, Iowa, asking the passage of more stringent laws to suppress lotteries—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

Also, petition of Walnut Camp, No. 1695, Modern Woodmen of America, Tracy, Iowa, asking that the fraternal press be admitted to the mails as second-class matter—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

Also, petition of L. E. Pack and 12 other citizens of Marion County, Iowa, asking for the passage of the Manderson-Hainer bill—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. LOCKWOOD: Petition of citizens of Buffalo, to amend the interstate commerce law to insure steady, stable, and equit-

able freight rates—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. MEIKLEJOHN: Petition from Clark, Nebr., for admission to the mails as second-class matter publications of fraternal and benevolent societies—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. PICKLER: Petition of R. T. Payne and 19 others, of Henry, S. Dak., and William T. Jones and 77 others, of Madison, S. Dak., in favor of the passage of the Manderson-Hainer bill—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. POST: Petition of the Illinois Blue Label League, with a membership of over 4,000 cigar-makers, against an increased revenue tax upon cigars made in this country—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of 36 citizens, together with Phoenix Lodge, No. 65, O. M. P., 165 members, in favor of the Manderson-Hainer bill—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. RICHARDSON of Michigan: Resolution of Carpenters' Union No. 42, of Detroit, in favor of governmental control of telegraph systems—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. RICHARDSON of Tennessee: Petition of W. H. Weakley, grand recorder, Ancient Order of United Workmen, of Tennessee, for the passage on the Manderson-Hainer bill—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. SPERRY: Petition of citizens of Hartford, Conn., in favor of the Manderson-Hainer bill—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. STEVENSON: Petition of Bricklayers and Stonecutters' Union and of Iron Workers' Protective Union, in favor of governmental ownership and control of the telegraph systems—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. TYLER: Claim of First Baptist Church, Suffolk, Va., for damages to property by Federal troops in 1862 and 1865—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. WILSON of Ohio: Petition of Trades and Labor Assembly of Springfield, Ohio, against increased internal-revenue tax on cigars—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

## SENATE.

TUESDAY, April 3, 1894.

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

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

## MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE.

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. T. O. TOWLES, its Chief Clerk, announced that the House had passed the following bills; in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

A bill (H. R. 1686) granting a pension to Margaret English; and

A bill (H. R. 4606) to amend sections 5365 and 5366 of the Revised Statutes.

## ENROLLED BILL SIGNED.

The message also announced that the Speaker of the House had signed the enrolled bill (H. R. 1919) authorizing the Texarkana and Fort Smith Railway Company to bridge Caddo Lake at or near Mooringsport La., and Cross Bayou, near Shreveport, La.; and it was thereupon signed by the Vice-President.

## PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS.

Mr. HARRIS presented the petition of W. H. Meadow, W. P. Rogers, and 20 other citizens of Waverly, Humphreys County, Tenn., praying that building and loan associations be exempted from the operation of the proposed income tax; which was ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. PETTIGREW. I present a petition of the chiefs, headmen and members of the Yankton tribe of Sioux Indians, praying the passage of the bill affecting their treaty with the United States Government for the relinquishment of their surplus land; which I move be printed as a document to accompany the bill (S. 1538) to ratify and confirm an agreement with the Yankton tribe of Sioux or Dakota Indians in South Dakota, and to make appropriations for carrying the same into effect, which is now on the Calendar.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. PETTIGREW presented a petition of citizens of Alcester, S. Dak., praying that fraternal society and college journals be admitted to the mails as second-class matter; which was referred to the Committee on Post-Offices and Post-Roads.

Mr. DAVIS presented a petition of the Chamber of Commerce of St. Paul, Minn., praying for the speedy settlement of the tariff question; which was ordered to lie on the table.