quette and other portions of the State of Michigan; 21 citizens of Newark, Ohio; 26 of Pittsburg, Pa., and 21 more citizens of Michigan City, Ind., for the passage of House bill 5804, an act to promote the safety of railroad employés—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of L. H. Whipple and other citizens of Needham, Mass., praying that the income-tax provision of the Wilson bill may be amended so as to exempt beneficiary orders, etc., from taxation—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LAYTON: Resolution of the Young Men's Christian Association and Young Woman's Christian Association of Normal University of Lebanon, Ohio, for the speedy passage of anti-lottery laws—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McGANN: Petition of Chicago Stamping Company, relating to House bill 4897—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. PATTERSON: Papers to accompany H. Res. 190, for the printing of the digest of the laws and decisions relating to the appointment, salary, and compensation of officials of the United States courts—to the Committee on Printing.

By Mr. PHILLIPS: Two petitions of 109 citizens of Beaver Falls, Pa., protesting against an income tax being levied on fraternal and beneficiary orders composing the National Fraternal Congress, having a combined membership of over 2,000,000 holding benefit certificates—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, resolution of the Economic Literary Club, of Beaver Falls, Pa., urging the passage of the two Coxey bills—to the Committee on Labor.

By Mr. REYBURN: Petition of citizens of Pennsylvania, praying that the beneficiary societies be exempted from the income tax—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. STORER: Petition of Ed. Bratfish and 14 other citizens of Hamilton County, Ohio, against sectarian appropriations—to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. WALKER: Petition of Good Citizenship Club, of Dudley, Mass., urging the passage of the Hoar antilottery bill—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. WEADOCK: Papers to accompany House bill 7400—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

SENATE.

MONDAY, *June 11, 1894.*

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

Prayer by Rev. T. BOWMAN STEPHENSON, LL. D., of London, England.

On motion of Mr. MORRILL, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Saturday last was dispensed with.

UNITED STATES NAVAL OBSERVATORY.

Mr. MORRILL. Mr. Speaker, I wish to ask as a personal favor the privilege of making remarks about ten minutes long in relation to an amendment proposed by me to the naval appropriation bill on Saturday.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the Senator from Vermont will proceed.

Mr. MORRILL. I will not ask for the reading of the amendment, but will insert it at the head of my remarks.

The amendment (submitted by Mr. MORRILL on the 9th instant) was to insert the following:

That from and after the passage of this act the Superintendent of the United States Naval Observatory shall be a person selected from civil life, learned in the science of astronomy, to be appointed by the President by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, and shall receive an annual salary of $5,000; he may also occupy the dwelling house near the observatory free of rent. The superintendent aforesaid is hereby authorized and directed, with the approval of the Secretary of the Navy, to reorganize said observatory establishment and to make such regulations as may be expedient in relation to the observatory and its subordinate officers, professors, and other employés: *Provided*, That after January 1, 1895, the total salaries and annual expenditures shall be adjusted to a basis of not exceeding $50,000 per annum.

Mr. MORRILL. Mr. President, I make this proposition, after mature deliberation, not in any hostility to the Navy, nor to any of its officers, but as a steadfast friend, with the purpose of relieving naval officers of the chief responsibility in the direction of our astronomical observatory, which the experience for the greater part of fifty years shows would be a grave error longer to impose.

One purpose of the change contemplated is that of economy, in order to escape from the overwhelming criticism that the United States parades great expenditures without the parade of great results. Another high purpose is to obtain a skilled and practical astronomer as superintendent of an observatory which, not the Navy but the nation supports, and of which our country must bear the responsibility and the recoiling reputation. It is wholly a conservative measure—a relief to the Navy, and a relief to the observatory. A large portion of the working force of competent officers, professors, and computers now at the observatory must be retained, although the force will be reduced by the limit proposed to the total expenditures.

No nation, as I am assured on the best authority, has now or ever had an astronomical observatory directed by its naval officers. The observatory in France is placed in charge of the department of public instruction, science, and fine arts. The Greenwich Royal Observatory is under the admiralty, or navy, but the director is a prominent practical astronomer, as he should be here.

No one will dispute that we have had very eminent naval officers detailed for service as superintendents of our national observatory, and it was fortunate soon after its start to have had, even for a brief time, such officers as Maury and Gilliss, with qualifications and genius that won deserved national recognition.

Some occasional notable work has since been done by officers of rare scientific culture, such as Prof. Hall, who were also ornaments of the naval profession.

Yet many blank years have passed without so much as an annual report of astronomical observations to show even the existence of our Naval Observatory, and when reports of the usual work well done have appeared the work has rarely been better done than that of observatories of much inferior nominal rank in different parts of our country. We want an observatory which will promote the advancement of astronomical science by day and by night, by "labor and study intent," and prove itself by its work at least able to contest the primacy of any other observatory in America.

We have purchased a site and erected a new Observatory at a cost of about $640,000, or greater than the cost of any similar national institution in Europe, and have furnished it with a 26-inch equatorial telescope, as well as other proper instruments for scientific observation. Manifestly the design could not have been less than to give our Observatory a higher national character and the means of answering the public demand for resulting work of commensurate importance. The present annual cost for its support is extraordinarily large, or $68,600, being nearly twice as much as that of the Greenwich Royal Observatory. If any recent extraordinary work has been done, its report has not yet leaped to light.

The United States naval officers are educated and trained in their legitimate profession as profoundly as any in the world. The curriculum at our Naval Academy is broad and exacting, embracing English studies, modern languages, mathematics, chemistry, steam engineering, ordnance, gunnery, drawing, mechanics, applied mechanics, and much else. To master these branches in four years is a task full of labor. But the cadets at the Academy do not touch either astronomy or navigation until the second term of the third year, and all instruction in these branches ends with some further attention and one or two brief voyages at sea in the fourth and last year at the Academy. This is the whole measure of instruction in navigation and astronomical science with which all our naval officers have been or can be practically equipped.

The numerous studies prescribed at the Naval Academy require the utmost diligence of students in order to pass the rigid examinations to which they are subjected, and final success here secures to our country the best possible material for the officers of the American Navy, of whose conduct, in peace or in war, our people have always been justly proud. That is their chosen and sufficient field of ambition, and however worthy in all other respects, it would seem impossible for them to have won distinction as experts in astronomy where they have merely had a brief opportunity to learn only something of the rudiments, and so far only as related to or necessary in navigation.

No one can more fully realize the impropriety of placing a naval officer at the head of an astronomical observatory than naval officers themselves. If the question could be submitted to them I have much reason to believe that no more such appointments would be made.

I will here make a brief extract from the very able report, in 1892, of the Secretary of the Navy, as follows:

The revolution which the last thirty years have witnessed in the requirements of marine warfare on the one hand and in the methods and appliances of astronomical research on the other have quite severed that close connection between the naval and astronomical professions which led to placing the old observatory under the direction of a naval officer and regarding it as a naval station; and the professional attainments now exacted by our officers and necessary to their efficiency include so wide a range of subjects and extend to such minute details that they have no time to devote to matters so far outside of the line of their profession as those which pertain to the management of a great modern astronomical observatory.

The position is not regarded as a perquisite logically belonging to naval officers, few of whom hanker for it and less obtain

it. The fair fame of the Navy can lose nothing but gain much by the coöperation of leading astronomers in building up a national observatory that will remain under the loyal protection of the Navy Department.

Since March 4, 1885, twenty-five new modern naval vessels have been completed; fifteen more are to be completed in 1894, three more in 1895, and five in 1896. In all there will be forty-eight new vessels, for which the best and most competent officers either have been or must be assigned. After deducting vessels lost or no longer seaworthy, the large addition of new vessels will demand an unusually large increase of the number of officers in active sea service and the surplus for duty on shore will be diminished.

When naval officers are to be entrusted with the command of these modern "gems of the sea," surely neither the gallant captain now serving as the superintendent of the Observatory nor his friends will consent that he shall be neglected or held back in tame shore duties.

The direct and discreet control by the presiding officer of institutions of learning and even of legislative bodies is found to be absolutely necessary, but for such service it has never been found equally necessary to select a military officer. Military authority is healthful and indispensable on the deck of a vessel of war, but in the studious and patient direction of a national astronomical observatory it may seem sometimes obtrusive, rather than always useful. The working force of almost any institution will cheerfully obey the chief director if known to be their superior in practical kowledge, as well as authority, of the work in hand. The number of eminent practical astronomers in the United States is comparatively large. No one of them, however, is a candidate for the position, but with a more permanent tenure in sight, some one of those who has made and still makes astronomy the ambition of life might be had for superintendent of our Observatory.

Except perhaps for the Nautical Almanac, astronomical observations are hardly more useful to the Naval Department than to that of Agriculture.

An astronomical observatory is a light-house in the skies by which we behold the magnificence of possible worlds, infinite in number, greater than that where we were created. Eagerness of the human race to explore the secrets of the heavens above us has prevailed in every age and grows more intense by its modern achievements. I only seek to have the work in that direction of the United States, by its admirable establishment on Georgetown Heights, take rank with that of other leading nations.

I present some papers in relation to the amendment which I move be printed as a miscellaneous document, and referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

The motion was agreed to.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION.

Mr. QUAY. Mr. President, I desire to make a personal explanation. It is understood pretty well that I am not in the habit of paying any attention to newspaper statements affecting myself, and I refer to this one, first, because legislation connected with the subject is to come up in the other House to-day, and if a contradiction is not made it may be affected by the article I send to the desk; and, secondly, because the name of the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. CHANDLER] is given as authority for the lying statement. I ask that the article may be read.

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

The Secretary read from the New York Sun of Sunday, June 10, 1894, as follows:

CORRUPTION IN CONGRESS—CHARGES AS SERIOUS AS THOSE INVOLVED IN THE SUGAR SCANDAL—EFFORTS OF THE PHILADELPHIA SYNDICATE, OF WHICH SENATOR QUAY IS SAID TO BE THE ACTIVE AGENT, TO GET CONTROL OF THE SURFACE ROADS IN THE DISTRICT AND TO PROCURE CHARTERS FOR THE CONSTRUCTION OF NEW LINES WITH THE TROLLEY AS THE MOTIVE POWER.

WASHINGTON, *June 9.*

Congress may soon be called upon to investigate charges of corruption against members of both Houses as serious as those involved in the sugar scandal. For several years past Congress has been besieged with applications for charters for the construction of new surface roads in this city and the extension of old lines, and there has been constant contention between the citizens, the District officials, and Congress as to the motive power to be used. The citizens of Washington generally are opposed to the use of the overhead trolley system, and it is in use by only one or two lines within the District, and only for a short distance. Moreover, under the law, even this short privilege will cease within a few months.

For the past few weeks the Washington News has persistently charged that the Philadelphia syndicate is making a systematic effort to get control of all the important surface roads in Washington, and that to carry out their plan a combination of wealthy men in the Senate and House has been formed by which the stock of the local companies is to be depressed so that it can be bought up at a low figure. The News charges further that Thomas Dolan, of Philadelphia, is the agent of the syndicate, and that the active man under him in trying to influence Congress is Senator QUAY. For sometime there has been a bill before the House granting a charter for a cross-town road, and in spite of the fact that nine-tenths of the property owners along the proposed route protest against using the street for a car line, the bill came near passing the House last Monday, which was District day. It was withdrawn in the face of the strong opposition, however, and will come up again on Monday next.

According to the News, which quotes Senator CHANDLER as one of the authorities for the statement, Dolan and QUAY have made a list of the men whose votes they can control, and have announced that the bill will certainly pass, with a proviso authorizing the use of the overhead trolley system. The vote on this bill, it is said, is to be used as a test of the strength of the Dolan-Quay combination, and if they win on that they feel sure of being able to pass the other bills and gridiron the city with trolley roads. According to the News there are fifty-eight bills pending asking for charters for new surface roads, in many of which the syndicate is interested, or of which they hope to get absolute control.

One of the most important car lines of Washington uses the cable system, and its main rival still employs broken-down horses. Several years ago Congress ordered this road to change its motive power within a given time, but it did not do it, although the date set has long since passed. This road, which is one of the greatest money-making concerns in the District of Columbia, also owes the Government a great many thousands of dollars for back taxes, and although negotiations have been in progress for two or three years for the settlement of the claim, not a cent has been paid. Congress, the District Commissioners, and the directors of the road are still in a wrangle as to the motive power that is to be used, and they are apparently as far from an agreement in this as they are with regard to the payment of the back taxes. The directors of the road say that the use of the cable is impossible on this line, owing to the great number of abrupt curves, and that the underground electric system, now in use with great success on one line within the city limits, is too expensive and too impracticable. The District Commissioners are divided in their opinion, and the citizens and taxpayers are opposed to the use of the overhead trolley. In the meantime horses pull the cars, the fight goes on, and Congress does not bring the road to terms. The vote in the House on Monday will probably show whether the Philadelphia syndicate or the citizens of Washington are in control of the city.

Mr. QUAY. I desire to state that the allegations in that article, as it is probably unnecessary for me to say, are absolutely false.

I will state the facts. Certain citizens of Philadelphia, how many I know not, and exactly whom I know not, of whom Mr. Thomas Dolan, who was recently president of the Manufacturers' Club in that city, is one, have corporate interests in some passenger railways in this city. I do not remember the name of their corporation. They are seeking an enlargement of some of their franchises, what I do not exactly know, for I have not seen the proposed legislation.

At their request I did for them what I will do for any other citizens of Pennsylvania or for citizens of any other State who come here for a fair and honest purpose. My interference in their behalf was simply to introduce Mr. Dolan to the Senator from Michigan [Mr. MCMILLAN], who is a member of the Committee on the District of Columbia, in order that Mr. Dolan might present the case to him.

I think I have not heard from the Senator from Michigan since on the subject. Also, at the request of Mr. Dolan, I spoke to the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. FAULKNER], who I understood was chairman of a subcommittee having this matter in charge, requesting that he should give Mr. Dolan a hearing. The Senator from West Virginia informed me that I was mistaken, that he was not chairman of the subcommittee, and I have not heard from him since on the subject.

On Friday last, at the request of Mr. Dolan, I asked a friend of mine of the other House to request some of the delegation from his State to be present to-day in order to constitute a quorum. He replied that there would be a quorum there to-day.

That is the extent of my knowledge of or connection with this enterprise. I think I am justified in this instance in departing from my usual course in relation to the thousands of newspaper attacks upon me, first, as I said before, because this article was evidently written to affect legislation to come up in the other House to-day; and, secondly, because the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. CHANDLER] is alleged to be the author of it.

Mr. CHANDLER. The Senator from Pennsylvania did not call the subject to my attention before sending up the paper. I only heard what he said, and I have not the statements of the article distinctly in mind. I did, however, see the statement in the Evening News, which is quoted by the article the Senator has had read. I have heard of the syndicate and the proposed formation of a traction company for the purpose of obtaining control of the street railways of this city, and that is about all I can say on the subject, except that I may have talked with newspaper men about it and asked them questions, and they may have asked me questions.

I never heard until this morning Mr. Dolan's name in connection with any such project, and I certainly have made no remarks attributing any improper motives to any Senator, or any improper relations, or any relations whatever to any such proposed traction company organization—certainly nothing connecting the Senator from Pennsylvania with any such organization in any way whatever. I have no reason to doubt the exact truth of the statement made by the Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. QUAY. I do not know but that the matter may as well be referred to the special committee of which the Senator from Delaware [Mr. GRAY] is chairman, so as to let him take charge

of this subject along with the other matters referred to that committee. I make that motion.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS.

Mr. QUAY presented petitions of Herman Diesenger and 230 other citizens of Philadelphia; of J. Harold Wickensham and 33 other citizens of Lancaster; of H. W. Taylor and 37 other citizens of Philadelphia; of W. J. Vance and 8 other citizens of Braddock; of John W. Schell and 10 other citizens of Philadelphia; of F. B. Schertz and 7 other citizens of Philadelphia; of W. M. Geesaman and 16 other citizens of Shippensburg; of Thomas Lamb and 37 other citizens of Boston; of B. F. Stedeford and 40 other citizens of Wilmerding; of C. B. Kebber and 7 other citizens of Coroy; of A. H. Koch and 8 other citizens of Sharpsburg; of C. B. Roberts and 10 other citizens of Philadelphia; of William H. White and 22 other citizens of Uniontown; of W. E. Baldwin and 19 other citizens of Unionville, and of C. R. Moore and 45 other citizens of St. Petersburg, all in the State of Pennsylvania, praying that the funds of mutual life insurance companies and associations be exempted from the proposed income-tax provision of the pending tariff bill; which were ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. HARRIS presented a petition of sundry citizens of Huntingdon, Tenn., praying that fraternal beneficiary societies and associations be exempted from the proposed income-tax provision of the pending tariff bill; which was ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. SHERMAN presented the petition of M. A. Meyer and sundry other citizens of Ohio, praying that the funds of mutual life insurance companies and associations be exempted from the income-tax provision of the pending tariff bill; which was ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented petitions of Thomas C. Bope and sundry other citizens of Lancaster; of D. E. Brown and sundry other citizens of Niles, and of Job D. Williams and sundry other citizens of Ironton, all in the State of Ohio, praying that the pending tariff bill be amended so that fraternal beneficiary societies, orders, or associations, operating upon the lodge system and providing for the payment of life, sick, accident, and other benefits to the members, and dependents of such members, shall be exempt from all the provisions of the bill requiring taxation in any form; which were ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. CULLOM. I present quite a number of memorials from wholesale and retail liquor dealers of various cities in Illinois, remonstrating against an increase of the whisky tax, and also against an extension of the present bonded period. I call attention to these memorials because there are a large number of them and they all seem to be endorsed alike. I move that the memorials lie on the table.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. CULLOM presented a petition of sundry citizens of Morgan County, Ill., and a petition of sundry citizens of Elgin, Ill., praying that fraternal beneficiary societies, orders, and associations be exempted from the proposed income-tax provision of the pending tariff bill; which were ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. MANDERSON presented a petition of 176 citizens of Lancaster County, Nebr., praying that in the passage of any law providing for the taxation of incomes, the funds of mutual life insurance companies and associations be exempted from taxation; which was ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented a petition signed by the officers of the State of Nebraska and sundry other citizens of Lincoln, Nebr., praying that fraternal beneficiary societies, orders, and associations be exempted from the proposed income-tax provision of the pending tariff bill; which was ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented a petition of the McCook Coöperative Building and Loan Association, of McCook, Nebr., praying that mutual building and loan associations be exempted from the proposed income-tax provision of the pending tariff bill; which was ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. PERKINS presented a memorial of sundry citizens of Placer County, Cal., remonstrating against the proposed income-tax provision of the pending tariff bill; which was ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented a memorial of the Chamber of Commerce of San Francisco, Cal., remonstrating against the abolishment of the custom-house at Eureka, Cal.; which was referred to the Committee on Commerce.

Mr. PATTON presented the petition of A. M. Todd and 69 other peppermint growers of Kalamazoo and Decatur, in the State of Michigan, praying for the retention of the present duty of $1 per pound on oil peppermint; which was ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented the petition of B. A. Born and sundry other citizens of Grand Rapids, Mich., praying that the funds of mutual life insurance companies and associations be exempted from the proposed income-tax provision of the pending tariff bill; which was ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. VEST presented the petition of E. C. Link and sundry other citizens of Adair County, Mo., praying that the funds of mutual life insurance companies and associations be exempted rom the proposed income-tax provision of the pending tariff bill; which was ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented the petition of Julius W. Koch and sundry other citizens of St. Louis, Mo., praying that the pending tariff bill be so amended "that fraternal beneficiary societies, orders, or associations operating upon the lodge system and providing for the payment of life, sick, accident, and other benefits to the members and dependents of such members, shall be exempt from all the provisions of the bill requiring taxation in any form;" which was ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. MARTIN presented petitions of J. D. Bowersock and sundry other citizens of Lawrence; of Alfred Welsh and sundry other citizens of Atchison; of A. X. Campbell and sundry other citizens of Holton, and of H. W. Berkley and sundry other citizens of Rossville, all in the State of Kansas, praying that in the passage of any law providing for the taxation of incomes, the funds of mutual life insurance companies and associations be exempted from taxation; which were ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. COCKRELL presented a petition from Eureka Council, No. 37, Royal League, of St. Louis, Mo., praying that the pending tariff bill be so amended that fraternal beneficiary societies, orders, or associations, operating upon the lodge system and providing for the payment of life, sick, accident and other benefits to the members and dependents of such members, shall be exempt from all the provisions of the bill requiring taxation in any form; which was ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. SMITH presented a memorial of the trustees of the East River Savings Institution, of New York City, N. Y., remonstrating against the imposition of a tax on the funds of savings institutions; which was ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented a memorial of the Democratic Club of New York City, N. Y., remonstrating against the proposed income-tax provision of the pending tariff bill; which was ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented the petition of Chas. P. Senger and sundry other citizens of Essex County, and the petition of George B. Raymond and sundry other citizens of Morris and Essex Counties, all in the State of New York, praying that the funds of mutual life insurance companies and associations be exempted from the proposed income-tax provision of the pending tariff bill; which were ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented the petition of J. W. Bailey and sundry other citizens of Arlington and Jersey City, and the petition of the Royal Arcanum, Grand Council, of Jersey City, all in the State of New Jersey, praying that the pending tariff bill be so amended "that fraternal beneficiary societies, orders or associations, paying benefits to their members in the nature of insurance, and operating upon the lodge system, shall be exempt from all the provisions of the bill requiring taxation in any form;" which were ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. HOAR presented the petition of Alfred L. Barbour and 19 other citizens of Massachusetts, praying that fraternal beneficiary societies, orders or associations, be exempted from the proposed income-tax provision of the pending tariff bill; which was ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. DOLPH presented sundry petitions of citizens of Umatilla and Multnomah Counties, in the State of Oregon, praying that in the passage of any law providing for the taxation of incomes, the funds of mutual life insurance companies and associations be exempted from taxation; which were ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented a petition of sundry citizens of Washington, praying that section 2324 of the Revised Statutes be amended so as to suspend for the year 1894 the performance of $100 worth of labor upon mining claims; which was referred to the Committee on Mines and Mining.

Mr. SHERMAN presented sundry memorials of wholesale and retail liquor dealers of Cincinnati, Cleveland, Sandusky, Bridgeport, Portsmouth, St. Marys, Zanesville, Toledo, Dayton, Columbus, Niles, Hamilton, and Chillicothe, all in the State of Ohio, remonstrating against an increase of the present tax on whisky and also against an extension of the bonded period; which were ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. TELLER presented a petition of members of the bar of Indian Territory, praying for the passage of a bill granting judicial relief in that Territory; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. MORRILL presented a petition of sundry citizens of Brattleboro, Vt., praying that fraternal beneficiary societies, orders, or associations be exempted from the proposed income-

tax provision of the pending tariff bill; which was ordered to lie on the lable.

He also presented a petition of the Vermont Association of Life Underwriters of Burlington, Vt., praying that mutual life insurance companies and associations be exempted from the proposed income-tax provision of the pending tariff bill; which was ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. HIGGINS presented a petition of sundry citizens of Middletown, Del., praying that fraternal beneficiary societies, orders, or associations be exempted from the proposed income-tax provision of the pending tariff bill; which was ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. SQUIRE presented a petition of sundry citizens of Washington, praying that mutual life insurance companies and associations be exempted from the proposed income-tax provision of the pending tariff bill; which was ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. MCMILLAN presented a petition of the Michigan Life Insurance Agents' Association, of Detroit, Mich., praying that the funds of mutual life insurance companies and associations be exempted from the proposed income-tax provision of the pending tariff bill; which was ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. FRYE presented a petition of the Board of Trade of Portland, Me., praying for the passage of House bill No. 6723, to promote the efficiency of the Revenue Cutter Service; which was referred to the Committee on Commerce.

He also presented petitions of 161 citizens of Winthrop; of 22 citizens of York Village, and of 18 citizens of Bath, all in the State of Maine, praying that fraternal beneficiary societies, orders, or organizations be exempted from the proposed income-tax provision of the pending tariff bill; which were ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. GORDON presented a petition of sundry citizens of St. Marys, Ga., praying for an increase of the appropriation for the improvement of the harbor at that city; which was referred to the Committee on Commerce.

He also presented a petition of sundry citizens of Rome, Ga., praying that fraternal beneficiary societies, orders, and associations be exempted from the proposed income-tax provision of the pending tariff bill; which was ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented the memorial of W. B. McDaniel, of Gundee, Ga., remonstrating against an increase of the postage on second-class mail matter; which was referred to the Committee on Post-Offices and Post-Roads.

Mr. HARRIS presented the memorials of Perry & Co., of Knoxville; of B. H. Carbery and Emil Nathan & Co., of Memphis; of N. C. Ford & Co., E. R. Betterton & Co., and Sobel & Co., of Nashville, all in the State of Tennessee, remonstrating against any increase of the internal-revenue tax on whisky; which were ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. BRICE presented memorials of Anne Etchells Lomas, of Dayton; of Frank L. Willcut, of Cleveland, and of Trades and Labor Council, of Zanesville, all in the State of Ohio, remonstrating against the proposed increase of postage on second-class mail matter; which were referred to the Committee on Post-Offices and Post-Roads.

He also presented petitions of sundry citizens of Piqua, Ohio, and Brooklyn and New York City, N. Y., praying for the retention of the present rate of duty on imported cocoa mats and matting; which were ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented a memorial of the Medical Society of Cleveland, Ohio, remonstrating against the proposed reduction in the appropriation for the Surgeon-General's library from ten thousand to seven thousand dollars; which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

He also presented a petition of the General Assembly of the State of Ohio, praying for the enactment of legislation providing a service pension of $8 per month for soldiers of the Union Army during the rebellion who have received an honorable discharge; which was referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also presented petitions of 44 citizens of Wayne County; of 88 citizens of Ohio; of 44 citizens of Mahoning, and of 212 citizens of Cincinnati, all in the State of Ohio, praying that mutual life insurance companies and associations be exempted from the proposed income-tax provision of the pending tariff bill; which were ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented the petition of Isaiah Leist, jr., and sundry other citizens of Napoleon, Ohio, and the petition of C. W. Nessler and sundry other citizens of Sidney, Ohio, praying that the pending tariff bill be so amended that fraternal beneficiary societies, orders, or associations operating upon the lodge system and providing for the payment of life, sick, accident, and other benefits to the members, and dependents of such members, shall be exempt from the provisions of the bill requiring taxation in any form; which were ordered to lie on the table.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES.

Mr. MCPHERSON, from the Committee on Naval Affairs, to whom was referred an amendment submitted by Mr. MORRILL on the 9th instant, intended to be proposed to the naval appropriation bill, reported favorably thereon, and moved that it be referred to the Committee on Appropriations and printed; which was agreed to.

Mr. DUBOIS, from the Committee on Public Lands, to whom was referred an amendment submitted by himself on the 9th instant, intended to be proposed to the legislative, executive, and judicial appropriation bill, reported favorably thereon and moved that it be referred to the Committee on Appropriations and be printed; which was agreed to.

TARIFF BULLETINS.

Mr. VOORHEES. I report from the Committee on Finance Tariff Bulletins Nos. 45, 46, and 47, inclusive, which I ask may be printed.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. It will be so ordered.

BILLS INTRODUCED.

Mr. WASHBURN introduced a bill (S. 2107) granting to the Northern Mississippi Railroad Company right of way through certain Indian reservations in Minnesota; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

Mr. TELLER (by request) introduced a bill (S. 2108) to amend an act entitled "An act to establish a United States court in the Indian Territory, and for other purposes," approved March 1, 1889, and an act entitled "An act to provide a temporary government for the Territory of Oklahoma, to enlarge the jurisdiction of the United States court in the Indian Territory, and for other purposes," approved May 2, 1890; to provide for the redistricting of the Indian Territory for judicial purposes, for an additional judge and more United States commissioners, and to prescribe the jurisdiction, duties, and authority of such judges and commissioners, and for other purposes; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying paper, referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. BRICE introduced a bill (S. 2109) to correct the military record of George W. Pilcher; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. GORDON introduced a bill (S. 2110) to aid and encourage the holding of a Cotton States and International Exposition at Atlanta, Ga., in the year 1895, and making an appropriation therefor; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Education and Labor.

AMENDMENT TO REVENUE BILL.

Mr. SHERMAN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill (H. R. 4864) to reduce taxation, to provide revenue for the Government, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table and be printed.

AMENDMENT TO APPROPRIATION BILLS.

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

Mr. VILAS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the sundry civil appropriation bill; which was referred to the Committee on the Quadro-Centennial (select), and ordered to be printed.

THE PADRONE SYSTEM.

Mr. CHANDLER. I submit a resolution to be printed and go over until to-morrow.

The resolution was read and ordered to lie over and to be printed, as follows:

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Treasury be directed to inform the Senate, so far as the records of the Department enable him to do so, to what extent the system now prevails under which immigrants from Italy or other countries fall into the hands of agents or bankers who entice or force them into contracts or customs under which their labor is farmed out to their employers, commonly called the padrone system; and also to inform the Senate whether any special measures are being taken or contemplated by the Treasury Department for breaking up every such system; whether the Department has sufficient funds at its disposal derived from the head moneys, or whether additional appropriations are needed for the suppression and extermination of such systems and for the due enforcement of the laws prohibiting the importation of contract laborers.

GRAND ARMY PLACE.

Mr. PALMER submitted the following concurrent resolution; which was referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia:

Resolved by the Senate of the United States (the House of Representatives concurring), That that portion of the public reservations in the city of Washington, D. C., lying south of the grounds of the Executive Mansion, and bounded on the east by Fifteenth street, on the south by B street, and on the west by Seventeenth street, be designated and hereafter known as "Grand Army Place."

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 and joint resolution; in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

A bill (H. R. 6500) to define and establish the units of electrical measure;

A bill (H. R. 7293) regulating the procedure in criminal causes in the district of Minnesota; and

A joint resolution (H. Res. 172) granting full permission to the State of Maryland and to the several State courts to occupy the old United States court-house in the city of Baltimore for the period of five years.

THE REVENUE BILL.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The hour of half past 10 o'clock having arrived, the Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business.

The Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 4864) to reduce taxation, to provide revenue for the Government, and for other purposes; the pending question being on the amendment of Mr. ALDRICH, in paragraph 237, line 25, page 52, before the word "cents," to strike out "one dollar and eighty" and insert "two dollars and fifty;" so as to read:

Brandy and other spirits manufactured or distilled from grain or other materials, and not specially provided for in this act, $2.50 per proof gallon.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Is the Senate ready for the question on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Rhode Island?

Mr. ALLISON. I suggest that we have the yeas and nays on the amendment.

The yeas and nays were ordered, and the Secretary proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MITCHELL of Wisconsin (when his name was called). I announce once for all, for the day, that I am paired with the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. CAREY]. The Senator from Wyoming wished me to state that he has been called out of the city by the death of a member of his family.

Mr. PALMER (when his name was called). The Senator from North Dakota [Mr. HANSBROUGH] is absent from the city, unwell. I announce my pair with him, and withhold my vote. I will not again announce the pair to-day. If he were present I should vote "nay" on this question.

Mr. PATTON (when his name was called). I am paired with the junior Senator from Maryland [Mr. GIBSON]. If he were present I should vote "yea."

Mr. QUAY (when his name was called). I am paired with the Senator from Alabama (Mr. MORGAN]. If he were present I should "yea."

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. MCPHERSON (after having voted in the negative). Has the Senator from Delaware [Mr. HIGGINS] voted?

The VICE-PRESIDENT. He has not voted.

Mr. MCPHERSON. Then I wish to withdraw my vote, as I am paired with that Senator. I shall not announce the pair again to-day.

Mr. CAFFERY. I inquire if the Senator from Montana [Mr. POWER] has voted?

The VICE-PRESIDENT. He has not voted.

Mr. CAFFERY. Then I announce my pair with that Senator, and withhold my vote.

Mr. GORDON. I transfer my pair with the Senator from Iowa [Mr. WILSON] to the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. IRBY] and vote "nay."

Mr. FRYE. I am paired with the senior Senator from Maryland [Mr. GORMAN], who is detained from the Chamber by illness.

Mr. LODGE. I am paired with the senior Senator from New York [Mr. HILL], and withhold my vote. If he were present I should vote "yea."

Mr. HOAR. I am paired with the Senator from Alabama [Mr. PUGH].

Mr. MITCHELL of Oregon. I am paired with the senior Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. VILAS], and the junior Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. MITCHELL] is paired with the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. CAREY]. We have agreed to transfer our pairs so that the senior Senator from Wisconsin will stand paired with the Senator from Wyoming. I vote "yea."

Mr. MITCHELL of Wisconsin. Under that arrangement I vote "nay."

Mr. DANIEL (after having voted in the negative). I desire to explain that I have a standing pair with the Senator from Washington [Mr. SQUIRE], but I have transferred that pair to the Senator from Georgia [Mr. WALSH], who is absent, understanding that he has no pair. If he has, I should be glad to know it, so that no mistake be made. If the Senator from Georgia is not paired I will let my vote stand.

Mr. BLANCHARD. I inquire if the Senator from Michigan [Mr. MCMILLAN] has voted?

The VICE-PRESIDENT. He has not voted.

Mr. BLANCHARD. I am paired with that Senator, and withhold my vote.

Mr. GEORGE. In order to make a quorum, I vote "nay," although paired with the Senator from Oregon [Mr. DOLPH].

Mr. HOAR. I suggest to the Senator from Mississippi that we transfer our pairs. I am paired with the Senator from Alabama [Mr. PUGH], and I will transfer that pair to the Senator from Oregon [Mr. DOLPH], which will enable the Senator from Mississippi and me to vote.

Mr. GEORGE. That is all right. I vote "nay."

Mr. HOAR. I vote "yea."

Mr. PLATT (after having voted in the affirmative). Has the Senator from Virginia [Mr. HUNTON] voted?

The VICE-PRESIDENT. He has not voted.

Mr. PLATT. Then, I think perhaps I ought to withdraw my vote, as I am paired with that Senator.

Mr. MCPHERSON. I suggest to the Senator from Connecticut that, if agreeable to him, we transfer our pairs. I am paired with the Senator from Delaware [Mr. HIGGINS].

Mr. PLATT. I shall be very glad to do so.

Mr. MCPHERSON. Then I transfer my pair with the Senator from Delaware [Mr. HIGGINS] to the Senator from Virginia [Mr. HUNTON].

Mr. PLATT. So that the Senator from Virginia will stand paired with the Senator from Delaware.

Mr. MCPHERSON. Yes.

Mr. PLATT. Then my vote may stand.

Mr. MCPHERSON. I vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 18, nays 27; as follows:

YEAS—18.

Allison,	Hale,	Morrill,	Shoup,
Chandler,	Hoar,	Peffer,	Teller,
Cullom,	Kyle,	Perkins,	Washburn.
Davis,	Manderson,	Platt,	
Dubois,	Mitchell, Oregon	Sherman,	

NAYS—27.

Allen,	Daniel,	McLaurin,	Roach,
Berry,	George,	McPherson,	Smith,
Blackburn,	Gordon,	Martin,	Turpie,
Butler,	Harris,	Mills,	Vest,
Call,	Jarvis,	Mitchell, Wis.	Voorhees,
Cockrell,	Jones, Ark.	Murphy,	White.
Coke,	Lindsay,	Pasco,	

NOT VOTING—40.

Aldrich,	Faulkner,	Hunton,	Proctor,
Bate,	Frye,	Irby,	Pugh,
Blanchard,	Gallinger,	Jones, Nev.	Quay,
Brice,	Gibson,	Lodge,	Ransom,
Caffery,	Gorman,	McMillan,	Squire,
Camden,	Gray,	Morgan,	Stewart,
Cameron,	Hansbrough,	Palmer,	Vilas,
Carey,	Hawley,	Patton,	Walsh,
Dixon,	Higgins,	Pettigrew,	Wilson,
Dolph,	Hill,	Power,	Wolcott.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. ALLISON. I observe in the printed bill an amendment at the end of paragraph 237. Has that been agreed to?

Mr. JONES of Arkansas. It has not been offered.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The reading of the bill will be resumed.

The Secretary read as follows:

238. Each and every gauge or wine gallon of measurement shall be counted as at least one proof gallon; and the standard for determining the proof of brandy and other spirits or liquors of any kind imported shall be the same as that which is defined in the laws relating to internal revenue; but any brandy or other spirituous liquors, imported in casks of less capacity than 14 gallons, shall be forfeited to the United States: *Provided*, That it shall be lawful for the Secretary of the Treasury, in his discretion, to authorize the ascertainment of the proof of wines, cordials, or other liquors by distillation or otherwise, in cases where it is impracticable to ascertain such proof by the means prescribed by existing law or regulations.

Mr. SHERMAN. Mr. President, I notice that in Schedule H, spirits, wines, and other beverages, the rates of duty prescribed by the existing law have been very largely reduced. On the first item, the one upon which the vote has already been taken, the duty has been reduced from $2.50 per proof gallon to $1.80 per proof gallon.

I also notice that in the latter part of the bill, in dealing with internal revenue it is proposed to increase the tax on domestic spirits very largely and to give certain advantages to the distillers of whisky. I should like to know from the Senator having charge of the bill whether it is true or not that the duties on imported brandies and spirits are largely decreased, while the tax on domestic spirits is largely increased?

Mr. JONES of Arkansas. Under the present law the tariff on brandy and liquors of that kind coming from abroad is $2.50 a proof gallon, and it is now proposed to reduce it to $1.80. The internal-revenue tax stands now under the present law at 90 cents a gallon, and the provision in this bill raises that tax to $1.10.

Mr. SHERMAN. That is the very point to which I wish to call the attention of the Senate. It seems to me that this is grossly wrong. Brandy is one of the strongest possible forms of spirituous liquor for common consumption which is imported from abroad. It does not come up to the standard of alcohol, but it approaches nearer to it than any other spirit.

It seems to me that here is a difficulty that ought to be at once

corrected. There is no reason in the world why the duties on wines, spirits, and other beverages imported from abroad, which are entirely articles of luxury and consumed mainly by those who are perfectly able to pay the duties, should be reduced, and I can see no reason, as this is intended to be a bill to provide revenue for the support of the Government, why the rates of duty should be reduced on articles which would be imported anyway, whatever may be the rate of duty, and would be imported probably to the same extent whether the duty is high or low.

Therefore, it seems to me that the theory of this whole schedule is wrong. I can not comprehend why the duties on these imported articles—not taking into account the question of protection at all, because, so far as that is concerned, no spirits made in the United States would probably compete with brandy, except whisky, which is very cheap, and on which the tax is very high—should be reduced, while the tax is increased on the domestic article.

I hold in my hand a large number of remonstrances, petitions, and resolutions of different commercial bodies, not only in Ohio but in other parts of the country, and even including Kentucky, against the increased tax on whisky and against the additional discrimination that is proposed to be given to imported spirits. I present these papers and ask that they be laid upon the table. They come from large organizations of business men, and from large firms and dealers who are known to me personally, and they uniformly remonstrate against any increase of the tax on spirits.

It is true, we have not yet come to the internal-revenue portion of the bill; but certainly we ought not, in view of the proposed increase of the tax on domestic spirits, to reduce the duty on imported spirits, especially on articles like champagne wines, although I believe the duties on them have not been materially changed, but if at all, they have been reduced. On brandy, gin, and all articles of that kind there is no occasion, in my judgment, for a reduction of the duty.

No one has complained against the duties now placed on those articles; no petition has been presented here for such a reduction, and there would be no sympathy in the Senate or among the people of the United States in favor of a reduction of duties on these articles of luxury, which may be consumed, but which the people are better without than with.

I think, under the circumstances, the Senate ought to give a little deliberation to the question of this proposed reduction of the duty on brandy alone. I have not the statistics before me, but I think it will bring about a large reduction of the revenue and that the decrease of revenue will not be made up by the increase of importations.

I think, in considering this whole schedule, it would be better for the Senate to allow it to stand as it now is. There has been no complaint against the provisions of the existing law, so far as the rates of duties on these imported articles of spirits are concerned, and no petitions and no remonstrances have been received against the present rates of duty on them.

Mr. JONES of Arkansas. The opinion of the committee was that the present tax on liquors of this class was entirely too high to derive the largest amount of revenue from them. We believe that a larger amount of revenue would come to the Treasury from a smaller rate of taxation; we believe that the present rate of duty approaches, in a considerable degree, to the point of prohibition, and that there would be a larger commerce in these articles under a tax of $1.80 per gallon than under a tax of $2.50 a gallon.

We impose an internal-revenue tax of 90 cents a gallon under the law upon domestic spirits, and we impose a tariff tax of $2.50 a gallon on imported spirits. It seem to me that those rates are unreasonable. When we reach the internal-revenue features of this bill, whether or not we shall impose a large domestic tax on liquor is a question to be determined then. The petition presented by the Senator from Ohio, of course, is addressed to that subject; and when we reach that portion of the bill will be the time to consider the question. For the present, it seems to me the proposed reduction of the tax on these foreign liquors from $2.50 a gallon to $1.80 a gallon is not unreasonable, particularly as French brandy is, to a very considerable degree, a medicinal article, a prime necessity otherwise than as a luxury or as a beverage.

Mr. HALE. Before the Senator sits down, I wish to say that, of course, the reason he has given was expected to be the only one that could be given in reply to the statement of the Senator from Ohio [Mr. SHERMAN], that this being a revenue duty a larger amount of revenue was expected from this duty than from a higher one.

Now, will not the Senator, as the organ of the committee conducting this bill upon business principles and in business fashion, tell the Senate upon what he bases his judgment that there will be a larger revenue from this reduced duty than from the old duty?

Mr. JONES of Arkansas. As a rule, Mr. President, a reduction of tariff will increase the importations. I presume it is not necessary for me to undertake to enter into an argument to show why that should be so, and that that rule will apply in this case as well as in others.

Mr. HALE. There must be some point at which that rule should cease. The Senator does not hold that, if duties were reduced 50 per cent or 75 per cent, there would be a larger revenue? I take it, if he did, he would have moved to reduce the duty to a lower point.

What I was seeking was the reason why the Senator, who has given a great deal of study to this bill—and we know his intelligence upon it—struck this particular point as being the place that would give the most revenue, and not any other. Why did he not either allow the old revenue rate to remain, or, if reduced duties give larger revenues, why not cut the rate still further and not rest at this point?

Mr. JONES of Arkansas. It is a matter of conjecture as to what the revenue point will be on an article until after a trial has been made. I am fully satisfied that a duty of 300 per cent is not a revenue duty; and so believing, I favor a reduction at least to this extent.

Mr. SHERMAN. Before the Senator sits down, I wish to state that I have the statistics before me, which I did not have a while ago, showing that this article of brandy and other spirits yields nearly $3,000,000 annually of revenue.

Mr. JONES of Arkansas. The Senator will allow me to say, in that connection, that more than a million and a half of that is levied upon an article that costs abroad only 65 cents; and the present duty is a tax of almost exactly 300 per cent on that class of goods.

Mr. SHERMAN. Very well; but we now tax our domestic whisky, which can be manufactured anywhere in the West for 20 cents a gallon, 500 per cent. The present tax on imported brandies, according to their valuation, is only 91 per cent, less than 100 per cent, and the Senator proposes to reduce it to 66 per cent on three items which now yield us nearly $3,000,000 of revenue. We certainly ought not to interfere with the revenue by such a reduction, especially when we know that these articles will be imported, and that the reduction of duty will increase the importation, but even if it would increase the importation we ought not to legislate in that way.

Mr. JONES of Arkansas. I do not see on what authority the Senator from Ohio can assert that there will be no increase of importation. The committee believe that there will be not only an increase of importation, but an increase of revenue from this decrease of taxation.

Mr. ALLISON. The Senator from Arkansas suggests that one reason for reducing the duty upon brandy is that it is used largely as medicine. It is used to some extent for that purpose; but, as I take it, our grape brandy in this country for medicinal purposes is quite as good as the grape brandy of France. But the unit of value on brandy is now $2.73 a gallon, as shown by the official tables. So that the duty is only about 65 per cent upon this great article of luxury. There is no article which is more an article of luxury than French brandy, and yet it is reduced here in this bill to a point much less than the duty upon many necessary articles of consumption.

On the next item, "other spirits distilled from grain," the unit of value is not 65 cents, but 85 cents a gallon. That is chiefly Scotch and Irish whisky.

I call the attention of Senators to the fact that by increasing these importations, they displace other articles of revenue in our own country. Why it is that this schedule should be selected when in all past tariff laws it has been considered purely a revenue schedule and nothing else, and it had no other purpose or aim, and why we should single this article out and reduce the duty upon brandy, upon Scotch whisky, and Irish whisky, and upon still wines seems to me a marvel. There will not be one cent additional revenue produced by this reduction, in my judgment; in other words, the reduction of duty will only reduce the revenue.

People are not going to drink Scotch whisky because they can get it a few cents less a gallon upon importation. Those who drink Scotch whisky do so because they like it and prefer it; they are accustomed to it, and they will pay the duty on it; and yet it is reduced to $1.80 a gallon from $2.50 a gallon. People who are fond of gin will buy it and pay the duty. There is no smuggling under it, and there is no complaint of a single sort as to the existing liquor schedule. It is a duty which is easily collected. Now, with all these cries for revenue, here is an article yielding $3,000,000 to the Treasury, which we are told we must cut down to a revenue point, as the gentleman from Arkansas says, in order that we may get a little more revenue.

Mr. President, the effect of this proposition will be simply to induce the importation of these foreign luxuries and reduce the revenue. That is all there is about it.

Mr. PLATT. The vote upon the paragraph which we have just passed was taken so quickly and quietly, and while my attention was diverted for the moment, that I did not say anything when it was under consideration. Of course, a motion to reconsider would put me in order, but I had supposed that the Senator from Iowa [Mr. ALLISON] would oppose this reduction before the vote was taken. I agree to all that has been said, but there were one or two other considerations which I should like to advert to.

The Senator from Iowa [Mr. ALLISON] has well said that there would be no more imported under a reduction of duty, for the reason that people who drink brandy and Scotch whisky and gin drink it because they have acquired a taste for it. Brandy is used for medicine, and by a few gentlemen of wealth, whom we call brandy drinkers. They will drink no other kind of liquor. The same is largely true of Scotch whisky. Nobody supposes that a prescription will be a cent cheaper by reason of the reduction of the duty on brandy. There will be no benefit to those who are obliged to use the medicine. It is quite improbable that there will be any diminution in the price to those who have acquired the habit of brandy drinking.

The Senator from Arkansas says we make no brandy in this country. I think the Senator is mistaken in that respect. I remember when I was in San Francisco I was taken to the grape farm of the late Senator Stanford, and I know that the process of making brandy was going on there at that time. I am informed that large quantities of brandy are made in California. I know that during recent sickness in my family my physician advised that for medicine I should obtain California brandy because it is pure, and we have no pure French brandy, certainly none the purity of which can be guaranteed.

There is another consideration which has not been adverted to. We have made a discrimination against Germany on sugar. I should like to speak at some length upon this matter, but being limited to five minutes I am precluded from doing so. If the newspapers are correct, and I think they are, an informal protest has been entered by the German minister on account of the discrimination which is proposed against Germany by reason of the special discriminating duty on sugar. Now, I will not say Germany and France are at swords points, but there is friction between them, as we all know. If we discriminate against Germany in the matter of sugar and discriminate in favor of France in the matter of brandy, will not Germany have the greater reason to complain to our Government, and will it not be an inducement for Germany to restore the prohibition on pork? I have little doubt that that will be done if we insist upon discriminating against Germany in the matter of sugar and discriminating in favor of her rival, France, in the matter of brandy.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The reading of the bill will be proceeded with.

The Secretary read the next paragraph, as follows:

239. On all compounds or preparations of which distilled spirits are a component part of chief value, not specially provided for in this act, there shall be levied a duty not less than that imposed upon distilled spirits.

The Committee on Finance reported to strike out paragraph 239 and insert:

239. Upon all compounds or preparations containing alcohol there shall be levied a duty at the rate of $1.80 per proof gallon upon the distilled spirits contained therein in addition to the duty provided by law upon the other ingredients contained in such compounds or preparations.

Mr. JONES of Arkansas. I withdraw the committee amendment. I move to strike out paragraph 239 and insert:

239. On all compounds or preparations (except as specified in the preceding paragraph of the chemical schedule relating to medicinal preparations, of which alcohol is a component part), of which distilled spirits are a component part of chief value, not specially provided for in this act, there shall be levied a duty not less than that imposed upon distilled spirits.

The amendment was agreed to.

The Secretary read the next paragraph, as follows:

240. Cordials, liquors, arrack, absinthe, kirschwasser, ratafia, and other spirituous beverages or bitters of all kinds containing spirits, and not specially provided for in this act, $1.80 per proof gallon.

The Committee on Finance reported an amendment to paragraph 240, after the word "gallon" in line 19, to insert:

But when imported in bottles or jugs no separate or additional duty shall be assessed on the bottles or jugs.

So as to read:

240. Cordials, liquors, arrack, absinthe, kirschwasser, ratafia, and other spirituous beverages or bitters of all kinds containing spirits, and not specially provided for in this act, $1.80 per proof gallon; but when imported in bottles or jugs no separate or additional duty shall be assessed on the bottles or jugs.

Mr. JONES of Arkansas. The amendment is withdrawn.

Mr. ALDRICH. In paragraph 240, line 18, I move to strike out "$1.80" and insert "$2.50;" so as to read:

Two dollars and fifty cents per proof gallon.

Mr. President, the reasons which were stated by the Senator from Iowa against the reduction of the duties upon brandy apply with greater force to the paragraph now under consideration. I can not understand why absinthe and the other cordials and liqueurs should be placed at a lower rate of duty than they are in the existing law. Certainly there can be no reason for increasing the importation into this country, and if they are imported they certainly ought to pay a very high rate of duty. The rate ought to be higher even than the existing law. Therefore I have moved to restore the rates of the act of 1890.

Mr. VEST. The decrease in the duty on these cordials, absinthe, ratafia, and other articles is inconsiderable. In the McKinley act the rate is 97.63 per cent, and we make it 70.27, a reduction of something over 20 per cent. We would judge from the arguments made by the Senator from Iowa and the Senator from Ohio that there was an inconsiderable duty upon these brandies which we have passed. But I simply want to call attention to the fact that brandies made out of grain have a duty in the pending bill of 211.14 per cent.

Mr. ALLISON. That rate does not apply to brandy; it applies to other spirits—Scotch whisky.

Mr. VEST. And brandy made from other materials 264.06. I am talking about the items we have passed.

Mr. ALLISON. The rate the Senator has quoted is applicable to Scotch and other whiskies.

Mr. VEST. It is spirits; other spirits not specially provided for, manufactured from grain, etc.

Mr. ALDRICH. Will the Senator from Missouri allow me to ask him a question?

Mr. VEST. Certainly.

Mr. ALDRICH. Does the Senator from Missouri think it good policy to encourage larger importations of absinthe and other articles enumerated in this paragraph?

Mr. VEST. No, Mr. President, I would not encourage the importation of any of them, and I would not encourage the manufacture of any of them in this country, to be entirely frank. But I would put such a duty upon them——

Mr. ALLISON. The Senator from Arkansas says the object of the duty is to increase importations.

Mr. VEST. I understood the Senator from Arkansas to say what he and I entirely agree about, that it is simply a revenue question. We reduced these duties because we think they are too high under the McKinley act. We are taxing those articles under the internal-revenue system, and as long as we treat them as manufactured articles we ought to treat them as we do other articles in the bill. We put upon whisky, for instance, and other alcoholic stimulants an internal-revenue tax of $1.10 in the bill and $1.80 is the import duty, making the differential 70 cents. Under the English system they impose in their tariff law an equivalent to the internal-revenue duty. We go beyond that and put in 70 cents more. Under the McKinley act the duties are considerably higher, and they are too high.

In other words, our friends in making the McKinley law did not increase the duties upon these articles simply because they are luxuries, but they seem to have injected into the act the idea of excluding them from the country because they are injurious luxuries. It seems to me that the duty now proposed upon cordials, a reduction of only 20 per cent, is a very fair one. There may be people in the United States, and we have no right to suppose anything else, who think that these cordials are necessary to their health and comfort. There is no question of competition between anything we produce here and these compounds; they do not come in competition directly with anything we make in this country, and the duty proposed is, it seems to me, a very fair one.

Mr. SHERMAN. Mr. President, although this item looks very innocent and harmless, it covers merely articles of luxury. Whatever may be said of pure brandy used for medicine can hardly be said of cordials, liqueurs, arrack, absinthe, kirschwasser, ratafia, and other spirituous beverages, which are used merely to encourage an appetite for drink. They are seasoning materials for brandy or whisky or anything of that kind. Their importation yields now a revenue of $491,596. The decrease of the rate of duty will not in the slightest degree affect the importation. The large amount of 196,000 proof gallons is introduced here, and will be introduced whatever rate of duty is put upon it. The present revenue derived from the imports is $3,213,000, and as a rule the committee have reduced it about one-third; so that it sacrifices about $1,000,000, which is paid by a class of people for a luxury that is not enjoyed generally.

Now, here is the discrimination. The tax of 90 cents a proof gallon upon spirits made in this country is 450 per cent, and you propose to tax these liqueurs at a rate of from 60 to 85 per cent, the present rate being, according to the McKinley act, from 90 to 115 per cent. It seems to me this is a great mistake, but I consider that my duty is done when I call attention to it. There is no public demand for it and no petitions asking that it be done. If there is any ring or trust behind it I do not know.

Certainly there can be no motive for reducing the revenue on these articles.

I hope Senators will review the matter. With the large proposed increase in the internal tax on spirits, which is opposed by our own people very stoutly and strongly, as I have shown by the mass of petitions which I have presented this morning, to reduce largely the duty on foreign brandies and whiskies and gins, it seems to me, is a departure from a just principle. It is throwing a burden upon our own productions and relieving the foreign product. It is legislation in the interest of foreigners and not in the interest of our own people. It is not in the interest of anybody here who complains of the prices he now has to pay for these expensive liquors.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, the Senator from Missouri has stated, as I think everyone must agree, that this is a revenue question. No one desires to encourage the production of absinthe, liquors, arrack, and the other articles enumerated in the schedule, in this country. The question of free trade or protection does not enter into this clause at all. It is purely a revenue question.

Now, these are articles of luxury. If there are any articles in the world that ought to bear a high tax, certainly it is the articles enumerated in this schedule. Their production is undesirable; their importation is undesirable, and it seems to me that all we ought to look at is how high a duty we can impose on those articles without going beyond what is called the smuggling limit; that is, without making it profitable to smuggle these things in large quantities.

As the Senator from Iowa said, these articles are going to be introduced and sold in substantially the same quantities that they are now sold, without any reference to the duty, until you reach the point at which it becomes profitable to take the risk of smuggling. No one pretends that that point was passed in the McKinley act.

The only argument I can see here made in regard to this provision is that it is more or less modeled after the English system. Surely we ought to be able in this country to raise our own revenue, in what we think the best way, on productions of this character on some better reason than the English tariff. It seems to me that we ought to get from these articles the largest possible revenue. I can not understand the principle on which a duty is placed upon sugar and then every duty is reduced on these spirituous liquors, cordials, etc., articles which ought to be made to bear the very heaviest tax which can be placed upon them.

Mr. PLATT. Mr. President, the more this matter is discussed the more its importance is seen. If there is anything upon which persons with differing views upon protection and free trade have been agreed, it is that luxuries ought to have a high duty placed upon them. Another principle has come in, which is that deleterious luxuries may have such a duty placed upon them as to be practically prohibitive.

Now, one of the articles included in this paragraph, absinthe, is about as deleterious as opium. One of any extensive reading can not but know that in France the habit of using this cordial is almost as deleterious to human life as the morphia habit. I think it does not prevail to such an extent in America, but a person who gets in the habit of using it will go on with its use until death comes.

Now, why, when we want revenue, when we hear every day about the need of revenue and the deficiency in the Treasury, the revenue upon articles of this sort should be reduced passes comprehension. I thought for a moment that when the Senator from Missouri stated that duties were too high in the McKinley act the reason might be that the other side do not want to fix exactly the same duties that were fixed in the McKinley act, but I turn to the next paragraph and I see there is at least one duty which the committee does not consider infamous, for they have let the rate of duty upon champagne stand without any reduction. So that can not be the reason.

I submit under the circumstances there can be no reason adduced why the duty upon the articles which we have been considering should be reduced. It is a reduction of the revenue at a time when the universal cry is that we have not revenue enough

Mr. HALE. Mr. President, it is another wonderful feature of this most wonderful bill, that while upon many articles of everyday consumption by all the people the duties have been raised, when you strike articles which are pure luxuries, and also, as the Senator from Connecticut suggests, injurious luxuries, and that are used by but few people, the duties are reduced. Here are brandies, Scotch whiskies, Holland gin, which are luxuries used by comparatively few, and in this class of cordials, liqueurs, arrack, absinthe, kirschwasser, ratafia, articles of luxury of a still narrower range than brandies and the other liquors, the same reduction is made.

The Senators in charge of the bill do not quite agree. The Senator from Arkansas says frankly that he thinks more duty will be raised by this lower rate; and while it is a matter of conjecture, he believes that they have reached just the proper rate where the most money can be put into the Treasury. But the Senator from Missouri balks at that conclusion——

Mr. VEST. The Senator is mistaken.

Mr. HALE. I understood the Senator to say——

Mr. VEST. I said this is a pure revenue duty.

Mr. HALE. So the Senator did say; but when he was reminded by the Senator from Iowa what the Senator from Arkansas had said, that this would raise more revenue and result in larger importations, the Senator said that he is not in favor of larger importations and that was not the reason why the duty had been reduced.

Mr. VEST. I said I would not put it lower to increase importations.

Mr. HALE. So I say the Senators differ. The Senator from Arkansas says plainly, squarely, and frankly that the rate has been reduced because he believes it will result in larger importations and larger revenue. The Senator from Missouri does not agree to that.

Mr. President, the whole sum and substance of this provision is that it will benefit only one very narrow class. The importations of these strong liquors, what are called good brandies, Scotch whiskies, Holland gin, and these cordials, is in the hands of a few importers, almost all foreigners. They are the only men who will get the benefit of it. The consumer will not get a dollar of benefit in a year; he will not get a cent of benefit at any time whatever. The consumers of these liquors are small in number. The consumers of these heavy liquors and cordials are a very small portion of the American people, but they are very much larger than the importers who bring them here. The consumers will not get any benefit from it, while the very few men, the foreigners who import these articles, will get so much more benefit from it. They will not charge a dollar less in their prices, and their profits will be increased.

If this duty is fixed, anyone who gets the figures, the facts, will learn that that is the result. Under the present duty there is no smuggling to amount to anything. There is no complaint from the Treasury Department that the present duty ought to be lowered in order to prevent smuggling. There is no pretense of that anywhere. The Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE] stated it right. It is not because the present duty reaches the smuggling limit. I do not understand that it has been stated here that the Treasury Department, looking carefully after the ingress of these liquors into this country and the payment of the duties, see where there are infractions of the law. I do not understand that the Treasury Department has declared that here is a grievance in the Department, and that the duty ought to be lowered. Where does the demand come from? Not from the people; not from the Treasury Department; not from the consumers of these cordials, many of which are noxious; only from the importers.

Mr. HOAR. I was in hopes that before the Senator from Maine ended he would have asked the Senator from Arkansas if he could state to the Senate from what source, if any request came to the committee, or on what authority this reduction was made. Is the Senator able to state?

Mr. JONES of Arkansas. The bill came in this form from the Ways and Means Committee of the House of Representatives. It was considered and passed by the other House in this form. It had the indorsement of a large number of gentlemen there, and I have no doubt the provision was indorsed by many other people besides.

Mr. HOAR. The mere fact that a particular rate of duty had the indorsement of the Ways and Means Committee or of the other House, does not seem to have governed our committee in other things. Do I understand the Senator he did not get any evidence which was before the Ways and Means Committee of the House, and that there was nothing before his committee urging this reduction of duty? I suppose from the answer of the Senator we are to understand that nobody applied to the Finance Committee of the Senate to reduce this duty?

Mr. JONES of Arkansas. I do not think anyone did.

Mr. HOAR. Why, when they depart from the House committee and put up duties because they say they need the revenue, the committee should put this rate down and keep it down, I do not understand.

Mr. HALE. They put it down from the old law.

Mr. HOAR. They put it down from the old law. I understand this is a foreign product, in the first place, purely. It is a luxury, in the second place, and the business of importing these liqueurs and the high-priced brandies is conducted by a class of persons mainly in the State of New York. I think the principal house in Boston which imported such things has nearly

discontinued its direct importations. I am not sure about that; but I suppose it is done by a few houses in New York, who are themselves foreigners chiefly, and the business is largely established by foreign capital, with foreign partners, under foreign management, so that the commerce part of it is foreign as well as the production.

The consumers perhaps are not foreigners, but they are pretty much all that class of Americans who spend a large part of their lives abroad, and when they are at home spend their time mainly in wishing that they were foreigners. I do not think there will be any increased revenue by this reduction, and if any revenue comes by the reduction anywhere, I do not think it will ever reach the Treasury of the United States.

Mr. PEFFER. Mr. President, the Republicans have made two points on this schedule. One is discrimination against the home manufacturer. I suggest to them that that discrimination has been measurably set off by the proposition in the bill to extend the bonded period five years for the benefit of the manufacturers. The other point is that we shall lose revenue. I suggest to those Senators that while we shall lose revenue upon the liquor schedule, it is made up about tenfold or more on the sugar schedule, so that we are not going to lose any revenue in the end.

For myself, I regard it as a very great mistake upon the part of the committee to attempt to reduce duties upon spirits and upon the different varieties of liquors imported into this country for any purpose, no matter what the purpose may be. I believe it would be a good deal better, if instead of having any schedule of duties upon imported liquors there should be a prohibitory paragraph, a provision that there should be no liquors of any kind imported into the country except for medical purposes, or scientific purposes, or some useful function in the arts or sciences.

But to remove duties from an article whose use is wholly voluntary, whose use is confined almost exclusively to the rich and to that class of rich people who neither do us nor anybody else any good, a class of people who spend a large part of their time in club houses, in yacht racing, in horse racing, and things of that kind; gentlemen and ladies who are able to pay very high prices for an article and who prefer such articles because they are high priced and because they are foreign. That class of people almost exclusively use the articles upon which these duties are proposed to be levied, and I submit to the Senate that it would be much wiser to prohibit their importation entirely rather than to reduce duties upon them, especially when we have to place a duty on sugar, a necessary of life, in order to make up a deficiency.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The question is on the amendment proposed by the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. ALDRICH].

Mr. HOAR. On that I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered, and the Secretary proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. CULLOM (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the senior Senator from Delaware [Mr. GRAY]. If he were present I should vote "yea."

Mr. DANIEL (when his name was called). I am paired with the Senator from Washington [Mr. SQUIRE], and I refrain from voting.

Mr. PEFFER (when Mr. KYLE'S name was called). The Senator from South Dakota has been called away from the Chamber on official business. He requested me to state when his name was called that if he were present he would vote for this amendment.

Mr. GORDON (when his name was called). I transfer my pair with the junior Senator from Iowa [Mr. WILSON] to the junior Senator from South Carolina [Mr. IRBY] and vote "nay."

Mr. McPHERSON (when his name was called). I am paired with the Senator from Delaware [Mr. HIGGINS].

Mr. MITCHELL of Oregon (when his name was called). I am paired with the senior Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. VILAS].

Mr. PATTON (when his name was called). I wish to announce my pair with the Senator from Maryland [Mr. GIBSON]. If he were present I should vote "yea."

Mr. PLATT (when his name was called). Has the Senator from Virginia [Mr. HUNTON] voted?

The VICE-PRESIDENT. He has not voted.

Mr. PLATT. Then I withhold my vote.

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. MILLS. I wish to ask if the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. GALLINGER] has voted?

The VICE-PRESIDENT. He has not voted.

Mr. MILLS. I am paired with that Senator. I should vote "nay" if he were present.

Mr. CAMDEN. I have a general pair with the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. PETTIGREW], but with the understanding that I can vote whenever it is necessary to make a quorum. The Senator from South Dakota is not in the city to-day, and I shall not vote at this time.

Mr. FRYE. I transfer my pair with the senior Senator from Maryland [Mr. GORMAN] to the senior Senator from Nevada [Mr. JONES], and vote "yea."

The result was announced—yeas 22, nays 26, as follows:

YEAS—22.

Aldrich,	Dixon,	McMillan,	Quay,
Allen,	Dolph,	Manderson,	Sherman,
Allison,	Dubois,	Morrill,	Shoup,
Cameron,	Frye,	Peffer,	Teller.
Chandler,	Hale,	Perkins,	
Davis,	Hoar,	Power,	

NAYS—26.

Berry,	Coke,	Martin,	Turpie,
Blackburn,	Gordon,	Morgan,	Vest,
Blanchard,	Harris,	Murphy,	Voorhees,
Butler,	Jarvis,	Pasco,	Walsh,
Caffery,	Jones, Ark.	Pugh,	White.
Call,	Lindsay,	Roach,	
Cockrell,	McLaurin,	Smith,	

NOT VOTING—37.

Bate,	Gorman,	Lodge,	Ransom,
Brice,	Gray,	McPherson,	Squire,
Camden,	Hansbrough,	Mills,	Stewart,
Carey,	Hawley,	Mitchell, Oregon	Vilas,
Cullom,	Higgins,	Mitchell, Wis.	Washburn,
Daniel,	Hill,	Palmer,	Wilson,
Faulkner,	Hunton,	Patton,	Wolcott.
Gallinger,	Irby,	Pettigrew,	
George,	Jones, Nev	Platt,	
Gibson,	Kyle,	Proctor,	

So the amendment was rejected.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The reading of the bill will be proceeded with.

The Secretary read the next paragraph, as follows:

241. No lower rate or amount of duty shall be levied, collected, and paid on brandy, spirits, and other spirituous beverages than that fixed by law for the description of first proof; but it shall be increased in proportion for any greater strength than the strength of first proof, and all imitations of brandy or spirits or wines imported by any names whatever shall be subject to the highest rate of duty provided for the genuine articles respectively intended to be represented, and in no case less than $1 per gallon.

Mr. ALDRICH. I move to insert the words "and fifty cents" after "one dollar," so as to read:

And in no case less that $1.50 per gallon.

The other House reduced the rates upon all genuine liquors, spirits, and wines, and here it is proposed to reduce the duties on importations of spirits and wines, I do not know for whose benefit.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The amendment will be stated.

The SECRETARY. In line 7, page 55, paragraph 241, after the word "dollar" insert the words "and fifty cents," so as to read:

one dollar and fifty cents per gallon.

Mr. ALDRICH. I hope there will be no objection to this amendment.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The question is on the amendment proposed by the Senator from Rhode Island.

The amendment was rejected.

The Secretary read the next paragraph, as follows:

Bay rum or bay water, whether distilled or compounded, of first proof, and in proportion for any greater strength than first proof, $1 per gallon.

Mr. ALLISON. The articles mentioned in this paragraph are not used as medicine; and therefore I move to insert the words "and fifty cents" after the words "one dollar."

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The amendment will be stated.

The SECRETARY. In line 10, page 55, paragraph 242, after the word "dollar," insert "and fifty cents;" so as to read:

One dollar and fifty cents per gallon.

The amendment was rejected.

The Secretary read the next paragraph, as follows:

Wines:

243. Champagne and all other sparkling wines, in bottles containing each not more than 1 quart and more than 1 pint, $8 per dozen; containing not more than 1 pint each and more than one-half pint, $4 per dozen; containing one-half pint or less, $2 per dozen; in bottles or other vessels containing more than 1 quart each, in addition to $8 per dozen bottles, or the quantity in excess of 1 quart, at the rate of $2.50 per gallon.

The Committee on Finance reported an amendment to the paragraph by adding thereto:

But no separate or additional duty shall be assessed on the bottles.

Mr. JONES of Arkansas. That amendment is withdrawn.

Mr. CHANDLER. I should like to ask some member of the Committee on Finance whether the duty on champagne wines is reduced from the present law proportionately as the reduction is made on brandies and cordials, arracks, absinthe, etc.

Mr. JONES of Arkansas. It is not reduced at all.

Mr. CHANDLER. I should like to ask the Senators in charge of the bill why a reduction is made on one class of spirituous drink and not upon another.

Mr. VEST. Simply because we thought this a fair duty, considering the quantity brought in and consumed in this country.

Mr. CHANDLER. I must confess that I am at a loss to understand the principle upon which the Senators on the other side of the Chamber have constructed this schedule. It seems that while we are to change free sugar to dutiable sugar and tax every poor man's household in the land, we are to encourage a larger importation of French brandies and "cordials, liquors, arrack, absinthe, kirschwasser, ratafia, and other spirituous beverages or bitters of all kinds containing spirits;" and we are to enlarge if possible the consumption of those articles in this country. They are luxuries and they contribute to vices; and they are to be encouraged at a time when we need more revenue.

Senators perhaps think there will be more revenue by encouraging a larger importation, but that larger importation will be an importation that will come in competition with our own whiskies and spirituous liquors, which I think it must be admitted are purer liquors and spirits than imported French brandies are likely to be. But that is the policy. This is to be done to get more revenue by encouraging vice; and when we come to champagne, which certainly is not more harmful than brandy and absinthe, we are told that the duty is to remain upon champagne. I did not distinctly understand the reason given by the Senator from Missouri for the discrimination, but we are to deal with one kind of intoxicant differently from the way we deal with other kinds of intoxicants. We are to encourage by a reduction of duty the importation of foreign ardent spirits in competition with Kentucky and Illinois whisky. We are not to encourage the importation of champagne wines, which are comparatively pure.

Mr. President, I dislike to coerce the Senator from Missouri into listening to speeches from me. He may stop up his ears if he likes, or go out of the Chamber; but I am obliged to take the opportunity to say that I think this schedule as it is being made is utterly inconsistent; and following the term which the Senator from Missouri commonly applies to the system of protection, it is an infamous schedule when you compare it with the duty that is to be imposed by the bill upon the sugar that is to be used in the coming years in this country.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The reading of the bill will be proceeded with.

The Secretary read the next paragraph, as follows:

244. Still wines, including ginger wine or ginger cordial and vermuth, in casks or packages other than bottles or jugs, 50 cents per gallon: *Provided*, That no such still wines in casks shall pay a higher rate of duty than 100 per cent ad valorem. In bottles or jugs, per case of 1 dozen bottles or jugs, containing each not more than 1 quart and more than 1 pint, or 24 bottles or jugs containing each not more than 1 pint, $1.60 per case; and any excess beyond these quantities found in such bottles or jugs shall be subject to a duty of 5 cents per pint or a fractional part thereof, but no separate or additional duty shall be assessed on the bottles or jugs: *Provided*, That any wines, ginger cordial, or vermuth imported containing more than 25 per cent of alcohol shall be classed as spirits and pay duty accordingly: *And provided further*, That there shall be no constructive or other allowance for breakage, leakage, or damage on wines, liquors, cordials, or distilled spirits. Wines, cordials, brandy, and other spirituous liquors imported in bottles or jugs shall be packed in packages containing not less than 1 dozen bottles or jugs in each package, or duty shall be paid as if such package contained at least 1 dozen bottles or jugs.

The first amendment reported by the Committee on Finance to paragraph 244 was, on page 56, in line 2, after the word "jugs," to insert:

If containing 14 per cent or less of absolute alcohol, 30 cents per gallon; if containing more than 14 per cent of absolute alcohol.

So as to read:

Still wines, including ginger wine or ginger cordial and vermuth, in casks or packages other than bottles or jugs, if containing 14 per cent or less of absolute alcohol, 30 cents per gallon; if containing more than 14 per cent of absolute alcohol, 50 cents per gallon.

Mr. ALLISON. I call the attention of the Senator from Missouri to what I think must be a vice in the amendment. It will practically allow all still wines to come in at 30 cents a gallon, because as a matter of course they will contain only 14 per cent of alcohol. The difference between 30 and 50 cents, 20 cents a gallon, will result in all these wines being so diluted as to alcohol as to make them measure only 30 cents. I think that is a very dangerous provision? I trust the Senator will leave the paragraph in that respect as the other House left it and as it is in the existing law. I certainly think the provision on page 56 was not put in at the request of the California Senators.

Mr. WHITE. May I ask the Senator from Iowa to repeat his statement?

Mr. ALLISON. I understand that the amendment proposed by the committee, found on page 56, reduces the duty upon the cheap wines to 30 cents a gallon.

Mr. WHITE. I will state to the Senator from Iowa, if I will not interrupt him, that the amendment reported by the committee is much more advantageous to the wine producers than the bill as it came from the other House, and it was on their suggestion that the change was made.

Mr. ALDRICH. It is much less advantageous, however, than the existing law.

Mr. WHITE. It is very little less; and in fact, in my judgment, so far as affecting the industry is concerned, there is no difference.

Mr. JONES of Arkansas. The question as to where this line should come in was discussed with representatives of the wine producers and the importers, and the opinion of the Treasury Department was taken on the question. Fourteen per cent was accepted as being the proper line for the cheaper class of wines, wines of little strength, and the strong wines.

Mr. ALLISON. But the question is as to whether we shall allow these wines to come in at 30 cents a gallon, or a little more than one-half the rate now imposed on the same class of wines.

Mr. JONES of Arkansas. My opinion is it ought to be less than that. The importations are absolutely prohibited by the present law. The wines of that class do not come here at all.

Mr. ALLISON. Still wines?

Mr. JONES of Arkansas. That class of still wines which go below 14 per cent. There is a considerable importation of still wines, but they contain more than 14 per cent of alcohol. Wines containing less than 14 per cent of alcohol are absolutely prohibited.

Mr. ALLISON. It seems to me to be very curious that just at the line of 14 per cent of alcohol there is to be a change, and that there shall be suddenly a jump from 30 to 50 cents. I think that will make great confusion in the administration of the law.

Mr. ALDRICH. Mr. President, I am greatly surprised at the statements both of the Senator from Arkansas and that of the Senator from California in this regard. One of the descriptions here given of the two kinds of still wines, that containing less than 14 per cent of alcohol, is intended to apply to clarets and red wines of that kind, and the other to what are called sweet wines. All clarets contain 14 per cent or less of alcohol, and all sweet wines, like ports and sherries, contain more than 14 per cent of alcohol.

If this paragraph is adopted as it now stands all clarets, which come in competition most largely with California wines, will only pay 30 cents a gallon, while ports and sherries will pay, as under the present law, 50 cents. Some time since I asked a large importer of wines in New York, a man who I think is more familiar with this question than anyone else, for an estimate of the amount of wines that would come in under these different rates. He gave me a statement which he had prepared, based on the importations of 1893, showing that substantially one-half of the still wines imported are claret and other wines containing 14 per cent or less of alchol, and about one-half wines containing more than 14 per cent. Any reduction of the rates of duties on still wines will, in my opinion, be harmful to the wine-producing interests of this country.

Mr. WHITE. Do I understand the Senator to say that no claret contains more than 14 per cent?

Mr. ALDRICH. No claret contains more than 14 per cent. None of the ordinary red table wines do.

Mr. ALLISON. Red wine.

Mr. ALDRICH. None of the ordinary red wines contain more than 14 per cent alcohol, or are not supposed to at least, and do not unless they are doctored; that is, if they have not had alcohol inserted. But the ordinary red wines as they are usually made would not contain more than 14 per cent of alcohol.

Now, I can not see any good reason for reducing duties on any still wines at all. It makes a difference in the revenue, as I remember, of about $250,000 a year if the reduction in rates is made. I think myself that the provision as it now stands will be less harmful to the domestic industry than the bill as it came from the House, because the imitation wines made in Cette and other points in France would come in at very much less than 30 cents per gallon, as I think they are sold at 10 or 12 cents a gallon.

Mr. WHITE. Seven or eight cents, sometimes.

Mr. ALDRICH. Sometimes they are sold, as the Senator says, at 7 or 8 cents, or even less. So the duty under the House provision would be very much less than the Senate provision as it now stands. We produce large quantities of still wines in this country, and will soon produce a sufficient quantity for our consumption. If people prefer foreign still wines to American it is no great hardship for them to pay the difference in cost growing out of the imposition of a considerable revenue duty.

Mr. WHITE. The statement of the Senator from Rhode Island that this rate is more favorable to the producers of wine than the rate prescribed by the other House is correct. I think he agrees with me in that regard.

Mr. ALDRICH. Yes.

Mr. WHITE. I will state the difficulty with the provision as

it came from the other House. The language used by the House is as follows:

That no such still wines in casks shall pay a higher rate of duty than 100 per cent ad valorem.

Of course where wine is sold at 8 cents a gallon, as was the case last year in France, where there was an immense surplus crop, the result would be very apparent.

Now, the wine producers of California got together and sent here a representative who is an expert in the business. He was in constant communication with me and with other members of the California delegation. We found the provision in the bill as it came from the other House and thought it was hardly fair. On the other hand, there were other parties representing other interests from other parts of the country where wines were not produced. Finally, as the result of considerable talk upon the subject, and, as the Senator from Arkansas has stated, after consultation with the revenue officers of the Government, we reached a point where we consented to accept the schedule as it is now found in the bill.

Mr. HALE. Will not the Senator from California tell us what interest is represented by the other side with which he says the California wine growers came in conflict and had to be yielded to, reducing the present duties? What is the interest to which the Senator refers?

Mr. WHITE. Those whom I spoke to about it—I met the parties myself—are from New York City.

Mr. HALE. They are New York importers?

Mr. WHITE. I presume so. Anyway, they are gentlemen who were here upon the subject. I refer to the men I myself saw.

Mr. HALE. Those were the men whose representations here resulted in the duty being reduced to the rate proposed, which is better than the House duty.

Mr. WHITE. I will say no. There were many others beside these parties, as I discovered, who were endeavoring to have low duties. In fact, there was a demand that came from various parts of the country. I read an article in a Chicago newspaper the other day attacking me very vigorously because it was said I insisted upon a duty of two or three hundred per cent upon some classes of wines. It was not confined to importers.

I will further state that the difficulty we have encountered in marketing our wines has been mainly due to the fact that a great many persons who consume beverages of that kind are still wedded to the idea that they must get their liquor abroad. Just before the last commercial treaty with France was ratified some of our California producers understood that our Government had succeeded in procuring the insertion of the favored clause in the treaty, and they entered into a contract with French manufacturers, involving some hundreds of thousands of dollars, to sell their wine in France. But we found that Mr. Reid had not been able to obtain, or at least did not obtain, the insertion of that clause in the treaty; and as the result, the California producers were forced to cancel their contracts.

Mr. ALLISON. What was the contract?

Mr. WHITE. They made a contract in France to sell wine to French dealers for the purpose of being remanufactured there, and sent back and sold to us under French labels.

Mr. ALLISON. Is not that prohibited under the French law?

Mr. WHITE. Under the French law as it is to-day they were unable to carry it out, principally owing to the French duty, which remains under the treaty negotiated by Mr. Reid, and which is a treaty very detrimental to our interest.

Mr. CHANDLER. I should like to ask the Senator from California whether it is not true that the pure article of brandy, made from the California grape, is sent to France and doctored in that way, coming back as French brandy?

Mr. WHITE. I will state to the Senator from New Hampshire that I, of course, do not know of my own knowledge, but I have heard that such is the case. But, as I said, I do not know anything about it.

Mr. CHANDLER. I have been informed by a person who thinks he knows, that that is the case. Therefore, I call the attention of the Senator from California to the importance of not having this reduced rate of duty, reduced from $2.50 to $1.80, put upon French brandy, because after all it is valued very high; it comes in an impure article, and is consumed here. I suggest to the Senator that if, instead of a specific rate of duty, he would get an ad valorem upon these high-priced French brandies—and that I believe is the Democratic principle now—it would be a great deal better for the consumers of this country and quite as well for the producers of brandy in California.

Mr. WHITE. I desire to correct a mistaken inference which may be drawn from a remark I made just now. I learn from an inspection of the record that but 1,000 gallons of brandy were exported to France last year. So that it could not have been sent over there to any great extent to be doctored.

Mr. HOAR. If the Senator will allow me, the proposition is that the product of the California grape is exported.

Mr. WHITE. Yes, sir; grape brandy.

Mr. HOAR. Is it not true that millions and millions are sent abroad and come back into this country?

Mr. WHITE. I think not.

Mr. HOAR. It is exported and comes back into this country as foreign wine.

Mr. WHITE. Not a great deal of it.

Mr. HOAR. It is a subject which I have not investigated, but I was told, I think by as high an authority as California contains, that that is true, going up into the millions.

Mr. PERKINS. I will state for the information of my colleague that I was informed a few days since that all the vintage of brandy on the Stanford estate had been shipped to Europe, part of it going to France.

Mr. WHITE. If my colleague will allow me, I shall perhaps explain the whole matter by simply referring to the table I hold in my hand. We exported to France 1,096 gallons, to Germany 38,052 gallons, undoubtedly to be remanufactured in Hamburg, and to the United Kingdon 77,000 gallons.

Mr. CHANDLER. I desire to state to the Senator from California that I am obliged to him for enlarging the 1,000 gallons which he said was all that was exported to France. I did not say that the importations of manufactured brandy came from France. I said there were importations of French brandy, not intending to imply that it was manufactured in France.

Mr. WHITE. I was speaking of the exports.

Mr. CHANDLER. I suppose it makes no difference whether French brandy is made out of California brandy in the United Kingdom or Germany; the fact remains that the brandy goes abroad. I do not think it can be made into anything but brandy, except that it may be made into some of the infernal cordials which are referred to in the bill, probably ratafia. But otherwise it is made into brandy and comes back as brandy, whether French brandy or any other brandy; and instead of being dutiable at $1.80 a gallon it ought to be $2.50 a gallon, or it ought to have a high ad valorem rate.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the committee; which will be stated.

The SECRETARY. In paragraph 244, after the word "jug," in line 2, insert:

If containing 14 per cent or less of absolute alcohol, 30 cents per gallon; if containing more than 14 per cent of absolute alcohol.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment of the Committee on Finance to paragraph 244, was, in line 5, page 56, after the word "gallon," to strike out:

Provided, That no such still wines in casks shall pay a higher rate of duty than 100 per cent ad valorem.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. ALLISON. In lines 18 and 19 I move to strike out "twenty-five," and insert "twenty-four," so that the proviso will read:

Provided, That any wines, ginger cordial, or vermuth, imported, containing more that 24 per cent of alcohol, shall be classed as spirits and pay a duty accordingly.

Under the existing law where those articles contain more than 24 per cent of alcohol they are forfeited. Now, 24 per cent of alcohol or 25 per cent of alcohol is equal to about 49 per cent, I should say, of proof spirits, and the object of the existing law as respects these articles is to forfeit them in case they are sought to be imported as wines and cordials and not as proof spirits. The House provision simply says that they shall be classed as spirits and pay duty accordingly.

There is no forfeiture and no punishment for the effort to import spurious or distilled spirits under the name of wines. But I remember very well, as I think the Senator from Rhode Island must remember, that in the consideration of the tariff bill in 1890 we were very careful as to the per cent. I remember that we had before us a good many dealers, and especially experts, who stated that 24 per cent of alcohol was a line beyond which it would not be safe to go.

I suggest to the Senator from Arkansas that the amendment I have proposed be made, and if afterward any reason can be shown why it should be increased (and I do think there can be, because it is equal now to more than 2 per cent proof spirits added) it can be changed afterward. The Senator from Arkansas may be in possession of a reason for it of which I am not advised.

Mr. JONES of Arkansas. The object of the committee in making this provision in lieu of the one which now exists is that we believe the tariff should be levied upon these spirits in

case they come in in this way without undertaking to levy a forfeiture.

Mr. ALLISON. I do not ask the Senator to change the provision in that respect. I do not contemplate moving an amendment for a forfeiture of the articles, but inasmuch as you have now provided that they shall be classed as spirits and pay duty accordingly I think it is important to insert 24 per cent instead of 25, because I am quite sure, although I speak only from memory, that when we had this subject up two years ago it was stated distinctly that that was a line beyond which forfeiture could not well go, beyond which, if you provided a greater strength, it would lead to fraud. Now, I suggest to the Senator that he allow 24 per cent to go in, and if later on it shall appear that 25 per cent is essential, I shall make no objection to it.

Mr. JONES of Arkansas. The penalty attached to finding 25 per cent of alcohol in wines is of, course, very heavy; they are classed as spirits, and compelled to pay a duty accordingly. The difference between 24 and 25 per cent is not very great, and it does not seem to me to be at all likely that any harm can be done to allow a margin this much wider for what might be an accident in the increase of the strength of wines beyond the point that it ought to be. I do not think there is a very great difference in it. We consulted the Commissioner of Internal Revenue on this point, and his opinion was that 25 per cent is nearer a correct line than 24; and we were governed more by his judgment than our own. Altogether itseems but a slight difference between the present law and the pending bill.

Mr. ALLISON. With all due deference to the Commissioner of Internal Revenue, I know this was a topic of very great consideration and it was a topic as respects what was called the legislation, in favor of California. Senators have stated on this floor that very little wine is exported and that very little brandy is exported. We went into a most elaborate and complicated scheme two years ago whereby the Californians were permitted to withdraw their grape brandy in bond. For what purpose? For the purpose of enabling them to fortify the wines in order that they might carry them around the Horn. Fourteen per cent was the minimum and 24 per cent the maximum. We went into that matter with the utmost elaboration. I remember it very well.

I wish to say to the Senator from Arkansas that I agree with him that this is very little, but it is a very big thing to somebody or else we should not see this provision in the bill. Somebody thinks it is a little bigger thing than the Senator from Arkansas does. All I ask of him is to make an amendment here so that we shall have it in control, and if it turns out that he is right and I am wrong, then we can change it.

Mr. VEST. Why not let it stay at 25 per cent, and if the Senator from Iowa can show us afterwards it is such an important matter we will change it?

Mr. ALDRICH. You can not change it then.

Mr. JONES of Arkansas. This provision was sent from the other House; the Commissioner of Internal Revenue indorsed it; the Senators from California, who are interested in the question, preferred 25 per cent. Why should we make a change?

Mr. ALLISON. Do I understand that the Senators from California prefer 25 per cent?

Mr. WHITE. The matter has never been suggested.

Mr. ALLISON. If the people who are interested in the question do not care anything about it, I do not see why I should stand up here and ask for the change. Here is a change that comes from the other House. I venture to say, without knowing anything especially about it, that there is an individual in the wood pile. If the provision is left as it is now, we can not go back to it and change it without having the fight all over again in the Senate.

Mr. HALE. Let me ask the Senator from Iowa if he does not think the "individual in the wood pile" is likely to be one of these New York importers, whom the Senator from California says he met here and who made the representations before the Committee on Ways and Means? Is not that likely to be the interest?

Mr. ALLISON. I do not know what the interest is; but I know that this matter does not come under the jurisdiction of the Commissioner of Internal Revenue at all. He has no more to do with it than the man who is reputed to be in the moon. Whilst his opinion on everything within his jurisdiction is valuable, and may also be valuable upon this subject if he has examined it, still, having examined it two years ago and having looked into it with the utmost care, I should like to look into it further before I consent to the change.

The Senator says let it go, and if it turns out to be all right so be it; but if we allow it to remain as the other House has put it, then the only way to deal with it is in the Senate after the bill has been reported to the Senate.

Mr. WHITE. With the permission of the Senator from Iowa, I desire to state that I have no doubt if I had called the attention of the committee, or if the committee's attention had in any way been called to the fact that there was a mistake, it would have been rectified. I do not know that there is any mistake about it.

Mr. ALLISON. Neither do I.

Mr. WHITE. The expert who was here representing our interest did not point it out. But as the difference is slight I think it is advisable to make the change. I do not see that any harm can come from making it 24 instead of 25 per cent, and it might possibly prevent a mistake.

Mr. ALLISON. As I am fortified by the Senator from California, I hope the committee will yield to him, as they do not to me.

Mr. JONES of Arkansas. We shall agree to it; but I hope the Senator from Iowa will point out the "individual in the wood pile," as we get further along in this matter.

Mr. ALDRICH. I think I can do that right now to the satisfaction of the Senator from Iowa and the Senator from Arkansas.

Mr. ALLISON. I did not see the individual, I will say to the Senator. I should be glad to see him now.

Mr. JONES of Arkansas. I should be obliged to the Senator if he would point him out.

Mr. ALDRICH. I call the attention of the Senator from Arkansas and the Senator from Iowa to the fact that under the provision as it now stands, taking the two provisions together, all still wines, including ginger wines and vermuth containing more than 14 per cent of alcohol, shall pay 50 cents a gallon duty.

If they contain 25 per cent of alcohol, according to this provision they will pay, as we now have it, only 45 cents a gallon. In other words, a vermuth containing 25 per cent of alcohol would pay a less rate of duty than a vermuth containing 15 per cent of alcohol, as 15 per cent would pay 50 cents a gallon, and under the provision as you have it, if it contains 25 per cent, it would pay less.

Mr. JONES of Arkansas. It would be classed as spirits.

Mr. ALDRICH. And of course it would pay a duty of 25 per cent proof spirits, which, at $1.80 per gallon, would be 45 cents a gallon, according to my arithmetic.

Mr. JONES of Arkansas. It would be classed as proof spirits, and pay a duty accordingly. We understand it pays a duty as if it were proof spirits.

Mr. ALDRICH. It pays duty on the proof spirits in it.

Mr. JONES of Arkansas. That is not what the provision says.

Mr. ALDRICH. That is what it would do according to the terms of the proposed law in other respects.

Mr. JONES of Arkansas. It says, "Containing more than 25 per cent of alcohol shall be classed as spirits and pay duty accordingly."

Mr. ALDRICH. That would be 45 cents a gallon.

Mr. JONES of Arkansas. It would pay the full tax.

Mr. ALDRICH. If you say it shall pay a duty of $1.80 a gallon I shall not object to it.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment proposed by the Senator from Iowa [Mr. ALLISON], which will be stated.

The SECRETARY. In paragraph 244, line 18, strike out "twenty-five" and insert "twenty-four;" so as to make the proviso read:

Provided, That any wines, ginger cordial, or vermuth imported containing more than 24 per cent of alcohol shall be classed as spirits and pay duty accordingly.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. ALDRICH. In line 20 I move to strike out the words "duty accordingly" and insert "a duty of $1.80 per gallon."

Mr. VEST. There is no occasion for that.

Mr. ALDRICH. If that is the meaning of the language we might as well have it expressed.

Mr. VEST. We prefer our own language, with all due respet to the Senator from Rhode Island.

Mr. ALDRICH. What does the Senator from Arkansas say in respect to my suggestion, that it will pay a duty of only 45 cents a gallon? What answer does the Senator make to that suggestion?

Mr. JONES of Arkansas. That is provided for in the bill, and that is sufficient.

Mr. ALDRICH. I do not think it is provided for. I therefore move to strike out the words "duty accordingly," in line 20, and insert:

A duty of $1.80 per gallon.

So as to read:

Shall be classed as spirits and pay a duty of $1.80 per gallon.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment proposed by the Senator from Rhode Island.

The amendment was rejected.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The reading of the bill will be proceeded with.

The Secretary read the next paragraph, as follows:

245. Ale, porter, and beer, in bottles or jugs, 30 cents per gallon, but no seperate or additional duty shall be assessed on the bottles or jugs; otherwise than in bottles or jugs, 15 cents per gallon.

The Committee on Finance reported an amendment, in line 7, before the word "cents," to strike out "fifteen" and insert "ten;" so as to read:

Ten cents per gallon.

Mr. ALDRICH. I move to amend the paragraph by inserting "forty" instead of "thirty" in line 4, and "twenty" instead of "ten" in the last line. Those are the rates of the present law.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The amendment proposed by the Senator from Rhode Island will be stated.

The SECRETARY. In paragraph 245, line 4, strike out "thirty" and insert "forty;" and in line 7 strike out "ten" and insert "twenty," so as to make the paragraph read:

245. Ale, porter, and beer, in bottles or jugs, 40 cents per gallon, but no separate or additional duty shall be assessed on the bottles or jugs; otherwise than in bottles or jugs, 20 cents per gallon.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment proposed by the Senator from Rhode Island.

Mr. HALE. On that let us have the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. ALLISON. I do not quite see why it is proposed to reduce the duty upon these articles imported from abroad. The duty is not a very high one, and especially in the last clause, which the committee propose now to reduce to 10 cents a gallon, while the House provision, I believe, is 15 cents a gallon.

Under the existing law ale, porter, and beer imported otherwise than in bottles or jugs pay just half the duty put upon beer in bottles. Now, it is proposed to make the duty upon bottled beer 30 cents, and the duty upon beer imported otherwise 10 cents a gallon. I think that is too great a difference, and I do not see any reason why we should reduce the duty. It is purely a revenue duty, just as the other articles here are articles having revenue duties. Of course, I do not expect to see it changed, but I regret that the committee have made the reduction.

Mr. JONES of Arkansas. Twenty cents is the difference provided for under the McKinley act between bottled beer and beer in barrels.

Mr. HALE. I call the attention of the Senator from Iowa, but in my own time to the fact that upon ale, beer, and porter in casks, imported from abroad, coming in competition with our own manufactures, at the moderate duty imposed by the present law, the imposts fort 1893 amounted to $112,377.40, and upon ale, beer, and porter in bottles, they amounted to $495,751, or an aggregate of $907,000.

Mr. ALLISON. Under an ad valorem of 41 per cent.

Mr. HALE. That sum was paid by the consumers of these higher priced malt liquors from abroad. No representation appears to have been made here by anybody, by the people at large, by the Treasury, by the consumers, as to why the duty should be reduced, and yet the committee proposes to take from it a large portion of this revenue and make it up on something else. Of course it is in the same line with the treatment which the committee has accorded to these imported products in the form of spirits, not malt liquors.

Somebody or other, somebody whom the Senator from California met when he was trying to protect his own producers, has been here. The foreign importer has been here. He has been abroad. His mark is shown here in the bill, and it runs all the way through whether it is spirits, brandy, Scotch whisky, Holland gin, favorite foreign liquors, or the finer kinds of beers, porters, and ales, made in England, Austria, Germany, and perhaps in France. It is all one way. The only person who in any way will get one dollar of profit out of it will be the foreign importer. There will not be a bottle of German beer, or Bass's ale, or malt liquor, or porter which will be one cent less to the consumer after the bill is passed.

Mr. VEST. Mr. President, whatever political differences there may be between the Senator from Maine and myself, I think he will believe me when I make a personal statement. Not a single human being has approached our committee in regard to these duties. This reduction from 15 cents to 10 cents upon ale and beer not in barrels or kegs was made at the instance of a member of the committee who is not present here today, and who insisted upon some reduction, and urged vehemently that the present duty is too high. I thought then and think now it should be put back, and I have no objection to putting back the duty to what was fixed by the other House, 15 cents, although it is not a matter of very great difference. It applies only to these peculiar brands of German beer which are brought into this country and are drank principally by Germans.

Americans very seldom drink any of them, but prefer the domestic beer. We will withdraw the amendment, because it is a matter of not the slightest importance. I wish to say to the Senator from Maine, however, that so far as any solicitation is concerned, none was made to us at all by anybody; not even a written communication.

Mr. HALE. Of course nobody will raise any question upon that score after the Senator's statement. I referred most naturally to the belief that the importer had been here, and largely because of the statement of the Senator from California—that when he was wrestling for the interests of his own people he did meet the New York importer who had other ends and other objects in view.

I am very glad he did not make his way to the committee. I for one do not think that the taking of the House proposition will satisfy either the revenues of the Treasury or the people. I think the vote ought to be taken upon the amendment offered by the Senator from Rhode Island, that restores the present rate, which is a moderate duty, and which gave us nearly a million dollars in revenue.

Mr. ALDRICH. Mr. President, if this proposition becomes a law the revenues will be reduced by it, based on the importations of 1893, at least $325,000 a year. The reduction of the rates would be about to 30 per cent ad valorem in both cases, if the changes suggested by the committee are adopted.

Now, I can not understand any economic theory which proposes to impose a duty of 30 per cent ad valorem upon foreign ale, porter, and beer, and on Saturday imposed a duty of 300 per cent upon currants, a revenue duty in both cases. It seems to me that if a high revenue duty is to be imposed upon anything it ought to be upon foreign ale, beer, and porter, and if we are to impose high revenue duties, we ought not to select sugar and currants, and other articles in common use by the people of the country and a necessity to them, and reduce the duty to the lowest point upon French brandies and upon foreign ales and porters.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. WHITE in the chair). The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. ALDRICH], on which the yeas and nays have been ordered.

The Secretary proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. CAFFERY (when his name was called). I am paired with the Senator from Montana [Mr. POWER], and withhold my vote unless I see that it is necessary to make a quorum.

Mr. CULLOM (when his name was called). I am paired with the senior Senator from Delaware [Mr. GRAY]. He is not present and I withhold my vote. I should vote "yea" if he were present.

Mr. LODGE (when his name was called). I am paired with the senior Senator from New York (Mr. HILL]. If he were present I should vote "yea."

Mr. MCPHERSON (when his name was called). I am paired with the Senator from Delaware [Mr. HIGGINS].

Mr. MORRILL (when his name was called). I am paired with the Senator from Florida [Mr. CALL], and therefore withhold my vote.

Mr. PATTON (when his name was called). I am paired with the junior Senator from Maryland [Mr. GIBSON]. If he were present I should vote "yea."

Mr. PLATT (when his name was called). I am paired with the Senator from Virginia [Mr. HUNTON].

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. PLATT. I wish to state that my colleague [Mr. HAWLEY], who was called away by the death of a relative and has not returned, is paired with the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. FAULKNER].

Mr. GORDON. I transfer my pair with the Senator from Iowa [Mr. WILSON] to the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. IRBY], and vote "nay."

Mr. MILLS. I am paired with the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. GALLINGER]. If he were present I should vote "nay."

Mr. CAMERON. Has the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. BUTLER] voted?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from South Carolina has not voted.

Mr. CAMERON. I withhold my vote, being paired with that Senator.

Mr. CAMDEN. I wish to announce my pair with the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. PETTIGREW] under the conditions heretofore stated. I shall only vote when necessary to make a quorum.

Mr. BRICE. I am paired with the Senator from Colorado [Mr. WOLCOTT]. If he were present I should vote "nay."

Mr. GEORGE. Has the senior Senator from Oregon [Mr. DOLPH] voted?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. He has not voted.

Mr. GEORGE. I am paired with that Senator.

Mr. DANIEL. I desire to state that I am paired with the Senator from Washington [Mr. SQUIRE]. Otherwise I should vote "nay."

Mr. CAMDEN. Under the terms of my pair with the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. PETTIGREW] I have a right to vote. I vote "nay."

Mr. DANIEL. Having the same privilege, in order to make a quorum, I vote "nay."

Mr. ALLISON (after having voted in the affirmative). Has the Senator from Missouri [Mr. COCKRELL] voted?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator has not voted.

Mr. ALLISON. Then I take the liberty of withdrawing my vote for the present. Of course if it is necessary to make a quorum I will renew it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Iowa withdraw his vote?

Mr. GEORGE. He had better let it stand.

Mr. ALLISON. I will allow my vote to stand.

Mr. CAMERON. Having a right to vote to make a quorum, I vote "yea."

Mr. MILLS. I do the same thing. If my vote is necessary to make a quorum, I vote "nay."

Mr. BRICE. If it is necessary to make a quorum, I vote "nay."

Mr. CAFFERY. I reserved the right to vote to make a quorum, and I vote "nay."

Mr. GEORGE. If necessary to make a quorum, I vote "nay."

Mr. MORRILL. If necessary to vote to make a quorum, I vote "yea."

The result was announced—yeas 19, nays 29; as follows:

YEAS—19.

Aldrich,	Dubois,	McMillan,	Quay,
Allison,	Frye,	Manderson,	Shoup,
Cameron,	Hale,	Morrill,	Teller,
Chandler,	Higgins,	Peffer,	Washburn.
Dixon,	Hoar,	Perkins,	

NAYS—29.

Berry,	George,	Martin,	Turpie,
Blackburn,	Gordon,	Mills,	Vest,
Blanchard,	Harris,	Morgan,	Voorhees,
Brice,	Jarvis,	Murphy,	Walsh,
Caffery.	Jones, Ark.	Pasco,	White.
Camden,	Lindsay,	Pugh,	
Coke,	McLaurin,	Roach,	
Daniel,	McPherson,	Smith,	

NOT VOTING—37.

Allen,	Gallinger,	Kyle,	Ransom,
Bate,	Gibson,	Lodge,	Sherman,
Butler,	Gorman,	Mitchell, Oregon	Squire,
Call,	Gray,	Mitchell, Wis.	Stewart,
Carey,	Hansbrough,	Palmer,	Vilas,
Cockrell,	Hawley,	Patton,	Wilson,
Cullom,	Hill,	Pettigrew,	Wolcott.
Davis,	Hunton,	Platt,	
Dolph,	Irby,	Power,	
Faulkner,	Jones, Nev.	Proctor,	

So the amendment was rejected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Chair understand the amendment of the committee is withdrawn?

Mr. JONES of Arkansas. It was withdrawn.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The reading of the bill will proceed.

The Secretary read the next paragraph, as follows:

216. Malt extract, including all preparations bearing the name and commercially known as such fluid, in casks, 15 cents per gallon; in bottles or jugs, 30 cents per gallon; solid or condensed, 30 per cent ad valorem.

Mr. JONES of Arkansas. There is a mistake in punctuation in line 9 of the paragraph. The comma after the word "fluid" should come in after the word "such," and not after the word "fluid."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there be no objection that change will be made. The reading of the bill will proceed.

The Secretary read the next paragraph, as follows:

247. Cherry juice and prune juice or prune wine, and other fruit juice not specially provided for in this act, containing 18 per cent or less of alcohol, 50 cents per gallon; if containing more than 18 per cent of alcohol, $1.80 per proof gallon.

Mr. ALLISON. I call attention to paragraph 247 in analogy to the wine provision. If cherry juice and prune juice contain 18 per cent of alcohol or less, they pay 50 cents. If they contain more than 18 per cent, they pay $1.80. So I think I am somewhat strengthened and invigorated by my statement made awhile ago.

Mr. JONES of Arkansas. The purpose of this paragraph is to prevent fraud being perpetrated under the pretense of the importation of fruit juice. Eighteen per cent is sufficient to preserve the juice and bring it here in a sound and healthy condition. When a greater amount of alcohol is put in it is evidently the intention of the importer to smuggle juice into the country, and the intention is to make him pay a penalty for undertaking to do so. If they want to import fruit juice fairly and honestly they can put in the necessary spirits to bring it in without difficulty, and after that limitation if they undertake to perpetrate a fraud they pay a penalty.

Mr. ALLISON. I am thoroughly in accord with the provision of the paragraph, but I was merely contrasting it with the one which we had under debate a little while ago when certain other people who want to bring in spirits under the name of wines were allowed to bring them in at 25 per cent.

Mr. JONES of Arkansas. The things are totally unlike. Regular order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There is no question before the Senate. The reading will proceed.

Mr. HALE. I noted and appreciated what the Senator from Arkansas said, that the object is to make the difference between the two sufficent to deter false entries; but why was it considered necessary to make the discrimination between the juices which are 18 per cent or less and those which are over so much greater than under the present act?

In the present act it is 60 cents per gallon for 18 per cent of alcohol or less, and for that which is over 18, where the opportunity for fraud arises, it is $2.50, or a difference of $1.90 between the two. The committee have made the difference by adopting the provision of the House only the difference between 50 cents and $1.80, which is $1.30. Now, does the Senator think that that discrimination is better than the older and larger discrimination?

Mr. JONES of Arkansas. I do not understand the criticism of the Senator from Maine. This juice containing 18 per cent or less under the present law pays 60 cents. Under the bill we propose that it shall pay 50 cents. That is a reduction from 60 to 50 cents. Then the juice containing more than 18 per cent pays the same duty that a gallon of proof spirits would pay, and for the reason I have explained distinctly to the Senator from Iowa. The tax on a gallon of proof spirits imported from abroad under the McKinley act was $2.50. Under this bill it is $1.80. That imposed the tax on a gallon of proof spirits upon this article when more than the required per cent of alcohol went into the prune juice, and this is just the same provision exactly.

Mr. HALE. Now I catch what I did not catch before, and it is perfectly satisfactory. This is made to adapt itself to the rate that is fixed on proof spirits.

Mr. JONES of Arkansas. Exactly.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The reading of the bill will be resumed.

The Secretary read as follows:

248. Ginger ale or ginger beer, 20 per cent ad valorem, but no separate or additional duty shall be assessed on the bottles.

249. All imitations of natural mineral waters, and all artificial mineral waters, 30 per cent ad valorem.

Mr. JONES of Arkansas. In paragraph 249, line 21, I move to strike out the word "thirty" and insert "twenty," so as to make the rate 20 per cent ad valorem on "all imitations of natural mineral waters, and all artificial mineral waters."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the amendment proposed by the Senator from Arkansas.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. CHANDLER. The Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE], not now in his seat, desires to offer an amendment at this point in the bill. I have sent for him, but in the meantime I send the amendment to the desk, and ask that it be read.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment proposed by the Senator from New Hampshire for the Senator from Massachusetts will be read.

The SECRETARY. It is proposed to strike out paragraph 249, and in lieu thereof to insert—

249. All mineral waters, and all imitations of natural mineral waters, and all artificial mineral waters not specially provided for in this act, in green or colored glass bottles, containing not more than 1 pint, 16 cents per dozen bottles; if containing more than 1 pint and not more than 1 quart, 25 cents per dozen bottles. But no separate duty shall be assessed upon the bottles. If imported otherwise than in plain green or colored glass bottles, or if imported in such bottles containing more than 1 quart, 20 cents per gallon, and in addition thereto duty shall be collected upon the bottles or other covering at the same rates that would be charged if imported empty or separately.

Mr. CHANDLER. If the Senator from Massachusetts does not come into the Chamber before I conclude the brief statement I desire to make, I shall ask that the paragraph may be passed over. He is engaged in performing a duty to which he has been assigned by direction of the Senate.

I notice that the present law puts a duty of 16 cents per dozen pint bottles on all mineral waters, which, I suppose, includes natural mineral waters. The committee not only reduce the duty on imitations of natural mineral waters and artificial mineral waters, but they propose to admit free of duty all natural mineral waters. I do not understand why it is necessary to relieve natural mineral waters from the payment of any duty whatever.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, the Senator from New Hamp-

shire was kind enough, during my temporary absence on business of the Senate, to offer an amendment which I desired to offer when this paragraph was reached, reimposing the rates of the McKinley act. Of course, this paragraph covers articles of consumption totally different from all the other articles in this schedule. It involves not only the important industry of natural mineral waters and the making of artificial mineral waters, but also many associated industries. I desire to read a letter stating the case, written by a gentleman largely engaged in this business. He is also an importer. So that, so far as he is immediately concerned, his business would not suffer; but he puts the case for the home manufacturer. He says:

BOSTON, *June 2, 1894.*

DEAR SIR: I wish you would place before the honorable Senate the following statement bearing upon the importation of mineral waters.

During the past twenty years the importation of mineral waters has increased to an enormous extent, and keeps increasing every year. This has seriously crippled the mineral-water industry of this country. The amount of money that leaves this country for those waters foots up to at least three quarters of a million dollars every year.

These imported waters are by no means superior to the waters we have in this country. We have the richest production of mineral waters, North, South, East, and West, that can be found in any part of the world. I can not understand why some check can not be put on the importation of foreign waters.

Several industries connected with the mineral-water trade have suffered seriously through this source, viz., the manufacture of mineral waters, manufacture of glass bottles, manufacture of mineral-water apparatus, the cork trade, label printing, etc., which would give thousands of skilled laborers employment in this country.

I wish to state here that we pay our employés from $10 to $30 per week, whereas in Germany, where the greater part of this water is manufactured, the same class of workmen receive from 6 to 18 marks per week (some receiving 1 mark per day, some as high as 3), or from about $1.50 to $4.50 per week. This is in the rural districts.

I am well acquainted with this subject, as I have been in Germany on three occasions and have traveled through those districts. Under such conditions it would be impossible for us engaged in the mineral-water business to compete with the importers, labor being so cheap there and high here, and the freight from Hamburg, Rotterdam, or any other port to this country is so low.

On that account instead of having the duty 30 per cent ad valorem, as it is in the Wilson bill, it should be 100 per cent, or in other words those waters should be prohibited altogether, as it is only a matter of fancy and luxury to use foreign waters in preference to our mineral waters here.

I hope you will make a strong argument in behalf of the mineral-water industry of this country, and also in behalf of the labor and industries in general, as in my judgment it is impossible for the country to exist in a prosperous state without a high tariff.

I remain yours, respectfully,

ROGER F. SCANNELL.

Hon. HENRY CABOT LODGE.

The writer of that letter is familiar with the entire business in all its aspects. Mineral springs, as he states, exist all over this country. Some are developed and some are undeveloped. They stand, so far as their value is concerned, on precisely the same ground as iron, or coal, or any other gift of nature of that character; and I can see absolutely no reason for drawing a distinction between mineral waters and coal or iron, which have both been given a large protective duty, whilst the duty proposed here on these mineral waters is absolutely insufficient. It will result in driving the native mineral waters from the market; it will also greatly diminish the associate industries, which are very numerous and employ a great many men.

It strikes not only the manufacturers of mineral water, but the manufacturers of glass bottles, which are made in this country for our own mineral waters, and it also strikes at the manufacturers of mineral-water apparatus, the label printing for bottles, and all the men engaged in every branch of the industry. If there could be any industry suggested entitled to a fair protection it certainly is this one. Mineral waters, if they are to be introduced and imported into this country, are a proper source of revenue. For that reason, Mr. President, I offer the amendment.

Mr. CHANDLER. Mr, President, reflection convinces me that mineral waters imported should pay a duty; that they should contribute to provide revenue for the Government and the general welfare of this country; and that they should also pay a duty as a protection to our own industries.

It is very evident from the letter read by the Senator from Massachusetts that the cost of the production of mineral waters is almost entirely a question of labor. The cost of producing foreign water for importation into this country is substantially all labor.

When I was in Carlsbad in 1889, where I saw them bottling the Carlsbad water for exportation to the United States, I inquired the price of labor and the kind of labor that they employed to do that work, and I was informed that full-grown men who did that work were paid a florin a day; that is, 40 cents. The same kind of labor for which 40 cents a day is paid in Carlsbad, according to my observation, would receive in this country from a dollar to a dollar and a half a day, and perhaps the more intelligent workmen engaged in bottling the mineral waters of this country would receive much more than that.

Mr. President, the taking the duty off of foreign mineral waters will simply flood the market with those mineral waters to the destruction of our mineral water industry. To be sure it is better that these waters should come in and supplant our own waters than that French brandies and vile compounds, like absinthe and other cordials, should come in and poison and destroy our people; but certainly the mineral waters which are produced by the cheap labor of Europe and other countries ought to have a duty imposed upon them out of regard to our own labor.

Mr. SHOUP. Mr. President, I desire to add a word to what has been said by the Senator from New Hampshire and the Senator from Massachusetts.

In Idaho the bottling of mineral waters has become a great industry. We have near the village of Soda Springs, on the line of the Oregon Short Line Railroad, several mineral springs which produce immense quantities of natural mineral water. The water is bottled, being naturally charged, and having as much life as the Apollinaris and other waters which are artificially charged.

The water of these springs find a market in Idaho, and they are also exported in large quantities into Montana, Oregon, Washington, and Utah, but the waters can not be shipped East on account of the heavy rates of transportation to Eastern points in this country, where they come in competition with the imported waters; and hence, in my opinion, a duty of 16 cents per 1 dozen pint bottles or 25 cents per dozen on quart bottles ought to be imposed on the imported waters.

As stated by the Senator from New Hampshire, and as I understand it, these imported natural mineral waters are a proper subject for the imposition of a duty, and in my opinion they are, of all waters, those which ought to pay a duty.

I will go further and say that artificial mineral waters should be required to be stamped "artificial mineral water" on the bottles, so as to prevent our people being deceived by them.

Mr. CHANDLER. May I ask the Senator what would be the cost in Idaho of the ordinary labor of adults that would be employed in bottling those waters? Would it be as low in any case as 40 cents a day for any kind of adult labor employed in that work?

Mr. SHOUP. Oh, no; nothing like it.

Mr. CHANDLER. What would probably be the labor cost in Idaho?

Mr. SHOUP. The probability is that the labor in such work there would cost from $1.50 to $2 a day.

Mr. HALE. Let me ask the Senator whether the mineral waters in his own State have not been proved by analysis and by use to be as good and as safe table waters as the mineral table waters of Europe?

Mr. SHOUP. I will say to the Senator that our waters are equal or superior to any waters of the kind in the world; and the mineral waters are bottled just as they come from our springs, requiring no artificial charging whatever. The difficulty is, as I have stated, that the rate of transportation from Idaho to New York is two or three times as much as the freight from Europe to the city of New York; and so our mineral waters are driven out of the Eastern market.

Mr. LODGE. I desire to emphasize the point which has been so strongly confirmed by the Senator from Idaho [Mr. SHOUP], that under this clause natural mineral waters, as I understand it—if I do not misread the clause—go upon the free list, and a duty of 30 per cent ad valorem is imposed on imitation mineral waters.

Mr. ALLISON. Let me call the attention of the Senator to the fact that before he came in the committee proposed an amendment reducing the duty of 30 per cent ad valorem to 20 per cent, which was agreed to.

Mr. LODGE. That I had not heard; but it only still further strengthens the point I make. Why should there be a duty on coal or a duty on iron ore and the refusal of a duty on mineral waters? We are opening these springs all over the country, and they are of great value, just as valuable as the European springs, and if they are stricken down and not allowed to be developed, while we have a duty on coal and iron, or if the duty on mineral waters is cut so low it will force men like my correspondent, whose letter I have read, who prefer to go on bottling the American mineral waters, to become solely importers. The result would be under this clause the practical destruction of the native industry and the forcing of these men into some other occupation.

Mr. CHANDLER. I should like to ask the Senator from Colorado [Mr. TELLER] whether water is not bottled at Colorado Springs, at Manitou, and also at Idaho Springs? When I was in Colorado in 1873 there was no habitation at the so-called soda springs at Manitou. There was a village at a place called Idaho Springs. I have been informed that since that time a large industry has grown up in the bottling of those waters. I should like the Senator to state whether that is so or not. I call his at-

tention to the fact that mineral water is to be admitted free under the provisions of this bill, and I should like the Senator to state what the price of labor would be in Colorado to-day employed in bottling those waters?

Mr. TELLER. Natural mineral water is bottled at Manitou in large quantities, and it is also bottled at two or three other places in the State—not at Idaho Springs now; that, I understand, has been discontinued; but quite a large industry has grown up in the bottling of natural waters, and it is being extended to a great many springs; though in my State there are many springs which have never been touched.

The labor cost in Colorado, as a rule, is nearly double what it is in the country east of the Alleghanies.

Mr. VEST. I can not understand why there is any complaint in the duties proposed in this bill on artificial mineral waters. As I understand, we are not now discussing the natural mineral waters.

Mr. FRYE. There is an amendment offered by the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE] to include natural mineral waters.

Mr. VEST. I did not know that.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment offered by the Senator from Massachusetts is to impose a duty on natural mineral waters.

Mr. VEST. I beg pardon. In 1890, after a debate which I remember very well, both by Republican and Democratic votes, all natural mineral waters were put upon the free list, and they remain there to-day under the existing law.

Mr. LODGE. The amendment that I offered is the same as the provision in the McKinley act.

Mr. VEST. I understand the Senator has offered an amendment; but I am speaking now of the existing legislation. Under the McKinley act all mineral waters, not artificial, were put on the free list.

Mr. HALE. They are on the free list in the McKinley act?

Mr. VEST. Yes; and I recollect very well the debate in which Apollinaris water figured very conspicuously.

Mr. LODGE. The McKinley act says:

All mineral waters, and all imitations of natural mineral waters.

It includes both.

Mr. VEST. If the Senator will turn to the free list in the McKinley act he will find that all mineral waters not artificial are on the free list.

Mr. LODGE. The mineral waters "not otherwise provided for," I suppose are on the free list; but these are otherwise provided for here.

Mr. VEST. Then I am worse mistaken than I have ever been in my life, and I have at times been badly mistaken. I read paragraph 650 of the McKinley act, which is part of the free list:

Mineral waters, all not artificial.

I remember the debate very well, and it was one of the very few things about which both sides of the Chamber seemed to agree in 1890. The Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. ALDRICH] remembers it.

The imitation waters under the McKinley act, in bottles containing not more than one pint, pay a duty of 22.59 per cent; artificial mineral waters, in bottles containing more than one pint and less than one quart, 19.52 per cent; and artificial mineral waters and waters in bottles containing more than one quart, 24 per cent.

The bill as it came from the House of Representatives put 30 per cent, or an increase of 8 per cent, over the first and 11 per cent over the second classification. We simply brought it down to the equivalent in the McKinley act, as it now is, of 20 per cent, which is a fair duty. Unless the Senate has changed its mind materially as to putting mineral waters on the dutiable list, the provision in this bill is right.

Mr. SHOUP. Mr. President, I desire to say a word.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair will state that the understanding has been that the Senate was proceeding under the five-minute rule. While there has been some transgression of the rule, as the Chair understands, the Senator can not speak a second time upon the same amendment.

Mr. VEST. I hope the Senator will be allowed to proceed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there be no objection, the Senator from Idaho will proceed. The Chair hears none.

Mr. SHOUP. Mr. President, in 1890 I made inquiry as to the amount of water brought in and shipped from Idaho springs, in the State of Idaho, and I was informed by the agent that in 1889 535,000 bottles had been shipped. The same authority states that about a million bottles or 250,000 gallons had been shipped in 1890.

I have some recent data at my hotel which I should like to present to the Senate. I therefore ask that this paragraph may go over until to-morrow to enable me to produce them.

Mr. VEST. Would the Senator not just as soon have the matter considered when the bill is reported to the Senate? We do not like to leave a gap and go back in the bill again. The Senator can bring the matter up when the bill is reported to the Senate.

Mr. HARRIS. The question will be quite as open then as it is now.

Mr. SHOUP. Very well.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the amendment proposed by the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE].

Mr. LODGE. On that I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered, and the Secretary proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BRICE (when his name was called). I am paired with the junior Senator from Colorado [Mr. WOLCOTT].

Mr. DANIEL (when his name was called). I am paired with the Senator from Washington [Mr. SQUIRE].

Mr. LODGE (when his name was called). I am paired with the Senator from New York [Mr. HILL]. If he were present, I should vote "yea."

Mr. MILLS (when his name was called). I am paired with the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. GALLINGER], and shall not vote unless it be necessary to make a quorum.

Mr. MORRILL (when his name was called). I am paired with the Senator from Florida [Mr. CALL], and therefore withhold my vote.

Mr. PATTON (when his name was called). I again announce my pair with the Senator from Maryland [Mr. GIBSON]. If he were present I should vote "yea."

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. GORDON. By an arrangement with the junior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE], I transfer my pair with the Senator from Iowa [Mr. WILSON] to the Senator from New York [Mr. HILL], and vote "nay."

Mr. LODGE. Then I vote "yea."

Mr. MITCHELL of Wisconsin. I am paired with the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. CAREY]. If he were present I should vote "nay."

Mr. MITCHELL of Oregon. I am paired with the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. VILAS]. If he were here I should vote "yea."

Mr. PLATT. I am paired with the Senator from Virginia [Mr. HUNTON]. I should vote "yea" if he were present.

Mr. MORGAN (after having voted in the negative). I withdraw my vote. I am paired with the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. QUAY], who, I observe, has not voted.

The result was announced—yeas 20, nays 26; as follows:

YEAS—20.

Aldrich,	Dolph,	Hoar,	Perkins,
Allison,	Dubois,	Lodge,	Shoup,
Chandler,	Frye,	McMillan,	Squire,
Cullom,	Hale,	Manderson,	Teller,
Dixon,	Higgins,	Peffer,	Washburn.

NAYS—26.

Berry,	George,	McLaurin,	Smith,
Blackburn,	Gordon,	McPherson,	Vest,
Blanchard,	Gray,	Martin,	Voorhees,
Caffery,	Harris,	Murphy,	Walsh,
Cockrell,	Jarvis,	Pasco,	White.
Coke,	Jones, Ark.	Pugh,	
Daniel,	Lindsay,	Roach,	

NOT VOTING—39.

Allen,	Gallinger,	Mills,	Proctor,
Bate,	Gibson,	Mitchell, Oregon	Quay,
Brice,	Gorman,	Mitchell, Wis.	Ransom,
Butler,	Hansbrough,	Morgan,	Sherman,
Call,	Hawley,	Morrill,	Stewart,
Camden,	Hill,	Palmer,	Turpie,
Cameron,	Hunton,	Patton,	Vilas,
Carey,	Irby,	Pettigrew,	Wilson,
Davis,	Jones, Nev.	Platt,	Wolcott,
Faulkner,	Kyle,	Power,	

So the amendment was rejected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The reading of the bill will proceed.

The Secretary read as follows:

SCHEDULE I—COTTON MANUFACTURES.

250. Cotton thread, yarn, warps, or warp yarn, whether single or advanced beyond the condition of single by grouping or twisting two or more single yarns together, whether on beams or in bundles, skeins, or cops, or in any other form, except spool-thread of cotton, hereinafter provided for, valued at not exceeding 12 cents per pound, 20 per cent ad valorem; valued at over 12 cents per pound and not exceeding 20 cents per pound, 25 per cent ad valorem; valued at over 20 cents per pound and not exceeding 30 cents per pound, 30 per cent ad valorem: valued at over 30 cents per pound and not exceeding 40 cents per pound, 35 per cent ad valorem; valued at over 40 cents per pound, 40 per cent ad valorem.

Mr. JONES of Arkansas. I move to strike out the paragraph which has just been read, and to insert in lieu of it what I send to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The SECRETARY. It is proposed to strike out paragraph 250, and insert:

Cotton thread and carded yarn, warps or warp yarn, in singles, whether on beams or in bundles, skeins or cops, or in any other form, except spool thread of cotton hereinafter provided for, not colored, bleached, dyed, or advanced beyond the condition of singles by grouping or twisting two or more single yarns together, 3 cents per pound on all numbers up to and including No. 15, one-fifth of a cent per number per pound on all numbers exceeding No. 15 and up to and including No. 30, and one-quarter of a cent per number per pound on all numbers exceeding No. 30; colored, bleached, dyed, combed or advanced beyond the condition of singles by grouping or twisting two or more single yarns together, whether on beams, or in bundles, skeins or cops, or in any other form, except spool thread of cotton hereinafter provided for, 6 cents per pound on all numbers up to and including No. 20, and on all numbers exceeding No. 20 three-tenths of a cent per number per pound: *Provided, however*, That in no case shall the duty levied exceed 8 cents per pound on yarns valued at not exceeding 25 cents per pound, nor exceed 15 cents per pound on yarns valued at over 25 cents per pound and not exceeding 40 cents per pound: *And provided further*, That on all yarns valued at more than 40 cents per pound there shall be levied, collected, and paid a duty of 45 per cent ad valorem.

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. PASCO in the chair). The reading of the bill will be continued.

The Secretary read as follows:

251. Spool thread of cotton, containing on each spool not exceeding 100 yards of thread, 4½ cents per dozen; exceeding 100 yards on each spool, for every additional 100 yards of thread or fractional part thereof in excess of 100 yards, 4½ cents per dozen spools.

Mr. JONES of Arkansas. There are certain amendments to that paragraph I desire to propose, which I send to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment proposed by the Senator from Arkansas will be stated.

The SECRETARY. On page 58, line 25, paragraph 251, after the word "thread," it is proposed to strike out "four and one-half" and insert "five and one-half;" and in line 4, on page 59, before the word "cents," to strike out "four and one-half" and insert "five and one-half;" so as to read:

251. Spool thread of cotton, containing on each spool not exceeding 100 yards of thread, 5½ cents per dozen; exceeding 100 yards on each spool, for every additional 100 yards of thread or fractional part thereof in excess of 100 yards, 5½ cents per dozen spools,

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The reading of the bill will proceed.

The Secretary read as follows:

252. Cotton cloth not bleached, dyed, colored, stained, painted, or printed, and not exceeding fifty threads to the square inch, counting the warp and filling, 1 cent per square yard; if bleached, 1¼ cents per square yard; if dyed, colored, stained, painted, or printed, 2 cents per square yard.

253. Cotton cloth, not bleached, dyed, colored, stained, painted, or printed, exceeding 50 and not exceeding 100 threads to the square inch, counting the warp and filling, 1½ cents per square yard; if bleached, 1½ cents per square yard; if dyed, colored, stained, painted, or printed, 2¾ cents per square yard: *Provided*, That on all cotton cloth not exceeding 100 thread to the square inch, counting the warp and filling, not bleached, dyed, colored, stained, painted, or printed, valued at over 6½ cents per square yard, 20 per cent ad valorem; bleached, valued at over 9 cents per square yard, 25 per cent ad valorem; and dyed, colored, stained, painted, or printed, valued at over 12 cents per square yard, there shall be levied, collected, and paid a duty of 30 per cent ad valorem.

Mr. JONES of Arkansas. I move to strike out paragraph 253, and insert what follows in small type.

The SECRETARY. It is proposed to strike out paragraph 253 and insert:

253. Cotton cloth, not bleached, dyed, colored, stained, painted, or printed, exceeding 50 and not exceeding 100 threads to the square inch, counting the warp and filling, and not exceeding 6 square yards to the pound, 1¼ cents per square yard; exceeding 6 and not exceeding 9 square yards to the pound, 1½ cents per square yard; exceeding 9 square yards to the pound, 1⅞ cents per square yard; if bleached and not exceeding 6 square yards to the pound, 1½ cents per square yard; exceeding 6 and not exceeding 9 square yards to the pound, 1⅞ cents per square yard; exceeding 9 square yards to the pound, 2¼ cents per square yard; if dyed, colored, stained, painted, or printed, and not exceeding 6 square yards to the pound, 2¾ cents per square yard; exceeding 6 and not exceeding 9 square yards to the pound, 3½ cents per square yard; exceeding 9 square yards to the pound, 3½ cents per square yard: *Provided*, That on all cotton cloth not exceeding 100 threads to the square inch, counting the warp and filling, not bleached, dyed, colored, stained, painted, or printed, valued at over 7 cents per square yard, 25 per cent ad valorem; bleached, valued at over 9 cents per square yard, 25 per cent ad valorem; and dyed, colored, stained, painted, or printed, valued at over 12 cent per square yard, there shall be levied, collected, and paid a duty of 30 per cent ad valorem.

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The reading of the bill will proceed.

The Secretary read as follows:

254. Cotton cloth, not bleached, dyed, colored, stained, painted, or printed, exceeding 100 and not exceeding 150 threads to the square inch, counting the warp and filling, 1½ cents per square yard; if bleached, 2½ cents per square yard; if dyed, colored, stained, painted, or printed 3½ cents per square yard: *Provided*, That on all cotton cloth exceeding 100 and not exceeding 150 threads to the square inch, counting the warp and filling, including all cotton duck, not bleached, dyed, colored, stained, painted, or printed, valued at over 7½ cents per square yard, 25 per cent ad valorem; bleached, including all cotton duck, valued at over 10 cents per square yard, 30 per cent ad valorem; dyed, colored, stained, painted, or printed, valued at over 12½ cents per square yard, there shall be levied, collected, and paid a duty of 35 per cent ad valorem.

Mr. JONES of Arkansas. I move to strike out that paragraph, and insert what follows in small type.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment proposed by the Senator from Arkansas will be read.

The Secretary read as follows:

254. Cotton cloth, not bleached, dyed, colored, stained, painted, or printed, exceeding 100 and not exceeding 150 threads to the square inch, counting the warp and filling, and not exceeding 4 square yards to the pound, 1½ cents per square yard; exceeding 4 and not exceeding 6 square yards to the pound, 2 cents per square yard; exceeding 6 and not exceeding 8 square yards to the pound, 2½ cents per square yard; exceeding 8 square yards to the pound, 2¾ cents per square yard; if bleached, and not exceeding 4 square yards to the pound, 2½ cents per square yard; exceeding 4 and not exceeding 6 square yards to the pound, 3 cents per square yard; exceeding 6 and not exceeding 8 square yards to the pound, 3½ cents per square yard; exceeding 8 square yards to the pound, 3¾ cents per square yard; if dyed, colored, stained, painted, or printed, and not exceeding 4 square yards to the pound, 3½ cents per square yard; exceeding 4 and not exceeding 6 square yards to the pound, 3¾ cents per square yard; exceeding 6 and not exceeding 8 square yards to the pound, 4½ cents per square yard; exceeding 8 square yards to the pound, 4½ cents per square yard: *Provided*, That on all cotton cloth exceeding 100 and not exceeding 150 threads to the square inch, counting the warp and filling, not bleached, dyed, colored, stained, painted, or printed, valued at over 9 cents per square yard, 30 per cent ad valorem; bleached, valued at over 11 cents per square yard, 35 per cent ad valorem; dyed, colored, stained, painted or printed, valued at over 12½ cents per square yard, there shall be levied, collected, and paid a duty of 35 per cent ad valorem.

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair calls the attention of the Senator from Arkansas to line 12, and suggests that the word "pounds" should be "pound."

Mr. JONES of Arkansas. It is not printed that way in the copy of the bill I have, but if it is so printed in any other copy, it should be corrected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The SECRETARY. In line 12, it is proposed to strike out the word "pounds" and insert "pound."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be made in the absence of objection.

The Secretary read as follows:

255. Cotton cloth, not bleached, dyed, colored, stained, painted, or printed, exceeding 150 and not exceeding 200 threads to the square inch, counting the warp and filling, 2 cents per square yard; if bleached, 2¾ cents per square yard; if dyed, colored, stained, painted, or printed, 4½ cents per square yard: *Provided*, That on all cotton cloth exceeding 150 and not exceeding 200 threads to the square inch, counting the warp and filling, not bleached, dyed, colored, stained, painted, or printed, valued at over 8 cents per square yard, 30 per cent ad varorem; bleached, valued at over 10 cents per square yard, 35 per cent ad valorem; dyed, colored, stained, painted, or printed, valued at over 12 cents per square yard, there shall be levied, collected, and paid a duty of 40 per cent ad valorem.

Mr. HOAR. I suggest to the Senator from Arkansas that there is no occasion for reading the text which is to be stricken out. I ask unanimous consent that it may be passed over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there be no objection, it will be so ordered. The Chair hears none.

Mr. JONES of Arkansas. I move to strike out paragraph 255, and insert what follows in small type.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment proposed by the Senator from Arkansas will be stated.

The SECRETARY. It is proposed to strike out paragraph 255 and insert:

255. Cotton cloth not bleached, dyed, colored, stained, painted, or printed, exceeding 150 and not exceeding 200 threads to the square inch, counting the warp and filling, and not exceeding 3½ square yards to the pound, 2 cents per square yard; exceeding 3½ and not exceeding 4½ square yards to the pound, 2¾ cents per square yard; exceeding 4½ and not exceeding 6 square yards to the pound, 3 cents per square yard: exceeding 6 square yards to the pound, 3½ cents per square yard; if bleached, and not exceeding 3½ square yards to the pound, 2¾ cents per square yard; exceeding 3½ and not exceeding 4½ square yards to the pound, 3½ cents per square yard; exceeding 4½ and not exceeding 6 square yards to the pound, 4 cents per square yard; exceeding 6 square yards to the pound, 4½ cents per square yard; if dyed, colored, stained, painted, or printed, and not exceeding 3½ square yards to the pound, 4½ cents per square yard; exceeding 3½ and not exceeding 4½ square yards to the pound, 4½ cents per square yard; exceeding 4½ and not exceeding 6 square yards to the pound, 4¾ cents per square yard; exceeding 6 square yards to the pound, 5 cents per square yard: *Provided*, That on all cotton cloth exceeding 150 and not exceeding 200 threads to the square inch, counting the warp and filling, not bleached, dyed, colored, stained, painted, or printed, valued at over 10 cents per square yard, 35 per cent ad valorem; bleached, valued at over 12 cents per square yard, 35 per cent ad valorem; dyed, colored, stained, painted, or printed, valued at over 12½ cents per square yard, there shall be levied, collected, and paid a duty of 40 per cent ad valorem.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the adoption of the amendment offered by the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. JONES].

The amendment was agreed to.

The next paragraph of the bill was read, as follows:

256. Cotton cloth, not bleached, dyed, colored, stained, painted, or printed, exceeding 200 threads to the square inch, counting the warp and filling, 3 cents per square yard; if bleached, 4 cents per square yard; if dyed, colored, stained, painted, or printed, 5¾ cents per square yard: *Provided*, That on all such cotton cloths not bleached, dyed, colored, stained, painted, or printed, valued at over 10 cents per square yard, 30 per cent ad valorem; bleached, valued at over 12 cents per square yard, 35 per cent ad valorem; and dyed, colored, stained, painted, or printed, valued at over 15 cents per square yard, there shall be levied, collected, and paid a duty of 40 per cent ad valorem.

Mr. JONES of Arkansas. I move to strike out that paragraph and insert what is in small type below.

The SECRETARY. It is proposed to strike out paragraph 256 and insert:

256. Cotton cloth not bleached, dyed, colored, stained, painted, or printed, exceeding 200 threads to the square inch, counting the warp and filling, and not exceeding 2¼ square yards to the pound, 3 cents per square yard; exceeding 2¼ and not exceeding 3½ square yards to the pound, 3½ cents per square yard; exceeding 3½ and not exceeding 5 square yards to the pound, 4 cents per square yard; exceeding 5 square yards to the pound, 4½ cents per square yard; if bleached, and not exceeding 2¼ square yards to the pound, 4 cents per square yard; exceeding 2¼ and not exceeding 3½ square yards to the pound, 4½ cents per square yard; exceeding 3½ and not exceeding 5 square yards to the pound, 5 cents per square yard; exceeding 5 square yards to the pound, 5½ cents per square yard; if dyed, colored, painted, or printed, and not exceeding 3½ square yards to the pound, 5½ cents per square yard; exceeding 3½ square yards to the pound, 6½ cents per square yard: *Provided*, That on all such cotton cloths not bleached, dyed, colored, stained, painted, or printed, valued at over 12 cents per square yard: bleached, valued at over 14 cents per square yard; and dyed, colored, stained, painted, or printed, valued at over 16 cents per square yard, there shall be levied, collected, and paid a duty of 35 per cent ad valorem.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the amendment proposed by the Senator from Arkansas.

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The reading of the bill will proceed.

The Secretary read as follows:

257. The term cotton cloth, or cloth, wherever used in the foregoing paragraph of this schedule, shall be held to include all woven fabrics of cotton in the piece, whether figured, fancy, or plain, not specially provided for in this act, the warp and filling threads of which can be counted by unraveling or other practicable means.

258. Clothing ready made, and articles of wearing apparel of every description, handkerchiefs, and neckties or neckwear composed of cotton or other vegetable fiber, or of which cotton or other vegetable fiber is the component material of chief value, made up or manufactured wholly or in part by the tailor, seamstress, or manufacturer, all of the foregoing not specially provided for in this act, 40 per cent ad valorem.

259. Plushes, velvets, velveteens, corduroys, and all pile fabrics composed of cotton or other vegetable fiber, not bleached, dyed, colored, stained, painted, or printed, 35 per cent ad valorem; on all such goods, if bleached, dyed, colored, stained, painted, or printed, 40 per cent ad valorem.

Mr. JONES of Arkansas. In line 23 of paragraph 259 I move to strike out the word "thirty-five" and insert "forty;" so as to read "40 per cent ad valorem."

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. JONES of Arkansas. In line 24, I move to insert the words "seven and a half;" so as to read "47½ per cent ad valorem."

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The reading of the bill will proceed.

The Secretary read as follows:

260. Chenille curtains, table covers, and all goods manufactured of cotton chenille, or of which cotton chenille forms the component material of chief value, 40 per cent advalorem.

Mr. JONES of Arkansas. I move to insert what follows in small type.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment proposed by the Senator from Arkansas will be stated.

The SECRETARY. It is proposed to add to paragraph 260:

Sleeve linings or other cloths, composed of cotton and silk, whether known as silk stripe sleeve lining, silk stripes, or otherwise, 45 per cent ad valorem.

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The reading of the bill will proceed.

The Secretary read as follows:

261. Stockings, hose, and half-hose, made on knitting machines or frames, composed of cotton or other vegetable fiber and not otherwise specially provided for in this act, and shirts and drawers composed of cotton, valued at not more than $1.50 per dozen, 30 per cent ad valorem.

Mr. JONES of Arkansas. I move to strike out the words included in brackets.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment proposed by the Senator from Arkansas will be stated.

The SECRETARY. After the word "act," in line 9, it is proposed to strike out "and shirts and drawers composed of cotton, valued at not more than $1.50 per dozen."

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The reading of the bill will proceed.

The Secretary read as follows:

262. Stockings, hose and half-hose, selvedged, fashioned, narrowed, or shaped wholly or in part by knitting machines or frames, or knit by hand, including such as are commercially known as seamless or clocked stockings, hose or half-hose, all of the above composed of cotton or other vegetable fiber, finished or unfinished, 40 per cent ad valorem.

Mr. JONES of Arkansas. In line 16 I move to strike out "clock" and insert "clocked." It should be "clocked stockings." It is a misprint.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. JONES of Arkansas. In line 17 I move to insert the words "and knitted shirts or drawers."

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. JONES of Arkansas. In line 18; I move to strike out "forty" and insert "forty-five;" so as to read "45 per cent ad valorem."

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The reading of the bill will proceed.

The Secretary read as follows:

263. Cords, braids, boot, shoe, and corset lacings, tape, gimps, galloons, webbing, goring, suspenders, and braces, made of cotton or other vegetable fiber, and whether composed in part of India rubber or otherwise, and cotton damask, in the piece or otherwise, 35 per cent ad valorem.

Mr. JONES of Arkansas. I move to strike out that paragraph, and insert what I send to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment proposed by the Senator from Arkansas will be stated

The SECRETARY. It is proposed to strike out paragraph 263, and insert:

263. Cords, braid, boot, shoe, and corset lacings, tapes, gimps, galloons, webbing, goring, suspenders, and braces, woven, braided, or twisted lamp or candle wicking, lining for bicycle tires, spindle binding, any of the above made of cotton or other vegetable fiber and whether composed in part of India rubber or otherwise, 45 per cent ad valorem.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. LODGE. Did I understand the amendment offered by the Senator from Arkansas omitted entirely "cotton damask"?

Mr. JONES of Arkansas. That is to be included in the following paragraph.

Mr. LODGE. It is to be offered as a separate paragraph?

Mr. JONES of Arkansas. It is to be offered as an amendment to follow the words "cotton duck," in the first line of the next paragraph.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The reading of the bill will proceed.

The Secretary read as follows:

264. All manufactures of cotton not specially provided for in this act, including cloth having India rubber as a component material, 35 per cent ad valorem.

Mr. JONES of Arkansas. I move to insert after the word "cotton," in the first line of the paragraph, the words "including cotton duck and cotton damask in the piece, or otherwise."

Mr. DOLPH. I desire to be heard upon that amendment.

Mr. President, of all the surprises during the progress of the bill this is the greatest. Here is one of the most important schedules in the bill, which covers ten pages of closely printed matter, and it has been substantially disposed of in thirty minutes. The Senate was for many days discussing the question of the proposed amendment of the committee fixing the time when the bill should take effect, and other comparatively trivial matters have occupied the time of the Senate for days.

Now, we are disposing of the cotton schedule, embracing ten pages of the bill, vital to a great industry of all the New England States, and my vigilant and aggressive friend from Rhode Island [Mr. ALDRICH] has not opened his mouth. No objection has been made to a single line or provision of the schedule. My friend from Massachusetts [Mr. HOAR], who has taken so able and instructive a part in this discussion is silent, and even my friend from New Hampshire [Mr. CHANDLER] is not in the Chamber.

Mr. HOAR. Will my friend from Oregon allow me to tender him my profound thanks and gratitude? For the first time in my life I have been commended for not opening my mouth, and I want it recorded. [Laughter.]

Mr. DOLPH. Mr. President, this silence is significant, and I want to know what it means. I want to know why my friend from Rhode Island, representing so many of the great cotton manufactories in that State, is silent now; I want to know why my friend from Connecticut [Mr. PLATT], who has been so vigilant in looking after the interests of his State, is absent. There is but one conclusion, and that is that this schedule is satisfactory to the cotton manufacturers. Why is it? Is it because the Democratic majority have abandoned its platform and its principles? Why have we not heard during the consideration of this schedule something about the profits of the cotton manufacturers? Why have we not heard some denunciation of the robber barons manufacturing cotton?

If our Democratic friends have abandoned their position, if they have gone astray from their platform, if they have become afraid of their principles, and know that to destroy this great industry would not only destroy the prosperity of the country, but destroy the Democratic party, I congratulate them on their conversion to the doctrine of protection. I can tell better whether that is the case when we reach the woolen schedule.

If I find in the woolen schedule that the woolen manufacturers of New England have been treated as liberally as the cotton manufacturers, I shall say that is conclusive proof that our friends have abandoned their position on the tariff in regard to the cotton manufactures of this country. If I find, on the contrary, that the provisions of the woolen schedule are not satis-

factory to the New England Senators, and that they will claim that the provisions of that schedule will destroy the woolen manufactures in their States, then, sir, I shall know that the action of the majority concerning this schedule is because cotton is a product of the South; then I shall know that the reason for fixing this cotton schedule so that it is satisfactory to New England, is because cotton manufacturing is an industry of the South.

Mr. President, I repeat that I am amazed that the cotton schedule, covering ten pages of the bill, should have been read and substantially passed in thirty minutes, and not a New England Senator opening his mouth to protest against its provisions. The Senator from Colorado [Mr. TELLER] asks me why should they, as it is satisfactory to them. How and why has it become satisfactory? Who was it that secured these satisfactory provisions? I can not, I do not believe that New England and the South have combined, that there has been any agreement between New England and the Democratic majority in regard to the progress or the final disposition of this bill which secured this result.

There must be some reason not apparent. Why is it that our friends have so suddenly changed front? Wy is it that protective duties are given to manufacturers of cotton? I understand the general reduction in this schedule will not be over 30 per cent upon the duties imposed by the McKinley law, and under the changed conditions of the country, with the fall in prices, no doubt the duties to be levied by this schedule, when it becomes a law, will be nearly equivalent to those in the McKinley law.

The Pacific coast is discriminated against, as we have no cotton manufactures. I should like to know why it is that the great industries of my State are to be destroyed and the industries of New England are to be protected; and some of the rest of us should like to know the reason why. I disclaim all idea that there has been any agreement between New England and the majority of the Senate concerning this schedule by which the final disposition of the bill is to be effected or the time when the bill shall be voted upon determined.

If I find the woolen schedule has not been dealt as fairly with, I shall believe that it is because the Democratic majority in this body has come to the conclusion that the South has an interest in cotton manufactures, and desires to preserve the home market for its cotton, and to protect its cotton manufacturers. I am glad that this industry has been protected and provided for. I should have voted for any increase of duties if it had been desired by the New England Senators, just as I voted on my own motion not to put rice in the same category with wheat and other agricultural products of the North. I believe in protection. I am willing to protect every industry, but I should like to know what is the secret of this matter, the reason why the cotton schedule has been dealt with as it has.

I desire to call the attention of the Senate and of the country to the fact that the Democratic majority, which has been denouncing the manufacturers of this country, and is seeking to destroy the agricultural industries of the country, to destroy the woolgrowing industry, and to put our laborers engaged in producing agricultural products on a level with the laborers of the rest of the world, and which proposes to put lumber on the free list, has presented here a cotton schedule that is so satisfactory to New England that not a New England Senator has opened his mouth to protest against it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the adoption of the amendment proposed by the Senator from Arkansas.

Mr. ALDRICH. I ought to say a word in answer to the suggestions made by the Senator from Oregon. I will say that the rates in the schedule are reduced, I should think, about 30 per cent upon the average below those imposed by the act of 1890.

Mr. DOLPH. I should like to have the Senator state the average imposed by the McKinley law and also by this bill, so that we may know.

Mr. ALDRICH. The average rate imposed by the act of 1890 upon cotton cloth, as shown by the imports of 1893, was about 55 per cent ad valorem. It is reduced by this bill, I think, to about 40 per cent ad valorem.

Mr. DOLPH. The Senator means, then, 30 per cent on the rates of duty, and not 30 per cent on the price of the goods. There was a controversy between the Senator from Missouri and the Senator from California the other day. The Senator from California was using the same comparison that the Senator from Rhode Island uses, and I saw the Senator from Missouri had reference to the percentage on the cost of the goods. But what the Senator from Rhode Island now means to say is that there has been a 30 per cent reduction on the duty; that is, that the difference between the duty as imposed under the McKinley law and a sproposed by this bill would be about 30 per cent of the duty under the McKinley law.

Mr. ALDRICH. That is the statement exactly.

Mr. DOLPH. I rose simply to call attention to the fact, after the controversy between the Senator from California and the Senator from Missouri, for one had one in mind and the other had another.

Mr. ALDRICH. I will state that aside from this reduction, this schedule, which was prepared by a number of manufacturers of Fall River so far as the price of cloth is concerned, is perhaps the most scientific schedule that has ever been prepared upon the subject. The rates are lower than the manufacturers of New England or the people interested in the manufacture of cotton throughout the country desire, but so far as the method of representing the rate is concerned it is most satisfactory.

I realize, as all the other Senators from New England do, that it is impossible to have the rates fixed in accordance with our notions. If that had been possible I certainly should have moved an amendment to every paragraph on the schedule, but I recognize the inevitable. I think that the committee deserves the thanks of the cotton manufacturers of the country, certainly, for having consented to an arrangement which, while the duties are not high enough, is perfectly satisfactory as to the methods by which they are levied.

Mr. GEORGE. How do they compare with the McKinley duties?

Mr. ALDRICH. I think they average about 30 per cent lower than the McKinley duties, and I suppose that is about the average reduction which is made throughout the bill. I trust this explanation will be satisfactory to my friend from Oregon as to the reasons why the New England Senators did not antagonize the schedule.

Mr. HOAR. The Senator from Oregon has not observed perhaps that the only question before the Senate upon these paragraphs is not the question of their adoption, but whether certain amendments to the House provisions should be adopted; and while those amendments do not raise the duty, they do make a scale fixing the duty which is more specific in its effect on the product in proportion to the labor. Instead of having one gross, sweeping provision by which there is a per cent ad valorem, as the House proposed, on articles that are 95 per cent labor and articles that are 30 or 40 per cent labor, the committee have granted an amendment which does not increase the rate of duty at all, I understand, but which does make a little more fitting adaptation of the duty to the amount of labor in the particular product.

Now, I think he would be a very strange Senator from New England or from the North anywhere who when that amendment is the only question should get up and undertake to make a long debate over it. It is remarkable while the whole proceeding was going on, the eloquent and resonant voice of the Senator from Oregon, which we so delight to hear, whether it utters the opinion of the Senator himself or utters the opinion of the State of Oregon which loves and trusts him, was also silent. We all agreed, I and the Senator from Rhode Island, and all were of the same opinion that the schedule as proposed should pass without discussion. I do not think the Senator from Oregon has had occasion to complain of any New England Senator, certainly not any Senator from Massachusetts, that he did not free his mind about the general wickedness of this bill; and I do not think my honorable friend will have occasion to do so in the future if he shall hear some few remarks I have been proposing to make when I get the floor.

I will inform the Senator, so far as the woolen schedule is concerned, that any proposition which does not take as good care of wool and of lumber as of any article in the cotton schedule, will be opposed by me as vigorously as I know how to oppose it; it will be attacked in argument as vigorously as I know how to attack it; it will be denounced on the stump hereafter as vigorously as I can denounce it; and it will be repealed in about two years, when the Republicans get into power; and I hope I may possibly help to repeal it.

Mr. DOLPH. I did not intend to complain of the Senators from New England. I drew the inference that they were satisfied with the schedule.

Mr. HOAR. With the amendments. We are very much dissatisfied with the schedule.

Mr. DOLPH. I drew the inference that they were satisfied with the amendments. It is no answer for the Senator from Massachusetts to say that the only question before the Senate was whether certain amendments proposed should be adopted. If those amendments were not satisfactory they were open to amendment, and if they had not been satisfactory the Senators from New England interested in cotton manufactures would have moved an increase of duties; but the amendments were so satisfactory that the Senators held their peace. I discussed the relations of the Senators from New England to this industry far enough to draw the conclusion that the cotton schedule had been reasonably satisfactory to the cotton manufacturer. I did that

for the purpose of then asking the majority why these cotton manufacturers had been so dealt with.

Mr. President, I have not complained of the manner in which the Senators from New England have discussed or voted upon questions in which my constituents are interested. My constituents are not especially interested in the question of cotton manufacture. We raise no cotton, and we manufacture none, I think; at least, we manufacture no cotton cloth in the State of Oregon. We are interested in the question of protecting cotton industries just as we are interested in protecting every industry of the country, because, as I have stated more than once on this floor, every industry in the country is intimately connected, and you can not strike down the cotton industry unless you strike a blow at the prosperity of Oregon; and you can not strike down the woolen industry and the woolgrowing industry unless you strike a blow at every industry in the United States and all the people of the United States.

Not only the States of the Union are so connected by interest, the people of the States of the Union are so connected, the industries of the country are so connected, the different classes of our population are so connected that you can not strike a blow at any industry in this country unless it falls upon every State of the Union, upon every industry of the Union, and every class of our citizens.

I did not feel called upon to move an amendment to any of the rates proposed in the cotton schedule. As I said, it is not an industry of my State, and if the Senators from New England are satisfied with it, that is all I desire. I said I am glad of their good fortune, and that all I should like for them to tell me is how this was brought about?

I should like to know the agencies, I should like to know the arguments, I should like to know the inducements, because I want to apply those agencies and use those inducements to protect the industries of my State. All the reason I had for calling attention to this schedule was to call the attention of the Senate and of the country to the fact that the cotton schedule has been treated differently from the industries of my State.

Mr. President, I rejoice in the good fortune of New England, and whatever reason has induced it, whether it is the selfish reason affecting the cotton-manufacturing industry, or the industries of the South, or whether a majority of the Senate have come to believe that to strike down the manufacturing industry of the country will destroy the country and the Democratic party as well—whatever the reason, I rejoice in the good fortune of New England in securing reasonable protection for cotton industries. I do not doubt that when we come to the woolen schedule we shall have the sympathy and the support of every New England Senator.

It is true that New England buys our wool and our food products to feed her operatives, and so New England and Oregon are jointly interested in maintaining the wool industry and the woolen manufacturing industry. While we are individually in Oregon less interested in the cotton schedule and cotton manufactures, as I have said before, we are interested because the people of Oregon understand that the question of protection or free trade is a national question, and they are quite willing, while only asking that their own industries may be protected, that every industry which affords employment to the laborers of the United States shall be protected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the amendment of the Senator from Arkansas.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. JONES of Arkansas. I wish to make one correction in an amendment. In passing over paragraph 262 I made a mistake and moved to insert "forty-five" where I should have moved to insert "fifty," in line 19, paragraph 262, relating to stockings, hose and half-hose, etc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The SECRETARY. In line 19 strike out "forty-five" and insert "fifty;" so as to read:

All of the above composed of cotton or other vegetable fiber, finished or unfinished, 50 per cent ad valorem.

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The reading of the bill will proceed.

The Secretary read as follows:

SCHEDULE J.—FLAX, HEMP, AND JUTE, AND MANUFACTURES OF.

265. Flax, hackled, known as "dressed line," 1½ cents per pound.
266. Hemp, hackled, known as "dressed line," 1 cent per pound.
267. Yarn, made of jute, 20 per cent ad valorem.

Mr. JONES of Arkansas. In line 10, page 68, paragraph 267, I move to strike out "twenty" and insert "thirty," so as to read "30 per cent ad valorem."

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The reading of the bill will be continued.

The Secretary read the next paragraph, as follows:

268. Cables, cordage, and twine (except binding twine), composed in whole or in part of New Zealand hemp, istle or Tampico fiber, manila, sisal grass, or sunn, 10 per cent ad valorem.

Mr. DOLPH. There is no amendment I believe to that paragraph. I move to strike out "ten," in line 14, and insert "twenty-five;" so as to read:

Twenty-five per cent ad valorem.

Some months ago I presented to the Senate a memorial from all the employés of the Portland Cordage Company, and I was proceeding to read it in the Senate when the Senator from Missouri objected, and I was not allowed to put it in the RECORD. I believe my colleague, in a speech which he made upon the pending bill, placed that memorial in the RECORD. It was signed by the employés without regard to politics, and I think stated substantially what is stated in a letter I hold in my hand from the secretary of that company. They present their case for a protective duty so clearly that I will read the communication.

PORTLAND, OREGON, *January 22, 1894.*

DEAR SIRS: Inclosed you will find, signed by thirty-one of our employés and addressed to the United States Senate, a protest against those clauses of the Wilson bill that relate to manila and sisal rope and binder twine. Please see that this protest is put in the way of doing all the good possible towards accomplishing the object prayed for.

It is of vital importance to us, and indirectly to this whole community, that the tariff on rope and twine be not reduced from its present schedule.

Free trade in these articles, or an approach to it, will put us in direct competition with the rope manufacturers in Hongkong, where labor is but a fractional part of what it is here (being from 10 cents to 25 cents per day). In addition to that the freight on rope from the East Indies will probably be very low, as a large proportion of our yearly grain fleet comes here in ballast from those climes (from Europe via East Indies with general cargoes for those ports), and they can and propably will accept very low rates from the East Indies to United States and save the handling of ballast.

We think our strongest competition in cordage will come from China. If so, the labor that we would pay here, under protection with free trade, will be transferred to China.

This west coast will be helpless without a protective tariff, because our volume of trade is so very limited (to say nothing of higher expenses) that our cost of manufacture must necessarily be at the maximum until there is a more plentiful supply of labor and increased consumption by increase of immigration.

Our European competition, under free trade, would come mostly from England, and there we must contend against interest, insurance, and labor, probably 50 per cent less than the average in the United States; but there is another item that we think is not given due consideration, and that is the marine transportation from the Philippine Islands and Yucatan to the factories and thence to the general markets of the world.

England for the past century has fostered her marine until now she has a direct line of sailing vessels to all the good markets of the world. This we, the American people, do not enjoy and regular and cheap transportation to the world's markets would be the life of any business. As it is, we are shut out of a large portion of the world's markets and the proposed tariff's advocates ask us to be content with only a portion of our home market. If we could manufacture as cheaply to-day as the English, we would still be shut out on account of transportation.

In years past at this season we have run our factory at full capacity and manufactured a large stock of binder twine and rope for the following summer's trade; but the uncertainty about the tariff now compels us to move cautiously, so we have made a reduction of 25 per cent in our pay-roll schedule and are only employing thirty-one hands, whereas a year ago we gave work to sixty-five mill hands. If free trade comes we want a small stock on hand at a reduced cost, because it is likely to prove more profitable to close the factory and loan the working capital.

We know that you are interested in the general cause of protection, but beg of you to give a little especial attention toward having the tariff on cordage and twine maintained as at present.

Thanking you and your honorable colleagues in advance, we remain,
Yours, respectfully,

THE PORTLAND CORDAGE CO.,
By S. M. MEARS, *Treasurer.*

Hon. J. N. DOPLH and Hon. JOHN H. MITCHELL,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

This letter tells the whole story so far as the Pacific coast is concerned. There are large cordage manufactories in Hongkong and in other points in China. They have improved machinery, manufactured, I think, in the United States. They are manufacturing cordage and twine with Chinese labor at from 10 to 25 cents a day as compared with the labor paid to the mill hands in the United States.

Mr. President, whenever we have discussed this question of Chinese labor there has been virtually an agreement on both sides of the Chamber as to the bad effect of allowing Chinese laborers to come into this country to compete with the American laborers. I should like to ask any Senator on the floor what is the difference in principle between importing Chinese laborers to this country to manufacture cordage and employing them in the manufacture of cordage and twine and the manufacture of cordage and twine in China, and bringing that either free of duty or at a very low rate of duty into this country. The principle is the same.

Mr. FRYE. There is a great difference. If we bring the foreigner here and let him manufacture we have the privilege of feeding him here, and clothing him here, and giving him house room here, and all that sort of thing, which we do not have if he manufactures abroad.

Mr. DOLPH. That is true; and I called attention to that

matter the other day; but there is less advantage in allowing Chinese labor to come to this country than bringing laborers from other countries, because they use less of the products of this country, they expend less of their earnings in this country, they make no permanent investments in this country. But the principle of protecting American labor is the same, whether we apply it to the exclusion of Chinese laborers or apply it to the exclusion of the products of cheap Chinese labor in China.

The letter I have read tells the whole story. I do not desire to take up the time of the Senate, because I have learned from experience that the amendments proposed under the caucus agreement of the majority here, like the laws of the Medes and Persians, can not be changed. I do not expect to bring about a change even when I show, so that every Senator can understand it, that in the present case the reduction of the duty upon cordage and upon binder-twine means that our cordage and twine will be largely manufactured in China. I do not suppose that the committee will relent, or that the majority of the Senate will consent to any increase of duty.

The Portland Cordage Company sent me their answers to the questions propounded to them through the circular of the Finance Committee, and they left it optional with me whether I should present their answers to the committee or keep them for use in the Senate. At the time their communication came to me I did not understand that the reports would be printed as they are now being printed in the bulletins which are laid upon our desks from day to day, and for that reason, fearing that it might never see the light if simply turned over to the committee, having the option given to me as to what I should do with it, I kept it in my desk for the purpose of presenting it to the Senate at the proper time. As it is a very full statement of the whole case and of this industry, I ask to have it read as a part of my remarks, and then I shall conclude.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. WHITE in the chair). The Secretary will read the communication, if there be no objection.

The Secretary read as follows:

REPLY TO CIRCULAR LETTER OF COMMITTEE ON FINANCE, UNITED STATES SENATE.

PORTLAND, OREGON, *February 17, 1894.*

SIR: We have the honor to transmit to you answers to your circular letter of December 20, received February 10.

1 to 5. The name of our corporation is the Portland Cordage Company, of Portland, Oregon. Our invested capital is $350,000, and we established in 1887.

6. We have run full time since 1888, adding to our plant each year until 1893. We began operations with $100,000 capital. In 1893 we were running full capacity until about July 1, when the general financial and business depression compelled us to curtail our output one half.

7. We consider the present specific duty of 1½ cents per pound none too great to enable us to compete profitably with foreign competition. Our neighbors in British Columbia and Canada are protected by a tariff of 1½ cents per pound and 10 per cent ad valorem, or an average duty of about 2 cents per pound. They have as cheap facilities for manufacturing as we have, and with our tariff removed they could invade our territory and we could not retaliate or protect ourselves, as they could afford to dispose of their surplus in this market at a very close figure.

8. If the present duty were removed one-third, we would be compelled to reduce our cost one-third, which would be a difficult matter to do except by a lowering of wages.

10. Both domestic and foreign competition has in a measure caused a gradual decline in our prices for the past four years.

11. Our preference is for specific duty. This is particularly applicable to manila hemp products, as fully 80 per cent of the cordage manufactured is of a standard grade, and the remaining 20 per cent of cordage does not average more than 20 per cent less in value, so that in this instance the duty can not be said to bear very unequally upon the different grades, and what little of that objection there is is more than offset by the assurances that the Government will not sustain any loss of revenue by under and dishonest valuation that is possible under the ad valorem system; especially as we understand the ad valorem duty is to be collected on market value at the port of shipments. With specific duty dishonest merchants have no advantage over their honest neighbors.

12. Since July 1, 1893, our sales have fallen off 40 per cent on account of the general depression in business, although we have lost no customers, and added some new accounts to our books.

13. Since July 1 the tendency of wages has been down. On January 1, 1894, we reduced our scale of wages 25 per cent.

16. The price of living in this locality has decreased some in the past four years from local competition in all lines, and lower freight rates from the East.

17. The causes of the present depression in trade, we think, can be attributed to the unprofitable management of railroads and other large corporations. Also, to overproduction and speculation, the result of ten years' prosperity under a protective tariff. These, however, are but auxiliaries to the main issue, the tariff changes now proposed.

It being generally understood that the political party now in power were pledged to radical tariff reform in the direction of free trade, the natural result was that those manufacturing protected articles could not wisely continue buying raw materials and continue the manufacture of products when they could form no safe idea of what the value of their goods would be in the near future, and most all manufacturers have to plan at least six months ahead. Uncertainty hampers any business.

The result in our particular line has been, that since the United States manufacturers have ceased buying fiber, except for immediate wants, the fiber market has declined in price 30 per cent, which means nearly that percentage of loss on all stocks of fiber and manufactured goods on hand. Such loss is depressing. Manufacturing can not resume to any extent except for immediate demands (demands prior to the date that the proposed Wilson bill goes into effect) until the tariff question is settled. If cordage manufacturing can then be resumed at a profit without protection, it is sure to be with a reduced market, from foreign competition. The world's source of supply for manila and sisal hemps are the Philippine Islands and Yucatan. These fibers are the raw material to cordage manufacturers, and they are now admitted free of duty. The higher rates of interest, insurance, and labor in this country will offset transportation charges from Europe to New York, so that foreign manufacturers will have an equal footing with us in our home market, and we must expect to divide with them. We certainly can not enter foreign markets, from lack of the low rates and regular sail transportation enjoyed by the English, and not by us.

As a remedy for the depression we believe in stopping the present radical changes suggested in the Wilson bill. Reform of our tariff laws may be advisable, but we pray it may be done gradually, so that business can adjust itself to the changes without a great loss.

18 and 19. Fibers are our raw materials and our products are necessities.

20. Our credit we consider unquestioned, and yet we are compelled to pay 8 per cent interest on sixty-day loans. We think foreign manufacturers only pay on the average of about 3 per cent.

21. We have not had enough immigration to feel the effects of it.

26. We have kept foreign rope out of this market by quoting prices that make it advantageous for our local merchants to trade with us.

27. The only country that we could export to is British Columbia, but their protective tariff and other foreign competition preclude our selling at a profit there. We can not export to any other country because freights are too high to allow us to compete with English manufacturers.

28. The cost of manufacture has decreased since our establishment by increasing our volume, which always brings cost nearer the minimum. That is the only decrease in cost we have experienced, except in fibers, until the last few months; since that time we have reduced our wages.

29. All raw materials have grown less in value from year to year, as transportation facilities to this coast have improved. In the summer of 1893 the fiber market made a sharp decline, and has continued declining ever since, caused by large falling off in demand in the United States and decline in silver exchange rates.

31. We do not use any products of this country except tar, oil, and tallow. Ninety per cent of our material is raw material from the Philippine Islands and Yucatan. These markets are the general source of supply for the world.

32. None of our component materials are dutiable, and yet we require a protective tariff on the manufactured articles for reason stated above.

We trust we have answered your queries to your satisfaction, and hope it may have some influence towards convincing your honorable committee that protective tariff for the cordage industry is a necessity for its successful prosecution in the United States.

Yours, respectfully,

PORTLAND CORDAGE COMPANY,
By S. M. MEARS, *Treasurer.*

D. W. VOORHEES, Esq., *Chairman.*

Mr. LODGE. Is there an amendment now pending?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There is an amendment, the Chair will state, pending to line 14, page 68, to strike out "ten" and insert "twenty-five"—the amendment proposed by the Senator from Oregon [Mr. DOLPH].

Mr. LODGE. I move to amend, in line 12, by striking out the words in parenthesis, "except binding twine."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Chair understand that the Senator from Oregon has yielded the floor?

Mr. DOLPH. I have yielded the floor, but my amendment is pending.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question before the Senate is the amendment proposed by the Senator from Oregon. That amendment is now pending.

Mr. LODGE. If only one amendment is pending it is in order of course to offer a second amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair was not aware that the Senator from Massachusetts understood exactly the amendment before the Senate.

Mr. LODGE. I understand it is to raise the rate from 10 to 25 per cent ad valorem.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is the amendment.

Mr. LODGE. My amendment is to strike out the words "except binding twine."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendments are disconnected, it appears to the Chair.

Mr. LODGE. They are, but it makes no difference. I give notice that I shall offer my amendment after the amendment of the Senator from Oregon is disposed of.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the amendment of the Senator from Oregon [Mr. DOLPH].

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. LODGE. I now offer my amendment. On page 68, line 12, paragraph 268, I move to strike out the words "except binding twine."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The SECRETARY. In line 12, page 68, paragraph 268, strike out the words "except binding twine;" so as to make the paragraph read:

Cables, cordage, and twine, composed in whole or in part of New Zealand hemp, istle or Tampico fiber, manila, sisal grass, or sunn, 10 per cent ad valorem.

Mr. LODGE. Of course, I need not say that after striking out the words proposed by my amendment it would require the addition of a separate clause to put the proper rate on binding twine, that is, to restore it to its present rate. The striking out of "binding twine" in the amendment I propose, if it shall prevail, is only preliminary to another amendment. Binding twine forms a portion of a very large industry of New England and some other portions of the country, and particularly the State which I represent, and I wish, as representing a large body of men engaged in the industry, to say a few words in regard to it.

Binding twine was first introduced in 1878 as a substitute for wire, and at a cost of 17 cents per pound, which was then fully 40 per cent cheaper to the farmer than wire. The manufacture of this article is carried on principally in the States of Massachusetts, New York, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, Ohio, Illinois, Indiana, and Texas, and has steadily increased in this country, and the entire amount of twine consumed has for many years been produced here, although it is also manufactured in England, France, Germany, Canada, and some in the Philippine Islands, and also in Italy. It is largely used in every civilized country on the globe.

The production here has reached the aggregate of 50,000 tons per annum. The price has steadily declined to 7½ cents per pound in May, 1891, at which point it remained during the entire year. Latterly the manufacturers have used domestic hemp in the manufacture of binder twine, until in 1890 one-seventh of the entire product was made from this material, and it is believed that the proportion has now largely increased. Manufacturers have been spending large sums of money every year for new improvements, and have been reducing price of twine; and with low-priced fibers binder twine has been sold fully 40 per cent cheaper, on the average, than when first introduced. The expenditures for one factory alone, for new machinery and mill, have been over $600,000, and this has been the rule all over the United States.

I mention this to show that the manufacturers have aimed to reduce cost, and by doing so increase consumption. There has been no single year since binder twine has been introduced that the manufacturers have not sold it at a reasonable price over and above the cost of fiber; the difficulty is, that they are too far from the farmer, from the fact that the twine will have passed through two or three dealers before it reaches the farmer, and then it is sold to them by the village storekeeper, who is obliged to trust them from one to two and sometimes three years' crops before he gets his money. If the farmer could buy closer to the manufacturer he could save from 3 to 4 cents per pound on his twine.

Under the tariff of 1883 the duty upon binder twine was 2½ cents per pound. The duty upon the raw material from which it was manufactured was, for manila, 1¼ cents per pound; sunn and sisal grass, three-fourths of a cent per pound; and jute 20 per cent ad valorem, being from one-half to three-fourths of a cent per pound. The Mills bill made these raw materials free, and reduced the duty upon binder twine to 25 per cent ad valorem, which amounted to about 2 cents per pound. The tariff act of 1890 makes all these raw materials free, and reduces the duty on binding twine to seven-tenths of one cent per pound, which is less than 10 per cent ad valorem.

Statistics show that the price of binding twine during the season of 1891 were so near the actual cost of fiber that binding twine could not be imported without loss, and yet the supporters of the bill now under consideration advocate the destruction of this industry in this country by putting the article on the free list, and yet they have the evidence, as given before the Committee on Ways and Means, that if the duty should be further reduced binder twine could not be made in this country.

It is therefore evident that to remove the tariff is to transfer the entire industry to other countries. It must be understood that there is no country in the world equipped with the machinery to supply the demand of the United States with binder twine, and if the manufacturers of the United States found that England, Ireland, and Germany were building and putting in machinery to do this work, the manufacturers here would be compelled to remove their works abroad or close the mills, for their wages in these three countries are fully 60 per cent less than ours, and the seven-tenths of a cent duty does not protect the American manufacturer. The duty now on binder twine is the lowest grade of duty on any article manufactured in the United States.

The cost of labor in this country to manufacture this twine is about 2 cents per pound. In Belfast and Dundee the cost of labor is fully 50 per cent less. In Hongkong there are now running American machines manufacturing this twine at a cost of $5 per month for labor. This industry distributes to labor yearly the sum of $2,000,000. It is estimated that 10,000 tons of American hemp are used in its manufacture yearly. The manufacture of this twine from American hemp is an industry peculiar to the Western and Northwestern States. The raising of hemp for this purpose is more profitable than that of any cereal. What will it profit the American farmer if the vast army of American workmen now employed in the production of binder twine is driven to adopt agricultural pursuits and the industry transferred to Belfast or Hongkong?

The majority, by implication at least, profess to think that the removal of this duty will relieve the consumer, not of American wheat, but of binder twine. They propose to destroy the business of one class of American citizens for the assumed benefit of another class, and yet on every occasion this same majority are loud in their denunciation of class legislation. The fact is, the removal of this duty would simply benefit foreign producers and foreign consumers of the surplus of American wheat.

In the end the farmer would bear whatever burden falls to the American consumer. Destroy the competition of the American manufacturer and you leave the farmer entirely at the mercy of the foreign producer and the importer. The seven-tenths of a cent protection, if taken off, would never reach the farmer, but would simply be the means of compelling the dealers to pay cash for their twine, if supplied from England, whereas the manufacturers in the United States sell to them on six months' credit without interest.

This industry is already established; the removal of this duty would destroy it, throwing thousands of men out of employment and rendering millions of invested capital useless, and turning $2,000,000 in wages annually to the laborers of other countries. There is a lively competition which can only be maintained by the present duty which enables manufacturers of American hemp binder twine to prolong their existence; the destruction of this industry would inevitably increase the price of binder twine.

I have a letter from the Plymouth Cordage Company, which is the largest cordage company I believe in the State, or one of the largest, written by the treasurer, Mr. G. F. Holmes, in which he states that:

PLYMOUTH CORDAGE COMPANY,
North Plymouth Mass., May 23, 1894.

We pay the same for labor engaged in the manufacture of binder twine as we do for making rope, and the labor is fully two-thirds of the expense of manufacturing either article. It puts us to a decided disadvantage and brings us in direct competition with foreign labor if these goods are admitted free of duty. Our foreign competitors have the same style of machinery that we use, and of course this can be made to turn out as many goods in Europe as in America.

Yours, very truly,

G. F. HOLMES, *Treasurer.*

Not only that, but they have American machinery in China, in Hongkong, just as good machinery as we have, and they get their labor there, as I have said, for something like $5 a week. The result of putting binding twine upon the free list will be the destruction of a large portion of the cordage industry in my State and several other States of the Union. I do not believe that it will be of the slightest benefit to the farmer whom it is intended to benefit, for while it will destroy beyond any question the American industry, it will remove the American competition and leave us entirely at the mercy of the foreign importer. For this reason I move to strike out those words preliminary to a further amendment restoring the existing duty of seven-tenths of a cent on binding-twine.

Mr. PEFFER. The people whom I represent are interested in binding-twine; not in its manufacture, but in its use. Those of us who use binding-twine are engaged in business out of which we produce a very large surplus of wheat, for the binding of which twine is used. That surplus is sold in a foreign market where the prices are regulated by wheat coming from half a dozen different nations, competing one with another, all the producers of which excepting our own work for wages ranging from 6 cents per day in India to about 25 cents per day in the Argentine Republic and Russia.

Now, if we are compelled to produce wheat in competition with such labor as that, I do not see why the manufacturers of twine in Massachusetts can not do as well as we do in this open, free-trade competition. Hence I object to the amendment proposed by the Senator from Massachusetts.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the amendment of the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE].

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. ALDRICH. I call the attention of the Senator from Arkansas to the language used in this paragraph in regard to the composition of twine. The language used is:

Cables, cordage, and twine (except binding-twine), composed in whole or in part of New Zealand hemp, istle or Tampico fiber, manila, sisal grass, or sunn, 10 per cent ad valorem.

In order to secure the admission of twine for 10 per cent ad valorem it will be necessary to insert a small proportion of some one of these articles. For instance, cotton twine or silk twine, with a small proportion of any of these fibers, would be admitted at 10 per cent ad valorem. It seems to me that the words "or in part" should be stricken out, and perhaps the words "or admixture of any of them" inserted; so that the paragraph would read:

Cables, cordage, and twine (excepting binding-twine), composed in whole of New Zealand hemp, etc.

Now, that was the intention of the committee. This paragraph was copied in part from the act of 1890, but the rates imposed by the act of 1890 were so much higher that there was really no danger of frauds in the direction which I have suggested. I think it would be much safer for the paragraph to have the lan-

guage changed as I have suggested, so that it would read, "composed in whole of New Zealand hemp, istle," and then add after "sunn," in line 14, "or a mixture of any of them." That is all it is intended to cover, I have no doubt, and I move to amend as I have indicated.

Mr. VEST. This is the same provision that was found in the McKinley act, and I have never heard of any trouble in regard to it.

Mr. ALDRICH. But the rate is a very different one. There was a considerable specific rate imposed by the act of 1890, and this is a very small ad valorem rate. The Senator will notice that he proposes to give a heavier duty upon yarns than upon the twine, and it is important that we should limit the articles to be admitted at this very low rate of duty, so that there will be no chance for deception or frauds upon the revenue.

Mr. VEST. All these are hard fibers. It would be almost impossible to mix them with cotton or other softer fabrics so as to produce the trouble the Senator anticipates. I should not like to make this change, because, as I said, there has never been any trouble in regard to it, and I do not think it ought to be done.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the amendment of the Senator from Rhode Island.

Mr. ALDRICH. I think the Senator from Missouri did not quite catch the meaning of what I said. I think that manila, for instance, could easily be mixed in a very small proportion with either cotton, or silk, or wool, and that a yarn could be imported under the name of twine at this very low rate of duty. But, in order to make the paragraph perfectly plain, I suggest to strike out "or in part," after the word "whole," and to insert after the word "sunn," in the fourteenth line, "or a mixture, or any of them." That, I think, will make the meaning of the paragraph, as the Senator from Missouri desires it, perfectly plain.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the amendment of the Senator from Rhode Island.

Mr. CHANDLER. What is the amendment?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The SECRETARY. After the word "whole," line 13, page 68, paragraph 268, strike out the words "or in part," and after the word "sunn," in line 14, same page, insert "or a mixture of any of them."

Mr. VEST. Then that would confine the paragraph to these articles alone.

Mr. ALDRICH. Is not that what was intended?

Mr. VEST. And mix New Zealand hemp with istle, or with Tampico fiber, or with manila or sisal grass?

Mr. ALDRICH. Is not that the intention of the committee?

Mr. VEST. In other words, it would shut out every one of them. It reads here, "composed in whole or in part."

Mr. ALLISON. Let me ask the Senator from Missouri if it is not intended by this paragraph that you may mix a twine of hemp and cotton, for example, or of hemp and silk, or that you may make manila twine with manila and cotton?

Mr. VEST. I think that certainly would be the construction the way it reads.

Mr. ALLISON. I think so, too; and it seems to me hardly the right thing to do, because surely the twines that are named here are intended to be made of these cheap raw materials, and they are intended to include twines made of cotton. For instance, you might put in a single thread of manila here under this paragraph as it reads. There is a great deal of cotton twine, and it could all come in at 10 per cent ad valorem. It may be that it is a proper duty for such an admixture, but I think not. Certainly the old paragraph was intended to include cables. cordage, twine made of all these articles, or of any one of them.

Mr. VEST. "Composed in whole or in part."

Mr. ALLISON. Yes; and it is now the suggestion of the Senator from Rhode Island to make it very clear, that it is composed in whole, or of any one of them, or of an admixture of any two of them or more. It seems to me that would make it a clear statement, and I hope the Senator will consent to the amendment.

Mr. PLATT. How would it affect paragraph 263 as it now stands?

Mr. ALLISON. Paragraph 263 accords. Of course, there is a large amount of what might be called cordage twine, I think, manufactured.

Mr. ALDRICH. I hope the Senators on the other side will accept the amendment. It will take a great deal less time to dispose of it in that way than to discuss it. It seems to me it makes clear what the committee must have intended.

Mr. VEST. I should like to know what was intended by the McKinley act. There the duty was 1½ cents. I understand the Senator to say now it might be all silk except one thread of the sisal grass, or of hemp, or of manila, and then it would come in at 10 per cent. The same thing could have happened under the McKinley act, but it never has been done. There has been no difficulty in regard to it. It can not be possible that anybody would take cotton, a very cheap article, or ordinary hemp, or the common or coarser grasses and put in a thread or two of the higher priced articles and then pay 10 per cent upon it.

Mr. ALLISON. I agree to that. I believe that statement true, and if it be true then there could be no objection to the change proposed.

Mr. VEST. It certainly never was the intention of either the McKinley act or the present enactment that these cables should be made entirely of the articles mentioned here, because it says "made in whole or in part." The 10 per cent attaches if there are any of these specific articles found in the texture. That unquestionably is the law and is so construed by the Department. If there has never been any trouble, why should we undertake to change it now?

Mr. ALDRICH. I ask that the paragraph be read as it would read as amended.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated as requested.

The SECRETARY. After the word "whole," in line 13, page 68, strike out the words "or in part;" and after the word "sunn," in line 14, insert "or a mixture of any of them;" so that the paragraph, when amended, will read:

Cables, cordage, and twine (except binding-twine), composed in whole of New Zealand hemp, istle or Tampico fiber, manila, sisal grass, or sunn, or a mixture of any of them, 10 per cent ad valorem.

Mr. ALDRICH. As I have already stated, the reason why this was not taken advantage of under the act of 1890 was undoubtedly because of the imposition of quite a large specific duty by that act. Now we are to have a very small ad valorem duty. I have always felt as though the paragraph might be taken advantage of even under the act of 1890 for the importation of high-class articles in fraud of the revenue. My attention was not called to it until after the bill had passed and become a law, and I have been fearful from that time to this that there might be some importations of different articles under the provision. It seems to me there can be no question but that the Senator's intent is covered by the language which I have proposed to use, and I hope my amendment will be accepted.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the amendment of the Senator from Rhode Island.

Mr. ALDRICH. I ask for a division.

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

The yeas and nay were ordered; and the Seretary proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. FAULKNER (when his name was called). I am paired with the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. HAWLEY]. I do not see him present.

Mr. PLATT. My colleague has not returnd from the funeral of his relative.

Mr. FAULKNER. I announce my pair with the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. HAWLEY].

Mr. McPHERSON (when his name was called). I am paired with the Senator from Delaware [Mr. HIGGINS].

Mr. QUAY (when his name was called). I am paired with the Senator from Alabama [Mr. MORGAN]. If he were present I should vote "yea" and he would vote "nay."

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. CULLOM. I have a general pair with the senior Senator from Delaware [Mr. GRAY]. If he were present I should vote "yea."

Mr. VILAS. I am paired with the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MITCHELL].

Mr. BLACKBURN. I am paired with the senior Senator from Nebraska [Mr. MANDERSON], but I transfer that pair to the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. RANSOM], so that the Senator from Maine [Mr. HALE] and myself may vote. I vote "nay."

Mr. HALE. I vote "yea."

Mr. GORDON. By an arrangement with the Senator from Illinois [Mr. CULLOM], I transfer my pair with the Senator from Iowa [Mr. WILSON] to the Senator from Delaware [Mr. GRAY], and vote. I vote "nay."

Mr. CULLOM. I vote "yea."

Mr. FAULKNER. Under an arrangement made, the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. QUAY] will transfer his pair with the Senator from Alabama [Mr. MORGAN], to the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. HAWLEY], and he and I will vote. I vote "nay."

Mr. QUAY. I vote "yea."

The result was announced—yeas 19, nays 26; as follows:

YEAS—19.

Aldrich,	Dolph,	Patton,	Sherman,
Allison,	Dubois,	Peffer,	Shoup,
Chandler,	Frye,	Perkins,	Squire,
Cullom,	Hale,	Platt,	Teller.
Dixon,	McMillan,	Quay,	

NAYS—26.

Berry,	George,	Kyle,	Turpie,
Blackburn,	Gibson,	McLaurin,	Vest,
Blanchard,	Gordon,	Martin,	Voorhees,
Cockrell,	Harris,	Murphy,	Walsh,
Coke,	Hunton,	Pasco,	White.
Daniel,	Jarvis,	Roach,	
Faulkner,	Jones, Ark.	Smith,	

NOT VOTING—40.

Allen,	Gallinger,	Lindsay,	Pettigrew,
Bate,	Gorman,	Lodge,	Power,
Brice,	Gray,	McPherson,	Proctor,
Butler,	Hansbrough,	Manderson,	Pugh,
Caffery,	Hawley,	Mills,	Ransom,
Call,	Higgins,	Mitchell, Oregon	Stewart,
Camden,	Hill,	Mitchell, Wis.	Vilas,
Cameron,	Hoar,	Morgan,	Washburn,
Carey,	Irby,	Morrill,	Wilson,
Davis,	Jones, Nev.	Palmer,	Wolcott.

So the amendment was rejected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The reading of the bill will be proceeded with.

The Secretary read the next paragraph, as follows:

269. Hemp and jute carpets and carpetings, 20 per cent ad valorem.

Mr. JONES of Arkansas. I move to strike out "20 per cent ad valorem," in lines 16 and 17, and insert "4 cents per square yard."

Mr. PEFFER. I move to amend the amendment by striking out the last five words "four cents per square yard," and inserting "shall be exempt from duty;" so that the paragraph will read:

Hemp and jute carpets and carpetings shall be exempt from duty.

The amendment to the amendment was rejected.

The amendment was agreed to.

The Secretary read the next paragraph, as follows:

270. Burlaps, not exceeding 60 inches in width, containing not over 40 threads to the square inch counting warp and filling, 15 per cent ad valorem; bags for grain made of such burlaps, 20 per cent ad valorem.

The Committee on Finance report to amend the paragraph, on page 68, line 21, by striking out after the word "burlaps," the word "twenty," and insert "twenty-two and a half."

Mr. JONES of Arkansas. I move to strike out in line 18, the words "not exceeding 60 inches in width."

Mr. ALDRICH. I should like to have the Senator from Arkansas explain why that is done.

Mr. JONES of Arkansas. I can see no reason why a higher rate of duty should be put on burlaps over 60 inches in width than those that are narrower. It seems to me they are of the same value practically, and if there is any reason for having a rate of duty on burlaps under 60 inches the same reason should apply to burlaps above 60 inches.

Mr. ALDRICH. I think the Senator from Arkansas stated but a very small part of his case. Burlaps exceeding 60 inches in width have been made in this country to a considerable extent, especially since 1883, when a higher rate of duty was imposed upon burlaps exceeding 60 inches in width. They are more expensive than narrower burlaps. The narrower burlaps have always been given a low rate of duty for the reason that they have not been made in this country to any considerable extent.

Mr. JONES of Arkansas. The wide ones are not made here practically.

Mr. ALDRICH. Yes; to a very considerable extent. One large concern in New York has made a great many of them, and they have been sold in competition with the foreign article at a rate of duty which was not more than reasonably protective. Now, the effect of this amendment if it is adopted will be to prevent absolutely the making of any burlaps exceeding 60 inches in width in the United States.

Let us see just what the committee have done. They have proposed by paragraph 267 to impose a duty of 30 per cent ad valorem upon jute yarn, and in the next paragraph but one they propose to impose a duty upon burlaps from which yarn is made of 15 per cent ad valorem, 30 per cent on yarns and 15 per cent on the finished cloth. If there could be a more absurd arrangement of paragraphs than that I can not imagine. Certainly jute yarns ought to be 10 per cent or some such sum if burlaps are to be 15 per cent.

To show the inconsistency of this scheme as it stands, here we have these three rates: First, a duty upon jute yarns of 30 per cent; then a duty upon burlaps, of which the yarns are made, of 15 per cent, and in the next paragraph still a duty upon the bags, from which the burlaps are made, of 22½ per cent, a decline from the yarns to the cloth of 15 per cent, and an advance from the cloth to the finished bag of 7½ per cent. All that is necessary to make this cloth into bags is to sew them up with a sewing machine. The total cost of making them does not exceed three-tenths of a cent apiece on bags, or four-tenths at the outside; and yet the committee proposes to advance the rate from 15 to 22½ per cent for a protection upon that one process, which I affirm is 400 per cent of the total cost of making bags in India, where they are made in competition with those who make bags in the United States.

If there is to be that great additional amount of protection to the man who makes bags over the man who makes burlaps, there certainly should be some protection in the manufacture of burlaps over the man who produces yarn in the United States. This whole jute schedule is certainly anything but creditable to the members of the committee who have prepared it. These different rates can never be considered with any relation to each other. I presume the duty on jute yarns was put up to accomodate somebody who was engaged in the manufacture of jute yarn, and the duty upon burlaps was put down possibly because the oilcloth manufacturers were not content with their rate of duty.

Then, the duty upon bags has been put up to please a small bag combine, or people who are engaged in making bags in the United States, to an inordinate rate of duty, I mean as compared with the others. The whole schedule is as inharmonious and as out of line as it is well to imagine any schedule to be constructed. If it is desirable to give up the production of jute to the foreign manufacturer in Calcutta or Dundee and they are to have this trade, let us give them the whole of it. Let us make all the jute product free, or let us see that there is some relation between the different products. I shall be glad to know why these different rates are made and on what theory they have been adopted.

Mr. HALE. There seems to be something almost heartrending after we have got through a schedule that had been the subject of pacificatory arrangement and had been settled satisfactorily to some parties, so that it went through quietly and almost unobservedly, to find following that in the same day a schedule that is legitimately subject to the very sharp denunciation which the Senator from Rhode Island has visited upon this schedule. While that Senator would like to know why this arrangement upon this product has been made, why the discrimination seems to have been against the classes where the most labor is employed, and in favor of that state of the article where the least labor is employed, I should be glad to have the Senator in charge of the bill to tell us why it was not possible to submit this schedule to the peaceful processes by which we had so easy a deliverance from the cotton schedule.

It would seem to me that we were going on in a way that might be satisfactory even to the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. HARRIS] in the previous schedule, and that everything was lovely and that every goose hung high. It is a warm day and everybody felt that progress was most gratifying. Now, we have struck another subject-matter, where some of us fondly hoped we would continue the same pacificatory course, and we find the Senator from Rhode Island denouncing this schedule as one entirely discreditable to the committee. It seems to me the committee has not bestowed average attention to these two schedules.

If they gave so much attention to pacificate the cotton schedule and had given a little more attention to pacificate this schedule it might be that out of the general average we would have got a schedule that would have run through here in a very easy manner comparatively. But I am disheartened when I hear the denunciation the Senator from Rhode Island has resorted to upon this schedule, and I am bound to believe he is correct because he knows all about it. I should like to have some explanation why it was not submitted to the unwarlike crucible that ground out the other schedule.

Mr. JONES of Arkansas. The complaint of the Senator from Rhode Island at the rate of ad valorem tariff on jute yarn, it seems to me, is hardly consistent with his constant contention on the higher rate of ad valorem tax upon all other yarns.

Mr. ALDRICH. I do not mean to be understood as objecting to the high rate upon jute yarns. I am objecting to the low rate upon the products of yarn. I do not think the 300 per cent ad valorem——

Mr. JONES of Arkansas. I understood the Senator to complain and say it was unphilosophical, and all that. That can be passed by so far as that goes. I was simply speaking of the fact that he is not satisfied with 40 or 50 per cent upon other yarns; that he wants the very highest possible rates on spinning and everything else except jute, and to jute is unwilling to accord 30 per cent.

Leaving that aside, the question of wide burlaps, it seems to me, is easily settled. I understand they are made to a very limited extent, if at all, in the United States, and when burlaps are admitted at 15 per cent there is no difference between wide and the narrow burlaps, except the mere question of width, and they can be made wide or narrow, about as easily one way as the other. I can see no difference in that now.

The difference suggested by the committee as to the ad valorem to be levied on grain bags was a rate that after careful ex-

amination we believed was absolutely just to the manufacturers of grain bags.

I think 2½ per cent on these bags amounts to a very small difference between the cost of the material and the cost of the bags. After all, it is less perhaps than 3 per cent. I do not know just what the amount is; I have not the calculation by me, but there seems to me to be but a reasonable difference between the two. I do not think the committee has made so grave a mistake as the Senator from Rhode Island thinks.

Mr. ALDRICH. I did not intend to criticise unfavorably the action of the committee in fixing the duties on jute yarns at 30 per cent. I think it is a fair rate. What I did intend to criticise was the fact that they put a less rate, in fact only half that rate, upon the cloth which is made from the yarn.

The Senator says that these are practically the same thing. They are not the same thing by any means. The narrow burlaps are made differently, woven on an entirely different kind of loom, are much more expensive to make, and are used for an entirely different purpose.

The narrow burlaps are used for making grain bags. The wide burlaps are used for the foundation of oilcloths, or for various kinds of cheap carpet. They are an entirely different product, made in an entirely different manner. These wide oilcloths, or wide burlaps, have been made to a very large extent in the United States. I think there is but one establishment, but I take it for granted that does not affect the claim which they have upon reasonable consideration. The present duty is 40 per cent ad valorem, as I remember it, or perhaps it is a specific rate.

The duty by the act of 1883 was 40 per cent ad valorem. I think it is not a fair treatment to that particular industry to reduce the rate from 40 per cent ad valorem to 15 per cent, as is proposed by this paragraph. From any standpoint, it is not fair to impose a rate of duty of 30 per cent upon yarns and 15 per cent upon the finished product.

Mr. VEST. Nothing could illustrate more distinctly the facility with which one can criticise the work that is done by somebody else, and the equal facility with which one can forget his own work of two or three years ago. The Senator from Rhode Island makes his argument upon the fact that there is a high duty in our bill upon jute yarn and a smaller duty upon the finished product to make which the yarns are used.

In the McKinley act, upon jute yarn the duty was 35 per cent. Upon burlaps 60 inches wide, which is the finished product, in the same law, the duty was 29.23 per cent, being a reduction from the raw material, which is the yarn, as is the case in the present bill.

But the Senator complained that there is a high rate of duty put upon the bags, on which there is very little labor, and which are made out of the burlaps. That is another criticism that he makes upon the pending bill. We find in the McKinley act that while the duty on burlaps was 29.23 per cent the duty on bags was 44.73 per cent. So that the same criticism he makes in regard to the pending measure is applicable in even a larger degree to the bill which he constructed in 1890.

Mr. President, I never pretend to conceal or avoid the force of any argument. It is a fault, possibly, with me, that I am a little too frank, even in discussion. I will say right now that I do not claim this schedule is symmetrical. I have stated frequently that we were compelled to make concessions in order to pass a bill in some shape which would reduce duties generally from the McKinley standard. But the very same argument which the Senator makes to-day against this bill is applicable even in a larger degree to the McKinley act, which the Republicans have told us was the perfection of tariff legislation, and which they propose now to keep upon the statute books if possible.

Mr. ALDRICH. Mr. President, the act of 1890 was not as inconsistent as the Senator from Missouri seems to think. The act of 1890 did impose a duty of 35 per cent upon jute yarns. It gave a rate of duty which was not protective to burlaps not exceeding 60 inches in width, as I have already stated in the presence of the Senate. The fact was that those burlaps had not been made to any considerable extent in the United States, and never have been made to any considerable extent, but it did give a much higher rate upon burlaps exceeding 60 inches in width. Upon burlaps exceeding 60 inches, if valued at 5 cents a pound or less, a certain rate was given, which was equivalent to 55 per cent ad valorem; upon goods valued above 5 cents a rate of 40 per cent was fixed.

So burlaps exceeding 60 inches in width under the act of 1890 either paid 40 per cent or 55 per cent, as they might be valued at more or less than 5 cents a pound. The duty on the finished product was higher than the duty upon yarns.

Mr. VEST. Was there not the same limitation under the act of 1890 on burlaps that there is now?

Mr. ALDRICH. Certainly.

Mr. VEST. The Senator's argument a few minutes ago was that we are now putting a high duty upon an article on which there is no labor.

Mr. ALDRICH. I was talking about the difference between burlaps and bags. I was stating that the committee in this case gives 7½ per cent additional protection to bags over burlaps, and that the cost of making grain bags from burlaps does not exceed four-tenths of a cent a pound; and that that 7½ per cent imposes the equivalent to three-tenths of a cent a pound, or about 300 per cent upon the entire cost of making those bags from burlaps in Calcutta. I am not saying that is excessive, but I am only stating the different methods by which these two different articles are treated.

I repeat, burlaps less than 60 inches in width have not been made very much in this country, and under the rates of duty which were imposed by the act of 1890 or under this bill they will not be made in this country, but burlaps exceeding 60 inches in width can be made and are made at the present time and they are entitled to a higher rate than the duty upon all yarn. That is the contention I make.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, I desire to say simply one word at this point. If there is any criticism to be made upon this schedule it is that the tariff, as suggested by the Senator from Missouri, may be too high upon some particular article. Certainly it is not as low upon any of the articles mentioned in paragraph 270. The grain bags mentioned in that paragraph are utilized almost entirely upon the Pacific coast. Nearly the whole consumption occurs upon the Pacific coast, because there wheat is placed in sacks and shipped in sacks to Liverpool. The McKinley law placed a tariff on grain bags amounting, according to the report upon import duties, to between 42 and 45 per cent ad valorem.

It was a tax of 2 cents per pound and is reported at that rate. Although the committee have imposed a tariff upon this article they have done I have no doubt the best they could. They have cut the duty down, reduced it one-half, and to that extent they have relieved us of a very onerous burden. We never have seen any chance of relief, and certainly have never obtained any from antecedent legislation under other political conditions here.

In 1891, after the McKinley act had been enacted, the Legislature of California passed a joint resolution which was voted for by all the members, Republican and Democratic alike. It can be found on page 525 of the Statutes of 1891. In that joint resolution the members of Congress were requested to relieve the people from this tax, as it was called in that resolution, by Democrats and Republicans alike. While the citizens of my State would no doubt prefer these articles absolutely free, they are very grateful to the party that has reduced them 50 per cent.

Mr. PLATT. Mr. President, the reason for this reduction is what I supposed it was, that upon the request made by the farmers of the Pacific coast, the Government gives away by the bill about $1,200,000 of revenue. I do not know that I object to it, because I think perhaps it is worth that for an object lesson. I do not suppose the farmers of the Pacific coast will ever hear of it, but I wish now to make a prediction that under this reduced rate, which relinquishes $1,200,000 of revenue to the Government a year, they will not get a grain bag a picayune cheaper.

Mr. PEFFER. I move to amend the paragraph by striking out all after the words "burlaps" in line 21 and inserting "shall be exempt from duty."

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. President, I simply desire to supplement that which has been so well stated by my colleague. If there is any one question which the farmers of the Pacific coast—of Washington, Oregon, and California—are deeply interested in, it is that of grain bags. We are differently situated in California and the other Pacific coast States than the farmers in the West. We have no grain elevators. Farmers can not take their grain to the warehouses and there have it emptied into bins and transported in bulk to market, but it must all be shipped in grain bags, in burlap sacks, to the port of shipment, where it is transported by vessel to Liverpool and other European ports.

It seems to me the different memorials from the farmers which have been submitted here from time to time, asking that they be relieved from this burden, should have found a hearing, if anything is to be placed upon the free list. Therefore it is not clear to me why the committee should raise the rate upon jute yarn from 20 to 30 per cent and increase the duty upon burlaps from 20 to 22½ per cent as the bill came from the other House. There are arguments without number which can be used why if any article should be upon the free list grain bags or the materials from which they are made should be.

California, realizing the importance of this to her farmers, made a liberal appropriation whereby grain bags might be manufactured in the penal institutions of our State, and the result is that we have at one of our State prisons burlap machin-

ery which is turning out bags by the 10,000 or 15,000 daily. It is the only equalizer, as it were, which helps the farmers from being imposed upon by the combinations of the country which are controlling the burlap imports into the country. I feel constrained in view of these facts to support by my vote the amendment offered by the Senator from Kansas [Mr. PEFFER].

Mr. PEFFER. I wish to modify my amendment slightly. I am satisfied it will be improved in the estimation of the Senator from California [Mr. PERKINS]. I wish to modify it by striking out of the paragraph also all the words after the word "burlaps," in line 18, until we come to the words "ad valorem," in line 20, and inserting before the word "bags" the word "and"; so that the paragraph will then read:

Burlaps and bags for grain made from burlaps shall be exempt from duty.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair will state that the first question is upon agreeing to the amendment of the committee.

Mr. PEFFER. Then I can say what I wish to say upon this point, and afterward we can take the vote.

Mr. President, grain that is shipped out of the United States from the farms is sold in a free-trade market. It has to compete with free-trade wheat. It has to compete in a gold market where all the prices are regulated by gold, and it occurs to me that it is not only reasonable, but that it is only fair, that while the farmers, the tradesmen, the merchants, and the mechanics in all parts of the country stand by their brethren of the loom and the shop, those brethren ought to stand by us, so as to cheapen as much as possible the articles which we are compelled to use in getting our surplus grain shipped to a free-trade market.

Mr. ALLISON. I should like to ask the Senator from Rhode Island whether he thinks that under paragraph 270 burlaps are likely to be manufactured in the United States?

Mr. ALDRICH. As the paragraph stands, most emphatically no.

Mr. ALLISON. As the paragraph stands?

Mr. ALDRICH. Yes.

Mr. ALLISON. Therefore, it seems to me, if the industry is to be destroyed in the United States, there is great force in the suggestion made by the Senator from Kansas [Mr. PEFFER] and the Senator from California [Mr. PERKINS]. I should be glad to so adjust the rate as to have the industry continued in the United States, but if that can not be done I see no objection to making it free.

Mr. HIGGINS. You do not wish to impose a tax on the farmers?

Mr. ALLISON. I do not wish to impose a tax on the farmers of California. And I will say to my friend from California we use these burlaps in Iowa as well.

Mr. PERKINS. They are used for wool bags and hop bags.

Mr. ALLISON. And for oats.

Mr. PERKINS. For oats, barley, and all other cereals.

Mr. ALLISON. Under existing law, of course where these bags are exported, largely from California, and also largely from every other portion of the country, there is a drawback equivalent to the duty, so that upon all burlaps and bags exported there is really no tax.

Mr. PERKINS. That usually accrues to the shipper, and not to the farmer.

Mr. ALLISON. I so understand. But if the result of this provision will be to import the bags and not to establish an industry and make them here, it would prevent a great deal of circumlocution and drawbacks in the way of duty to put them upon the free list, and they may as well go on the free list.

Mr. VEST. Do I understand the Senator from Iowa to say he wants to put these bags on the free list?

Mr. ALLISON. I think the Senator from Missouri must have had his attention diverted when I was making my observation.

Mr. VEST. It was.

Mr. ALLISON. I inquired of the Senator from Rhode Island if under the paragraph as it stands it would be possible to conduct this industry in the United States, he being an expert upon the subject and more familiar with it than I am, and he says it is absolutely impossible. So if that be true, it seems to me it might be wise to put these bags on the free list rather than to leave them in this nebulous state without doing any good to our own people.

Mr. VEST. I am glad to hear the Senator say it, because his party put a 44 per cent duty upon them in 1890. We propose to reduce that.

Mr. ALDRICH. That was for a protective duty.

Mr. ALLISON. I supposed then and hoped that it would be an industry in connection with the jute industry, which we were seeking to establish in the United States, and which would measurably prosper here under the duty proposed. But now it seems the industry is to be destroyed. If so, why should we tax the people of California or Iowa for this article which they must have?

Mr. VEST. That is the Democratic doctrine.

Mr. PERKINS. I understand that under the revision of the paragraph we have already adopted burlaps bags can not be manufactured at a profit in this country. If that were not true, then I should be in favor of doing what I could do to protect the American manufacturing interest in this country and at the same time do justice to the farmer.

Mr. CHANDLER. Will the Senator from California give me information on a point about which I desire to learn something, and that is as to the capacity of this country to produce the burlaps—the bagging?

Mr. PERKINS. We have not yet a sufficient number of factories to produce the burlaps required, but yearly they are augmenting, and in time, should the McKinley law remain, I doubt not that in a few years we should be able to manufacture all the bagging we desire.

Mr. CHANDLER. Is it all made from coarse hemp?

Mr. PERKINS. So I understand.

Mr. CHANDLER. I believe the agricultural product can be raised to supply all the bags——

Mr. ALDRICH. It is not raised in the United States at all.

Mr. CHANDLER. Is none of it raised here?

Mr. ALDRICH. It is jute, and comes from India.

Mr. CHANDLER. It is made from foreign material?

Mr. ALDRICH. Yes, sir.

Mr. CHANDLER. Then what is the question? Is it between the raw material and the manufactured material, or both?

Mr. ALDRICH. The motion of the Senator from Kansas is to put bags and bagging upon the free list.

Mr. CHANDLER. That is, the manufactured article?

Mr. ALDRICH. Yes.

Mr. CHANDLER. The result of which will be, then, that there will be no manufacture of them in this country.

Mr. ALDRICH. There will not be any under this bill, so far as burlap is concerned. Bags might survive, possibly.

Mr. WHITE obtained the floor.

Mr. HOAR. Mr. President——

Mr. WHITE. I yield to the Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. HOAR. I have here a letter from Messrs. E. S. Halsted & Co., manufacturers of bags and bagging, 75 Pearl street, New York, in which they say that when the exportation of flour to Cuba began under the reciprocity policy we were exporting very little; that we were not exporting more than 60,000 to 75,000 barrels of flour and those in wood. They say:

The duty against our country in favor of Spain was so great as to almost exclude shipment. The first six months after reciprocity went into effect shipment of flour alone amounted to 200,000 barrels. Most of this was in sacks, and since then, in the two years or nearly two years that have elapsed, there has been from six to seven hundred thousand barrels.

Certainly a very excellent showing in favor of this present tariff. In addition to this there have gone from this market several hundred thousand sugar sacks to the West Indies, for sugar to place in shipment to this country; this is a very great innovation on the shipments from England. The reason of it is that under the present system of reciprocity these bags can be made in this country from goods manufactured in Dundee and sold from here at a cheaper rate than they can be sent from Europe.

I should like to have the whole letter printed in the RECORD as a part of my remarks. I have read nearly all of it. There are one or two sentences which would not sound pleasant to Democratic ears. I ask leave to have it printed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. KYLE in the chair). Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Massachusetts? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

The letter is as follows:

FEBRUARY 10, 1894.

DEAR SIR: Yours of the 9th came duly to hand and noted. We are greatly obliged to you for your kindness in replying to ours. We do not know whether it can be made to have any effect upon the Democratic majority now ruling, but would add to what we stated to you in our last a thing which no doubt you are perfectly familiar with, but nevertheless we can give you the information from positive knowledge and experience.

Before the present law came into existence we were doing comparatively little in the way of exporting flour in sacks. To cite one instance, we would refer to Cuba; previous to the negotiations based on reciprocity, our country was not exporting more than about 60,000 to 75,000 barrels of flour, and those in wood. The duty against our country in favor of Spain was so great as to almost exclude shipment. The first six months after reciprocity went into effect, shipment of flour alone amounted to 200,000 barrels; most of this was in sacks, and since then in the two years, or nearly two years, that have elapsed there has been from 600,000 to 700,000 barrels. Certainly a very excellent showing in favor of this present tariff. In addition to this, there have gone from this market several hundred thousand sugar sacks to the West Indies for sugar to place in shipment to this country.

This is a very great innovation on the shipments from England. The reason of it is that under the present system of reciprocity these bags can be made in this country from goods manufactured in Dundee and sold from here at a cheaper rate than they can be sent from Europe; this difference is occasioned from the fact that the duties against England on these bags are greater than those against the United States, resulting from reciprocity treaty. Give the United States a proper protection in these matters and there is no doubt but what we can command a large proportion of this foreign trade. While we have very grave doubts as to being able to preach loud

enough or strong enought upon these deaf ears, yet we could trust that in the near future we may be able to recover to this country this prestige and strength again.

Yours, truly,

E. S. HALSTEAD & CO.

Hon. G. F. HOAR, *Washington, D. C.*

Mr. HOAR. I suppose, Mr. President, that if the reciprocity policy were retained we should have a very large exportation of these bags, with our flour and to some extent our beef, because they export the beef, and also pork to some extent, in these bags, and with the very large importation from these countries with which we have reciprocity arrangements, which would come in in these bags, that would be sent from America for that purpose—these manufacturers say that under those circumstances we would establish the manufacturing in this country and have a very large foreign trade.

I have no interest in the matter as representing any constituency interested in the manufacture, but if the Senator from California [Mr. PERKINS] and the Senator from Kansas [Mr. PEFFER] think the protective system should be applied to any manufacture, I suppose the mere fact that they have a constituency who buy these things does not change their minds as to what is the proper policy. I have no doubt that retaining the present duty will result in cheapening the bags and establishing the industry in this country.

Mr. ALLISON. I think the manufacture of bags is an industry quite well established in this country. I know there is a very large manufactory at Minneapolis. I am sorry the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. WASHBURN] is not here. All the flour shipped to Europe is shipped in these bags; and where the burlaps are exported the shippers receive a drawback equivalent to the duty upon the burlaps, although they make the bags in Minneapolis. This is my understanding.

Mr. WHITE. Those bags are made of a different material from the grain sack.

Mr. ALLISON. They are jute bags, and are made from jute. But I had supposed that under the duty imposed in the McKinley act burlaps suitable for these bags was actually made in the United States. I think they are, to some extent, although I do not know.

Mr. WHITE. My colleague mentioned a fact in the course of the discussion which I will call to the attention of the Senator from Iowa and other Senators. In the State of California, in order to give employment to a number of convicts in one of the penitentiaries, that of San Quentin, we have established a jute mill for the manufacture of grain bags.

The jute is imported. There is no duty upon jute, I will state, and there has not been any lately. The jute is imported from India, Calcutta, and brought directly to the San Quentin penitentiary, which is located upon San Francisco harbor, and the bags are made there. I have seen the process myself. Everything is done there. The bales of jute are brought in right there. They are delivered on board ship at Calcutta and delivered there.

Mr. ALLISON. Then the bags are made in California.

Mr. PERKINS. We also have two other jute mills in California.

Mr. WHITE. I was about to state that. We have two other jute mills in the State of California where these products are made. Nevertheless, although we are manufacturing the article there, there is not the least question that our people have always been in favor of a great reduction of duty. Before the McKinley bill became a law our people were here endeavoring to impress upon the authorities in charge of the Republican measure, or they stated that they did, that there should be a reduction, but they were unable to get it.

The Democratic party, however, as represented in the present committee, has reduced the tariff tax 50 per cent, and to that extent it is a great relief. As far as concerns the benefit which has accrued to us from the manufacture in that State, our farmers would a great deal rather take every employé and board him at the Palace Hotel than to permit the imposition of such a duty as has hitherto been upon this product. I am glad that Senators upon the other side who have heretofore found it necessary to impose almost 50 per cent duty upon this article have so radically changed their minds that they have now abandoned their original ground.

Mr. VEST. Mr. President, I congratulate the country and the Democratic party upon the accession we have had to the doctrine to-day. I have listened with great and unalloyed pleasure to the argument of the Senator from Iowa and the statements of the Senator from Rhode Island. We can not resist the appeals which they have made in behalf of free bags made out of burlaps. So we withdraw the amendment, and in behalf of the committee we will move to strike out that portion of paragraph 270 from the words "ad valorem" in line 20, down to the end of the paragraph, including "bags for grain made of such burlaps, 22½ per cent ad valorem." That gives free bags for grain, wool, etc., to the agricultural portion of our country.

Mr. ALLISON. I understand the Senator proposes to retain the duty on burlaps and then make bags free. Of course under such a provision no burlaps will be imported.

Mr. VEST. It will all come in in the shape of bags.

Mr. ALLISON (to Mr. ALDRICH). Is that your understanding?

Mr. ALDRICH. That is my understanding of the amendment.

Mr. VEST. I suppose some burlaps will come in for oilcloth manufacture. They use large quantities. But what we are dealing with now is the agriculturist. I am for the farmer.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the committee, in line 18, to strike out the words "not exceeding 60 inches in width."

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment proposed by the Senator from Missouri, which will be stated.

The SECRETARY. In paragraph 270, after the words "ad valorem" in line 20, strike out the remainder of the paragraph, as follows;

Bags for grain made of such burlaps, 22½ per cent ad valorem.

Mr. PEFFER. Does the amendment proposed by the Senator from Missouri take precedence of the amendment I offered some time ago?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the arrangement of the Senate amendments offered by the committee must first be acted upon.

Mr. HARRIS. The effect of the amendment of the Senator from Kansas I understand is to make burlaps and bags made of burlaps free?

Mr. PEFFER. That is right.

Mr. JONES of Arkansas. Whereas the motion of the Senator from Missouri is to make bags free and leave burlaps taxed.

Mr. PEFFER. I shall insist upon my amendment when the amendment of the Senator from Missouri is disposed of.

Mr. VEST. Under the amendment of the Senator from Kansas he would give to the oilcloth manufacturers free burlaps.

Mr. CHANDLER. Mr. President, I am unable to vote for the amendment of the Senator from Kansas. I understand very well that the farmers, the grain producers in the great West, and the grain producers of California labor under many disadvantages, and in some respects they are perhaps entitled to peculiar and special consideration. But I do not believe that the farmers of any portion of the country wish to have any industry that is established in this country destroyed.

I do not believe that the farmers of this country are very largely demanding either free lumber or free barbed fence wire, or free binding twine, or that the farmers are educated up to the idea that it will materially increase their farm profits to destroy the business of making jute bags in this country. It seems to me that these are infinitesimal benefits which will not result in any appreciable help to the farmers, while they will destroy these industries, especially this industry which is now in this country in competition with the factories that are worked by the labor of India, where the processes are so cheap.

I say, Mr. President, that I do not believe the farmers are demanding these things. I admit that some demagogues, speaking for the farmers, or attempting to do so, are endeavoring to satisfy themselves or somebody else that the farmers want the manufacture of these articles destroyed in order that they may receive some possible benefit by it. But the farmers of this country, when they come face to face with the fact that they are demanding that there shall be convict labor in order that they may have cheaper bags, are asking something that is not reasonable.

I have had occasion already to call attention to the great danger to the industries in this country from the cheap labor of Asia. I have here a paragraph which gives the pay of the workmen in the textile mills of India. A workman in the textile mills of India earns about 15 cents a day, and he toils from twelve to fourteen hours a day, including Sunday. That is the kind of labor which is employed in the mills of India that make these bags for grain. Now, I ask the Senator from Kansas whether his people are really demanding that they shall have bags made by that labor and whether when the free raw material comes in—the jute from India—they are not willing that the bags shall be manufactured by American labor at American prices?

Mr. PEFFER. Answering the Senator's question, I say to him that the farmers of Kansas do not care who makes their bagging or who makes anything they have to use in shipping their wheat, when they are compelled to sell their wheat in competition with the very class of men to whom the Senator re-

fers. The ryots of India who labor on the farms work for about 6 cents to 10 cents a day. Kansas farmers are worth $1.50 or $2.50 a day, and if we have to sell our products in competition with those fellows over there who receive but 12 cents a day we do not care who make the bags.

Mr. CHANDLER. I admitted that the farmers labor under peculiar difficulties, and that they may be entitled to special consideration in some respects, but I do not believe they want special consideration in this respect. The farmers ought to have protection upon their wool. They do not want to raise wool in competition with the cheap labor of Australia. They want protection upon their wool, and they ought to have protection upon their wool, and they have had protection upon their wool while the Republican party has made tariffs.

But because the tariff is taken off wool and because the Democratic party in that respect is attacking the interests of the farmer, I do not believe that the farmer wants to have the manufacture of bags for grain in this country stricken down. I do not believe the farmer wants to destroy a wire factory, or that the farmer wants any of these little things which, as the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. PLATT] has well said, will not make themselves felt in the practical reduction of the price of any article which the farmer buys, any more than I believe the men who raise the cotton at the South care anything about free cotton ties.

It is all an outcry gotten up by the opponents of the protective system, and I do not think that the real interests of the farmer are promoted by this class of exceptions to the general principle of protection, any more than I think the interests of the cotton-grower are protected by giving him nominally cotton ties free. I believe the prosperity of the farmer, of the man who raises grain in Kansas and California, and the prosperity of the man who raises cotton in the South are equally to be benefited by the system of protection to be maintained as a whole upon correct principles of protection, which principles are, that by a duty we will protect everything which we can manufacture in this country by our highly-paid labor against similar articles manufactured by the pauper labor of Europe and of Asia.

Mr. ALDRICH. Mr. President, the Senator from Missouri, by the amendment which he now submits, undertakes to impose upon me a certain responsibility for his amendment which I do not propose to accept. In answer to a question asked by the Senator from Iowa I stated that in my opinion burlaps could not be made in this country with 15 per cent duty. I repeat that opinion. I have no question whatever about it.

It would not be possible, considering the different rates of wages paid in India and in the United States, with free jute to make burlaps in the United States with 15 per cent duty. I stated that so far as that industry is concerned, if that is all we are considering in this matter, the duty might as well be taken off entirely, so far as any American interest in the production of burlaps is concerned, and beyond that it is simply a question of revenue. I did not mean to say that burlaps can not be taken under this duty and made into bags in the United States, because I believe the difference between 15 per cent and 22½ per cent in this paragraph is a protective duty. I think bags consumed in the United States will be made here, if this paragraph shall become a law.

Now, the suggestion of the Senator from Missouri is to place the bags, the finished product, upon the free list and to impose a duty of 15 per cent upon burlaps. Of course that would absolutely prohibit the making of any bags in this country, and to that extent I think it would be unjust to our people engaged in the production of bags, and certainly there must be a great many in different parts of the country. Therefore I think the suggestion made by the Senator from Missouri is not a proper one to be adopted.

If we are going to put anything upon the free list in this connection it should be burlaps, with a reasonable and moderate protection upon bags. I should impose protective duties upon all these things. It was the purpose of the act of 1890 to give to the jute industry in the United States fairly protective duties for the first time in the history of the country. This might be a very important American industry. Thousands of people are engaged in the manufacture of burlaps into bags at Calcutta and other points in India and at Dundee in Scotland.

This great industry might be and ought to be transferred to the United States, but it is simply a farce to give it a duty that will not and can not be protective. That is the fault I find with the proposition of the committee. If anything at all should be put upon the free list it should be the burlaps and not the bags. A small protective duty should be given to the bag manufacturers of the United States.

Mr. VEST. Nobody understands better than the Senator from Rhode Island what will be the effect of putting bags on the free list and leaving a duty on burlaps. No burlaps will come in. The bags will come in, of course.

Mr. ALDRICH. Of course.

Mr. VEST. But there will be no necessity for bringing burlaps here, because the entire demand for bags will be supplied from abroad. But the Senator's colleague, the Senator from Iowa, made an argument and wound up by saying that these bags should be put on the free list. As that is in the direction I have been traveling for sometime, and am now traveling, I was entirely willing to agree. I hope it will not be said that it is sectional, because there is a factory in St. Louis engaged in the making of these bags and the proprietor has been more aggressive on this subject than anybody else I know of in this country.

In the next paragraph, 271, will come bagging for cotton. The same doctrine would apply there. I hope our friends will be consistent, and I will go with them, because it has been my contention all the time that these articles should be made free in order to relieve the expenses that are piled up year by year upon the farmers and planters of the West and South. We can not protect them by tariff duties. All we can do is to diminish the cost of the absolute necessities of life, both in the way of what they wear and what they use in preparing their products for market.

Mr. TELLER. Mr. President, I do not believe it is possible to build up the burlap industry in the United States with any amount of tariff you put on. The Dundee manufacturers are being ruined by the manufacturers of India, and as long as the present monetary condition of the world continues there will be no probability of any industry of that kind being built up in this country. India receiving, as it practically does, a bounty upon all its exports of burlaps and bags that they may make, will rule the business of the world in that direction duty or no duty. I do not believe a duty on burlaps or bags made out of that material will be of the slightest benefit to anybody in this country.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment proposed by the Senator from Missouri, which will be stated.

The SECRETARY. In line 20, after the word "ad valorem," strike out the remainder of the paragraph, as follows:

Bags for grain made of such burlaps 22½ per cent ad valorem.

Mr. BLANCHARD. I desire to inquire if that is a committee amendment or one that the Senator offers originally in the Senate?

Mr. VEST. My colleague on the committee agrees to it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment proposed by the Senator from Missouri.

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question recurs on agreeing to the amendment proposed by the Senator from Kansas, which will be stated.

The SECRETARY. After the word "burlaps," in line 18, strike out the remainder of the paragraph and insert the words "and bags for grain made of such burlaps shall be exempt from duty;" so as to make this paragraph read:

Burlaps and bags for grain made of such burlaps shall be exempt from duty.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment proposed by the Senator from Kansas.

Mr. ALDRICH. I suppose the Senator from Missouri intends to follow this up by putting bags on the free list. Otherwise he has raised the duty instead of lowering it.

Mr. VEST. I have enlisted under the banner of reform led by the Senator from Iowa and the Senator from Rhode Island, and I will stay with them. If they will make the motion I will vote for it.

Mr. ALDRICH. I am not making any motion in this connection.

Mr. VEST. I am merely an humble private.

Mr. ALDRICH. The Senator from Missouri made the other suggestion.

Mr. VEST. The Senator from Iowa made the last suggestion.

Mr. ALDRICH. The effect of the action of the Senate taken at the suggestion of the Senator from Missouri will be to increase the duty on bags.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment proposed by the Senator from Kansas.

Mr. PEFFER. I ask for a division, Mr. President.

Mr. HARRIS. Let us have the yeas and nays. A division will not develop a quorum.

The yeas and nays were ordered, and the Secretary proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. CULLOM (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the senior Senator from Delaware [Mr. GRAY]. I should vote "nay" if he were present.

Mr. GORDON. I suggest to the Senator from Illinois that we make the same transfer of pairs that we made on the previous vote.

Mr. CULLOM. That is perfectly agreeable to me. I did not

see the Senator from Georgia, or I should have made the suggestion.

Mr. GORDON. The Senator from Iowa [Mr. WILSON] will stand paired with the Senator from Delaware [Mr. GRAY], so that the Senator from Illinois [Mr. CULLOM] and I will both vote.

Mr. CULLOM. I vote "nay."

Mr. GORDON (when his name was called). I vote "nay."

Mr. MORRILL (when his name was called). I am paired with the Senator from Florida [Mr. CALL], and therefore withhold my vote.

Mr. QUAY (when his name was called). I am paired with the Senator from Alabama [Mr. MORGAN].

Mr. VILAS (when his name was called). I am paired with the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MITCHELL].

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. BLACKBURN. I am paired with the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. MANDERSON]. I withhold my vote in his absence.

Mr. FAULKNER. I am paired with the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. HAWLEY].

Mr. HIGGINS. I ask if the senior Senator from New Jersey [Mr. MCPHERSON] has voted?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. He has not.

Mr. HIGGINS. Then I withhold my vote.

Mr. MILLS. I am paired with the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. GALLINGER].

Mr. FAULKNER. I will make the same transfer that I made with the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. QUAY] before, pairing the Senator from Alabama [Mr. MORGAN] with the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. HAWLEY], and we will both vote. I vote "nay."

Mr. QUAY. I vote "nay."

Mr. MITCHELL of Wisconsin. I am authorized to vote to make a quorum. I vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 5, nays 40; as follows:

YEAS—5.

Kyle,	Perkins,	Power,	Teller.
Peffer,			

NAYS—40.

Aldrich,	Dolph,	Jarvis,	Pugh,
Allison,	Dubois,	Jones, Ark.	Quay,
Blanchard,	Faulkner,	Lindsay,	Roach,
Caffery,	Frye,	Lodge,	Sherman,
Chandler,	George,	McLaurin,	Smith,
Cockrell,	Gibson,	McMillan,	Turpie,
Coke,	Gordon,	Mitchell, Wis.	Vest,
Cullom,	Harris,	Murphy,	Walsh,
Daniel,	Hoar,	Pasco,	Washburn,
Dixon,	Hunton,	Patton,	White.

NOT VOTING—40.

Allen,	Davis,	Jones, Nev.	Platt,
Bate,	Gallinger,	McPherson,	Proctor,
Berry,	Gorman,	Manderson,	Ransom,
Blackburn,	Gray,	Martin,	Shoup,
Brice,	Hale,	Mills,	Squire,
Butler,	Hansbrough,	Mitchell, Oregon	Stewart,
Call,	Hawley,	Morgan,	Vilas,
Camden,	Higgins,	Morrill,	Voorhees,
Cameron,	Hill,	Palmer,	Wilson,
Carey,	Irby,	Pettigrew,	Wolcott.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. SHERMAN. I ask that paragraph 270 be read, so that I may see how it stands.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The paragraph will be read.

The Secretary read as follows:

Burlaps containing not over 40 threads to the square inch counting warp and filling, 15 per cent ad valorem.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The reading of the bill will be proceeded with.

The Secretary read the next paragraph, as follows:

271. Bagging for cotton, gunny cloth, and all similar material suitable for covering cotton, composed in whole or in part of hemp, flax, jute, or jute butts, 15 per cent ad valorem.

Mr. PEFFER. I move to amend paragraph 271 by striking out in lines 1 and 2, page 69, the words "fifteen per cent ad valorem" and inserting "shall be exempt from duty," so as to read:

Bagging for cotton, gunny cloth, and all similar material suitable for covering cotton, composed in whole or in part of hemp, flax, jute, or jute butts, shall be exempt from duty.

Mr. HOAR. I rise to make a parliamentary inquiry as to the time. I wish to know if it is understood by the Senate under the arrangement made taking up these schedules in their order that questions relating to the free list are taken up as the schedules are taken up, or when the free list is reached?

Mr. VEST. I will state in reply to the Senator from Massachusetts that we intended to take these matters up when we came to the free list.

Mr. HOAR. I thought that was the understanding of the Senate. I have no choice about it myself.

Mr. PEFFER. Mr. President, I wish to say in relation to this paragraph and the proposed amendment that cotton stands in the same relation to the commerce of the world that wheat and corn do; that it comes in competition with the same class of material made in other parts of the world by the cheapest sort of labor that has to be sold in a gold market in competition with the products of that kind of labor, and that it as well as wheat and corn is entitled to every possible concession from the manufacturing interests that they can extend to it, for there is no other way by which cotton or wheat or corn can receive any protection through the operation of our tariff laws.

Cotton has to be compressed and put into large bales and covered with this bagging, and if the cotton planters shall have the benefit of free bagging, free material, if you please, you may term it free raw material, because their cotton when it is in bales is the finished product—if they have the benefit of the concession to that extent the revenue laws which are intended to protect manufacturing interests will also protect the agricultural interests. With that simple statement Senators have the entire question.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment proposed by the Senator from Kansas.

Mr. PEFFER. I shall ask the yeas and nays on the amendment when we come to a vote.

Mr. PLATT. I regret that the Senator has proposed this amendment, as I understand, cotton bagging is made of jute butts and made largely in the South and Southwest. I am sorry to see him propose to strike down a Southern and Southwestern industry in this way.

Mr. BLANCHARD. Mr. President, I hope the amendment of the Senator from Kansas [Mr. PEFFER] will be accepted on behalf of the committee. We have just adopted an amendment to paragraph 270, which makes free of any tax or duty bags for grain used by the farmers of the West. In another part of the bill I find that binding-twine, used exclusively in the West in putting up the products of that region for the market, is placed upon the free list.

Now, bagging for cotton is to us in the South what binding-twine is to the farmers of the North, and what the grain bags just placed upon the free list are to the farmers in the Northwest. It is a fact that the bagging placed around cotton is an absolute loss to the cotton producer. While it is true that when a bale of cotton is rolled up on the scales and weighed nothing is deducted here in this country in the markets where cotton is sold for the bagging in which the cotton is wrapped, or for the ties that are around the bale, it is nevertheless a fact that the price of cotton grown in the United States and throughout the world is fixed in the great cotton marts of Liverpool and Manchester, and there, as is well known, a tare of 22 pounds per bale is deducted.

So, when you sift it down to the actual fact, the cotton producer of the South gets nothing whatever for the bagging and ties placed around his bale of cotton, and the price of those articles is a dead loss to him.

Under these circumstances, since binding-twine is made free, and since bags for grain have just been made free, it would seem a fair thing to do to make bagging for cotton free also. It seems we are legislating just now in the interests of the farming classes of the United States, and have extended favors just now to the farmers of one section of the country. Let us be consistent and extend like favors to the cotton producers of the South. Let us make bagging for cotton free, as we have just made bags for grain free.

Mr. FRYE. Mr. President, in 1866 bagging for cotton was controlled by a foreign trust. The price of it was 36 cents a square yard. In 1867 it was 31 cents, and in 1868 it was 28 cents; in 1869 it was 30 cents; in 1870 it was 31 cents. Then in 1870 we put a duty upon this bagging and commenced the manufacture in the United States, and to-day it is manufactured in nineteen different States.

There is a manufactory of it in the State of Texas. These factories make all the bags we use. Now, what has been the effect of that? Capital, induced by the duty to go into this business, has, as I say, gone into it in nineteen States. Now, let me give the price list of this cotton bagging since the duty was imposed upon it.

In 1871 it had fallen to 18 cents a square yard, in 1875 to 13 cents a square yard, in 1878 to 12 cents a square yard, in 1890 to 9½ cents a square yard, in 1891 to 8½ cents a square yard, in 1892 to 7½ cents a square yard. It has gone from 36 cents a square yard down to 7½ cents a square yard, and still the Senator from Louisiana cries out for more protection!

Mr. BLANCHARD. Mr. President, if the Senator from Maine [Mr. FRYE] had taken up almost any other article mentioned in the tariff bill now pending, he would have found that exactly the same thing is true. Prices have declined all along

the line on everything, just as they have on cotton bagging. But that is no reason why the same treatment should not be meted out to bagging for cotton that was meted out just now for bags for grain—make both free of any tax. If the Senator from Maine had inquired into the prices of bags for grain, I think he would have found that the decline in prices has been as great with respect to them as it has been upon bagging for cotton.

But he did not make that argument when the Senator from Kansas and other Senators were proposing to make bags for grain free of any tax. He does make it, however, when it is proposed to adopt the other amendment of the Senator from Kansas which means that the Senate be consistent and extend to the farmers of the South the same favor just now extended to the farmers of the West. If you make bags for grain free of tax, make also bagging for cotton free of tax.

Mr. VEST. The Senator from Maine is mistaken about the price of this article. If he will turn to the Treasury reports on page 249, as to cotton bagging, he will see that it was lower in 1887 and 1888 than at any other time. It was then 2 cents a pound. These bags have 2 pounds to the bag. So you must double these rates. In 1891, which is the last quotation, it was 4 cents a pound. In 1871 it was 5 cents a pound, the next year 4 cents, then 5, and 5, and 4, and 4, and 5, and then 4 again, and then 3, and then 2.

Mr. President, as I said a few minutes ago, I should be very glad if the Senator from Rhode Island or the Senator from Iowa had followed up the suggestion as to putting the bags made out of burlaps upon the free list by also putting these bags for cotton on the free list. As it is a movement in the interest of the cotton planters, I myself hesitated to make the suggestion as coming from the committee. The State of Missouri has about three counties interested in this matter. It is a very considerable interest in my State.

I believe, however, that as a matter of right these bags ought to be upon the free list, because, in the line of general observation that I have frequently indulged in here, it is impossible for us to protect the farmer and the planter. The ingenuity of mortal man can not find a way in which you can extend what our friends call the beneficent influences of the protective system to the agriculturists of this country. All that we can do is to cheapen what they use both as to their persons and in sending their products to market. Therefore whenever I can get a chance to make the burden lighter upon them I shall do so; and I make no opposition, speaking for the committee and for myself, to the amendment of the Senator from Kansas.

Mr. FRYE. Does the Senator from Missouri mean that the committee report in favor of the proposition of the Senator from Kansas?

Mr. VEST. The committee will make no opposition to it.

Mr. FRYE. The Senator from Louisiana says the same reason applies to this that applies to putting grain bags on the free list. I think that may be true, but there was no reason in that. In my judgment, in putting grain bags on the free list, there was no sense or propriety in it.

Mr. BLANCHARD. I did not hear the Senator from Maine argue against it.

Mr. FRYE. I was not present when it was done and did not know until this moment that it had been done. I presume that was done by some one on this side of the Chamber saying something——

Mr. VEST. The suggestion was made by the Senator from Iowa, and I accepted it.

Mr. FRYE. I presume it was done by some one on this side of the Chamber saying something or other that the Senator from Missouri did not fancy, and therefore he immediately retired from the proposition that the committee reported, and put it on the free list.

Mr. VEST. My friend is mistaken. I did fancy it. The Senator from Iowa made the suggestion, and I thought it was so fair and in the right direction that I immediately accepted it.

Mr. FRYE. I have no doubt about it.

Mr. ALLISON. I not only did not make the suggestion, but the suggestion was made elsewhere, as I did not happen to be in the Chamber when that paragraph was voted upon. The only suggestion I made was a suggestion of inquiry to the Senator from Rhode Island, in reply to which I was told that the arrangement of duties here would result in the destruction of our manufacturing industry.

After having made that slight observation, the Senator from Missouri undertakes to hold me responsible for the amendment, which I wholly disclaim. I will give it to the Senator from California now in the chair [Mr. WHITE] and the other Senator from California, who is not present at this moment, and so I absolve the Senator from Missouri from quoting me further upon that suggestion.

Mr. VEST. I would not, under any circumstances, even to pass this bill—and I do not know anything that I desire more than to get rid of it—misrepresent the Senator from Iowa. He knows that, I hope. I think I quote almost his exact words. After asking the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. ALDRICH] whether the duty we proposed would cause the production of these bags or the making of these bags and the making of burlaps in this country, and the Senator from Rhode Island said no, then the Senator from Iowa said: "I see no reason why those bags should not go upon the free list." If he did not so state, then I never was more mistaken in my life.

Mr. ALLISON. Of course the reporters know what I did say. I inquired of the Senator from Rhode Island, who is an expert, as to whether, in the first place, these burlap bags were made in this country, and he said they were. I then inquired if the present arrangement of duty was sufficiently large for their production, and he said it was not. Then I said, "If that be true, what objection is there to putting them on the free list?"

That is all I said, and that was after the Senator from California, who is now in the chair, and the other Senator from California had suggested that it was very important to California that they should be placed upon the free list, and having made that observation, I retired from the Chamber for a moment.

Mr. FRYE. I had not completed, and had not yielded the floor.

Mr. ALLISON. I beg pardon.

Mr. FRYE. Go on.

Mr. ALLISON. I retired from the Chamber for a moment, and when I came back I was told that bags had been put on the free list. The Senator from Missouri is entitled to everything he can gather from my observation.

Mr. FRYE. The prices which I gave were taken from the New York Financial Chronicle, as given in the last debate on the tariff.

Mr. JARVIS. Will the Senator from Maine be kind enough to read those prices again?

Mr. FRYE. In 1866 the price of this covering for cotton was 36 cents a square yard, and in 1892 7½ cents a square yard. The price ran down from 1870, when a duty was placed on this article, from 18 cents a square yard to 7½ cents.

I want to say a word in relation to this other matter——

Mr. VEST. The prices the Senator quotes were the domestic prices, and not the import prices.

Mr. FRYE. Not the import prices, but the domestic prices.

It seems to me the putting of binding twine upon the free list is the cheapest possible kind of demagogy. If the entire duty—I think it was only seven-tenths of a cent placed on binding-twine in the McKinley act——

Mr. ALLISON. That is all. It was 6.47 per cent ad valorem.

Mr. FRYE. If that whole duty is a tax to be paid by the farmers out West, the enormous amount, by the closest calculation that they would be relieved from, would be 1 cent an acre; and yet I have heard talked of here in the United States Senate the policy of putting on the free list binding twine in the interest of the farmers of the United States, so that they might save a cent an acre!

Here is the industry of making bags established in this country, and bags are lower now than they ever were, and lower than they ever will be again, provided they are put on the free list, because we will be giving up the business, and the men who use the bags will be obliged to pay more for them in less than two years, simply because there is a little talk gotten up here in the Senate about the farmers and getting this article on the free list, and because the Senator from Missouri saw an opportunity to score one against somebody on this side, away they go in the twinkling of an eye on the free list, notwithstanding the committee has reported in favor of having them on the dutiable list—an enormous industry in the United States, an industry which has reduced the cost of the article enormously—and the proposition comes from the Senator from Kansas to put that on the free list and destroy this industry, and the Senator from Missouri rises in his place, acting on behalf of the Committee on Finance, and says that the Senator from Iowa has placed grain bags on the free list, and other Senators have placed binding twine upon the free list, and so he is in favor of putting these coverings for cotton on the free list.

I do not believe in that kind of statesmanship. We are dealing with pretty serious matters in this bill. There is hardly an item here which does not affect somebody, and nearly all of the items affect a great many somebodies, and I do not believe that a bill of this kind ought to be dealt with in that way. If there is an industry entitled to protection, and the committee believe that it is entitled to protection, and if the committees of both Houses reported in favor of it, I do not believe that that protection ought to be surrendered simply because somebody in the United States Senate says what may have been an indiscreet thing; and I do not think the Senator from Missouri and the Senator from Arkansas, representing the Committee on Finance, ought to permit themselves to do this thing.

When the lumber schedule was under argument here there were charges made that there was an enormous duty on planed lumber. The duty on planed lumber was perfectly right. It was not an enormous duty but a fair one, and the most important thing in the lumber schedule. That ought to have been protected. It afforded more protection to more men than anything else in the lumber schedule, yet because somebody charged that it was an enormous duty, and all that sort of thing, immediately the two Senators in charge of the bill permitted it to go on the free list, thus doing immense damage to hundreds of thousands of men and to hundreds of millions of capital in the United States.

Mr. President, I think we ought to deal seriously with these matters, where they have or may have such serious effects.

Mr. JARVIS. Mr. President, the Senator from Maine [Mr. FRYE], in reading the prices of cotton bagging for the last twenty years, omitted unadvisedly an important fact, that in the year 1889 there was a combination formed in this country by those manufacturing and selling cotton bagging, to put up the price of bagging which the farmers put around their cotton, from 7 cents a pound to 14 cents a pound, and they were enabled to do that because of the high duty by the then existing tariff law upon cotton bagging.

Against this trust and combination the farmers assembled in the country and in villages and declared that they would not submit to such an outrage. I remember well that in the South the farmers brought their cotton into town, wrapping it up in old sugar bags and in old, worn-out sacks of various kinds. They even resorted to the temporary expedient of making bagging out of pine straw, and resorted to every expedient they could devise to defeat that conspiracy and combination which had been formed under the laws which enabled this trust and combination thus to rob the farmer.

Now, sir, here is an opportunity to put this article upon the free list, so that no such conspiracy or combination can be formed in the future; and I trust the Senate will put this necessary article to the farmer upon the free list.

Mr. JONES of Arkansas. If the Senator from North Carolina will allow me to interrupt him a moment, I should like to remind him of another fact in connection with this subject. The members of this organization, the manufacturers of cotton bagging, at that time appeared before the Finance Committee of the Senate, and when asked the question as to whether they had made this combination to put up the price of cotton bagging within two weeks from 6 or 7 to 14 cents, answered "Yes, we did; and what are you going to do about it?"

Mr. ALLISON. I think there ought to be just one other word said about that. The Mills bill, so called, which had passed the House of Representatives, had put practically no duty upon cotton bagging, and it was very well understood that these gentlemen were endeavoring to punish the gentlemen on the other side for what they were doing. They did admit practically, as the Senator from Arkansas says, that supposing they would be entirely struck down by what was then called the Mills bill, they thought they would get as much out of cotton bagging as they could for the moment.

Mr. FRYE. If there was such a trust as that to which the Senator from North Carolina has alluded in 1889, it was broken up before 1890, because the price of cotton bagging in 1890 was only 9 cents a square yard, and it went from that down to a little over 7 cents a square yard for domestic cotton bagging. I do not believe that there is any trust or that there has been any in the last three years, and I think the Treasury reports will bear out that statement.

Mr. DOLPH. A few days ago the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. ALDRICH] read an Associated Press dispatch——

Mr. ALLEN. Will the Senator allow me?

Mr. DOLPH. I shall only take a moment.

Mr. ALLEN. I only want to put a question to the Senator from Maine while he is on his feet.

Mr. FRYE. I am not on my feet for a speech. I only wanted to make a statement, which I have made.

Mr. DOLPH. A few days ago the Senator from Rhode Island read an Associated Press dispatch from Oregon showing the result of the election in Oregon, and showing what the farmers of Oregon thought about the Wilson bill, or the pending measure. The Senator from Kansas [Mr. PEFFER] was good enough to say "wait until the back counties are heard from." I then stated that the opposition had elected less than 20 out of 90 members of the Legislature. I said I thought when the back counties were heard from the opposition would not exceed 10. Full returns are given in the Evening Star of this city, of to-day, as follows:

PORTLAND, OREGON, *June 11*.

Reliable election returns show that Hermann (Republican), for Congress in the First district, has 9,087 plurality, and that Ellis (Republican), in the Second district, has a plurality of 9,320.

The Legislature stands as follows: Senate—Republicans 19, Democrats 8, Populists 3; House—Republicans 52, Democrats 1, Populists 7. The Republican majority on joint ballot is 52.

Of the 8 Democrats in the Senate 7 are hold-overs and 2 are classed as Populists—one ran as a Populist and the other was elected on a citizens' ticket in Multnomah County. Three Populists were elected two years ago. So the total number of members elected by the opposition to the Republican party of all kinds is 1 Democrat and 1 Populist in the senate, and 1 Democrat and 7 Populists in the house, making 10 out of 90.

Mr. LINDSAY. I should like to ask the Senator a question. I ask if the paper indicates how that very large number of Republicans expect to vote in the election of a United States Senator?

Mr. PLATT. We know how they ought to vote.

Mr. DOLPH. The Senator from Kentucky [Mr. LINDSAY] need not trouble himself about that. I am not troubling myself about it.

Mr. PLATT. Mr. President, the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. BLANCHARD] seems to be worried all at once about the possibility that some little inconsistency may be developed in the treatment of the different industries and interests in this bill, and therefore wants cotton bagging on the free list, because he does not want the Senate to do anything inconsistent. Having put grain bags on the free list, and barbed wire and binding-twine, for the benefit of the farmers, he now insists that the Senate must be consistent and put bagging on the free list for the benefit of the cotton-planters.

He did not say anything, I believe, about when this commenced. It began by putting cotton ties on the free list for the benefit of the cotton-planter, but when it comes to the question of consistency, that does not seem to have had a very great deal of consideration in the forming of this bill. We had a duty on rice, which was only reduced 25 per cent, which was 118 per cent before the reduction began.

Then there came up the question of the reduction of the duty on hay, the largest crop of the United States, and in behalf of the farmers who raise hay, a few of us tried to convince the Senate that the same proportional reduction only should take place which had taken place on the rice industry; but that found no supporters on that side of the Chamber.

So, as it seems to me, this question of consistency does not cut very much of a figure in this matter, and I am glad to be able to stand up and say that this ought not to be done, that the industry of manufacturing cotton bagging ought not to be destroyed, because I believe there does not happen to be one single mill of that sort in New England. Therefore I shall not be accused of any sectionalism or any desire to promote the interests of my own section, when I say that I do not think that that industry ought to be destroyed. It is an industry in the West largely and in the South considerably.

It is an industry employing a great deal of capital and a great many men. The proposition now is to turn it over to the tender mercies of foreign manufacturers and foreign trusts because of some supposed benefit which will inure to the cotton planter. It has been admitted that so far as this country is concerned all this cotton bagging is sold at a price which exceeds what the cotton planter pays for it, though it is claimed that in the cotton which goes abroad it is deducted in the way of tare.

But look at it. Whatever may have been the condition with regard to a trust in former times, that trust is broken up, and whatever price that trust may have imposed upon cotton planters, there is no longer any complaint from cotton planters of the price of this bagging. There was no complaint in 1890, and the duty on it under the present law, where it is valued at 6 cents or less a square yard, is only 32 per cent ad valorem, and valued at more than 6 cents per yard, 26 per cent ad valorem, which the pending bill proposes to reduce to 15 per cent ad valorem.

The price has gone steadily down under the manufacture in this country, and if you destroy this manufacture it will go steadily up under the manipulations and the combination of foreign manufacturers. The planter will get nothing. It will simply be the destruction of an industry which I am just as much interested in the preservation of as if it were a New England industry.

I do not know, Mr. President, that this delusion of free trade can ever be eradicated from the minds of the American people until they have had experience with it. It is possible that putting this article upon the free list may operate to give the American people a little experience of what the result of the free traders' logic is really to be. It may be that putting it on the free list will at last convince the cotton planter that when he destroys a manufacturing interest in this country he gains nothing by it, and loses something.

It may be that putting grain bags on the free list will have the effect to convince the Western grain grower than when he destroys an industry in this country the competition in which

has reduced the price, he gains nothing by it, but loses something by it. If that should be the effect it is possible that the destruction which is to follow the adoption of this proposition will not have been too dearly purchased.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the amendment proposed by the Senator from Kansas.

Mr. PEFFER. On that I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered, and the Secretary proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. CAFFERY (when his name was called). I am paired with the Senator from Montana [Mr. POWER].

Mr. FAULKNER (when his name was called). I am paired with the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. HAWLEY].

Mr. GORDON (when his name was called). I am paired with the Senator from Iowa [Mr. WILSON].

Mr. HALE (when his name was called). I am paired with the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. RANSOM]. I transfer that pair to the Senator from Ohio [Mr. SHERMAN] and vote "nay."

Mr. HIGGINS (when his name was called). I am paired with the senior Senator from New Jersey [Mr. MCPHERSON]. If he were present I should vote "nay."

Mr. MILLS (when his name was called). I am paired with the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. GALLINGER]. If he were here I should vote "yea."

Mr. MITCHELL of Wisconsin (when his name was called). I am paired with the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. CAREY].

Mr. HIGGINS. I suggest to the Senator from Wisconsin that we transfer pairs, so that the Senator from Wyoming will stand paired with the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. MCPHERSON] and we can both vote.

Mr. MITCHELL of Wisconsin. Very well. Then I vote "yea."

Mr. HIGGINS. I vote "nay."

Mr. QUAY (when his name was called). I again announce my pair with the Senator from Alabama [Mr. MORGAN].

Mr. VILAS (when his name was called). I transfer my pair with the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MITCHELL] to the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. IRBY], and vote "yea."

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. CALL. I am paired with the Senator from Vermont [Mr. MORRILL]. If he were present I should vote "yea."

Mr. GORDON. The arrangement announced on the other vote will stand on this, and the Senator from Iowa [Mr. WILSON] will stand paired with the Senator from Delaware [Mr. GRAY]. I vote "yea."

Mr. BRICE. I desire to announce my pair with the junior Senator from Colorado [Mr. WOLCOTT], unless there is a question of a quorum, in which case I shall vote.

The result was announced—yeas 34, nays 19; as follows:

YEAS—34.

Allen,	Gibson,	Martin,	Squire,
Berry,	Gordon,	Mitchell, Wis.	Turpie,
Blackburn,	Harris,	Murphy,	Vest,
Blanchard,	Hunton,	Pasco,	Vilas,
Butler,	Jarvis,	Peffer,	Voorhees,
Cockrell,	Jones, Ark.	Perkins,	Walsh,
Coke,	Kyle,	Pugh,	White.
Daniel,	Lindsay,	Roach,	
George,	McLaurin,	Smith,	

NAYS—19.

Aldrich,	Dolph,	Hoar,	Power,
Allison,	Dubois,	McMillan,	Shoup,
Chandler,	Frye,	Manderson,	Teller,
Cullom,	Hale,	Patton,	Washburn.
Dixon,	Higgins,	Platt,	

NOT VOTING—32.

Bate,	Faulkner,	Jones, Nev.	Pettigrew,
Brice,	Gallinger,	Lodge,	Proctor,
Caffery,	Gorman,	McPherson,	Quay,
Call,	Gray,	Mills,	Ransom,
Camden,	Hansbrough,	Mitchell, Oregon	Sherman,
Cameron,	Hawley,	Morgan,	Stewart,
Carey,	Hill,	Morrill,	Wilson,
Davis,	Irby,	Palmer,	Wolcott.

So the amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The reading of the bill will proceed.

The Secretary read as follows:

272. Flax gill netting, nets, webs, and seines, 30 per cent ad valorem.

The Committee on Finance reported an amendment in line 3, to strike out "thirty" and insert "thirty-five;" so as to read "35 per cent ad valorem."

Mr. JONES of Arkansas. I withdraw the committee amendment, and move to strike out "thirty" and insert "forty," in line 3.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment proposed by the Senator from Arkansas will be stated.

The SECRETARY. In line 3, it is proposed to strike out "thirty" and insert "forty;" so as to read "forty per cent ad valorem."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the amendment proposed by the Senator from Arkansas.

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The reading of the bill will proceed.

The Secretary read as follows:

273. Oilcloth for floors, stamped, painted, or printed, including linoleum, corticene, cork carpets, figured or plain, and all other oilcloth (except silk oilcloth), and waterproof cloth, not specially provided for in this act, 30 per cent ad valorem.

The committee reported an amendment to the paragraph, in line 8, after the word "act," to insert "valued at 25 cents or less per square yard, 20 per cent ad valorem; valued above 25 cents per square yard;" and in line 11, after the word "yard," to strike out "thirty," and insert "thirty-five;" so as to read:

273. Oilcloth for floors, stamped, painted, or printed, including linoleum, corticene, cork carpets, figured or plain, and all other oilcloth (except silk oilcloth), and waterproof cloth, not specially provided for in this act, valued at 25 cents or less per square yard, 20 per cent ad valorem; valued above 25 cents per square yard, 35 per cent ad valorem.

Mr. JONES of Arkansas. I move, in line 9, to strike out "twenty" and insert "twenty-five;" and in line 11 to strike out "thirty-five" and insert "forty."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment proposed by the Senator from Arkansas to the amendment of the committee will be stated.

The SECRETARY. In line 9, page 69, it is proposed to strike out "twenty" and insert "twenty-five;" and in line 11 to strike out "thirty-five" and insert "forty:" so as to read:

273. Oilcloth for floors, stamped, painted, or printed, including linoleum, corticene, cork carpets, figured or plain, and all other oilcloth (except silk oilcloth), and waterproof cloth, not specially provided for in this act, valued at 25 cents or less per square yard, 25 per cent ad valorem; valued above 25 cents per square yard, 40 per cent ad valorem.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The amendment as amended was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The reading of the bill will proceed.

The Secretary read as follows:

274. Yarns or threads composed of flax or hemp, or of a mixture of either of these substances, valued at 13 cents or less per pound, 25 per cent ad valorem; valued at more than 13 cents per pound, 30 per cent ad valorem.

Mr. JONES of Arkansas. I move the amendment which I send to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment proposed by the Senator from Arkansas will be stated.

The SECRETARY. After the word "substances," in line 13, it is proposed to strike out down to the word "pound," in line 15, and to insert after the word "thirty," the word "five;" so as to read:

274. Yarns or threads composed of flax or hemp, or of a mixture of either of these substances, 35 per cent ad valorem.

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The reading of the bill will proceed.

The Secretary read as follows:

275. Collars and cuffs, and shirts, and all articles of wearing apparel of every description, not specially provided for in this act, composed wholly or in part of linen, and linen hydraulic hose, 35 per cent ad valorem.

The Committee on Finance reported an amendment in line 17, after the word "cuffs," to strike out "and shirts," and insert "composed wholly or in part of linen, 55 per cent ad valorem; shirts;" in line 19, after the word "all," to insert "other," and in line 22, after the word "linen," to strike out "and linen hydraulic hose, thirty-five," and insert "fifty;" so as to make the paragraph read:

275. Collars and cuffs, composed wholly or in part of linen, 55 per cent ad valorem; shirts and all other articles of wearing apparel of every description, not specially provided for in this act, composed wholly or in part of linen, 50 per cent ad valorem.

Mr. JONES of Arkansas. I move to amend the amendment by striking out the words "fifty-five," in line 18, and inserting "30 cents per dozen pieces, and in addition thereto thirty."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment proposed by the Senator from Arkansas will be stated.

The SECRETARY. It is proposed in line 18 to strike out the word "fifty-five" and insert "30 cents per dozen pieces, and in addition thereto thirty;" so as to make the paragraph read:

Collar and cuffs, composed wholly or in part of linen, 30 cents per dozen pieces, and in addition thereto, 30 per cent ad valorem; shirts and all other

articles of wearing apparel of every description, not specially provided for in this act, composed wholly or in part of linen, 50 per cent ad valorem.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the amendment as amended.

Mr. PLATT. Mr. President, we have here an absolutely protective duty, and for one I am very glad of it; we have also a duty which, to all practical purposes, is as high, or higher, than the duty in the McKinley act. I am glad of that, too. It is not a duty which affects anybody in the State of Connecticut. I am glad of that, too.

Mr. PUGH. The Senator is pleased all around.

Mr. PLATT. So I think I may be permitted, without doing any damage to the amendment proposed by the committee, to make some observations with regard to this protective McKinley duty. I do not think it will be quite prohibitory, because there were imported last year, in all, 89,000 dozen collars and cuffs, composed in whole or in part of linen, of the value of $93,000, on which there was $64,000 duty paid.

Those, Mr. President, are the collars which dudes wear, and they would be imported if the tariff were 300 per cent instead of about 60 per cent, as it will be by the pending bill. To be a little more specific, the duty in the McKinley act was 30 cents per dozen and 40 per cent ad valorem. The duty now proposed is 30 cents per dozen, and 30 per cent ad valorem. The equivalent duty under the McKinley bill was, as given, 68.54 per cent.

As it is figured, it will be under the proposed amendment 58.54 per cent, a nominal apparent reduction of 10 per cent in the duty from the McKinley law; but the changed conditions, the fall in price of collars, has been such that at the end of a year's time, when the record is made up, I have no doubt that the average ad valorem will be higher than that given by the duty under the McKinley act. But that is no objection to it, in my mind. I am quite willing that this industry should be continued in the United States.

I congratulate the Democratic Senators that they have given us an absolutely protective and high tariff and, as I believe, prohibitive duty. I congratulate the men and women and girls engaged in this occupation in Troy, that there will be no necessity for reducing their wages; that their wages can be kept up to the point at which they have been kept during the past two or three years, and that there will be no occasion even for a 10 per cent reduction of wages.

Mr. CHANDLER. May I ask the Senator how he can show that? When the duty is kept up on collars and cuffs at the old rate, and when other industries will be destroyed by the reductions which have been made, will not the people who were employed in those industries flock into this highly protected collar and cuff industry, so that the wages will be lowered?

Mr. PLATT. I hope not. I hope that this industry will be preserved for that radically Democratic city of Troy, and that no Democratic workingman, nor his daughter, nor anybody who has been engaged in this industry, will have their wages reduced one penny.

But it was not so much to congratulate the Democratic Senators on having thus come to this protective duty that I rose, as it was to call attention to this paragraph as illustrating the evolution of tariff reform.

Immediately after the election, as before it, we heard a great deal in this country about tariff reform. It was printed on every Democratic banner before the election, and even after the election it stood in black headlines at the head of the editorial columns of almost all the Democratic newspapers; and even, indeed, when we came to this Congress, when we had this bill reported in another place, which I shall not designate, by a gentleman whose name ought no longer be connected with or attached to it, we were told that this bill embodied the real, genuine tariff reform upon which the election was won. Every speaker who advocated that bill in that place advocated it as a measure of Democratic tariff reform.

I have not heard so much about that recently, Mr. President. Indeed, until the Senator from Missouri [Mr. VEST] to-day cautiously and incidentally mentioned it, I do not think I have heard those words in this Chamber for the last three weeks. The last time I remember to have heard them was when the Senator from Georgia [Mr. WALSH], evidently not understanding the changed condition in the Senate, beat his rub-a-dub on the drum of tariff reform.

This is a paragraph which will bear looking at as well as reading, and I am going to ask to have it reproduced in the RECORD with my remarks in the same type in which it appears in the bill under consideration. It will indeed require the explanations which are to be found on the first page of the bill in order that any reader of the RECORD may understand what represented tariff reform on collars and cuffs at the different stages after this bill reached the Senate.

The paragraph referred to is as follows:

275. Collars and cuffs, ~~and shirts,~~ *composed wholly or in part of linen,* [*fifty-five*] ~~thirty~~ cents per dozen pieces, and in addition thereto ~~thirty~~ *per centum ad valorem; shirts* and all *other* articles of wearing apparel of every description, not specially provided for in this Act, composed wholly or in part of linen, ~~and linen hydraulic hose, thirty-five~~ *fifty* per centum ad valorem.

Mr. PLATT. Before this bill reached the Senate, as I have said, it was tariff reform and 35 per cent ad valorem upon collars and cuffs, and a gentleman elsewhere, whom I shall not mention, when he called the roll for this bill, which put a duty on collars and cuffs of 35 per cent ad valorem, said:

This is a roll of honor. This is a roll of freedom; and in the name of honor and in the name of freedom, I summon every Democratic member of this House to inscribe his name upon it. [Loud and prolonged applause.]

That was tariff reform then; and I have heard that his associates were roused to such a pitch of exaltation by the bugle blast with which he summoned them to rally around the standard of tariff reform, that after the "roll of honor" had been made up they bore him in triumph from the Chamber on their shoulders. The Wilson bill came to the Senate, and we heard various suggestions—I shall not say suspicions— that in some way or other the duty of 35 per cent ad valorem on collars and cuffs did not after all truly illustrate the doctrine of tariff reform.

So, when the bill was being concocted in some room in this Capitol, into which we on this side of the Chamber could not get, and afterwards when a Democratic caucus was held and another printed bill, which we have not been permitted to see, was passed around among Democratic members of the Senate, it was all at once discovered that it took 55 per cent ad valorem on collars and cuffs composed wholly or partly of linen, to constitute the real, genuite, simon-pure Democratic tariff reform. So, when the bill came in on the 20th day of March, the caucus having been held some time in February, we found the bill proposed to be amended by putting an ad valorem duty of 55 per cent on collars and cuffs.

I think that would have been protective, Mr. President; but it was not protective enough for somebody. Then there were whisperings. In the meantime the Senator from Missouri [Mr. VEST] informed the Senate that he was compelled by "political exigencies" to submit to something that he did not want to submit to, which he did not believe in and which he was going home to tell his constituents he did not believe in, but submitted to it because he must.

We are told by the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. HARRIS] that no Republican should have anything to do with the shaping of this bill. Very frank it was. So on the 7th of May the bill came in perfected by the so-called Jones amendments, and all the Democratic tariff reform which was embodied in 35 per cent ad valorem and then in 55 per cent ad valorem duty on collars and cuffs had disappeared, and the old staff of the tariff reform banner, with the flag all tattered and torn, had graced the head of a procession of Democratic Senators who succeeded in placing a duty of 30 cents per dozen pieces and, in addition thereto, 30 per cent ad valorem on collars and cuffs.

We had just been told a little while before by the Senator from Indiana—I will not say the Senator from Indiana, but by the chairman of the Finance Committee—that this ad valorem business was true, Simon pure, genuine tariff reform, that a specific duty was practically the synonym of protective plunder. That is the way he stated it—the chairman of the Finance Committee, understand.

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.

* * * * * * *

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.

Ad valorem rates, then, gave the true ring to tariff reform. So in the House of Representatives it was 35 per cent ad valorem on collars and cuffs. When the Democratic caucus had manipulated the bill, after its manipulation in a secret room in this Capitol, it was 55 per cent ad valorem on collars and cuffs. But when the final act comes, in which the protectionist "shuns ad valorem rates as guilt shuns discovery," we find a compound duty,

partly ad valorem and partly specific, of 30 cents per dozen pieces, and in addition thereto, 30 per cent ad valorem!

Mr. President, that has been all figured out by the expert of the committee. He tells us that the compound ad valorem and specific duty together will be 58.54 per cent ad valorem; a higher ad valorem duty than is to be found upon any other article of textile manufacture; practically the same ad valorem duty which the wine and liquor schedule averages, which we discussed this morning; that is to average 58.98 per cent, and these collars and cuffs are to average 58.54 per cent.

I believe collars and cuffs, collars certainly, are worn by poor people. They are, as I suppose, articles of prime necessity, about all the Democrats wear them. I think there are few people in the land so poor, so abject, as not to wear collars and cuffs, and yet for somebody, in some way, mysteriously, this tariff reform, which fixed the duty originally at 35 per cent ad valorem, has been so stretched and enlarged that we have now a specific ad valorem duty averaging 58.54 per cent, a duty upon these articles of prime necessity higher than any duty upon any textile fabric or upon the materials made from any textile fabric in the bill.

Why this was it is best, perhaps, not to inquire a great deal. I do not want to hurt anybody's feelings, and I do not want to imperil this duty, because I want it to stand in the bill as an instance of the fact that tariff reform upon a discussed subject means McKinley duties pure and simple.

I have my own ideas about how this occurred. There is an old saying that "if you scratch a Russian you will find a Cossack," and my observation has taught me that whenever you scratch a protective amendment in this bill you find a Democrat under it. [Laughter.]

Perhaps that is enough to say with relation to how this protective duty came to be inscribed in this bill as an illustration of the beauties of tariff reform.

I should like to go into this subject a little more at length, but I have not the time this evening; I am very anxious to get on with the bill; but it would be an exceedingly instructive half hour which might be spent here inquiring what has become of the professions of tariff reform on which the election was carried. But I refrain, Mr. President, and I close with a single remark illustrative of the course of tariff reform in the Senate, a sort of a parody on those famous lines of Bret Harte:

> For ways that are dark
> And tricks that are vain,
> This tariff reform is peculiar.

[Laughter.]

Mr. HOAR. Mr. President, I do not wish to discuss this matter at this time, except to ask a word of explanation of the honorable Senator from Missouri as to whether articles which are covered by this provision are, in the opinion of the committee, a luxury or a necessity?

Mr. VEST. Both.

Mr. ALDRICH. In the absence of the Senator from New York, who, I suppose, would naturally be expected to understand and defend this duty, I should be glad to have the Senator from Missouri, who is now present and who for the moment seems to be alone in the protection of this bill, to state whether this is a revenue duty or a protective duty?

Mr. VEST. A revenue duty of course. [Laughter.] I am astonished the Senator should ask me that question.

Mr. ALDRICH. Imposed solely for the purpose of raising revenue?

Mr. VEST. As a matter of course—a revenue duty.

Mr. ALDRICH. Would the Senator state about what per centage ad valorem it would be upon the ordinary kinds of collars and cuffs?

Mr. VEST. Oh, Mr. President, the Senator does not want any information from me about the tariff.

Mr. SQUIRE. How much revenue will be derived from it?

Mr. ALDRICH. I received a letter to-day from a very extensive importer, in which he said this duty would amount to 150 per cent on the kind of collars and cuffs which the ordinary people of the country wear. I should be glad to have that statement confirmed or otherwise by the Senator from Missouri.

Mr. VEST. It seems to me that a Senator whose political stomach can stand 240 and 250 per cent on common wool clothing, ought not to gag at this duty on collars and cuffs.

Mr. ALDRICH. But the Senator from Missouri has a much more sensitive stomach than that, and I wanted to find out what was the limit of his endurance in this regard.

Mr. VEST. I have been associated with the Senator from Rhode Island so long that I have fallen into a few of his habits. I propose to get rid of them after this bill is disposed of; but for the present I leave him to explain this duty for himself.

Mr. CHANDLER. We are obliged to stand anything which is necessary for the other side to do to get this bill through, and once in awhile we are gratified with a protective duty and are disposed to cackle a little—to use the sweet and expressive word which the Senator from Missouri used in this debate—and we do not refrain from cackling over this vindication of Republican principles because the junior Senator from New York [Mr. MURPHY] cackles also.

I do not understand that the Senator from New York should be criticised for getting his share of what goes to the so-called conservative Senators on the other side of the Chamber. The Senator from Maine [Mr. HALE] who early in this debate grouped these Senators—and I think he spoke this afternoon on this subject—will be obliged to rearrange his group, and perhaps absolve everyone of them.

Some dozen or fifteen Senators, it was rumored early in the session, had organized either to prevent the passage of this bill or to secure a modification of it, and they have gone on and secured the necessary modifications of the bill.

The Senator from Maryland [Mr. GORMAN], who spoke so smoothly the other day about this bill and its future passage, which was soon to take place, said to us that the bill as it came from the House could not have commanded a majority of the Senate, that the bill as reported by the committee could not have commanded a majority vote in the Senate, but the Senator from Maryland took pleasure in announcing that then the Democratic party was united, and the bill was about to pass.

Then the Senator retired from the Chamber and we have not seen him since. We trust that if he is not well, that he will soon be restored to health, and that we shall see his cheerful and joyous countenance with us before this bill is put upon its passage.

The Senator from Maryland omitted to tell us, in his modesty, that the two situations of which he spoke were created by him. He omitted to tell us that the bill could not pass the Senate as it came from the House because he and the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICE], as the two ringleaders of the conservative party, organized to prevent its passage. He did not tell us the bill as reported by the Finance Committee could not pass this body because he and the Senator from New York organized a conservative party in order to prevent its passage in the form in which it then stood.

The Senator omitted to tell us much history which he might have usefully given to the Senate concerning this bill. The Senators composing the conservatives of whom I have spoken, the group of Senators whom the Senator from Maine has described, went on and got what they desired.

It was first necessary, however, to capture and hold securely the Populists upon the other side of the Chamber, and they have been taken care of by free binding-twine, free barbed wire, and free lumber; and it may be that they are even now setting other traps for the Populist Senator who so pleasantly associates with Senators upon this side of the Chamber. At any rate, the Populist party was conciliated and taken care of.

Then the conservative Senators from Maryland, West Virginia, and Alabama, and the conservative Senator from Ohio were conciliated by a duty on iron ore and a duty on coal. Thus one after another the conservatives began to disappear. I do not know whether the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH], who made so brave a speech against the income tax, has been sufficiently conciliated or not, but time will tell upon that point.

Under those circumstances, however, who can blame the genial junior Senator from New York for consenting to be conciliated? Why should any one criticise if he, in the general wreck of the conservative party among the Democrats, accepted at the hands of this generous committee a duty practically prohibitive upon collars and cuffs?

Mr. President, as I understand, cotton collars and cuffs, which were dutiable under the McKinley law, have disappeared from the list; and under the duties which are now proposed, with the fall in prices which has taken place—which fall in prices upon other articles has been used by Senators upon the other side of the Chamber as some justification for reductions which they have made from the McKinley law, amounting to from one-fourth to one-half of the existing duties—the fall in prices has been such that upon the cheapest linen collars and cuffs, worth, say two and a half cents apiece, the two and a half cents duty derived from such collars and cuffs will be 100 per cent.

Then there is 30 per cent ad valorem in addition. The duties upon the cheapest linen collars and cuffs under this bill will be 130 per cent, and they will not be lower than 80 per cent in the case of any collars and cuffs which will be imported.

Mr. President, that makes the duty almost prohibitive. The present duty has practically given the manufacturers of Troy a monopoly of the collar and cuff business. There have been substantially no importations of cotton collars and cuffs, and very few importations of linen shirts, and, as stated by the Sen-

ator from Connecticut [Mr. PLATT], only importations of about $92,000 worth of linen collars and cuffs under the present duty.

With the fall of prices which has taken place, the duty which is now proposed, of 30 cents a dozen and 30 per cent ad valorem, is a prohibitive duty, and the monopoly of the manufacture of collars and cuffs for this country is pretty nearly given to the city of Troy, the Senator's own home; and the Senators upon the other side of the Chamber, as well as the Senators upon this side, will undoubtedly vote to give that duty, and to present that testimonial of the protectionists in this Chamber to the junior Senator from New York as an evidence of the appreciation in which his associates hold one of the most distinguished of the conservative party to which I have alluded.

Mr. President, one other question remains. Is the last remaining conservative to be conciliated? Is the income tax to be thrown over in order to pass this bill? I sincerely hope that the Senator from Missouri and the Senator from Arkansas are making up their minds to perform the last act of conciliation. When they concede the exclusion of the income tax from this bill and everything has been made dutiable which seeks a duty, except lumber and wool, they can then perform the last acts of mercy and I hope we shall have them reconsider their action upon lumber, put a duty upon wool, satisfy the farmers of the United States, and strike out the income tax from the bill and thus conciliate us all.

If this could be done, while I think the bill would be like a leopard, spotted with a little protection here and a little destruction there, I should have a feeling that it might possibly pass the Senate. It would not be satisfactory to me and would not be a bill then constructed upon any consistent principle, such as a protectionist would advocate, or such as the Senator from Texas [Mr. MILLS], who wishes to destroy all protection, would advocate; but it would be a bill which, while destroying many industries, would allow other industries to survive; the country would be saved from the Populist income tax, and, as I said, I think if all this could be done, the Senators upon this side of the Chamber would be willing to agree to fix a time when a vote might be taken upon the bill.

Mr. ALDRICH. Mr. President, I was not very successful in securing an explanation of the provisions of this paragraph from any Senator on the other side of the Chamber, and I assume, from their continued silence, that I shall not be able to obtain such an explanation.

But there is another portion of this paragraph, however, to which I desire to call the attention of the Senator from Missouri. After fixing a rate upon collars and cuffs which is amply protective, as I think Senators on the other side might be willing to admit, the paragraph goes on in this way:

> Shirts and all other articles of wearing apparel of every description, not specially provided for in this act, composed wholly or in part of linen, 50 per cent ad valorem.

Paragraph 258, which we have adopted to-day, reads as follows:

> 258. Clothing ready made, and articles of wearing apparel of every description, handkerchiefs, and neckties or neckwear, composed of cotton or other vegetable fiber, or of which cotton or other vegetable fiber——
>
> Including, of course, linen——
>
> is the component material of chief value, made up or manufactured wholly or in part by the tailor, seamstress, or manufacturer, all of the foregoing not specially provided for in this act, 40 per cent ad valorem.

Here is one paragraph that fixes a duty upon "wearing apparel of every description * * * composed of cotton or other vegetable fiber at 40 per cent ad valorem," and another which fixes the duty "on wearing apparel of every description * * * composed wholly or in part of linen at 50 per cent ad valorem."

Mr. VEST. I should like to ask the Senator from Rhode Island, as a matter of information in which we are all interested, whether he does not think that the words "not specially provided for in this act" would meet the criticism he is now making?

Mr. ALDRICH. Those words are used in both paragraphs. They are alike in that respect.

Mr. VEST. The provision fixing 50 per cent ad valorem, which we are now considering in the pending paragraph, is certainly a special provision.

Mr. ALDRICH. It applies, according to its terms, to shirts and all other articles of wearing apparel of every description, and paragraph 258 applies to all articles of wearing apparel of every description, and both have the limitation "not specially provided for in this act." They are both general clauses.

Mr. VEST. There can be no trouble about that.

Mr. ALDRICH. Perhaps there is no trouble about it, but it is very evident that two different rates of duty are imposed by these paragraphs upon the same articles. Under the similitude clause, I suppose, they would all pay the higher rate of duty, 50 per cent ad valorem, unless specially enumerated in either paragraph; but the only articles enumerated in paragraph 258 are handkerchiefs, neckties, or neckwear, and the articles enumerated in paragraph 275 are shirts, which would pay 50 per cent, while handkerchiefs, neckties, and neckwear would undoubtedly pay 40 per cent; but the two paragraphs are open to the same construction, and with the similitude clause operative also, these articles would pay 50 per cent. That, perhaps, may be what the Senator desires, and I am inclined to think it is what ought to be done; but certainly there is an apparent inconsistency in rates.

We have two or more paragraphs applying to the same articles—I have recited two of them—other paragraphs of the bill apply to wearing apparel composed of other material; for instance, the woolen schedule contains a paragraph fixing a rate for wearing apparel at 45 per cent, and we have also a provision in this schedule applying to miscellaneous manufactures, flax, hemp, jute, etc., of 35 per cent. So that we have in various parts of this bill paragraphs applying to similar miscellaneous manufactures of 35, 40, 45, and 50 per cent.

I suggest to the Senator from Missouri that at some time before the bill passes the Senate, these inequalities, which I suppose have arisen from the various degrees of pressure exercised by different conservative Senators on various portions of the bill, may be equalized, and that we shall have some one rate, perhaps an average rate of say 45 or 50 per cent, which will apply to all similar wearing apparel. If this is not done there will be inextricable confusion in the administration of the law.

Before I sit down, in answer to the question of the Senator from Colorado [Mr. TELLER], as to whether I am satisfied with this rate, I desire to say I am perfectly satisfied. I will add, if this entire tariff bill had been constructed on the collars-and-cuffs basis, there would have been no remonstrance or criticism from this side of the Chamber as to a single item.

What I am criticising is that only a small portion of the bill is builded on the collar and cuff basis, and that portion is comparatively unimportant. We have had within the last half hour some manufactured articles put upon the free list, and upon others a rate of duty of 125 and 150 per cent placed, and the latter articles are of no more consequence than the former, and no better entitled to protective duties.

I know it is too much to expect any consistency in the preparation of this bill, but I do think that some of these manifest and glaring defects should receive attention, and at some time before final action is taken I trust that some corrections will be made.

Mr. HOAR. Mr. President, we do not seem to get much explanation from the Senators in charge of this bill in regard to this particular item.

The Senator from Missouri [Mr. VEST] the other day was polite enough to say in regard to this side of the Chamber that they cackled over the Oregon election. I am afraid there is a gander somewhere on the other side of the Chamber who has been sitting about twelve weeks on a cuckoo's egg, who does not seem disposed to cackle just now, or even to crow over this item.

Mr. President, this bill was introduced by the honorable chairman of the Committee on Finance with a statement of principle; and although I suppose that honorable Senator has left the detail of some of these matters to his lieutenants, yet he is still in command of his army. He used this language:

> Darkness and deception lurk in the very principle of specific rates of duty.
>
> * * * * * * *
>
> This is the favorite device of high protection.
>
> * * * * * * *
>
> That the people should know how much tribute they pay, or to what extent they are plundered.

And the Senator gave as an illustration the specific duty on shirt buttons. He said it was no consolation for an Indiana farmer who paid one-sixth of 1 cent, as it turned out to be on ciphering on the buttons on his shirt, so that he would get six buttons additional at a duty of a cent, to know that that was covered up by a specific duty.

Here it is proposed to add to the high ad valorem duty of 50 per cent on the shirt, 30 cents a dozen on cuffs and collars, which the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. CHANDLER] says is a little over 100 per cent ad valorem, and a specific duty. I should like to know on what principle that is vindicated. I think we are entitled to some explanation, as are the American people, as to what is the reason of putting on every man's shirt in this country this plunder; what is the reason for cheating every Indiana farmer, not only a sixth of 1 cent—I believe that is taken off—but cheating every Indiana farmer to the amount of 150 per cent on his shirt and his shirt collar.

Will the Senator from Indiana [Mr. VOORHEES] kindly tell us? The Indiana farmer is ready for revolution against these plundering outlaws and robbers, when he pays a sixth of a cent on his shirt buttons, and yet he is going to pay an addition of 30 per cent

ad valorem, over 100 per cent, on his collars and cuffs, more than thirty times as much, and he is going to be comforted by the fact that that is what his favorite statesman, the great and good Senator from Indiana recommends, the great economist of this generation, the champion of the oppressed and plundered Democracy, against the wicked robber barons, and he, indeed, is responsible for it. Will not the Senator from Texas tell us?

Mr. MILLS. With the greatest pleasure in the world.

Mr. HOAR. I should like to hear it.

Mr. MILLS. I thought you would come to me directly, and I was just waiting for you, and came over close by you on purpose.

Mr. HOAR. I am glad to see the amiable smile on the Senator's countenance.

Mr. MILLS. We found ourselves in a situation where it was necessary to make this concession in order to prevent some other barons, who were engaged in plundering the people of the United States out of about $300,000,000 on woolen goods and $125,000,000 on cotton goods, and in order to reduce that plunder about $150,000,000 on woolen goods and not so much on cotton goods—very little, I believe, on them—we thought we could afford to stand a little rise on collars and cuffs.

Mr. HOAR. Ah, Mr. President, that is not the way to state it. The Senator is not standing "a little rise on collars and cuffs;" he is doing a little cheating and stealing himself, according to his account. He takes to the highway with his bludgeon in his hand, and says, "There is a man on the highway who is plundering at large; and therefore, in order to discourage him, I will take to the byways and lanes, and do a little plundering myself."

That is the difficulty; but I should like to have the Senator go a little further. I ask him how is it that it was necessary to do this? How did it happen that his friends on the Democratic side of the Chamber, who are a clear majority, would not have voted for this bill if the principle of the Senator from Indiana had been carried out?

Mr. MILLS. Your friend from New Hampshire [Mr. CHANDLER] has been discussing all the conservatives and knows more about the matter than I do, and he knows what is the fact. The Senator had better cross-examine him.

Mr. HOAR. I do not think the Senator quite answers this cross-examination. I did not talk about the Senator from New Hampshire, who knows it and has the facts, as I dare say; but I want to get the facts out of this witness, who, when I was addressing the court on a legal proposition, stood up and volunteered his testimony, and have him say how it was necessary to get votes to pass the bill, and what votes are they?

Mr. MILLS. The Senator knows that. He asked me for the facts, and I gave him the facts, and I answered that the bill could not be passed without concessions.

Mr. HOAR. Why not?

Mr. MILLS. I do not want to go into particulars.

Mr. HOAR. Why?

Mr. MILLS. The Senator wants me to go into our family affairs, and is asking me to discuss matters he has no right to know. I deny the jurisdiction of the court to institute the inquiry. [Laughter.]

Mr. HOAR. The Senator seems to me to use Burke's phrase—I do not use it in the offensive sense—but Burke spoke of a gentleman in the British Parliament who had sneaked out of a difficulty which he had boldly strutted into. Of course that phrase of Burke is not applicable to so gallant and chivalrous a Senator as my friend from Texas. He said he would tell why it was that this thing had to be done.

Mr. MILLS. I told you why.

Mr. HOAR. The Senator gets up and asks us why is it necessary to pry into their family secrets. The American people will want to know the policy of the party which is governing this country, they will want to know why it is that they have got to be taxed and plundered, as the Senator says, and when asked the reason the answer is, it is a family secret. This is the first time I have ever heard in an economic discussion such a doctrine avowed.

Mr. President, it is not a family secret and it is not a necessity. This breach of the promise made to the New England manufacturers to put coal and iron on the free list can not be vindicated by the Senator from Texas, or anybody else, on the ground that they can not pass their bill without it, for every Senator from a coal producing State has risen in his place and declared that he should have voted for the bill which the majority of the Democratic party supported whether coal had been free or had been protected.

It is not the necessity of passing this bill, which the President in advance said he approved, and which the House of Representatives have sent us; it is the fear of popular indignation in the election and it is the hope of saving some Southern or Northern communities interested in certain manufactures which is inducing the Democratic party to put these things, which they say are crimes, robbery, and plunder—I do not say so—into this measure.

Mr. ALDRICH. Will the Senator from Massachusetts allow me?

Mr. HOAR. It is another delusion, a mistake, a pretense, that this bill is made up in this way because they can not pass a better one. It is made up in this way because they can not face the popular indignation with a worse one.

Now I yield to the Senator from Rhode Island.

Mr. ALDRICH. I ask the Senator from Texas, through the Senator from Massachusetts, the question, whether any assertion could be made—I think no assertion has been made—that any Senator sitting upon that side of the Chamber would have voted against this bill, unless this duty on collars and cuffs had been put in?

Mr. MILLS. The Senator from Rhode Island showed on the floor of the Senate some weeks ago that he knew more about this business than I did, and there is no use of him asking me questions. The Senator knows all about this thing from top to bottom, from center to circumference.

Mr. HOAR. Mr. President, the substance of it then is, when there is a departure in pleading, my honorable friend from Texas pleads guilty and throws himself on the mercy of the court. [Laughter.]

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. JARVIS in the chair). The question is on the amendment proposed by the Committee on Finance as amended.

The amendment as amended was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The reading of the bill will proceed.

The Secretary read as follows:

276. Laces, edgings, embroideries, insertings, neck rufflings, ruchings, trimmings, tuckings, lace window curtains, and other similar tamboured articles, and articles embroidered by hand or machinery, embroidered or hemstitched handkerchiefs, and articles made wholly or in part of lace, rufflings, tuckings, or ruchings, all of the above-named articles, composed of flax, jute, cotton, or other vegetable fiber, or of which these substances or either of them, or a mixture of any of them is the component material of chief value, not specially provided for in this act, 40 per cent ad valorem.

Mr. JONES of Arkansas. I move to strike out the words inclosed in brackets in the printed bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment proposed by the Senator from Arkansas will be stated.

The SECRETARY. In line 2, page 70, after the word "curtains," to strike out "and other similar," and in line 3, after the word "embroidered," to strike out "or hemstitched."

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. ALDRICH. I move the amendment which I send to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the amendment proposed by the Senator from Rhode Island, which will be stated.

The SECRETARY. In line 9, page 70, it is proposed to strike out "forty" and insert "sixty;" so as to read, "60 per cent ad valorem."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the amendment proposed by the Senator from Rhode Island.

Mr. PEFFER. I move to amend the amendment by striking out "sixty" and inserting "seventy-five."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the amendment proposed by the Senator from Kansas to the amendment of the Senator from Rhode Island.

Mr. PEFFER. Mr. President, these are articles which are properly classified among the luxuries for which people are well able to pay if they wear them; and according to the rule which I have adopted for myself, at least, that the luxuries should bear the burdens and not the necessaries, I think 75 per cent is not too high a duty on this class of articles.

Mr. VEST. The Senator from Kansas, I know, is laboring under a mistake about this matter. These are not articles of luxury. The units of value show that they are the cheapest sort of cotton embroideries, used by servant girls and people not able to buy any better. It is as much a matter of necessity to them, considering their social rank, as any article can possibly be. These are not the fine laces of the rich and luxurious, but they are the commonest laces and the plainest articles of everyday wear by women in the lower classes of life. Some of these laces are very fine, it is true, but I speak of the large majority of them.

Mr. CULLOM. Are there no other classes of laces than those described in this paragraph in the bill anywhere? The Senator says these are common laces of the poorer people.

Mr. VEST. As a matter of course, this embraces all of them, but I am speaking of the large mass embraced in this paragraph which are not of high value. It is an ad valorem duty.

Mr. ALDRICH. The suggestion of the committee in regard to this paragraph means a reduction of over $3,000,000 in revenue to be derived from articles of pure luxury. Notwithstanding the statement of the Senator from Missouri, I say there is not an article in this paragraph which is not an article of luxury, an article of voluntary use.

Mr. VEST. And of high value?

Mr. ALDRICH. Of high and low value. Most of them are, of course, of high value. This includes all the laces, except silk laces; the finest of the high-priced cotton laces, all the high-priced linen laces, all the laces used by the rich people of the country; and if there is any article in the bill upon which a high revenue duty should be levied it is upon the articles contained in this paragraph. To reduce the revenue $3,000,000 upon articles of this kind and increase duties, as Senators on the other side propose to do, upon sugar and other necessaries of life is an outrage upon the American people.

Mr. CULLOM. I find that paragraph 301 reads:

Laces and articles made wholly or in part of lace, and embroideries, including articles or fabrics embroidered by hand or machinery, etc.

Mr. ALDRICH. Those are laces composed of silk. That paragraph includes all the other laces. Of course, cotton laces and linen laces are the most expensive laces. They are used by the rich people of the country. The finest laces in the world are included in this paragraph, and I desire to have the yeas and nays upon my amendment, which restores the rate in the existing law, which is 60 per cent ad valorem.

Mr. VEST. I am compelled to ask the Senator from Rhode Island if this is an outrage, what was the McKinley law in regard to this provision?

Mr. ALDRICH. The rate in the McKinley law was 60 per cent, which I think is a fair revenue duty upon this class of articles. I think revenue ought to be derived by an imposition of high rates of duty upon articles of pure luxury.

Mr. VEST. Does the Senator not think these duties are high enough on these very fine laces which are used by rich and luxurious people?

Mr. ALDRICH. I think we should probably collect as much revenue at 60 per cent as at seventy-five. Some of these articles are easily smuggled. If we put the duty too high, of course it would only lead to fraud and evasion of the law.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the amendment to the amendment.

The amendment to the amendment was rejected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question recurs upon the amendment proposed by the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. ALDRICH].

Mr. HALE. On that I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered, and the Secretary proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. CAFFERY (when his name was called). I am paired with the Senator from Montana [Mr. POWER], whom I do not see in the Chamber, but I have a right to vote to make a quorum. I vote "nay."

Mr. FAULKNER (when his name was called). I am paired with the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. HAWLEY], but I transfer that pair to the Senator from Georgia [Mr. WALSH], and vote "nay."

Mr. HALE (when his name was called). I transfer my pair with the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. RANSOM] to the Senator from Ohio [Mr. SHERMAN], and vote "yea."

Mr. HIGGINS (when his name was called). I announce my pair with the senior Senator from New Jersey [Mr. MCPHERSON]. If he were present I should vote "yea."

Mr. MILLS (when his name was called). I am paired with the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. GALLINGER]. If he were here I should vote "nay."

Mr. MITCHELL of Wisconsin (when his name was called). I am paired with the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. CAREY].

Mr. VILAS (when his name was called). I am paired with the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MITCHELL]. The Senator from Delaware [Mr. HIGGINS] is paired with the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. MCPHERSON]. I suggest to the Senator from Delaware that we transfer our pairs, so that the Senator from New Jersey will stand paired with the Senator from Oregon, and we can both vote.

Mr. HIGGINS. That will be satisfactory to me.

Mr. VILAS. I vote "nay."

Mr. HIGGINS. I vote "yea."

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. BLACKBURN. I transfer my pair with the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. MANDERSON] to the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. IRBY], and vote "nay."

Mr. GORDON. I transfer my pair with the Senator from Iowa [Mr. WILSON] to the Senator from New York [Mr. Hill], which relieves the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE] and myself, so that we may both vote. I vote "nay."

Mr. LODGE. Under that arrangement I am at liberty to vote. I vote "yea."

Mr. CALL. I announce my pair with the Senator from Vermont [Mr. MORRILL]. If he were present I should vote "nay."

Mr. GEORGE. I am paired with the Senator from Oregon [Mr. DOLPH].

Mr. FAULKNER. I see that the Senator from Georgia [Mr. WALSH], to whom I transferred my pair with the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. HAWLEY], has returned to the Chamber and voted. I shall therefore be compelled to withdraw my vote.

The result was announced—yeas 22, nays 28; as follows:

YEAS—22.

Aldrich,	Frye,	McMillan,	Shoup,
Allison,	Hale,	Patton,	Squire,
Chandler,	Higgins,	Peffer,	Teller,
Cullom,	Hoar,	Perkins,	Washburn.
Dixon,	Kyle,	Platt,	
Dubois,	Lodge,	Quay,	

NAYS—28.

Blackburn,	Daniel,	Jones, Ark.	Roach,
Blanchard,	Gibson,	Lindsay,	Smith,
Brice,	Gordon,	McLaurin,	Vest,
Caffery,	Gray,	Morgan,	Vilas,
Camden,	Harris,	Murphy,	Voorhees,
Cockrell,	Hunton,	Pasco,	Walsh,
Coke,	Jarvis,	Pugh,	White.

NOT VOTING—35.

Allen,	Faulkner,	McPherson,	Power,
Bate,	Gallinger,	Manderson,	Proctor,
Berry,	George,	Martin,	Ransom,
Butler,	Gorman,	Mills,	Sherman,
Call,	Hansbrough,	Mitchell, Oregon	Stewart,
Cameron,	Hawley,	Mitchell, Wis.	Turpie,
Carey,	Hill,	Morrill,	Wilson,
Davis,	Irby,	Palmer,	Wolcott.
Dolph,	Jones, Nev.	Pettigrew,	

So the amendment was rejected.

The Secretary read the next paragraph, as follows:

277. All manufactures of flax, hemp, jute, or other vegetable fiber (except cotton), or of which flax, hemp, jute, or other vegetable fiber, except cotton, is the component material of chief value, not specially provided for in this act, 30 per cent ad valorem.

Mr. JONES of Arkansas. In lines 12 and 13, I move to strike out the words "flax, hemp, jute, or other vegetable fiber, except cotton," and insert "these substances, or either of them."

Mr. HOAR. I should like to ask the Senator if that is not ungrammatical?

Mr. JONES of Arkansas. Perhaps the word "is" ought to be "are."

Mr. GRAY. I do not think so. Is the Senator from Massachusetts quite right about that?

Mr. HOAR. It is a debatable question, but I think it is better as the Senator from Arkansas now leaves it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Arkansas make it "is" or "are"?

Mr. JONES of Arkansas. I think the word "is" is correct. Let it remain "is."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Arkansas.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. JONES of Arkansas. In line 15, I move to strike out "30" and insert "35;" so as to read; "35 per cent ad valorem."

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. HOAR. In my absence some days ago the Senator from Arkansas was kind enough to pass over an item in regard to spectacles, which is a manufacture largely carried on in my district. I desire to address the Senate very briefly on that matter to-morrow morning, if the Senate will take it up now and let it go over until to-morrow.

Mr. VEST. I ask the Senate to go back to paragraph 258, page 66.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the paragraph will be read.

The Secretary read the paragraph, as follows:

258. Clothing ready made, and articles of wearing apparel of every description, handkerchiefs, and neckties or neckwear, composed of cotton or other vegetable fiber, or of which cotton or other vegetable fiber is the component material of chief value, made up or manufactured wholly or in part by the tailor, seamstress, or manufacturer, all of the foregoing not specially provided for in this act, 40 per cent ad valorem.

Mr. VEST. In lines 14 and 15 I move to strike out the words "or other vegetable fiber," so as to confine it to cotton.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the adoption of the amendment?

Mr. ALDRICH. There is objection, because those words will have to be put in paragraph 275.

Mr. VEST. What words?

M. ALDRICH. The words "or other vegetable fiber. I suggest to the Senator from Missouri to leave that for the present. It will need, I think, a careful comparison of the various paragraphs to arrange it properly.

Mr. VEST. It can be passed over, but I do not think that is necessary.

Mr. ALDRICH. It will be necessary to put something in its place.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The paragraph will be passed over for the present.

Mr. HOAR. I ask consent that the Senate go back to paragraph 98, on page 19, relating to spectacles, which was passed over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Massachusetts requests that to-morrow morning the Senate shall take up the paragraph indicated. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. PEFFER. I understand that Schedule K is to be passed over until tomorrow morning. Is my understanding correct?

Mr. HARRIS. That will be the result. I will say to the Senator that it will not be taken up this evening.

Mr. PEFFER. I wish to give notice that to-morrow morning as soon as Schedule K is taken up I shall move to amend the first paragraph by inserting the provisions of the present law with relation to the duties on raw wools, excepting that the rate of duty will be decreased about 40 per cent. I shall have the figures arranged in the morning.

Mr. QUAY. I desire to announce that to-morrow when the woolen schedule is reached for consideration it is my purpose to resume the remarks on that schedule which were interrupted some four week ago.

EXECUTIVE SESSION.

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

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business. After eight minutes spent in executive session the doors were reopened, and (at 6 o'clock and 6 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until to-morrow, Tuesday, June 12, 1894, at 10 o'clock a. m.

CONFIRMATIONS.

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate June 11, 1894.

SURVEROR OF CUSTOMS.

Buchanan Schley, of Maryland, to be surveyor of customs in the district of Baltimore, in the State of Maryland..

UNITED STATES ATTORNEY.

W. Oscar Hamilton, of Texas, to be attorney of the United States for the northern district of Texas.

APPOINTMENT IN THE ARMY.

To be post chaplain.

Ruter W. Springer, of Illinois.

PROMOTIONS IN THE MARINE CORPS.

First Lieut. Randolph Dickens, United States Marine Corps, to be a captain.

Second Lieut. Cyrus S. Radford, United States Marine Corps, to be a first lieutenant.

Second Lieut. Thomas C. Treadwell, United States Marine Corps, to be a first lieutenant.

PROMOTIONS IN THE NAVY.

Passed Assistant Engineer Warner B. Bayley, to be a chief engineer.

Assistant Engineer Martin A. Anderson, to be a passed assistant engineer.

POSTMASTERS.

Samuel J. Tetley, to be postmaster at Farmington, in the county of St. Francois and State of Missouri.

William K. Spiller, to be postmaster at Bridgeport, in the county of Jackson and State of Alabama.

W. M. Dunklee, to be postmaster at Christiansburg, in the county of Montgomery and State of Virginia.

Joseph J. Wharton, to be postmaster at Morgantown, in the county of Monongalia and State of West Virginia.

James J. White, to be postmaster at Oakland, in the county of Alameda and State of California.

Nicholas C. Stanton, to be postmaster at West Liberty, in the county of Muscatine and State of Iowa.

William H. Morgan, to be postmaster at Northumberland, in the county of Northumberland and State of Pennsylvania.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

MONDAY, *June 11, 1894.*

The House met at 12 o'clock m. Prayer by Rev. EUGENE R. HENDRIX, D. D., of Kansas City, bishop of the Methodist Episcopal Church South.

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

LEAVE OF ABSENCE.

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

To Mr. ELLIS of Kentucky, indefinitely, on account of important business.

To Mr. GROSVENOR, for one week.

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

To Mr. O'NEILL of Missouri, on account of ill health.

To Mr. PAYNTER, indefinitely.

PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH OF BETHEL SPRINGS, TENN.

Mr. ENLOE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill (H. R. 725) for the relief of the trustees of the Presbyterian Church of Bethel Springs, Tenn.

The bill was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay to the trustees of the Presbyterian Church in Bethel Springs, Tenn., out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of $400, being for the use, occupation, and damage to said church by the Army of the United States during the late war.

Mr. ENLOE. I would like to have an amendment striking out the word "damage," and making the clause read "for use and occupation." I ask unanimous consent that the bill be amended in that way.

The SPEAKER. The question is first on consent to consider the bill. Is there objection?

Mr. COOMBS. Reserving the right to object, I would like to have some explanation of the bill, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. BURROWS. Mr. Speaker, this is one of the claims which arose some thirty years ago, and I think it had better be considered with other claims of that class on Friday. I object to it.

Mr. ENLOE. I will state to the gentleman from Michigan that this is a Republican church, in a Republican community. The people are all loyal there, and they vote his ticket.

Mr. BURROWS. I do not care whether it is Republican or Democratic. I do not care about their politics, one way or the other.

Mr. ENLOE. It is sufficient for the gentleman that this claim comes from a Southern State.

The SPEAKER. Objection is made.

WILLIAM A. WINDER.

Mr. BOWERS of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of a bill (H. R. 450) to restore William A. Winder to the Army, and to place him on the retired list with the rank of captain of artillery.

The bill was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the President is hereby authorized to appoint and restore to his proper rank in the Army, as captain of artillery, and to place him on the retired list, William A. Winder, of San Diego, Cal.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of this bill?

Mr. ENLOE. Let us have the regular order, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. HOOKER of Mississippi. I hope the gentleman will withdraw that demand. I want to ask unanimous consent for the consideration of a bill which has been pending for several years here.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. ENLOE] demands the regular order.

Mr. HOOKER of Mississippi. I hope the gentleman will withdraw that demand.

Mr. ENLOE. If I can not have a bill considered by unanimous consent once during a session, no other man shall.

Mr. HOOKER of Mississippi. I have not had a bill considered in that way in three years.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE.

A message from the Senate, by Mr. PLATT, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the House to the bill (S. 1950) to authorize the Pennsylvania and New Jersey Railroad Companies, or either of them, to construct and maintain a bridge over the Delaware River between the States of New Jersey and Pennsylvania.

The message also announced that the Senate had passsd with amendment the bill (H. R. 5778) to supply a deficiency in the grant of public lands to the State of Mississippi for the use of the State University; in which the concurrence of the House was requested.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed without amendment bills of the following titles:

A bill (H. R. 2710) for the relief of Edward Morrison and Nellie Morrison, now deceased; and

A bill (H. R. 6126) to amend an act to authorize construction of a bridge at Burlington, Iowa, approved August 6, 1888, and amended by act approved February 21, 1890.

The message further announced that the Senate had passed bills of the following titles; in which the concurrence of the House was requestsd:

A bill (S. 210) for the relief of Wetmore & Brother, of St. Louis, Mo.;

A bill (S. 544) to reclassify and prescribe the salaries of railway postal clerks; and

A bill (S. 1301) for the relief of the legal representatives of Hiram Somerville.

PRESIDENTS' MESSAGES, PROCLAMATIONS, ETC.

Mr. RICHARDSON of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I desire to present a privileged report from the Committee on Printing.

The report was read, as follows:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, *April 3, 1894.*

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That there be printed and bound in cloth 3,000 copies of the complete compilation of all the annual, special, and veto messages, proclamations, and inaugural addresses of the Presidents of the United States from 1789 to 1894 inclusive; 800 copies for the use of the Senate and 2,000 copies for the use of the House. The work shall be prepared under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing.

The committee have considered the concurrent resolution introduced by Mr. BAILEY, of Texas, into the House of Representatives on April 3, 1894, which was referred to this committee, and which provided for the printing and binding in cloth of 3,000 copies of the compilation of all the annual, special, and veto messages, proclamations, and inaugural addresses of the Presidents of the United States from 1789 to 1894 inclusive, and direct me to report the same with the recommendation that it do pass.

The committee are of the opinion that these various public documents consolidated into one publication will be of great historic value. They do not exist in such form. It is almost impossible to refer to them in their present form of publication. The demand for such a publication as a public document as is contemplated by the resolution is so obvious and manifest no argument need be adduced therefor by the committee.

The compilation provides very properly that the work shall be prepared and printed under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing of the two Houses of Congress.

Mr. HEPBURN. Mr. Speaker, is that resolution open to amendment?

The SPEAKER. It is.

Mr. HEPBURN. Then I move to strike out "3,000," and insert "10,000." It seems to me that in the case of a publication of such importance an edition of 10,000 would not be at all too large. I know of no publication which would be of more general interest. Three thousand copies would hardly be enough for the public libraries of this country, to say nothing about private libraries.

Mr. RICHARDSON of Tennessee. This is a valuable publication, and if the gentleman will move an amendment to make the number 6,000, 2,000 for the Senate and 4,000 for the House, I will not object.

Mr. HEPBURN. Very well; I move that amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The resolution as amended was adopted.

REPORT OF BUREAU OF ETHNOLOGY.

Mr. RICHARDSON of Tennessee. I desire to report from the Committee on Printing a resolution for printing the annual report of the Director of the Bureau of Ethnology. The printing of this document has not yet been ordered, although it is provided for in the printing bill passed by the House.

The resolution was read, as follows:

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That there be printed at the Government Printing Office 8,000 copies each of the thirteenth and fourteenth annual reports of the Director of the Bureau of Ethnology, with accompanying papers and illustrations, and uniform with the preceding volumes of the series, of which 1,000 shall be for the use of the Senate, 2,000 for the use of the House of Representatives, and 5,000 for distribution by the Bureau of Ethnology.

The report was read, stating the estimated cost of the printing at $12,000, and recommending an amendment striking out such of the resolution as provides for the printing of the thirteenth annual report, the same having been already ordered.

The amendment of the committee to strike out after "8,000 copies" the word "each," and to strike out before the word "fourteen" the words "thirteen and," was agreed to.

The resolution as amended was adopted.

The committees were called for reports, and no reports were presented.

ORDER OF BUSINESS.

Mr. HEARD. This being District day, I desire to call up a bill now on the Calendar, reported from that committee——

Mr. HOLMAN. I rise to a parliamentary inquiry. This being District day, will it be necessary to postpone each of the bills which may be presented by the District Committee before it will be in order to move to go into Committee of the Whole for the consideration of appropriation bills?

The SPEAKER. Under the practice that would be necessary. This day being assigned to the Committee on the District of Columbia, that committee may call up any matter of District business which is on the Calendar, but upon each bill as called up the question of consideration may be raised.

POLICE FUND OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA.

Mr. HEARD. I desire to call up for consideration the bill (H. R. 7238) making permanent provision for the police fund of the District of Columbia.

Mr. HEPBURN. I rise to a parliamentary inquiry. Two weeks ago, when we were engaged in the consideration of District business, we had a bill pending when the House adjourned. I wish to inquire whether the regular order does not require the taking up of that bill now.

Mr. COOMBS. The gentleman refers to a bill with reference to a suburban railroad?

Mr. HEPBURN. Yes, sir.

Mr. HEARD. According to my understanding of what has been the uniform practice, it is optional with the committee what bill on the Calendar they shall call up for consideration.

Mr. HEPBURN. But the House was engaged in the consideration of that bill.

Mr. HEARD. I understand that; but on the same day the House had under consideration another bill which was laid over for want of a quorum. So that, as far as that matter is concerned, the question would be as to which one of those bills would have precedence; I suppose it would be held that the bill first laid aside and with which the House had farthest progressed would take precedence.

Mr. COOMBS. But I suggest to the gentleman that the bill to which he now refers was withdrawn from the consideration of the House.

Mr. HEARD. Only temporarily.

The SPEAKER. The rule provides that—

The second and fourth Mondays in each month shall, when claimed by the Committee on the District of Columbia, be set apart for the consideration of such business as may be presented by said committee.

Mr. HEARD. The bill which I now call up will not, I think, receive one adverse vote in the House. The bill to which the gentleman from Iowa has referred will probably be contested; it may be passed or may be defeated. The bill I now call up demands immediate action. It provides for replenishing the police fund of this District which, as the Chief of Police informs us will, without this provision, be entirely depleted within a month. The immediate necessity for action on this bill and the fact that it will, as I assume, meet with no opposition is the reason I propose bringing it first to the attention of the House.

Mr. HEPBURN. Is it your intention to call up afterward the bill that we were considering the other day?

Mr. HEARD. In perfect candor I will say to the gentleman that upon consultation with the committee it is my purpose to call up after this bill is disposed of, a bill drawn by the Commissioners and approved by the committee, to provide for the extension of the Georgetown cable road to a point opposite the Aqueduct bridge, a measure which we believe will meet with no opposition, and then to revert to those bills which have heretofore been considered and left undisposed of.

I was about to appeal to the House, in view of the importance of this measure, that we may have order while the bill is being read, and the report of the committee. The report of the committee is practically the report made by the Chief of Police, Maj. Moore, covering all of the facts in connection with the matter.

Mr. DINGLEY. Should not this bill be considered in Committee of the Whole?

The SPEAKER. The bill is on the Union Calendar.

Mr. HEARD. It is on the Union Calendar, and, if the point of order is made, it would have to be considered there. I would ask, however, unanimous consent that it be considered in the House.

Mr. DINGLEY. I desire to make some observations on an opinion recently given by the attorney of the District Commissioners, and if I can have an opportunity for that I shall not object to the request of the gentleman.

Mr. HEARD. It will afford me pleasure to extend every facility that the gentleman from Maine may desire in the way of discussion.

Mr. DINGLEY. Then I have no objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri to consider this bill in the House as in Committee of the Whole?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will read the bill.

The bill was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Commissioners of the District of Columbia shall hereafter, beginning July 1, 1894, set aside and retain each fiscal year $30,000, or so much thereof as may be necessary, of the moneys received for municipal licenses issued for the sale of intoxicating liquors in said District, and deposit the same with the Treasurer of the United States to the credit of the police fund, and apply the same, as far as may be necessary, to carry out the provisions of "An act making appropriations to provide for the expenses of the government of the District of Columbia for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1886, and for other purposes," approved February 25, 1885, for the relief of any policeman who, by injury received or disease contracted in the line of duty, or, having served not less than fifteen years, shall become so permanently disabled as to be discharged from service therefor, and in case of his death from such injury or disease, leaving a widow or children under 16 years of age, for their relief: *Provided*, That such relief shall not exceed for any one policeman or his family the sum of $50 per month, and shall not be paid to a widow who remarries; and a sum not exceeding $75 may be allowed from said fund to defray the funeral expenses of any policeman dying in the service of the District.

Mr. HEARD. I desire to have the report of the committee read, as it states the case more fully and completely than I could do it myself.

The report (by Mr. HEARD) was read, as follows:

The Committee on the District of Columbia, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. 7238), making permanent provision for the police fund in the District of Columbia, having examined and considered the same, report it back to the House and recommend that it do pass.

Your committee respectfully submit herewith a statement by Maj. W. G. Moore, superintendent Metropolitan police, which fully explains the propriety and necessity for the enactment of such legislation as is proposed in this bill, together with interesting and valued information bearing on this subject. Also the report of the Commissioners of the District of Columbia recommending said bill.

HEADQUARTERS METROPOLITAN POLICE,
DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA,
Washington, April 23, 1894.

SIR: The police pension fund will be depleted another month, and thereafter it will be a question as to how 19 disabled policemen, 30 widows, and 28 children will derive a livelihood. The persons enumerated have been a charge upon the fund at a monthly expenditure of $1,685. The nucleus of the fund on which they have been dependent was created by act of Congress, August 6, 1861. This provision reads as follows:

"All fines imposed by the board of police upon members of the police force, by way of discipline, and collectable from pay or salary, and all rewards, fees, proceeds of gifts, and emoluments that may be paid and given for extraordinary services of any member of the police force, except when allowed to be retained by such member, shall be paid to the treasurer of the board of police, unless otherwise appropriated by the board," and, with "all moneys arising from the sale of unclaimed goods shall constitute the 'policeman's fund.'"

The board of police was made the trustee of this fund, and empowered to invest it as they should see fit. The same law provided that "whenever any member of the police force, in the actual discharge of his duty, shall become actually disabled, his necessary expenses, during the time of such disability, on the certificate of a competent surgeon, stating the manner, cause, and condition of the injury, and approved by the board of police, may become a charge upon the policeman's fund; but the board may discontinue such allowance for any satisfactory reason."

This law being incomplete in that it made no allowance for officers who might be discharged on account of permanent disability incurred in the line of duty, the following provision was incorporated into the act making appropriations for the expenses of the District of Columbia for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1890, and approved February 25, 1885:

"That hereafter the Commissioners shall deduct $1 each month from the pay of each policeman, which sum so deducted shall be added to and form a part of the present police fund, to be invested in the United States or District bonds by the Treasurer of the United States, and be held by him subject to the drafts of the Commissioners for expenditures made in pursuance of law, and such expenditures shall be accounted for as required by law for other expenditures of the District; and said police fund shall be used for the relief of any policeman who, by injury received or disease contracted in line of duty, or having served not less than fifteen years, shall become so permanently disabled as to be discharged from service therefor; and in case of his death from such injury or disease, leaving a widow or children under 16 years, for their relief; *Provided further*, That such relief shall not exceed for any one policeman or his family the sum of $50 per month; and a sum not exceeding $75 may be allowed from said fund to defray the funeral expenses of any policeman dying in the service of the District."

At the time of the passage of this law, which became immediately operative, a large number of policemen who had been on the force from the time of its organization in 1861 were eligible to retirement under its provisions. Up to that time the Department had been in existence twenty-four years. Since the law became operative ninety-one allowances have been made upon the recommendation of an impartial board, composed of the captain of police, two lieutenants, and the attending surgeon of police. These allowances range from the maximum of $50 to the minimum of $10 per month, as provided by law, and an examination of the papers submitted to the accounting officers of the Treasury in each case will reveal the fact that the highest pension was given only to those by whom it had been justly earned. Physical condition, cause of disability, length and kind of service were taken into consideration, the evidence of the police surgeon who attended the applicant during his active career or at the time his disability occurred furnishing the principal basis for the award.

In the eight years which have elapsed since the law went into effect but 19 policemen have been granted the maximum of $50, while 1 has been allowed $40, 4 $30, and 5 $25 per month. Some of these have died. One widow has been given $30, 3 $25, and 26 $20 per month; 32 dependent children have been awarded $10 a month until they should reach the age of 16 years.

Under the law approved February 25, 1885, the report of the Treasurer of the United States shows that the Commissioners had in their charge, under the original act of 1861, a total cash fund of $27,469.10, which was turned over to the Treasurer of the United States, the *ex-officio* Commissioner; and the same report, the first year after the Treasurer became the custodian of this fund, shows that the sum paid for the benefit of policemen amounted to $2,534.48, and each succeeding year from that time shows increasing demands upon the fund, until in 1893 the sum of $19,420 was required to sustain those dependent upon it, an increase of over 666 per cent in eight years. It must be remembered that during the period covered the Metropolitan police force was increased from a total of 267 men to 449, and the dollar apiece required to be paid by each member of the force each month, together with about $100 from fines and rewards turned in to the fund, would be far from adequate to keep up the monthly expenditure even at its present rate of $1,685 per month.

Therefore I have to urge, as one of the most important questions that now concern this Department, that Congress make immediate provision to care for those who have been heretofore dependent upon the pension fund and those who may be dependent hereafter. This matter has been considered in all its phases, and I am fully convinced, as I have already expressed myself to and urged upon the members of this committee, that the best means to provide for this emergency, and for ensuing years, is to set aside from year to year, from sums paid the District of Columbia as excise or liquor-license fees, a sum sufficient to meet such demands.

As to the amount required, I have the honor to invite your attention to my letter addressed to the Commissioners of the District of Columbia under date of October 21, 1893, wherein I asked "that the sum of $3,951.88 be included in the deficiency estimate for the ensuing fiscal year, to enable this Department to continue in effect the provisions of police-relief act of Congress approved February 25, 1885," and stated that "the current rate of expenditure is about $1,710 per month, and will be $20,520 for the year, leaving a deficiency, provided there are no further retirements and funeral expenses to defray, of $3,951.88." For the support of those now dependents, and at the same rate and under the usual conditions of retirements and funeral expenses, there would be required for the fiscal year 1895, $24,463.20.

In this connection I have to state that the police pension fund has become a permanent feature in the police institutions throughout the United States. No city, in fact, has a well-regulated police organization without a fund of some kind from which to provide for the relief of its sick or disabled policemen, or their widows and orphans. These funds are maintained in various ways. In New York City, on the 1st of January, 1891, the largest proportion of the fund was derived from excise money paid over by the comptroller, it amounting to $234,277.50, the amount disbursed being $487,927.99, making provision for 1 inspector, 16 captains, 58 sergeants, 9 roundsmen, 511 patrolmen, 25 doormen, 7 detectives, 2 surgeons, 350 widows, 58 orphans—in all 1,037.

In Brooklyn the fund for 1892 amounted to $157,304.43, of which $78,590, or 20 per cent, was derived from excise fees.

In the city of Boston legislative enactment requires compulsory retirement at the age of 65 on one-half pay. The payment on account of pensions during the year 1892 was $61,085.31, and the board of police of that city estimated that $69,500 would be required for the purpose in 1894.

I have the honor to be, very respectfully, yours,

W. G. MOORE,
Major and Superintendent Metropolitan Police.

Hon. JOHN T. HEARD,
House of Representatives.

OFFICE COMMISSIONERS OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA,
Washington, June 1, 1894.

DEAR SIR: The Commissioners of the District of Columbia recommend favorable action upon the bill (H. R. 7238) "making permanent provision for the police fund of the District of Columbia," which was referred to them at your instance for their views thereon.

Very respectfully,

JOHN W. ROSS,
President Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia.

Hon. JOHN T. HEARD,
Chairman Committee on the District of Columbia.

Mr. HEARD. All I desire to say, Mr. Speaker, in addition to what is set forth in the report is this: A fund was created—a police pension fund—for the benefit of disabled or superannuated policemen in 1861. This was added to in 1886 by the addition of a certain amount deducted from the pay of the members of the police force. This fund now is grossly inadequate, and the proposition is to add $30,000 a year, or so much as may be necessary, from moneys received from liquor licenses in the District. That is all the bill contemplates. It is recommended by the Commissioners of the District and unanimously by the Committee on the District of Columbia.

I yield to the gentleman from Maine so much time as he desires.

Mr. DINGLEY. Mr. Speaker, I understand the pending bill provides to set apart $30,000 per annum of the receipts from the excise taxes for the purpose of increasing the fund for the benefit of the disabled or superannuated policemen in the District of Columbia. This is a civil-service pension.

It appears that in 1861 certain fines that had been imposed on policemen, and also the proceeds of certain unclaimed property, were set apart as a police pension fund——

Mr. HEARD. That is right.

Mr. DINGLEY (continuing). For the benefit of such policemen as might become disabled or superannuated. Now, it is proposed to add to this fund a sum of money to be taken from the ordinary sources of taxation in the District.

Mr. HEARD. Let me say to the gentleman that again in 1886 this fund was increased by deducting $1 per month from the pay of each policeman and adding it to said fund.

Mr. DINGLEY. In 1886, as the gentleman says, a deduction of $1 per month from the pay of each policeman was authorized to increase this fund.

Mr. HEARD. Which is now found to be exhausted.

Mr. DINGLEY. That is to say, this pension fund has been a fund which came from certain fines, and from the payment by the police force themselves from their salaries, which is entirely proper, but it is now proposed to divert the receipts or revenues derived from taxation to increase the fund some $30,000 a year. I desire simply to call attention to the fact that this bill is the beginning of a civil-pension policy.

Mr. HEARD. I will state to the gentleman that if he will refer to the report accompanying this bill he will find that in New York, Brooklyn, and Boston this fund is taken largely from the proceeds of the excise taxes.

Mr. DINGLEY. It is well to take into consideration, in considering this bill, the question of policy whether or not we propose to begin the establishment of a civil-service pension under the Government; for when we set apart $30,000 at this time, probably twice that sum will be needed within a year or two, and by and by we will have the system thoroughly established, and it will begin to extend itself to other departments.

But what I rose particularly to call attention to was, since we are on the subject of excise taxes, as to whether the chairman of the Committee of the District of Columbia has any information that the attorney of the District Commissioners has recently given an opinion that a simple application for a license, while it continues as an application, and has not been rejected by the Commissioners, is a license within the meaning of the act of March 3, 1893, which prohibited the licensing of persons to sell liquor within 400 rods of a church or schoolhouse, but provided in an amendatory act that those dealers who were licensed at the time the act passed would be exempted from its provisions.

It is stated in the daily papers that the attorney of the District Commissioners has delivered an opinion that it does not require an actual existing paper license at the time, but if the application is pending it is held to be a license within the meaning of the act of Mareh 3, 1893, and the act amendatory thereof.

Mr. HEARD. Replying to the inquiry of my friend from Maine, I will say that I have no information on the subject except what I have derived from my conversation with him a day or two ago when he directed a similar inquiry to me. I have not seen any notice of such decision in the city papers.

I will say, Mr. Speaker, if there has been any publication of that kind it has escaped my notice.

Mr. DINGLEY. I noticed the opinion published at length in the Evening Star of this city.

Mr. HEARD. If that publication gives the opinion correctly, and as now stated by the gentleman from Maine, it seems to me an extraordinary opinion, that the filing of an application for a license is equivalent to the granting of a license!

Mr. DINGLEY. That is, during the time that it has not actually been rejected by the Commissioners.

Mr. HEARD. I will say, however, that I have no information on that point. I have not even seen the publication to which the gentleman from Maine refers.

Mr. DINGLEY. The opinion was published in the Evening Star, and is to the effect that I have stated, and I agree entirely with the chairman of the committee that it is a most extraordinary opinion. It practically overrides the provisions of the act of March 3, 1893, which prohibited licenses for the sale of intoxicating liquors within 400 feet of a church or schoolhouse, with certains exceptions made by an amendatory act as to those then licensed.

It is in effect an overriding of the act of March 3, 1893, and I desire simply to call the attention of the District Committee to this extraordinary attempt of the attorney of the District Commissioners to override in this manner an act of Congress. If there is any intention on the part of the District Commissioners to act under the opinion rendered by their attorney, it is extremely desirable that some amendatory act should be immediately reported by the committee in order to make clear what Congress intended by the act of March, 1893.

Mr. HOLMAN. Will the gentleman from Maine state the effect of that act of 1893?

Mr. DINGLEY. The act of March 3, 1893, according to my recollection—I have not the act before me—prohibited the granting of licenses to liquor saloons within 400 feet of a schoolhouse or a church. There was subsequently an amendatory act passed, which excepted from the operation of that prohibitory provision those establishments that were licensed at the time the act went into effect.

Now, under that provision, designed to relieve four or five parties, as I understand, the attorney of the District Commissioners, according to a publication in the daily Star of this city, has given an opinion that any liquor seller who had an application pending for a license at that time, notwithstanding the application was rejected subsequently, but not rejected until after the passage of the act of March 3, 1893, was, within the meaning of the act of March, 1893, and the act amendatory thereof, licensed, and therefore that he may continue to be licensed, although carrying on his trade within 400 feet of a church or schoolhouse.

Mr. HEARD. I will suggest that if that is a correct statement of the opinion of the attorney, it would seem to me in substance that it establishes the fact that the only man outraged was the man whose license was rejected, for those who were licensed stood on the same ground only as those whose applications were not considered.

Mr. DINGLEY. It is an outrage that ought not to be permitted to go on.

Mr. HEARD. I think that if on investigation it be found that such opinion has been rendered, the law to which it refers ought to be amended.

Mr. DINGLEY. But what purports to be the opinion of the attorney for the Commissioners has been published.

Mr. HEARD. There may be a mistake about it, and I hope there is, but if the published statement correctly sets forth the opinion it occurs to me the gentleman is right in suggesting that the law may need some further amendment.

Mr. DINGLEY. I merely desire to call the attention of the committee to this attempt to override a deliberate enactment of Congress in the interest of these men conducting business illegally within 400 feet of a church or schoolhouse. I have nothing further to say.

Mr. HEARD. I yield to the gentleman from New York [Mr. COOMBS].

Mr. COOMBS. This bill is in the line of the practice of a great many cities, of contributing from the license fund toward the police pension fund.

Mr. HEARD. I will say in furtherance of the statement just made by the gentleman, that in Brooklyn in 1892 the fund amounted to $157,000 in round numbers, of which $78,000, or about one-half, was derived from excise fees, the same as proposed in this case.

Mr. REED. Will the gentleman from Missouri allow me?

Mr. COOMBS. I can not yield the floor.

Mr. HEARD. I will yield to the gentleman from Maine later.

Mr. COOMBS. There is a very general feeling at this time that it will be wise to do away with this way of providing funds for that purpose. It is beginning to be looked upon as an unwise thing to connect the police as beneficiaries with the question of licenses.

It is a part of the duty of the police to see that laws governing licenses are not violated. The plan now proposed for Washinton, and now in use in several cities, creates a relation between the two that is believed by many to be prejudicial to good order. I make that point against the bill, Mr. Speaker; and I make the further point that it is an unwise thing to divert any revenues before they are actually paid into the Treasury. This bill proposes to give the police commissioners, who collects these funds, the right to divert $30,000 before it goes into the public Treasury.

Mr. WILSON of Washington. How much does this entire fund amount to?

Mr. COOMBS. I do not know. I believe in a police pension fund; I believe in having a fund that will warrant men in taking risks when risk is necessary, but I do not believe that the fund ought to be diverted out of any money collected from taxes of any kind until that fund is converted into the Treasury. There should be no indirect appropriations; it opens the doors to unlimited abuses.

I think that the chairman of this committee will agree with me that that is good Democratic doctrine. I am sorry that I can not vote for the bill, but I shall not for these two reasons: First, it is unwise to connect the police as beneficiaries with the license fund. It brings them into a relationship with the liquor dealers which is not wise, proper, or in the interest of public order. In the second place, I think it is unwise to divert any funds before they go into the Treasury. Let the fund be paid into the Treasury and then let a regular appropriation be made if it is necessary, and I will vote for it.

Mr. COX. Will the gentleman allow me one moment?

Mr. COOMBS. Certainly.

Mr. COX. Does not this question presented here involve this point in its practical application? You collect from the whisky dealer an amount of money assessed, and then you take that fund and make it a kind of trust fund for the benefit of policemen.

Mr. COOMBS. Yes; before you pay it into the Treasury.

Mr. COX. Wait a moment. I am not talking about that. Now, where is the authority to take the fund that the licensed dealer pays and appropriate it as a fund for retired policemen?

Mr. HEARD. I will say that there is no authority except it be given by this bill.

Mr. COX. When you take this fund, collected from the licensed dealer, and appropriate it in that way, do not you make the Government of the United States pay half of it? I ask you that question.

Mr. HEARD. You just appropriate that much of the collection.

Mr. COX. That results in the Government of the United States paying half of it.

Mr. HEARD. I suppose it is like any other payments. I say that the practice and the effect would be that the amount collected by the District and appropriated to this use would lessen the amount if put into the Treasury.

Mr. COX. Precisely; so that the effect is the same as if you appropriated any money out of the Treasury of the United States to pay these pensions.

Mr. HOLMAN. To pay civil pensions.

Mr. COX. That is just what it is.

Mr. HEARD. Let me say to the gentleman——

Mr. COX. Let me state that with my understanding of the bill this will be a diversion of the funds that now go into the Treasury, and which make up that which the District has collected, and one-half of the expense will have to be paid by the General Government.

Mr. HEARD. Precisely.

Mr. COX. That is what I understand to be the case.

Mr. CANNON of Illinois. But, if the gentleman will pardon me, this pension fund, as I understand it, is to come out of the District revenues?

Mr. COX. No, no; it does not.

Mr. HEARD. I think, upon reflection, that the gentleman from Illinois is right, that the United States Government is obligated to appropriate only as much from the Federal Treasury as is contributed by the District for the current expenses. I did not clearly understand the position of the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. COX. Well.

Mr. HEARD. Now, this fund comes out of the money collected in the District, and it would not go into the Treasury for current expenses. The amount which the General Government would have to contribute, being equal to that furnished by the District, would, therefore, be less by that amount; and therefore we would not appropriate so much by that amount.

Mr. COX. Pardon me. Let us get down to it practically. Suppose the amount paid for the license by the licensed dealers amounts to $30,000. Suppose you take that $30,000 and pay it to the policemen under this regulation. Of course the revenues of the District would be that much less, and the Government of the United States would lose its half of that $30,000, which would require an assessment on it for the half.

Mr. HEARD. Now, the gentleman has asked me a question and I will answer him.

Mr. COX. That is what I want.

Mr. HEARD. I think the gentleman is wrong, for this reason. Suppose, for instance, you raise $2,030,000 in the District; then, under the act of 1878, the Federal Treasury would have to appropriate two millions and thirty thousand. Now, if the thirty thousand is diverted to this use without going into the Treasury, then it does not increase by a dollar the amount the Government has to contribute, but will lessen it, because then the Government will have to contribute only two millions in order to offset the two millions contributed by the District.

Mr. COX. Does not that diminish the amount of the fund?

Mr. HEARD. It diminishes the amount in the District fund. I think the gentleman is wrong in this. It does not increase the amount the Government contributes, because the limit of the Government contribution is the amount contributed by the District to the general fund. Therefore, if the District puts $2,000,000 into the District fund we have got to put into that fund just an equal amount, but we have not to put in anything for the $30,000 that has been diverted for this particular purpose.

Mr. COX. Suppose, now, that the District of Columbia diverts $30,000 of the two million and thirty thousand dollars; after that has been diverted, then, when the expenses of the District of Columbia require so much money and an assessment is made on the property of the District to raise it, does not the Government have to bear its share of that?

Mr. HEARD. The effect of that would be to lessen the amount that the Government would contribute by just the amount which was diverted to this purpose.

Mr. COX. If that is so, you had better appropriate it all.

Mr. HEARD. Mr. Speaker, the point is clear, I think, to most of the gentlemen who have heard this dialogue that the amount which the Government, under our present compact, has to put in, is the exact amount which the District contributes, and if you lessen the amount which the District puts in from taxation, you do not increase, but on the contrary, you lessen the amount which the Government has to put in. Now, if you take $30,000 of the taxes collected in the District and divert it for this purpose, that makes $30,000 less that the Government has to put in to equal what the District puts in.

Mr. COX. So your argument means this, that if the District of Columbia raises $2,000,000 by assessment the Government must meet that with two millions on its part?

Mr. HEARD. That is correct.

Mr. COBB of Alabama. The gentleman from Tennessee does not state the case correctly. The Government of the United States does not contribute an amount equal to the amount which is assessed upon the District. There is the point where he falls into error. There is a large amount over and above the amount which is expended on the District expenses which remains in the District treasury.

Mr. HEARD. But the amount contributed by the Government is equal to the amount contributed by the District for the same purpose.

Mr. COBB of Alabama. That is correct.

Mr. COX. That is my proposition.

Mr. COBB of Alabama. But the argument of the gentleman from Tennessee is based upon the idea that the Government of the United States contributes dollar for dollar the amount that is raised by taxation in the District; which is not the fact. The District of Columbia raises a certain amount of money by taxation and appropriates, out of the sum so raised, the amount which is required to pay the current expenses of the District, or rather half the current expenses.

Mr. COX. Who pays the other half?

Mr. COBB of Alabama. The Government of the United States pays the other half of the current expenses of the District. Now, it is perfectly plain that if an amount of money is collected from the taxpayers of the District which never goes into the Treasury, that amount of money will not have to be duplicated by the Government of the United States. The Government will not have to pay a dollar of it. It is just so much money over and above the current expenses of the District, and the Government has nothing whatever to do with it. It is only the money that is appropriated out of the Treasury for the current expenses of the District that the Government of the United States has to meet by contributing a like amount.

Mr. COX. Now, I have listened with great patience to the gentleman, and I ask him to yield to me a moment.

Mr. COOMBS. I will yield to the gentleman for a moment, for I believe I still have the floor. [Laughter.]

Mr. COX. I understand the point to be that if the government of the District of Columbia makes an assessment for a certain purpose, and that money does not go into the Treasury of the United States, then the Government of the United States is not called upon to pay a corresponding amount?

Mr. HEARD. That is correct.

Mr. COX. Then the gentleman's argument is that this $30,000 is paid by the District?

Mr. HEARD. Certainly.

Mr. COX. That it is an extra amount which is paid by the District of Columbia, and that the Government does not have to pay a corresponding amount?

Mr. HEARD. That is correct.

Mr. COX. Now, do not you gentlemen see at once that if that $30,000 was paid into the Treasury of the United States for the District of Columbia it would reduce the amount that the Government would have to pay toward the expenses of the District?

Mr. HEARD. No, sir; on the contrary, it would add to it.

Mr. COX. The gentleman has not met my point yet.

Mr. HEARD. I think I have.

Mr. COX. Suppose out of $150,000 of taxation raised by the District, $30,000 obtained as license tax is taken out; that reduces the District fund to $120,000, so that the Government of the United States has to meet by taxation only that amount.

Mr. HEARD. That is right.

Mr. COX. Now take your $30,000 and put it over into the District account and compare it with your expense account, and you will see the effect.

Mr. HEARD. I ask my friend to wait a moment and listen to my answer to that point. I stated in the first place, and I think it was generally understood, that the amount which the Government of the United States has to contribute to the current expenses of the District is limited to the amount contributed by the District treasury; the Government's contribution must simply be equal to that. When, therefore, you reduce the amount contributed to the District treasury, you lessen the contribution of the Government instead of adding to it. If there were an obligation resting on the Government to make up to the District treasury any deficit which might arise after this joint contribution, the gentleman would be right; but there is no such agreement; the limit of what the Government contributes is the amount contributed by the District for current expenses. Therefore, when this District fund is reduced $30,000 we thereby lessen to that extent the contribution of the Government instead of adding to it.

Mr. COX. I am sorry we do not agree on this point.

Mr. COBB of Alabama. Now, if the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. COX] will give me his attention——

Mr. COX. With pleasure.

Mr. COBB of Alabama. I will give him a little information as to how the moneys of the District are distributed or paid out.

Mr. COX. I think I can see how this proposition will work.

Mr. COBB of Alabama. In this connection, I think I can show to the gentleman from New York [Mr. COOMBS] the reason why in this case there is some propriety in diverting this fund before it reaches the public Treasury, although I agree in the main with the principle on which the gentleman's proposition rests.

An assessment of a certain percentage is made by way of tax on the citizens of the District of Columbia, and in that way a certain amount of money is raised which goes into the Treasury. It is no part of the law that the Government of the United States is to expend an amount equal to the amount which the taxpayers of the District have paid into the Treasury, and there is the gentleman's error. The only money which the Government of the United States pays is an amount equal to the amount required to be expended for public purposes in the District—not the amount collected from the taxpayers. Does not the gentleman see the distinction?

Here is, we will suppose, $3,000,000 collected from the taxpayers of the District, which goes into the public Treasury. The, amount needed to be expended in the city for public purposes is—we will suppose, $5,000,000, of which the amount paid by the District is two millions and a half, and the amount paid by the Government two millions and a half, leaving in the Treasury $500,000 collected from the taxpayers. This balance remains there for any proper expenditure that may be made under any act of Congress.

Now, here is a proposition to pay $30,000 for a specific purpose. The proposition is that the taxpayers of the District shall pay this; that the Government of the United States shall pay none of it. If this amount, $30,000, should be deposited in the Treasury and should be considered a part of the regular expenditures for District purposes, then the Government of the United States would have to pay the same amount, because the agreement by law is that the Government of the United States shall pay half of the current expenses of the District. But it is quite evident that this is an extra fund, not going into the public Treasury, not used for ordinary District purposes; and the Government of the United States will not have to pay a dollar on account of this amount raised from the citizens. This fund of $30,000, collected in a certain way and used for a certain purpose, is something outside of the ordinary expenditures of the District, and with this outside expenditure the Government of the United States has nothing to do.

Mr. GROUT. In fact the Government gains by it.

Mr. COBB of Alabama. Yes; the Government gains by it. If this money going into the Treasury were considered an ordinary District expenditure, the Government of the United States would have to appropriate an equal amount; but the proposition of this bill is to take this proposition out of that category, to make it a separate fund for a specific purpose; and the District taxpayers alone contribute to this fund. It seems to me this proposition is too plain for argument.

Mr. DINGLEY. I wish to ask the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. COBB] whether the Congress of the United States is not bound to exercise the same discretion and care in making these appropriations out of the District funds that it would in making an appropriation from the United States Treasury? Is not the objection primarily here to initiating the policy of civil pensions to be paid by taxation, no matter whether the funds come from the people of the District or the people of the country at large? The principle is one which seems to me exceedingly unwise.

Mr. COBB of Alabama. Very well, I shall not take issue with the gentleman on that point. I am not talking about the underlying principle, but simply endeavoring to state what this proposition is.

My proposition would be, or rather I would prefer the proposition, to let all money go into the public Treasury and let the Government of the United States pay its part in any proper expenditure, considering it as a part of the regular District expenditures. I think that would be better; but the members seem to prefer the bill in the other form.

Mr. DINGLEY. If it is to be done at all, it certainly should be done in that way.

Mr. COBB of Alabama. I say I would prefer that myself; but the proposition comes here in a different shape, and seems to be acceptable, or to meet favor with the members as to how this particular fund should be paid, that is, by the taxpayers of the District alone. If that principle is to prevail this bill carries it out and the Government of the United States is not called upon to pay a dollar. I am simply trying to get my friend from Tennessee to understand that point. I am not defending the principle on which the bill rests.

Mr. HOLMAN. I hope the gentleman from New York will yield to me for a few moments.

Mr. COOMBS. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. HOLMAN. I simply rise for the purpose of calling attention to the fact that this discussion is, after all, a mere abstraction. The United States Government has to carry on the District government, and this proposed pension system of the District police is simply a diversion of a certain amount from the sum raised by taxation for a specific object; but the burden, after all, of deficiencies falls on the Federal system.

But I rose mainly to call attention to a fact that was mentioned on the floor a few years ago when the subject of the civil pension list was under consideration. The fact was stated—I have not looked over the journals of the proceedings of the Convention, which framed the Constitution of the United States, to see for myself if it was correct or not—but it was stated that during the sittings of that constitutional Convention, some gentleman, possibly Robert Morris, proposed a provision prohibiting Congress from creating a civil pension list, a subject with which the men of that period were well acquainted. One of the causes of the hostility to the British system of government at that time was the extraordinary expenditure induced by the civil pension list, which was impoverishing that country; and very naturally a proposition was made to incorporate into the Federal Constitution, a provision against granting pensions for any civil service whtaever.

Mr. COX. They were right there.

Mr. HOLMAN. John Rutledge or Ben. Franklin, I am not sure by which member of the Convention it was, said that the provision was unnecessary; that with the experience of European governments before the American people and which would be always before the American people, if they should ever reach that condition of affairs that they were willing to tax themselves—the whole people—to pay pensions for civil services rendered by the few, with sufficient salaries, the spirit of liberty and of equal rights would have so completely died out that no constitutional provision against special privileges would be of any avail.

For one I protest against entering upon or extending that policy. I admit that we did take a step in that direction some years ago in relation to the Federal judiciary at a time when the subject could not receive proper consideration. It was during the period of reconstruction. But I implore the House not to go beyond that. It is discouraging to the friends of free institutions that Federal judges and army and navy officers, after a comparatively brief public service, with ample salaries, are retired to private life with pensions enormously exceeding the pensions you pay to men disabled in the conflicts of arms. Gradually the favoritism of classes common to all monarchies is creeping into our system of government. For one, while deploring the favoritism to classes already expressed in our legislation, I protest against going a tithe of a hair further.

I have always favored liberal pensions for patriotic services in war, in the Army or Navy. No one can doubt the justice of this policy, but I protest against the granting of civil pensions. I denounce a civil pension list as un-American. It is easy to see how such a system, if once inaugurated, will grow and expand until in the progress of time it shall have impoverished the masses of our people for the benefit of the few. I enter my protest against a civil pension list as not only un-American, but as a most unmanly and discreditable imitation of the ideas of monarchies of Europe, from which our fathers hoped they had forever emancipated our country.

Mr. COOMBS. I yield a few moments to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. COX].

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, the proposition that I have been discussing lies in this direction. If you take $30,000 (and I use that sum merely as an illustration of the revenues of the District) and appropriate it for this special purpose, to say the very least of it, you will have levied a special tax of that amount on the District for the purpose of creating a fund for civil-service pensions. There is no doubt of that. There is no dodging that proposition. Now, whether you would increase the taxes of the General Government or not, I stop for a moment just simply to ask when you undertake to legislate for the District of Columbia and the city of Washington, to tax the people of the District of Columbia for the creation of a special fund for the purpose of paying special pensions for certain officers in the employ of the District, I ask, gentlemen, where it is to end?

Mr. HEARD. I will say to the gentleman, if he addresses that inquiry to me, that he has now stated the case exactly right. He is correct in that statement.

Mr. COX. Well, I am very glad to know that I am correct anyhow.

Mr. HEARD. And I am glad to be able to congratulate you upon the fact.

Mr. COX. Very well; I will proceed now, if the gentleman will allow me.

Mr. HEARD. I shall not occupy but a moment of your time. The proposition is that this is to levy this tax practically on the people of the District themselves, by themselves, and for a special purpose. That is true.

Now my response to the gentleman is this, that the people of this District are alone interested, and they come and ask Congress, which can alone make the provision, that they may pay their own taxes and provide a fund for these superannuated and crippled policemen. They ask permission to do this thing, and Congress holds the purse strings of the District. They can not get the authority except from Congress. If Congress does not authorize the people here to set apart this fund it can not be done. We are not taking a dollar out of the Treasury of the General Government, but simply authorizing the people of the District to make the fund and foot the bill.

Mr. COX. But you are taking all my time. [Laughter.]

Mr. HEARD. I will give the gentleman more time if he wants it. But putting this question fairly before the House it is simply a proposition to allow the people of the District to pay out of their own funds a certain tax to be applied to taking care of disabled and superannuated policemen and their families. Application is made by this bill to Congress for authority to do this thing. That is all there is of it.

Mr. COX. Now, I ask the gentleman in all candor, if he has heard a single taxpayer make an application here in behalf of this, outside of the Commissioners of the District of Columbia?

Mr. HEARD. Mr. Speaker, the District Commissioners sent this bill to us. As I have stated here repeatedly, they are in my judgment the immediate representatives of the people of the District, and I will say to the gentleman that probably fifty taxpayers in this District have spoken to me favorably about this matter, and there has not been a single protest, and I am advised that the public press and the people of the District unanimously approve it. This is not a new proposition. It is simply to add to a fund established first in 1861, and again added to in 1886 by a Democratic House, on an appropriation bill, and it is simply a proposition to add to that which is now inadequate.

Mr. COX. Will the gentleman pardon me for an interruption?

Mr. HEARD. Certainly.

Mr. COX. If that principle is correct, that the taxpayers of the District of Columbia ask Congress to apply a special fund for the purpose of paying pensions upon a civil-service list, I ask gentlemen in all candor and honesty, when a man serves the Government of the United States in a civil capacity, and after a lapse of years is worn out by age and infirmities, does not the same argument apply with all of its force in favor of putting him on a pension list?

Mr. HEARD. Not at all.

Mr. COX. What is the reason it does not apply? Is not a man who is working in the Capitol here just as much entitled to the respect of the Government as a man who is working on the police force in this city? And if a policeman is to be retired on account of his age or infirmities, or on account of some accident, then I say, take the whole civil-service list and apply the same principle. When I vote to put a tax upon the District of Columbia for a purpose of this kind, I will vote to put a tax upon the people of the United States for the same purpose, because Congress is legislating for both upon the same lines.

Mr. HEARD. Will my friend allow an interruption?

Mr. COX. I am done with the subject.

Mr. HEARD. I want to give the gentleman a reason why I think there is a very material difference.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. The gentleman from New York [Mr. COOMBS] is entitled to the floor.

Mr. COBB of Alabama. Will the gentleman yield for a moment?

Mr. COOMBS. Yes.

Mr. COBB of Alabama. I just want to say one word in answer to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HOLMAN], and also in answer to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. COX], in regard to this pension business. I am as much opposed to a civil pension list as anybody can possibly be, but this matter does not come under the principle of a civil pension list by the Government of the United States. We are here not only as a Congress, attending to the business of the whole country, but we are practically the common council of the District of Columbia, and in regard to this matter we are doing that which the civil authorities of every large city in the United States are in the habit of doing for their police officers.

Mr. STOCKDALE. Suppose this bill should pass, and then the Capitol police should come in and ask that they be put in the same attitude?

Mr. COBB of Alabama. That would be a question for Congress to determine when it came up.

Mr. BRETZ. Are you not setting a precedent for it?

Mr. COBB of Alabama. Not at all, because this matter, as I said before, is in line with the action of every large city in the country, if I am correctly informed, or if not, it should be made so. I understand that the cities of New York, Brooklyn, Cincinnati, Chicago, and others, have the same system.

Mr. COOMBS. I am not sure about that.

Mr. COBB of Alabama. They have a fund for this purpose, if my information is correct.

Mr. HEARD. The report shows that the cities of New York, Brooklyn, and Boston have similar funds.

Mr. COBB of Alabama. It is not, strictly speaking, a pension.

Mr. HOLMAN. In most cities, I understand, a portion of the monthly salary of each policeman is set apart and applied to this fund. But I wish to ask my friend if the Government of the United States, at a moment when legislation can be fairly conducted, in deliberate assembly, establishes the principle that pensions for civil services are proper, how can you answer that large class of people whom you have in your employment as postal clerks, the great mass of people you have in your employment in connection with the river and harbor system—engaged in perilous employment—how can you answer the argument in favor of granting them pensions, after accepting the principle that it was proper as applicable to the District of Columbia? If it is proper here, it is proper in every other Department.

Mr. COBB of Alabama. If it is proper in New York, is it not proper everywhere else?

Mr. HOLMAN. We are not legislating for New York.

Mr. COBB of Alabama. Of course not; and we are not legislating now for the people of the United States. We are legislating for the people of the District of Columbia, along a line which is followed in every large city of the country.

Mr. HOLMAN. I want to say to my friend that if this step is taken it will be invoked year after year, in cases that are much stronger than this. I am willing to pay these gentlemen ample salaries where they render public service, but not a dollar beyond. Why, a member of Congress claims that he is worn out by the public service, and under this British system they would come in here for aid. Would my friend tolerate that idea?

Mr. COBB of Alabama. Do you believe a large city does wrong to make provision for this class of men?

Mr. HOLMAN. My only theory about the matter would be this: The salary should be sufficient, and a portion of the fund, just as in the case of your army establishment up here, the military home, should be set apart for their use under just such circumstances as it is now desired to appropriate this fund. That is the principle of your National Home; and I see no impropriety in that.

Mr. COBB of Alabama. I just want to say, in conclusion, in answer to the gentleman who took my time, that I am not advocating a civil pension list, nor do I propose to go further in this legislation than the District authorities would, if they had a government of their own, be authorized to go in the direction of the practices which obtain in the various cities of this country.

So far as the bill provides for civil pensions it should be amended. I will consent to go no further in the direction of aid to policemen than to provide a plan which, avoiding the idea of granting pensions, will give such temporary relief as the exigencies of their service demand.

Mr. COOMBS. Do I understand the gentleman from Maine desires to address the House?

Mr. REED. I would like a moment or two.

Mr. COOMBS. I want to say about ten words.

Mr. HEARD. The gentleman from New York has the floor.

Mr. COOMBS. How much time does the gentleman from Maine desire?

Mr. REED. A few moments.

I think the gentleman from Missouri made some mistake in his opening statement in regard to this question, as he spoke of it as a mere extension of existing law. To my mind it is very different from that. The existing law provides that fines which are inflicted upon policemen for neglect of duty and money which arises from the sale of unclaimed goods and money which has been bestowed upon the body for meritorious services are to be appropriated for a particular purpose; and it having been discovered that that was not a sufficient fund, the law went further and provided that the policeman should pay $1 a month out of his own salary, to become a part of this fund.

Mr. HEARD. Will the gentleman allow a correction?

Mr. REED. Certainly.

Mr. HEARD. I think you will find my remark to be that it was proposed to increase the fund established by existing law.

Mr. REED. Very well; I am glad the gentleman did not say what I supposed, but I think the impression made was——

Mr. HEARD. I then went on to explain how this fund had been increased.

Mr. REED. I think the impression made was that it was a mere extension of the existing law.

Mr. HEARD. That was not my intention at all.

Mr. REED. Anyone will see that this is more than a mere extension of existing law; for, instead of being a fund which the policemen, with a slight exception, themselves directly contribute everything, it is now proposed to make a fund which shall be paid by the people of the District of Columbia, and possibly by the people of the United States. Now, whether it is paid by the people of the District or the people of the United States is a matter that interests me very little. I am perfectly willing that the people of the United States shall pay one-half of the expenses of the District of Columbia, for reasons which are very simple and plain. But whether we should adopt the plan of a pension for disabled policemen is another question; and it is a question the importance of which can not be overestimated; because if we do pension the policemen, I fancy that I hear in my ear the tones of some gentleman saying, "Having pensioned policemen, ought we not to be fair towards the rest? It may be that it was not proper to pension policemen; but having pensioned policemen, why not pension other equally deserving men?"

Why, I have seen the whole "leave" system extend over the civil service, until the Government pays one-twelfth more than any other employer, simply because of this system, and as my mind extends back over the service, I find that owing to the adoption of the civil-service plan, unless men can be hunted out they are kept in office through their lives. Now, you observe at once there is going to be a very heavy pressure brought to bear upon Congress, and that pressure is going to take this form, that the old men are going to be objects of charity.

Government employés, as a rule, spend their entire salary; and when they get old the alternative is presented to the man who has the appointing power, at the head of a department, to either keep that man in when he has become useless, on full pay, or discharge him and throw him upon the charities of the cold world. That he is not likely to do; and there are services already clamoring here for action on the part of Congress, on the score of economy, that it would be better to put these men on the retired list at one-half pay and get vigorous men to fill their places.

Now, you want fully to comprehend that. To my mind, if there is going to be any solution of that problem which is at all sensible it has got to be a solution so radical that I despair of seeing it reached upon an appropriation bill conducted through the House in the usual fashion. It ought to commence at the beginning. Instead of paying twelve hundred dollars a year, we ought to commence at five hundred. Instead of stopping at eighteen hundred or two thousand, we ought to stop at thirty-five hundred or four thousand, and from the money saved in that way we ought to establish a superannuation fund with which to provide for the superannuated and the disabled, so that a man who is useless shall not be kept on full pay on the ground of charity.

But until we take hold of this matter in a thorough and systematic fashion we run the risk of paying the large salaries that we now pay, and at the same time having to provide a superannuated fund to keep these public servants in decent condition in their old age, when, properly, they ought to have saved enough for that purpose out of their abundant salaries; for the salaries paid to the clerks and other departmental employés of the United States are large compared with the nature of their employment, and they were made large because, under the old system, a man gave five or six, or seven or eight of the best years of his life to the service, and then quit it, and it was reasonable that he should be highly paid for those years. But if you are going to keep men in the service during their lives, then you ought to arrange the salaries so that if the men will not save what will keep them in their old age, you can save it for them. Otherwise you do in that branch of the public service what you are doing in the Revenue Service to-day.

There are many men there who are entirely unfit for sea duty, and yet who are receiving the same pay as if they were active, vigorous men, while the young men in the service are being delayed in their promotion and prevented from receiving the pay to which they are properly entitled. I freely admit that there is one strong reason why something special should be done for policemen. Their occupation may at times become dangerous, and a man ought to have the consolation of knowing, when he goes into a fight in the performance of his official duty, that he does not risk the sustenance of his family by so doing. Consequently, I say there is a certain propriety in doing something of this kind for policemen, but the law has already struck the true plan, which is to make the force contribute to a superannuation fund in such fashion as to provide that disability or superannuation shall not be followed by poverty and suffering. In other words, when these men will not save from their salaries, we as public officers ought to adopt some plan or system by which a portion of their salaries shall be saved for them.

Now, what effect that has upon this particular pending measure I leave for the House to consider.

Mr. HEARD. The gentleman from Maine understands, of course, that the District of Columbia has no means of making any provision of this kind unless as it may be authorized by Congress?

Mr. REED. I understand that.

Mr. HEARD. Then it comes to this: The gentleman concedes the propriety, and even the necessity, of establishing such a fund as this?

Mr. REED. What I say is that, if we are going to establish such a system, we ought to establish it upon a sound principle, and to my mind this is not exactly the right way to do it. If we are not paying these policemen enough so that we can take out of their salaries a fund which will save from suffering and want those who become superannuated or disabled, then we ought to pay them more, but we ought to make the job a complete one, and a proper precedent as well.

Now, look at the situation. Here we have freed our office-holders from the danger of being turned out by unmeritorious persons—except, perhaps, in the Treasury Department and a few other places [laughter], and the result is that those gentlemen are forming associations so as to impress upon us their views with regard to their own salaries, and we are impressionable people. [Laughter.] We are moved by the cry of distress, especially when it is backed up by a considerable voting power. [Laughter.] It seems to me that civil-service reform has reached that point when it ought to be taken hold of in the right spirit, and with due regard to the change of attitude of the Government toward its civil employés, in order that two things may be accomplished: In the first place, that the Government shall receive the faithful service of trained men, and in the second place, that the Government shall pay them fairly. I will add another point: that it shall pay them in such manner as will justify them in devoting their lives to the business, so that they may find themselves with a reasonable compensation during their active days and with reasonable support in their nonactive days.

Mr. HEARD. With the permission of the gentleman from New York [Mr. COOMBS], I want to say just a word in reply to the gentleman from Maine. The gentleman concedes, if I understand, the propriety of having some provision made for superannuated policemen, firemen, and those who are engaged in such risky avocations in the public service.

Mr. REED. And in other kinds of business.

Mr. HEARD. So that we go so far together. Now, the question in this case arises not upon the ground suggested by the gentleman from Maine. He has inveighed against the system of pensioning civil servants as a general rule, against the principle of providing pensions for people who ought to provide for themselves.

Mr. REED. No. It is quite evident that I have not made my meaning clear. I say that if we are going to adopt another method than that of paying men for their day's work, then we ought to go into it upon a principle which is uniform and which is justifiable upon the idea that men earn during their active life an amount which ought to be spread over their active and their inactive life.

Mr. HEARD. I come now directly to the point to which attention has been called, and I think there can be no misunderstanding about it. The gentleman insists that, however commendable the object may be, this method of accomplishing it is not perhaps the best. Now, let us see about that. The gentleman, in his elaboration of the plan which he would set up as counter to this, suggests that the proper thing would be to deduct a certain amount from the salary of each policeman and thus make a fund—a plan provided for by the act of 1886 and which has proved to be inadequate.

Mr. REED. Inadequate in amount, but not inadequate as to principle.

Mr. HEARD. Well, of course, you might deduct half the salary of these policemen so far as that is concerned; but in point of fact the amount realized from that source is not sufficient. The question then is, what is the better way to increase this fund, and I ask the gentleman's attention to this plan. The proposition is to divert certain excise taxes——

Mr. REED. That does not make any difference.

Mr. HEARD. I think it does; I think I can convince the gentleman that it does. The proposition is to divert a certain fund

collected in the District by excise taxes, and apply it to this specific object. Now, the diversion of that fund in this way would not, I still insist, tax the citizens outside of the District to the extent of one dollar. I insist that gentlemen are bound to concede that point, because the fund is diverted before it goes into the Treasury, and the Government is not obliged to place dollar for dollar against that $30,000.

The question, then, is (and I know this is the controlling question with some members on this floor) whether this provision can be made in accordance with the wishes of the people of this District without taxing people outside the District is not a just and a wise one. The plan here proposed, would, I think, effect that object; whereas if we should adopt the plan suggested by the gentleman from Maine, and first increase the salaries of policemen so as to make them adequate to stand the necessary deduction for the creation of this fund, then any increase of salary made for the police fund would come partially out of the United States Treasury, because this fund is paid half by the Government and half by the District.

Mr. REED. We entered into an understanding with the District that we were to pay one-half. There were good reasons in favor of that policy——

Mr. HEARD. All right; I am not objecting to that.

Mr. REED. And I do not think it creditable to us to be trying every piecemeal method of evading the obligation we assumed.

Mr. HEARD. I agree with the gentleman on that point. That compact was made; whether it be entirely fair or not we find it existing and should respect it so long as it does exist. But that does not obscure the point I make—that any tax levied upon the salaries of these policemen, which would call for an increase in their salaries, would be borne in the proportion of one-half by the Federal Treasury and one-half by the District; whereas a tax levied in the way here contemplated would be paid by the people of this District for a purpose applicable alone to the District, in accordance with the application made by citizens of the District for the carrying out of an object which can not be authorized by any other body than ourselves.

I am opposed to a civil pension list except when paid by the citizens themselves, voluntarily, as they would in this case, and in accordance with their votes when they have suffrage, as in Brooklyn, New York, Boston, and other cities. I am opposed to ingrafting the principle of a civil pension list upon the practice of the United States Government. But here is an application from the people, for whom, as the gentleman from Alabama has said, we are by the laws made a common council, for authority to pay their servants out of their own pockets. They ask that we appropriate out of their funds a certain amount for a specific purpose, which they believe to be a worthy one and which we concede to be worthy. If there is any better way, in fairness to the Government and to the District, in which this purpose can be accomplished, I want to adopt it. But I want to say distinctly that I am opposed to the principle of giving pensions to persons engaged in the civil service outside of occupations like that of policemen, and in such cases only when it is sanctioned by the citizens whose money is to be thus expended, as has been done by the common councils of Brooklyn, Boston, etc., and as I fully believe is the case here.

Mr. STOCKDALE. I wish to ask the gentleman a question which I tried to have answered by the gentleman from Alabama. When this plan is accomplished (if it should be accomplished) and the Government's policemen in this city make application for similar provision, what answer will the gentleman make to them?

Mr. HEARD. I will say to those Government policemen that the people of this country, who have their bills to foot, have made no application for such a measure and that I had no assurance that those people would sanction any such law.

Mr. STOCKDALE. But suppose that application is made?

Mr. HEARD. We would have the right to reject it, of course.

Mr. STOCKDALE. Is not the principle the same?

Mr. HEARD. Not at all; for this reason: that the present proposition affects only the people of this District, who, I believe, are unanimous in its favor.

Mr. STOCKDALE. Why, then, do they not make provision for taxing their own property in order to carry out this measure?

Mr. HEARD. They do tax their own property; they have got to pay the taxation levied; and if there is a deficit they have got to pay increased taxation in order to raise their half of what is necessary to meet the required public expenditures.

Mr. COOMBS. I now yield to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. HUTCHESON].

The SPEAKER. The gentleman has seven minutes remaining.

Mr. HUTCHESON. I would like to occupy about ten minutes.

Mr. HEARD. I shall be glad to yield to the gentleman any time he may desire.

Mr. COOMBS. I may want five minutes.

Mr. HEARD. I shall be glad to yield also to the gentleman from New York [Mr. COOMBS].

Mr. HUTCHESON. Mr. Speaker, I think the greatest opportunity ever presented to Congress is presented right here. From the foundation of the Government until now we have never taken the step which this committee proposes we shall take. We have never had an aristocracy in this country, and in my opinion it is a thing which we very much need at this time—if for no other purpose than to illustrate to a Republican Government what an aristocracy should be.

Now, the gentleman from Missouri says very properly that he wants to limit this to the city of Washington. That suggestion is entirely correct. If this system should be extended to other portions of the country, the policemen of this District would not be any better than the policemen anywhere else, and you would not have your aristocracy.

Mr. HEARD. My friend does not want to put me in a false attitude. He wants to be fair. I undertook to distinguish between the policemen here and policemen elsewhere, because the people of this District, who contribute the money we are proposing to expend, have applied to our committee for a measure of this kind.

Mr. HUTCHESON. I understand all that, and do not blame the gentleman at all. I know the committee have acted upon the matter as it came to them. But, Mr. Speaker, if I were amongst the people of Washington, and there was to be an aristocracy established in this country, I would insist that we should have our full share of it. I would want our policemen pensioned and nobody else's.

If you want immigration to come to this country, just pass this bill, and all the ships that plow the sea will not be able to bring the numbers that will want to come in. You will have immigration from every part of the earth, men of all nationalities, coming here and running for policemen in the District of Columbia. [Laughter.] Why, there is not a man in this country who can tell who his great-great-grandfather was, but there are a great many men who would be relieved from the necessity of doing so if he were able to say "I do not know who my great-great-great-grandfather was, but I do know that my father is a pensioned policeman and lives in the District of Columbia." [Laughter.]

Any man under the sun who is anxious to rise to distinction in this world has nothing to do but take a club in his hand, come to Washington, spend his life here as a policeman, and then retire on the aristocratic pension list. [Laughter.] Any man who has a daughter who wants to distinguish herself will find that she has nothing to do but to marry a young fellow 25 years old with a blue suit and brass buttons and with the distinct understanding that he is to be a pensioned policeman after he becomes too feeble to knock a Coxeyite on the head who chances to tramp on the grass. It is the grandest opportunity ever presented to this country, and that man in the Fifty-third Congress who votes against it votes against the chance of his life and the privilege of making a class which has not heretofore been provided for under the laws of the United States. I hope, of course, that such an important measure will prevail if we are to have an aristocracy anywhere in this country, and the committee seems to think we are.

Mr. COOMBS. Mr. Speaker, a great deal has been said in the parenthesis intervening between my opening and closing remarks, much of which I shall not indorse or object to. I want to express, however, going back to the original proposition on which I started, the opinion that I believe it to be unwise to connect the policeman, or the police pension fund, or bring him in contact with the local liquor dealer in any way except to enforce the law. That is one proposition, and the other is that I think it undemocratic and improper to divert funds before they get into the Treasury.

And I want to express in closing my sense of appreciation of the fairness and courtesy of the chairman of the District Committee for the impersonal manner in which he has considered and discussed the purposes of the bill which we now have under consideration.

Mr. HEARD. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HEPBURN].

Mr. HEPBURN. Mr. Speaker, there are two or three objections to this bill, it seems to me, which have not been considered. One, that this amount asked for is unnecessary. It is more than or quite 50 per cent larger than can be expended this year. This bill provides for $30,000. Now, the total expenditure estimated for this year is about $25,000. The fund, from the method now in use for its collection, will be about $10,000, so that there exists only a deficit of $15,000 for this fiscal year, and yet $30,000 is appropriated for in the pending bill.

I want to call your attention to the extraordinary rapidity with which the necessities for this fund have increased. We find 666 per cent of increase since 1885, or in other words this pension fund has grown at that rate. I desire also to call your attention to the extraordinary expenditure necessary for this fund in the city of New York. The amount needed as a pension fund for about 4,000 men is $485,000. More than $120 per capita upon the policemen of that city would be required to make good the pension fund if raised by contribution from the force. Apply that to the two and three-quarters millions of men that were in the Federal army, and if the same ratio was observed, your pension list, now $145,000,000, would be increased to $350,000,000 a year.

It is entirely safe in my judgment to continue the method of raising this fund now in vogue. Let there be appropriated a sum, whatever it may be, from the monthly pay of each of these men necessary for the requirements of this fund. It will be carefully scrutinized then, there will not be the extraordinary growth which is now apparent, and the expenditure of the fund will be limited to what is absolutely necessary. It may be that it will be required eventually to increase the pay, and some would say that that was tantamount to an appropriation of this character. But it would not be, in my judgment; because there would be a careful scrutiny and examination of every expenditure, there would be an interest on the part of all the force in seeing that there were no abuses in the fund, and that it was being applied to necessary and legitimate purposes only.

I think, too, Mr. Speaker, that there is very much force in the objection raised by the gentleman from New York [Mr. COOMBS]. If the liquor license fund of this city is set apart for this special purpose, it gives policemen an interest in that business and in that fund and the profits arising from it, that they otherwise would not have. Instead of being watchful and careful with regard to what is going on in the saloons, they will have a direct, or if not a direct, certainly some interest in having the largest possible returns from that business, so that the fund from which their pensions are to be derived shall in no instance be jeopardized. I do not think that the police force of this city should be forced into a copartnership with the liquor-dealing interest of the city. The policeman ought to be the enemy of the saloon and not its sponsor. He ought to have his eye on the saloon at all times, because all men recognize the fact that the saloon is the nursery of crime here, as well as elsewhere, and there should be no relation between the police and that interest to make it his pleasure or interest to look leniently on the saloon, the chief of all the enemies of society.

Mr. HEARD. Mr. Speaker, I only care to say a few words. Directing my attention to the remarks made by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. HUTCHESON] for a moment, I will say that instead of this being an attempt to create an aristocracy, or an attempt to create a new class, that is not the case. The police pension fund exists in this District to-day, as has been explained fully. It was inaugurated by an enactment in 1861, and later in 1886. That fund is now inadequate, and this is a method which is suggested by the Commissioners for the increase of that fund. Whether this is a proper method of raising that money or not, is for the House to determine.

I have put the case fairly before the House, and have submitted with the report a statement which shows that this plan is in force in Brooklyn, New York, Boston, and perhaps other cities. I do not know of any better plan for raising the necessary money here. There may be a better plan. This plan, I insist, however, has this merit: That it is designed to provide that the money shall be raised not from the people of the United States, but from the people in the District; and as I say, this bill is here in response to an application on the part of the people for this legislation, for their benefit, to be paid for out of their money, and not from the Treasury of the United States. I have responded to their demand as best I could, believing it to be right, and realizing that this is the one legislative body to which they can appeal for authority to expend their own money for such public purposes as they may think right.

Mr. BYNUM. I should like to ask if the gentleman has ever made any investigation as to what rules have been adopted by this board that passes on the question of disability? I ask that for the reason that I have also noticed the same point made by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HEPBURN], that this appropriation has grown so enormously that it does seem to me that it is being squandered.

Mr. HEARD. I will say to the gentleman that, as I understand it, the provision is explained in the statement made by the chief of police.

Mr. BYNUM. My question is whether you have made any investigation as to the rules regulating the determination of disability. Unless the matter is properly conducted there would be danger of a man being put on the pension list to get rid of him, or something of that kind.

Mr. HEARD. I have never had occasion to examine that question in detail. The police force stands in the same relation as the firemen, the school board, and others of that kind. These matters of detail are supervised by the District Commissioners, and I have never had my attention specially directed to this, because no occasion required it. I am not able to give any more detailed information than the report presents.

Mr. CANNON of Illinois. I want to say that I have read this bill with some care since it was called up this morning, and also the report.

Under the law of 1861 and the law of 1885, as has been stated, the pension that goes to disabled policemen goes substantially from their pay. Certain fines for breach of discipline are levied against policemen from time to time, when they ought to be, and those fines go into this pension fund, and a dollar a month is taken from the salary of each policeman, of whom I believe there are about four hundred, and this sum goes into the pension fund.

As now constituted, every man on the police force is interested in seeing that no one gets there improperly, because the policemen themselves pay the bills. They not only police the city, but they police this fund; and the same principle applies to appointments. I apprehend that it would now be pretty difficult to get a man upon the police force who in fact is disabled, because the members of the force would naturally watch that matter narrowly to see that no man was appointed who would be likely soon to become a charge upon that fund, which the members of the police force pay.

I am not opposed to payment of disabled policemen, but I believe that the law should be amended increasing their pay somewhat, if proper, and increasing the amount taken from their monthly pay to go into this fund. Therefore, I shall vote against this bill in its present shape, with the hope and expectation that the Committee on the District of Columbia will mature a proper bill and report it to the House at an early day. A policeman now gets, I believe, $900 a year to begin with, and the highest pay that the privates can get is $1,080. I have no doubt, as the gentleman from Maine [Mr. REED] has well said, that they might properly commence at a smaller rate, perhaps at $600, and the age be fixed a little younger than it now is for them to go on the force, and then let length of service and fidelity give the gradual increase of pay.

As to the public service being treated in this way all along the line, that will come later. The gentleman from Texas may talk about the aristocracy of office-holders from a tenure during good behavior. It is very easy to talk about that kind of thing. We are all talking about it. Yet we have already taken the step, and you can not get rid of it, either. You can not repeal your civil-service law; and the result is that we take a callow youth, who could not earn, as a rule, $400 a year in private employment anywhere in the United States, and we start him in a clerical position under the civil service, at a thousand or twelve hundred dollars a year. Once in, if he gets his backing, he is promoted up to $1,800 for the maximum in the classified service. That starts our civil employés at a higher rate than Great Britain pays when her employés go off the roll at the age of sixty-two on half pay.

These things will have to be looked to after awhile, as the gentleman from Maine has so ably said, and as I believe every thinking man will acknowledge.

But, as I understand, we are not going to look after that to-day; but we can look after this to-day, namely: we could refuse to divert $30,000 a year from the District revenues for this pension fund. When you divert it, if you pass this bill, I fear it will be twice as easy to become a policeman and twice as easy to be pensioned as it is now, because the pension will be paid out of the District revenues instead of being paid by the policemen. That is about all I want to say.

Mr. MCNAGNY. Will the gentleman pardon me for asking him a question?

Mr. CANNON of Illnois. Certainly.

Mr. MCNAGNY. I would like to have the gentleman's opinion of this phase of the question—whether or not civil pensions are not wrong in principle, because they sap the independence and self-reliance of Amerieans, which is the best capital of all our men and women?

Mr. CANNON of Illinois. I will say to my friend I have had, in the past fifty years, the experience which most men and boys throughout the length and breadth of the country have had, who have had to make their own way. I have had the ambition and experience that the ordinary boy has had, taught at the country school, and all that sort of thing, and I will grant that years ago it was perhaps a good thing for an American citizen to get office under the Government. But I want to say now, in light of the experience I have had, the same industry and

ability that command place, if a man rests upon his merit in the public service, will yield fivefold in private service.

We have entered upon a new era, and I can not stop it, and you can not stop it; we had just as well march up and look it squarely in the face, and say we have adopted a system, and are not going to repeal it, that does away with the necessity for the salaries that were paid heretofore, and that we had better revise our salaried list and make it lower, for without law in most cases and with it in some cases we practically give a civil pension in many instances. When a member of Congress dies we give his widow not to exceed $5,000; when an employé of the House dies we bury him and give his widow six months' pay. All Federal judges can retire at the age of 70, after ten years' service, on full pay. In the classified service employés incompetent from age or disease remain in service at full pay when they should retire on half pay or no pay.

I have stood here for many years, and sometimes when my fellow-members thought me ungracious, and by the mere right to say no, have kept considerable amounts of money from being paid that seemed to me to look like establishing in effect a civil pension. I did it for the reason that it seemed to me that we ought not to go further in that direction until the whole matter was taken up and intelligently considered. I have in mind two cases where I objected, and made, or helped to make, the fight.

One was the case of Justice Miller, the other of Chief Justice Waite. They were great men, and served their country well; and the proposition was to pay $8,000 or $10,000 to each of their widows. It was a little ungracious, my friends thought, and I was not quite clear myself whether I should not consent to it, on account of the service of their distinguished husbands, deceased; notwithstanding that, I knew that seated about the floor of this House there were many men ready to make the same motion for the widow of every United States judge who had died for the last twenty-five or thirty years, and later on as other judges should die.

Now, all of these things grow on us; and we will not only have the tenure in the civil service of the United States that is to last during good behavior and life, but we will have it upon the most extravagant terms, unless we wake up at an early day and take the matter in hand and regulate it. However, I will again apologize for having spoken in this matter; perhaps I should not have done so had not the gentleman from Maine so ably and clearly called attention to the matter; but I will say again, as to this specific bill, for the reasons assigned my vote shall be "no;" and if it is defeated I trust that the Committee on the District of Columbia will properly investigate and at an early date report a bill by which this pension fund can be increased, and increased from the earnings of the beneficiaries themselves and their fellows.

Mr. RICHARDSON of Tennessee. I want to ask my friend, if he will make any suggestion, from what source this increase can properly be made for an increase of the pensions of the policemen.

Mr. CANNON of Illinois. In my judgment if you will provide that no man shall be appointed a policeman who is over twenty-four years of age, that his salary should begin at about $360—I am not particular as to the exact amount—and that it should increase every year of faithful service $50 or $100, as the case might be, until it reached the maximum of a thousand or a thousand and eighty, which is the present maximum, then, as you have four hundred of these men, if you would deduct three or four dollars instead of $1 a month from each, you would have a fund which would be large enough to take care of the disabled, a fund that four hundred men would be interested in policing to see that it was not pirated.

Mr. DINGLEY. What is the salary of these policemen now?

Mr. CANNON of Illinois. The minimum is $900 and the maximum $1,080.

Mr. DINGLEY. And only $1 a month is deducted for this fund. Now, there would be no difficulty in increasing the deduction to $50 per annum, which would furnish a most abundant fund and the compensation would still be very liberal.

Mr. CANNON of Illinois. Well, the committee ought to investigate the whole matter. Of course it is impossible for me to suggest what the details of such a bill should be, but I think the bill ought to be constructed on that principle.

Mr. HEARD. I hope the District Committee will have the benefit of the gentleman's suggestions. I see that one of these acts was passed on an appropriation bill when the gentleman from Illinois was a member of the Appropriations Committee, and it might be well that the result of that committee's investigation should be brought to bear to supplement the labors of the District Committee.

Mr. CANNON of Illinois. The act of which the gentleman speaks is the one passed in 1885, the first year of Mr. Cleveland's first Administration. I had not the honor at that time to be in the majority on the committee, but the provision put upon that act was that there should be a dollar a month deducted from the salary of each policeman to make up this fund. That, I think, was in the line of correct legislation, and while I ought not have the credit of it, having been in the minority, I was on the committee, and I have no doubt that I indorsed the proposition at the time.

Mr. RICHARDSON of Tennessee. That was before President Cleveland came in.

Mr. CANNON of Illinois. Well, just as President Arthur went out.

Mr. HEARD. Mr. Speaker, I am somewhat surprised to see so much opposition manifested to this bill, but it may be that a better method of providing this fund may be devised, either in a bill presented by some individual member of the House or by the committee. It has been suggested to me that it might be well to withdraw this bill, but I do not see any reason for doing that.

The committee have presented this as the plan approved by the Commissioners. The discussion that we have had this morning has doubtless been profitable to the committee and to us all, and may prove to be so to the Commissioners also, and to the police department. I am in favor, however, of letting the House pass its judgment upon the bill, and, therefore, I ask for a vote.

The SPEAKER. General debate is concluded.

Mr. HEARD. Mr. Speaker, since this bill has been before the committee, in fact within the last thirty minutes, there has been brought to me a report of the Commissioners upon this subject. They recommend favorable action upon the bill, as they do in the report which has been read here, but in this they also suggest an amendment which, in deference to their views, I now offer.

The amendment was read, as follows:

Add the following words, after the word "District," in line 26: *Provided further*, That the further sum of $6,000 per annum, or so much thereof as may be necessary, of the moneys received as aforesaid shall be applied to carrying out the provisions of the act approved February 25, 1885, entitled, "An act making appropriations to provide for the expenses of the government of the District of Columbia for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1886, and for other purposes," which establishes the firemen's relief fund.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the amendment.

Mr. DINGLEY. Mr. Speaker, before that question is put, I would like to ask the gentleman from Missouri whether there is any pension fund now for firemen in this District?

Mr. HEARD. This amendment recommended by the Commissioners would indicate that there is.

Mr. DINGLEY. Does the gentleman know whether any deduction is made from the pay of firemen for the purposes of that fund?

Mr. HEARD. I have no further knowledge than is contained in the amendment just read, but the gentleman from Indiana beside me [Mr. HOLMAN] says that there is a fireman's fund.

Mr. HOLMAN. That is my recollection.

Mr. HEARD. Mr. Speaker, upon consultation with some of my colleagues upon the committee, and at their suggestion, I ask that this bill be recommitted to the committee.

Mr. COOMBS. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry. If that is agreed to will it do away with debate upon the bill in case it is brought forward again by the committee?

The SPEAKER. Not at all.

Mr. HEARD. I assure the gentleman that he shall have ample time to discuss this or any other measure that the committee may report.

There being no objection, the bill was recommitted to the committee.

WASHINGTON AND GEORGETOWN RAILWAY COMPANY.

Mr. HEARD. Mr. Speaker, I call up the bill H. R. 6953, the purpose of which is to authorize and require the extension of the cable road from its present terminus at Thirty-second and M streets to a point opposite the end of the Aqueduct Bridge, and to authorize the company to acquire land there and build a station.

The SPEAKER. This bill ought to be considered in Committee of the Whole.

Mr. HEARD. I ask unanimous consent that the bill be considered in the House as in Committee of the Whole.

Mr. PERKINS. I object.

Mr. HEARD. Then, Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole for the consideration of this bill.

The motion was agreed to.

The House accordingly resolved itself into Committee of the Whole, Mr. O'NEIL of Massachusetts in the chair.

The CHAIRMAN. The House is in Committee of the Whole for the consideration of the bill which the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Washington and Georgetown Railroad Company be, and it is hereby, directed and required to extend its tracks and run its cars thereon as follows: Beginning at the present terminus of its tracks in Georgetown; thence west on M street to or near Thirty-fourth street; thence northerly and westerly, on a private right of way to be acquired by said company to a point to be designated by the Commissioners of the District of Columbia, between M and Prospect, Thirty-fourth and Thirty-sixth streets.

SEC. 2. That all plans relating to the location and construction of said railroad extension and of the passenger houses hereinafter mentioned shall be subject to the approval of the Commissioners of the District of Columbia; the said company shall furnish at the western terminus of its route a passenger house within such reasonable time as may be required by the said Commissioners, and shall maintain such passenger house and permit its use by connecting lines of street-car companies for the safe, convenient, and comfortable transfer of passengers, upon terms mutually agreed upon by said railway company and the connecting line or lines, or, in default of agreement, as may be fixed by the said Commissioners. Any violation of the requirements of this section as to passenger house shall be punished by a fine of $50 for each day such violation is continued and maintained, said fine to be recovered in any court of competent jurisdiction at the suit of the Commissioners of the District of Columbia.

SEC. 3. That the said company shall bear all the expenses of necessary changes to underground construction incident to the construction of the extension of its roads herein directed and required, and shall deposit with the Treasurer of the United States, before commencing work on said extension, to the credit of the Washington Aqueduct, such sum as the Secretary of War may consider necessary to defray all the expenses that may be incurred by the United States in connection with the inspection of the work of construction of said extension, and in making good any damages done by said company, or its works, or by any of its contracting agents, to any water mains, fixtures, or apparatus, and in completing, as the Secretary of War may consider necessary, any of the work that the said company may neglect or refuse to complete and that the Secretary of War may consider necessary for the safety of said mains, fixtures, or apparatus; and the said company shall also deposit, as aforesaid, such further sums for said purposes at such times as the Secretary of War may consider necessary: *Provided*, That the said sum shall be disbursed like other moneys appropriated for the Washington Aqueduct, and that whatever shall remain of said deposits at the end of one year after completion of the said extension shall be returned to said company, on the order of the Secretary of War, with an account of its disbursement in detail: *And provided also*, That disbursements of said deposits shall, except in cases of emergency, be made only on the order of the Secretary of War. And the said company shall also deposit with the collector of taxes of the District of Columbia such amounts as may be deemed necessary by the Commissioners of said District to cover the cost of inspection, supervision, pavement, and repairs incident to the said extension of its road; any unexpended balance of such deposits remaining after the completion of the said extension shall be returned to said company with an account in full of the disbursement of such deposit.

SEC. 4. That the said company shall commence the construction of the extension of its road, herein directed and required to be made, within three months and complete it, with cars running thereon, within six months after the date of the passage of this act: *Provided*, That this time limit shall be waived in case of unavoidable delay in securing the right of way herein authorized. Any violation of the requirements of this section shall be punished by a fine of $50 for each day such violation is continued and maintained, said fine to be recovered in any court of competent jurisdiction at the suit of the Commissioners of the District of Columbia.

SEC. 5. That in the event the said railroad company shall be unable to come to any agreement with the owner or owners of any land required for the extension of its road, as herein provided for, and for a passenger house, as contemplated in section 2 of this act, the said company is hereby authorized to institute proceedings in the supreme court of the District of Columbia, in accordance with existing law for the taking of private property for public use, for the condemnation of so much land as may be required for said purposes, said proceedings to be under such rules and regulations as to notice as said court may prescribe.

SEC. 6. That said railroad company is authorized to furnish and maintain a passenger house at Pennsylvania avenue between the tracks of the Navy Yard and the Baltimore and Ohio depot branches of said company's railroad.

SEC. 7. That this act may at any time be altered, amended, or repealed by the Congress of the United States.

The amendment reported by the committee was read, as follows:

Strike out the following:

"SEC. 6. That the said railroad company is authorized to furnish and maintain a passenger house at Pennsylvania avenue between the tracks of the Navy Yard and the Baltimore and Ohio branch of said company's railroad."

Mr. HEARD. The proposition contained in this section, which the committee disapprove, is to give the railroad company authority to build a shed down here in front of the Peace Monument between the two tracks. That provision we propose to strike out.

Mr. COOMBS. Is there a report on this bill?

Mr. HEARD. There is.

Mr. COOMBS. I should like to hear it.

Mr. HEARD. I ask a vote on this amendment of the committee. I do not think any one will oppose it.

Mr. DINGLEY. General debate must take place before any amendment is voted upon.

Mr. HEARD. There is no further amendment we wish to offer.

Mr. DINGLEY. This amendment can be voted upon with the understanding that it shall not interfere with general debate.

Mr. HEARD. Certainly. No advantage will be taken.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will put the question on agreeing to the amendment, with the understanding that the vote on the amendment will not interfere with general debate.

Mr. HEARD. That is right; that is perfectly well understood.

The CHAIRMAN. The amendment will be again read.

The Clerk again read the amendment.

Mr. HEARD. For the benefit of gentlemen who may not have heard my previous statement, I will say that this section proposes to authorize the company to put a shed between their tracks down here in front of the Peace Monument. The committee disapproves that proposition and moves to strike out the section.

Mr. CANNON of Illinois. One word on this question, because you are legislating in regard to my carriage. I ride on it back and forth daily, paying the usual price, six tickets for a quarter. It is the only carriage I have. I do not know whether the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. RICHARDSON] who sits before me has any other kind.

Mr. RICHARDSON of Tennessee. I ride on it every day on the same terms.

Mr. CANNON of Illinois. Gentlemen understand that when we start for the Capitol on a yellow car we are obliged to change cars near the Peace Monument at the foot of the hill. To-day we do not need any shed there, because we can stand the sunshine; sunshine is healthy; but during the winter or in stormy weather the transfer can not be made without waiting a minute or two, sometimes five minutes; I suppose the time will average a couple of minutes. Now, why should there not be a shed (constructed under the direction, if you choose, of the Commissioners, so that it may be ornamental and as little in the way as possible)—why should there not be a shed at that point which would keep off the rain and the sleet from women and children, saying nothing about the men?

Mr. HEARD. I will answer my friend's question; and that is all the argument I have to make on this proposition. The reason the committee objected to putting this shed at the place proposed is that they thought it would obscure the view of the monument, and while it might afford some shelter, would be regarded as a detriment to the appearance of things, and that it could better be placed elsewhere. The company is perfectly willing to erect a shed, and the Commissioners recommend that permission be granted; but the committee had an aversion to locating the shed there, believing that the opposition which has been made to a shed used for a similar purpose on Fifteenth street, in front of the Treasury Department, would be intensified against a shed erected in the place here proposed. The whole question is whether the House prefers to have that shed put there or not. If the shed is such a desirable thing, let us vote down the amendment and accept the bill as it stands.

Mr. GROUT. Why not put the shed on the sidewalk?

Mr. CANNON of Illinois. It seems to me if the District Commissioners were authorized to superintend the erection of a shed, we will say on the south side of the avenue, at the curb, it might not be objectionable. It would not materially obstruct the view from down the avenue. And I would rather have a little less view and a little more protection from the elements.

Mr. HEARD. I understand the gentleman from Illinois to uggest a shed on the south side of the avenue?

Mr. CANNON of Illinois. Yes, sir; by the curb.

Mr. HEARD. That is a different proposition from the one contained in the section we move to strike out, which proposes to locate a shed between the railroad tracks, in the middle of the Avenue, directly in front of the Peace Monument. That is what we object to. If my friend wishes to offer an amendment to locate this shed on the south side of the Avenue, that proposition can be considered by the House. But we are not in favor of having this shed in the middle of the street in front of the monument.

Mr. PERKINS. It was that proposition that the committee very properly, I think, objected to.

Mr. CANNON of Illinois. I would sooner have it there than not at all.

Mr. HEARD. If my friend from Illinois desires to have a shed on the south side of the Avenue, let him offer an amendment to that effect. But there is no proposition of that kind in the bill. We simply propose to strike out the section in its present form, which we think objectionable.

Mr. CANNON of Illinois. Then, Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out and insert what I send to the desk.

Mr. BINGHAM. Let me ask the chairman of the committee where this road is to run?

Mr. RICHARDSON of Tennessee. This is simply an extension of the Washington and Georgetown road, in Georgetown, from the end of the present line up to or near the Aqueduct bridge. The road ends now at Thirty-second street, and this authorizes the extension of the road some three or four blocks further on the same street.

Mr. CANNON of Illinois. I offer the amendment I send to the desk as a substitute for the amendment recommended by the committee.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 6. That the said railroad company is authorized and required to furnish and maintain a passenger house at Pennsylvania avenue near the tracks of the Navy-Yard and Baltimore and Ohio branches of said company's railroad, over the sidewalk, on the south side of Pennsylvania avenue.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the substitute.

Mr. RICHARDSON of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, before the vote is taken on the substitute I suggest that the gentleman ought to add, so as to make this harmonious with the rest of the bill:

To be constructed under the direction of the Commissioners of the District of Columbia.

Mr. CANNON of Illinois. I accept that modification, Mr. Chairman.

The substitute, as modified, was agreed to.

Mr. HEARD. Now, Mr. Chairman, I have nothing further to add in presenting this bill to the House. It is simply a proposition to extend the tracks of the Washington and Georgetown Railway Company about three or four blocks from its terminus on M street between Thirty-second and Thirty-third streets, to a point that has been recommended by the Commissioners between Thirty-fourth and Thirty-fifth streets, which will give railroad accommodations for three or four blocks beyond the present terminus, and allow them to land their passengers close to the Aqueduct Bridge. In addition, it requires the company to buy a block of land between M street and Prospect avenue, which is back of the bridge, and to construct thereon a passenger house for the accommodation of the passengers now transported over the present road; and it is the plan proposed by the Commissioners that other roads may run into the same passenger house, and make transfer of their passengers under cover. That is all there is of the bill.

Mr. TAWNEY. I would like to ask the gentleman from Missouri a question.

Mr. HEARD. Certainly.

Mr. TAWNEY. As I understand the gentleman, the proposition here is to authorize the Washington and Georgetown Railroad Company to buy a block of ground. Is it not a fact that the company owns now more than a block of ground west of Thirty-fifth street, and that you propose to clothe the company with the right of eminent domain for the purpose of acquiring title to a half block of land that they have not been able to buy, and that in doing so they will take and destroy the home of Mrs. Morris? And is it not also true that this lady requested a hearing before your committee, in opposition to the project as embodied in the bill, and was denied a hearing?

Mr. HEARD. I am very glad to be able to set my friend right. We will get through after awhile with having our friends imposed on by false statements of interested parties outside. That statement is absolutely false. Of course my friend is not to blame; but the statement is without foundation, and he has been imposed on. I do not know what this company owns beyond Thirty-fifth street, or whether they own a square, as the gentleman suggests.

Mr. TAWNEY. They do, or rather it has been bought in their interests.

Mr. HEARD. I do not know that they own a foot. But I know that this statement about Mrs. Morris having been denied a hearing before the committee is without foundation. The fact is this: The bill was before the committee for some time and was considered. About three weeks ago the committee, without a dissenting voice, directed a report to be made and without any opposition in the District, except Mrs. Morris through her attorneys.

Mr. TAWNEY. Permit me there. The reason you did not hear a dissenting voice was because the company bought up the property west of Mrs. Morris, and hope to buy enough on the east side of her property to accomplish the purpose they seek to accomplish.

Mr. HEARD. Then what do they want of Mrs. Morris's property at all?

Mr. TAWNEY. Because that lies between the two lots which they possess or hope to acquire by purchase.

Mr. HEARD. Well, Mr. Chairman, to continue what I was saying. After the bill was directed be reported the Commissioners of the District found, on attention being called to it, that one or two suggestions had been made in their report, and which brought in some irrelevant matter, notably some suggestions about the propriety of ultimately allowing other roads to come across the river over the Aqueduct bridge, which we knew would be prejudicial to this bill and which have no connection with its object. They were suggestions that did not pertain to the bill, and would be so considered in this House. The Commissioners saw that it was better to reform their report so made to the committee, and they did so. As soon as that was done, and that was the only reason of the delay, the committee made their report of the bill to the House.

Now, on the day of our last meeting, which I believe was last Wednesday, I received a note from the attorney of Mrs. Morris asking permission for a hearing before the committee. As I say, the matter had been considered three weeks before, and, as I advised him by letter, had already been unanimously ordered to be favorably reported.

Now, about the Morris proposition. This bill authorizes the condemnation of that property under existing law in the District, and the company can not take a dollar's worth of her property without paying for it, and the same is true as to the property of anybody else.

Mr. TAWNEY. If this is a public corporation, and if the use to which this company seeks to put this property is a public use, why is it necessary to authorize the condemnation proceedings which you authorize here by section 5? Why can they not come in under the general law and institute condemnation proceedings without this provision?

Mr. HEARD. They have no authority under the general law to condemn private property.

Mr. TAWNEY. Why have they not that authority?

Mr. HEARD. Because it is not given to any corporation in the District of Columbia, except by special action of Congress. Now, the gentleman misapprehended me. I said they would proceed, under existing law, for the condemnation of property, as for highways and so forth, which general law protects every property holder in the District. That is the situation.

Mr. TAWNEY. But is it not a fact that this is not one of those corporations entitled to invoke the power of eminent domain, under existing law?

Mr. HEARD. This corporation has no power to condemn property, except when the power is given by an act like this.

Mr. TAWNEY. Nobody ever heard of a street railway company being clothed with the power, especially when it would operate to deprive a person of their home.

Mr. HEARD. I suppose not, and therefore this is the proper manner in which to proceed. If Congress in its judgment feels that the good of the public may be met by authorizing the exercise of that power in a particular case, it is competent for Congress to do it, and that is what Congress proposes to do in this case, if it acts favorably upon the bill.

Mr. TAWNEY. Then we are to pass upon the question whether or not this is a proper corporation to clothe with that power, and whether the use to which the company is going to put this property is a public use.

Mr. HEARD. Most assuredly.

Mr. TAWNEY. And in order to pass upon that question, I say the owners of the property have a right to be heard.

Mr. HEARD. I do not know what hearing they had before the District Commissioners.

Mr. TAWNEY. None whatever. They were never notified.

Mr. HEARD. If they had made an application before our committee before the bill was considered and ordered to be reported, they could have got the hearing, although they had no right to claim it except as a matter of courtesy which the committee always gives.

Mr. TAWNEY. Do you say they have no right to a hearing, when you propose to pass a law which will take from them their private property?

Mr. HEARD. I say it is a courtesy always extended by the committee to anybody who asks it under reasonable conditions, but they have no right to complain. There is only one proposition in the bill which the Commissioners recommend, and I think wisely recommend, and that is that we require this railroad company, which is a rich one, to buy a block of ground for which they must pay, and put a passenger house there, where they can decently accommodate the public, and in that way give the public the right to the use of the street.

The company should take care of their passengers under a decent cover, to be constructed at their expense. Not a dollar of Mrs. Morris's property or of anybody else's property can be taken without full compensation. Everybody knows that where a jury sits upon a case on one side of which stands a corporation and on the other side of which stands a private citizen, no private citizen's rights are sacrificed. If there is any tendency to be partial, it is a tendency to be partial to a private citizen. That is the way it should be, and the way it is.

I apprehend nobody will doubt that this property can not be taken for this meritorious purpose without full compensation being made for it. That is the entire purpose of this bill, and I hope it will be favorably considered.

I want to say, Mr. Speaker, that two years ago, when this company was about to put in this cable plant, they were perfectly willing, on the suggestion of our District Committee, to extend their line up to the point now contemplated, and we presented to

the House a bill for that purpose, which was bitterly fought on this floor. I thought then that the opposition to it was unreasonable, and said to the House at that time that it would not be more than two years, that during the life of the then next Congress, the public would demand that these people make that change, and that it would cost forty or fifty thousand dollars to remove the terminal plant, which they should have been permitted then to locate at the right place. But that is a burden which the bill puts upon the company, and which the company is ready to assume, because they know that in order to get a good service they must do it, and that the demands presented in this bill are not on that account unreasonable.

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

Mr. HEARD. Certainly.

Mr. EVERETT. When a bill is pending before the committee, and before it has been reported, how are property owners who are interested to ascertain that it is pending, so that they may apply to the committee to extend to them the courtesy of a hearing? Until it is reported to the House, how can they know that it is pending?

Mr. HEARD. The gentleman is surely advised of the fact that all these bills relating to the District of Columbia are always reported in the newspapers. It is a matter of general report that they are pending; and I will state further to the gentleman that every bill that comes to the Committee on the District of Columbia, except such as come from the Commissioners themselves, is referred to that body for information and recommendation; and they, as I am advised, invariably advertise the fact that it is there and give hearings to those who are interested.

Mr. EVERETT. Has the Chairman investigated the subject sufficiently to be able to state whether this property owner did have a hearing by the District Commissioners?

Mr. HEARD. I am not advised as to that. I do not know that she was before the Commissioners when this bill was under consideration; but I know that the newspapers stated that this property holder did apply, through her attorney, to the Senate committee for a hearing. I think they had a hearing before the Senate, but whether she did before the District Commissioners I do not know.

Mr. EVERETT. I understand she did have a hearing before the Senate committee. It is, I understand, a great security that property owners shall be duly heard; and as I understand the gentleman, they have a chance to be heard by the Commissioners.

Mr. HEARD. I am advised that it is the practice of the Commissioners in every instance where there is notice of any opposition, to advertise the fact that the bill is there, and that hearings will be given.

Mr. EVERETT. And it is fair to assume that such hearing is given in every case.

Mr. HEARD. It is entirely fair to assume that any property holder applying will have a hearing, and in every case when it comes before the committee, before a case has been considered and acted on, I never knew of it being declined. I will say that courtesy is always extended by the committee wherever application is preferred before the bill is considered.

Mr. TAWNEY. I desire to move to strike out section 5 of this bill.

Mr. RICHARDSON of Tennessee. I submit to the gentleman that the motion is not in order until general debate is closed.

Mr. HEARD. I ask that general debate be closed on this bill.

Mr. TAWNEY. I give notice that at the proper time I will move to strike out this section. My principal object is this. The primary purpose of this bill is to extend the line of the Georgetown and Washington road to the Aqueduct bridge from its present termination.

Mr. HEARD. Not to the bridge, but to a point north of the bridge.

Mr. TAWNEY. To a point opposite the end of that bridge.

Mr. HEARD. That is correct.

Mr. TAWNEY. Now, coupled with that proposition is another proposition to purchase or to condemn private property for the purpose of erecting and maintaining a station, a transfer station. Now, the gentleman from Missouri says that this station is absolutely necessary to the public in using that road, notwithstanding the fact that the road has been used——

Mr. HEARD. I used no such language. I beg the gentleman's pardon. He does not certainly wish to misrepresent me. I used no such language as "that it was absolutely necessary." All I meant to state was that it would be an accommodation to the people which we should provide.

Mr. TAWNEY. I understood the gentleman very clearly to say that the use of this property was essential to the public accommodation and for the benefit of the company.

Mr. HEARD. The gentleman will allow me to say that my purpose was to argue that it would be for the benefit of the public that this erection be located at this point. And in order to enable these people to accomplish that end it is required that they should be authorized to condemn that property if they can not purchase it at a fair price.

Mr. TAWNEY. Now, then, the purpose is to erect and maintain a station there for the accommodation of the people. Mr. Chairman, that road now terminates about five blocks from the point proposed for its termination in this bill, and for a good many years they have had no station and have needed no station terminus. Why? Because the cars are standing there, and people desiring to go east simply get on the cars. Those people who wish to go west go on to their destination. The only way in which there could arise a necessity for a transfer station is by connecting that line with some line going beyond the Aqueduct Bridge, and this is the scheme contemplated, when taken together with the bill passed two weeks ago, giving another railroad a charter on Prospect street north of M street, on which the Washington and Georgetown line is located.

Now, this company has bought a large amount of property west of Thirty-fifth street, between Prospect and M streets. There is one half block, however, which it has not been able to secure. It is owned by Mrs. Morris, a native of my State, but who has resided on this property for a great many years; first with her parents and afterwards with her husband, until his death. That property is valuable. It is the lady's home, the only home she has. It fronts on Prospect 150 feet, and 120 feet on M street; the distance between the two streets is 240 feet, and the difference in elevation between M street and Prospect street is 75 feet. Now, how does this company propose to maintain a transfer station on property of that character without excavating the entire bank? They do not propose to take only a part of Mrs. Morris's property, but the whole tract; 150 feet on Prospect street and 240 feet deep, or the entire half block between the two streets.

Mr. HEARD. Your purpose, as I understand, is to strike out section 5, which authorizes condemnation proceedings?

Mr. TAWNEY. Yes, sir.

Mr. HEARD. It is not your purpose, however, to strike out the requirement that the company shall build a station there?

Mr. TAWNEY. No, sir.

Mr. HEARD. Therefore you ought to move to change the title of the bill to "A bill for the benefit of Mrs. Morris," by compelling the railroad company to pay her her price for her ground.

Mr. TAWNEY. She has set no price upon the land. It is her home, and she proposes to live there; and because this street railroad company is not one of those corporations that can invoke the right of eminent domain, you propose to give it that right by this act, which is wrong, and ought not to be done, especially in view of the fact that there is property just west of this that can be obtained for this purpose. If the company will extend their terminus one block further west they can get the necessary property without invoking the aid of a special act of this kind. They can go there and buy property as they have done heretofore. They own the block, or part of the block, west of this, and also part of this block adjoining Mrs. Morris's property.

Mr. HEPBURN. Suppose these condemnation proceedings take place and the company acquire the title to the two blocks between Thirty-fourth and Thirty-sixth streets and between Prospect and M streets and then grade those two blocks to the level of M street, what becomes of Thirty-fifth street between Prospect and M streets? Will it not be absolutely destroyed?

Mr. TAWNEY. Certainly.

Mr. GROUT. How?

Mr. HEPBURN. By reason of the difference in grade.

Mr. WASHINGTON. You can hardly walk up or down there now.

Mr. TAWNEY. Oh, yes; you can.

Mr. WASHINGTON. If you are a billygoat you can. [Laughter.]

Mr. TAWNEY. Well, perhaps the gentleman has tried it, and I have no doubt he has succeeded. [Laughter.] In fact, Mr. Chairman, there is a street there dedicated to the public and open to the public. Now, I submit that this Congress ought not to clothe a quasi-public corporation with the powers that this corporation would be clothed with under this section, and I submit that under the circumstances this lady ought not to be deprived of her home. There is no necessity for the company taking that property, none whatever.

This is simply part of a mammoth scheme of persons interested in suburban property. This House passed the other day a charter for a road that will connect with the Washington and Georgetown road running up the Potomac River from the Aqueduct Bridge, where they hope in the distant future to have occasion

for a transfer station, but there is no present necessity for it and no public demand for it. The Washington and Georgetown road now connects with no other road at that end, and the people who come from that direction are accommodated by the cars on the track, and the people who go in that direction go to their destinations without stopping at this point, and would not stop even if there was a transfer station there.

Mr. HEARD. I desire to say only a few words in reply to the gentleman from Minnesota. I repeat, Mr. Chairman, that the extension of this road would accommodate the people on three or four blocks on either side of M street where there is now no railroad accommodation. The gentleman refers to this as a part of a scheme to connect this road with other roads, but he should be fair enough to say that that scheme is one that is recommended by the District Commissioners.

Mr. TAWNEY. Is there any demand for it by the public?

Mr. HEARD. Yes, sir. It is the judgment of the committee and it is my judgment that the public greatly desire it.

Mr. TAWNEY. Have the committee received any petitions or anything of that kind in favor of it?

Mr. HEARD. Mr. Chairman, I state what I believe to be true, that this extension is demanded by the public, and there is only this one property-holder, so far as I have ever heard, who has made objection to the proposed extension to the Aqueduct Bridge. So far as the railroad company are concerned, they would get no more fare for carrying passengers on to this proposed terminus than they receive now for carrying them to their present terminus, and this extension will put them to large cost in moving their terminal plant up there, but they are willing to do it, for they know they have to go there ultimately.

Now, sir, one word about this scheme of another railroad to which the gentleman has referred.

The railroad company to which the gentleman from Minnesota has referred, a suburban road, came into Congress with a bill, not asking for this transfer station but on the contrary asking to be permitted to come down Prospect street and to connect with this road over the Tennallytown track at its present terminus. When the Commissioners reported upon their bill, and proposing a union railway station at this point, they required the bill to be amended, which was done on this floor by the committee, so as to permit the road to run to a point opposite this spot between Thirty-fourth and Thirty-sixth streets, with a view to using the station there when built, and requiring them to use it when the plan should be carried out. Now, in all fairness, if this road is to be extended as a public benefit to accommodate those people beyond its present terminus, the railroad company ought not to be required to go to work and purchase ground and build a station without having the power to protect themselves against exorbitant prices.

Mr. TAWNEY. How many people are there west of the terminus of this road?

Mr. HEARD. I never took any census of them, but there are several blocks. But I wish to call the gentleman's attention to the fact that this extension is not only a matter of accommodation to those people, but it concerns everyone who may want to go to Arlington by that road, or to any point beyond the Aqueduct Bridge. Such persons have a right to be put down at the point nearest to the bridge consistent with the public good.

Now, if you want to authorize the extension of this road, saying nothing about the use of the station, I shall not object, though I think the company ought to be compelled to buy ground and erect a station. I do not think they ought to be placed at the mercy of Mrs. Morris, however, or anybody else who may wish to oppress them by demanding three or four prices for their property. The general law of the District in regard to the condemnation of property, under which these people would have to proceed, sufficiently protects everybody whose property it may be necessary to take.

Mr. GEAR. Why was it that these parties in interest were denied a hearing?

Mr. HEARD. They were not denied a hearing. I contradict that statement on this floor. They made their application two or three weeks after the bill had been considered and ordered reported to the House.

Mr. GEAR. I have seen a letter stating that a hearing was denied them.

Mr. HEARD. No, sir; you saw my letter, and I wrote no such letter as the gentleman states. I wrote a letter stating why a hearing could not be granted at that time because the bill had been considered two or three weeks before. Let the gentleman bring that letter here.

Mr. GEAR. I saw the letter.

Mr. HEARD. The gentleman, when he states to the House a matter affecting the standing of other members, ought to be very careful to state the truth.

Mr. GEAR. I am not stating anything against the gentleman or his committee.

Mr. HEARD. I say that the statement affects me as a member of the committee; and it is not the truth.

Mr. GEAR. I am making no charge against the gentleman.

Mr. HEARD. The gentleman does make a charge, whether he intends it or not.

Mr. GEAR. A reputable gentleman told me this morning that he had such a letter; he took it out of his pocket and showed it to me. I did not read the letter——

Mr. HEARD. That will do. I excuse the gentleman.

Mr. GEAR. He said that letter showed that these parties had been denied a hearing.

Mr. HEARD. It is absolutely untrue, except under the conditions I have explained. Those people applied to us for a hearing two or three weeks after the bill had been considered and ordered reported, and while we were waiting simply for an amended report from the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to accompany our report.

Mr. TAWNEY. Do you know whether the owners of this property were notified of the pendency of this bill?

Mr. HEARD. I do not know; I never heard. Why, Mr. Speaker, those people are all immediately represented by the Commissioners who, as I am advised, advertise these hearings when notified of opposition before them. I never heard of Mrs. Morris till I heard through the papers she was before the Senate committee in regard to this bill; and when her lawyer wrote that letter to me, I stated to him in reply why the hearing could not be granted to him. If my friend from Iowa had brought that letter here and read it, there would have been no need for any further explanation about the matter. It would establish the facts as I have stated them. The bill has already been ordered reported, and we were merely waiting the return of the amended report of the District Commissioners in order that the bill might be presented to the House, and we had that when the attorney's letter was received.

Mr. TAWNEY. Just one word. Mrs. Morris went to the Commissioners and they told her there was no proposition pending for the condemnation of her property. Then she went to the president of the Washington and Georgetown road, who evaded her question as to what they proposed to do by this bill. Then application was made to the committee.

Mr. HEARD. Let me ask my friend this question: If she made that application to the Commissioners, why did she not follow it up then with an application to the committee? If she had done so she would have had a hearing.

Mr. TAWNEY. I understand that she did——

Mr. HEARD. She did no such thing.

Mr. TAWNEY (continuing). Through her attorney.

Mr. HEARD. She did nothing of the kind at that time. The Commissioners had the bill there, for we sent it to them, and her attorney should have been able to see the provision in the bill about the condemnation clause and called her attention to it.

Mr. TAWNEY. She went in person and they told her that there was no proposition to condemn the property.

Mr. HEARD. Well, I do not know what the Commissioners may have told her. I was not there. If they misrepresented the matter to her then they ought to be held responsible for it and not the committee, but I apprehend there must be some misunderstanding about their statement to her. I am stating exactly the facts as far as they concerned the committee.

Mr. BYNUM. Let me ask the gentleman from Missouri a question: I understand that at the time this application was made, the bill had not been reported?

Mr. HEARD. No, sir; but the committee had ordered it made.

Mr. BYNUM. Please state then what urgent necessity existed for reporting it so hurriedly without giving her an opportunity to be heard?

Mr. HEARD. Well, Mr. Chairman, this bill had been considered and ordered to be reported to the House; and I suppose there is no committee of the House which ever held up a bill on any such ground as that. I never knew a committee to do it. The bill was considered by the committee, was ordered to be reported, and the report was made, and I do not know any reason why it should have been held up because of such an application. This bill contains but one proposition, it must be remembered. All persons in interest had notice, I presume, from the Commissioners of the District of Columbia that the bill was being considered by them; and I know, and I presume all the members of the committee know, that we have considered the matter thoroughly, and that if this party had a dozen hearings upon the facts here stated by her friends it would not have changed the views entertained by the committee. I am frank to say no amount of evidence to show the facts claimed here would have changed

my view, and I presume that is true of the other members of the committee.

Now, the facts are before the House for your action. Here is a proposition to authorize this railroad company to extend its line of road to accommodate the traveling public. It can be voted down or voted up; I do not care a penny. There is a proposition, in addition to the bill, allowing this company to buy more land for the purpose of building a transfer station. That is a matter for the determination of the House. Strike it out if you desire; vote the bill down if you will. But the bill is a good one, the Commissioners say so; the Committee on the District of Columbia believe it ought to be passed. It is for the House to vote as it pleases in regard to the matter.

Mr. GROUT. This land is wanted for the purpose of establishing a passenger station upon it, as I understand?

Mr. HEARD. Yes, sir.

Mr. GROUT. Well, a statement has been made that other land has been bought adjoining this on the west side by this company.

Mr. HEARD. I know nothing whatever about that. I have no such information.

Mr. GROUT. That is stated as a fact.

Mr. TAWNEY. It is a fact.

Mr. GROUT. I was wondering if the other land was purchased why they might need this also.

Now, I want to say with reference to this bill that I would like to see the road extended to connect with any proposed line for Great Falls.

Mr. HEARD. Or all lines.

Mr. GROUT. Or any other lines extending anywhere else into the country, wherever they may choose to run. I do not altogether share the objection which has been raised here by gentlemen to condemning private property for such purposes, although it is a little outside of the purpose indicated by the name given a street railway, for that is supposed to cling to the street. Yet I can see no real absurdity or impropriety, if necessary for the proper exercise of that franchise for the accommodation of the public, for private property to be condemned for this purpose.

Mr. BYNUM. Will the gentleman answer one question?

Mr. GROUT. Yes, sir.

Mr. BYNUM. When this company was required to change its motor power was a condition put into the law allowing them to condemn private property for the establishment of a power house?

Mr. GROUT. I think not.

Mr. BYNUM. Was it ever granted any such right, or any other street railroad?

Mr. GROUT. I am not able to say.

Mr. TAWNEY. Not anywhere in the United States.

Mr. BYNUM. Did not they purchase this square of ground down here at what they claimed to be an excessive cost, some six hundred and odd thousand dollars, because they could not have the right to condemn it?

Mr. GROUT. Oh, they have no right of condemnation under the general law, as I understand it. It must be expressly conferred.

Mr. HEARD. They have no power of condemnation, of course, unless it be expressly granted.

Mr. GROUT. And it has never been specially conferred, I believe.

Mr. BYNUM. I think not.

Mr. GROUT. But granted that it has not the power, wherein lies the objection, if it be for the convenience of the public?

Mr. BYNUM. I say to the gentleman that this power ought not to be conferred upon a corporation of this character. I do not believe it is such a public corporation as brings it within the rule authorizing the exercise of the principle of eminent domain.

Mr. GROUT. But why not on this, if on others? It is certainly given steam railways.

Mr. GEAR. It should not be granted to any.

Mr. BYNUM. No street railway corporation in the District should have that right.

Mr. GROUT. Do you mean simply because it is called a street railway and not a steam railway?

Mr. BYNUM. I do not believe this corporation should have that right. It has no public station at the other end of the line. Why is one more necessary at that end of the line than at the other end of the line?

Mr. GROUT. On account of its connections beyond.

Mr. BYNUM. Is not there something behind this, that they want to get this property for some other purpose?

Mr. GROUT. Of course that should be guarded against. But I can not understand why this corporation should want to build a passenger-house there unless it is for the accommodation of the company and the accommodation of the public. I can not imagine any other reason. Its self-interest can be trusted to regulate this.

Mr. HEARD. I will explain to the gentleman that it is a scheme of the District Commissioners——

Mr. GEAR. "Scheme" is the proper word.

Mr. HEARD. A plan of the District Commissioners, absolutely. It originates with Maj. Powell and the District Commissioners, and they made their first suggestion of it in connection with the Great Falls road, when that matter was here.

Mr. GROUT. I do not care where it originated. Let us look at it as a practical question. That is all we have to do with it.

Mr. TAWNEY. Is the gentleman aware of the fact that there are scarcely any people residing west of the terminus?

Mr. GROUT. I suppose it does go pretty well out to the city limits, but it connects with other lines beyond.

Mr. TAWNEY. There are no other lines beyond.

Mr. GROUT. Well, projected lines beyond.

Mr. TAWNEY. In the future, when this suburban property is developed, there may be some necessity for a connection, but at the present time there is no other road there to connect with and there are no people to travel on the road, if they had one there.

Mr. GROUT. There are people up the valley toward Cabin John, and pretty much all the way to Great Falls, to be accommodated by the proposed line there.

Mr. HEARD. It is a mistake to suppose there are no people there. There are people on that street along which this line runs.

Mr. GROUT. I have been up as far as the Great Falls. I went in a carriage, at the expense of another man. Now, if a company want to build a railway there which will take me up, I am willing that they should, and I am willing that they should have the trolley up in that section. Then, when the line is built, I may take it sometime on my account, not being able to support a carriage. And this illustrates the convenience it will be to the general public. I have no objection to corporations building railways for the accommodation of the public. I am in favor of it, heartily in favor of it; but let us come back to the question. Wherein lies the reasonable objection to giving this company the right to take private property for a passenger house, provided that passenger house is for the accommodation of the public? I am unable to see any reason for objection. I can see no difference in principle to have a street railway and a steam railway. The fact that no street railway company has ever had the right before, if that be true, is not a sufficient reason. Before I can concur in this objection something must be suggested to distinguish a street railway from a steam railway, for which it is granted in every State and Territory.

Mr. WARNER. Will the gentleman allow an interruption?

Mr. GROUT. Certainly.

Mr. WARNER. I wish to ask a question. Possibly it would be more pertinent to ask the chairman of the committee, but I think the gentleman from Vermont is informed on this subject. I understand from what has been said that this road proposes to extend its line only about five blocks, and that the neighborhood where this land is to be condemned has been suggested as being peculiarly appropriate for a passenger station, because it may hereafter be a place where very much more important transportation lines from outside will center. Now, may I ask, what there is in this bill which, when that time comes, will prevent this company—which is given the opportunity to acquire this land when it is not specially needed—from becoming a dog in the manger to prevent the public from being well served by the other companies which will then need the land, and which will find this company in possession of the point of vantage?

Mr. HEARD. There is ample provision in the bill to guard against that.

Mr. GROUT. It is provided for in the bill.

Mr. HEARD. And this plan is proposed by the Commissioners of the District.

Mr. WARNER. As I read the bill, it did not seem to be very well provided for.

Mr. HEARD. It is provided for.

Mr. GROUT. It is satisfactorily provided for in the bill as I read it. If the corporations can not agree among themselves, the Commissioners are to determine.

Mr. HEARD. That is the fact.

Mr. GROUT. But, to come back to the question, I can see no reason why a street railway company may not be allowed to take private property for the convenience of the public, the same as a steam railway company may. I should want, of course, to know that it was absolutely necessary for the purpose assigned, and for no other purpose.

Now, in reply to the suggestion of the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. TAWNEY] that notice was not given these parties, so they might have a hearing, let me say: If there be any suggestion of any matter which should have been presented to the committee, which can not with equal fullness and certainty be presented to the House, that objection would be a good one, undoubtedly. But I can hardly imagine what matter of that kind there could be. The objection stated by my friend from Minnesota [Mr. TAWNEY], that the company have no right to condemn private property, is an objection which the House would have to consider ultimately, even if it had been passed upon by the committee, after argument before committee by counsel in behalf of the person heard.

Mr. TAWNEY. But they had a right to be heard.

Mr. GROUT. They have a right to be heard and are being heard now, it seems to me; so that that objection is not a good one. But I wish to be sure, as has been suggested by the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BYNUM], that it is necessary to take this private property for this purpose; and I want to know, too, that it can not be misapplied or afterward appropriated to any other purpose. So I have drawn an amendment which I will submit when the time comes, provided the section is not stricken out. I will read the amendment for the information of the House and will send it to the Clerk's desk to be called up in due time. It is as follows:

Add to section 4 the words:

"*Provided*, That no land shall be condemned under this act unless it be absolutely necessary for the construction of the passenger house hereinbefore provided; *And provided also*, If said land is ever put to any other purpose whatever it shall revert to the owner."

Mr. HEARD. That is right.

Mr. GROUT. Now, very likely it might take that course under the law, but we want it expressly provided.

Mr. HULL. Is it proposed to provide that the Commissioners may determine the necessity?

Mr. GROUT. No; let that go to the courts. The courts have control of the condemnation proceedings, and I want to leave that to the courts, to be determined by them when the proceedings are instituted. The company should be compelled to show that it is necessary to take this land before they can have it, and when they do establish that fact and take the land, then they must not divert it to any other purpose. When these conditions are complied with I shall be satisfied.

It does seem to me a little strange, if it be true, that they have been buying other blocks in that neighborhood, and it naturally raises the question whether there is not some other scheme in contemplation, and I do not propose to further any plan to buy land, or to acquire land for any other purpose; but if we can be sure that it will be applied to that purpose and that alone, then I am in favor of allowing them to do it. This provided for and I am in favor of the bill.

Mr. HEARD. I think the gentleman's amendment is altogether proper. I have no earthly objection to it.

Mr. GEAR. Mr. Chairman, I am opposed to this bill. I happen to know the parties who own this property and have known them for many, many years. I took a carriage and rode there this morning and went all over this ground. The south half of this block has been bought by private parties, as I am informed. I oppose the bill on that account. I oppose the bill because the parties interested were not given a hearing. I further oppose it upon the ground that I do not believe it is right to give to a street railroad company the right of eminent domain so as to enable it to condemn other people's property. I recognize as much as anyone the importance of having these street railroads, and street improvements to furnish the people with facilities for travel, but I do not believe in granting at will franchises worth $100,000 to $200,000 out of which they can make money at the expense of the people.

Mr. HEARD. If the gentleman will permit me, I will state that this railroad company, if it extends its road, will collect no more fare.

Mr. GEAR. That is an altogether different question.

Mr. HEARD. Then how does it add to the value of their franchise?

Mr. GEAR. Now, there is other property beyond that, and as the gentleman from Vermont stated, there is very little population west of this place. Why, they have selected to put their station at this place, 70 feet above, taking a beautiful homestead and confiscating it for the interests of the parties who bought the south half of that property. I never will vote the right to condemn and destroy property at random. The original act chartering the road required them to procure proper stable and station grounds, but it does not give them the right of eminent domain to which Congress alone can give the right, and I earnestly hope the members will pause before they will grant this particular road the right to confiscate this property.

Mr. GROUT. I would like to make an inquiry of the chairman of the committee. I do not understand from what you said, and I did not hear every utterance and presume it has been stated, but I want to ask if the proposition is to take in the dwelling place of this woman and not merely the land in connection with it?

Mr. HEARD. I say to the gentleman from Vermont that I have no information on that point.

Mr. GROUT. I was not aware that it went further. I am not clear about that.

Mr. GEAR. The lot on which this building stands extends 150 feet from north to south.

Mr. TAWNEY. Two hundred and forty feet.

Mr. GEAR. And 150 feet from east to west. All south of that property, including all the buildings to the west of the property, have been bought by certain parties, who, I understand in a general way, though I do not know anything positive about it, are connected with this road. Presumably it has been bought, as many other pieces of the property have been bought, where a gentleman buys it and turns it over to the corporation.

Mr. GROUT. And all of this is abutting this private property to the west.

Mr. GEAR. All west of it is abutting the whole length.

Mr. GROUT. Well, Mr. Chairman, if that is the fact——

Mr. GEAR. One moment. If you confer the right of eminent domain—if you give them this right to take the property—they can take the whole block from this lady.

Mr. GROUT. The language of my amendment is—

Unless it is absolutely necessary for the purpose of erecting this passenger station.

And if there is open land beyond, no court in the world will say it is absolutely necessary, especially if owned, as is stated, by this company. I think she is protected under my amendment.

Mr. HEARD. I am perfectly content to accept the amendment of the gentleman from Vermont.

The CHAIRMAN. The amendment can not be accepted at this stage of the proceedings, as the committee is still proceeding to consider the bill under general debate. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York.

Mr. WARNER. Mr. Chairman, I believe it will be conceded by every member——

Mr. GEAR. I want to say to the gentleman from Tennessee——

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York has the floor.

Mr. WARNER. I yield to the gentleman for a moment.

Mr. GEAR. I want to say that this block or building and property is between Thirty-fifth and Thirty-sixth streets. The residence is 3508, and it is a very charming and lovely home.

Mr. WARNER. Mr. Chairman, I believe it will be conceded by every member present that this is a most extraordinary power, for the granting of which to a similar corporation there is absolutely no precedent in the District; and I say, even if there were precedents innumerable, we should be most careful of the extent to which we grant it.

And now, sir, when it is proposed to grant this extraordinary power of the condemnation of land for the purposes of stations, etc., to a railroad which only proposes to extend its road for five blocks, I submit that such is scarcely a case to call for the exercise of any such extraordinary power as is now proposed to be given.

Again, sir, if the chairman of the committee has stated the matter correctly—and I have no doubt he has—this power is proposed to be given to provide accommodation not so much for what this railroad now needs, or for it will need after it has completed this extension, as for what may be needed by the development of other roads, which are expected to open up new traffic demanding such additional accommodations. If that be so, sir, it seems to me that what we should do is to wait until those needs have developed, and then, if we are going to confer this extraordinary power at all, confer it upon the corporations which shall then have need to exercise it.

But that is not my main objection to this proviso giving the right of eminent domain to this company. I have not examined the statutes of the District of Columbia in this regard, and if I am mistaken the chairman of the committee I know will correct me, but unless there is some peculiar provision in them which is not contemplated by any reference in this bill, the fact is that when this railroad shall have completed these condemnation proceedings it will become the owner in fee simple of the lands thus taken and they will not be subject to forfeiture in case the company shall afterwards wish to use them for other purposes.

Mr. HEARD. That will not be so if the amendment suggested by the gentleman from Vermont [Mr. GROUT] should be adopted.

Mr. WARNER. I did not hear that.

Mr. HEARD. The gentleman from Vermont has proposed an

amendment providing that if any land taken under this right is ever used for any other purpose, then it shall revert to the original owner.

Mr. WARNER. If that is the tenor of the amendment of the gentleman from Vermont, I am in favor of that amendment. But, even if that amendment were adopted and the company were thereafter kept from appropriating for its own benefit and not for the public advantage the result of the exercise of this power of eminent domain now proposed to be given, there would still remain a serious defect in this bill. The land that is proposed to be condemned is confessedly the land that would be needed for a passenger station for what the chairman of the committee has stated will probably be a great development of suburban travel and traffic.

Mr. HEARD. I want to say at this point, for the information of the House, that in connection with another bill recently under consideration here the Commissioners of the District recommended the establishment of a union transfer station at this point. I think they had elaborated a plan in which they had named six or seven such stations, which they proposed to recommend to Congress, and this is among them.

They propose to establish a station at that end of Washington into which suburban roads may come, including roads which are expected to cross the river. The scheme originated with the Commissioners, and it is not confined at all to this particular case.

Mr. WARNER. I am glad the gentleman has so far explained the matter; and his explanation simply goes to show that it is one of even greater importance than, upon his former statement, I had imagined, In so far as he has explained it, it seems to me a matter of the very greatest importance, for it is practically the provision of a general center for the whole of the great suburban traffic on both sides of the river that may be expected on the north and west of the District of Columbia, and for that reason, if there were no other, it would seem to be preposterous that at this time we should put the power to acquire in fee simple all the very extensive property which in such a case would be proper and necessary into the hands of a single railroad company which does not now need it even for its own purposes.

But that is not my only objection. In section 2 of this bill—which I presume is the section to which the gentleman referred when he mentioned the guaranties provided by the bill against this road standing like a dog in the manger after it should have exercised this right of eminent domain and acquired this property—the only provisions of that character that I find, are practically, first, that this company shall allow other lines to use its station, under such arrangements as the Commissioners of the District of Columbia may prescribe; and second, that if it does not do this, it shall forfeit $50 per day for the days that it does not do it.

Now, sir, to allow a company to have the power of eminent domain to acquire a considerable tract of land—and the gentleman himself intimates that the tract ought to be large enough to provide a central station for all the suburban traffic in that direction—to confer such a power upon a corporation and then simply to provide that, as to the passenger house which it may put upon that property, it shall allow the use of that passenger house by such other corporations as the Commissioners of the District may direct, but that if it does not do so, the only penalty shall be the payment of $50 per day for the days when it refuses to permit such use, seems to me to be legislation which, however well intended, would be effective in enabling this company to stand as a dog in the manger, by protecting it from being called upon to respond in damages in the ordinary way upon the ground that Congress had already prescribed the penalty in this act.

In other words, sir, a little experience, and a very painful experience, in watching the proceedings of roads which have obtained rights of way and vantage ground in competition with others, has convinced me that if any serious attempt is to be made, after granting this unwarranted power, so to restrict it as to make it as little hurtful as possible, some other method must be adopted than that which is here provided.

Mr. HEARD. I will ask the gentleman from New York whether the objection he has last made in regard to the inadequacy of the fine would be met by increasing the fine, or by providing for a forfeiture?

Mr. WARNER. Nothing short of a forfeiture would be any deterrent whatever; and to a company which employs good counsel in this District, even a threatened forfeiture, as experience has shown, has no terrors.

Mr. HEARD. The gentleman has made some suggestion in regard to a recommitment of the bill. That, of course, if meant honestly by the gentleman, as it doubtless is, would mean to reform the bill. Now, since the House has the bill before it for consideration, why should we not adopt such amendments as may be necessary to put it in acceptable form if that can be done?

Mr. WARNER. I suggest to the gentleman an amendment which I believe would put the bill in perfectly acceptable form as regards the only matter to which my criticisms have referred; and that is an amendment leaving out all provision for giving this company the right of eminent domain. It does not need to use this right; it is not pretended that it will be used mainly for this company; and as for any other company, it will be very easy to confer that right, if necessary, whenever the occasion may arise.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HEARD obtained the floor.

Mr. TALBERT of South Carolina. I suppose it is not absolutely necessary that the company should have this particular property?

Mr. HEARD. I apprehend not. The Commissioners recommend the location of a union transfer station at this point, between Thirty-fourth and Thirty-sixth streets. It seems to me this might be limited to ground between Thirty-fourth and Thirty-fifth streets, if that would remove any objection.

Mr. TALBERT of South Carolina. Then why make such a contention on this point?

Mr. HEARD. We are acting in accordance with the recommendation of the District Commissioners, including the Engineer Commissioner, who is supposed to be familiar with the requirements in this regard. I will say, however, to the gentleman from South Carolina and to the gentleman from New York, that so far as I am concerned as a member of the committee and as a member of the House, if it is desired to strike out the condemnation proceedings altogether and also the provision requiring a transfer station to be built, while I think that the only sufferers will be the general public (and would be inclined to object on that account), still if it is the choice of the House that those provisions should go out, let them go.

Mr. TALBERT of South Carolina. That was my suggestion, in order that all difficulty might be obviated and the bill passed.

Mr. HEARD. Then the bill would provide simply for extending the line of the road up to the point named, which I think ought to be done, even if nothing further is.

Mr. TAWNEY. I have no objection to the bill in that form.

Mr. HEARD. I think that in the interests of the public we ought to require the erection of a decent structure to accommodate passengers; but that can be done hereafter. If such is the wish of the House, I should have no objection to asking permission to withdraw the bill and recommit it to the committee for the purpose of reforming it in that direction.

Mr. RICHARDSON of Tennessee. Why not amend it here in the House?

Mr. HEARD. As my colleague on the committee [Mr. RICHARDSON] suggests, we might by an amendment in the House strike out that provision authorizing the company to acquire property by condemnation or purchase, and also the provision requiring the building of a transfer station. In that case the company would take their chances about getting the ground. Hereafter if the District Commissioners should make it appear to the satisfaction of Congress that there is need for clothing the corporation with power to acquire ground for this purpose, it can be done. Two years ago I stood here insisting that this corporation should extend their line to this point for the public benefit. I am perfectly willing that those provisions be stricken out, retaining only the portion of the bill which directs this company to extend its line to the point named. That would leave to further legislation the question of the establishment of a passenger station. I understand this arrangement will obviate the objection of gentlemen who have opposed this bill. But I wish to state that I think the bill would be better as it is.

The CHAIRMAN. If there be no objection, the Chair will regard general debate as closed, and the bill will be read by paragraphs, with the understanding that when the provisions referred to have been reached amendments shall be offered striking them out.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc. That the Washington and Georgetown Railroad Company be, and it is hereby, directed and required to extend its tracks and run its cars thereon as follows: Beginning at the present terminus of its tracks in Georgetown; thence west on M street to or near Thirty-fourth street; thence northerly and westerly, on a private right of way to be acquired by said company, to a point to be designated by the Commissioners of the District of Columbia, between M and Prospect, Thirty-fourth and Thirty-sixth streets.

Mr. GROUT. I do not see that it is specified what kind of power shall be used over this extended line—I presume the cable.

Mr. HEARD. The cable, of course.

Mr. GROUT. Then, why not amend by inserting in the fifth line the words "to be operated by cable?"

Mr. HEARD. There is no objection to that.

Mr. GROUT. Without such an amendment, if there should be a steam railway up there it might undertake to pass its steam cars over this line of road.

Mr. HEARD. There is no objection at all to the amendment the gentleman suggests.

Mr. GROUT. I move to amend by inserting after the word "follows," in the fifth line, the words "to be operated by cable."

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 2. That all plans relating to the location and construction of said railroad extension and of the passenger houses hereinafter mentioned shall be subject to the approval of the Commissioners of the District of Columbia; the said company shall furnish at the western terminus of its route a passenger house within such reasonable time as may be required by the said Commissioners, and shall maintain such passenger house and permit its use by connecting lines of street car companies for the safe, convenient, and comfortable transfer of passengers, upon terms mutually agreed upon by said railway company and the connecting line or lines, or in default of agreement, as may be fixed by the said Commissioners. Any violation of the requirements of this section as to passenger house shall be punished by a fine of $50 for each day such violation is continued and maintained, said fine to be recovered in any court of competent jurisdiction at the suit of the Commissioners of the District of Columbia.

Mr. HEARD. Mr. Chairman, in accordance with the understanding with gentlemen of the committee, I move to strike out of this section, beginning with line 2, after the word "extension," down to and including the word "mentioned," in line 3, the following words: "extension and of the passenger houses hereinafter mentioned;" so it will read:

That all plans relating to the location and construction of said railroad shall be subject to the approval of the Commissioners of the District of Columbia, etc.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection the amendment will be agreed to.

Mr. COOMBS. I object and ask for a vote upon it.

Mr. HULL. I object, Mr. Chairman.

It seems to me that one of the very things that should not be adopted is proposed in the amendment of the gentleman from Missouri. Every man who has gone to Arlington by that railroad line will agree with me, first, that it should be extended to the Aqueduct Bridge; and second, that some provision should be made for the care of the people who are compelled to wait on the street at the end of the route either for a carriage or some other conveyance to get to Arlington.

I am one of those who believe that this company should be compelled to erect a passenger station there, and I am opposed to the motion of the gentleman from Missouri, for the reason that every Sunday hundreds of people are going to Arlington, and if it is raining they are compelled to stand in the rain or else seek shelter in private doorways until carriages come along to take them to the national cemetery.

I do not believe that the railroad company is specially interested in this extension. I believe that the people are directly interested in it, and the course adopted upon this bill has been largely, in my mind, the erecting of a "man of straw" to fight. The Commissioners recommend the bill; the railroad does not ask it. The company does not get a cent more for carrying passengers to the end of the line than it gets for carrying them to the present terminus; and this is a great, rich corporation, carrying more people than any other company in Washington, having a valuable franchise, and they ought to be compelled to provide some means to take care of their passengers at the end of the line.

You adopted an amendment compelling it to provide a little station here at the foot of the hill to accommodate the few people who transfer from the main line to the Baltimore and Ohio branch. Now, there are a hundred that take the cars out to the terminus of the road for one that is transferred at the foot of the hill here.

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

Mr. HULL. Certainly.

Mr. HEARD. I do not know whether the gentleman was present during the course of this debate or not.

Mr. HULL. I have been here all the time.

Mr. HEARD. Then you understand the objections which have been made to the acquisition of the property at the place suggested by the Commissioners for the erection of this station. The object of the committee now is to get rid of these objections, if possible, and yet authorize the extension of the road, leaving the question of the acquisition of property for the construction of a passenger station to be determined hereafter.

Now, if my colleague will prepare an amendment providing for the erection of a passenger station there, drawn up in proper terms, I am perfectly willing to accept it. The only effort now is to meet the wishes of those gentlemen who have objected to that provision of the bill.

Mr. HULL. I am opposed to striking out the section that has been discussed, and I wish to say that I favor the amendment of my friend Mr. GROUT, that this property shall be used exclusively for a passenger station, or revert to the original owners.

Mr. HEARD. I agree with that. I am not opposed to it. I would much prefer not to strike out the provision in the bill. I am satisfied with the amendment of the gentleman from Vermont, but I believe it avoids very much of the confusion and objection that has been raised if the provision for this passenger station is stricken out; so I have moved to strike it out in accordance with the understanding which I supposed had been reached.

Mr. BURROWS. Let us test it by a vote of the committee.

Mr. HULL. If the House agrees to strike it out, let it do so, but let the matter be tested by a direct vote. I am not willing to sacrifice what I believe to be right merely to meet the objections of some gentlemen who do not agree with me. I would prefer to leave the matter to the judgment of the House rather than accommodate myself to the views of some other member of the House who differs with me.

Mr. TAWNEY. Let me ask the gentleman why is it not as necessary to have a station at the present termiuns as it is if the road is extended three blocks farther?

Mr. HULL. I think it is necessary.

Mr. TAWNEY. Why is it necessary at all? When people are coming this way there are cars to get in at the terminus. If they are going west, when they get to the terminus of the line, if they are going beyond there, they have got to walk or wait for a conveyance.

Mr. HULL. They should have provision made for a passenger house there of some kind now to shelter people.

Mr. TAWNEY. Is it the duty of Congress to provide shelter for the people?

Mr. HULL. It is the duty of a corporation, receiving the money of the people, to provide proper accommodations for them, especially when they are enjoying a valuable right that costs them nothing. It is necessary that they should provide a depot for the people, and I think they should be compelled to erect one there. If you extend the road up to the Aqueduct Bridge you are beyond the reach of the private shelter which people have been compelled to seek in doorways, because you strike that part of the street where one side is practically a wall of rock, and where you can get no shelter. For that reason I am insisting that they should be compelled to put up a passenger house there.

Mr. BAKER of New Hampshire. In reply to the remarks just made by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HULL] I wish to read, for the information of the committee, part of a section of the act by which the Washington and Georgetown Railway Company was originally incorporated. The first part of section 10 reads as follows:

And be it further enacted, That said company shall procure such passenger rooms, ticket offices, stables, and depots, at such points as the business of the railroad and the convenience of the public may require.

That was passed on the 17th of May, 1862. So this is not a new question, but is a requirement of the original act of incorporation, which for more than thirty years has not been carried out; and I presume that the gentleman's objection would be disregarded in the same way.

Mr. HULL. We can put it in the law, all the same.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment proposed by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. HEARD].

Mr. HEARD. I want to say that I agree perfectly with the remarks of the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HULL] that these people ought to be compelled, whether they want to or not, to extend that line, and they ought also to be compelled, under proper conditions, to provide accommodations for the passengers. That is my view. Yet, in view of the opposition to the bill as it stood, I was content to have this matter go out of the bill.

Believing as the gentleman does about the matter, having made the motion, I myself shall vote against it, because I believe that they ought to have the power to secure that property and to build a station there. With the consent of the House, I will withdraw the amendment which I have offered.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the withdrawal of the amendment proposed by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. HEARD]?

Mr. GEAR. I object.

Mr. HEARD. Then let the amendment be voted down.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. HEARD. Let the amendment be again reported.

The Clerk read as follows:

On page 2, section 2, line 2, after the word "extension" strike out the words "and of the passenger houses hereinafter mentioned."

Mr. HEARD. I will simply suggest to the members of the committee that whether we subsequently adopt the provision

about the building of the station house or not, that amendment would not materially interfere. If you by a subsequent provision require the construction of the house you withdraw the supervision of its construction from the District Commissioners if you strike this out; but that can be put in to such amendment if adopted.

Mr. BURROWS. It would be better to leave it in.

The question was taken on the amendment, and the Chairman announced that the noes seemed to have it.

Mr. COOMBS. Division.

The committee divided, and there were—ayes 9, noes 39.

Mr. COOMBS. No quorum.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York [Mr. COOMBS] makes the point of no quorum. The Chair will appoint as tellers the gentleman from Missouri, Mr. HEARD, and the gentleman from New York, Mr. COOMBS.

Mr. HEARD. Owing to the probability that there is not a quorum present, I think it is my duty to the committee to ask to withdraw the bill and to give the committee authority to report a substitute, if in the judgment of the committee it deems it best.

Mr. DINGLEY. The gentleman can move to recommit.

The CHAIRMAN. That can only be done in the House.

Mr. COOMBS. I move that the committee do now rise.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. HEARD] has the floor.

Mr. HEARD. I will move that the committee rise.

The motion was agreed to.

The committee accordingly rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. O'NEIL of Massachusetts, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that committee had had under consideration the bill (H. R. 6953) to amend an act entitled, "An act to incorporate the Washington and Georgetown Railroad Company," approved May 17, 1862, and had come to no resolution thereon.

Mr. HEARD. Mr. Speaker, I desire now to withdraw the bill from the consideration of the House for the present.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the gentleman can withdraw the bill from the further consideration of the House.

ORDER OF BUSINESS.

Mr. HEARD. I now desire to call up the bill which was before the House on the last District day, and which was withdrawn from the House because of the fact that no quorum voted upon the amendment which was pending. I now call up the bill H. R. 6596.

Mr. HEPBURN. I submit to the chairman of the committee that it is scarcely fair to do that. We understood from the gentleman a little while ago, when objection was made to the consideration of another bill, that as soon as the committee disposed of two bills, naming them—the two that have been disposed of—he would then call up the bill we were considering when the House adjourned two weeks ago—not the L-street bill.

Mr. HEARD. The gentleman misunderstood me clearly, for on the contrary I told the gentleman that I felt that, the L-street bill having progressed further than the other, debate having been closed and the bill having been withdrawn because no quorum appeared on the amendment which was offered, that bill was entitled to precedence, and that I should call it up first.

Mr. HEPBURN. That is not the understanding. I certainly understood the gentleman clearly to say that the measure that we were considering two weeks ago would be called up as soon as we had disposed of those two measures.

Mr. HEARD. I clearly intended to say a different thing. The gentleman very clearly misunderstood me.

Mr. HEPBURN. I did not misunderstand you; you misunderstood yourself.

Mr. HEARD. I beg the gentleman's pardon. The gentleman misunderstood me, because I am sure I stated a different thing.

Mr. GROUT. The gentleman from Iowa asked what bill it was understood we would return to.

Mr. HEARD. Well.

Mr. GROUT. Designating the one that we left off upon the other day, when a quorum was lacking, which was the suburban railroad, and I understood the gentleman, maybe unintentionally, to state that that was the bill we would return to after two bills were disposed of.

Mr. HEARD. Of course I do not pretend to infallibility, and it may be I said what I did not intend to say; but I desire to say to the gentleman from Vermont now, that I had stated to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WILLIAMS], who came to me and asked about the other bill, that it would not be taken up until the Belt Line bill was disposed of; and I had so stated to my colleague [Mr. RICHARDSON] and others who asked for the consideration of that bill.

For the reason I stated before I asked to call up this bill. As I say, Mr. Speaker, I have no desire to take any advantage of the House, nor do I see how it can make any difference, not the slightest. The L street road bill that was before the House before had progressed to that stage where general debate had been closed, the first section had been read for amendment, an amendment had been offered by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HEPBURN], and a substitute by the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. RICHARDSON], and upon the pendency of that substitute the vote was being taken when no quorum was developed. It was my belief that it was the proper thing to return to that bill, it having been abandoned because on a vote no quorum appeared to be present.

Mr. HEPBURN. Mr. Speaker, I raise the point of order against the consideration of this bill. My point of order is that the measure that was pending, and which the House was considering at the time of adjournment two weeks ago, that being District day, is now the proper measure to be considered by the House. That it is the regular order. I understand the gentleman to say that he seeks to have this other matter disposed of.

The SPEAKER. What disposition was made of it? What was the order in relation to the bill when it was up before?

Mr. HEPBURN. None. It was under consideration when the committee rose, pending consideration.

Mr. COOMBS. If the Speaker will look at the RECORD, on page 6419, he will find this:

> Mr. HEARD. I desire to withdraw the bill from the consideration of the House.
> The SPEAKER. The gentleman withdraws the bill.

Then, after that, the House considered the bill in relation to the Great Falls Railroad, which passed the House; then came the Suburban Railroad bill, which went over on account of lack of a quorum. The House was dividing, and that bill was before the House. That is the way it stands in the RECORD, and that is the true statement.

Mr. HEARD. It is not the purpose of the committee to be put in the attitude of taking advantage of any misunderstanding on the part of the gentleman from Iowa or anybody else, so far as I am concerned and as the committee is concerned. We thought that that bill had the right of way, for the reason I have stated: that it had passed the stage of general debate. I will not, however, call up that bill for the present. If the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WILLIAMS] is here I will call up the suburban bill, but having made the statement to him that said bill would not be called up next, I will not call that up at present.

Mr. HULL. He is not here.

Mr. RICHARDSON of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, upon the question of order, if I may be heard, this is a matter which is entirely in the discretion of the Committee on the District of Columbia. While I would be perfectly willing to take up the suburban bill, it seems that the chairman has made an arrangement with the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WILLIAMS], who is not here, and who is not here possibly by reason of that arrangement, and it might be considered as bad faith to take that up in his absence; while I would not object if he were present, I do object to be deprived of the right to call up another measure.

It is a matter entirely within the discretion of the committee to decide what measure it will take up. While the chairman has very properly stated that he would not take up the suburban bill, because there appears that some misunderstanding has been created, by reason of some statement he made, inasmuch as that can not be done, I insist we ought to take up the other and dispose of it. We have an hour, and I think we can dispose of it in that time.

Mr. BAKER of New Hampshire. You can not do it.

Mr. HEARD. Mr. Speaker, I do not like to take any issue with my colleague. I aimed to state exactly to the gentleman from Iowa what I stated here, and in consequence of what I stated to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WILLIAMS], and because of that statement, perhaps, he has probably absented himself, and while I do not feel that the District should lose the balance of the day, and I do not much like withdrawing absolutely from the field, yet I am not willing to assume a position which might be considered unfair to anybody concerned.

I suggest to the gentleman from Tennessee, my colleague, that if we call up this L-street road bill now, the first proposition will be a vote on the pending amendment, and if that develops the want of a quorum, then the bill will have to be withdrawn again. I am advised, Mr. Speaker, that my friend, the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WILLIAMS], is now here, so that the embarrassment on that account no longer exists, and I now move to take up the suburban railroad bill, which was under consideration in the House two weeks ago.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read as follows:

A bill (H. R. 6816) to amend the charter of the District of Columbia Suburban Railway Company.

The SPEAKER. The pending question is upon the amendment of the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WILLIAMS], which the Clerk will now read:

The Clerk read as follows:

Strike out all of lines 6, 7, 8, 9, and 10 on page 1, after the word "that" in line 6; and strike out line 1 on page 2, and also the words "and assigns are hereby created" in line 2 of the same page; and insert after the word "company" in line 4, page 2, these words:

"Is hereby created to consist of such person or persons as shall at public auction, to be held at such time and place as shall be prescribed by the District Commissioners, after notice of not less than thirty days by publication in a Washington, D. C., newspaper, bid the highest percentage of annual gross proceeds of said railway business, for a term of not exceeding twenty years."

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I do not want to say anything on this amendment except to call the attention of the House to the character of it lest some gentleman should not know what they are to vote upon.

Mr. DINGLEY. Mr. Speaker, does not this bill require to be considered in Committee of the Whole?

Mr. GROUT. It is being considered in the House as in Committee of the Whole.

Mr. COOMBS. I suggest to the gentleman from Tennessee that he did not ask to have it considered in the House as in Committee of the Whole.

Mr. RICHARDSON of Tennessee. It is being so considered, if I am not mistaken. I am informed that the Journal shows that the bill is being considered in the House as in committee, and one section of it has been read.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I do not feel well enough to make any remarks on the subject of this amendment, even if I had the inclination to do so, and if the necessity existed. Upon last District day I undertook to present the merits of the amendment to the House to the best of my ability. It involves merely putting up this franchise for sale to the highest bidder, the bids to be based upon a percentage of the gross proceeds of the business to be carried on. I merely wish to call the attention of the House to the character of the amendment, so that all may know what they are called to vote upon.

Mr. RICHARDSON of Tennessee. Only a word in reply, Mr. Speaker. I do not think this amendment ought to be adopted. It is a proposition to sell a railroad franchise. The adoption of it would be a complete revolution, a complete departure from the course of proceeding in reference to street railroads that has ever prevailed in the District of Columbia, and I see no reason why this new method should be applied to this little suburban road, which merely wants to get into town from the neighborhood of Bladensburg. I hope the gentleman will not insist upon the amendment.

Mr. CANNON of Illinois. I understand, Mr. Speaker, that for this suburban road the adoption of the amendment of the gentleman from Mississippi would be equivalent to striking out the enacting clause of the bill?

Mr. RICHARDSON of Tennessee. Certainly.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. The gentleman from Illinois is mistaken and so is the gentleman from Tennessee. This amendment does not strike out any enacting clause. All it does is to strike out the names of the persons mentioned as incorporators. Instead of saying that A, B, C, and their associates shall be a body politic, it simply gives the name of the corporation and says that it shall be a body politic, to consist of such persons as shall bid the highest percentage of the gross proceeds for this franchise. The amendment strikes out the names and leaves the corporation to consist of persons who shall buy the franchise in the manner prescribed.

Mr. CANNON of Illinois. And limits the grant of the franchise to twenty years.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Yes; but in order to bring the matter up fairly, I will say that I am perfectly willing that the limit shall be extended to fifty years, and, if it is parliamentary to do so, I will now modify my amendment in that way. All that I want is to guard against granting these corporate privileges in perpetuity. I append to my remarks an article on this subject from the Evening Star of this city:

STREETS, STREET RAILROADS, AND PROPERTY OWNERS.

To the Editor of the Evening Star:

In the discussion of the bill for the extension of the tracks of the Belt Line Railroad, the question has arisen as to the right of property owners to damages. Citizens who are interested do not think Congress will let their homes be destroyed and the market value of their property, whether for their own use, for rental or sale, be seriously injured by the destruction of the trees and the parking, which now give to the street the shade and beauty and repose which are so highly prized, without at least making the railroad corporation liable for actual ascertainable damages.

The United States dedicated the street and beautified it with trees and appropriated the spaces for roadway, sidewalk, and parking. The planting of the trees was a pledge that the dedication was made in good faith, and that if the citizen bought land abutting on the street so dedicated and appropriated and spent his money in building a residence, the Government which had induced him to build would not allow the character of the street to be radically changed and its eligibility for residence destroyed without compensation.

To say that the Government owns the fee of the street and can do with it as it chooses, without regard to the interests of the abutting owners, whom it induced to establish their homes where they are, is to say that the Government may be like a heathen god—a greater scoundrel than any of his worshipers.

It has been held by the highest courts of the different States that the right of an abutting owner to damages does not depend upon his ownership of the fee of the street. At one time the supreme court of New York took the view that this right did so depend, but the court of appeals, in the Story case (90 N. Y., 122), and the subsequent elevated railroad cases, held that damages could be recovered for an injury to an easement as well as to a fee. The reason and right of the thing have been well stated by the supreme court of Colorado, in the City of Denver *vs.* Bayer (7 Colo., 113), as follows:

The position taken in some of the cases is, that if the adjoining owner have not the fee of the streets, and the value of his property be diminished by 50 per cent by the construction of a railroad therein, he has no redress; while if he be the fortunate owner of this fee, he may recover not only for the taking or appropriation of the streets, but also for the interference with his easement, and the decrease occasioned in the value of his premises. Yet, whether he own the fee or not, his rights in connection with the street, while it remains a street, are practically the same. His possession of his fee in no special way contributes to the use or enjoyment of his lot, and enables him to exercise no greater control over the street than he would have without it.

The distinction as to the fee seems to rest upon the fact that in one case there is a wrongful incumbrance of his freehold, while in the other there is not. The actual injury is about the same in both. But while, if the fee rests in the city, there may be no wrongful incumbrance of his estate in the sense of these cases there is under our Constitution at least a damaging thereof, for which he is entitled to compensation.

Congress can be trusted to eventually recognize a right which is now guarded by the constitutions or statutes of so many of the States, and to enact some general law under which such franchises may be acquired, under proper conditions, for their fair market value. What may be accomplished in this direction has been signally illustrated in the city of Glasgow, as shown in an article entitled "Street Railroad Franchises," published in last Wednesday's Star.

C. K.

The question being taken on the amendment as modified, the Speaker declared that the noes seemed to have it.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. I ask for a division.

The House divided; and there were—ayes 14, noes 47.

Mr. WILLIAMS. No quorum.

Mr. RICHARDSON of Tennessee. I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered, and Mr. COOMBS and Mr. RICHARDSON of Tennessee were appointed tellers.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 92, nays 67, answered "present" 3, not voting 190; as follows:

YEAS—92.

Arnold,	De Armond,	Lester,	Richards, Ohio
Bailey,	Dinsmore,	Linton,	Robbins,
Baker, Kans.	Dunn,	Livingston,	Rusk,
Baker, N. H.	Erdman,	Lynch,	Russell, Ga.
Bankhead,	Everett,	Maddox,	Sayers,
Barwig	Forman,	Maguire,	Shell,
Bell, Tex.	Geissenhainer,	McCreary, Ky.	Sibley,
Black, Ga.	Grady,	McCollough,	Sipe,
Boatner,	Hager,	McDannold,	Snodgrass,
Branch,	Hall, Minn.	McEttrick,	Springer,
Bretz,	Hare,	McRae,	Stockdale,
Brookshire,	Harris,	Money,	Strait,
Bryan,	Hermann,	Neill,	Talbert, S. C.
Bynum,	Hooker, Miss.	Ogden,	Tate,
Cabaniss,	Ikirt,	Outhwaite,	Turner, Ga.
Cannon, Cal.	Johnson, N. Dak.	Paschal,	Warner,
Catchings,	Kem,	Patterson,	Washington,
Clark, Mo.	Kyle,	Pearson,	Weadock,
Coombs,	Lane,	Pendleton, Tex.	Wheeler, Ala.
Cox,	Lapham,	Perkins,	Williams, Ill.
Crain,	Latimer,	Pigott,	Williams, Miss.
Crawford,	Lawson,	Post,	Wolverton,
Culberson,	Layton,	Powers,	Woodard.

NAYS—67.

Adams, Pa.	Epes,	Jones,	Reed,
Bingham,	Funston,	Kiefer,	Reilly,
Brosius,	Fyan,	Lucas,	Reyburn,
Cadmus,	Gardner,	Mahon,	Richardson, Tenn
Campbell,	Gillett, Mass.	Marsh,	Stephenson,
Cannon, Ill.	Grout,	Martin, Ind.	Stone, C. W.
Cobb, Ala.	Harmer,	Marvin, N. Y.	Stone, W. A.
Cobb, Mo.	Haugen,	McAleer,	Stone, Ky.
Cogswell.	Heard,	McCleary, Minn.	Sweet,
Cooper, Wis.	Hendrix,	Meredith,	Tarsney,
Curtis, Kans.	Hepburn,	Montgomery,	Tawney,
Dalzell,	Hooker, N. Y.	Northway,	Taylor, Tenn.
Davis,	Hulick,	O'Neil, Mass.	Thomas,
Draper,	Hull,	Page,	Updegraff,
Durborow,	Hunter,	Pendleton, W. Va.	VanVoorhis, Ohio
Edmunds,	Izlar,	Quigg,	Walker.
English, Cal.	Johnson, Ind.	Ray,	

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—3.

Dingley,	Ellis, Oregon	Smith,

NOT VOTING—190.

Abbott,	Alexander,	Baldwin,	Bell, Colo.
Adams, Ky.	Allen,	Barnes,	Beltzhoover,
Aitken,	Apsley,	Bartholdt,	Berry,
Alderson,	Avery,	Bartlett,	Black, Ill.
Aldrich,	Babcock,	Belden,	Blair,

Bland,	Ellis, Ky.	Lefever,	Ryan,
Boen,	English, N. J.	Lisle,	Schermerhorn,
Boutelle,	Enloe,	Lockwood,	Scranton,
Bower, N. C.	Fielder,	Loud,	Settle,
Bowers, Cal.	Fithian,	Loudenslager,	Shaw,
Breckinridge, Ark	Fletcher,	Magner,	Sherman,
Breckinridge, Ky.	Funk,	Mallory,	Sickles,
Brickner,	Gear,	Marshall,	Simpson,
Broderick,	Geary,	McCall,	Somers,
Brown,	Gillet, N. Y.	McDearmon,	Sorg,
Bundy,	Goldzier,	McDowell,	Sperry,
Bunn,	Goodnight,	McGann,	Stallings,
Burnes,	Gorman,	McKaig,	Stevens,
Burrows,	Graham,	McKeighan,	Storer,
Caminetti,	Gresham,	McLaurin,	Straus,
Capehart,	Griffin,	McMillin,	Strong,
Caruth,	Grosvenor,	McNagny,	Swanson,
Causey,	Grow,	Meiklejohn,	Talbott, Md.
Chickering,	Hainer,	Mercer,	Taylor, Ind.
Childs,	Haines,	Meyer,	Terry,
Clancy,	Hall, Mo.	Milliken,	Tracey,
Clarke, Ala.	Hammond.	Moon,	Tucker,
Cockran,	Harter,	Morgan,	Turner, Va.
Cockrell,	Hartman,	Morse,	Turpin,
Coffeen,	Hatch,	Moses,	Tyler,
Conn,	Hayes,	Murray,	VanVoorhis, N. Y.
Cooper, Fla.	Heiner,	Mutchler,	Wadsworth,
Cooper, Ind.	Henderson, Ill.	Newlands,	Wanger,
Cooper, Tex.	Henderson, Iowa	Oates,	Waugh,
Cornish,	Henderson, N. C.	O'Neill, Mo.	Wells,
Cousins,	Hicks,	Payne,	Wever,
Covert,	Hines,	Paynter,	Wheeler, Ill.
Cummings,	Hitt,	Pence,	White,
Curtis, N. Y.	Holman,	Phillips,	Whiting.
Daniels,	Hopkins, Ill.	Pickler,	Wilson, Ohio
Davey,	Hopkins, Pa.	Price,	Wilson, Wash.
DeForest,	Houk,	Randall,	Wilson, W. Va.
Denson,	Hudson,	Rayner,	Wise.
Dockery,	Hutcheson,	Richardson, Mich.	Woomer,
Dolliver,	Johnson, Ohio	Ritchie,	Wright, Mass.
Donovan,	Kilgore,	Robertson, La.	Wright, Pa.
Doolittle,	Kribbs,	Robinson, Pa.	
Dunphy,	Lacey,	Russell, Conn.	

No quorum voting.

Before the result was announced——

Mr. PIGOTT. The gentleman from Florida [Mr. MALLORY] was obliged to leave the House an hour ago on account of sickness. I ask that he be excused.

There was no objection.

Mr. BRETZ. My colleague from Indiana [Mr. TAYLOR] left the House a while ago, sick. I ask that he be excused for this day.

There was no objection.

Mr. JOHNSON of North Dakota. I ask that the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. BOEN] be excused on account of sickness.

There was no objection.

Mr. KEM. I ask that my colleague [Mr. MCKEIGHAN] be excused on account of sickness.

There was no objection.

Mr. JONES. I ask that my colleagues from Virginia, Mr. TUCKER and Mr. TURNER, be excused on account of sickness.

There was no objection.

Mr. ENLOE. I am paired with the gentleman from Maine [Mr. BOUTELLE]. If he were present I should vote in the affirmative.

The following pairs were announced:

Until further notice:

Mr. SICKLES with Mr. DANIELS.

Mr. CLARKE of Alabama with Mr. HENDERSON of Illinois.

Mr. WHITING with Mr. CHILDS.

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

Mr. CARUTH with Mr. RUSSELL of Connecticut.

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE of Arkansas with Mr. HOPKINS of Illinois.

Mr. SCHERMERHORN with Mr. MILLIKEN.

Mr. LOCKWOOD with Mr. AITKEN.

Mr. DOCKERY with Mr. DINGLEY.

Mr. BARNES with Mr. MCCLEARY of Minnesota.

Mr. ENLOE with Mr. BOUTELLE.

Mr. ALLEN with Mr. AVERY.

Mr. O'NEILL of Missouri with Mr. SHAW.

Mr. KRIBBS with Mr. LEFEVER.

Mr. SORG with Mr. WEVER.

Mr. MUTCHLER with Mr. WHITE.

Mr. TYLER with Mr. MERCER.

Mr. LISLE with Mr. WRIGHT of Massachusetts.

Mr. ROBERTSON of Louisiana with Mr. STRONG.

Mr. MOSES with Mr. WRIGHT of Pennsylvania.

Mr. CAMINETTI with Mr. RANDALL.

Mr. PAYNTER with Mr. GROSVENOR.

Mr. KILGORE with Mr. WILSON of Ohio.

Mr. ALDERSON with Mr. HITT.

Mr. GOODNIGHT with Mr. HENDERSON of Iowa.

Mr. HATCH with Mr. CURTIS of New York.

Mr. BLAND with Mr. MORSE.

For this day:

Mr. TERRY with Mr. WANGER.

Mr. BLACK of Illinois with Mr. HEINER of Pennsylvania.

Mr. BERRY with Mr. APSLEY.

Mr. TALBOTT of Maryland with Mr. PHILLIPS.

Mr. HENDERSON of North Carolina with Mr. STORER.

Mr. WELLS with FUNK.

Mr. ENGLISH with Mr. BUNDY.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE.

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

To Mr. MOSES, for ten days, on account of sickness in his family.

To Mr. DANIELS, for one week from to-morrow, on account of illness in his family and important engagements.

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

To Mr. WILSON of West Virginia, indefinitely, on account of sickness.

To Mr. RANDALL, indefinitely, on account of important business.

Mr. STOCKDADE. I ask leave of absence for the gentleman from Missouri, Mr. HALL, on account of sickness in his family.

There being no objection, leave was granted.

The result of the vote was announced as above stated.

And then, on motion of Mr. HEARD (at 4 o'clock and 25 minutes p. m.), the House adjourned.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

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

By Mr. GRADY: A bill (H. R. 7412) to fix the standard and regulate the quality and price of gas within the District of Columbia—to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. PATTERSON: A resolution fixing a day for the consideration of the bill H. R. 7273—to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. RUSK: A resolution to pay the salary of clerk to the Hon. Robert F. Brattan—to the Committee on Accounts.

PRIVATE BILLS, ETC.

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

By Mr. BRECKINRIDGE of Arkansas: A bill (H. R. 7408) for the relief of Lorenzo D. Gilbreath—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. HARE: A bill (H. R. 7409) for the relief of W. S. Hammaker—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7410) granting a pension to Mary Carrol—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HAYES: A bill (H. R. 7411) for the relief of Louis A. Yorke—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

PETITIONS, ETC.

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

By Mr. BAKER of New Hampshire: Petition of A. M. Wilkins, of Amhurst, N. H., and 10 others of the same place, praying that fraternal beneficial societies, orders, or associations, operating upon the lodge system and providing for the payments of life, sick, accident, and other benefits to members, be exempt from the operations of any income tax which may be enacted—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BROOKSHIRE: Petition of E. H. Bindley & Co., Cook, Bell & Black, and Samuel C. Parker, of Terre Haute, Ind., against any increase of the tax on whisky, and any extension of the present bonded period, and to indorse most heartily the resolutions adopted at a meeting of the wholesale liquor dealers of Cincinnati, June 4, 1894—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of M. N. Cortner and others, of Terre Haute, Ind., favorable to the eight-hour law proposed by Mr. GRESHAM, of Texas—to the Committee on Labor.

By Mr. COCKRELL (by request): Petition of citizens of Indian Territory for Federal court—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. COGSWELL: Petition of James Higgins and others, of Haverhill, Mass., members of certain beneficiary orders, against an income tax—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CRISP (by request): Resolutions of Congress of Ameri-

can Physicians, relating to medical department of the Army—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. DALZELL: Three petitions of A. Klinerlinger & Son, James McKay, and Joseph Greenswald, citizens of Pittsburg, against any increase of the tax on whisky and against any extension of the bonded period—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GORMAN: Petition of Brewers' Union and the Germen Typographical Union of Detroit, Mich., for the establishment of a Government telegraph system—to the Committee on Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. HOOKER of New York: Protest of W. P. Decker against any increase of the tax on whisky and any extension of the present bonded period—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio: Resolutions of the Cleveland Printing Pressmen's Union, protesting against the manner of appointment of pressmen in the Government Printing Office at Washington, D. C., and favoring the passage of House bill 4737—to the Committee on Printing.

Also, resolutions of the Cleveland Chamber of Commerce, adopted May 15, 1894, advocating appropriation for Naval War College at Newport, R. I.—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. JOSEPH: Memorial of the Commercial Club of the city of Albuquerque, N. Mex., praying Congress to pass legislation authorizing citizens of the United States to go upon grants of lands made by the Spanish and Mexican Governments, and mine for precious metals to be found within the same—to the Committee on Mines and Mining.

By Mr. LAYTON: Protest of P. F. Dugan, of Celina, Ohio, and of A. Pauch & Son, of St. Marys, Ohio, against any increase of the tax on whisky or any extension of the bonded period—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. McALEER: Petition of A. H. Ladner and others, against the employment of convict labor—to the Committee on Labor.

By Mr. McCALL: Petition of citizens of Medford and Somerville, Mass., for an amendment to the proposed income tax—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. McDEARMON (by request): Petition of A. J. Collingsworth and 14 other citizens of Crockett County, Tenn., protesting against taxing income of fraternal beneficiary societies—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MORSE: Petition by L. N. Francis, regent, and the eight other officers of Bristol Council, No. 158, Royal Arcanum, Taunton, Mass., praying that fraternal beneficiary societies be exempted from the provisions of the proposed income tax—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. OUTHWAITE: Petition of citizens of Lancaster, Ohio, urging amendment to the Wilson bill to exempt secret societies, etc., from taxation—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, resolutions indorsed by Collins Bros., Lang, Schenck & Co., Theobold & Son, and Bott & Cannon, all of Columbus, Ohio, protesting against any increase of tax on whisky and extension of bonded period—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PAGE: Petition of William Legg and 19 other citizens of Burrillville, R. I., and of H. S. Woodworth and 18 other citizens of Providence, R. I., asking for an amendment to the proposed tariff bill—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PENCE: Petition of the Evangelical Lutheran Church of Morgan County, Colo., against the proposed change in the Constitution of the United States—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of the Chamber of Commerce of Colorado Springs, for appropriation for Galveston Harbor—to the Committee on Appropriations.

Also, petition of Park County, Colo., to permit mining locations on forest reservations—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. PERKINS: Petition of 41 citizens of Sioux City, against an income tax upon beneficiary assessments—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. RAY: Petition of Cigar Makers' Union of Binghamton, N. Y., on the subject of convict labor—to the Committee on Labor.

By Mr. REYBURN: Petition of citizens of Pennsylvania, praying for an exemption of beneficial societies from income tax—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SIPE: Petition of 40 citizens of Boston, Allegheny County, Pa., and vicinity, members of benevolent societies, not for profit, and of Conclave No. 168, Improved Order Heptasophs, located at Red Stone, Pa., praying that such societies and orders be exempt from the provisions of the bill passed by the House to tax incomes of corporations—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, memorial of Conclave No. 81, Improved Order of Heptasophs, located at McKeesport, Pa., having a membership of 600, praying for the passage of Senate bill 1353 and House bill 4897—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. STEPHENSON: Petition of the Board of Trade of the city of Detroit, Mich., protesting against the Hatch anti-option bill—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of the Board of Trade of the city of Detroit, Mich., urging certain amendments to the interstate-commerce law—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. WILLIAM A. STONE: Resolutions of wholesale liquor dealers at Cincinnati, Ohio, against increase of tax on whisky and extension of bonded period—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, protest of beneficiary associations, against the income tax upon social associations—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WARNER: Memorial of the Chamber of Commerce of the State of New York, in favor of provision for pooling agreements—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

SENATE.

TUESDAY, *June 12, 1894.*

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

Prayer by the Rev. E. B. BAGBY, Chaplain of the House of Representatives.

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

The Secretary proceeded to read the Journal of yesterday's proceedings, when, on motion of Mr. CHANDLER, and by unanimous consent, the further reading was dispensed with.

HOUSE BILLS REFERRED.

The bill (R. R. 6500) to define and establish the units of electrical measure was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Finance.

The bill (H. R. 7293) regulating the procedure in criminal causes in the district of Minnesota was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

The joint resolution (H. Res. 172) granting full permission to the State of Maryland and to the several State courts to occupy the old United States court-house in the city of Baltimore for the period of five years was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS.

Mr. PEFFER presented the petition of H. W. Cadott and sundry other citizens of Jackson County, Kans., praying that fraternal beneficiary societies, orders, or associations, operating upon the lodge system and providing for the payment of life, sick, accident, and other benefits to the members, and dependents of such members, shall be exempt from all the provisions of this bill requiring taxation in any form; which was ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. ALLEN presented a memorial of Hastings Saddle and Harness Makers' Union, No. 41, of Hastings, Nebr., remonstrating against the present system of convict labor; which was referred to the Committee on Education and Labor.

He also presented a petition of the McCook Coöperative Building and Loan Association, of McCook, Nebr., praying that mutual loan and building associations be exempted from the proposed income-tax provision of the pending tariff bill; which was ordered to lie on the table.

He also persented a petition of sundry citizens of the State of Washington, praying that section 2324 of the Revised Statutes of the United States, relating to mining claims, be amended so as to suspend for the year 1894 the performance of $100 worth of labor; which was referred to the Committee on Mines and Mining.

Mr. PASCO. I present a joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Florida, in the nature of a petition, praying that the Fort Jupiter military reservation be not sold at public sale, but that it be opened to homestead entry. Without taking the time of the Senate to have it read, I ask that it may be printed in the RECORD, and the bill on the subject having been reported, I ask that it lie on the table.

The petition was ordered to lie on the table, and to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

House joint resolution requesting the Secretary of the Interior not to cause the Fort Jupiter military reservation to be sold at public sale; and to urge the Senators and Representatives from Florida in the Congress of the United States to secure the passage by Congress of an act opening the said reservation to homestead entry.

Whereas the Fort Jupiter military reservation in Florida was established, by order of the President, May 14, 1855, and not being longer required for