

to construct wagon-roads between North and South Idaho—to the Committee on the Territories.

By Mr. ENLOE: Petition of citizens of Decatur County, Tennessee, in favor of House bill 7389—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. ERMENTROUT: Memorial of Francis Whittaker & Sons, of St. Louis, Mo., in favor of House bill 6138—to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition of Charles Stoughton and others, of New York, favoring the completion of Harlem Canal—to the Committee on Railways and Canals.

By Mr. FARQUHAR: Resolutions of Pressmen's Union, No. 27, of Buffalo, N. Y., favoring the passage of the Chace international copyright bill—to the Committee on Patents.

By Mr. FORD: Petition of Olney, Shields & Co., of Grand Rapids, Mich., for reduction of duty on rice—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GLASS: Papers in the claim of Sarah J. Mosby, of Warren County, of Jesse Martin, of Woodruff County, and of Alice Cole, of Calhoun County, Alabama.

By Mr. GOFF: Petition of E. M. Atkinson and others, of West Virginia, in favor of additional protection to wool—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HARMER: Memorial of dealers in tobacco, of Philadelphia, in favor of the speedy repeal of the entire tax on tobacco—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. JOSEPH: Petition of citizens of New Mexico and Colorado, for an investigation of the Sangre de Cristo land grant, in said Territory and State—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, petition of citizens of San Juan County, New Mexico, protesting against the location of the county seat of said county at Aztec—to the Committee on the Territories.

By Mr. MCKINNEY: Petition to be filed with bill for the relief of Isaac Hays—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MORGAN: Papers in the claim of James J. Ritch, of Scott County, Mississippi—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. NELSON: Resolution of the Grand Army of the Republic, of Minneapolis, Minn., for an appropriation for head-stones for soldiers—to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. OATES: Papers in the claim of Henry Sterne, Bullock County, Alabama—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. PERKINS: Resolutions of the council of Coffeyville, Kans., for the passage of the bill giving the Kansas City and Pacific Railroad the right of way through the Indian Territory—to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. RICE: Memorial and papers of the mayor and other prominent citizens of Minneapolis, Minn., in relation to the preservation of St. Anthony's Falls—to the Committee on Commerce.

Also, resolution of the Grand Army of the Republic, of Minnesota, for an appropriation of \$200,000 for head-stones for soldiers' graves—to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. TILLMAN (by request): Petition of Jackson M. Hoover, of Pierson Peoples, of Pierson Peoples, trustee for Isham Peoples, and of Henry J. Harter, for reference of their claims to the Court of Claims—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. A. C. THOMPSON: Petition of John Scott, late postmaster at Brookville, Pa., for relief—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. TOWNSHEND: Papers to accompany House bill No. 8939 for the relief of John S. Ball—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WHEELER: Petition of Samuel F. Ryan, of Jackson County, and of George M. Hanaway, of Lauderdale County, Alabama, for reference of their claims to the Court of Claims—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. WILKINS: Petition of Rev. Favis Brown and 81 others, citizens of New Concord, Ohio, for prohibition in the District of Columbia—to the Select Committee on Alcoholic Liquor Traffic.

By Mr. YOST: Petition of W. A. Pattie, late postmaster at Warrenton, Va., for relief—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

The following petitions for the repeal or modification of the internal-revenue tax of \$25 levied on druggists were received and severally referred to the Committee on Ways and Means:

By Mr. LEE: Of E. S. Pendleton & Son., of Louisa Court House, Va.

By Mr. CHARLES O'NEILL: Of citizens of Philadelphia, Pa.

By Mr. ROMEIS: Of H. B. Tiffany, of Clyde, Ohio.

By Mr. STRUBLE: Of C. Teal and A. E. Smith, pharmacists, of Ochevedan, Iowa.

The following petitions for the proper protection of the Yellowstone National Park, as proposed in Senate bill 283, were received and severally referred to the Committee on the Public Lands:

By Mr. CAREY: Of citizens of Phillips, Lawrence County, Wyoming.

By Mr. CUTCHEON: Of citizens of Antrim County, Michigan.

By Mr. KETCHAM: Of Robert P. Paulding and 29 others, citizens of Cold Spring, N. Y.

The following petitions for the more effectual protection of agriculture, by the means of certain import duties, were received and severally referred to the Committee on Ways and Means:

By Mr. REED: Of citizens of North Jay, Me.

By Mr. THOMAS WILSON: Of citizens of Concord, Minn.

The following petitions, indorsing the per diem rated service-pension bill, based on the principle of paying all soldiers, sailors, and marines of the late war a monthly pension of 1 cent a day for each day they were in the service, were severally referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions:

By Mr. BELDEN: Of Peter Kappesser and 21 others, soldiers and sailors, of Syracuse, N. Y.

By Mr. CUTCHEON: Of soldiers and sailors, of the wives of soldiers and sailors, of the sons of veterans, and citizens, of Osceola County, of Charlevoix County, and of Sherman, Mich.

By Mr. KEAN: Of soldiers of Plainfield, N. J.

By Mr. MCKINLEY: Of citizens of Harlem Springs, Ohio.

By Mr. E. B. TAYLOR: Of citizens of Ashtabula County, Ohio.

The following petitions praying for the enactment of a law providing temporary aid for common schools, to be disbursed on the basis of illiteracy, were severally referred to the Committee on Education:

By Mr. COOPER: Of the faculty of Ohio Wesleyan University, and others, of Delaware, Ohio.

By Mr. CROUSE: Of 89 citizens of Medina County, Ohio.

By Mr. CUTCHEON: Of 212 citizens of Mecosta, Lake, and Charlevoix Counties, Michigan.

By Mr. GIFFORD: Of 217 citizens of Aurora, Pembina, and other counties of Dakota.

By Mr. HERMANN: Of 84 citizens of Linn County, Oregon.

By Mr. LAIRD: Of 143 citizens of Seward, Adams, Fillmore, and Thayer Counties, Nebraska.

The following petition for an increase of compensation of fourth-class postmasters was referred to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads:

By Mr. TURNER: Of W. B. Womble and others, citizens of Cuba, Ga.

SENATE.

WEDNESDAY, May 2, 1888.

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

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

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATION.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore* laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a recommendation of the Supervising Architect that \$18,000 be appropriated to complete approaches to the Santa Fé (N. Mex.) court-house; which, with the accompanying papers, was referred to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

HOUSE BILLS REFERRED.

The following bills, received yesterday from the House of Representatives, were severally read twice by their titles, and referred to the Committee on Commerce:

A bill (H. R. 2097) to authorize the construction of a bridge across Trail Creek, in the city of Michigan City, Ind.;

A bill (H. R. 7340) to authorize the construction of a bridge across the Mississippi River at Hickman, Ky.; and

A bill (H. R. 8343) to authorize the construction of a wagon and foot-passenger bridge across the Noxubee River at or near Gainesville, in the State of Alabama.

The bill (H. R. 2695) for the relief of Charles V. Mesler was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Post-Offices and Post-Roads.

The bill (H. R. 6232) for the relief of Nancy G. Alexander was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

PROPOSED EXECUTIVE SESSION.

Mr. SHERMAN. I desire to give notice that immediately after the morning business is over I shall move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The Chair presents the petition of John Pope Hodnett, of Washington, D. C., praying for an investigation of his claims to payment for services as counsel for the workmen of the District of Columbia in the investigation of 1874; which will be referred to the Committee on Claims, if there be no objection.

Mr. SPOONER. That subject was before the Committee on Claims at the last Congress, and by direction of that committee I reported it back to the Senate, asking that the committee be discharged from its further consideration and that it be referred to the Committee on Education and Labor, which was done. I move that the petition just presented be referred to the Committee on Education and Labor.

The motion was agreed to.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore* presented the petition of James Sumner, of Rockport, Spencer County, Indiana, praying to be allowed a pension; which was referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. BLODGETT presented a petition of ex-Union soldiers and sailors, citizens of the States of New Jersey and New York, praying for the passage of the per diem rated service-pension bill; which was referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also presented a petition of vessel-owners, consignees, and business men of Atlantic City, N. J., and other citizens of New Jersey, praying that an appropriation be made for the erection of jetties near the entrance of the harbor at Atlantic City; which was referred to the Committee on Commerce.

Mr. FARWELL presented the petition of John F. Ryon, of Paris, Ill., late a private in Company I, One hundred and twenty-third Regiment Indiana Volunteers, praying to be allowed an increase of pension for the loss of his right eye; which was referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. WILSON, of Iowa, presented a concurrent resolution of the Legislature of Iowa; which was referred to the Committee on Public Lands, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[Concurrent resolution in relation to swamp land indemnity.]

Whereas the provisions of the act of Congress of March 2, 1855, as extended by act of Congress of March 3, 1857, granting indemnity to the States for swamp and overflowed lands disposed of by the United States, are held not to apply to sales and locations made after March 3, 1857; and

Whereas a large amount of land properly falling to the State and counties in Iowa under the swamp grant have been disposed of by the Government since March 3, 1857, thereby compelling the counties and their grantees to abandon their claim to such lands or litigate with the purchasers of the Government; and

Whereas on the 8th day of February, 1888, Hon. William McRae, from the Committee on Public Lands, made a report, to accompany bill H. R. 6897 in the House of Representatives in Congress, to extend said indemnity provisions of said act of March 2, 1855, and making the same applicable to sales and locations made since March 3, 1857, which bill is pending in Congress; and

Whereas, under the rulings of the Department, certificates, called scrip or indemnity scrip, issued for indemnity for swamp lands located with warrants can not be located on lands outside of the State, and there being no vacant land in Iowa on which scrip can be located, many of the counties in this State, after great expense, are unable to realize anything for their swamp lands so disposed of by warrant locations, and by that means are damaged to a large amount: Therefore,

Be it resolved by the Senate of the State of Iowa (the House concurring), That our Senators be instructed and our Representatives in Congress be requested to use all proper and lawful means in their power to secure the passage of said bill H. R. 6897, or by the enactment in some other bill of provision substantially as herein contained.

Resolved further, That the secretary of state transmit to each of our Senators and Representatives in Congress a copy of this resolution.

I hereby certify the foregoing concurrent resolution passed the senate and the house of representatives of the Twenty-second General Assembly of the State of Iowa.

[SEAL.]

FRANK D. JACKSON,
Secretary of State.
By C. S. BYRKIT, Deputy.

Mr. DAVIS presented a petition of citizens of St. Paul, Minn., praying for the passage of a bill for the preservation of the Yellowstone National Park; which was ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. STEWART presented the petition of James Walsh, a citizen of California, praying reimbursement for losses sustained on account of Indian depredations in Nevada County, California; which was referred to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

Mr. CHANDLER presented the petition of H. E. Proctor and 47 other citizens of Stoddard, N. H., and the petition of Jonathan D. Hale, of Stoddard, N. H., praying that reimbursement be made for moneys raised and expended by the town of Stoddard, N. H., during the late war between the States; which were referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

He also presented the petition of Jonathan D. Hale, formerly postmaster at Hale's Mills, Tenn., praying to be reimbursed the sum paid the United States Government in 1861, alleged to have been wrongfully exacted from him; which was referred to the Committee on Claims.

Mr. EDMUNDS presented the petition of A. J. Stone and 12 other citizens of Vermont, praying for the passage of Senate bill 548, granting pensions to widows and minor children of pensioners; which was referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. MITCHELL presented a petition of citizens of Junction City, Oregon, praying for the correction of the military record of M. J. Gilstrap, of that place; which was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. PADDOCK presented a petition of citizens of Nebraska, praying for the repeal of that portion of the internal-revenue law which classes druggists as liquor dealers, and for a reduction of the duty on spirits; which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES.

Mr. EDMUNDS. I am instructed by the Committee on the Judi-

ciary to report adversely the bill (S. 2470) to repeal section 714 of the Revised Statutes, allowing pensions to judges in certain cases. It may be placed on the Calendar, as my friend from Mississippi [Mr. GEORGE] desires to be heard upon it.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The bill will be placed on the Calendar with the adverse report of the committee.

Mr. FAULKNER, from the Committee on Claims, to whom was referred the bill (S. 987) for the relief of the administrators of the estate of Isaac P. Tice, deceased, reported it without amendment, and submitted a report thereon.

Mr. PASCO, from the Committee on Claims, to whom was referred the bill (S. 750) for the relief of Pearson C. Montgomery, of Memphis, Tenn., reported it with amendments, and submitted a report thereon.

Mr. DAVIS, from the Committee on Pensions, to whom was referred the petition of Clara B. Davidson, praying for an increase of pension, submitted a report thereon, accompanied by a bill (S. 2852) granting increase of pension to Clara B. Davidson; which was read twice by its title.

BILLS INTRODUCED.

Mr. EDMUNDS introduced a bill (S. 2846) to increase the pensions of soldiers and sailors in the war of the rebellion who contracted heart disease in the service; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. DAWES introduced a bill (S. 2847) granting a pension to Albert F. Jones; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. BECK introduced a bill (S. 2848) granting a pension to Thomas B. Dearman; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. HARRIS introduced a bill (S. 2849) for the relief of Collin Adams; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

Mr. FRYE introduced a bill (S. 2850) granting a pension to Harriet M. Smith; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Pensions.

FORFEITURE OF UNEARNED RAILROAD LANDS.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. If there are no resolutions, concurrent or other, the order of morning business is closed, and the Chair lays before the Senate, pursuant to the order of yesterday, the bill (S. 1430) to forfeit certain lands heretofore granted for the purpose of aiding in the construction of railroads, and for other purposes.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE.

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. CLARK, its Clerk, announced that the House had passed the bill (S. 2458) to amend an act to authorize the construction of a bridge across the Eastern Branch of the Potomac River at the foot of Pennsylvania avenue east, with amendments in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message also returned to the Senate, in compliance with its request, the bill (S. 1161) granting a pension to Mrs. Jennie Stone, widow of General Charles P. Stone.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED.

The message further announced that the Speaker of the House had signed the enrolled bill (H. R. 1788) for the erection of a public building at Lancaster, Pa.; and it was thereupon signed by the President *pro tempore*.

EXECUTIVE SESSION.

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

Mr. PLUMB. Will the executive session be long?

Mr. SHERMAN. Only a few minutes.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The Senator from Ohio moves 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 ten minutes spent in executive session, the doors were reopened.

BALTIMORE AND POTOMAC RAILROAD.

Mr. FARWELL. I ask the unanimous consent of the Senate to take up Senate bill 2615, Order of Business 938.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The bill (S. 1430) to forfeit certain lands heretofore granted for the purpose of aiding in the construction of railroads, and for other purposes, being before the Senate, the pending question being on the amendment of the Senator from Florida [Mr. CALL], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. FARWELL] asks unanimous consent to proceed to the consideration of a bill the title of which will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. A bill (S. 2615) to authorize the Baltimore and Potomac Railroad Company to acquire and use real estate for railway purposes in the District of Columbia.

Mr. PLUMB. I will not object if the bill can be disposed of without debate.

Mr. FARWELL. If it leads to any debate I shall withdraw my request.

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

Mr. GORMAN. I trust the Senator from Illinois will not press the consideration of the bill this morning. It has only been reported from the District Committee within a few days.

Mr. FARWELL. It has been on the Calendar since the 6th of April—almost a month.

Mr. GORMAN. I trust the Senator will not press the bill this morning, but will let it go over until to-morrow. I shall not object to its consideration at any time after to-day. I think there are some amendments that should be offered to it, and there are some reasons why the whole question as to the entry of these railroads into the city should be considered in the same connection.

Mr. FARWELL. I withdraw the request I made, so as to let the bill go over until to-morrow.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The bill having been read, and the Senator from Maryland objecting to its present consideration, it will resume its place on the Calendar.

MRS. JENNIE STONE.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore* laid before the Senate the message of the House of Representatives returning to the Senate in compliance with its request the bill (S. 1161) granting a pension to Mrs Jennie Stone, widow of General Charles P. Stone.

Mr. SAWYER. I move that that bill be indefinitely postponed.

Mr. HOAR. Why should that be done?

Mr. SAWYER. There is on the Calendar a bill from the House of Representatives covering exactly the same point, I understand.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The bill having passed the Senate it can only be indefinitely postponed after reconsidering the vote by which it was passed.

Mr. HOAR. Let it lie on the table for a little while and I will look into it. My impression is that my honorable friend is in error in thinking that the bill which the other House has sent is to the same effect as the Senate bill.

Mr. SAWYER. It may be possible that it varies in amount.

Mr. HOAR. It varies in amount.

Mr. SAWYER. But it is for the benefit of the same person.

Mr. HOAR. Let this stand, and we may deal with them both at the same time.

Mr. SAWYER. Very well.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The bill will lie on the table.

EASTERN BRANCH BRIDGE.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The Chair lays before the Senate the amendments of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 2458) to amend an act to authorize the construction of a bridge across the Eastern Branch of the Potomac River at the foot of Pennsylvania avenue east, which will be read.

The CHIEF CLERK. In line 3, after the words "plan of," strike out "said bridge" and insert "the bridge across the Eastern Branch of the Potomac River at the foot of Pennsylvania avenue east;" so as to read:

That the Secretary of War be, and he is hereby, authorized, in his discretion, to make such alterations in the plan of the bridge across the Eastern Branch of the Potomac River at the foot of Pennsylvania avenue east as will best accommodate the traffic over and under said bridge.

Mr. CAMERON. I move that the Senate concur in that amendment.

The motion was agreed to.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The next amendment of the House of Representatives will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. Add to the bill the following proviso:

And provided further, That one-half the sum hereby appropriated shall be paid out of the revenues of the District of Columbia.

Mr. CAMERON. I move that the Senate concur in that amendment.

The motion was agreed to.

INDIANAPOLIS POST-OFFICE BUILDING.

Mr. TURPIE. I ask the Senate to take up for consideration at this time Order of Business 1170, being House bill 1325.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The Senator from Indiana asks unanimous consent that Senate bill 1430 be informally laid aside, and that the Senate proceed to the consideration of a bill the title of which will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. A bill (H. R. 1325) providing for the purchase of additional ground in the city of Indianapolis, Ind., adjoining the post-office site, and for the improvement of the building thereon, and appropriating \$125,000 therefor.

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

Mr. TURPIE. I move to amend the bill, in line 16, by making the amount appropriated \$150,000 instead of \$125,000.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The amendment will be reported.

The CHIEF CLERK. In line 16, after the words "one hundred and," it is proposed to strike out "twenty-five" and insert "fifty;" so as to read:

And for the purpose herein mentioned the sum of \$150,000, or so much thereof as may be necessary, be, and the same is hereby, appropriated out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended, and the amendment was concurred in.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill providing for the purchase of additional ground in the city of Indianapolis, Ind., adjoining the post-office site, and for the improvement of the building thereon, and appropriating \$150,000 therefor."

PUBLIC BUILDING AT ATCHISON, KANS.

Mr. SPOONER. I ask unanimous consent that the unfinished business may be informally laid aside, and that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the bill (S. 1726) to provide for the erection of a public building for the use of the post-office and Government offices at the city of Atchison, Kans. I think it will not elicit debate.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. Is there objection to laying aside Senate bill 1430 informally for the purpose of proceeding to the consideration of the bill indicated by the Senator from Wisconsin? The Chair hears no objection, and the bill is before the Senate as in Committee of the Whole.

Mr. BERRY. I thought it was the intention to press the land-forfeiture bill at as early a day as possible. If that order is to be laid aside and other matters are to be taken up, I have no objection; but if the purpose is to go on with the land-forfeiture bill, I should be glad to have it proceeded with.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The consideration of these bills is proceeding by unanimous consent only, and a single objection—

Mr. BERRY. I shall not object.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. A single objection will require the resumption of the unfinished business.

Mr. PLUMB. It is common, I think, to ask the consent of a Senator who has charge of a measure that it be laid aside. That formality has been waived this morning, but I am willing to allow this bill to be proceeded with.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The Chair has upon every occasion submitted the question whether there was objection to laying aside the unfinished business and proceeding to the consideration of the bill indicated.

Mr. SPOONER. The Senator from Kansas will do me the justice to say that before making this request I consulted him on the subject.

Mr. PLUMB. I was speaking about his action as a Senator, not about his action as an individual.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill mentioned by the Senator from Wisconsin?

By unanimous consent, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill, which was reported from the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds with an amendment, in line 4, after the word "purchase," to insert "or acquire by condemnation proceedings, or otherwise;" so as to read:

That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he hereby is, authorized and directed to purchase, or acquire by condemnation proceedings, or otherwise, a site and to cause to be erected at the city of Atchison, in the State of Kansas, a suitable building for the use and accommodation of the post-office and other Government offices in said city, with fire-proof vaults extending to each story; the site, and the building thereon, when completed according to plans and specifications to be previously made and approved by the Secretary of the Treasury, not to exceed the cost of \$100,000; and the sum of \$100,000 is hereby appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, for the purchase of said site and the completion of said building.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended, and the amendment was concurred in.

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

PUBLIC BUILDING AT WILMINGTON, DEL.

Mr. GRAY. If the Senator from Kansas will yield to me to make a request for unanimous consent to take up Senate bill 1062, I should be much obliged to him.

Mr. PLUMB. Having myself opened the door in a certain way by letting in the bills of two or three Senators, I do not think I ought to object to the request of the Senator from Delaware, who has spoken to me about the matter privately. I shall not object to bringing up the bill that he seeks to call up if it does not lead to debate, but I shall not yield any further.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The Senator from Delaware asks unanimous consent that the pending business be informally laid aside to enable him to move the consideration of the bill (S. 1062) to increase the appropriation for the erection of the public building at Wilmington, Del.

By unanimous consent, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill. It proposes to increase the amount heretofore fixed as the limit of cost for the erection of a public building at Wilmington, Del., to \$250,000.

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

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE.

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. T. O. TOWLES,

its Chief Clerk, announced that the House had passed the following bills:

A bill (S. 1064) for the relief of L. J. Worden; and

A bill (S. 2614) to authorize the Batesville and Brinkley Railroad to build a bridge across the Black River in Arkansas.

The message also announced that the House had passed the following bills, each with an amendment; in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

A bill (S. 1828) to provide for a light-house at Newport News, Middle Ground, Virginia; and

A bill (S. 2506) for the establishment of a light-house, fog-signal, and day beacon in the vicinity of Goose Rocks, Fox Island Thoroughfare, Maine.

FORFEITURE OF UNEARNED RAILROAD LANDS.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The Senate bill 1430 will now be proceeded with.

The Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 1430) to forfeit certain lands heretofore granted for the purpose of aiding in the construction of railroads, and for other purposes, the pending question being on the amendment proposed by Mr. CALL.

Mr. PLUMB. Concerning the amendment of the Senator from Florida which is now pending, I will state that the Senator from Florida has agreed that he will not object to my motion to strike out all of the amendment after line 6. I therefore move to strike out that part of the amendment.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The amendment to the amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. In line 6 of the proposed amendment, strike out all after the word "laws" down to and including the word "acres" in line 14, as follows:

All lands affected by any grant where the granting act required a disposal by the Legislature of the State and there has been no legislative disposal by the State Legislature in the time required by the granting act are hereby declared subject to homestead entry and settlement; and in all cases persons in possession of lots in town-sites and of tracts of land shall have the preferred right of entering the same to the extent of 360 acres;

So as to make the amendment read:

SEC. 8. That all actual settlers on any of the public lands in the State of Florida affected by the grants, who made actual settlements on any of said lands after the time limited in the granting act for the construction of said road, shall have the right to perfect their entries respectively under the homestead or pre-emption laws.

Mr. CALL. Mr. President, I have accepted the modification of the amendment as suggested by the Senator from Kansas, and only wish to say that I do so because I desire the amendment to be adopted without any controversy. So far as it goes it protects the actual settlers now upon this grant. I have maintained and expect to continue to maintain (and the Senator from Kansas assures me that there will be a bill before the Senate in which that question may be considered) that the whole of these grants are now by law subject to homestead entry and settlement, and the only difficulty in the way is that the Interior Department, by some strange and wonderful fatuity, although there has never been any legislative disposal or any pretense of a legislative disposal of this grant, or any portion of it, and although the time has expired years and years ago, and all the acts touching upon the subject have been repealed, until there was an attempt in 1881 to give a portion of the grant to a road to be located after that time, differing entirely from the road and the railroad company originally projected, and having neither succession to it nor connection with it, the charter of which was repealed years ago—until that time there had never been to 1881, nearly fifteen years after this grant had expired, either a location of any line of road with the authority of the State or a disposal of any kind to anybody by the Legislature of the State of this grant. Now, as to the larger portion of it, these facts still remain. There has never been a pretense, even, not a word, not a syllable, in all the laws of Florida of a legislative disposal of the larger portion of this grant, and none of even a part of it, until fifteen years after the time fixed in the grant for its completion.

Notwithstanding these facts, at the suggestion of the Senator from Kansas, I accept the modification to the amendment, to the end that this much may be now accomplished, declaring my intention to continue my efforts to make all this part of the public domain open to the people for homes for themselves and their families, saving only to purchasers of limited portions reasonable protection, and confirming to purchasers of town sites the title to their lots.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The Chair understands, then, that there is no objection to the proposed amendment to the amendment of the Senator from Florida. If there be no objection, it is agreed to.

Mr. PLUMB. I now move to insert, after the word "road," in line 5 of the same amendment, the words "and before May 1, 1888;" so as to read:

SEC. 8. That all actual settlers on any of the public lands in the State of Florida affected by the grants, who made actual settlement on any of said lands after the time limited in the granting act for the construction of the said road, and before May 1, 1888, shall have the right to perfect their entries respectively under the homestead or pre-emption law.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. MITCHELL. The amendment of the Senator from Florida as now modified provides that all actual settlers on any of the public lands in the State of Florida affected by the grants, "who made actual settlement on any of said lands after the time limited in the granting act for the construction of the said road, shall have the right to perfect their entries respectively." What I wish to know is whether any of the companies in Florida which received grants from the United States, and which did not complete their road or roads within the time required in the act, have since completed their roads or any portion of them?

Mr. CALL. There is no company in the State of Florida which has received any direct grant of lands from the United States.

Mr. MITCHELL. The company received the lands from the State?

Mr. CALL. The grant was to the State.

Mr. MITCHELL. It received the lands from the State?

Mr. CALL. The grant was to the State. There is no company that has completed any part of its line that has any grant from the State of the land embraced within the grant of the United States. There are companies which have been since chartered and which have constructed portions of their route since the passage of the granting act by the United States, and since the expiration of the time limited in the act, but there are no companies which have constructed roads under the authority of the Legislature of the State giving them any interest in the grant of 1856. That is the difficulty in this case.

The difficulty in this case is that the State of Florida received a grant from the United States to aid in the construction of certain lines of road, which was limited to ten years for the completion of the entire lines of road. That act required a legislative disposal of the grant. The Legislature never made any disposal of the larger portion of this grant, although the act of Congress expressly required a legislative disposal of the grant. The governor of the State in 1858, by a letter on file in the office of the Secretary of the Interior, notified the Commissioner of the General Land Office that there was no disposal by the Legislature of the State of this land to any railroad company, and that the reservation which had been made, upon the assumption that there had been or would be such a disposal, had never become effective or valid because of such failure of legislation upon the subject, and therefore that he could not accept as final or authoritative any selection of the lands.

Mr. MITCHELL. You claim, then, that the State never parted with the title; that it never transferred the title to any company in Florida?

Mr. CALL. It never did. I will show the Senator, if he will look at this map. [Exhibiting.] This grant embraced two lines, one from Jacksonville, on the St. John's, to Pensacola and the waters of Escambia Bay; the other from Fernandina to Tampa Bay, with an extension to Cedar Keys. There was a reservation made of the land from Fernandina to Cedar Keys and from Jacksonville to a point on the waters of Escambia Bay. The road was built within the time from Fernandina to Cedar Keys, but there never was a reservation made from Waldo to Tampa Bay until 1881, when Secretary Schurz, without any authority of the State Legislature, made such a reservation. In 1881 there was a new charter given as to the line from Chattahoochee to Pensacola, the old charter having been repealed in express terms as to the companies on both lines as to the uncompleted part of the line, and new companies created; and there was a charter given to a new company who projected another and a different line of road from Chattahoochee to Pensacola, Fla. This was in 1869-70.

The companies authorized to build the road from Chattahoochee to Pensacola in 1869-70, on one line, and from Waldo to Tampa on the other, both failed to build either line, and the charter of the I. P. & M. R. Company from Chattahoochee to Pensacola expired and was repealed; and in 1881, fifteen years after the grant expired, the State granted a charter to a new company and gave to it about 23,600 acres to the mile of the swamp and overflowed lands, and also gave to it whatever rights they had in the grant of 1856, so far as it lies along that line of road.

Mr. MITCHELL. Who gave the charter?

Mr. CALL. The State of Florida; and they said in the act as "to so much of this land as lay along their line of road whatever rights the State may have in this reservation we give under this act," or words to this effect.

Mr. MITCHELL. I shall not trouble the Senator with any further explanation, but what I wish to know is this: He has stated that the grant was originally made by Congress to the State with a proviso that the State should transfer it to some company or companies. He has stated further that his understanding is that the State never made any such transfer. Is it not a fact that this company or these two companies actually went on and built portions of these roads, claiming the grant?

Mr. CALL. No; that is not a proper statement. It is a fact that the Pensacola and Georgia Railroad Company under the authority of the internal-improvement act authorizing them to build any portions of that line, either the whole or a part, did construct before 1860 a line of road to the town of Quincy, near the Chattahoochee River. It is true that after the war the Legislature of Florida repealed that act, that they created a different system entirely and disposed of the swamp

and overflowed lands which were to be the foundation of the fund for the construction of that road to other purposes. They never did therefore build any portion of that road, and the original companies are extinct to-day, without succession or privity to or with any other corporation.

Mr. MITCHELL. But is it not the fact that a company or companies built portions of those roads claiming this land, and do they not to-day claim the land that is proposed to be forfeited by this bill?

Mr. CALL. Yes.

Mr. MITCHELL. Very well.

Mr. CALL. It is true another company has been chartered since that time and within a few years past, that has no connection whatever with the company which built the original portions of the line, having its origin within six or eight years past, long after this grant became extinct; but it is untrue that these companies have for the greater portion of this grant, except the part which I have indicated, any authority whatever from the Legislature of the State.

Mr. MITCHELL. That may all be, but now I wish to ask another question. Assuming for the sake of the argument that the title to these lands is in the company and not in the State, what I want to know, then, is whether or not this amendment would protect settlers who are located by the line of the road now completed.

Mr. CALL. Certainly; it would protect nobody if the title is in the company. If the title is in the company the amendment will not protect the settler.

Mr. MITCHELL. Why?

Mr. CALL. Because no act we can pass will divest the title that is already vested in a railroad company.

Mr. MITCHELL. I entirely agree to that proposition; but does not this amendment propose to do that very thing? That is the point I want to get at.

Mr. CALL. This amendment proposes to say that the settler upon this grant, there being no legislative disposal of it if that be a fact, there never having been a location of the line of road within the time required for completing the whole line, this amendment declares what the Supreme Court and every other court have repeatedly declared, that if during the life-time of the grant there has been no legislative disposal by the State of Florida of it and no road either located or built under it, then the settler shall have his rights protected, and the grant has never taken effect, and therefore the land has always been a part of the public domain, because an illegal executive act reserving public lands can confer no right on any one.

Mr. MITCHELL. I entirely agree with the Senator from Florida. If he is correct in his proposition to the effect that no legislative disposal has ever been made of this grant by the Legislature of the State of Florida, then this amendment is entirely proper, and comes within the authority of Congress as repeatedly declared by the Supreme Court of the United States; but if, on the other hand, the Senator from Florida is wrong in assuming that no legislative disposal of the grant has ever been made—

Mr. CALL. In the life-time of the grant.

Mr. MITCHELL. In the life-time of the grant, and that there has been a legislative disposal of the title so that it is vested in a railroad company, then I say this amendment is entirely beyond and without the principle declared by the Supreme Court.

Mr. CALL. Undoubtedly that is true, but we legislate on facts, and I have brought here half a dozen times the statutes of the State of Florida and read them to the Senate, and I have read from the message of the governor of the State in 1853, and from the resolutions and acts of the Legislature of the State, showing the fact that there was not then, and has not been since, until 1881, and then only for a small portion of this line, when there was this vague and indefinite declaration of the Legislature, which, after granting 23,600 acres to the mile of swamp and overflowed land to the railroad company to be selected anywhere in the State, they provided that whatever rights the State may have, if it has any, in the grant from Chattahoochee to Pensacola should be granted to the company.

Now, it is clear that the reservation made in 1856 on the verbal request of Mr. Yulee, the Senator, not being then nor afterwards authorized by the Legislature, and the road never having been built, the only right the State could have, even if the granting act of 1856 by the United States was still alive, was to select them in 1881 along the line of the road then for the first time authorized and located under authority of the Legislature.

Mr. MITCHELL. The point I wish to make is this: I think in view of the rule well settled now by the courts as to the want of power in Congress to declare forfeiture of any portion of a grant *in presenti* that is adjacent to a road that has been completed, it would be a very great injustice to settlers for Congress to undertake to legislate upon that subject or to attempt to protect them. It would lead to "confusion worse confounded," and that is the very point I wish to get at, whether this amendment proposes to do that thing or not. Of course if the fact is as stated by the Senator from Florida, that there has been no legislative disposal of this grant, then the amendment is all right. Otherwise I think it is all wrong.

Mr. CALL. Now, Mr. President, the Senator and I differ as wide

as the heaven from the earth in regard to the law and what the courts have decided. I understand that no supreme court has ever decided that there was no power in Congress to forfeit lands where the road was not constructed within the time required by the granting act. And I affirm furthermore, without undertaking to go into that discussion, that the proposition is untenable, without a shadow of reason, and can not be sustained in argument.

Mr. MITCHELL. I am utterly amazed at the Senator from Florida. Mr. CALL. Now wait a moment. I do not care to discuss that question with the Senator here. That has been discussed before. I only wanted to emphasize my dissent to his proposition. This matter of *in presenti* grants, according to the decision of the Supreme Court, in my opinion, has no kind of justification, and some day in some other case will be reversed by the same court otherwise constituted. But be that as it may, the question presented here is whether or not a settler upon the public lands in the State of Florida, upon a reservation made without the authority of law, made upon the verbal request of a Senator of this body, so notified to the Department by the governor of the State, the location not approved by the State, and not made under any authority of the Legislature of the State, of a railroad company whose charter has been repealed, and which was never built and has no successor—whether or not that settler upon the public domain should be protected in his rights.

The Senator says he agrees to that, but if I am mistaken in my facts then there would be an invitation to the settler to occupy and improve land the title to which might be taken away by a court. What objection is that to his protection?

If the law has vested the title the railroad company will be sure enough to take advantage of it. If the law has not vested the title then the settler will have the protection of the courts. So this bill giving this right is simply a direction to the Interior Department, which has always leaned against the settlers and in favor of the corporations of this country, and when the settlers, the citizens, are poor and unable to litigate in the courts, and are dependent upon that Department alone for protection, it is an effectual denial of the rights of the settler not to legislate in his favor here. That is all I ask. I ask to give a direction and a status of right which will require the officers of the Interior Department to protect the settler upon that void reservation, made illegally upon the request of a Senator here and so declared officially in the records of the public land department.

Mr. MITCHELL. I should like to inquire who that Senator was.

Mr. CALL. Mr. Yulee, of Florida.

Mr. MITCHELL. Who was the Secretary of the Interior, or Commissioner of the General Land Office?

Mr. CALL. I forget, now; but I think Mr. Hendricks, and afterwards Mr. Wilson.

Mr. MITCHELL. What date was it?

Mr. CALL. In 1856. I have read it here. If I had my speeches here I could show it. I have the printed letter of the Commissioner of the General Land Office—I believe it was in 1856 or 1857—declaring in express words that this reservation was made upon the request of Mr. Yulee, and upon his statement that there had been or soon would be some legislation which would authorize the construction of that line of road.

Mr. MITCHELL. I know nothing about the facts myself; but if the Senator is not correct, then I undertake to say that this amendment is simply holding out to the settlers on land adjacent to the completed road a false hope, and the effect of it will be to involve them in litigation that they otherwise might avoid.

Mr. CALL. They are upon these lands. They have their homes there; they have their improvements there; and these are the facts as presented to Congress. All that we can do is to give them the protection of the law and the benefit of the exercise of such power as we have. It is no objection to the proposition that it may be the courts may place some other and different construction of the law upon a different state of facts than those presented here.

Mr. DOLPH. Will the Senator from Florida allow me to ask a question?

Mr. CALL. Certainly.

Mr. DOLPH. I understand that the amendment proposed by the Senator has been modified by striking out all after the words "pre-emption laws," in line 6. Now, I state frankly to the Senator that I do not understand this amendment as it stands. It reads:

That all actual settlers on any of the public lands in the State of Florida—

I understand that where a grant has been made to a railroad company and no act of forfeiture has been had it is no longer a part of the public domain, and therefore settlers within the limits of the grant, either on the earned lands or the unearned lands, to use that term to distinguish lands situated adjacent to completed road and those which are adjacent to uncompleted line of the road, would not be (if that is the correct position) upon the public lands.

The next clause is—

affected by the grants.

That is, you say "public lands in the State of Florida affected by the grants." Suppose that the land within the limits of the grant to a

railroad company or to a State for the purposes of aiding in the construction of a railroad is public land and part of the public domain, what "grant" does the Senator mean? Has he made it plain so that the Secretary of the Interior and the courts will understand what grant is meant by "the grants?"

Then there follows:

who made actual settlement on any of the said lands.

If they were not public lands, if persons went on them without the authority of the Interior Department or of law and squatted upon the lands, are they settlers within the meaning that has come to be attached to that term under the land laws of the United States, or are they mere squatters, persons upon the land without authority? What does the term "said lands" refer to? Does it refer to the lands which are forfeited by the first section of this act? That seems to me to be the only thing to which it can relate.

I call the attention of the Senator to these suggestions in regard to his amendment. I do not understand in the first place what "the grants" means or "said lands" or "said road," because there is no road specified, there is no grant specified, there are no lands specified in the bill to which these words can relate unless the land forfeited by the first section of the bill.

Mr. CALL. Mr. President, I think that is all very plain. I do not think the amendment needs further amendment. I did first propose to include the words "the grants hereinbefore referred to." Here is one of these grants referred to in the language of the bill in the State of Florida:

All lands heretofore granted to any State or to any corporation to aid in the construction of a railroad.

In the State of Florida, the grant of 1856 to the States of Alabama and Florida will be shown by the laws to be the only grants affected by this act, because it is the only grant ever made to the State for that purpose. Therefore that is a sufficient description.

Now, the meaning of the term "said lands" used in that section of the amendment is plain. Of course "grant" and "lands" are the subjects respecting which the legislation is had; they convey the same idea; and we have very little difficulty in ascertaining what lands are referred to, the word "grants" having been used and the phrase "grants of lands," and the original bill referring in express terms to "all lands heretofore granted to any State." So I think there will be no difficulty in regard to that.

Now I will answer the Senator's suggestion in regard to what is meant by "settler." I mean, and I think the courts will sustain that construction, and if they do not (inasmuch as any act which we pass is subject to their construction) they will limit it according to the Senator's idea, to the term "actual settler" as used and recognized in the Department of Public Lands. Certainly the anomaly of our Government is that in any case of individual right before one man, termed a judge or a court, all the people of the United States and their Congress and executive department may enact and construe a law to mean one plain and clear thing, and the one man, the judge or court, may say it means another, and for that case his decision makes it so.

That is judicial power, and relates to this and to all our acts so far as individual rights or cases are concerned.

Mr. DOLPH. The Senator will understand that there might be within that definition a settler on these railroad lands, because there was a time, as I understand, when as to some of these lands the Department held that they were subject to settlement, and persons went on and filed their certifications and made their settlements and complied with the law as far as they could at the time.

Mr. CALL. That may be so or it may not; but what I mean by "settler" is a person who is in occupation of the public land and who makes application for homestead or right of entry thereon, and that is the condition of much of this land in the twenty-five years during which there was never a pretense of the construction of a railroad, during which the State had repealed the only charter and the only act under which it had ever given a right to any corporation to build a road and prohibited it from proceeding, during which the land was unclaimed by any corporation or by the State, the State having passed a joint resolution asking Congress to revive the grant upon the condition that the company which had been authorized to build the road before the war should never have the benefit of any portion of it.

During the time in which Secretary Chandler decided wisely and with entire conformity to law that these grants had expired and the lands had become public domain, the people settled upon them, and have grown families of children upon them, and have their homes there. If this reservation made against the protest of the governor of the State on record in the Department, upon the verbal request of a Senator, stating that legislation would be had that was never had, no railroad built, no foot of a road built, no charter to any railroad company to build—all charters having been repealed up to 1881, and none now existing as to the larger part of the grant to any, yet it has stood there in the Land Department menacing the homes of these people, and many of them have been sold out, having no power to litigate this question in suits brought upon the pretended claim of a railroad company, chartered twenty-five years after the time of the passage of the act and seventeen

years after the grant had expired. The homes of these people have been taken from them.

Now we only ask that this amendment be put in this bill in order that the actual settlers living upon these lands who have grown up their families there and sought to be allowed to enter their homes, who were invited to go there by the decision of Secretary Chandler, shall have the benefit of this remedial law.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The question recurs on the amendment proposed by the Senator from Kansas [Mr. PLUMB] to the amendment of the Senator from Florida [Mr. CALL].

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The question recurs on the amendment of the Senator from Florida as amended.

The amendment as amended was agreed to.

Mr. SPOONER. I offer an amendment.

Mr. DAWES. Will the Senator from Wisconsin allow me to offer an amendment now, as I am obliged to leave the Senate?

Mr. SPOONER. I yield to the Senator from Massachusetts.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The Senator from Wisconsin withdraws his amendment.

Mr. DAWES. I offer the following amendment:

Provided further, That this act shall not be considered to impair any rights, legal or equitable, now vested in any person or corporation to any of the lands herein forfeited.

Mr. BERRY. It seems to me that the object of the bill is to forfeit the title of railroad corporations to these lands, and yet the amendment says that it shall not affect the title of any corporation, either legal or equitable. The whole purpose of this bill is to forfeit these lands and restore them to the public domain. I suppose the Senator's object is to say that it shall not affect the title of a different corporation, a certain canal company that claims equitable rights in certain lands in Michigan.

Mr. DAWES. That is the object of it.

Mr. BERRY. That word "equitable" ought not to be inserted in the amendment. Whether or not the canal company has an equitable right is a question that perhaps the courts ought to pass on and will pass on. The point is whether the canal company has an equity which the courts would recognize. But the Senator from Massachusetts is seeking to establish an equity that can not be established in the courts of the country and to have Congress declare an equity which those who favored the amendment offered by the other Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. HOAE] sought to establish the other day. This is seeking to do indirectly that which that amendment sought to do directly, and it was laid upon the table.

I think the amendment ought not to be adopted. If these persons have legal rights which they can assert in the courts, it is not necessary to put in a clause granting this right, because the law will take care of them, and if the Senator is seeking to give that canal company some kind of Congressional equity which does not exist in law, then I insist that the amendment ought not to be adopted after we have laid the amendment of his colleague on the table.

Mr. DAWES. If the purpose of the Senator from Arkansas is, when he knows that there is a technical defect in the title held by this canal company for which it paid a valuable consideration, to intervene for the benefit of an organization that put squatters upon its lands, telling them when they were put there that they knew the lands were not open to settlement, but when the time for forfeiture came they would be on the road to make good their claims from that date—if that is the purpose of the Senator from Arkansas, then it is proper to lay this amendment upon the table. If, however, the Senator from Arkansas desires to protect innocent purchasers for a valuable consideration of lands as to the title to which there is a technical defect simply because the title is in a railroad corporation who have not earned it, then he should be willing that the technical defect should be cured in a court that would recognize legal and equitable considerations. That is the whole of it.

Now, it is apparent that there is in this city an organization that has planned for this very hour, that has put upon this land men to whom it has said in its letters of instruction, "We know that you can not make a legal entry now because the legal title is in a railroad corporation, but whenever the lands are forfeited, you, knowing you were not there as honest settlers, will be there ready to perfect your claim." This canal corporation obtained this land through the State of Michigan, supposing, and everybody supposing, that the title was perfect, but finding out now by a subsequent decision of the Supreme Court that it has a legal and technical defect, if the Senator wants to forfeit that title and give it to these men, then he will lay this amendment on the table.

Mr. BERRY. I would say to the Senator from Massachusetts that the purpose of the Senator from Arkansas is to prevent the canal company from getting twenty-five or forty million dollars' worth of land for a canal which was never built; one that was a fraud, as shown by the testimony taken; one that selected this land in defiance of the laws of the United States—a company that never completed its contract. My purpose is to prevent a confirmation to that canal company of lands to which they have no title, and to prevent a confirmation which will

deprive settlers who went there in good faith of their pre-emption and homestead claims.

There is nothing, however, in this bill that says these settlers shall have any preference whatever. The bill simply leaves them to their rights in the courts of the country, and if the canal company has superior rights in the courts under the bill the canal company is protected. But if the courts say, as the Secretary of the Interior has said, that the rights of the settlers who have homes there, who have raised families there, are superior, I do not wish by an act of Congress to take these people's homes from them and turn them and their children out, and give the land to this company for a canal that was never constructed, and that a committee of the House of Representatives before which the testimony was taken said was fraud, that it was not only a fraud in the construction of the canal, but a fraud in the selection of the lands, selected directly in the face of the law.

I hold that the bill as it comes from the committee does not protect the homestead settlers or any others unless they are protected under the laws of the land. If the canal company seek to assert its rights before the courts, and if the homestead and pre-emption settlers have no rights, then they will gain on showing their own right. If the canal company has the better right the courts will so hold. The bill does not give them a preference in any way whatever. But it is the Senator from Massachusetts who seeks by legislation to do what we know the laws of the land do not do—give this canal company lands to which they are not entitled, lands selected in fraud of the law, lands selected outside of the grant, and lands selected, I repeat, for a canal that is worthless as declared by the House of Representatives, and that the State of Michigan is trying to get the United States to take off its hands.

These lands are of immense value which it is proposed to give to them by legislation which they are not entitled to under the law. If they have equitable rights, I apprehend when they assert those rights in the courts of the country, the courts will say that as this thing was conceived in fraud, you can not come here and have this confirmation because you must come in with clean hands. If the courts do not say that, if they say they have legal rights, then so be it, and these settlers will have to give way.

In regard to what the Senator has said about there being men in this city hiring men to go there and settle, I know nothing of it; but I know the law to be that if men went there under a contract agreeing that any person should take a part of the homestead, the law of the land is that they can obtain no title whatever; they can not get confirmation. They would gain no benefit by it, because the law absolutely prohibits all such arrangements. That is all I have to say about it.

Mr. PALMER. Mr. President, I do not know what will be the effect of the pending amendment; but if it is considered as giving any advantage to the canal company to which reference has been made, it surely ought not to pass.

The appeal to the Senate is for consideration for that canal company which got these lands not alone in contravention of law, but in direct defiance of law and by nefarious methods. They had an honest man removed from the place of receiver at Marquette that they might procure these very illegal entries, as appeared in a report of a House committee which was read here the other day. The whole course of this canal company in the first selections of the lands which were illegal, in the wrecking of the original company by a conspiracy which was nefarious in itself, has been attended with fraud from the beginning to the end; and now they come in a pathetic manner before the United States Senate and ask that a technical defect be remedied. It was a defiance of the law in the first place, and it was a conspiracy to get these lands. I have a map here, and I can go over it again to-day as I did the last time the subject was up, and if called upon I will show the course of the canal company after the successors came into possession of the land, how they wrecked the original company. It is beneath the attention of the United States Senate to extend them any relief. Let them have their legal rights; but do not put anything into any of the amendments that will give them an advantage before the courts.

I do not believe that the Senators from Massachusetts have read the different reports in regard to this Portage Canal Company. If they have they must see that it has been attended with irregularity, if not fraud, from the beginning to the end.

If this is going to continue, and I imagine from the look of things that it is going to be the salient point of the discussion and probably will take up the time of the Senate all day, I shall send up some reports to be read which it seems to me will extinguish any claim in equity, right, or decency of the canal company to the consideration of the Senate.

Mr. HOAR. Let them be read. I should like to hear them.

Mr. PALMER. The Senator from Massachusetts says he would like to hear them read. If it would not bore the Senate, it would give me great pleasure. I dislike to trespass on their time. Will the Secretary read?

Mr. DAWES. Let me reply first.

Mr. PALMER. I yield before calling for the reading.

Mr. DAWES. Mr. President, the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. BERRY] says that if the canal company have a legal title to this land they can go into the courts and assert it. The Senator knows that if

they had a perfect title to this land they would not be talking here, nor would anybody be representing them here. He has heard it stated over and over again just what the technical defect in their title is; and he knows (because he is a good lawyer) that the effect of this bill is to forfeit to-day their right and everybody else's right. The rights of the men who are on the land, whom he calls honest settlers, are forfeited to-day, whatever they are, and so is the right of the canal company.

Mr. PALMER. Will the Senator permit me to interrupt him? The honest settlers do not consider their rights jeopardized at all by this forfeiture unless amendments are injected into this bill. They ask for no legislation.

Mr. DAWES. I understand that the settler who went there upon his contract with an attorney does not feel that he has the slightest trouble, and why? That is what I want to ask the Senator from Arkansas and the Senator from Michigan, why is he perfectly satisfied to have the canal company and himself cut off and this land forfeited to the United States? The Senator from Michigan lives in a Western country and knows just what is the condition of things there, that the man starts *de novo* as a settler. The canal company has no place, for whatever right, legal or equitable, it has has been forfeited to the public domain.

Mr. PALMER. Let me interrupt the Senator to ask him to explain how the canal company's rights are forfeited by this bill. Have they sailed along under the shelter of the grant to the Ontonagon and Brulé Company for the last thirty years? Have they sought to have that grant forfeited without any amendment asserting their own rights?

Mr. DAWES. Why, Mr. President, I suppose it is all my fault that I am unable to make the Senator see that the language of the bill is that every acre of the odd sections opposite unearned land grants is forfeited to the United States and made a part of the public domain as of to-day. Now, these 15,000 acres are of that kind, and therefore they will be forfeited as of to-day to the public domain if this bill passes, notwithstanding his own State conveyed them to this corporation and this corporation took its money and built this canal, because the technical title is in the railroad company and an act of Congress is necessary to take it out of the railroad company. Therefore the grant of Michigan to the canal corporation does not take effect.

Now, does not the Senator see what becomes of all claim of the canal corporation to these lands? And the same is true of any man who is on them. But he has this difference: The moment it is public domain he becomes a settler on the land from that day; no matter how he got in there, no matter how he came there, he is there to-day a settler, and that is his advantage. That is why the Senator comes in with amendment after amendment, which if they were drawn by these attorneys down here on the Avenue for the very purpose could not have been drawn in any different language from that which is embodied in the amendment of the Senator.

Now, I wish the Senator from Arkansas—

Mr. PALMER. Will the Senator permit me to interrupt him?

Mr. DAWES. Yes, sir.

Mr. PALMER. I believe I have the floor, however.

Mr. DAWES. No, I have the floor.

Mr. PALMER. I yielded to the Senator from Massachusetts, as I think the record will show.

Mr. DAWES. If the Senator has the floor—

Mr. PALMER. I was going to say that the Senator from Michigan has no amendment to offer and would prefer to have this bill go through pure and undefiled; but when able lawyers, men whose lives have been passed in legislation, keep injecting amendment after amendment, when foiled at one point embody the ideas that they have been foiled in upon other amendments and keep shoving them in, it is time that the Senator from Michigan, who is a plain, blunt man, should have some one back of him that will tell him the force of legal language. It is David not only against Goliath but a whole host—

Mr. HOAR. The Senator has compared himself to David very much. He will remember that David was a victorious chieftain; I never heard that Goliath was, and I do not think he need be very much afraid.

Mr. PALMER. I hope that will be the result.

Mr. HOAR. I merely wish to correct one misapprehension of my honorable friend. He says some Senators here have been foiled in their amendments and have redrawn them and offered other amendments of the same sort. If that applies to any one, if the Senator has it in his mind as applying to anybody, it applies to me. I offered an amendment the other day and I was notified that the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. SPOONER] had an amendment which contained my amendment and something else which he wanted inserted, a modification which he was going to offer. Thereupon there was a vote taken on my amendment and a few said "ay" and a few "no," and I did not even call for a division, supposing that the next thing that was to come up at that time was my amendment modified by the Senator from Wisconsin; and so I allowed my amendment to be declared voted down.

I had something more that I intended to say, but I thought I would let that go, so that the amendment of the Senator from Wisconsin should be before the Senate. It turned out when I came to examine the amendment of the Senator from Wisconsin that it did not contain

mine. It contained merely his own provision, without mine. I never should have allowed that vote to pass without calling for a division or calling for the yeas and nays, and without having a further explanation. My amendment, if it was voted down, was voted down under these circumstances alone.

Mr. PALMER. I am not trying to cast discredit on either of the Senators from Massachusetts. They are fighting valiantly for what they believe to be the right. I believe them to be wrong. It is a question of ethics on which wise and great men may differ.

I do not think that I said that that was the state of the case, that Senators were coming in with amendment after amendment when foiled on previous amendments. I said that when that was the case it was time for a plain, blunt man to have lawyers to advise him.

I stand here for the homesteaders of the State of Michigan. This canal company never should have the land inside of these railroad limits confirmed. There is no doubt about that. Those lands were gotten in direct defiance of the law and by strategy, by getting one receiver removed and a pliant tool put in his place; and I think it is beneath the dignity of the Senate to have anything to do with confirming that grant, and that they should be relegated to the courts for any relief they may ask.

I will say further, that I was inclined to accede to the amendment of the Senator from Massachusetts, but if it is going to be construed as giving a hold to the canal company by which they can further their schemes, I must oppose it. It all depends upon the construction of that word "equitable."

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CHACE in the chair). The question is on the adoption of the amendment of the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. DAWES].

Mr. DAWES. I understand the amendment to mean just what I understood the Senator to consent to early in the discussion. I stated publicly that if gentlemen would leave these 15,000 acres of land not affected at all by this forfeiture to be settled in the courts between the canal company and anybody else who set up claims thereto without forfeiting the land into the public domain, we should be perfectly content; and that is the whole purpose of this amendment. If the Senator prefers to put it in that language I will accept that language. I desire simply that this forfeiture shall not have the effect to make a new title of public domain to-day applicable to these 15,000 acres.

Mr. PALMER. I think that is eminently fair. I do not wish to take away from the canal company a single right they have, but I do not wish them to get any new right by legislation.

Mr. DAWES. I do not intend by this amendment to give them any new title. I merely try to let them maintain in court such title as they have got as against anybody else.

Mr. PALMER. It all turns upon the construction of that word "equitable."

Mr. DAWES. Is the Senator afraid of the equitable consideration of the equitable title?

Mr. PALMER. I am afraid of phraseology.

Mr. DAWES. I want to reply to what the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. BERRY] has said about the fraud in this matter. The Senator says there was fraud in the selection. The Department says there was no fraud in the selection, and I will read what the Department says on that point. The Senator says there was fraud in the selection first because they selected lands not nearest the canal. I refer him to the report of the Commissioner of the General Land Office, from which the Senator from Michigan read, of date June 9, 1886, in which it is said:

The grant of 1866, although additional to that of 1865, was not made subject to the conditions and limitations of the act of 1865, nor is there anything in the latter grant indicating any intention on the part of Congress to make it subject to such conditions and limitations. The conditions and limitations upon which each was made are plainly set forth in the respective granting acts, and differ in several essential particulars. The act of 1865 provided that the lands granted thereby should be selected from lands subject to private entry nearest the location of the canal; the grant of 1866 was of lands to which the right of homestead or pre-emption had not attached.

The act of 1866 should, therefore, be construed as though it stood alone, without reference to the act of 1865. In this view of the case it follows that selections under said act were not restricted to the lands nearest the location of the canal, nor to lands subject to private entry.

The other charge of fraud made by the Senator from Arkansas is that they selected mineral lands. That was decided the other way by the Secretary of the Interior in a letter of June 6, 1863, in which he decided that these very lands were not the mineral lands that were excluded and that the company had a right to take them. I refer him to that decision. Now he says that they never built any canal. He has never been there and I have never been there. The act required that the governor of the State of Michigan should determine when the canal was completed. I read the other day the determination of the governor of Michigan that it was completed.

If there has been any other fraud the Senator has not suggested it that I know of. If he has, I have omitted to hear it. He says that he wants to forfeit all rights that this canal company have so that they shall not come into court at all. The Senator shakes his head. Then he does not want this bill. If there is anything plainer in the world than the words of this bill and their legal effect, I do not know what it is. The Scripture can not be made plainer than these words—

Mr. BERRY. Will the Senator allow me one moment?

Mr. DAWES. Certainly.

Mr. BERRY. The bill does not propose to forfeit lands granted to the canal company. The bill proposes to forfeit lands granted to railroad companies throughout the United States, what are commonly called the unearned lands, lands opposite that portion of the roads yet uncompleted. That is the object and purpose of the bill, and it is a worthy object.

Mr. DAWES. Then I am for it.

Mr. BERRY. This bill forfeits 15,000 acres of that land, the title to which was supposed to be in the Ontonagon and Brulé Railroad Company. Under the decision in *Schulenberg vs. Harriman* it is necessary for Congress to pass an act of forfeiture in order to divest the railroad company of that land. This bill does that. The canal company come and say they have some sort of title. This bill does not propose to forfeit that title, but unfortunately for the canal company they have no title, and it is proposed by the amendment of the Senator from Massachusetts now to give them a title to these 15,000 acres, whereas the bill if it passes as it is will divest the railroad company of the lands, and then if the canal company have any legal right to them it does not affect it in any way whatever. If the homestead or pre-emption claimants have legal rights it does not affect them in any way whatever, but leaves them to settle those rights between themselves in the courts. The homestead settlers are seeking no advantage by legislation here to-day. They ask that the railroad company be divested of this title, and that the courts of the country may determine whether or not they have any title or whether the canal company has.

Now, in regard to the fraud. Under the second grant of 1866 I did not say they were required to select the lands nearest the canal. I said that it had been argued by able lawyers that such was the effect of it, because it must be construed with the previous act, which contained that restriction, and I said the original act required that they should so select lands; but they did select lands in fraud of that law, as the House report shows. That report shows that the canal was never constructed in the manner required by law.

Mr. HOAR. Will the Senator allow me to ask on what authority he makes that statement?

Mr. BERRY. I make it on the authority of a report made by Mr. Henley, of California, from the Committee on Public Lands of the House of Representatives in the last Congress.

Mr. HOAR. Now the Senator will allow me to make a statement, and I will give him my authority. The governor of Michigan, Hon. Henry P. Baldwin, lately a member of this Senate, as honorable a man as breathes on this continent, as many persons within the sound of my voice will testify, appointed an eminent engineer to report whether that canal was completed or not, and he reported that it was, and thereupon the successor of Mr. Baldwin, Governor Bagley, also an eminent and able man of high character, certified that it was completed; and the honorable Senator from Michigan [Mr. STOCKBRIDGE] has told me within five minutes that the canal was completed and was in constant use, and that he has been through it himself on the largest lake steamers a dozen times. I think that story ought to stop in the Senate.

Mr. PALMER. Will the Senator permit me?

Mr. BERRY. One moment. I assert that here is a report made by a majority of the committee of the House of Representatives, which was made after thorough investigation. It was made after proof taken and after witness after witness was brought before that committee; and after long and mature deliberation that committee decided that the canal never was constructed according to the terms of the grant, that it had wholly failed to meet the conditions; and while I do not wish to impute any wrong to the governor of Michigan—I know nothing about him—I refer to the report of a majority of the committee of the House of Representatives acting under their sworn oaths after hearing the testimony of witnesses, including the same engineer, if I am not mistaken, of whom the Senator speaks—after his testimony was taken, and that of many others, the committee said it was not completed according to law. There is where I get my authority. I know nothing about it personally, but a majority of the Committee on Public Lands of the House of Representatives, who are supposed to be honorable and truthful men, acting under their oaths as members of Congress, after patient investigation so stated in their report; and it is on that authority that I assert it. If the Senator calls it a story I give him the authority on which that story originated.

Mr. HOAR. The minority of the committee decided otherwise.

Mr. BERRY. Yes, sir; but I rely on the majority report. There was a minority report also.

Mr. PLUMB. This debate threatens to go on indefinitely. I move to lay the amendment on the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair did not understand the remark of the Senator from Kansas.

Mr. PLUMB. I move to lay the amendment on the table.

Mr. HOAR. I hope the Senator will not do that.

Mr. PLUMB. I do not want it debated all day.

Mr. HOAR. There is no stopping the debate. The amendment may be offered again.

Mr. PLUMB. That is true, but this question has been discussed backwards and forwards, and having charge of the bill I feel some responsibility in the matter, and I wish to bring it to an issue as soon as I can. My idea was that we might get a vote on the proposition.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Kansas moves that the amendment of the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. DAWES] be laid on the table.

Mr. HOAR. I ask to have the motion withdrawn for a moment.

Mr. PLUMB. I withdraw it.

Mr. HOAR. I have drawn an amendment which I have submitted to the Senator from Michigan, and which he prefers a little to the one which is proposed by my colleague, and it seems to me that it will answer what I understand to be the professed desire of both sides to this controversy.

As I understand the chairman of the Committee on Public Lands and the gentlemen who have discussed this question, they say that what they want to do by this bill is to make a general declaration of forfeiture of all unearned railroad grants, and that they do not want to go at this time into the question whether this, that, or the other railroad or person claiming under this, that, or the other railroad has got an equity which we ought to respect, but to let all such parties come to Congress hereafter if they require legislation, or let them go to the courts and present their case if they have a good legal title now, one which the courts may enforce.

That being the purpose, it seems to me—and I have submitted it to my colleague and others—that this bill as it is framed goes further than that, and that when these grantees come to Congress hereafter they will be met with the answer, "Why, Congress had that all up before them when this forfeiture bill was passed, and they determined that they would not make you an exception to any general forfeiture. Your question has been settled, and we will not reopen it." I suppose the honorable Senator from Kansas would agree that that would not be a fair result from this legislation to-day.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Massachusetts will suspend. The morning hour having expired, the Chair lays before the Senate the regular order.

Mr. HOAR. I ask unanimous consent to complete this statement.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair will lay the regular order before the Senate.

The CHIEF CLERK. A bill (S. 2083) to provide for the establishment of a Bureau of Animal Industry, and to facilitate the exportation of live-stock and their products, to extirpate contagious pleuropneumonia and other diseases among domestic animals, and for other purposes.

Mr. HOAR. Now, if I may be permitted by unanimous consent to complete my statement—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there unanimous consent to the Senator from Massachusetts proceeding? The Chair hears no objection.

Mr. HOAR. To this amendment to the land bill the Senator from Michigan expresses his assent, and I desire to read it to the Senator from Kansas, and if I can get the assent of the Senator from Kansas it will save all trouble. It is in reference to this single canal company:

Provided, That this act shall not be construed to prejudice any right of the Portage Lake Canal Company or any person claiming under them who applies hereafter to the courts or to Congress for any legal or equitable relief to which they may be now entitled.

I can not see that I give any human being an advantage.

Mr. PLUMB. If the Senator from Michigan is willing to agree to that, I shall not stand in the way myself.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The regular order is Senate bill 2083.

Mr. PLUMB. I want to say about this whole business, if I can have a moment, that this railroad forfeiture bill remained on the Calendar unacted on for a long time because of the fact that the Senators from Michigan desired to have some amendments made which would meet the situation in that State as they respectively understood it. In the hope that they would be able to agree on something which would meet with concurrence on the part of the Senate, and thus dispose of what has always been an active and acrimonious controversy, I did not ask the Senate to consider this bill as early as I otherwise should. The debate has now gone on substantially upon this proposition for days. I shall not as far as I am concerned agree to any further extension of it, and I ask unanimous consent that the bill may come up to-morrow immediately on the conclusion of the morning business, and I will make every effort as far as I am concerned to reach a final vote before 2 o'clock to-morrow.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Did the Chair understand the Senator from Kansas to ask unanimous consent that this bill be considered to-morrow at 2 o'clock notwithstanding the regular order?

Mr. PLUMB. No; at the conclusion of the morning business to-morrow.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Kansas asks—

Mr. HOAR. Is there anything else? Suppose this amendment should be adopted now, can not the bill be disposed of at once?

Mr. BERRY. I object to passing the amendment until we can examine it by to-morrow morning.

Mr. HOAR. Let the amendment be printed.

Mr. DAWES. I accept the modification of my amendment suggested by my colleague.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair understands the other amendment is withdrawn and this substituted for it.

Mr. HOAR. I move that as an amendment, and ask that it be printed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there be no objection that will be done, and the new amendment proposed will be printed. Is there objection to the proposition of the Senator from Kansas that the Senate bill 1430 come up to-morrow morning at the conclusion of the morning business? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

WHARF AT FORTRESS MONROE.

Mr. PADDOCK. I call now for the regular order for the purpose of submitting some remarks on the question.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The regular order is Senate bill 2083, which is the unfinished business.

Mr. DANIEL. I desire to have a bill considered.

Mr. PADDOCK. I will yield to the Senator if it requires no time.

Mr. DANIEL. It will require no time. I ask unanimous consent to call up Order of Business 1155, being the bill (S. 2624) to provide for the enlargement of the dimensions of the wharf at Fortress Monroe. I would not ask this of the Senate but for the fact that there are public considerations why the bill should be acted upon immediately if at all. There is a wooden structure in process of erection, and the proposed change in it has been recommended by the War Department and by a report of the Committee on Commerce. I see the Senator from Maine [Mr. FRYE] is in his seat, who is quite familiar with the details of this matter, and I should be very glad if he would supplement my remarks by making a statement.

Mr. FRYE. Probably there will be no objection made to the passage of the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Virginia asks for the consideration of the bill named by him. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill (S. 2624) to provide for the enlargement of the dimensions of the wharf at Fortress Monroe.

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

AMENDMENT TO INDIAN APPROPRIATION BILL.

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

INTERSTATE COMMERCE.

Mr. CULLOM. I am instructed by the Committee on Interstate Commerce to report back several bills, being Senate bills Nos. 613, 291, 362, and 363, and to submit a substitute for them all in the shape of a new bill. I ask that the amendments to the original act which are made in this substitute bill be printed, so that they may be shown to be amendments to the law.

Mr. HARRIS. I suggest to my colleague on the committee that instead of encumbering his substitute with the original bill he should move to indefinitely postpone all of these bills and report an original bill, so that we shall have but the one bill to deal with.

Mr. CULLOM. I have no objection to that. I presume it is the most regular way. I report the following bill from the committee.

The bill (S. 2851) to amend an act entitled "An act to regulate commerce," approved February 4, 1887, was read twice by its title.

Mr. CULLOM. I move that the other bills be indefinitely postponed.

The motion was agreed to, and the following bills were postponed indefinitely:

A bill (S. 291) to amend the second and fourth sections of "An act to regulate commerce," approved February 4, 1887;

A bill (S. 362) to be entitled "An act to amend the first section of the 'Act to regulate commerce,' approved February 4, 1887;"

A bill (S. 363) to amend the fourth section of the "Act to regulate commerce," approved February 4, 1887; and

A bill (S. 613) to amend an act entitled "An act to regulate commerce," approved February 4, 1887.

Mr. CULLOM. I renew the suggestion that the new bill be printed, so that the amendments proposed to be made to the law as it now is shall be shown on the print.

Mr. HARRIS. Let the act be printed and the amendments printed with the act.

Mr. CULLOM. Let the section proposed to be amended be set out and then the amendments to that section here made. I want the amendments to be printed in italics so as to show the changes.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. That course will be pursued if there be no objection.

BUREAU OF ANIMAL INDUSTRY.

The Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 2083) to provide for the establishment of a Bureau of Animal Industry, and to facilitate the exportation of live-stock and

their products, to extirpate contagious pleuro-pneumonia and other diseases among domestic animals, and for other purposes, the pending question being on the amendment offered by Mr. PALMER as a substitute for the bill.

Mr. PADDOCK. Mr. President, in the attempt to discuss some of the constitutional questions that naturally arise in the consideration of this subject in the presence of so many able lawyers I confess to no little embarrassment. The consciousness of my inferior learning in the law, and that the charge of presumption can be made good against me, coupled with the expectation that I shall be subjected to the criticism of "threshing over the old straw" of elementary principles in the hearing of those to whom they are as the alphabet, are not calculated to assure me. But, sir, this method seems to me to be necessary for the particular purpose I have in view, and the purpose itself being honest, I think I shall be cheerfully indulged by the Senate.

Of course, sir, there is no doubt nor question whatever that the National Government has absolute, undivided power to regulate commerce with foreign nations. All concede this. As to this great function of government the United States stand as a nation with a perfect, an indivisible autonomy. In the presence of this supreme authority State lines fade away and disappear. When the national arm is extended to strengthen, defend, "regulate" our commerce with foreign nations, it is the arm of the sovereign people, divided by no boundary lines of geographical or political subdivisions, but massed in all the majesty and strength of nationality. In the exercise of this great power the Federal Government may, when necessary to protect commercial intercourse, quarantine against ships from foreign ports at which a contagious disease is believed to have secured a foothold epidemically, and when there is a reasonable apprehension that such ships may be infected by the contagion thereof. It may, and it does, place restrictions on the importation of domestic animals that are believed to be afflicted with or to have been exposed to a contagious disease or to contagious disease-conditions.

It may prohibit altogether all commerce with a foreign nation which discriminates against ours in favor of that of another nation, or which may refuse to us fair, reasonable, and satisfactory regulations as to commercial exchanges—indeed it may do all things not inconsistent with international law "to promote the general welfare" by liberal or restrictive regulations for the protection and for the advancement of our interests through foreign commerce. But, sir, it will be remembered that the same clause of the same section and article of the Constitution which gives this supreme control over foreign commerce to the National Government, in exactly the same language gives exactly the same "power to regulate commerce among the several States and with the Indian tribes." If it is an exclusive power as to foreign commerce, "and with the Indian tribes," which latter, under the theory of the Constitution, have been treated as quasi nationalities, it is equally an undivided power as respects the exercise thereof in the regulation of "commerce among the several States." The very restrictions placed upon this power by Section 9 of Article I of the Constitution, that "no tax or duty shall be laid on articles exported from any State," and "no preference" given "to the ports of one State over another," and that "vessels bound to or from one State" shall not "be obliged to enter, clear, or pay duties in another;" and the corresponding restraint placed upon the States by section 10 of the same article that no State shall "lay any imposts or duties on imports or exports" except for purposes of local inspection, and that all State laws, even as to this limited privilege, shall be under the revisory control of Congress, prove the absolutely exclusive national character of this power not only to regulate foreign, but internal commerce. The same control in the matter of these regulations and restrictions for the removal of impediments or obstructions in the way of the free course of foreign commerce exists as to the commerce among the several States, qualified only by the restraints thereupon before referred to.

The power of a State under the Constitution to quarantine as to a matter or thing which is clearly a subject of interstate commerce can only be exercised subject to the duty of Congress to regulate such commerce. The entirely independent exercise of this power under such circumstances by a State would be inconsonant with the national attribute respecting the regulation of commercial intercourse between the States with which the Constitution has clothed the National Government, and would be wholly inadmissible except with the sanction of Congress. Undoubtedly non-action by Congress would be such sanction. Quarantine is a potential instrumentality when employed as a health or police regulation by a State, and may become by its misuse most dangerous, most hurtful to the very interests for the protection of which it is invoked. When interjected by authority of a State into the general plan and policy of interstate commerce, as is sometimes done without due and proper public notice of the same to all the other States, it is liable to disturb commercial relationships between the States and derange the economic checks and balances that have grown into our commercial system through the sanctions of the Constitution. Verily, sir, this power can not be too prudently employed by a State nor too jealously guarded by the National Government. Great irritation between the States may occur from the careless exercise of this power locally on account of the suspicion that may be created that the State

establishing the quarantine has a competitive interest to conserve through the practical embargo thus laid upon the commerce of other States. Recently one or more of the States of the farther West quarantined against the shipment to those States of cattle raised in certain Middle, Eastern, and Southern States under the apprehension that pleuro-pneumonia existed therein. One of the States thus prohibited from engaging in this kind of commerce was Virginia, from which had been exported formerly to the farms and ranges of the great trans-Missouri country many thorough-bred or high-grade animals for the improvement of the Western herds.

There was not at the time, nor had there ever been anywhere, either in the section of Virginia where the stock-farms are located upon which such animals are raised, nor upon the transportation routes over which they would be shipped, a single case, nor any exposure of any kind to the contagion of pleuro-pneumonia. Now it would be difficult, I think, to convince the men engaged in this industry—carrying on this commerce—that there was not a competitive interest in stock raising in that section whence the prohibition came which furnished the inspiration for such prohibition, and that it was not due, as alleged, to any apprehension of the spread of this disease through such commerce. I do not think this suspicion was well founded. The quarantine was undoubtedly the result of misinformation, which often reaches remote States as readily as correct information. But from whichever of these causes it resulted it shows the importance of the chief control of this subject being lodged with the National Government, which can be relied upon most surely to act in such a case without bias or prejudice for or against any particular State or section, and only upon carefully-collected information gathered from all parts of the country, from day to day, through official avenues always open to it. Under the powerful influence of great transportation companies, operating exclusively in one, or possibly in several contiguous States, such State or States, without sufficient cause, might quarantine against the commerce in domestic animals, or, indeed, in other or perhaps all of the products of other States, the real object being, through the interruption of intercourse thus secured, to specially advance the interests of the former, and the particular commercial centers or ports therein. Thus it might happen that the restraints placed by the Constitution upon the National Government to prevent "a preference for the ports of one State over another" might be removed by such State or States themselves, acting independently of the national authority, and in violation not only of the essential spirit but the plain provisions of the Constitution.

There was a unanimous consensus of opinion with the eminent men who framed the Constitution that commerce between the States should be under the exclusive control of the National Government. They were not afraid of encroachments by Congress upon the States in dealing with this subject. Mr. Madison said in the debate in the convention upon the plan of government proposed:

Every one is impressed with the idea of a general regulation of trade and commerce.

Again he said, speaking of the proposed relations between the national and State governments:

Apprehend the greatest danger is from the encroachment of the States on the National Government.

Mr. Wilson said:

We have unanimously agreed to establish a general government—that the powers of peace, war, treaties, coinage, and the regulation of commerce ought to reside in that government.

In this enumeration of the great powers which were afterwards given to the National Government the word "commerce" is italicized in the report of the debate, indicating that Mr. Wilson considered the power to regulate commerce one of exceptional importance. These wise men foresaw, if this power to regulate commerce among the several States was not given absolutely to the National Government, that with the growth of the country, the increase of business, the multiplication of great commercial centers, and the preponderance in wealth, financial influence, natural resources, and advantages of some of the States over others the equilibrium so essential to the maintenance of the Union and the retention of its component parts in their proper spheres of subordination to the national authority would be impossible; that where the interests should become so diverse, the competition so great, the rivalries so formidable, if each State should have independent control, each striving to make its own regulations with the others, considering only its own special interests, it would be impossible to secure anything like uniformity of regulations, and a national government thus organized would speedily go to pieces.

But the Constitution could never have been framed upon such a theory. It could not have received a single vote in the convention if the great power over internal as well as foreign commerce had not been given by it without reservation or qualification to the National Government. It is a historical fact that one of the chief incentives for a stronger National Government was the universal embarrassment to commerce through the regulations thereof under the Confederation by the several States acting independently. Indeed, the difficulties, hardships, and irritations under this rule became finally so intolerable that a concerted movement by business men throughout the confederacy was inaugurated to secure relief from this oppressive system. Mr. Presi-

dent, I shall in no sense disparage or detract from the prescience of the great men who framed that immortal instrument when I say that, astute and far-seeing as they were, "they even builded better than they knew" in this as in many other respects.

The wise design of the fathers to secure uniformity of commercial regulations among the several States was very clearly set forth, after the experience of many years, in the opinion in Railroad Company vs. Richmond (19 Wall., 584), in which the court said:

The power to regulate commerce among the several States was vested in Congress in order to secure equality and freedom in commercial intercourse against discriminating State legislation.

And, sir, whoever, under the apprehension of encroachments upon the rights of the States through the exercise of this power by the National Government in the manner best calculated to reach and regulate every incident, remove every menace, every impediment or obstruction from the path of interstate commerce, or who seeks to subtract from or limit such power to gratify State-rights sentimentalism, imperils the commercial prosperity and safety of all the States. Congress is the only safe repository of this power. If it errs at all it will be sure to err in the right direction, i. e., for the advancement and protection of the commerce of the whole country and the promotion of the general welfare of all the people. It will always be found safer and better to resolve whatever doubts may arise in favor of the most liberal and comprehensive regulations of commerce by the National Government rather than for such limited regulations as shall make it possible for the States, through the exercise of their police powers, to encroach upon the domain of the national authority over this subject.

And now, Mr. President, I desire to call the attention of the Senate to the importance of the great interest for the protection of which this bill is designed, with the view of making a practical application of the theory I entertain as to the power and duty of Congress over this whole subject.

The United States owns more live-stock than any nation of Europe, with the sole exception of Russia. Leaving the domains of the Czar out of the calculation, and excepting sheep, we exceed by five times the number of farm animals in all Europe. By the census of 1880 the United States was credited with 34,921,670 cows and other cattle; an increase of more than 13,000,000 over the number reported in 1870. According to the last estimates of the Department of Agriculture, a corresponding increase in this class of live-stock had taken place from 1880 to January, 1887. In the single State of Nebraska, by the State census of 1885, the value of live-stock had increased in five years from \$33,440,265 to \$83,776,720. To-day eight States and Territories west of the Mississippi River own more than one-third of all the cattle in the United States.

The aggregate value of live-stock in the whole country, according to the census of 1880, was \$1,500,464,609. On January 1, 1887, this enormous amount had increased to the stupendous aggregate of \$2,400,586,938, of which \$1,041,000,000 are represented by cattle, including milch cows.

Mr. President, more than nine years ago I ventured, on behalf of the great State which I had the honor then, as I have now, to represent here in part, to call the attention of the Senate to the rapidly-developing need for national legislation upon the subject presented by the bill now under consideration. Time has more than verified the predictions then made as to the growth of this great interest, and the importance to the whole country of giving it stronger national protection than it has yet been able to secure. The figures I present to-day show that the increase of our flocks and herds during the past decade has been marvelous. The great ranching industry on the plains of the far West has been enormously developed, while the still larger industry of cattle feeding in small herds on the farms has been correspondingly stimulated. The demand for cheap meats has been met by new facilities for food production, and new processes and methods for the condensation of food products for shipment and distribution to the consumers, not only of this, but European countries. More and more each year the live-stock interest, particularly in the farther West, is becoming the essential feature of farm husbandry. The small herd is rapidly taking its place with the flock and drove as the most important wealth-producing factor in Western agriculture.

And here, Mr. President, if I may be permitted to further digress, is the explanation of the existence of a very large part of the farm mortgages in the trans-Mississippi River States of which we have heard so much lately from demagogues and others.

The increase in the number and aggregate amount of such mortgages is in no respect the result of unsuccessful agriculture, as has been charged, but quite the contrary. Tens of thousands of farmers in the States mentioned, who formerly depended upon the raising of cereals exclusively, have during the past ten years been acquiring herds and flocks. To make this change in their farm husbandry a great deal of money has been required, and some part of it has been borrowed. When you deduct the number of those who have purchased new farms, or who have enlarged their original farms by purchasing contiguous lands and have made moderate loans for that most proper and legitimate purpose, it will be found that a much larger sum than the remainder of the mortgages is represented by the value of the immensely increased number of

cattle, horses, sheep, etc., that have been placed at great profit to the owners upon such farms. Through this diversification which has been for years and is still going on in the great agricultural States of the West the wealth of that country has been enormously increased, and farmers as a class are becoming more prosperous each year, while their farms have greatly increased in value. The capitalist has made in these cases the best loans to be found in the whole world, while the money thus borrowed has immensely increased the business, the wealth, and the general prosperity of those States, and indeed of the whole country.

The aggregate of these mortgages has been enormously overstated, while the properties upon which they have been placed have been correspondingly undervalued, both by the pessimists in politics who have sought through this attack upon Western securities to score a partisan advantage, and by the army of conscienceless speculators in watered stocks and other like securities in Wall street and elsewhere in the East, who are restless under this withdrawal of capital from their own kiting ventures for employment by the industrious and thrifty farmers of the West in the safest and most useful of all legitimate industries, the development and carrying on of agriculture in the chosen field of all the world. At another time, in the discussion of another subject, I shall have more to say about these misrepresentations.

Thus, Mr. President, the live-stock industry has come to be second only to all others combined in respect of its contributions to the staple food supplies of the people. It furnishes more than two-fifths of the internal commerce of the whole country. A large part of this commerce is carried on between the great inland grazing fields of the trans-Missouri States and Territories and the commercial centers in the Middle, Eastern, and Southern States, whence the products of this industry are distributed universally among the consumers of the whole country and of Europe as well. So that while the value of this commerce is enormous, with hundreds of millions of dollars invested in it, and hundreds of thousands of men employed in one way and another in carrying it on, it is even more important to the mass of the people because of the fact that upon it they largely depend for their supply of meats. Considering all these things, it would be almost impossible to estimate the magnitude of the calamity that would befall the country if this great industry should be destroyed.

It would not only bring ruin upon the multitude of men who have their money invested in the industry, or who labor in it for the support of their families, but it would greatly reduce the meat supply and thus make it impossible for the laboring classes, with their narrow incomes, on account of the increased cost resulting from the constantly increasing disproportion of supply to demand, to use meat, as at present, as an essential part of their daily food. In view of these important facts, will any one say that it is not the imperative duty of the National Government to foster, encourage, strengthen, and protect this industry and the enormous interstate commerce in the products thereof, by the use of all the powers intrusted to it by the Constitution? Indeed, it would be difficult to discover a better subject than this to operate upon for the promotion of "the general welfare."

It is well known that of all the contagious diseases to which cattle are subject there is none so terrible, so much dreaded, as pleuro-pneumonia. When it has once secured a firm lodgment among the herds occupying considerable areas of any country, no limit can be placed upon its ravages short of complete extermination—nothing can prevent its spread indefinitely except the slaughter or the perfect isolation of all animals affected and the entire destruction of every condition from which the disease can be communicated. Once well started the contagion will travel through a region devoted to cattle-raising almost with the rapidity of a prairie fire.

If, for instance, it should secure a firm footing in the herds of Central Illinois before the work of extirpation could be effectively commenced, the contagion might so spread as to envelop the whole country through which pass the transportation routes over which this enormous commerce from the farther West is borne to the great distributing centers of the East, virtually laying thereupon as complete an embargo as if such commerce should be absolutely prohibited by law. I can not accept for a moment the doctrine that if such a state of things should come to exist, and the State of Illinois, for instance, in the exercise of its general police powers, was powerless, from want of means or from other causes, or having the ability, should neglect to deal summarily and effectively with such an emergency, the National Government, with its unlimited jurisdiction over the whole subject of commerce, could not provide by Congressional enactment for the employment of its enormous forces to hunt out such contagion wherever it might be and destroy it in order to speedily secure the reinstatement of the commerce, thus destroyed or threatened with destruction. But more than this. The State or States in which such a situation should develop could not be called upon in the interest of interstate commerce alone to expend their money, to tax their resources, to employ their agencies to remove an obstruction thus interposed, unless they should themselves elect so to do. Besides, an intermediate State on the routes of such commerce might not have a special interest in its protection, or it might have a paramount interest in another direction competitive in its character that would be better conserved by the continuance of such obstructions to the commerce between other States passing through it, and there-

fore it might be indifferent as to these obstructions. Can it be possible that the National Government, which is charged specially with the duty not only to guard but to promote commerce between the States, could refuse under such circumstances, even without the assent of the State itself, to intervene? I think not, sir.

In my opinion, sir, the omission to do so would be a crime on the part of those charged with such responsibility under their oaths to support and defend the Constitution.

But, sir, it is contended by some that the powers reserved to the States to enact quarantine, health, inspection, and other similar laws carry with them exclusive control as to police regulations of all kinds and for all purposes whatsoever; that the national jurisdiction over this subject, if it exists at all, is secondary, subordinate, or auxiliary to State authority, and that the exercise of the same is permissible only when the State to be affected gives assent thereto. Abstractly considered this may be partly true, but in the concrete it is not true. The power to regulate commercial intercourse between the States belongs exclusively to the National Government by specific grant. It is a power to be exercised solely and independently by authority of Congress, not for the States as such, but for all the people of the United States standing together, and perfectly equal as to their rights, privileges, and immunities as citizens of one nationality in respect of all matters and things connected with such commerce and intercourse between the States. This power is not only specifically granted to the National Government for the benefit of the whole people, but it is with equal definiteness prohibited to the States. The inspection laws are distinctly subordinated to this larger grant of powers, and in order to emphasize this subordination more fully and forcefully it is provided that these very laws shall be subject to the revision and control of the Congress in order to make it certain that this exceptional authority may not be used in any manner or form to impede in the slightest degree the free course of commerce between the people in all sections of the Union, which the National Government is specially required to promote and preserve.

Undoubtedly, sir, there is a perfect and unbroken consensus of opinion running through all the debates in Congress and all the decisions by the courts since the adoption of the Constitution that the State may legislate primarily for the protection of the public morals, the public health, and the domestic welfare generally of society in the State, but I have been unable to find any decision of the Supreme Court from Chief-Justice Marshall down to the present day indicating that if through an incompetent, a negligent, or an indifferent administration of the affairs of a State, the insufficiency of its general statutes, or the poverty of its resources, or all these combined, the health or other local conditions have been permitted to fall so low as to become continuously a menace, an obstruction to the commerce between other States necessarily passing through the State so afflicted, that the National Government could not intervene and act directly upon such conditions for amelioration or removal, and the reinstatement of the commerce thus interrupted and threatened with destruction. Indeed, from my reading of the Constitution, I am satisfied that the warrant of authority is not only given, but the duty is imperatively enjoined upon the Congress by the Constitution to make full and careful provisions against all such contingencies. Nor is it permissible, in my opinion, for Congress to await the invitation, nor to be deterred by the protest of the State so affected when satisfied that conditions exist therein obstructive of commerce between the several States which the Constitution says must be protected by the national authority without reference to the geographical lines of any particular State, and which the State refuses or neglects to remove.

In the great case of *Gibbons vs. Ogden*, made historic by the learned opinion delivered by Chief-Justice Marshall, in which he considers the whole question of the powers of the National Government over the subject of commerce, that most eminent jurist, while not dissenting from the view that a State may provide by quarantine and other laws for the protection of the public health, is very careful to indicate that when a State law, whether quarantine, health, or other, may operate as an obstruction or an impediment to commerce it must fall before the supreme power of the National Government over that whole subject. Referring to the acts of 1796 and 1799 he says:

But in making these provisions the opinion is unequivocally manifested that Congress may control the State laws so far as it may be necessary to control them for the regulation of commerce.

In other words, that Congress may accept the State laws, as was done in 1799, and co-operate with the State authorities in their enforcement, or by implication that it may modify or even replace them altogether by other laws of its own enactment, and provide for their enforcement through the agencies of the National Government alone if it shall deem it necessary, considering the interests of commerce, to do so.

Again, in this same opinion, speaking of "the power to regulate," he says:

This power, like all others invested in Congress, is complete in itself, may be exercised to its utmost extent, and acknowledges no limitations other than are prescribed in the Constitution.

By parity of reasoning, if there are no "limitations" upon this power, and if it "may be exercised to the utmost" in conforming even the police and other regulations of a State to the requirements of commerce,

Congress may undoubtedly, where there is an entire absence of law in a State for the protection of a great subject of interstate commerce, adopt regulations to protect the same when such protection is necessary to the maintenance of the commerce therein passing through such State to and from the several other States.

In the case of *Walling vs. Michigan* (116 U. S., 446) it was said by the court that—

The police power can not be set up to control the inhibitions of the Constitution or the powers of the United States Government created thereby.

In other words, that the police power can not be employed by a State to prevent the necessary regulations of commerce, nor to limit nor abridge the powers of the National Government over this subject through the inhibitions in respect of such power. And so I maintain that, *pari passu*, if the police power may not be invoked by the State to obstruct, it may be set in motion by the national authority itself under some circumstances to remove obstructions in the way of interstate commerce. To illustrate: If certain police regulations necessary to protect a particular branch of interstate commerce in its passage through a State are not supplied by a State, the Congress may provide for making and enforcing such regulations in the interest and for the protection of such commerce, having due regard for all the interests of the people of such State to be affected by these regulations.

As for instance, if yellow fever should suddenly take possession, epidemically, of the States of the Lower Mississippi, and intercourse between the great States of the Northwest and the ports below, which are usually employed to make the exchanges incident to the commerce of that vast region, should be seriously interrupted—I maintain that in the absence of the necessary health or police regulations in those States to deal quickly and effectively with the situation, Congress could and it would be its duty under the Constitution to supply those regulations and authorize action directly upon the case anywhere in those States for the purpose of removing such obstacles to commerce when they could not otherwise be removed. And ultimately this rule will obtain and be gladly accepted by the people of every State in the Union. Of course these are extreme cases, but the law should be ready always to protect commerce among the several States in any and every emergency.

Certainly it would always be most desirable, and undoubtedly it would generally happen, if the bill under consideration should become a law, that where the State had provided laws to meet the case the national power would be exercised as an auxiliary force only, the State laws being supplemented by the regulations established by Congress, and the State agencies being employed so far as practicable to carry out the purposes of the proposed act. It is upon this theory of co-operation, where possible, that this bill was framed.

The reasons for such a policy are manifold. They could not be better presented than they were by Chief-Justice Marshall in the learned opinion in the case of *Gibbons vs. Ogden*, from which I before quoted. He said:

The acts of Congress passed in 1796 and 1799 empowering and directing the officers of the General Government to conform to and insist in the execution of the quarantine and health laws of a State proceed, it is said, upon the idea that these laws are constitutional. It is undoubtedly true that they do proceed upon that idea, and the constitutionality of such laws has never, so far as we are informed, been denied. But they do not imply an acknowledgment that a State may rightfully regulate commerce with foreign nations or among the States, for they do not imply that such laws are an exercise of that power, or enacted with a view to it. On the contrary, they are treated as quarantine and health laws, are so denominated in the acts of Congress, and are considered as flowing from the acknowledged power of a State to provide for the health of its citizens. But as it was apparent that some of the provisions made for this purpose and in virtue of this power might interfere with and be affected by the laws of the United States made for the regulation of commerce, Congress, in that spirit of harmony and conciliation which ought always to characterize the conduct of governments standing in the relation which that of the Union and those of the States bear to each other, has directed its officers to aid in the execution of these laws, and has in some measure adapted its own legislation to this object by making provisions in aid of those of the States. But in making these provisions the opinion is unequivocally manifested that Congress may control the State laws, so far as it may be necessary to control them, for the regulation of commerce.

However, it will be remembered that Chief-Justice Marshall, in the case of *Gibbons vs. Ogden*, had before him primarily the question only of certain State enactments, under which Congress had authorized co-operation through certain officers of the National Government with the State authorities, whereas the requirement now is to provide not only for co-operation, when that can be had, but for independent action by the National Government in the case of non-action by the State, or of the non-existence of any State laws or regulations whatever to meet the case.

While the bill under consideration may be faulty in some of the details of its provisions as to administration, etc., it is in its general features within the scope of the authority of Congress over the subject under consideration. I think, however, that it aims to confine the operations of the national bureau or board, for which it provides, too narrowly, too closely, to established lines of transportation. As I have before said, if pleuro-pneumonia should exist epidemically and generally in Central Illinois, it would become a menace to the interstate commerce throughout the entire region through which three or four great interstate lines of transportation pass. Without authority to operate universally in that entire district for its eradication it would be impossible to relieve these great avenues of trade.

It often happens that cattle are gathered into herds preparatory to

shipment at points somewhat removed from the actual shipping-point on the railroad over which they are to be transported. There can certainly be no question as to the importance of extending the jurisdiction of the board over such herds. Moreover, I think it would be safe to say that there are very few, if any, stock farms in the State of Illinois which are not within 20 miles of one or the other of these interstate transportation lines. I believe it would be entirely prudent to say that there are very few, if any, cattle in that State farther removed from one or the other of these routes than one day's drive at most; that one-half of them are even nearer, and that fully one-quarter of all of them are located not farther than three hours' drive at most from some one of these interstate roads. In my opinion, therefore, you can not safely confine the operations of this board to the exact limits of the right of way of each of these lines of traffic. As a member of the committee which presented this bill I accepted the provisions thereof respecting this jurisdiction as apparently the best attainable under the circumstances, and not because I indorsed the theory upon which they rest. I think the jurisdiction of the board should be more extended, and that it is a mistake not to make it so.

Mr. President, it would be impossible to estimate the importance of this subject. In a comparatively few years pleuro-pneumonia has cost this country directly and indirectly \$10,000,000. Within ten years the losses from hog-cholera have been estimated at the enormous sum of \$300,000,000 or more. We have to-day 125,000,000 of ferra animals at the mercy of infectious diseases which commonly affect herds and flocks. Besides, we should not forget the lessons taught some of the older nations in the school of costly experience.

In Western Europe a single epidemic of the rinderpest swept away thirty million head of cattle of the estimated value of \$1,500,000,000. France alone during the last century lost ten million head of cattle from malignant diseases. In the years from 1856 to 1862 lung fever and epizootic apthia cost Great Britain over one million head of cattle, worth \$50,000,000; and in eighteen months in 1865-'66, from rinderpest, \$10,000,000 more were added to the cattle losses of the same country.

If no calamity shall happen to the live-stock interest of this country, the census of 1890 will undoubtedly show its aggregate value to be nearly, if not quite, \$3,000,000,000. And yet if this result shall be reached the supply per capita, with the enormous increase of our population, will be relatively smaller than it is now. Notwithstanding the great increase in the number of cattle of all kinds since 1860, while the ratio in that year was 814 head to each 1,000 of population, it has fallen to 600 to the 1,000 of population at this time. If, in addition to this, an infectious disease like pleuro-pneumonia should become general, particularly in the Western ranges, from which our beef supply largely comes, and our herds should be diminished through the insufficiency of our precautionary measures or the inefficiency of administration, it would seriously injure the whole country, and the condemnation of those who should be responsible for these omissions would be swift and terrible. You can not legislate for the evils of the present moment only. You must provide for those that may belong to the future as well. The National Government must deal with this matter. Congress can not shift the responsibility to the States.

There must be uniformity of regulation and action, with unlimited power and resources to meet any and every emergency. One method in one State, another system in another, and none of any kind in many, with non-co-operation between all, will not do. They are, so to speak, simply so many invitations for the introduction and spread of disease.

I am frank to say that the bill presented by the committee does not suit me in all particulars. There had to be, as is usual in perfecting important bills, concessions and compromises on the part of those who joined in reporting the bill, and I hope the proposition—considering the importance of the subject—will receive equally liberal and unselfish treatment in the Senate.

RAILROAD BRIDGE AT LITTLE ROCK, ARK.

Mr. JONES, of Arkansas. I ask the unanimous consent of the Senate to take up from the Calendar Senate bill 2198.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The Senator from Arkansas asks unanimous consent that the pending order be informally laid aside to enable him to move the consideration of the bill (S. 2198) to authorize the building of a railroad bridge at Little Rock, Ark.

Mr. SHERMAN. I do not wish to interfere with the bill indicated by the Senator from Arkansas, but I wish to call the attention of the Senate to the state of the public business. There are several important bills awaiting action. The time of the Senate in the last week or two has been wasted, in my judgment, by taking up and laying down and taking up and laying down bill after bill. Unless the Senator from Michigan will press his bill and have it disposed of, I propose to antagonize that bill and the other bills which are occupying so much time with some other measures. I give fair notice now.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. Is there objection to laying aside informally the pending order and taking up the bill indicated by the Senator from Arkansas?

By unanimous consent, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill (S. 2198) to authorize the building of a

railroad bridge at Little Rock, Ark., which was reported from the Committee on Commerce with an amendment, to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That it shall be lawful for the Little Rock Bridge and Terminal Railway Company, a corporation organized under the laws of the State of Arkansas, to construct and maintain a bridge, and approaches thereto, over the Arkansas River, at a point on said river at or near the city of Little Rock, in the State of Arkansas, and to lay on and over said bridge a railroad track or tracks for the more perfect connection of any railroad or railroads that are or shall hereafter be constructed to the said river, on either or both sides thereof, at or opposite said point, under the limitations and conditions hereinafter provided; said bridge shall be constructed to provide for the passage of railway trains, and at the option of the builders and owners thereof, may be used for the passage of wagons and vehicles of all kinds, for the transit of animals of all kinds, and for foot-passengers for such reasonable rates of toll as may be approved, from time to time, by the Secretary of War as to railway trains; and as to wagons, vehicles, animals, and foot-passengers, such rates as may be provided by the laws of Arkansas.

Sec. 2. That any bridge built under this act is subject to its limitations, shall be a lawful structure, and shall be recognized and known as a post-route, upon which also no higher charge shall be made for the transmission over the same of the mails, troops, and the munitions of war, or other property of the United States, than the rate per mile paid for the transportation of the same over the railroads or public highways leading to the said bridge, and it shall enjoy the rights and privileges of other post-roads in the United States. Equal privileges in the use of said bridge shall be granted to all telegraph companies; and the United States shall have the right of way across said bridge and its approaches for postal telegraph purposes.

Sec. 3. That the said bridge shall be constructed with a draw or pivot span which shall be over the main channel of the river at an accessible navigable point, and the openings on each side of the pivot pier shall not be less than 160 feet in the clear, and, as nearly as practicable, both of said openings shall be accessible at all stages of water; that the spans be not less than 10 feet above extreme high-water mark, as understood at the point of location, to the lowest point of the superstructure of said bridge; that the piers and draw rests of said bridge shall be built parallel with the current at that stage of the river which is most important for navigation, and the bridge itself at right angles thereto; and that no riprap or other outside protection for imperfect foundations be permitted to approach nearer than 4 feet to the surface of the water at its extreme low stage, or otherwise to encroach upon the channel-ways provided for in this act: *Provided*, That said draw shall be opened by the company or persons owning said bridge upon reasonable signal for the passage of boats; and there shall be maintained, at the expense of the owners thereof, from sunset till sunrise, such lights or other signals on said bridge as the Light-House Board shall prescribe.

Sec. 4. That all railroad companies desiring the use of said bridge shall have, and be entitled to, equal rights and privileges relative to the passage of railway trains over the same, and over the approaches to the same, upon payment of a reasonable compensation for such use; and in case the owner or owners of said bridge, and the several railroad companies, or any of them, desiring such use, shall fail to agree upon the sum or sums to be paid, and upon rules and condition which each shall perform in using said bridge, all matters at issue between them shall be decided by the Secretary of War upon hearing of the allegations and proofs of the parties.

Sec. 5. That any bridge authorized to be constructed under this act shall be built and located under and subject to the regulations for the security of said river, as the Secretary of War shall prescribe; and to secure that object the owner or owners thereof shall submit to the Secretary of War, for his examination and approval, a design and drawings of the bridge, and a map of the location, giving for the space of 1 mile above and 1 mile below the proposed location, the topography of the banks of the river, the shore-line at high or low water, the direction and strength of the current at all stages, and the soundings, actually showing the bed of the stream, the location of any other bridge or bridges, and shall furnish such other information as may be required for the full and satisfactory understanding of the subject, and until such plan and location of the bridge are approved by the Secretary of War, the bridge shall not be commenced or built, and should any change be made in the plan of said bridge during the progress of construction, such change shall be subject to the approval of the Secretary of War.

Sec. 6. That the right to alter, amend, or repeal this act is hereby expressly reserved, and the right to require any changes in said structure, or its entire removal at the expense of the owners thereof, whenever the Congress shall decide that the public interest requires it, is also expressly reserved.

Sec. 7. That this act shall be null and void if actual construction of the bridge herein authorized be not commenced within one year and completed within three years from the date thereof.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended, and the amendment was concurred in.

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

LIGHT-HOUSE AT GOOSE ROCKS, MAINE.

Mr. FRYE. I desire to call up from the table the bill (S. 2506) for the establishment of a light-house, fog-signal, and day beacon in the vicinity of Goose Rocks, Fox Island Thoroughfare, Maine, which has been returned from the other House with an amendment.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore* laid before the Senate the amendment of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 2506) for the establishment of a light-house, fog-signal, and day beacon in the vicinity of Goose Rocks, Fox Island Thoroughfare, Maine, which was to strike out all after the word "sites," in line 6 of the bill.

Mr. FRYE. That amendment simply strikes out the appropriating clause, and I move that the Senate concur in the amendment of the House of Representatives.

The amendment was concurred in.

NEWPORT NEWS LIGHT-HOUSE.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore* laid before the Senate the amendment of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 1828) to provide for a light-house at Newport News, Middle Ground, Virginia, which was to strike out all after the word "Virginia," in line 3 of the bill.

Mr. DANIEL. I move a concurrence in the House amendment. The amendment was concurred in.

ORDER OF BUSINESS.

Mr. DAVIS. I ask unanimous consent that the pending order be in-

formally laid aside, and that the Senate proceed to the consideration of unobjected pension bills.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The Senator from Minnesota asks unanimous consent that the pending order be informally laid aside for the consideration of private pension bills upon the Calendar to which there is no objection. Is there objection to that course of proceeding?

Mr. PADDOCK. In the absence of the chairman of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, who is in charge of the pending bill—

Mr. DAVIS. He gives consent.

Mr. PADDOCK. Very well; I understand that he gives consent to the course suggested by the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. CHACE. I object temporarily for the purpose of asking a question or two and making a few remarks, not that I intend to object to the proposition of the Senator from Minnesota.

The Senate has before it now three separate measures, all of them matters of considerable public interest, what is ordinarily termed the animal-industry bill, upon which the Senator from Nebraska has been making an address, the land-forfeiture bill, and Senate bill 554, to provide for an international copyright.

The Senator from Michigan [Mr. PALMER] having charge of the first bill which I have named has kept it before the Senate week after week, retaining his right of way and yielding occasionally for the consideration of other bills.

The copyright bill has got along so far as to a vote. The Senate adjourned the other day in the midst of a vote on an important amendment to that bill. I feel that in justice to the public, and to the parties who are interested in that measure, the Senate ought either to take some action on these other bills and get them out of the way or permit a positive assignment by which they will put the copyright bill upon its passage.

I give notice that I shall ask to-morrow at 2 o'clock to lay aside the pleuro-pneumonia or animal-industry bill and also the land-grant forfeiture bill, and I shall ask the Senate to take up, any objection to the contrary nevertheless, Senate bill 554, and proceed with that bill to a conclusion.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. Order of Business 1012 is the first private pension bill on the Calendar.

Mr. DOLPH. I object temporarily for the purpose of giving a notice.

I was in the chair when the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. SPOONER] gave notice that after the disposition of the pending order of business he would move to take up the bill to regulate the manufacture and sale of gas in the District of Columbia. A previous notice had been given, I think, by the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. PLATT], if not by the Senator from Nevada [Mr. STEWART], that at the earliest opportunity a motion would be made to take up for consideration the bill for the admission of the Territory of Washington. I introduced that bill and am anxious for its early consideration, and I wish to give notice that I shall feel disposed to antagonize the motion to take up any other bill, after the disposition of the pending business, in advance of that measure. I entirely agree with the Senator from Ohio [Mr. SHERMAN] that these bills ought to be disposed of, and that we are losing ground by first taking up one bill and then another and laying them aside.

Mr. MITCHELL. As it seems to be in order to give notices, I desire to give notice (and in order that I may not interfere with any other measure I will put it so far ahead that there can be no objection) that on next Wednesday, the 9th instant, immediately after the conclusion of the morning business, I shall ask the Senate to indulge me in taking up the bill (S. 566) making an appropriation for a final survey and estimates for and the commencement of the construction of a boat railway around the obstructions to navigation at The Dalles and Celilo Falls, in the Columbia River.

This is a matter outside of the river and harbor bill. The bill has been reported unanimously from the Committee on Transportation Routes to the Seaboard, and is a measure of great local and national importance. I shall not ask the Senate to take it up for the purpose of wearying the Senate's time with a speech or anything of that kind, but for the purpose of its consideration by the Senate and action on the bill.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The pension bills on the Calendar to which there is no objection will be proceeded with in their order.

WIDOW OF JOHN LEARY.

The bill (S. 1076) granting a pension to the widow of John Leary, deceased, was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension-roll the name of the widow of John Leary, late a first sergeant in Battery F, Third Artillery, United States Army, in the war of the rebellion, at the rate of \$20 per month.

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

JACOB PITNER.

The bill (S. 2371) granting a pension to Jacob Pitner was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension-rolls the name of Jacob Pitner, late private in Company K, One hundred and ninety-second Regiment of Ohio Volunteers.

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

SARAH C. ANDERSON AND MINOR CHILDREN.

The bill (S. 2370) granting a pension to Sarah C. Anderson and children under sixteen years of age was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension-rolls the name of Sarah C. Anderson, widow of William H. Anderson, late a private of the Fifth Independent Battery Ohio Light Artillery, and the names of the children under sixteen years of age of Sarah C. and William H. Anderson.

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

SARAH C. TAYLOR.

The bill (S. 1482) granting a pension to Sarah C. Taylor was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension-roll the name of Sarah C. Taylor, a volunteer nurse in the Army during the war of the rebellion, at \$25 a month during life.

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

GEORGE L. FLECH.

The bill (S. 2372) restoring pension to George L. Flech was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to restore to the pension-roll the name of George L. Flech, late of Company G, One hundred and fifth Ohio Volunteer Infantry, from the time of his suspension from the roll.

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

MARY J. BYRD.

The bill (S. 2334) granting a pension to Mary J. Byrd was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension-roll the name of Mary J. Byrd, widow of Solomon G. Byrd, late of Company B, Forty-third Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry.

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

CATHARINE K. WHITTLESEY.

The bill (S. 2274) granting a pension to Mrs. Catharine K. Whittlesey was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It was reported from the Committee on Pensions with an amendment, in line 8, before the word "dollars," to strike out "forty" and insert "twenty-five;" so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to place on the pension-roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws, the name of Mrs. Catharine K. Whittlesey, widow of the late Major J. H. Whittlesey, United States Army, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$25 per month, in lieu of the pension she is now receiving.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended, and the amendment was concurred in.

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

MARGARET M. MILLER.

The bill (S. 1500) granting a pension to Margaret M. Miller was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension-roll the name of Margaret M. Miller, of Elgin, Ill., a volunteer Army nurse during the war of the rebellion, at the rate of \$25 per month.

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

MANHATTON PICKETT.

The bill (S. 2301) to increase the pension of Manhattan Pickett was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It was reported from the Committee on Pensions with an amendment, in line 6, before the word "dollars," to strike out "one hundred" and insert "forty-five;" so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to increase the pension of Manhattan Pickett, late a sergeant of Company B, One hundred and twelfth Regiment New York Volunteers, to \$45 per month, in lieu of the pension now authorized by law.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended, and the amendment was concurred in.

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

ANNA M. FREEMAN.

The bill (S. 1136) granting a pension to Anna M. Freeman was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension-roll the name of Anna M. Freeman, widow of Thompson P. Freeman, late private in Company F, One hundred and thirteenth Regiment Ohio Volunteers.

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

SALLIE R. ALEXANDER.

The bill (S. 1009) granting an increase of pension to Sallie R. Alexander, widow of Lieut. Col. Thomas L. Alexander, United States

Army, was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It was reported from the Committee on Pensions with an amendment in line 8, before the word "dollars," to strike out "one hundred" and insert "fifty;" so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to place on the pension-roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws, the name of Sallie R. Alexander, widow of the late Lieut. Col. Thomas L. Alexander, United States Army, at the rate of \$50 per month, for and during her natural life, in lieu of the pension of \$30 per month now paid to her.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended, and the amendment was concurred in.

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

FRANK PASCHKEE.

The bill (S. 2263) granting a pension to Frank Paschker was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension-roll the name of Frank Paschker, late a private in Company I, First Regiment New York Light Artillery.

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

ELIZABETH DETTIS.

The bill (S. 2575) granting a pension to Elizabeth Dettis was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension-roll the name of Elizabeth Dettis, widow of Jacob Dettis, late a private in Company E, Twenty-seventh Regiment Wisconsin Volunteers.

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

H. H. RUSSELL.

The bill (S. 2609) granting a pension to H. H. Russell was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension-roll the name of H. H. Russell, late of Company E, Seventy-fifth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry.

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

RICHARD HUDSON.

The bill (S. 2576) granting a pension to Richard Hudson was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension-roll the name of Richard Hudson, late of Company B, Third Regiment Wisconsin Volunteer Cavalry.

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

MRS. MAGGIE A. WEED.

The bill (S. 2579) granting a pension to Mrs. Maggie A. Weed, formerly Miss Maggie A. Egan, was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension-roll the name of Mrs. Maggie A. Weed, formerly Miss Maggie A. Egan, a volunteer nurse in the late war, at the rate of \$12 per month.

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

OLIVER H. JUDD.

The bill (S. 2538) granting a pension to Oliver H. Judd was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension-roll the name of Oliver H. Judd, late private Company I, Fifteenth Regiment Illinois Cavalry.

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

D. G. SCOOTEN.

The bill (S. 2435) granting a pension to D. G. Scooten was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place the name of D. G. Scooten, late a private in Company H, Fifty-ninth Regiment Illinois Infantry Volunteers, on the pension-roll.

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

JARRET SPENCER.

The bill (S. 2418) granting a pension to Jarret Spencer was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension-roll the name of Jarret Spencer, late of Company H, Fifth Regiment Wisconsin Volunteer Infantry.

Mr. COCKRELL. I should like to have the report in that case read.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The report will be read.

The Chief Clerk read the following report, submitted by Mr. SAWYER April 17, 1888:

The Committee on Pensions, to whom was referred a bill granting a pension to Jarret Spencer, have examined the same, and report:

This claimant was a member of Company H, Fifth Wisconsin Volunteers. The Adjutant-General's report shows that he was enrolled on the 13th day of August, 1862, and it appears from the record that he was continuously in service until he was mustered out with his company at Hall's Hill, Va., on the 20th of June, 1865. In his declaration he says that at Brandy Station, in the State of Virginia, on or about the 15th of February, 1864, he contracted rheumatism, resulting in paralysis, and that at the date of filing his application he suffers constantly from rheumatism, paralysis, and general debility, which disqualify him for any kind of manual labor: that he was never treated in any hospital.

The history of this man's service is remarkable. He was fifty years and seven months old when he enlisted, and he was in all the skirmishes and engagements in which his regiment participated, and which included the battles of Antietam, Marye's Heights, Chancellorsville, Rappahannock Station, Gettysburg, the battles of the Wilderness, and around Richmond. He was never off duty, never in hospital, but the hard, continuous service at his advanced age affected him seriously, and since his discharge he has had a progressive disability. The certificate of the medical board which examined him in 1887 says: "He can feed and dress himself by taking time; can not perform manual labor; does not require constant aid and attendance, but requires watching when moving about, because he frequently falls, and when down can not rise without help." They rate him total for rheumatism and heart trouble, and total for paralysis.

He is now eighty years old. In the past year his disabilities have increased; he needs the constant care and attendance of another person, and should be so rated. A petition to Congress for his relief, and signed by nearly two hundred of his neighbors, says his wife, the mother of all his children, with whom he has lived for nearly fifty years, takes care of him, and should not be separated from him. Nevertheless, their poverty is so great that they will have to be separated by placing him in a charitable institution unless Congress extends the relief which he has earned and which, if it is to be of any use to him, must speedily be conceded.

The claim is still pending in the Pension Office. It has not been rejected, but it is awaiting testimony which, in his disabled condition, it is impossible for him to furnish without protracting the time of its completion beyond the limit of his life.

The bill is reported favorably, with a recommendation that it do pass.

Mr. COCKRELL. I wanted the record to show the reason why the Pension Committee, contrary to what I understand to be its established rules, has proposed to grant a pension in this case while the case is still pending in the Pension Office.

Mr. DAVIS. I will state to the Senator from Missouri that under the peculiar circumstances of this case, this man's advanced age and present condition, we made an exception.

Mr. COCKRELL. I think the report shows that fact clearly.

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

ROZALIA JUNK.

The bill (S. 2310) granting a pension to Rozalia Junk was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension-roll the name of Rozalia Junk, widow of John Junk, alias John Younge, late a private of Company K, Sixth Regiment of Wisconsin Volunteers.

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

MRS. MARY MOTT.

The bill (S. 1838) granting a pension to Mrs. Mary Mott was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension-roll the name of Mrs. Mary Mott, widow of Henry A. Mott, late lieutenant of Company K, Fifty-sixth Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteers.

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

ALEXANDER H. WHITE.

The bill (S. 1925) granting a pension to Alexander H. White was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension-roll the name of Alexander H. White, late a private in Company D, One hundred and forty-first New York Volunteers.

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

MADISON M. MEREDITH.

The bill (S. 1591) granting a pension to Madison M. Meredith was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension-roll the name of Madison M. Meredith, late captain of Company D, One hundred and third Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteers, at \$20 per month, in lieu of the amount he is now receiving.

Mr. COCKRELL. Let the report be read in that case.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The report will be read.

The Secretary read the following report, submitted by Mr. QUAY April 17, 1888:

The Committee on Pensions, to whom was referred the bill (S. 1591) granting an increase of pension to Madison M. Meredith, having examined the same, beg leave to submit the following report:

Claimant was mustered in, November 13, 1861, as first lieutenant of Company D, One hundred and third Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, commissioned as captain April 10, 1862, and honorably discharged for disability July 12, 1862.

He filed his declaration March 8, 1882, alleging that before Yorktown, Va., about March or April, 1862, he contracted chronic diarrhea and rheumatism and fistula.

He was granted a pension, to date from March 8, 1882, at \$3.50 per month, with rank of first lieutenant, for chronic rheumatism.

Upon application of claimant his rating was corrected, and his pension increased to \$10, as of the rank of captain. The claim for pension for fistula was rejected, the Pension Office deciding that claimant had not conclusively proven the existence of the disability since the war.

The papers on file in the Bureau of Pensions make the following exhibit:

First, that claimant was strong and healthy before his enlistment.

Second, that claimant contracted hemorrhoids or fistula while in the service and line of duty. The certificate of the regimental surgeon, upon which claimant was discharged July 12, 1862, was as follows: "I certify that I have carefully examined the above-mentioned officer, and find him suffering with chronic rheumatism and hemorrhoids, and that he is unable to perform the duties required of him, and has been since the 10th of May, 1862, and in my opinion ever will be."

Third, that claimant was still suffering from fistula May 6, 1885, when examined by the medical examining board. The board reports: "There is a blind internal fistula (internal opening 1 inch from anal margin) on right side, which applicant thinks resulted from diarrhea."

This board, as a result of this examination, rated claimant one-half of total for rheumatism and one-half of total for fistula.

Claimant was unable to conclusively prove the continuance of fistula from the date of the regimental surgeon's certificate (upon which claimant was discharged) until the medical board's examination, May 6, 1885, chiefly owing to the death of the physician who attended him after his discharge. But from all the evidence in the case your committee are of the opinion that the disability now existing is a continuation of that contracted in the spring of 1862, and that this bill simply gives the claimant the total pension to which he was entitled under the finding of the board of medical examiners, and under the evidence on file in the Bureau of Pensions. They therefore report the bill with a recommendation that it do pass.

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

WILLIAM SMITH.

The bill (S. 1926) granting a pension to William Smith was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It was reported from the Committee on Pensions with an amendment, in line 5, before the word "dollars," to strike out "fifty" and insert "forty-five;" so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to place on the pension-roll, at the rate of \$45 per month, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws, the name of William Smith, late a private in Company H, Ninety-third Pennsylvania Volunteers, this act to take effect from its passage, and the pension hereby granted to be in lieu of that which he is now receiving.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended, and the amendment was concurred in.

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

PIERRE BOTTINEAU.

The bill (S. 2713) granting a pension to Pierre Bottineau was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension-roll the name of Pierre Bottineau, at the rate of \$25 per month.

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

SUSAN EDSON.

The bill (S. 915) granting a pension to Susan Edson was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It was reported from the Committee on Pensions with an amendment, in line 6, after the words "rate of," to strike out "seventy-two" and insert "twenty-five;" so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to place on the pension-roll the name of Susan Edson, M. D., a volunteer surgical nurse in the late war of the rebellion, at the rate of \$25 per month.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended, and the amendment was concurred in.

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

R. H. BLACKISTON.

The bill (S. 1988) granting a pension to R. H. Blackiston was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension-roll, at the rate of \$72 per month, the name of H. R. Blackiston, late an acting master in the United States Navy.

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

MAHALA DEXTER.

The bill (H. R. 4104) granting a pension to Mahala Dexter was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension-roll the name of Mahala Dexter, dependent mother of Henry H. Dexter, late of Company M, Second Massachusetts Cavalry Volunteers.

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

WILLIAM B. JOHNSON.

The bill (H. R. 428) granting a pension to William B. Johnson was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension-roll the name of William B. Johnson, late of Company D, Thirty-ninth Regiment Iowa Volunteer Infantry.

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

JOHN B. COVERT.

The bill (S. 2314) granting a pension to John B. Covert was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension-roll the name of John B. Covert, late a private in Company B, One hundred and forty-seventh Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteers.

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

MRS. EMELINE ANDERSON.

The bill (S. 2366) granting a pension to Mrs. Emeline Anderson was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension-roll the name of Mrs. Emeline Anderson, widow of Jeff Anderson, late a private in Company K, First Regiment Minnesota Cavalry.

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

ELLEN J. SNEDAKER.

The bill (S. 2313) granting a pension to Ellen J. Snedaker was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension-roll the name of Ellen J. Snedaker, the dependent mother of James W. Snedaker, late second lieutenant of Company D, One hundred and eleventh Regiment New York State Volunteers, and of Albert I. Snedaker, late a private in the same company and regiment.

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

HANNAH BABB HUTCHINS.

The bill (S. 1540) granting a pension to Hannah Babb Hutchins was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension-roll the name of Hannah Babb Hutchins, a volunteer nurse in the war of the rebellion, and to pay her a pension during life of \$25 per month, in lieu of the one now received by her.

Mr. COCKRELL. I should like to hear the report read in that case.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The report will be read.

The Chief Clerk read the following report, submitted by Mr. DAVIS April 17, 1888:

The Committee on Pensions, to whom was referred the bill (S. 1540) granting a pension to Hannah Babb Hutchins, have examined the same, and report:

A bill of like tenor was favorably reported on by this committee at the first session of the Forty-ninth Congress, granting the claimant a pension for services rendered and disabilities resulting from her labors as nurse during the late war. Adopting the views expressed in such report, the committee report the bill favorably, and recommend its passage.

[Report Forty-ninth Congress, first session.]

The evidence and attendant circumstances of this case are set forth in the following report of the Committee on Invalid Pensions of the House of Representatives (House Report No. 1058) made during the present session:

Mrs. Babb makes the following presentment of her case in petition addressed to Congress:

"The undersigned, Hannah B. Hutchins, a resident of Freeport, in the State of Maine, respectfully represents: That at the time of the breaking out of the civil war she had recently lost her husband and four children; that her name was then Hannah Babb; that in response to the advertisement of the Government for nurses she offered her services in the capacity of a nurse, and on the 1st day of June, 1862, received a dispatch to report immediately at Washington, and that she did so at once; that upon arriving there she signed enlistment papers as a nurse, and mustered into the United States service as a nurse; that she served in that capacity three years and three months in the hospitals in and about Washington, and received pay at the rate of \$12 per month and one ration; that she used the money received for pay largely for the purposes of procuring necessary delicacies for the sick and wounded soldiers; that on the 1st day of January, 1865, while engaged in said service at the Harewood Hospital, in Washington, in passing from ward 12 to ward 10, she slipped on the outside steps and fractured her ribs and injured herself otherwise severely; that she was confined to her quarters for a month, and after partially recovering again commenced services as a nurse; that on the 31st day of July, 1865, she was discharged at that hospital; that she returned to Maine, and subsequently married Solomon S. Hutchins, who died in 1880, leaving her a widow with no means of support; that her injury aforesaid affected her so that she was unable to labor and was obliged to be a patient for some eight months in the Maine General Hospital, whereby she got partially relieved, but has never been able to perform any manual labor; that she is seventy-six years of age and entirely without means of support; that she believes she is justly entitled to aid from the nation precisely as if she had been a soldier and been incapacitated from labor by injury received in the line of duty, but that she is informed that there is no law of the nation under which she would be entitled to a pension, as the laws for those purposes do not include nurses. She therefore prays that she may be granted a pension."

In connection with this petition is the following certificate by Josiah H. Drummond, dated December 27, 1885:

"I hereby certify that I have known the above-named Mrs. Hutchins for nearly twenty years; that I have personal knowledge that the statements in the foregoing petition as to matters happening during that time are all true; also that she is very poor, and has had to depend upon charity for support, although, being an excellent nurse, she could support herself but for her disability. The State of Maine, upon a hearing of her case, granted her a pension for two years from January 1, 1885. She has no relations able to assist in her support, and she must have aid from the public, and must go to the poor-house unless she has it in some other way.

"The efficient and faithful character of Mrs. Babb's services in the hospitals are attested by Mrs. H. B. Corts, M. Hoard, Elvina Bliss Sheldon, Harriet P. Dame, and Caroline A. Burghardt, M. D., members of the Army Nurse Association, all of whom speak from personal knowledge of her services. Twenty-five members of the Soldiers' Aid Society and other citizens of Chelsea, Mass., testify to her fidelity as an army nurse. They say:

"We knew her before the war as a worthy woman, and during the war some of us were in constant correspondence with her, forwarded her supplies from the above-named [Soldiers' Aid Society] and from individuals. Her services and sacrifices seem to entitle her to recognition by the Government, and we earnestly commend her to the favor of Congress."

Dr. Albion Cobb, of Webb's Mills, Me., who was on duty at the Harewood Hospital, writes that she was one of the best nurses there; that he remembers of her sick in the nurses' quarters, but has forgotten the cause of it.

Dr. David Dana Spear, of Freeport, Me., certifies under date January 14, 1886, that she has been his patient since 1880, treated for chronic diarrhea, and has known of her being treated for this and other troubles at the Maine General Hospital.

Dr. Charles O. Hunt, resident physician and superintendent of said hospital, certifies:

"Mrs Hannah B. Hutchins has been under treatment at this hospital since April 23, 1883, for cystocele, for which she has been obliged to have a surgical operation performed. She claims that the trouble was originated by a fall received while in the employ of the Government as a nurse in one of the army hospitals during the late war. I have no doubt that she has suffered much from this disease in the past, and that it has proved a real hindrance to her gaining a livelihood by her labor, and if there is any way by which such cases could be pensioned and her claims as above are substantiated, I think she richly deserves to be remembered by the Government she has served so well, now that age and infirmity render her unable to support herself."

James M. Bates, M. D., formerly surgeon of the Thirteenth Maine Regiment, makes a certificate, which Dr. Spear indorses:

"I have known Mrs. Hannah Babb, now Mrs. Hutchins, for several years past, and at one time attended her professionally for an extensive humor in her hands, wrists, and arms, which she supposed to be the result of blood poisoning, which she received while performing the duties of hospital nurse during the late civil war. She also complained, and does now, of pain and lameness in the region of the spine, between the shoulders, which she believes to be the result of slipping and falling on some door-steps at Harewood Hospital, while performing the duties of nurse. I know of no other cause for the disabilities named above, and consider Mrs. Hutchins a perfectly reliable woman, and any statement which she may make entitled to credit."

The evidence seems to disclose a meritorious case, which entitles Mrs. Hutchins to the same consideration accorded others of her class. The committee accordingly recommend the passage of the bill.

This bill passed the House at \$12, having been reduced to that amount by the committee, mainly on the ground, as your committee are advised, that this lady was paid at the time for her services. The evidence before your committee shows that what little money she did receive was used for the purpose of purchasing necessary delicacies for the sick and wounded soldiers and food for herself; so that in no real sense did she receive compensation. She is now old, in poverty, and helpless, suffering by reason of disabilities incurred in her service.

The evidence shows that \$12 per month will not be enough to relieve her necessities, and there appears to be no valid reason why she should not receive the same amount which in several other cases has been granted to other nurses. Her appeal that her services and sufferings be thus recognized is strongly urged by the Army Nurses' Association.

In view of all these facts your committee report back the bill with a recommendation that it do pass, with the following amendment: Strike out the word "twelve," in line 6, and insert in lieu thereof the words "twenty-five."

Mr. COCKRELL. I thought the committee had adopted a rule allowing \$12 a month as the pension for these nurses.

Mr. DAVIS. The rule of the committee in cases of this character has been \$25 a month. The second page of the report is covered with evidence confirming the petition.

Mr. COCKRELL. I have seen the evidence there. I wish to call the attention of the Senate to the fact that this lady was a nurse, and received a regular monthly compensation of \$12 per month. We have heretofore heard it said that the nurses were voluntary, and performed their services without any compensation. The report in this case flatly contradicts that position.

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

JOHN C. ABBOTT.

The bill (S. 2246) granting a pension to John C. Abbott was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension-roll the name of John C. Abbott, late a private of Company B, Second Illinois Artillery.

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

FANNY WILLIAMS.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. Order of Business 1086, House bill 335, is the next pension bill on the Calendar favorably reported.

Mr. FAULKNER. I was requested by the Senator from Florida [Mr. PASCO] to ask when Order of Business 1064 was reached (which I reported adversely, and which he asked to be put upon the Calendar), that it be indefinitely postponed, as he did not understand the reasons for the action of the committee, and the report was really in the interest of the claimant, as the case is now pending in the Pension Bureau. The Senator from Florida desired me to ask that the bill be indefinitely postponed when it was reached.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The title of the bill will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. A bill (S. 2236) granting a pension to Fanny Williams, widow of William H. Williams, a lieutenant in the Seminole war.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The report of the committee will be agreed to, and the bill indefinitely postponed, if there be no objection.

GENERAL W. E. WOODRUFF.

The bill (H. R. 335) granting a pension to General W. E. Woodruff was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes, in recognition of meritorious service, to place the name of General W. E. Woodruff, of Kentucky, on the pension-roll at the rate of \$50 per month.

Mr. COCKRELL. Let the report be read in this case.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The report will be read.

The Secretary read the following report submitted by Mr. SAWYER April 23, 1888:

The Committee on Pensions, to whom was referred a bill granting a pension to General W. E. Woodruff, have examined the same, and report: This bill passed the House on the 13th of April. The House report is adopted and is as follows:

"General W. E. Woodruff was a soldier in the Mexican war. He was one of the first Kentuckians to respond to President Lincoln's call for troops at the outbreak of the civil war. He was the organizer and drill-master of both the First and Second Kentucky Regiments, and rendered great service in keeping his State in the Union. He was captured early in the war, and was one of the first prisoners confined in the Libby prison at Richmond. He was one of the five Union officers who were held as hostages and sentenced to death in the event of the execution of certain Confederates who were confined at Philadelphia as pirates."

"The gallows on which he was to be hung was constructed and was erected in sight of his window. He was thus held four months under death sentence, in full view of the scaffold, until the United States Government agreed to treat the Philadelphia prisoners as prisoners of war. Whilst on duty in West Virginia he was thrown from his horse and suffered internal injuries from which he has never recovered. General Woodruff was a brave and gallant officer, and has suffered greatly for his devotion to the Union cause. He is now over sixty years of age, infirm, and without resources."

"Your committee think the modest sum of \$50 a month asked by him should be cheerfully allowed."

The bill is reported favorably with a recommendation that it do pass.

Mr. COCKRELL. I should like to ask if this officer was pensioned in the Pension Office? Has there ever been any pension granted to him?

Mr. SAWYER. No, I think not. It is a House bill.

Mr. COCKRELL. Did he apply there for a pension?

Mr. SAWYER. I do not remember about that; I have had so many cases to examine. I am quite willing that the bill shall go over, if the Senator from Missouri desires to look into it.

Mr. COCKRELL. I do not desire to object to it, but let it stand over for the present, retaining its place on the Calendar.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The bill will be passed over, retaining its place on the Calendar.

FRANCIS DANIELS.

The bill (H. R. 2664) for the relief of Francis Daniels was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension-roll the name of Francis Daniels, of Cropseyville, N. Y., late a private in Company H, One hundred and twenty-fifth Regiment of New York Volunteers.

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

MARY M'GRATH.

The bill (H. R. 404) for the relief of Mary McGrath was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension-roll the name of Mary McGrath, dependent mother of Peter McGrath, deceased, late of Company F, Twenty-seventh Regiment Michigan Volunteers.

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

ELIZA SHREEVE.

The bill (H. R. 3735) granting a pension to Eliza Shreeve was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension-roll the name of Eliza Shreeve, widow of Alfred T. Shreeve, late of Company A, Sixth Regiment Maryland Volunteer Infantry.

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

MRS. JEANNIE STONE.

The bill (H. R. 401) granting a pension to Mrs. Jeannie Stone was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to pay to Mrs. Jeannie Stone, widow of General Charles P. Stone, a pension.

Mr. SAWYER. I move to amend the bill by adding: "at the rate of \$50 per month."

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended, and the amendment was concurred in.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time, and passed.

Mr. SAWYER. I move that the Senate ask for a conference on the bill and amendment.

The motion was agreed to.

By unanimous consent, the President *pro tempore* was authorized to appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate; and Mr. DAVIS, Mr. HOAR, and Mr. TURPIE were appointed.

Mr. SAWYER. I ask that the bill (S. 1161) granting a pension to Mrs. Jeannie Stone, widow of General Charles P. Stone, be indefinitely postponed.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. If there be no objection, the vote by which the bill was ordered to a third reading and passed will be reconsidered, and the bill will be postponed indefinitely.

JOSEPH PERRY.

The bill (H. R. 138) granting a pension to Joseph Perry was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place the name of Joseph Perry, of Dearborn County, Indiana, late a private in Capt. Joseph H. Burkam's company, Twelfth Regiment of Indiana Militia, on the pension-roll, he having been disabled while in the line of duty in the military service in the late war.

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

JOHN KINNEY.

The bill (H. R. 7882) granting a pension to John Kinney was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension-roll the name of John Kinney, late private Company M, First Regiment Ohio Heavy Artillery.

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

HENRY H. STUTSMAN.

The bill (H. R. 680) granting a pension to Henry H. Stutsman was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension-roll the name of Henry H. Stutsman, late of Company F, Thirteenth Regiment Iowa Volunteers.

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

ROYAL J. HIAR.

The bill (H. R. 879) granting a pension to Royal J. Hiar was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension-roll the name of Royal J. Hiar, late of Company K, First Regiment Michigan Engineers and Mechanics Volunteers.

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

GEORGE W. FOGLE.

The bill (S. 2333) granting a pension to George W. Fogle was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension-roll the name of George W. Fogle, Company G, Sixty-second Ohio Volunteer Infantry.

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

ELLEN WHITE DOWLING.

The bill (S. 1481) granting a pension to Ellen White Dowling was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension-roll the name of Ellen White Dowling, a volunteer nurse in the Army during the war of the rebellion, at \$25 a month during life.

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

LYDIA K. WHITE.

The bill (S. 1269) granting a pension to Lydia K. White was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension-roll the name of Lydia K. White, a volunteer nurse in the late war, during life at \$25 a month.

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

JOHN TAYLOR.

The bill (S. 2058) to increase the pension of John Taylor was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to increase the pension of John Taylor, late of Battery M, Third New York Light Artillery, from twelve to sixteen dollars per month, on account of gunshot wound of the head and its results.

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

NATHAN B. RARICK.

The bill (S. 2578) granting a pension to Nathan B. Rarick was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension-roll the name of Nathan B. Rarick, late a private of Company F, Thirty-ninth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry.

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

JAMES E. KABLER.

The bill (S. 2616) granting a pension to James E. Kabler was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension-roll the name of James E. Kabler, late a private in Company I, Tenth Regiment Kentucky Cavalry Volunteers.

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

ALONZO H. GREGORY.

The bill (H. R. 5311) granting a pension to Alonzo H. Gregory was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension-roll the name of Alonzo H. Gregory, of Company H, Fifteenth Regiment Vermont Volunteers.

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

PETER CLARK, JR.

The bill (H. R. 6971) to pension Peter Clark, jr., was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension-roll the name of Peter Clark, jr., of Atchison, Kans., late of Company H, Second Illinois Light Artillery.

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

DAVID L. PARTLOW.

The bill (H. R. 8185) granting a pension to David L. Partlow was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension-rolls the name of David L. Partlow, father of David S. Partlow, late of Company A, Fifth Regiment Minnesota Volunteers.

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

DAVID W. SEELY.

The bill (H. R. 5195) granting a pension to David W. Seely was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place the name of David W. Seely on the pension-roll.

Mr. COCKRELL. Let the report be read in that case.
The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The report will be read.

The Secretary read the following report, submitted by Mr. SAWYER April 24, 1888:

The Committee on Pensions, to whom was referred a bill granting a pension to David W. Seely, have examined the same and report:

This bill passed the House, and the report, which is as follows, is adopted:
"The applicant in this case was a member of Lieut. R. Crandall's company, of the Minnesota State Militia, called out to fight the Indians in 1865. In 1866 he filed an application in the Pension Office for pension, which was rejected on the ground that the injury was not received in actual engagement with the Indians.

"It seems that while he was in pursuit of the Indians with his company, by the accidental discharge of his gun he was wounded in the left arm, rendering amputation necessary. The facts as herein set forth seem to be fully established. Had the wound been received in an actual engagement with the Indians claimant would have been entitled to and would have received a pension under the general laws.

"Your committee feel that the man was actually engaged in protecting the frontier from the hostile Indians, and that the technicality ought to be waived."

The bill is reported favorably, with a recommendation that it do pass.

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

MARY G. CROCKER.

The bill (H. R. 4579) granting a pension to Mary G. Crocker, was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension-roll the name of Mary G. Crocker, widow of George W. Crocker, late of the Seventy-fifth Regiment New York Volunteers.

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

ROSANNA ROBEY.

The bill (H. R. 4491) granting a pension to Rosanna Robey was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension-roll the name of Rosanna Robey, widow of Phineas S. Robey, deceased, late of Company L, Third Wisconsin Cavalry Volunteers.

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

WILLIAM L. EDDY.

The bill (S. 2763) granting a pension to William L. Eddy was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension-roll the name of William L. Eddy, late a private in Company F, Seventh Regiment Massachusetts Volunteers.

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

LENA NEUNINGER.

The bill (S. 2452) placing the name of Lena Neuninger on the pension-rolls, was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension-rolls the name of Lena Neuninger, widow of John Neuninger, deceased, late second lieutenant Company I, One hundred and ninety-sixth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry.

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

BRIDGET WHITE.

The bill (S. 2450) placing the name of Bridget White on the pension-rolls was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place the name of Bridget White, widow of William White, deceased, late private Company I, Eleventh Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, on the pension-rolls.

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

SARAH E. M'CALEB.

The bill (H. R. 6609) for the relief of Sarah E. McCaleb was considered as in Committee of the Whole. The Committee on Pensions reported an amendment, in line 6, to change the name "Hebert" to "Hubert;" so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to place on the pension-roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws, the name of Sarah E. McCaleb, widow of the late Hubert A. McCaleb, of Company I, Eleventh Illinois Infantry.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended, and the amendment was concurred in.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed, and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time, and passed.

WINEMAH RIDDELL.

The bill (S. 2126) to pension Winemah Riddell was considered as in Committee of the Whole. The Committee on Pensions reported an amendment, in line 7, after the words "sum of," to strike out "twenty-five" and insert "twelve;" so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby authorized and directed to place on the pension-roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws, the name of Winemah Riddell, and to pay her, from and after the passage of this act, during life, the sum of \$12 per month.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended, and the amendment was concurred in.

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

EDWIN E. CHASE.

The bill (S. 2571) granting a pension to Edwin E. Chase was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension-roll the name of Edwin E. Chase, late of Company B, Third Regiment Massachusetts Cavalry.

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

MRS. MATILDA WILKINS EMORY.

The bill (S. 2547) to increase the pension of Mrs. Matilda Wilkins Emory was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension-roll the name of Matilda Wilkins Emory, widow of the late Brig. Gen. William H. Emory, United States Army, at \$50 per month, in lieu of the pension she now receives.

Mr. COCKRELL. Is there a report in that case?

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. Report No. 1097. Does the Senator from Missouri desire to have it read?

Mr. COCKRELL. Let it be read, please.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The report will be read.

The Secretary read the following report, submitted by Mr. DAVIS April 24, 1888:

The Committee on Pensions, to whom was referred the bill (S. 2547) to increase the pension of Mrs. Matilda Wilkins Emory, have examined the same, and report:

The committee report favorably upon the bill under consideration and recommend it for passage.

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

ELLEN SHEA.

The bill (H. R. 1579) granting a pension to Ellen Shea was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension-roll the name of Ellen Shea, mother of Michael Shea, late of Company A, Thirteenth Illinois Volunteers.

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

CATHARINE BLACK.

The bill (H. R. 3554) granting a pension to Catharine Black was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension-roll the name of Catharine Black, widow of Patrick W. Black, deceased, late a first lieutenant in Company F, Ninth Massachusetts Volunteers, also captain of Company B, Twenty-eighth Massachusetts Volunteers.

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

JAMES M. M'KEEHAN.

The bill (H. R. 6576) for the relief of James M. McKeehan was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension-roll the name of James M. McKeehan, late private in Company G, Seventh Kentucky Volunteer Infantry.

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

WILSON C. MOLES.

The bill (H. R. 3844) granting an increase of pension to Wilson C. Moles was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to increase the amount of pension paid to Wilson C. Moles, late Company H, First Ohio Heavy Artillery, from \$50 to \$72 per month.

Mr. COCKRELL. Let the report be read in that case.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The report will be read.

The Secretary read the following report, submitted by Mr. DAVIS, April 24, 1888:

The Committee on Pensions, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. 3844) granting a pension to Wilson C. Moles, have examined the same, and report:

Your committee have reported favorably several bills involving the same principle as the present one, and they therefore recommend the passage of this bill. The report of the House committee is subjoined.

HOUSE REPORT.

The claimant in this case was pensioned for partial paralysis, receiving \$8 per month from March 3, 1864, \$15 from May 1, 1869, \$18 from June 4, 1872, \$24 from August 9, 1880, and \$50 from May 27, 1885. This is the highest rate that can be allowed in this case by the Pension Office, because the claimant does not come under the provisions of the act of June 16, 1880, not being on the pension-roll at that time for \$50 per month.

The files in the Pension Office show that though comparatively a young man, having enlisted in the service when only a little more than sixteen years of age, he is a complete wreck.

The report of the examining board of surgeons at Marysville, Kans., after describing the disabilities, add:

"This man is certainly a pitiable subject, dependent upon the kindness of friends for everything. He requires the regular aid and attendance of another person."

Affidavits filed in the case show that from the effects of the paralysis the soldier has lost all control of his bowels, and has to be cared for as an infant would be. His condition is certainly worse than that of a man who has lost the sight of both eyes, or of one who has lost both legs or both arms, and is otherwise in good health. The present pension is inadequate to provide for his comfortable support and to pay for necessary medical attendance. It is not possible for him to live many months, and your committee believe that it is the duty of the Government to make him as comfortable as possible for the short time he can live. Your committee therefore report favorably, and recommend the passage of the bill.

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

NANCY F. JENNINGS.

The bill (H. R. 5545) granting a pension to Nancy F. Jennings was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to put the name of Nancy F. Jennings, widow of William Jennings, late of Company F, Thirteenth Regiment Michigan Cavalry, on the pension-roll.

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

JOHN H. SAYERS.

The bill (H. R. 3180) granting a pension to John H. Sayers was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place upon the pension-roll the name of John H. Sayers, late captain of Company H, Twenty-sixth Regiment of Michigan Volunteer Infantry.

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

ELIZABETH WARD.

The bill (H. R. 6582) granting a pension to Elizabeth Ward was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension-roll the name of Elizabeth Ward, wife of Joseph S. Ward, late a private in Company B, Seventy-second Enrolled Missouri Militia.

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

MARTHA GRAY.

The bill (H. R. 2071) for the relief of Martha Gray was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension-roll the name of Martha Gray, widow of Charles Gray, deceased, formerly of Company A, Fourth Illinois Cavalry.

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

HOWARD S. ABBOTT.

The bill (H. R. 3158) increasing the pension of Howard S. Abbott, was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes that the pension of Howard S. Abbott, certificate 73522, late adjutant of the Seventy-eighth Ohio Volunteer Infantry, be increased from \$17 to \$30 per month.

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

DAVID M. RENNOE.

The bill (H. R. 6379) to increase the pension of David M. Rennoe was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to increase the pension of David M. Rennoe, late private in Company H, Twenty-ninth Regiment Indiana Volunteers, to \$40 per month, for disability resulting from wounds in left foot, neck, and hand.

Mr. COCKRELL. Let the report be read in that case.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The report will be read.

The Secretary read the following report, submitted by Mr. DAVIS April 24, 1888:

The Committee on Pensions, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. 6379) granting a pension to David M. Rennoe have examined the same and report:

The grounds on which this increase is asked are set out in the following report of the House committee.

Your committee concur in the conclusion therein reached, and recommend the passage of the bill.

This claimant, David M. Rennoe, enlisted as a private in Company H, Twenty-ninth Indiana Volunteers, November 29, 1861, and was honorably discharged March 23, 1863, for gunshot wounds received at the battle of Murfreesborough, Tenn., December 31, 1862.

Claimant was pensioned December 28, 1863, at the rate of \$8 per month, for loss of right foot, which was increased from time to time by the Pension Department until he received a pension for total third grade. At the session of the Forty-ninth Congress a special act was passed, June 4, 1886, increasing his pension to \$30 per month, because of wounds of left foot, neck, and hand. Subsequent to the passage of the aforesaid act a general act of Congress was passed August 4, 1886, increasing the rate for total disability of right foot to \$30 per month. Since the passage of the aforesaid act he continued to receive only \$30 per month, or the rate for the disability of right foot, and nothing for the disabilities of foot, neck, and hand.

By the ruling of the Pension Bureau the special act for his relief, passed June 4, 1886, must govern, and therefore the general act of August 4, 1886, which increased the rate on his disability of right foot to \$30 per month, is made to repeal the effect of the special act of June 4, 1886, which increased his pension from \$24 to \$30 per month because of wounds of left foot, neck, and hand, and this bill for an increase of pension is to secure what Congress by special act allowed him for the last-named disabilities, but which has not been permitted by the Pension Bureau since the approval of the general act of August 4, 1886.

The evidence now on file in this case discloses the following facts: Soldier was wounded at the battle of Murfreesborough, Tenn., December 31, 1862, the ball passing through the left foot, just in front of the astragalus and os calcis bones, and through the center of the os calcis of the right foot, fracturing the bone in many pieces. Three months after soldier was discharged from the service on account of said wounds. In discharge it is stated "gunshot wound, fracture of the right and left metatarsals; disability total."

In a short time after the arrival of soldier at home it became necessary to amputate the right foot to save his life. The board of examining surgeons at South Bend, Ind., make the following report upon examination:

"Pensioner's right foot is off about 15 inches above the ankle; left foot shot through below and a little forward of the ankle joint. We find the foot tender, and he is not capable of walking or being on his left foot much on account of the lameness and soreness it produces; foot looks tender and red. The wounds of neck and hand are not painful, and, he says, do not trouble him. We find his disability as described above to be equal to and entitling him to total third grade for loss of right foot, and one-half total for wound of left foot."

The evidence of the examining surgeons and the citizens of his home clearly establish the fact that the soldier is now receiving a pension only for the amputation of right leg, and nothing on the wounds of the left foot, neck, or hand, and that soldier is unable for the performance of manual labor.

The committee, being unanimously of the opinion that claimant is entitled to

the benefit of the general act of August 4, 1886, submit a favorable report and recommend the passage of the bill.

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

MRS. LEPHA A. OSBORN.

The bill (H. R. 5966) granting a pension to Mrs. Lepha A. Osborn was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place the name of Mrs. Lepha A. Osborn, widow of Henry A. Osborn, late corporal Company C, One hundred and eleventh Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteers, and of Company E, One hundred and twenty-eighth Ohio Infantry Volunteers, on the pension-roll.

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

MRS. THEODORA M. PIATT.

The bill (H. R. 2282) granting a pension to Mrs. Theodora M. Piatt was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension-roll the name of Theodora M. Piatt, widow of Benjamin M. Piatt, late a captain and assistant adjutant-general of United States Volunteers.

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

FARNAREN BALL.

The bill (H. R. 4580) granting a pension to Farnaren Ball was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension-roll the name of Farnaren Ball, mother of Augustus F. Coldecott, late private in Company F, Seventy-fifth Regiment New York Volunteers, war of the rebellion.

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

WILLIAM H. HESTER.

The bill (H. R. 8164) granting a pension to William H. Hester was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension-roll the name of William H. Hester, late of Company M, Nineteenth Kansas Cavalry.

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

JOHN G. MERRITT.

The bill (S. 2738) granting an increase of pension to John G. Merritt was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension-roll the name of John G. Merritt, late a sergeant of Company K, First Regiment Minnesota Volunteer Infantry, at \$45 per month, in lieu of the pension he now receives.

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

MRS. MARY M. ORD.

The bill (S. 2663) granting an increase of pension to Mrs. Mary M. Ord, was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension-roll the name of Mrs. Mary M. Ord, widow of the late General E. O. C. Ord, at the rate of \$100 per month, in lieu of the pension she is now receiving.

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

WILLIAM J. MILLER.

The bill (H. R. 4519) granting a pension to William J. Miller was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place the name of William J. Miller, of Salina, Kans., late a private in Company G, One hundredth Pennsylvania Volunteers, on the pension-roll.

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

LAFAYETTE LAKIN.

The bill (H. R. 8211) to pension Lafayette Lakin was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension-roll the name of Lafayette Lakin, late of United States steam-ship Albany.

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

NOAH S. CRAMER.

The bill (H. R. 5237) granting a pension to Noah S. Cramer was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension-roll the name of Noah S. Cramer, late of the United States Navy.

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

ELIZABETH TWIGG.

The bill (H. R. 5847) granting a pension to Elizabeth Twigg was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension-roll the name of Elizabeth Twigg, as dependent mother of Henry Twigg, late a member of Company H, Fourteenth Regiment United States Infantry.

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

SALLY A. RANDALL.

The bill (H. R. 88) granting a pension to Sally A. Randall was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension-roll the name of Sally A. Randall, widow of Antipas Taber, who served as private in the war of 1812.

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

HANNAH VARQUISON.

The bill (H. R. 431) granting a pension to Hannah Varquison was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension-roll the name of Hannah Varquison, widow of John M. Varquison, late private in Company A, One hundred and forty-first Regiment of Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry.

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

ALETTA V. QUICK.

The bill (H. R. 7181) granting a pension to Aletta V. Quick was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension-roll the name of Aletta V. Quick, dependent mother of Abram Quick, late sergeant-major of Thirteenth Regiment New Jersey Volunteers.

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

CYRENIUS G. STRYKER.

The bill (H. R. 5234) granting a pension to Cyrenius G. Stryker was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension-roll the name of Cyrenius G. Stryker, late a private in Company A, Thirtieth Regiment New York Volunteers.

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

WILHELMINA KUHLMANN.

The bill (H. R. 4845) granting a pension to Wilhelmina Kuhlmann was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension-roll the name of Wilhelmina Kuhlmann, widow of Frederick Kuhlmann, deceased, late private in Company F, Twentieth Regiment New York Volunteers.

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

JOHN E. SMITH.

The bill (H. R. 130) granting a pension to John E. Smith was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension-roll the name of John E. Smith, late a private in Company B, Fifty-ninth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry.

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

ELIZA M. SCANDLIN.

The bill (S. 2779) granting a pension to Eliza M. Scandlin was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension-roll the name of Eliza M. Scandlin, widow of William G. Scandlin, late a chaplain in the Fifteenth Regiment Massachusetts Volunteer Militia, at the rate of \$12 a month.

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

CHARLES H. SMITH.

The bill (H. R. 5249) granting an increase of pension to Charles H. Smith was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to increase the present pension of Charles H. Smith, late corporal, Company K, Seventy-sixth New York Volunteers, from \$31.25 to \$72 per month.

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

SARAH J. FOY.

The bill (S. 2829) granting a pension to Sarah J. Foy was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension-roll, at the rate of \$25 per month, the name of Sarah J. Foy, late a nurse in the Second Vermont Regiment Volunteers.

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

JOHN B. TIMBERMAN.

The bill (S. 2606) granting a pension to John B. Timberman was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension-roll the name of John B. Timberman, late private in Company G, Thirty-fourth Regiment of Ohio Volunteers.

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

LYDIA HAWKINS.

The bill (S. 2655) granting a pension to Lydia Hawkins was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension-roll the name of Lydia Hawkins, widow of Richard Hawkins, late private in Company D, Fifty-seventh Regiment of Ohio Volunteers.

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

WIDOW AND CHILDREN OF PATRICK FRAWLEY.

The bill (S. 2656) granting a pension to the widow and minor children of Patrick Frawley was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension-roll the names of the widow and minor children of Patrick Frawley, late a private in Company C, Tenth Regiment Ohio Volunteers.

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

MRS. EMMA DILL.

The bill (S. 2638) granting a pension to Mrs. Emma Dill was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension-roll the name of Mrs. Emma Dill, widow of William Dill, late a captain Company D, Thirty-fifth Iowa Volunteer Infantry, at the rate of \$20 per month.

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

BARTOLA THEBANT.

The bill (S. 2629) to pension Bartola Thebant, a soldier in the Florida Seminole Indian war of 1849 and 1850, was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension-roll the name of Bartola Thebant, a soldier in the Florida Seminole Indian war of 1849 and 1850.

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

ALLEN BLETHEN.

The bill (S. 2700) granting increase of pension to Allen Blethen was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension-roll the name of Allen Blethen, late of Company H, One hundred and twenty-fourth Ohio Volunteers, at the rate of \$24 per month, in lieu of that which he is now receiving.

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

ANN E. COONEY.

The bill (S. 1822) granting a pension to Ann E. Cooney was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension-roll the name of Ann E. Cooney, a volunteer army nurse during the late rebellion, and to pay her, during life, a pension of \$25 per month, in lieu of the pension now received by her.

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

ERNST HEIN.

The bill (S. 2413) granting an increase of pension to Ernst Hein was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension-roll the name of Ernst Hein, late a private in Company H, Eighteenth Massachusetts Volunteers, at such a rate and increase over and in addition to the pension now received by him as he may be entitled by reason of gunshot wound in the index finger of the left hand.

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

BRIDGET A. MURPHY.

The bill (S. 2052) for the relief of Bridget A. Murphy was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension-roll the name of Bridget A. Murphy, widow of Thomas Murphy, deceased, formerly of Company I, Twenty-third Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry.

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

MARTHA V. COLEMAN.

The bill (S. 1264) granting a pension to Martha V. Coleman was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension-roll the name of Martha V. Coleman, a volunteer nurse in the late war, for life, at \$25 a month.

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

ANNA SLATER.

The bill (S. 1319) granting a pension to Anna Slater was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension-roll the name of Anna Slater, a volunteer nurse in the late war, giving her, during life, the sum of \$25 a month.

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

ELVIRA M. DORMAN.

The bill (S. 2830) granting increase of pension to Elvira M. Dorman was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension-roll the name of Elvira M. Dorman, minor child of James Dorman, late of Company A, First Kansas Cavalry, at the rate of \$14 per month, in lieu of that which she is now receiving.

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

NANCY VAN DYNE.

Mr. SAWYER. I ask leave to report from the Committee on Pensions and have put on its passage a pension bill which I neglected to report heretofore. I report without amendment the bill (H. R. 7094) granting a pension to Nancy Van Dyne. I ask for its present consideration.

By unanimous consent, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill. It proposes to place on the pension-roll the name of Nancy Van Dyne, mother of James B. Van Dyne, who was a private in Company B, Thirty-third New York Volunteers, and late orderly sergeant in Company I, First Regiment New York Veteran Cavalry.

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

Mr. COCKRELL. I call attention to the wording of the latter part of that bill.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. It will be again read.

The CHIEF CLERK. "Subject to the provisions and limitations of the of the pension laws."

Mr. COCKRELL. I move to strike out one of the "of the's."

Mr. SAWYER. I thought of that, but then we should have to send it back to the House and it would cause more bother than it is worth. It does not amount to anything.

Mr. COCKRELL. Is it a House bill?

Mr. SAWYER. Yes; the repetition will not do any hurt.

Mr. COCKRELL. Let it go.

The bill was passed.

PUBLIC BUILDING AT ASHEVILLE, N. C.

Mr. RANSOM. I ask leave by unanimous consent to call up Order of Business 1163, House bill 1697.

There being no objection, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 1697) for the erection of a public building in the city of Asheville, N. C.

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

HENRY H. SIBLEY'S REPRESENTATIVES.

Mr. DANIEL. I ask the Senate to take up Order of Business 1165, Senate bill 518, the second on the Calendar below the one just read.

There being no objection, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill (S. 518) for the relief of the legal representatives of Henry H. Sibley, deceased.

Mr. HOAR. I move to amend in line 4 by striking out "W." and inserting "H.;" so as to read "Henry H. Sibley."

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended, and the amendment was concurred in.

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

PUBLIC BUILDING AT WOONSOCKET, R. I.

Mr. ALDRICH. I ask unanimous consent for the consideration of Order of Business 1012, Senate bill 165.

There being no objection, the bill (S. 165) for the erection of a public building in the city of Woonsocket, R. I., was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

The Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds reported the bill with amendments, in line 4, after the words "directed to," to insert "acquire by;" in the same line, after the word "purchase," to insert "condemnation;" and in line 5, after the word "otherwise," to strike out "provide;" so as to read:

That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and hereby is, authorized and directed to acquire by purchase, condemnation, or otherwise a suitable site, and to cause to be erected thereon, at the city of Woonsocket, in the State of Rhode Island, a substantial and commodious public building, with fire-proof vaults, for the use and accommodation of the United States post-office and for other Government uses.

The amendments were agreed to.

The next amendment was, in line 13, before the word "thousand," to strike out "seventy-five" and insert "fifty;" so as to read:

The site, and the building thereon, when completed according to plans and specifications to be previously made and approved by the Secretary of the Treasury, shall not exceed the cost of \$50,000.

Mr. ALDRICH. I hope that amendment will not be adopted. I have already explained to the members of the committee that that sum is inadequate, and I think I have the assent of the committee in asking that the bill shall stand as originally presented.

The amendment was rejected.

The next amendment was, in line 17, before the word "thousand," to fill the blank by inserting "fifty;" so as to read:

And the site purchased shall leave the building unexposed to danger from fire in adjacent buildings by an open space of at least 40 feet, including streets and alleys; and for the purposes herein mentioned the sum of \$50,000 is hereby appropriated, out of any moneys in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to be expended under the direction of the Secretary of the Treasury.

Mr. ALDRICH. I hope that amendment will not be agreed to.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. It can be amended.

Mr. ALDRICH. I move to amend by striking out "fifty" and inserting "seventy-five."

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.
The amendment as amended was agreed to.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended, and the amendments were concurred in.

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

PUBLIC BUILDING AT FORT DODGE, IOWA.

Mr. ALLISON. I ask that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Senate bill 289, Calendar number 1178.

There being no objection, the Senate, as in Committee on the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill (S. 289) for the erection of a public building at Fort Dodge, Iowa.

The bill was reported from the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds with amendments.

The first amendment was, in line 4, after the word "purchase," to insert "or acquire by condemnation proceedings or otherwise;" so as to read:

That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he hereby is, authorized and directed to purchase or acquire, by condemnation proceedings or otherwise, a site for, and cause to be erected thereon, a suitable building, with fire-proof vaults therein, for the accommodation of the United States district and circuit courts, post-office, and other Government offices, at the city of Fort Dodge, Iowa.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, in line 12, after the words "sum of," to strike out "one hundred" and insert "seventy-five;" so as to read:

The plans, specifications, and full estimates for said building shall be previously made and approved according to law, and shall not exceed for the site and building complete the sum of \$75,000.

Mr. ALLISON. The original bill provided an appropriation of \$100,000. The committee have reported an amendment reducing the sum to \$75,000. That amount is not sufficient to put up such a building as should be constructed at Fort Dodge, Iowa, where the United States circuit and district courts are held. Therefore I hope the Senate will non-concur in the amendment reducing the sum to \$75,000. A very good example has just now been set in the case of the Asheville bill for North Carolina, which passed the Senate with \$100,000, though that is a much smaller place.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. If there be no objection, the amendment will be disagreed to. The Chair hears no objection, and it is disagreed to.

The next amendment reported by the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds was, in line 22, before the word "thousand," to strike out "one hundred" and insert "seventy-five;" so as to read:

And no purchase of site nor plan for said building shall be approved by the Secretary of the Treasury involving an expenditure exceeding the said sum of \$75,000.

The amendment was rejected.

The next amendment was, in line 33, before the word "thousand," to strike out "one hundred" and insert "seventy-five;" so as to read:

For the purpose of this act the sum of \$75,000 is hereby appropriated, out of any moneys in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the same to be expended under the direction of the Secretary of the Treasury.

The amendment was rejected.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended, and the amendment was concurred in.

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

PUBLIC BUILDING AT STERLING, ILL.

Mr. CULLOM. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Order of Business 1190, Senate bill 1940.

By unanimous consent, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill (S. 1940) to provide for the construction of a public building at Sterling, Ill.

The bill was reported from the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds with amendments.

The first amendment was, in line 4, after the word "purchase," to insert "or acquire by condemnation proceedings or otherwise;" so as to read:

That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to purchase, or acquire by condemnation proceedings or otherwise, a site for, and caused to be erected thereon, a suitable building for the accommodation of the post-office and other Government offices at the city of Sterling, in the State of Illinois.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, in line 11, before the word "thousand," to strike out "one hundred" and insert "forty;" so as to read:

And plans, specifications, and full estimates for said building shall be previously made and approved according to law, and shall not exceed, for the site and building complete, the sum of \$40,000.

Mr. CULLOM. The amendment proposed reduces the amount from \$100,000 to \$40,000. I wish to say that I was misled, because I recommended to the committee to make that reduction myself. I thought \$40,000 was the right amount from what I had heard; but I desire to say that on investigation I find there can not be such a building put there for the amount after purchasing the ground, and so I ask that the amount be increased to \$50,000 instead of \$40,000 as proposed by the committee.

Mr. COCKRELL. I notice the same thing has been done in two or three cases. It seems to me the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds ought to make investigation, and if they make a report here that we should not ignore it lightly. There have been two cases passed to-day where they recommended a smaller amount than the Senate voted. In a bill that provided \$100,000 they recommended \$75,000, and so reported a few days ago, and we trampled the report under foot and gave \$100,000.

Mr. CULLOM. The remarks of the Senator do not apply to this case.

Mr. COCKRELL. I am only speaking of the precedent. If we are going to have a committee to do its work, let it do its work and dismiss it. No member of the committee is here to defend the action of the committee and its reports are ignored and trampled under foot.

Mr. CULLOM. I move to amend the amendment by striking out \$40,000 and inserting \$50,000. I exonerate the committee, as I told the committee myself that I thought possibly \$40,000 would do, but I find on investigation that it is not enough. The committee would probably have made it more than \$50,000 if I had insisted upon it.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The question is on the amendment to the amendment to strike out "forty" and insert "fifty."

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The amendment as amended was agreed to.

The next amendment reported by the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds was, in line 30, before the word "thousand," to strike out "one hundred" and insert "forty;" so as to read:

And no purchase of site, nor plan for said building, shall be approved by the Secretary of the Treasury involving an expenditure exceeding the said sum of \$40,000 for site and building.

Mr. CULLOM. I move to make that \$50,000 also.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The amendment as amended was agreed to.

The next amendment of the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds was to add as a new section the following:

SEC. 2. That the sum of \$40,000 be, and the same is hereby, appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to be used and expended for the purpose provided in this act.

Mr. CULLOM. I move to amend that amendment in line 1 by making the amount \$50,000 instead of \$40,000.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The amendment as amended was agreed to.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended, and the amendments were concurred in.

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

RIGHT OF WAY THROUGH INDIAN TERRITORY.

Mr. BERRY. I move to take up for consideration Order of Business 1162, Senate bill 2644.

There being no objection, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill (S. 2644) granting the right of way to the Fort Smith, Paris and Dardanelle Railway Company to construct and operate a railroad, telegraph, and telephone line from Fort Smith, Ark., through the Indian Territory, to or near Baxter Springs, in the State of Kansas, and authorizing said company to build a bridge across the Arkansas River at or near the city of Fort Smith, Ark.

The bill was reported from the Committee on Indian Affairs with amendments.

The first amendment was in section 4, line 6, after the word "mile," to strike out:

and shall in all respects conform to the laws of Congress on the subject of interstate commerce which have been or may hereafter be enacted on the subject: *Provided,*

And insert:

Congress hereby reserves the right to regulate the charges for freight and passengers on said railway and messages on said telegraph and telephone lines, until a State government or governments shall exist in said Territory within the limits of which said railway, or a part thereof, shall be located; and then such State government or governments shall be authorized to fix and regulate the cost of transportation of persons and freights within their respective limits by said railway; but Congress expressly reserves the right to fix and regulate at all times the cost of such transportation by said railway or said company whenever such transportation shall extend from one State into another, or shall extend into more than one State: *Provided, however,* That the rate of such transportation of passengers, local or interstate, shall not exceed the rate above expressed: *And provided further,*

So as to make the section read:

SEC. 4. That said railroad company shall not charge the inhabitants of said Territory a greater rate of freight than the rate authorized by the laws of the State of Arkansas for services or transportation of the same kind: *Provided,* That passenger rates on said railway shall not exceed 3 cents per mile. Congress hereby reserves the right to regulate the charges for freight and passengers on said railway and messages on said telegraph and telephone lines until a State government or governments shall exist in said Territory within the limits of which said railway, or a part thereof, shall be located; and then such State government or governments shall be authorized to fix and regulate the cost of transportation of persons and freights within their respective limits by said railway; but Congress expressly reserves the right to fix and regulate at all times the cost of such transportation by said railway or said company whenever such transportation shall extend from one State into another, or shall extend into more than one State: *Provided, however,* That the rate of such transportation of passengers, local or interstate, shall not exceed the rate above expressed: *And provided further,* That said railway company shall carry the mail at such

prices as Congress may by law provide, and until such rate is fixed by law the Postmaster-General may fix the rate of compensation.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, in section 9, line 2, before the word "miles," to insert "fifty," and in the same line, after the word "within," to insert "three years;" so as to make the section read:

SEC. 9. That said railway company shall build at least 50 miles of its railway in said Territory within three years after the passage of this act, or the rights herein granted shall be forfeited as to that portion not built; and that said company shall construct and maintain continually all road and highway crossings and necessary bridges over said railway wherever said roads and highways do now or may hereafter cross said railway's right of way or may be by the proper authorities laid across the same.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was to strike out "Sec. 13" and connect section 13 with section 12.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was to strike out sections 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, and 19, as follows:

SEC. 14. That the said Fort Smith, Paris and Dardanelle Railway Company shall have the right to construct and maintain a bridge across the Arkansas River, at or near the city of Fort Smith, Ark., and also to lay on and over said bridge a railway track or tracks for the passage of railway trains; and said company may, at its option, construct and maintain ways for wagons, carriages, and foot passengers, charging and receiving such reasonable tolls therefor as may be approved by the Secretary of War, if built in the Indian Territory, and if built in the State of Arkansas, by the authorities of the State of Arkansas.

SEC. 15. That said bridge shall be constructed and built without interference with the security and convenience of navigation of said river beyond what is necessary to carry into effect the rights and privileges hereby granted; and in order to secure that object the said company shall submit to the Secretary of War, for his examination and approval, a design and drawings of the bridge, a map of the location, giving for the space of 1 mile above and 1 mile below the proposed location, the topography of the banks of the river, the shore lines at high and low water, the direction and strength of the currents at all stages, and the soundings, accurately showing the bed of the stream, the location of any other bridge or bridges, and shall furnish such other information as may be required for a full and satisfactory understanding of the subject; and until the said plan and location of the bridge are approved by the Secretary of War the bridge shall not be built: *Provided*, That the bridge built under this act shall be a draw-bridge, with a draw over the main channel of the river at an accessible and navigable point, and with the spans of not less than 300 feet, should the width of the river between the draw span and the banks be sufficient to permit it, and the head room under such spans shall not be less than ten feet above high-water mark: *Provided, also*, That said draw-bridge shall be opened promptly upon reasonable signal for the passing of boats; and said company shall maintain at its own expense, from sunset until sunrise, such light or other signal on said bridge as the Light-House Board shall prescribe.

SEC. 16. That the Secretary of War is hereby authorized and directed, upon receiving such plan and map and other information, and upon being satisfied that the bridge upon such plan with such necessary works and at such locality will conform to the prescribed conditions of this act, to notify the company that he approves the same; and upon receiving such notification the said company may proceed to an erection of the bridge, conforming strictly to the approved plan and location; and should any change be made in the plan of the bridge or accessory works during the progress of the work thereon, such change shall be subject likewise to the approval of the Secretary of War, and, in case of any litigation arising from any obstruction or alleged obstruction to the free navigation of said river, caused or alleged to be caused by said bridge, the case may be brought in the United States court for the western district of Arkansas.

SEC. 17. That the said bridge and accessory work, when built and constructed under this act and according to the terms and limitations thereof, shall be lawful structures; and said bridge shall be recognized and known as a post-route, upon which also no higher charge shall be made for the transportation over the same of mails, the troops, and munitions of war of the United States, than the rate per mile paid for the transportation over the railroad said company may construct on its right of way granted in this act, this bridge being a part of the same; and said bridge and railway line shall enjoy the rights and privileges of other post-routes in the United States; and should said bridge be constructed and built in the Indian Territory, Congress reserves the right at any time to regulate by appropriate legislation the charges for freight and passengers over said bridge.

SEC. 18. That the United States shall have the right of way for such postal-telegraph lines across said bridge as the Government may construct or control.

SEC. 19. That the right to alter, amend, or repeal this act is hereby expressly reserved; and the right to require any changes in said structure, or its entire removal, at the expense of the owner thereof, whenever Congress shall decide that the public interest shall require it, is also expressly reserved.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. HOAR. I move to strike out in the third section of the bill the words in the forty-sixth line beginning "If the judgment of the court" down to the word "damages" in line 49. It is the same provision which was struck out of the railroad bill which was passed the other day. My colleague informed me that he intended to have all these bills modified so as to correspond with the one then passed.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. In section 3, line 46, after the word "company," it is proposed to strike out the words:

If the judgment of the court shall be for the same or a less sum than the award made by the referees, then the costs shall be adjudged against the party claiming damages.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended, and the amendments were concurred in.

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

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill granting the right of way to the Fort Smith, Paris and Dardanelle Railway Company to construct and operate a railroad, telegraph, and telephone line from Fort Smith, Ark., through the Indian Territory, to or near Baxter Springs, in the State of Kansas."

FORT SEDGWICK MILITARY RESERVATION.

Mr. PADDOCK. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Order of Business 821, Senate bill 1765.

There being no objection, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill (S. 1765) to provide for the sale of the Fort Sedgwick military reservation, in the State of Colorado and Territory of Wyoming, to actual settlers.

The bill was reported from the Committee on Public Lands with amendments.

The first amendment was, in section 1, line 6, after the word "settlers," to strike out "only at minimum price," and in line 8, after the word "laws," to insert "only;" so as to read:

That it shall be the duty of the Secretary of the Interior to cause said tract of land to be surveyed, sectionized, and subdivided as other public lands, and after said survey and appraisement to offer said land to actual settlers under and in accordance with the provisions of the homestead laws only.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, in section 1, line 8, after the word "person," to insert "who;" in line 10, after the words "to the," to strike out "appraisalment thereof" and insert "1st day of January, 1888;" and in line 14, after the word "laws," to insert "notwithstanding such prior entry;" so as to read:

Provided, That if any person who has made permanent improvements upon said land prior to the 1st day of January, 1888 (being an actual settler thereon), has exhausted his right to make a homestead entry, such person, or his heirs, may enter one quarter-section of said land under the provisions of the homestead laws, notwithstanding such prior entry.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, in section 1, line 17, after the words "prior to," to strike out "such appraisalment" and insert "January 1, 1888;" and in line 18, after the word "complete," to strike out "the pre-emption or;" so as to make the clause read:

And provided further, That the heirs of any deceased person who had made settlement and improvement as above described prior to January 1, 1888, may complete homestead entry of the person so deceased.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. REAGAN. I should like to hear the bill read as it now stands amended.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The bill will be read as amended.

The Chief Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That it shall be the duty of the Secretary of the Interior to cause said tract of land to be surveyed, sectionized, and subdivided as other public lands, and after said survey and appraisement to offer said land to actual settlers, under and in accordance with the provisions of the homestead laws only: *Provided*, That if any person who has made permanent improvements upon said land prior to the 1st day of January, 1888 (being an actual settler thereon) has exhausted his right to make a homestead entry, such person, or his heirs, may enter one quarter-section of said land under the provisions of the homestead laws, notwithstanding such prior entry: *And provided further*, That the heirs of any deceased person who had made settlement and improvement as above described prior to January 1, 1888, may complete homestead entry of the person so deceased.

SEC. 2. That the sum of \$1,500, or so much thereof as may be necessary, is hereby appropriated, out of any moneys in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, for the purpose of carrying out the provisions of this act.

Mr. REAGAN. I am not advised about this bill, but I should like to hear the Senator who reported it explain why it is that this land is to be left open to be taken up by homestead entries. It seems to be a military reservation, and doubtless, being a military reservation, it has a primary value attached to it. It seems to me it is proper that the Senate should know whether the land is of great value, and whether there are persons now on it prepared to take it up as soon as the law authorizes them to do so.

Mr. PADDOCK. I will state for the information of the Senator from Texas that the land is not of great value. It is of very ordinary value. It is very common arable land. Some settlers have gone upon it to develop it, and the aim is to put it upon the same footing as the surrounding arid country in Northwestern Nebraska. The land is of very little value. It could not be sold at a dollar and a quarter an acre under the circumstances.

Mr. REAGAN. Will the Senator tell us how long a military post was kept at that place?

Mr. PADDOCK. For a very short time. It was only a temporary post. It was never an important post.

Mr. REAGAN. I do not know the particulars.

Mr. PADDOCK. The bill is the unanimous report of the Committee on Public Lands, and was recommended by the Commissioner of the General Land Office.

Mr. REAGAN. I suppose the committee in passing upon the bill has inquired into it, but it seems to me that the legislation proposed is unusual; and that a military reservation which is of the value that generally attaches to those reservations, after being surveyed, should be sold to the highest bidder. I do not understand why it should be taken up by homestead entries.

Mr. PADDOCK. The bill is in exact accordance with the provisions of all the bills which have been passed with reference to military reservations in that whole region of country. The Fort Kearney military reservation, which was composed of land very much more valuable than this, was disposed of exactly under the provisions of this bill, the aim being to give the poor people who have gone on the land to

develop the country the same opportunities that they have under the general homestead law. There is actually no value in this land. I assure the Senator that it is one of the commonest tracts of land there is in this country.

Mr. REAGAN. Of course, if the bill has been examined by the Committee on Public Lands and reported favorably, I shall raise no further objection; but it seems to me that it is rather an unusual thing that a military reservation should be disposed of under pre-emption or homestead.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended, and the amendments were concurred in.

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

The Committee on Public Lands reported to amend the preamble in line 1 by striking out the word "State" and inserting "District of Columbia" and in the same line by striking out the words "Territory of Wyoming" and inserting "Nebraska;" so as to make it read:

Whereas the tract of land in the States of Colorado and Nebraska, known as the Fort Sedgwick military reservation, is no longer needed or used for military purposes, and has been abandoned by the military authorities: Therefore.

The amendment was agreed to.

The preamble was amended as agreed to.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill to provide for the sale of the Fort Sedgwick military reservation, in the States of Colorado and Nebraska, to actual settlers."

HEIRS OF SOLOMON SPITZER.

Mr. HISCOCK. I ask to call up House bill 2699, Calendar number 776.

There being no objection, the bill (H. R. 2699) for the relief of the heirs of the late Solomon Spitzer was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to pay \$12,500 to the heirs of Solomon Spitzer for the unexpended increase in the work of weighing imports at the port of New York, under his contract with the Secretary of the Treasury, during the year 1879.

Mr. COCKRELL. Why was not the money paid to Spitzer if he had a written contract?

Mr. HISCOCK. The report shows that there was some technical objection to the payment by the Secretary of the Treasury, but he recommended that it be paid by Congress.

Mr. COCKRELL. Let the report be read.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The report will be read.

The Chief Clerk read the following report submitted by Mr. STEWART March 21, 1888:

The Committee on Claims, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. 2699) for the relief of the heirs of the late Solomon Spitzer, after having considered the same, submit the following report:

A bill similar to the one under consideration was favorably reported upon by the House Committee on Claims of the first sessions of the Forty-seventh, Forty-eighth, Forty-ninth, and Fiftieth Congresses, and passed the House of Representatives on the 2d instant. The facts in the case are fully stated in the last-mentioned report.

A report made by the committee of Treasury officers appointed by the Secretary of the Treasury to examine into Spitzer's claim in 1880 for extra compensation, and the concurring opinion of the Secretary of the Treasury, are hereto attached and also made a part of this report.

In view of the facts stated in the accompanying papers, your committee report back the bill favorably and recommend its passage.

The following is the report of the Committee on Claims of the House of Representatives, made on February 14 last, to which is added the above-mentioned report of the committee of Treasury officers and the concurring opinion of the Secretary of the Treasury:

"The Committee on Claims, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. 2699) for the relief of the heirs of Solomon Spitzer, would respectfully report:

"That a similar bill was favorably reported by Mr. TILLMAN, from the Committee on Claims, in the Forty-eighth Congress. Your committee concur in the report, which is hereto annexed, and recommend that it do pass."

"The Committee on Claims, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. 1089) for the relief of Solomon Spitzer, and accompanying papers, have had the same under consideration, and make the following report:

"This bill appropriates the sum of \$12,500, or so much thereof as in the opinion of the Secretary of the Treasury may be necessary, to pay the claim of Solomon Spitzer for the unexpected increase in the work of weighing imports at the port of New York under his contract with the Treasury Department for the year 1879.

"It appears that Spitzer entered into a contract with the Treasury Department to do all the work of weighing imports at the above-named port for three years from February 1, 1878, at a compensation of \$75,000 per annum.

"The contract also specified that in case the work was increased more than 10 per cent, by legislative action increasing the classes of weighable goods, the contractor should be entitled to compensation in proportion to the increase, less the 10 per cent, specified.

"An unanticipated increase in the volume of importations took place in the latter part of the year 1879, and the quantity of weighable goods imported continued to increase to such an extent that Spitzer was no longer able to perform his contract, and it was terminated on the 1st of January, 1880. Spitzer presented a claim to the Treasury Department for extra compensation on account of the unexpected increase, and it was referred to a committee of Treasury officers, appointed by the Secretary of the Treasury. They examined the matter carefully, and reported that, under the terms of the contract, Spitzer was equitably entitled to additional compensation to the extent of \$12,500, but there was no power vested in the Department to pay same, and recommended legislative action. The Secretary of the Treasury concurred in the report of the committee.

"The average number of tons weighed during each of the six years from 1873 to and including 1878 was 1,104,488, and it is fair to assume bidders for furnishing the labor in question took into consideration, in making their bids to perform the service, the average number of tons weighed during former years. The quantity of goods weighed in 1879 was 1,570,907 tons, or 466,419 tons more than the average of each of the six preceding years, an increase of about 42 per cent,

while the price paid by the Government for the labor performed was over \$100,000 less than 1877, according to the report of the Treasury officials.

"The collector of the port of New York, the deputy naval officer, and General Curtis all seem to indicate, by communication to the Department on this subject, that in their judgment it would be equitable to allow Mr. Spitzer 33 per cent, in addition to his contract price for such period as the Secretary might deem proper.

"The report of the collector of February 10, 1880, states that according to Spitzer's pay-rolls the labor under the contract cost him \$32,000 in 1879 more than the \$75,000 received from the Government. He also estimated that during the year 1880 the work done by Spitzer would cost something like \$144,000, and experience has shown that this was an underestimate.

"Your committee are therefore of the opinion that as Spitzer made his contract in good faith, and as it is fair to assume, on the estimate as furnished by the Government for the six years preceding 1878, that, in accordance with the said contract, he would be equitably entitled to an addition of 33 per cent, to his contract price for the last half of the year 1879, or \$12,500.

"At the commencement of the first session of the Forty-seventh Congress, of 1882, Mr. Spitzer came to Washington and presented his claim, and, while here prosecuting said claim, was suddenly taken sick, and died April 13, 1882.

"In view of the foregoing facts, your committee therefore report back the bill, amended so as to pay said amount of \$12,500 to the legal representatives of the late Solomon Spitzer, and recommend that it do pass."

"TREASURY DEPARTMENT, OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY,
Washington, D. C., August 16, 1880.

"SIR: In accordance with instructions contained in the letter of Assistant Secretary French, of the 12th of February last, we have examined the claims of Solomon Spitzer for extra compensation on account of weighing imports at New York, and beg leave to make the following report:

"The only other branch of the subject remaining to be considered is, what extra compensation, if any, shall be paid to Spitzer on account of the large increase in the work prior to the 1st of January last, and what period such compensation shall embrace. It is conceded that the work for which this extra compensation is sought was of a character covered by the contract. If Mr. Spitzer can be paid extra compensation on account of such increase, the following table, furnished by the superintendent of the weighers, Mr. Lake, may be taken as exhibiting the number of tons and cost per ton of weighable goods weighed at the port of New York from 1873 to and including 1879:

| Year. | Number of tons weighed. | Expenses of weighing. | Cost per ton of 2,000 pounds. |
|-----------|--|-----------------------|--------------------------------------|
| 1873..... | 1,184,386 ¹ / ₁₀₀₀ | \$367,934.09 | \$0.31 ¹ / ₁₀₀ |
| 1874..... | 1,138,132 ² / ₁₀₀₀ | 301,536.30 | .26 ¹ / ₁₀₀ |
| 1875..... | 1,008,944 ³ / ₁₀₀₀ | 314,109.73 | .29 ¹ / ₁₀₀ |
| 1876..... | 1,057,437 ⁴ / ₁₀₀₀ | 301,891.18 | .28 ¹ / ₁₀₀ |
| 1877..... | 1,097,368 ⁵ / ₁₀₀₀ | 314,294.72 | .28 ¹ / ₁₀₀ |
| 1878..... | 1,068,662 ⁶ / ₁₀₀₀ | 197,467.22 | .18 ¹ / ₁₀₀ |
| 1879..... | 6,626,931 ⁷ / ₁₀₀₀ | 198,207.78 | 1.62 ⁸ / ₁₀₀ |
| | 1,570,907 ⁸ / ₁₀₀₀ | | .12 ⁹ / ₁₀₀ |

"Average number of tons weighed during each of the six years from 1873 to and including 1878, 1,104,488.

"Average cost per ton, 0.2713+ cent.

"It is assumed that bidders for furnishing the labor in question took into consideration, in making their bids, the average number of tons weighed during former years. The quantity of goods weighed in 1879 was 466,419 tons more than the average of each of the six preceding years; an increase of about 42 per cent.

"The contract specified that in case the work was increased more than 10 per cent, by legislative action, increasing the classes of weighable goods, the contractor should be entitled to extra compensation in proportion to the increase, less the 10 per cent, specified.

"The collector, by his letter of January 14 (see Exhibit F); the deputy naval officer, by his letter of January 12, and General Curtis, by his report of January 10 (both inclosures of Exhibit F), all seem to indicate that, in the judgment of these officers, it would be equitable to allow Spitzer 33 per cent, in addition to his contract price, for such period as the Secretary may deem proper.

"To form any judgment as to the period of time which this extra compensation should embrace, it is proper to inquire what were the expenses and receipts of Mr. Spitzer in connection with the contract for the year 1879. The report of the collector of February 10, 1880, marked I, states that according to Spitzer's pay-rolls the labor under the contract cost him \$32,000 in 1879 more than the \$75,000 received from the Government as the contract price. The collector estimates in said letter that during the present year the work done by Spitzer would cost, on the basis of last year's importations, something like \$144,000, and later experience has shown that this was a serious underestimate.

"Upon review of all the circumstances, we are of opinion that if Mr. Spitzer has in good faith performed his contract according to its terms, he would be equitably entitled to an addition of 33 per cent, to his contract price for the last half of the year 1879, or \$12,500.

"We are, however, of the opinion that no power exists in the Secretary to make this award without legislative sanction.

"Very respectfully,

"J. H. ROBINSON,
Assistant Solicitor.
"A. K. TINGLE,
Supervising Special Agent.
"H. B. JAMES,
Chief Customs Division.

"Hon. JOHN SHERMAN, Secretary."

"TREASURY DEPARTMENT, OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY,
Washington, D. C., March 1, 1881.

"SIR: I am in receipt of a note from the clerk of your committee, dated the 21st ultimo, requesting, on behalf of the subcommittee charged with the preparation of the deficiency bill for 1881, an expression of the views of this Department upon the merits of a bill therewith inclosed for the relief of Solomon Spitzer.

"This bill proposes to appropriate the sum of \$12,500, or so much thereof as, in the opinion of the Secretary of the Treasury, may be necessary to pay the claim of Solomon Spitzer for the unexpected increase in the work of weighing imports at the port of New York under his contract with this Department for the year 1879.

"Mr. Spitzer entered into a contract with this Department to do all the work of weighing imports at the port of New York for three years from February 1,

1878, at a compensation of \$75,000 per annum. This contract was let to Spitzer after public advertisement, he being the lowest bidder.

"A great, and to a large extent unanticipated, increase in the volume of importations took place in the latter part of the year 1879, and the quantity of weighable goods imported continued to increase to such an extent that the contractor was no longer able to perform his contract, and it was accordingly terminated on the 1st of January, 1880.

"After the abrogation of the contract Spitzer presented a claim for extra compensation on account of the heavy and unexpected increase in the volume of the work during the last half of the year 1879, and this claim was referred by me to a committee consisting of the Assistant Solicitor of the Treasury, the chief of the special agent's force, and the chief of the customs division, and I inclose herewith a copy of their report upon the case. Their conclusion was that inasmuch as this work was done while the contract remained in force there was no power vested in the Department to grant the relief sought, but that if Spitzer had faithfully performed the terms of his contract he was equitably entitled to additional compensation to the extent of \$12,500. The method by which they arrive at this sum as a basis of compensation is given in their report.

"I know of no facts which lead me to dissent from the conclusion reached by the committee.

"Very respectfully,

"JOHN SHERMAN, Secretary.

"Hon. J. D. C. ATKINS,

"Chairman Committee on Appropriations, House of Representatives."

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

PUBLIC BUILDING AT DULUTH, MINN.

Mr. SABIN. I move to take up the bill (H. R. 7218) for the erection of a public building in the city of Duluth, State of Minnesota.

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

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

PUBLIC BUILDING AT DOVER, N. H.

Mr. CHANDLER. I move to take up Order of Business 1179, Senate bill 384.

By unanimous consent, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill (S. 384) to provide for the erection of a public building in the city of Dover, in the State of New Hampshire, which was reported from the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds with amendments.

The first amendment was, in section 1, line 4, after the word "purchase," to insert "or acquire by condemnation proceedings or otherwise;" so as to make the section read:

That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he hereby is, authorized and directed to purchase, or acquire by condemnation proceedings or otherwise, a site for, and cause to be erected thereon, a suitable building, with commodious fire-proof vaults, for the accommodation of the post-office, internal-revenue office, and other Government offices at the city of Dover, in the State of New Hampshire.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, in section 1, line 12, before the word "thousand," to strike out "one hundred" and insert "seventy-five;" so as to read:

The site, and the building thereon, when completed upon plans and specifications to be previously made and approved by the Secretary of the Treasury, shall not exceed the cost of \$75,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, in section 2, line 1, before the word "thousand," to strike out "one hundred" and insert "seventy-five;" so as to make the section read:

That the sum of \$75,000 be, and the same is hereby, appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to be used and expended for the purposes provided in this act.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended, and the amendments were concurred in.

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

T. J. EDWARDS.

Mr. HOAR. I move to take up the bill (H. R. 518) for the relief of T. J. Edwards, administrator of David Edwards, deceased.

There being no objection, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill. It proposes to pay to T. J. Edwards, as administrator of the estate of David Edwards, deceased, late of Jackson County, Ohio, \$225, for the balance due said David Edwards, deceased, for property taken by the United States Army in 1862.

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

JOHN F. SHORTER.

Mr. SPOONER. Mr. President—

Mr. HOAR. If the Senator from Wisconsin will pardon me a moment, I moved the other day, unless I am mistaken in my recollection, to recommit to the Committee on Military Affairs, with the assent of the chairman of that committee, Order of Business 997, being the bill (H. R. 2465) for the relief of the heirs of John F. Shorter, but I find it still stands on the Calendar. I move that the bill be recommitted if it has not already been sent back to the committee.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The mistake is in the Calendar, and not in the condition of the business. The bill has been recommitted, and it should be taken from the Calendar.

SURETIES OF DENNIS MURPHY.

Mr. SPOONER. I ask the Senate to proceed to the consideration of Order of Business 935, Senate bill 1715.

There being no objection, the bill (S. 1715) for the relief of the sureties of Dennis Murphy was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to release from liability the sureties of Dennis Murphy, who was formerly paymaster and military storekeeper at the national armory at Harper's Ferry, Va., upon his official bond to the United States as such paymaster and military storekeeper, executed on the 28th of April, 1858.

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

ESTATE OF JOSEPH H. MADDOX.

Mr. MITCHELL. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Order of Business 508, being the bill (S. 2201) for the relief of Laura E. Maddox, widow and executrix, and Robert Morrison, executor of Joseph H. Maddox, deceased.

Mr. COCKRELL. Pending that motion I move that the Senate do now adjourn.

Mr. MITCHELL. Will the Senator allow me a moment?

Mr. COCKRELL. Certainly.

Mr. MITCHELL. This bill—

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The motion is not debatable.

Mr. COCKRELL. I withdraw the motion, if the Senator desires to make an explanation.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The motion to adjourn is withdrawn.

Mr. MITCHELL. This bill was reached in regular order three or four weeks ago, and was passed over at the suggestion of a Senator on my own motion. The bill has been twice reported unanimously after careful investigation by the Committee on Claims; and I trust the Senator from Missouri will suspend his motion to adjourn and let the bill be passed.

I will state in addition that there were two bills of the same nature, arising out of similar transactions. One was passed two or three weeks ago and this one was held over so that the Senator from Iowa [Mr. ALLISON] might examine into the matter. He has done so and he withdraws his objection. I appeal to the Senator from Missouri not to interpose any objection by a motion to adjourn, and let us pass this bill.

Mr. COCKRELL. I appeal to the Senator from Oregon not to ask the Senate to pass a bill of this character with no quorum here. There is no quorum present; it is past 5 o'clock; and there is no time to discuss this bill, which may involve millions of dollars. I know that when you touch the question of insurrectionary claims, claims for property acquired technically under the law, you touch a very large number of claims. They have been pending here for the last twenty years.

I am not certain whether this comes within the category of those claims or not. If it does I am opposed to it *in toto*. It may not come within the same rule that would be applied to the others which have been reported adversely time and again by the Committee on Claims; and I believe the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. HOAR] once reported this claim adversely.

Mr. MITCHELL. No, Mr. President—

Mr. COCKRELL. We want some explanation about it, and I tell the Senator the bill can not be passed now at 5 o'clock without a quorum. There is no use in wasting time with it now.

Mr. MITCHELL. It is not necessary that the Senator from Missouri should make any threats at all. I know he is a just man, and I know he would not do a wrong for anything in the world. I shall not press the bill now, but I ask him to-morrow or this week to look into this case carefully.

Mr. COCKRELL. I will do so.

Mr. MITCHELL. I am quite sure if he will do so he will come to the same conclusion that the Committee on Claims have twice come to unanimously.

Mr. COCKRELL. I will look into it carefully. I shall get all the reports. I see it has been reported twice adversely, and I think I was a member of the committee once when it was reported adversely.

Mr. MITCHELL. I ask that the bill retain its place on the Calendar.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. It is so ordered.

WILLIAM P. GORSUCH.

Mr. GORMAN. I ask the Senate to consider Order of Business 761, House bill 3727.

By unanimous consent, the bill (H. R. 3727) for the relief of William P. Gorsuch was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to pay William P. Gorsuch, of Carroll County, Maryland, \$300, the amount paid by him for commutation, he having been drafted into the military service of the United States after he had arrived at the age of forty-five years.

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

Mr. COCKRELL. I move that the Senate do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 8 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until to-morrow, Thursday, May 3, 1888, at 12 o'clock m.

NOMINATIONS.

Executive nominations received by the Senate May 2, 1888.

CHIEF-JUSTICE.

Melville W. Fuller, of Illinois, to be Chief-Justice of the United States, in the place of Morrison R. Waite, deceased.

UNITED STATES CONSUL.

David N. Burke, of New York, now consul at Puerto Cabello, to be consul of the United States at Bahia, *vice* William O. Patton, resigned.

ASSISTANT APPRAISER OF MERCHANDISE.

Francis Gross, of New York, to be assistant appraiser of merchandise in the district of New York, in the State of New York, to succeed William Kent, deceased.

ARMY APPOINTMENT.

James S. Jouett, late first lieutenant Tenth Cavalry, to be first lieutenant in the Tenth Cavalry, with rank from February 17, 1883.

PROMOTIONS IN THE ARMY.

Third Regiment of Artillery.

Capt. Wallace F. Randolph, of the Fifth Artillery, to be major, April 25, 1888, *vice* Lodor, promoted to the Fifth Artillery.

Fourth Regiment of Artillery.

Lieut. Col. Henry W. Closson, of the Fifth Artillery, to be colonel, April 25, 1888, *vice* Best, retired from active service.

Fifth Regiment of Artillery.

Maj. Richard Lodor, of the Third Artillery, to be lieutenant-colonel, April 25, 1888, *vice* Closson, promoted to the Fourth Artillery.

First Lieut. Benjamin K. Roberts, to be captain, April 25, 1888, *vice* Randolph, promoted to the Third Artillery.

Second Lieut. Harvey C. Carbaugh, to be first lieutenant, April 25, 1888, *vice* Roberts, promoted.

Second Regiment of Infantry.

Second Lieut. John S. Mallory, to be first lieutenant, April 10, 1888, *vice* Muhlenberg, deceased.

Third Regiment of Infantry.

Lieut. Col. Edwin C. Mason, of the Fourth Infantry, to be colonel, April 24, 1888, *vice* Brooke, appointed brigadier-general.

Fourth Regiment of Infantry.

Maj. Frederick Mears, of the Twenty-fifth Infantry, to be lieutenant-colonel, April 24, 1888, *vice* Mason, promoted to the Third Infantry.

Twenty-first Regiment of Infantry.

First Lieut. Joseph W. Duncan, regimental adjutant, to be captain, April 24, 1888, *vice* Miles, promoted to the Twenty-fifth Infantry.

Twenty-fifth Regiment of Infantry.

Capt. Evan Miles, of the Twenty-first Infantry, to be major, April 24, 1888, *vice* Mears, promoted to the Fourth Infantry.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

WEDNESDAY, May 2, 1888.

The House met at 12 o'clock m. Prayer by the Chaplain, [Rev. W. H. MILBURN, D. D.]

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

VETO MESSAGE, H. B. WILSON.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will now read the message from the President of the United States, the reading of which was interrupted on yesterday by the adjournment.

The Clerk read as follows:

To the House of Representatives:

I return without approval House bill No. 19, entitled "An act for the relief of H. B. Wilson, administrator of the estate of William Tinder, deceased."

The purpose of this bill is to refund to the estate of William Tinder the sum of \$5,000 which was paid to the Government by his administrator in June, 1880, upon the following facts:

In 1876 two indictments were found against one Evans, charging him with passing counterfeit money. In May, 1878, he was tried upon one of said indictments and the jury failed to agree; thereupon the prisoner entered into two recognizances in the sum of \$5,000 each, with W. R. Evans and William Tinder as sureties, conditioned for the appearance of the prisoner Evans at the next term of the court, in November, 1878, for trial upon said indictment. Before that date, however, the prisoner fled the country and failed to appear according to the condition of his bond. In the mean time William Tinder died and H. B. Wilson was appointed his administrator.

Suits were brought upon the two bail bonds, and the liability of the sureties not being admitted, the suits were tried in March, 1880, resulting in two judgments in favor of the United States and against the surety Evans and the estate of Tinder for \$5,000 each and the costs.

Soon thereafter an application was made by the administrator of the estate of William Tinder for relief, and an offer was made by him to pay \$5,000 and the costs, in compromise and settlement of the liability of said estate upon said two judgments.

These judgments were a preferred claim against the estate, which was represented to be worth sixteen or eighteen thousand dollars. The other surety, Evans, was alleged to be worthless, and it was claimed that neither the admin-

istrator of the Tinder estate nor his attorneys had known the whereabouts of the indicted party since his flight, and that some time would elapse before certain litigation in which the estate was involved could be settled and the claims against it paid.

It was considered best by the officers of the Government to accept the proposition of the administrator, which was done in June, 1880. The sum of \$5,059.05, the amount of one of said judgments, with interest and costs, was paid into the United States Treasury, and the estate of Tinder was, in consideration thereof, released and discharged from all liability upon both of said judgments.

Thus was the transaction closed, in exact accordance with the wishes and the prayer of the representative of this estate, and by the favor and indulgence of the Government upon his application. There was, so far as I can learn, no condition attached, and no understanding or agreement that any future occurrence would affect the finality of the compromise by which the Government had accepted one-half of its claim in full settlement.

It appears that in 1881 the party indicted was arrested and brought to trial, which resulted in his conviction. And apparently for this reason alone it is proposed by the bill under consideration to open the settlement made at the request of the administrator and refund to him the sum which he paid on such settlement pursuant to his own offer.

I can see no fairness or justice to the Government in such a proposition. I do not find any statement that the administrator delivered the prisoner to the United States authorities for trial. On the contrary, it appears from an examination made in the First Comptroller's Office that he was arrested by the marshal on the 25th of May, 1881, who charged and was paid his fees therefor. And if the administrator had surrendered the prisoner to justice, it would not entitle him to the repayment of the money he has paid to compromise the two judgments against him.

The temptation to relieve from contracts with the Government upon plausible application is, in my opinion, not sufficiently resisted. But to refund money paid into the public Treasury upon such a liberal compromise as is exhibited in this case seems like a departure from all business principles and an unsafe concession that the interests of the Government are to be easily surrendered.

GROVER CLEVELAND.

EXECUTIVE MANSION, May 1, 1888.

The SPEAKER. What action will the House take with the message?

Mr. WHEELER. I move that it be referred to the Committee on Claims, and ordered to be printed.

The motion was agreed to.

COLLECTION OF REVENUE, NO MAN'S LAND.

The SPEAKER also laid before the House a letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting correspondence and recommending legislation for enforcing the laws for the collection of internal revenue in the Public Land Strip known as "No Man's Land," which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

BRIDGE ACROSS BLACK RIVER, ARKANSAS.

The SPEAKER also laid before the House the bill (S. 2614) to authorize the Batesville and Brinkley Railroad to build a bridge across the Black River in Arkansas; which was read a first and second time.

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent of the House for the consideration of this bridge bill at the present time; and hope I will be permitted to state in this connection that the bill has been reported unanimously by the House committee in the exact form here presented. It has also received the approval of the Secretary of War and the Chief of Engineers. I ask unanimous consent, not only to consider the bill now, but also to dispense with the reading of the bill at length, in order to save time. It is provided with all of the usual restrictions placed in bills of this character.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

Mr. DINGLEY. I have no objection; but there is another Senate bill which came over on Friday last, relating to the establishment of a certain light-house in Maine; and I ask that I may also be recognized for the purpose of asking the present consideration of that bill.

Mr. ROGERS. I hope the gentleman will let that come up afterwards. I did not object to its consideration.

Mr. MILLS. Let each stand on its own merits.

The SPEAKER. The Chair has withheld from the House, at the suggestion of members who desired to ask unanimous consent, several Senate bills, among them the one to which the gentleman from Maine refers. The Chair has sent for the bill.

Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill referred to by the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. Is the reading of the bill demanded?

Mr. ROGERS. I hope the reading will be dispensed with.

The reading of the bill was dispensed with.

The bill was considered, ordered to be read a third time; and was accordingly read the third time, and passed.

Mr. ROGERS moved to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed; and also moved that the motion to reconsider be laid on the table.

The latter motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. If there be no objection, the House bill No. 6563, upon the same subject, will be laid upon the table.

There was no objection, and it was so ordered.

LIGHT-HOUSE, ETC., FOX ISLAND, MAINE.

The SPEAKER also laid before the House the bill (S. 2506) for the establishment of a light-house, fog-signal, and day beacon in the vicinity of Goose Rocks, Fox Island Thoroughfare, Maine.

Mr. DINGLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of that bill.

The SPEAKER. The bill will be read, subject to objection.

The bill was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That there be established at or near Goose Rocks, at the entrance of Fox Island Thoroughfare, on the coast of Maine, a light-house and fog-signal, and that there be established at or near Channel Rock, in the vicinity of Goose Rocks, a day beacon, the cost of which shall not exceed the sum of \$35,000, including the cost of the sites, and said \$35,000, or so much thereof as may be necessary for said purposes, is hereby appropriated out of moneys in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated.

Mr. DINGLEY. I wish simply to state, in connection with this bill, that it has been unanimously reported by the Committee on Commerce of the House, with this exception, that in the House bill there is no appropriation, as appears in the present bill, and if unanimous consent is given for the consideration of the bill at this time, I will move to strike out the appropriation, so that it will be precisely the bill reported by the House committee, and also precisely in the form of the bill which was passed a few days ago for the establishment of a light-house on the Florida coast, on motion of the gentleman from Florida [Mr. DAVIDSON]. I will state that this is recommended by the Secretary of the Treasury and by the Light-House Board.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. CRISP. Before consent is given, as I do not see the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CLARDY] in his seat, who has charge specially of matters referring to light-houses, I would like to know whether this meets his approval?

Mr. DINGLEY. I consulted with the gentleman from Missouri, and he has given his consent to this application.

Mr. CRISP. Then I have no objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there further objection to the present consideration of the Senate bill?

There was no objection.

Mr. DINGLEY. I now move to strike out the appropriating clause in the bill.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will read that portion of the bill proposed to be stricken out.

The Clerk read as follows:

And said \$35,000, or so much thereof as may be necessary for said purposes, is hereby appropriated out of moneys in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated.

The motion to strike out was agreed to.

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

Mr. DINGLEY moved to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed; and also moved that the motion to reconsider be laid on the table.

The latter motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the House bill No. 1492, upon the same subject, will be laid upon the table.

There was no objection, and it was so ordered.

LIGHT-HOUSE AT NEWPORT NEWS, VIRGINIA.

The SPEAKER also laid before the House the bill (S. 1828) to provide for a light-house at Newport News, Middle Ground, Virginia; which was read a first and second time.

Mr. PHELAN. I ask for the present consideration of that bill.

The bill was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is hereby authorized and directed to cause a light-house to be constructed at Newport News, Middle Ground, Virginia; and \$50,000, or so much thereof as may be necessary, is hereby appropriated for this purpose from any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. CRISP. I believe that the chairman of the Committee on Commerce, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CLARDY], is now present. I desire to call his attention to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. PHELAN].

Mr. CLARDY. Is this a Senate bill?

The SPEAKER. It is.

Mr. CLARDY. It seems to carry an appropriation.

Mr. PHELAN. I am willing to have the appropriation stricken out.

Mr. CLARDY. I ask the gentleman further if the Senate bill conforms in every respect to the House bill.

Mr. PHELAN. It conforms to the House bill exactly, except that the House bill provided for an appropriation of \$35,000 and the Senate bill for an appropriation of \$50,000, but that being stricken out, there is no cause for objection.

The SPEAKER. If there be no objection, the amendment of the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. PHELAN] to strike out the appropriating clause will be agreed to.

Mr. CLARDY. I ask if there ought not to be an amendment prescribing the amount which this light-house will cost.

Mr. PHELAN. That can be settled by an appropriation hereafter. The Light-House Board calls for an appropriation of \$50,000. The House committee recommended an appropriation of \$35,000. The Sen-

ate bill calls for an appropriation of \$50,000. That can be settled in the future. I ask for the passage of the Senate bill.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the appropriating clause, which it is proposed to strike out.

The Clerk read as follows:

And \$50,000, or so much thereof as may be necessary, is hereby appropriated for this purpose from any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated.

The amendment offered by Mr. PHELAN to strike out the appropriating clause was agreed to.

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

Mr. PHELAN moved to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed; and also moved that the motion to reconsider be laid on the table.

The latter motion was agreed to.

The corresponding House bill (H. R. 1891) to provide for a light-house at Newport News, Middle Ground, Virginia, was laid on the table.

L. J. WORDEN.

The SPEAKER also laid before the House the bill (S. 1064) for the relief of L. J. Worden; which was read a first and second time.

Mr. FUNSTON. I desire to say that I introduced a bill like this in the House, which has been favorably reported. I also introduced a similar bill in the last Congress, and it was favorably reported. I ask unanimous consent that the Senate bill be now considered, and that the House bill be laid upon the table.

The SPEAKER. The Senate bill will be read.

The bill (S. 1064) was read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Postmaster-General be, and is hereby, authorized and directed to allow L. J. Worden, late postmaster at Lawrence, Kans., for expenditures made by said L. J. Worden for clerk-hire necessary for the proper transaction of the business of said post-office during the period from July 1, 1882, to June 30, 1883, the sum of \$825; and that a sum sufficient to pay said allowance is hereby appropriated out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. CRISP. I ask if that bill has been considered by the House committee?

Mr. FUNSTON. It was considered in the last Congress by the House committee and favorably reported. A similar bill was introduced in this House and has been favorably reported.

Mr. CRISP. In this Congress?

Mr. FUNSTON. Yes, sir.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There was no objection.

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

Mr. FUNSTON moved to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed; and also moved that the motion to reconsider be laid on the table.

The latter motion was agreed to.

The corresponding House bill (H. R. 2265) was laid on the table.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE.

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

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

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

ORDER OF BUSINESS.

Mr. MILLS. I now call for the regular order, and move to dispense with the morning hour for the call of committees for reports.

Mr. TOWNSHEND. I wish to call attention to the fact that the Nicaragua Government has asked this Government to permit one of their youths to be educated at the West Point Military Academy. A House bill giving that permission has been reported. A Senate bill for the same purpose has been received, and I ask that it be passed.

The SPEAKER. But the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MILLS] has called for the regular order.

Mr. TOWNSHEND. This is not a private request. It is a matter of international courtesy, and I hope the gentleman will yield long enough to allow that bill to be passed.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Texas has declined to withdraw his call for the regular order, and the Chair has no discretion. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Texas to dispense with the morning hour for the call of committees for reports.

The motion was agreed to, two-thirds voting in favor thereof.

Mr. MILLS. I ask unanimous consent that gentlemen having reports to make from committees may have leave to hand them to the Clerk for reference to the appropriate Calendars.

There was no objection.

The following reports were filed by being handed in at the Clerk's desk:

ALASKA SEAL FISHERIES.

Mr. DUNN, from the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, reported back favorably the following resolution; which was referred to

the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, and, with the accompanying report, ordered to be printed:

Resolved, That the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries be authorized and directed to fully and thoroughly investigate the fur-seal fisheries of Alaska, and all contracts or leases made by the Government with any persons or companies for the taking of fur seals or other fur-bearing animals in Alaska; the character, duration, and conditions of such contracts or leases; and whether and to what extent the same have been enforced and complied with or violated; the receipts therefrom, and the expenses incurred by the Government on account of any such contracts or leases; and to fully investigate and report upon the nature and extent of the rights and interests of the United States in the fur-seal and other fisheries in the Bering Sea, in Alaska; whether and to what extent the same have been violated, and by whom; and what, if any, legislation is necessary for the better protection and preservation of the same; that said committee be authorized to send for persons and papers, issue process, summon witnesses, administer oaths, etc., and to employ a clerk, stenographer, and messenger, whose compensation shall not exceed \$6 a day while so employed; and that all expenses of such investigation shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House.

DEFICIENCY IN EXPENSES OF COLLECTING CUSTOMS REVENUE.

Mr. BURNES, from the Committee on Appropriations, reported a bill (H. R. 9788) making an appropriation to supply a deficiency in the appropriation for expenses of collecting the revenue from customs for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1888, and for other purposes; which was read a first and second time, referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, and, with the accompanying report, ordered to be printed.

JOHN FARLOW.

Mr. PIDCOCK, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, reported back favorably the bill (S. 2014) granting a pension to John Farlow; which was referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the Private Calendar, and, with the accompanying report, ordered to be printed.

RACHAEL A. SINKINSON.

Mr. PIDCOCK also, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, reported back favorably the bill (S. 1101) granting a pension to Rachael A. Sinkinson; which was referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the Private Calendar, and, with the accompanying report, ordered to be printed.

SAMUEL NOBLE.

Mr. OATES, from the Committee on the Judiciary, reported back favorably the bill (S. 2202) for the relief of Samuel Noble; which was referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the Private Calendar, and, with the accompanying report, ordered to be printed.

SANDY HOOK SHIP-CHANNELS.

Mr. CATCHINGS, from the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, reported back resolution moved by Mr. SPINOLA April 30, 1888, with the following substitute therefor; which was referred to the House Calendar, and, with the accompanying report, ordered to be printed:

Resolved, That the Secretary of War be, and he is hereby, requested to transmit to the House of Representatives a detailed statement of the work being done in deepening the Sandy Hook ship-channels, giving the terms of the present contract, the facilities of the contractors for doing the work, the amount of material removed by the said contractors to date, and the estimated amount of material yet to be removed under the contract, and also at the present rate of progress what length of time will be required to exhaust the present appropriation of \$750,000, and why the work has not been pushed forward more rapidly.

ACADEMIC BUILDING AND GYMNASIUM, WEST POINT.

Mr. TOWNSHEND, from the Committee on Military Affairs, reported back the bill (H. R. 9409) for the erection of an academic building and gymnasium at West Point; which was referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, and, with the accompanying report, ordered to be printed.

PUBLIC BUILDING, WATERBURY, CONN.

Mr. SOWDEN, from the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds, reported back with amendments the bill (H. R. 7729) for the erection of a public building at Waterbury, Conn.; which was referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, and, with the accompanying report, ordered to be printed.

POLICE MATRONS, DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA.

Mr. ATKINSON, from the Committee on the District of Columbia, reported back favorably the bill (H. R. 8039) providing for the appointment of police matrons for the District of Columbia, defining their duties, and for other purposes; which was referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, and, with the accompanying report, ordered to be printed.

ACKNOWLEDGMENT OF DEEDS IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA.

Mr. RUSSELL, of Massachusetts, by unanimous consent, introduced a bill (H. R. 9804) to validate acknowledgment of deeds made before commissioners of the circuit courts of the United States or before any of the commissioners of the supreme court of the District of Columbia since the 16th of September, 1850; which was referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia, and ordered to be printed.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE.

A message from the Senate, by Mr. McCook, its Secretary, announced that the Senate had agreed to the amendments of the House to the bill

(S. 738) granting a pension to the guardian of Enos J. Searles, of Clermont County, Ohio.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed without amendment the joint resolution (H. Res. 56) authorizing the use and improvement of Castle Island, in Boston Harbor.

The message further announced that the Senate had disagreed to the amendments of the House to the bill (S. 2345) authorizing the construction of bridges across the Cape Fear River and the Northeast River in the State of North Carolina, asked a conference upon the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and had appointed as conferees on the part of the Senate Mr. RANSOM, Mr. VEST, and Mr. SAWYER.

The message further announced that the Senate had passed a bill (S. 1913) for the erection of a public building at Emporia, Kans.; in which the concurrence of the House was requested.

TARIFF.

Mr. MILLS. I move that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of bills raising revenue.

The motion was agreed to.

The House accordingly resolved itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, Mr. SPRINGER in the chair.

The CHAIRMAN. The House is now in Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the purpose of considering the bill the title of which the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

A bill (H. R. 9051) to reduce taxation and simplify the laws in relation to the collection of the revenue.

Mr. WILSON, of Minnesota. Mr. Chairman, the collection of taxes is one of the admitted functions of government; but how they should be collected, in what proportion imposed on different industries and individuals, and for what purposes are still vexed questions that nearly affect the interests of the people. No class is disposed to cavil at any tax or system of taxation merely intended to raise revenue for the support of the Government, honestly and economically administered; but it is claimed that this is the limit of the power, and certainly it is the measure of the duty of the Government in respect to taxation. It is claimed that the Government has no right to take from the people by taxation a sum more than commensurate with its needs, or to tax, directly or indirectly, A, B, and C for the purpose of enriching D. When a greater sum is raised by taxation than is demanded for governmental purposes, even though it is retained in the Treasury vaults, the people have a right to complain. Excessive or unnecessary taxation takes from the people what is theirs, and what they have a right to retain and use, and the unnecessary accumulation of money in the Treasury merely adds to the wrong, for it can only have the effect of appreciating the price or value of money and depreciating the price of every other species of property. To the masses of the people such a policy is especially unjust and oppressive. As has been said by an eminent writer on economics:

Federal taxes, both direct and indirect, with very few exceptions, are levied on commodities, fall on consumption, and must be paid by the consumer in the increased price of the things he consumes. Hence it follows that the burden of such taxes must be disproportionately heavier on the man who, from necessity, expends all or nearly all of his wages, salary, or other income, in mere living, than on him who expends one-half or one-third, or a smaller proportion of his income for like purposes, and lays up a surplus for increasing his resources. * * * Every dollar raised by the Government by taxation for any other purpose than to provide revenue for its most economical administration, constitutes, therefore, a heavier burden on the recipients of smaller incomes and wages than upon any other class of the community.

The taxes levied in the States are imposed on the property, every one paying in proportion to his wealth and ability. But tariff taxes often fall more heavily upon the necessities of the poor than upon the luxuries of the rich. The poor man's blankets or his wife's cloak or shawl pay a tariff five or ten times as high as the rich man's diamonds.

By overtaxation we have now in the Treasury more than \$100,000,000, and for a number of years we have had an unnecessary accumulation of the money of the people withdrawn from the circulating medium of the country. The amount of this drain on the country is not at once appreciated. David A. Wells, one of our best thinkers and writers on economics, in an article published in the Princeton Review a few years ago, said:

Recent investigations have shown that, accepting the highest reasonable estimate that can be made of the value of the annual product of the nation, and supposing the same to be equally divided among our present population, the average income of each person, out of which subsistence, savings, education, means of enjoyment, reparation of waste, and taxes are to be provided, would not be in excess of 50, probably not over 40, cents per day. But, as a practical matter, we know that the annual product is not divided equally, and never can be, and some receive the annual average as stated multiplied by hundreds and thousands, which of course necessitates that very many others shall receive proportionately less.

When, now, it is further considered that the present aggregate of Federal, State, and municipal taxation in the United States probably amounts to 7 per cent. on the value of the entire annual product of the country, and that the unnecessary taxation of \$100,000,000 which the Federal Government now collects from the people is equal to 15 or 20 per cent. of what the whole people annually save from the product of their labors (taking no account of the additional burden which the imposition of such taxation entails through increased prices, taxation which the people pay, but which the Government does not receive), it is possible to form some idea of how a fiscal policy of large taxation, which so many politicians and so-called statesmen advocate as in the interest of the

masses, fearfully trenches on the narrow measure of comfort which the masses under the most favorable circumstances can obtain.

Such taxes—

Says Mr. Atkinson, alluding to the fact before noticed that the Federal taxes fall on commodities—

take from the many what they may actually need for a bare subsistence. They must fall with the greatest hardship on those whose earnings for their families are less, on the average, than a dollar a day to each adult man and woman; and while our present excess of national taxation may be equal to only 15 per cent. of the possible savings of the whole people, they may take 100 per cent.—even the little all—of what the poor man may save.

In addition to the direct injury to the general business of the country and to the individual citizen such an accumulation in the Treasury is demoralizing in the extreme. It is an incentive to the multiplication of offices, the increase of salaries, and to extravagance, if not corrupt, expenditures generally. It can not be necessary to enlarge on the wrong of overtaxation or the evils of such a surplus. All will, at least, in theory, admit them. The President has at different times called the attention of Congress to the situation and its dangers.

The questions therefore arise, What is the remedy? Why is it not applied?

To answer these questions it is necessary to take a brief retrospect of our system of Federal taxation, and to look at the reasons why it was adopted and why and by what means retained.

At the breaking out of the war of the rebellion, the "Morrill tariff bill," so called, was enacted, which was an increase of the then existing tariff. Even that increase was not demanded by the manufacturers, as was declared by their friends on the floor of Congress, and there is certainly no reason to suppose that the manufacturers asked for a higher tariff than that of the Morrill bill, in 1861.

But during the war very heavy internal taxes having been imposed on nearly every class of business, the import taxes were accordingly raised. This was a simple act of justice to our manufacturers, for it would otherwise have been impossible for them to bear the burdens of our high internal-revenue taxes and compete with outside untaxed competitors. The tariff on imports was therefore raised, but with the distinct understanding expressed by the advocates of the tariff and the friends of the manufacturers on the floor of Congress, that the measure should be only temporary as an offset to the internal taxes. The several bills increasing the tariff were passed with this distinct understanding. Mr. MORRILL, in a speech introducing one of the bills, used this language:

It will be indispensable for us to revise the tariff on foreign imports so far as it may be seriously disturbed by any internal duties, and to make proper reparation. * * * If we bleed manufacturers, we must see to it that the proper tonic is administered at the same time.

And Mr. Stevens said:

We intended to impose an additional duty on imports equal to the tax which had been put on the domestic article. It was done by way of compensation to domestic manufacturers against foreign importers.

These gentlemen had charge of the bills and were, as it is well known, leading protectionists.

The three revenue acts of June, 1864—practically one measure—were the greatest measure of taxation the world had ever seen. The first provided for an enormous extension of the internal-tax system; the second for a corresponding increase in duties on imports; and the third authorized a loan of \$400,000,000. The first two were understood to be and advocated as companion acts, one the complement of the other—the first made necessary by the second, and only to exist while the second existed.

When the war was terminated, its floating debt paid, and the then exciting questions of reconstruction disposed of, the attention of Congress was naturally called to the reduction of taxation. Then common fairness and the previous solemn understanding obviously required that in proportion as the internal taxes were abated the tariff on imports, imposed during the war and as a war measure, should also be abated. Mr. MORRILL, who, as I have said, was an extreme protectionist and the author of the tariff bills, said in 1870:

For revenue purposes, and not solely for protection, 50 per cent. in many instances has been added to the tariff (during the war) to enable our home trade to bear the new but indispensable burdens of internal taxation. Already we have relinquished most of such taxes. So far, then, as protection is concerned, * * * we may safely remit the percentage of tariff on a considerable part of our foreign importations. * * * It is a mistake of the friends of a sound tariff to insist upon the extreme rates imposed during the war if less will raise the necessary revenue. * * * Whatever percentage of duties was imposed on our foreign goods to cover internal taxation on home manufactures could not now be claimed as lawful prize of protection when such taxes have been repealed. There is no longer an equivalent.

In the year 1870, and prior years, it was estimated that an annual reduction had been made in internal-revenue taxes as follows:

| | |
|---------------------|--------------|
| By act of 1866..... | \$55,000,000 |
| By act of 1867..... | 40,000,000 |
| By act of 1868..... | 23,000,000 |
| By act of 1869..... | 45,000,000 |
| By act of 1870..... | 55,000,000 |

So far as they affected the manufacturers the internal-revenue taxes were wiped out. The people had, therefore, a right to demand that the promised reductions should be made in the taxation on imports. But during the war and the years following the protectionists had seen

many fortunes made—I should rather say acquired—in a few years, and they thought this their opportunity. And our princely masters—for, disguise it as we may, they have dominated us for years—insisted on retaining, and do still substantially retain, what was conceded to them by the patriotism of the people as a war measure, on the express understanding that when the pressure of internal taxes should cease the pressure of their exactions should also cease.

The good old rule
Sufficeth them, the simple plan,
That they should take who have the power,
And they should keep who can.

It is difficult to consider this subject with equanimity. But perhaps we should not be too severe in our condemnation of the course of these monopolists, for when has ever any class of people willingly surrendered such an advantage? It is hardly to be expected that a few favored classes should, without a struggle, consent to the surrender of their power to levy tribute upon the people. Self-interest obscures the moral sense of all men. These lines of Scotland's great poet are almost as true as the precepts of Holy Writ:

But, och! mankind is unco weak,
And little to be trusted,
If self the wavering balance shake
It's rarely right adjusted.

For the last few years the contest has been going on, and growing hotter and hotter, between the monopolists on one side, fighting like feudal lords of the middle ages for the right to compel the masses of the people to contribute to their magnificence, and, on the other side, the people, in almost an unorganized condition, resisting the injustice and oppression. The contest is an instructive one; humiliating to the people in some respects, it is true, because at the bidding of party hacks they have permitted themselves to be overborne by a handful of capitalists; but nevertheless its lessons, if carefully read and pondered, can not be without advantage.

Though the internal taxes had been so largely reduced, the annual receipts of the Government had become greater than its needs, with a certainty that the surplus would increase annually. There was, therefore, a necessity for a reduction of taxes. One class or party in Congress insisted that the reduction should be made so as to lessen the taxes on the necessities of the people, according to the understanding when the tariff was increased, while the other side insisted that the reduction should be so made as to lessen or abate the taxes on the property of the wealthy class and on those articles the tax on which bore heavily on no one. The latter class succeeded.

So, that the very truth may appear, I refer to the record.

In 1870, a bill being before the House to regulate internal taxes and for other purposes, Mr. HOLMAN moved an amendment imposing—

a tax of 10 per cent. per annum on the interest and income accruing from all bonds, notes, and other securities of the United States, the same to be deducted and withheld from such interest at the time of payment thereof by the Treasurer of the United States—

Which was disagreed to—yeas 46, nays 135; of the yeas all were Democrats but 3; of the nays all were Republicans but 5.

Mr. BECK moved to—

amend by levying a tax of 5 per cent. on the interest or coupons of all bonds or evidences of debt, including United States bonds.

Which was disagreed to—yeas 78, nays 111. Of the yeas all were Democrats but 26; of the nays all were Republicans but 2.

This bill being in the Senate in the same year, Mr. Bayard moved to amend by adding the following words:

That hereafter there shall be annually deducted and withheld by the Treasurer of the United States 5 per cent. of all moneys payable as interest upon the public debt of the United States, the same being hereby imposed as a tax upon the property represented by the bonds heretofore issued under the laws of the United States.

Which was disagreed to—yeas 12, nays 36. Of the yeas 8 were Democrats and 4 Republicans; of the nays all were Republicans.

Mr. Thurman moved to amend by adding the following words:

That there shall be levied and collected in the manner hereinafter specified a tax of 5 per cent. upon the income of every person residing in the United States, and of every citizen of the United States residing abroad, derived from interest on the bonds of the United States, said tax to be collected by withholding the same in the payment of such interest.

Which was disagreed to—yeas 11, nays 35. Of the yeas all were Democrats but 3; of the nays all were Republicans.

At the first session of the Forty-seventh Congress (1882) a bill was pending, the first section of which was in the following words:

Be it enacted, etc., That on and after the passage of this act, except as herein provided, the taxes hereinafter specified, imposed by internal-revenue laws now in force, be, and the same are hereby, repealed, namely: The stamp tax on bank-checks, drafts, orders, and vouchers; the tax on the capital and deposits of banks and bankers, under section 3408 of the Revised Statutes of the United States, as amended; the tax of capital and deposits of national-banks, under section 5214 of the Revised Statutes; * * * the tax on matches, perfumery, medicinal preparations, other articles, imposed by Schedule A, following section 3437, of said Revised Statutes.

On the passage of that bill there were yeas 127, nays 80; of the yeas all were Republicans but 23, of the nays all were Democrats but 16, and of those 16 four were Independents.

When this bill reached the Senate Mr. GEORGE moved to limit the repeal of the stamp tax to checks, etc., under \$100 in amount; which

was disagreed to—yeas 19, nays 39; of the yeas all were Democrats, of the nays all were Republicans but 7, two of whom were Independents.

Mr. GEORGE then moved to strike from the bill that part which relieved from tax the capital and deposits of banks and bankers, and which repealed the stamp tax on bank checks, drafts, orders, and vouchers; which was disagreed to—yeas 15, nays 41; the yeas were all Democrats; the nays all Republicans but 8; one of the 8 was an Independent.

Mr. BECK then moved to strike from the bill that clause which took the tax off perfumery, medicinal preparations, and other articles. ("Other articles" here included pills, powders, tinctures, troches, lozenges, sirups, cordials, bitters, anodynes, tonics, plasters, liniments, salves, ointments, waters, essences, spirits, oils, or other medicinal preparations; in fine, it included all that class of medicines.) On this amendment of Mr. BECK there were—yeas 26, nays 29; the yeas were all Democrats, the nays all Republicans but 2, and they were Independents.

Mr. VANCE then moved to amend as follows:

Except playing-cards, after the words "Schedule A," so as to retain the stamp tax on playing-cards.

Which was disagreed to—yeas 28, nays 28; of the yeas all were Democrats; the nays were all Republicans but 1, and he an Independent.

Up until 1883, when on many articles a considerable reduction was made, the war taxes had remained, with slight modification, on all necessities of the people. In that year complaints of the people became too loud to be ignored. Hence, some tariff legislation became absolutely necessary, and I beg leave to call attention to the record of the struggle that followed.

A bill pending in the Senate in that year, fixing the rate of duties on certain articles, contained the following clause:

All other earthen, stone, and crockery ware, white-glazed, branded, painted, and dipped or cream-colored, composed of earthy or mineral substances not specially enumerated or provided for in this act, 50 per cent. ad valorem.

Mr. VANCE moved to substitute 25 per cent. for 50 per cent., which was rejected—yeas 20, nays 27; the yeas were all Democrats but 1, the nays all Republicans but 3, one of the 3 being a Liberal.

Mr. BECK thereupon moved to substitute 40 per cent., which was rejected—yeas 17, nays 23; the yeas being all Democrats, the nays all Republicans but 2, one of whom was a Liberal.

Mr. VANCE moved thereupon to substitute 45 per cent., which was rejected—yeas 20, nays 28; the yeas being all Democrats, nays all Republicans but 4, one of whom was a Liberal.

Pending the following clause of the same bill—

Porcelain and Bohemian glass, painted glassware, stained glass, and all other manufactures of glass, or of which glass shall be a component material of chief value, not specially enumerated or provided for in this act, 45 per cent. ad valorem—

Mr. BECK moved to amend so as to reduce the duty to 40 per cent. ad valorem, which was rejected—yeas 16, nays 25; the yeas being all Democrats but 1, the nays all Republicans but 3, one of whom was a Liberal.

Pending the same bill Mr. INGALLS moved to strike out the clause imposing a tariff on lumber, laths, shingles, clapboards, etc., the object being to place these on the free-list, which was agreed to—yeas 25, nays 23. The yeas were all Democrats but 5, one of whom was a Liberal, and the nays were all Republicans but 1. This amendment was subsequently defeated by the Republicans.

Pending the following clause of the same bill—

Bar-iron, rolled or hammered, comprising flats less than 1 inch wide and not less than three-eighths of an inch thick, nine-tenths of a cent per pound; comprising round iron not less than three-fourths of an inch in diameter, and square iron, not less than three-fourths of an inch square, 1 cent per pound; comprising flats less than 1 inch wide or less than three-eighths of 1 inch, round iron less than three-fourths of an inch and not less than seven-sixteenths of an inch in diameter, and square iron less than three-fourths of an inch square, 1.2 cents per pound—

Mr. BECK moved to amend by making—

Bar-iron, rolled or hammered, comprising flats not less than an inch wide nor less than three-eighths of an inch thick, and round iron not less than three-fourths of an inch in diameter, and square iron not less than three-fourths of an inch square, seven-tenths of a cent per pound; comprising flats less than 1 inch wide or less than three-eighths of an inch thick; round iron less than three-fourths of an inch and not less than seven-sixteenths of an inch in diameter; and square iron not less than three-fourths of an inch square, eight-tenths of 1 cent per pound.

Which was rejected—yeas 25, nays 33; the yeas were all Democrats, the nays all Republicans but 4, two of whom were Liberals.

In the same bill was the following clause:

Iron or steel T-rails weighing not over 25 pounds to the yard, and iron or steel flat rails punched, nine-tenths of 1 cent per pound.

Pending which Mr. Bayard moved to make the rate seven-tenths of 1 cent per pound, which was rejected—yeas 24, nays 26. Of the yeas all were Democrats but 1; of the nays all were Republicans but 2.

In the same bill, pending a clause taxing boiler or other plate iron 1.3 cents per pound, Mr. BECK moved to reduce the tax to 1½ cent per pound, which was agreed to—yeas 28, nays 25. Of the yeas all were Democrats but 3, one of whom was a Liberal; of the nays all were Republicans but 1, and he a Liberal.

In the same bill, pending the following clause—

Wrought iron or steel spikes, nuts, and washers, and horse, mule, or ox shoes, 2 cents per pound—

Mr. VANCE moved to reduce the rate to 1½ cents, which was rejected—yeas 23, nays 25; the yeas were all Democrats, the nays all Republicans.

Pending this clause—

Iron or steel blacksmiths' hammers and sledges, track-tools, wedges, and crow-bars, 2½ cents per pound—

Mr. VANCE moved to reduce the rate to 2 cents, which was rejected—yeas 18, nays 21. The yeas were all Democrats, the nays all Republicans but 1, and he an Independent.

Pending this clause—

Horseshoe nails, hob nails, and wire nails, and all other wrought-iron or steel nails, not specially enumerated or provided for in this act, 4 cents per pound—

Mr. COKE moved to reduce the rate to 2½ cents, which was rejected—yeas 22, nays 23; the yeas all Democrats, the nays all Republicans.

Pending this clause—

Hand, back, and all other saws, not specially enumerated or provided for in this act, 40 per cent. ad valorem—

Mr. COKE moved to make the rate 20 per cent., which was rejected—yeas 21, nays 27; yeas all Democrats, nays all Republicans.

Pending this clause—

That on all kinds of iron or steel articles or manufactures of iron or steel heretofore in this act enumerated, when galvanized or coated with any metal or compound, alloy, or mixture of metals, by any process whatever, there shall be paid one-half cent per pound in addition to the rates provided in this act—

Mr. SAULSBURY moved to amend by inserting after the word "enumerated" the words—

Except wire used for fencing only between sizes 8 and 13—

Which was not agreed to—yeas 27, nays 27; yeas being all Democrats but 1, the nays all Republicans but 2, and they were Liberals. It will be seen that the scope and effect of this amendment, if adopted, was to except fence-wire from the additional burden imposed by this act.

Pending this clause—

Hollow-ware, coated, glazed, or tinned, 3 cents per pound—

Mr. VANCE moved to make the rate 2½ cents, which was rejected—yeas 19, nays 22; the yeas all Democrats but 2, one of whom was a Liberal; nays all Republicans.

Pending this clause—

Potato or corn starch, 1 cent per pound; rice starch, 2½ cents per pound; other starch, 2½ cents per pound—

Mr. HALE moved to make the first-named rate 2 cents, which was agreed to—yeas 23, nays 24; the yeas all Republicans but 2, and they were Liberals; the nays all Democrats.

Pending this clause—

Cotton thread, yarn warps or warped yarn, whether single or advanced beyond the condition of single by twisting two or more single yarns together, whether in beams or in bundles, skeins, or cops, or any other form, value not exceeding 25 cents, 10 cents per pound; valued at over 25 cents and not exceeding 40 cents per pound, 16 cents per pound; valued at over 40 cents per pound and not exceeding 50 cents per pound, 22 cents per pound; valued at over 50 cents per pound and not exceeding 60 cents per pound, 27 cents per pound; valued at over 60 cents per pound and not exceeding 70 cents per pound, 35 cents per pound; valued at over 70 cents per pound and not exceeding 80 cents per pound, 40 cents per pound; valued at over 80 cents per pound and not exceeding \$1 per pound, 50 cents per pound; valued at over a dollar per pound, 50 per cent. ad valorem—

Mr. HARRIS moved to place upon all the classifications one uniform rate of 30 per cent. ad valorem, which was rejected—yeas 23, nays 30; yeas all Democrats but 2, nays all Republicans but 2.

Mr. HARRIS then moved to make a uniform rate of 35 per cent. ad valorem, which was rejected—yeas 24, nays 25; yeas all Democrats but 1, nays all Republicans but 2, one of whom was a Liberal.

Mr. HARRIS then moved to make a uniform rate of 40 per cent. ad valorem, which was rejected—yeas 25, nays 26; yeas all Democrats but 2, nays all Republicans.

Mr. BECK then moved to change the rate first named from 10 cents to 7½ cents per pound, which was rejected—yeas 25, nays 26; the yeas all Democrats, nays all Republicans but 1, and he a Liberal.

Pending this clause—

On stockings, hose, half-hose, shirts, and drawers, fashioned, narrowed, or shaped wholly or in part by knitting machines or frames, or knit by hand, and composed wholly of cotton, 45 per cent. ad valorem—

Mr. BECK moved to make the rate 35 per cent. ad valorem, which was rejected—yeas 27, nays 27; yeas all Democrats but 1, and he a Liberal; nays all Republicans but 1.

Mr. BECK then moved to make it 40 per cent. ad valorem, which was agreed to—yeas 31, nays 24; the yeas were all Democrats but 4, one of whom was a Liberal; nays all Republicans.

Pending this clause—

Spool thread of cotton, 7 cents per dozen spools containing on each spool not exceeding 100 yards of thread; exceeding 100 yards on each spool, for every additional 100 yards of thread or fractional part thereof in excess of 100 yards, 7 cents a dozen—

Mr. BECK moved to strike out "7" where it occurs and insert "6," which was rejected—yeas 26, nays 28; the yeas being all Democrats but 2; the nays were all Republicans but 2.

Pending this clause—

And like manufactures of jute or jute butts (materials used for cotton bales, sacks, and bags), or in which jute or jute butts shall be component material of chief value, 20 per cent. ad valorem—

(The effect of this amendment was to reduce the tariff on this article from 35 to 20 per cent.)

This was agreed to—yeas 25, nays 18; the yeas were all Democrats but 5, one of whom was a Liberal; the nays were all Republicans.

Pending this clause—

Women's and children's dress goods, coats, linens, Italian goods, and goods of like description now or heretofore known as worsted stuffs, the warp of which was made wholly of cotton, linen, ramie, china grass, or other vegetable materials, or of a combination of them, and the woof of which is made wholly or in part of wool, worsted, or hair of the alpaca, goat, or other like animal, valued at not exceeding 20 cents per square yard, 5 cents per square yard, and in addition thereto 35 per cent. ad valorem; valued at above 20 cents per square yard, 7 cents per square yard, and in addition thereto 40 per cent. ad valorem—

Mr. VANCE moved to strike from the clause all after the word "animal" and insert in lieu thereof the words "fifty per cent. ad valorem." (It will be observed this would have been a considerable reduction.)

This was rejected—yeas 26, nays 27. Of the yeas all were Democrats, the nays all Republicans but 1, who was a Liberal.

Pending this clause—

Precious stones of all kinds, 10 per cent. ad valorem—

Mr. VANCE moved to make the clause read—

Diamonds, cut or uncut, and precious stones of all kinds, 25 per cent. ad valorem.

Which was agreed to—yeas 21, nays 18. Of the yeas all were Democrats but 3, nays all Republicans.

Pending this clause—

Free-list—

Mr. HAWLEY moved to strike therefrom "garden seeds" (so as to make garden seeds subject to tariff); which was rejected—yeas 25, nays 32. The yeas were all Republicans but 1 Liberal, nays all Democrats but 5, one of them a Liberal.

Pending this clause—

Salt in bags, sacks, barrels, or other packages, 10 cents per 100 pounds; in bulk, 6 cents per 100 pounds—

Mr. VANCE moved to strike out, with the view to put salt on the free-list; which was rejected—yeas 22, nays 24; the yeas all Democrats but 2, nays all Republicans but 2.

These references sufficiently illustrate the position and policy of the parties. Some of the votes above referred to would seem to show that those in favor of tariff reduction had succeeded on certain propositions, but in nearly all, I believe in all, such cases on a subsequent vote they were overruled. These facts and figures should be carefully considered. With a heavy tax on the tools and machinery of the mechanic, the implements of the farmer, and the clothing of all classes, from the swaddling-cloth to the shroud, and on nearly every article that is a part of the common needs of the people, a tax varying from 25 to 100 per cent., and in many instances heavier on the necessities of the poor than on the luxuries of the rich; with a constant augmentation of the surplus in the Treasury, increasing the value of money and decreasing the value of all other property; with the wealth of the country accumulating in an unprecedented degree in the hands of a few favored classes; and with the burden of taxation pressing heavily on the laboring and producing classes, we had this singular spectacle—the leaders of a great party of the country, backed and impelled by the money power and the monopolists (generally the same persons), struggling contrary to a solemn understanding to retain the war taxes on the necessities of the people and to remove all taxes from the property and luxuries of the wealthy.

The people asked for bread, and they were given a stone; for a fish, and they were given a serpent. They asked to have the taxes, heavy beyond precedent in any other country in the world, lessened on the things that are necessary, not only to their comfort but to their very existence, and the answer to their prayer was the removal of the taxes from bank deposits, bank stock, incomes from United States bonds, playing-cards, perfumery, cosmetics, and many other such articles.

I do not argue that because an act was passed or defeated while either party had a numerical majority in Congress therefore that party is necessarily responsible wholly or at all for the act or its defeat. No party, either political or religious, can fairly be held blamable for the vote or act of every individual who calls himself by its name. Self-interest or lack of principle will always affect the conduct of a few.

But all the legislation to which I have above referred was enacted while the Republican party was in power in every branch of the Government, and these measures were carried by a majority of its members, approximating to unanimity. They, therefore, must be admitted to have been Republican measures. On that proposition the record leaves no ground for discussion.

I now wish to refer to two other measures originating in the House while the Democrats were in the majority in that body. I refer to the Morrison tariff bills, so called, of 1884 and 1886, respectively.

In 1884 Mr. Morrison introduced a bill to reduce import duties and war-tariff taxes, by the provisions of which the tariff was reduced 20 per cent. on manufactures of wool, metal, sugar, earthenware, glass-ware, and certain other articles, it being expressly provided that nothing in the act should operate to reduce the duty so imposed on any article below the rate at which said article was dutiable under the Morrill tariff of 1861, to which I have above referred. This Morrison

bill of 1884 placed on the free-list coal, timber, shingles, laths, and lumber. The Committee of the Whole voted to strike out the enacting clause—156 yeas to 151 noes, in which the House concurred by a vote of 159 yeas to 155 noes. This killed the bill. This was done without offering even a single amendment. In other words, it was a refusal to even consider the question of a reduction of the tariff. Of the 159 yeas there were 41 Democrats and 118 Republicans, and of the 155 noes there were 151 Democrats and 4 Republicans.

In 1886 Mr. Morrison again, from the Committee on Ways and Means, reported a bill to reduce the tariff. By its provisions the tariff was reduced on woolen and cotton goods, on glass, manufactures of metal, and other articles of prime necessity. Timber, lumber, laths, shingles, wool, flax, hemp, jute butts, and other articles of necessity were put on the free-list. On a motion to consider this bill there were 140 yeas, 157 noes. Of the affirmative vote, 135 were Democrats, 1 Greenback Democrat, and 4 Republicans. Of the negative vote, 121 were Republicans, 1 Greenback Republican, and 35 Democrats. So the House refused even to consider the subject of the reduction of the tariff.

I wish here, Mr. Chairman, to emphasize these facts: (1) That in the Morrison bill of 1884 it was expressly provided that nothing in that act should operate to reduce the duty imposed thereby on any article below the rate at which said article was dutiable under the Morrill tariff bill of 1861; (2) that when the duty was raised above that in the Morrill bill of 1861 it was with the distinct understanding that the increase should only be retained so long as the internal-revenue taxes imposed on the protective industries should be retained; (3) that long before the Morrison bill of 1884 was introduced the internal-revenue taxes affecting the protected industries had been removed; and (4) that notwithstanding these facts, the protectionists, including all the Republicans in the House but four, refused to even consider the question of reducing the tariff.

I would not be justified in spending time to further refer to the position of the parties on this question. If anything can be established beyond the possibility of a doubt, it is this: That the Republicans in Congress of late years have, with almost unanimity, been opposed to even considering the question of a reduction of the tariff on necessities of the people and in favor of reducing or abating the tax on the wealth and luxuries of the rich, and the record shows with equal clearness that the Democrats in Congress, with the exception of certain ones residing in districts where manufacturers and monopolists are powerful, have been opposed to taking the tariff from the luxuries and wealth of the country and in favor of reducing it on the necessities of the people.

It is here proper to inquire more particularly what protection is and what are now the demands of the protectionists. The demands of the protectionists are not what they were in the days of Henry Clay, nor, as I have shown, what they were at the commencement of the late war. Their demands are each year greater. On this question I will first let one of the most prominent Republicans and at the same time one of the ablest men of our country, the late Emory A. Storrs, speak. In 1870 he delivered a speech before a meeting of farmers at Springfield, Ill., which I send to the Clerk's desk to be read.

The Clerk read as follows:

A surplus so gigantic demonstrates, better than any argument could possibly do, that taxation is unnecessarily high. Still there stands, in a time of profound peace, an enormous tariff, the effect of which is felt in every department of business, and the maintenance of which enhances the cost of living to every man in the land. Why should that tariff be continued? The fact of the surplus demonstrates that it is not necessary for the support of the Government, and so those who are interested in maintaining it are compelled to place their demands upon what they call the "protection of American industry."

I will inquire precisely what is meant by protecting American industry? Against what or against whom is American industry to be protected? Who attacks or proposes to attack American industry? How is the attack made? Is American industry so feeble that it can not, without assistance from the Government, protect itself? These are all vital questions. If no one is attacking American industry, it needs no protection. The forms of American industry are wonderfully diversified. The great body of the farmers of the country constitute a large element of what may be called American industry, and I know of no attack upon them so serious in its character as that made by the tariff; and if the farmers need protection against anything it is against protection. There are thousands of printers in the country; who attacks or proposes to attack them? No one, except it be the tariff, which enhances the cost of material with which their industry is carried on, of the clothes which they wear, of the coal which they burn, of the lumber with which their homes are built, of the salt which they consume, and of the books which they read. There are thousands of shipbuilders in the country; who attacks them and their interests, and from what enemy do they need to be protected? The deserted ship-yards of the East answer this question—they need to be protected against protection, and that is all the protection they need. The thousands and hundreds of thousands of carpenters and joiners, boot and shoemakers, blacksmiths, and the daily toilers with their hands, upon the land or upon the sea, are threatened with an attack against which, for their own protection, the intervention of the Government is necessary.

I apprehend that should the Government levy a direct tax upon all the property of the country, to be paid over directly to iron manufacturers, so that they might be enabled to hold their own against the competition of the foreign manufacturers, but few would be found who would justify such an exercise of the power of taxation. When reduced to its exact practical operations, the protection of American industry, so called, is simply the forcible taking from the consumer of a portion of his earnings and handing it over to the manufacturer. The proposition to the consumer is simply this: We, the Government, will take from you 16 or 15 or 20 per cent. of your earnings and give it to the manufacturer, and he will spend it so much more judiciously than you would; that ultimately and in the process of time it will in some curious and circuitous manner which we have not the time to explain now redound more greatly to your advantage than it would had you spent it yourself and for yourself.

Mr. WILSON, of Minnesota. These words are not less appropriate and truthful now than they were then.

The tariff on many of the necessities of the people is double what it was before the imposition of the war tax, and while the duty paid at the custom-houses on importations is the measure of the sum collected by the Government, it is not the measure of the sum paid by the people. This will be apparent when it is considered that the foreign manufacturer can not afford to sell his goods in our market at less than their value plus the duty paid to the Government, nor can he sell at a price higher than that at which our goods of home manufacture of a like kind are sold. If he pays 25 or 50 per cent. tariff on his goods he of course must add that sum to the price, and it is borne by the consumer. So, if domestic goods are raised to the price of the foreign, as they must be or no foreign goods would be imported or sold, the sum of the increase is likewise paid by the consumer. The effect of the tariff is, therefore, to raise the price of both, and to put into the Treasury of the United States the sum of the increase on the imported goods, and into the treasury of the protectionists the sum of the increase on the domestic goods.

The imports of dutiable goods into this country for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1887, were \$460,000,000, on which the duty collected was \$218,000,000, being an average tax of over 47 per cent. While it is impossible to state with accuracy the value of domestic manufactures raised in price by the tariff, it is estimated that it very much exceeds the amount of imported goods. These facts considered, it is not a matter of wonderment that fortunes in such numbers and with such rapidity are of late years amassed by the favored classes, nor that the agriculturists and producing classes are not prosperous. All these things are the inexorable logic, the necessary consequence of our unprecedentedly high protective tariff.

Even the promise of the protectionist, that by competition among themselves prices should be reduced, has proved delusive, as is shown by the following lists of trusts or combinations to keep up prices, with the per cent. of tariff duty protecting each:

| Name of trust. | Protected by duties averaging— Per cent. | Name of trust. | Protected by duties averaging— Per cent. |
|---------------------------|---|------------------------|---|
| Salt trust..... | 50 | Tin trust..... | 32 |
| Earthenware trust..... | 56 | Lead trust..... | 74 |
| Bessemer-steel trust..... | 84 | Glass trust..... | 55 |
| Plow-steel trust..... | 45 | Soap trust..... | 26 |
| General steel trust..... | 45 | Linseed-oil trust..... | 54 |
| Nail trust..... | 45 | Rubber-shoe trust..... | 25 |
| General iron trust..... | 45 | Envelope trust..... | 25 |
| Copper trust..... | 24 | Paper-bag trust..... | 35 |
| Zinc trust..... | 52 | Cordage trust..... | 25 |

The unreasonableness of the demands of the protectionists is more clearly seen by reference to the percentage of people for whose benefit it is insisted the Government shall levy tribute on the whole. The following table, prepared by David A. Wells from the census of 1880, furnishes a good illustration:

Tables and estimates deduced from the census of 1880 will afford approximately correct data for estimating the method in which the burden of the taxation imposed to maintain the protective tariff policy of the United States distributes itself among population, occupations, and professions:

OCCUPATIONS OF THE PEOPLE OF THE UNITED STATES IN 1880.

| | |
|---|-------------------|
| Agriculture..... | 7,670,493 |
| Professional and personal service..... | 4,074,238 |
| Trade and transportation..... | 1,810,256 |
| Manufacturing, mechanical, and mining industries..... | 3,837,112 |
| Total..... | 17,392,099 |
| Proportion engaged in agriculture who may possibly be subjected to foreign competition in some manner—mainly the growers of sugar and of rice, and of wool possibly to a very small extent, about 5 per cent. or..... | 400,000 |
| Proportion engaged in manufacturing, mechanical, and mining industries, who can be in part but not wholly subjected to foreign competition—large estimate based on calculation..... | 837,112 |
| Total..... | 1,237,112 |
| Proportion that are heavily taxed and placed at a disadvantage in agriculture, manufactures, mechanical pursuits, and in mining by the protective system..... | 16,154,989 |
| Proportion in whose favor the protective system is invoked, but whose wages are not lower than in other employment..... | 1,237,112 |

It will be seen that it is proposed to heavily tax 16,154,112 of our population for, as it is claimed, the benefit of 1,237,112, but in fact for the benefit of a handful of wealthy manufacturers. In the face of these facts, the cry of "free-trader" will not silence protest nor satisfy the masses of the people who bear the burden. It is not epithets, but arguments and reason that are demanded in such a case.

The assertion that those who demand a reduction of taxation wish to destroy the industries of the country will not be accepted as true without evidence, nor will the pretense that the tariff is for the benefit of labor deceive any one in view of the known fact that laborers in protected industries do not fare better than in other branches. The advo-

cates of tariff reform would neither embarrass the industries of the country nor reduce the rewards of labor. What they complain of is that the protectionists are appropriating much that properly belongs to labor; that they are limiting the income and field of labor, and levying an unreasonably high tribute on the people of the country, especially on the agriculturists and other industrial classes without any equivalent.

All of our wealth is the product of capital and labor, and when capital appropriates too much it follows, of course, that labor receives too little. When the capitalist in a few years accumulates a fortune as his share of the profits, while the laborer is enabled merely to make a living, the inequality and injustice are self-evident; and when a few favored classes secure such legislation as compels the people to contribute to their wealth, the burden is on them to show some benefit to the public to offset the essential injustice of taxing one class or person for the benefit of another.

In answer to these objections we are met with the stereotyped exclamation, "Our laborers must be protected against the pauper labor of Europe." That is now, apparently with one consent, accepted as the most taking argument, as they are pleased to style it.

Some years ago the claim was that protection would only be needed to aid our "infant industries." But as these industries have grown older and stronger and richer their demands have grown greater. Now they appear in the rôle of patriots and public benefactors. They propose to contribute largely of other people's money to aid, as they pretend, our laborers in their competition with the "pauper labor of Europe and Asia."

A few weeks ago, in a speech delivered in Congress, a leading protectionist stated their argument as follows:

He who strikes down the protection the laboring man enjoys against the cheap labor of Europe and Asia strikes at the prosperity, happiness, intelligence, and independence of the masses of the American people, and therefore at the prosperity of the country and the existence of republican institutions.

He then went on to state what the senior Senator from Maine had learned during the past summer about wages in Italy, Belgium, Germany, England, and other countries. He added, referring to the Senator from Maine—

He says: "Of the countries I visited the wages of Switzerland and Italy were the lowest, Germany next, then Belgium, then France, while those of England were highest."

Warning up with the subject, he triumphantly exclaimed:

If the labor of the country can not stand the competition of the Chinese upon the Pacific coast and a few thousand imported Italian laborers upon the Atlantic coast, how could it stand the competition of 404,000,000 of Chinamen, 40,000,000 of Japanese, of 60,000,000 of the population of India, and the pauper millions of Europe under a free-trade policy? There was never a greater fallacy than the one being so persistently advocated by the free-traders, and which was presented by the Secretary of the Treasury—that the greater efficiency of our laborers and the consequent low labor cost of our agricultural and manufacturing products enable us to compete successfully with the cheap labor of other countries.

I quote at length from the speech, because it is a bold and full statement of the staple argument of the protectionist against revenue reform and tax reduction. It is true that the wages in England are considerably higher than in any other of the countries named, and grow lower in those countries about in the order stated—France, Germany, Belgium, Switzerland, Italy, Japan, China, India. If this contention of the protectionist means anything it means this: That the cost of production is lower where wages are lower, and that high-wage countries can not without protection stand up against the competition of countries where wages are lower.

If it were necessary to disprove a proposition which I had supposed every one knew to be untenable, the data furnished by the speaker would be its sufficient refutation. Every school boy knows that England needs no protection against the manufacturers of India, China, Japan, or Russia, though the wages of England are five times as high as in any of those countries. It is a well-known fact that though free-trade England pays the highest wages in Europe, it makes the cheapest goods and is the most successful manufacturer. England neither needs nor asks protection against the cheaper labor of any of those other countries, while they insist that they need protection against the products of her high-priced labor.

Nor is the disproof of the protectionist's assumption found alone in the history of manufacturing in England. France and Germany do not ask protection against the lower wages of the other lower wage-paying countries named, but against the higher wages of England.

In 1887 of all the merchandise by us imported we got from free-trade England nearly 20 per cent.; from Germany over 11½ per cent.; from France nearly 10 per cent.; from Italy, China, British East Indies, respectively, a little over 2½ per cent.; from Japan a little less than 2½ per cent.; from Russia a little over nine-tenths of 1 per cent. These figures show how successfully Russia, China, India, and Japan, with their untold millions of laborers working for nominal wages, compete with the highest wage-paying country of Europe. They conclusively show that low wages and low intelligence are beaten in the race with higher wages and greater intelligence.

The subjoined table, made by the Chief of the Bureau of Statistics of the Treasury Department from the census of 1880 and official data in the Treasury Department, furnishes indubitable proof that the high rate of present tariff is not needed to offset the difference between the cost of labor in this country and in Europe.

Table of specified manufactures, showing amount of capital, value of materials, amount of wages, and value of product, with the per cent. of material and wages, also the average ad valorem rate of duty on similar importations for the fiscal year 1887.

[Compiled from the United States census of 1880.]

| Manufactures. | Capital. | Value of materials. | Total amount paid in wages during the year. | Value of products. | Per cent. of— | | Ad valorem rate of duty on imports, 1887. |
|--|---------------|---------------------|---|--------------------|---------------|--------|---|
| | | | | | Materials. | Wages. | |
| Cotton manufactures | \$219,504,794 | \$113,765,537 | \$45,614,419 | \$210,950,383 | 53.93 | 21.62 | Per cent. 40.17 |
| Cotton manufactures (specific) | 208,280,346 | 102,206,347 | 42,040,510 | 192,090,110 | 53.21 | 21.88 | 45.49 |
| Glass | 19,844,699 | 8,028,621 | 9,144,100 | 21,154,571 | 37.95 | 47.95 | 59.14 |
| Iron and steel manufactures | 230,971,884 | 191,271,150 | 55,476,785 | 296,557,685 | 64.50 | 18.77 | 40.92 |
| Hosiery and knit goods | 15,579,591 | 15,210,951 | 6,701,475 | 29,167,227 | 52.15 | 22.97 | 162.80 |
| Silk and silk goods | 19,125,300 | 22,467,701 | 9,146,705 | 40,033,045 | 56.12 | 22.84 | 139.57 |
| Woolen goods | 96,095,564 | 100,845,611 | 25,836,392 | 160,606,721 | 62.79 | 13.08 | 50.00 |
| Worsted goods | 20,374,043 | 23,012,628 | 5,683,027 | 33,549,942 | 68.59 | 16.94 | 67.21 |
| Mixed textiles | 37,996,057 | 87,227,741 | 13,316,753 | 66,221,703 | 56.22 | 20.11 | 54.20 |
| Woolen and worsted goods | 116,469,607 | 123,858,239 | 31,519,419 | 194,156,663 | 63.79 | 16.23 | 67.21 |
| Woolen goods and mixed materials | 134,091,621 | 138,073,352 | 39,153,145 | 226,828,424 | 60.87 | 17.27 | 160.70 |
| Woolen goods, mixed materials, and worsted goods | 154,465,664 | 161,085,980 | 44,936,172 | 266,378,366 | 60.47 | 16.87 | 161.81 |

* Cotton cloths.

† Woolen hosiery.

‡ Cotton hosiery.

§ Estimated.

TREASURY DEPARTMENT, BUREAU OF STATISTICS, January 25, 1888.

WM. F. SWITZLER, Chief of Bureau.

It will be observed that the percentage of duty is in all cases higher, and in many cases twice and in some cases three times as high as the whole cost of labor in the production of the article. The statistics in the volume of the Census from which these figures are taken, were compiled by Joseph D. Weeks, an authority on such subjects and a prominent Republican. Nothing further surely need be said in disproof of the "pauper-labor" argument.

Even loaded down by the disadvantages and burdens imposed by our protective tariff, the ingenuity, energy, and intelligence of our people are so great that they in many departments compete successfully in the markets of other countries. And it will be instructive to observe that our competition has been most successful in those manufactures, the principal cost of which is labor, and high-priced labor, too; such as musical instruments, carriages and cars, clocks and watches, earthen and stone ware, manufactures of iron, steel, paper, etc.

Another argument in favor of the retention of our extremely high taxes is that it is necessary to build up our home manufacturing industries, and thus create a home market for our agricultural products. We have had now about a quarter of a century to discover the beneficial effects of our tariff, a hundred per cent. higher than that of any other country in the world, and the result can be satisfactory only to those for whose protection it was imposed, and their advocates. It is true that many individual fortunes have been made by it at the expense of the people. The excessive tariff and high prices—our market being limited—have not infrequently stimulated overproduction, followed of course by reduction in labor and wages, and that by strikes and lockouts to the great detriment of labor.

We have succeeded in many instances in building factories, but not in building up industries to an extent that can be satisfactory to any one who unselfishly considers the interest of the whole country. A reference to the figures will best illustrate this. The following table, compiled from official data, shows the imports and exports of the manufactures of metals and textiles by the countries named, in the year 1886:

Total values of manufactures of metals and textiles imported into and exported from the United Kingdom, Germany, France, Netherlands, and the United States in 1886.

| Countries. | Imports. | | Exports. | |
|----------------|---------------|-------------|---------------|-------------|
| | Total. | Per capita. | Total. | Per capita. |
| United Kingdom | \$203,258,137 | \$5.48 | \$664,936,612 | \$17.93 |
| Germany | 114,991,366 | 2.45 | 289,831,878 | 6.19 |
| France | 63,189,867 | 1.75 | 186,360,142 | 5.15 |
| Netherlands | 69,750,000 | 17.44 | 49,200,000 | 12.30 |
| United States | 190,727,090 | 3.27 | 38,031,459 | .66 |

NOTES.—The imports into Germany and France are the net imports, and the exports from all countries the exports of domestic products. The data for Germany are those for the German Customs Union.

All metals beyond the condition of ore, and all textiles not raw or unmanufactured, are classed as manufactures.

There being no later official data for Netherlands than 1883, the data furnished by Hon. Thomas Wilson for 1880 are repeated.

WM. F. SWITZLER,
Chief of Bureau.

TREASURY DEPARTMENT, BUREAU OF STATISTICS, April 17, 1888.

These figures show that the United States import more largely than any other of the countries named, except Great Britain, of those manufactured articles which we attempt to exclude by our exceptionally high tariff, and an analysis of the list would show that of the imports of Great Britain a large percentage is in a partly manufactured state, to be exported greatly increased in value; so that the United States are, beyond a doubt, the largest importers of manufactured goods, properly so called.

These figures also show that per capita England exports over twenty-seven times, Germany over nine times, France nearly eight times, and the Netherlands nearly twenty times as much as the United States, notwithstanding our exceptional advantages.

The testimony of Mr. Howard M. Newhall, one of the leading manufacturers of shoes in Lynn, Mass., before a committee of the Massachusetts Legislature in 1882-'83 (quoted by Mr. Wells in an article written by him a few years ago), is so apposite that I quote from it:

I have come before this committee—

Said Mr. Newhall—

to present a few facts in regard to one specific branch of business interest—a protected shoe industry. The shoe industry is the most thoroughly American in its parts of any of our great industries. A few years before 1860 few would have dared to predict that a shoe could ever be made by machinery, or that in a quarter of a century there would be so many people employed in making shoes by machinery as to render the American market altogether too small for their industrial capacity. Yet such is the fact. In Lynn alone the capacity is 300,000 pairs of shoes per week, and Lynn is only one great representative of a great many shoe-manufacturing centers in New England, New York, Pennsylvania, and the West. This is its present capacity, but the power of enlarging this capacity is unlimited. This whole system could be duplicated and reduplicated if necessary within a short term of years. With such facilities it is very natural that the business should soon outgrow the home consumption.

Where a few years ago it took nine months in each year to shoe this country it now takes six months, and with the present increase of factories a few years hence it can be done in less than that time. Of course the increase of capacity engenders competition among the manufacturers, and there is a constant incentive to underbid the market to secure trade. As in all trade, a low price (often quoted) "sets" the market, and in order to meet the market articles have to be made cheaper at the expense of the operatives. If the materials used to make a shoe go up in price, labor always has to go down. Strikes result, as that seems to be the only way the laborer can protect himself from the encroachment of the employer. In a general strike in a shoe manufacturing center the operatives often gain temporary advantage, but with a supply greater than the demand it can not long continue.

Gentlemen, do not blame the manufacturer for trying to meet the market, or blame the operatives for resisting a reduction in wages. It all goes to show that the supply is greater than the demand, and that our market is not large enough. Perhaps you may wonder how and where we are "protected" in our shoe-making. I will mention two or three articles specially and speak of the others generally. Take, for instance, serges or lastings. The average duty on the serges or lastings used in the manufactures of shoes is 85 per cent; and how many factories do you think are protected by this enormous duty? I know of only two, one at Oswego, N. Y., the other at Woonsocket, R. I. I may be in error, but these are all which have been named to me, although I have made diligent inquiry.

As another instance take that well-known article, French kid, or, in fact, kid of any foreign make. Kid requires a duty of 25 per cent. on the average. French kid costs all the way from \$18 to \$45 per dozen skins, according to the quality. An average skin would cost about \$30 per dozen, and each skin would cut out about one pair of shoes. Hence, the prospective penalty for wearing soft, pliable French kid shoes is 60 cents before the process of making the shoe has begun. This appeals to our own pockets, but in its broader sense we are at just 60 cents disadvantage in competition with the rest of the world in that grade of shoe. The light, pliable glove-calf of foreign manufacture is taxed by a duty of 20 per cent. I have selected the serges, kid, glove-calf, which perhaps form a sufficient variety to illustrate the argument. In the warm climates where we must push these very kinds of shoes which have been mentioned American calf, goat, or grain is too heavy for use, and if we are to compete with foreign manufacturers we need every advantage of competition. Cottons, nails, tacks,

buttons, threads, all have to be used in the make-up of a shoe, and they are protected. The iron from which we make our machinery is protected. If, as facetiously said, we make shoes of paper, that is protected too. In short, you have paid a duty on nearly every component part of the shoe which you are now wearing on your foot.

A removal of duty from all articles used in the manufacture of a shoe would be an advantage to employer and employed. Why, up in Canada and in the Provinces they have been obliged to protect themselves from American shoes by a duty of 25 per cent.; and even though we are having to pay a high tariff on importation and exportation, we are sending as many shoes into Canada as ever. This alone proves what our shoe-manufacturing industry is capable of achieving if it can have a chance. There is no other country knows how or could make shoes as fast and as cheap as the Yankees, and all we need is one end of the bargain. If we are able to sell our goods when protected and protected against, if half the disadvantage we now stagger under were removed, we could soon fix ourselves into a place where the world's buyers could not afford to purchase from any other market.

This speaks volumes to thoughtful men; and what is here said would equally apply to other industries. It is not against the pauper labor of Europe or Asia that the laborer or the people generally need protection so much as against the rich beggars among ourselves who have secured the passage of laws compelling every industry, class, and person in the country to contribute to their enrichment, and who are now, by every means in their power, opposing the modification of these laws. This is but another illustration of the fact that what we need most is protection against protection. If we were not put at a disadvantage by our extremely high tariff we could hold our own against the world.

We export annually to Great Britain of raw cotton \$200,000,000 worth, and of breadstuffs, \$125,000,000 worth. The breadstuffs are consumed by the operatives who manufacture our cotton in England. It is not doubted but that if our manufacturers were not put at a disadvantage by our protective tariff, they could successfully compete with Great Britain or any other country in the manufacture of cotton goods, especially of the lower grades.

At our very doors there is a heavy trade in these goods with the South American and Central American Republics. They entertain the most friendly disposition toward us. They have hardly any manufacturing industries of their own. We naturally should supply them. But the following table of the imports of English and American cotton goods into Central and South American States for the year ending June 30, 1887, shows that we do not compete with Great Britain notwithstanding our exceptional advantages:

Total values of the exports of domestic manufactures of cotton from the United Kingdom, and the United States to Mexico, Central and South America, and to the West Indies in 1886.

| Countries to which exported. | Exported from United Kingdom. | Exported from United States. (*) |
|--------------------------------|-------------------------------|----------------------------------|
| Mexico..... | \$2,239,570 | \$829,596 |
| Central American States..... | 2,288,632 | 377,612 |
| British Honduras..... | 69,513 | 27,883 |
| British West Indies..... | (†)2,799,084 | 152,672 |
| Other West Indies..... | 5,202,483 | 1,438,148 |
| United States of Colombia..... | 2,350,607 | 443,112 |
| Venezuela..... | 1,297,356 | 602,131 |
| British Guiana..... | (‡) | 21,408 |
| Brazil..... | 14,915,978 | 705,638 |
| Uruguay..... | 2,401,798 | 188,258 |
| Argentine Republic..... | 7,227,779 | 797,216 |
| Chili..... | 3,152,567 | 408,434 |
| Ecuador..... | 665,630 | 255,401 |
| Peru..... | 1,845,430 | 90,062 |
| Total..... | 46,456,727 | 6,335,701 |

* Year ending June 30, 1887.

† Includes British Guiana.

‡ Included in British West Indies.

TREASURY DEPARTMENT, BUREAU OF STATISTICS, April 17, 1888.

We sell them a little over \$6,000,000; Great Britain over \$46,000,000. Illustrative of this point, I call attention to the following table, showing the ratio which the exports of unmanufactured and manufactured products from the United States have sustained to each other during the periods designated.

The ratio which the exports of the unmanufactured and manufactured products from the United States have sustained to each other during the decennial periods included between the years 1859-'60 and 1879-'80, and from 1881 to 1887, are as follows:

| | Unmanufactured products. | Manufactured products. |
|------------------------------------|--------------------------|------------------------|
| 1859-'60.....Per cent. of total... | 82.3 | 17.7 |
| 1869-'70.....do..... | 86.6 | 13.4 |
| 1879-'80.....do..... | 87.5 | 12.5 |
| 1881-'87.....do..... | 85.20 | 14.80 |

Unmanufactured products have risen, therefore, from below 82.3 per cent. of the total exports in 1859-'60 to 87.5 per cent. in 1881-'87, while during the same period manufactures have fallen from 17.7 per cent. to 14.80 per cent. Further illustrations can not be necessary to demonstrate the fact that our tariff has not built up our manufacturing industries. Though we have piled stone upon stone upon the high-tariff Chinese wall by which we have undertaken to exclude foreign imports, they have continued rapidly to increase. The value of our imports of merchandise from all countries in 1860 was \$353,620,000, but it had gradually risen in 1887 to \$692,320,000. If anything can be conclusively proven by facts and figures, this is, that protection does not exclude European manufactures from our market, and that it does exclude our manufactures from the markets of the world. Hardly any country on earth could compete with us under equal conditions. Our situation is most favorable, our natural resources great, and the superior intelligence and ingenuity of our people unquestioned.

But to any thoughtful person, who honestly seeks to discover the truth, the reason that our imports of manufactured products are so great and our exports so insignificant is not far to seek. Of the countries named the United States is the only one that prevents the free importation of raw materials, by our tariff on which we largely increase the cost of our manufactured products. Our domestic manufacturers have to pay a very high tariff directly on their tools, machinery, dye-stuffs, chemicals, and on all raw material, and indirectly on many other articles that enter into the cost of production. This must ordinarily exclude them from the markets of the world, where they come in competition with those who are not so burdened.

That a manufacturer of woolen goods, for instance, who is compelled to pay from 25 to 30 per cent. more than another manufacturer in the same line for his wool, dies, machinery, etc., can not compete with the latter is a proposition too plain to admit of doubt. Every person who reflects on the subject must perceive the truth of the statement of Schoenhoff, that—

Taxes on raw materials inevitably lead to the decay of manufacturing industries. Either one or the other has to give way. There is no choice, no alternative.

Nor is this the only disadvantage at which our tariff places our manufacturers, so far as markets outside of the United States are concerned. To sell, we must buy. Commerce is traffic. But under our tariff laws our manufacturer can not purchase and import on equal terms with his competitors of other countries. The effect of all this is of course to make traffic difficult or impossible, and practically to shut us out of the markets of the world. It must, too, as a consequence, lessen wages and the demand for labor. To compete in the markets of other countries our manufacturers must sell at market prices; and as the cost of the materials, tools, machinery, etc., plus the cost of labor, fixes the cost of production, it is a plain proposition that as the cost of raw materials, tools, and machinery go up labor must go down, or our manufacturers must go out of the market. And certainly, that as the markets for our goods are circumscribed the demand for labor is lessened is a proposition that can hardly be denied.

The protectionists are accustomed to point to the volume of our domestic manufactures as the fruits of the tariff; but they do not state, what ordinary observation shows to be true, that 80 or 90 per cent. of such products must, and would of necessity, be made in the United States, tariff or no tariff.

And as I have attempted to show, so far as we export we do so in spite of the tariff. I am therefore opposed to our present tariff, because while it enriches a few it prevents the expansion of our industries and lessens the field and the reward of labor. But my opposition is intensified by the belief that it is especially unjust and oppressive to the agriculturists of the country.

While, Mr. Chairman, experience and uncontroverted facts show that, in the business of manufacturing, unintelligent, low-priced labor can not and does not compete with intelligent, high-priced labor aided by improved machinery, they also show that our farmers are brought in direct and severe competition with the lowest-priced labor in the world. Perhaps in no other country on the globe are wages so low as among the natives of India and Russia. In either country they are not over about one-fifth as high as in the United States.

That the annual surplus of our wheat which fixes the price of the whole crop comes in competition with the harvests of India and Russia is known to every one, and improved facilities for transportation from these countries are each year making this competition more sharp.

In 1870 British India exported of wheat only 78,208 cwt., and not until 1874 did it export as high in any year as a million of bushels. The table which I append shows that between 1880 and 1886 inclusive, the exports of wheat from Russia in Europe had nearly doubled; from British India had more than trebled; from Victoria, South Australia, and New Zealand had largely increased (but how much we have not the data to show), while within the same period the exports from the Argentine Republic grew twenty-five times greater, but from the United States they shrunk nearly one-half in volume and over one-half in value.

Quantities and value of domestic wheat exported from Russia in Europe, British India, the Australian colonies, the Argentine Republic, and the United States during the years 1880 to 1886, inclusive.

| Calendar year. | Russia in Europe. | | British India. | | The colonies Victoria, South Australia, and New Zealand. | | Argentine Republic. | | United States. | |
|----------------|-------------------|--------------|----------------|--------------|--|--------------|---------------------|-----------|----------------|---------------|
| | Bushels. | | Bushels. | | Bushels. | | Bushels. | | Bushels. | |
| 1880..... | 36,565,653 | \$53,524,459 | 13,896,168 | \$15,952,105 | 13,999,415 | \$13,905,808 | 42,829 | \$45,111 | 144,483,007 | \$171,420,195 |
| 1881..... | 48,972,597 | 71,672,255 | 37,078,571 | 41,871,765 | 9,729,596 | 9,632,390 | 5,772 | 10,722 | 120,451,888 | 140,218,714 |
| 1882..... | 76,373,532 | 100,008,804 | 26,402,893 | 29,534,467 | 8,506,904 | 9,727,058 | 62,659 | 65,844 | 110,343,185 | 125,051,895 |
| 1883..... | 83,777,096 | 102,296,594 | 39,118,791 | 43,202,651 | 7,481,949 | 8,219,776 | 2,292,352 | 2,245,128 | 71,013,280 | 79,065,180 |
| 1884..... | 67,719,720 | 78,089,132 | 29,550,741 | 30,703,430 | 19,466,921 | 17,326,920 | 3,986,663 | 4,188,071 | 81,628,478 | 74,962,078 |
| 1885..... | 91,754,000 | 83,905,180 | 39,312,969 | 38,943,436 | No data..... | No data..... | 2,884,138 | 3,029,845 | 53,025,938 | 46,678,287 |
| 1886..... | No data..... | No data..... | 41,558,250 | 41,977,479 |do..... |do..... | 1,288,362 | 1,457,516 | 89,201,887 | 75,955,039 |

I also append another table that shows the quantities and values of certain leading articles of domestic merchandise exported during the years ending June 30, 1887 and 1881, respectively, and presents a com-

parison of the percentages of decrease or increase in the quantities with the percentages of decrease or increase in the values of the same articles since 1881:

| Articles. | Quantities. | | Per cent. of increase + decrease from 1881. | Values. | | Per cent. of increase + decrease from 1881. |
|---|--------------------------------------|---------------|---|---------------|-------------|---|
| | 1887. | 1881. | | 1887. | 1881. | |
| | Cotton, unmanufactured.....pounds... | 2,169,457,330 | | 2,190,928,772 | - .97 | |
| PRINCIPAL ARTICLES OF BREADSTUFFS. | | | | | | |
| Corn.....bushels... | 40,307,252 | 91,908,175 | -58.14 | 19,347,361 | 50,702,669 | -61.8 |
| Corn-meal.....barrels... | 265,333 | 434,993 | -38.7 | 705,343 | 1,270,200 | -44.4 |
| Rye.....bushels... | 357,256 | 1,928,437 | -81.4 | 216,190 | 1,855,813 | -88.5 |
| Wheat.....do..... | 101,971,949 | 150,565,477 | -32.2 | 90,716,481 | 167,698,485 | -45.9 |
| Wheat flour.....barrels... | 11,548,449 | 7,945,786 | +44.97 | 51,950,082 | 45,047,257 | +15.3 |
| Cattle.....number... | 106,459 | 185,707 | -42.7 | 9,172,136 | 14,394,103 | -35.9 |
| PRINCIPAL ARTICLES OF PROVISIONS. | | | | | | |
| Beef products: | | | | | | |
| Beef, fresh.....pounds... | 83,560,874 | 106,004,812 | -21.1 | 7,228,412 | 9,860,284 | -26.5 |
| Beef, salted and cured.....pounds... | 36,479,379 | 40,698,649 | -10.3 | 1,990,188 | 2,665,761 | -25.3 |
| Tallow.....do..... | 63,278,403 | 96,403,372 | -34.3 | 2,836,900 | 6,800,628 | -50.8 |
| Pork products: | | | | | | |
| Bacon and hams.....pounds... | 419,922,955 | 746,944,545 | -43.7 | 33,314,670 | 61,161,205 | -45.5 |
| Pork.....do..... | 85,893,297 | 107,928,086 | -20.4 | 5,641,327 | 8,272,285 | -31.8 |
| Lard.....do..... | 321,533,746 | 378,142,496 | -14.9 | 22,703,921 | 35,226,575 | -35.5 |
| Butter.....do..... | 12,531,171 | 31,560,500 | -60.3 | 1,983,698 | 6,256,024 | -68.4 |

It will be seen that during that period there was a decrease in quantity varying from 10 to 60 per cent., and in value varying from 25 to 68 per cent. on every article mentioned but one—wheat flour; and if we take wheat and flour together there was a great decrease in that.

The records of the Treasury Department show that since the years 1855, 1856, the export prices of the following products have not been as low as in 1885 and 1886, only as hereafter stated, namely:

Corn, but once; wheat, not once; wheat flour, not once; cotton, not once; pork, but once; beef, not once; butter, but three times; cheese, but once.

My time, Mr. Chairman, will not permit me to dwell on the lesson taught by these figures, nor is it necessary that I should. They speak with an eloquence greater than I could command of the great injustice of our tariff.

Pressed on one side by the products of the labor of myriads of semi-serfs, and with their markets constantly growing narrower and their products lower priced, our agriculturists are at home oppressed by an unprecedented tariff imposed, not for the support of the Government, but for the protection, so called, of a mushroom, moneyed aristocracy that it has built up.

I append a table showing the tariff on a few of the necessities of the people:

| Articles. | Tariff. |
|---|--------------------------|
| Lumber..... | \$2 per thousand. |
| Nails..... | 43 per cent. |
| Common window-glass..... | 68 per cent. and upward. |
| Linseed-oil..... | 54 per cent. |
| White lead..... | 40 per cent. |
| Red lead..... | 77 per cent. |
| Wall-paper..... | 25 per cent. |
| Stoves..... | 45 per cent. |
| Carpets..... | 50 per cent. |
| Oil-cloth..... | 40 per cent. |
| Books..... | 25 per cent. |
| Glassware, cheapest kind..... | 45 per cent. |
| Cooking utensils, pots and kettles..... | 45 per cent. |
| Knives, forks, spoons, etc..... | 35 per cent. |
| Common soap..... | 20 per cent. |
| Plowshares, hoes, and forks..... | 45 per cent. |
| Shingles..... | 17 per cent. |
| Salt, in bags..... | 39 per cent. |
| Salt, in bulk..... | 79 per cent. |
| Needles..... | 25 per cent. |

| Articles. | Tariff. |
|---|--------------------|
| Grindstones..... | 14 per cent. |
| Garden seeds..... | 20 per cent. |
| Castor-oil..... | 19 per cent. |
| Earthenware..... | 55 per cent. |
| Wool hats, not valued at over 80 cents per pound..... | 66 per cent. |
| Knit goods, not valued at over 30 cents per pound..... | 88 per cent. |
| Wool yarn..... | 69 per cent. |
| Women's and children's dress goods, wholly or partly of wool..... | 60 to 80 per cent. |
| Clothing, ready-made..... | 54 per cent. |
| Cloaks, dolmans, jackets, etc..... | 67 per cent. |
| India-rubber shoes..... | 25 per cent. |
| Umbrellas..... | 45 per cent. |
| Looking-glass..... | 78 per cent. |
| Round and sheet iron..... | 40 to 50 per cent. |
| Cut-nails and brads..... | 35 per cent. |
| Wrought-iron spikes, nuts, washers, etc..... | 54 per cent. |
| Horse or ox shoes..... | 55 per cent. |
| Anvils, mill irons, etc..... | 68 per cent. |
| Iron or steel axles..... | 62 per cent. |
| Horse-shoe nails, hobnails, etc..... | 76 per cent. |
| Iron or steel chains..... | 47 per cent. |
| Hand-saws and buck-saws..... | 40 per cent. |
| Files..... | 64 per cent. |
| Screws..... | 60 per cent. |
| Hollow-ware, glazed or turned..... | 47 per cent. |
| Pens..... | 43 per cent. |
| Penknives..... | 50 per cent. |
| Sugar..... | 60 to 80 per cent. |
| Molasses..... | 47 per cent. |
| Starch..... | 95 per cent. |
| Rice..... | 113 per cent. |
| Cotton thread..... | 50 per cent. |
| Cotton cloth..... | 50 to 75 per cent. |
| Bags and bagging..... | 54 per cent. |
| Woolen cloth, not over 80 cents per pound..... | 89 per cent. |
| Shawls, not over 80 cents per pound..... | 88 per cent. |
| Flannels, not over 30 cents per pound..... | 73 per cent. |
| Blankets, not over 30 cents per pound..... | 79 per cent. |

The following table states the description of the goods, their width in inches, and the weight per yard of each kind, the price of the goods at the factory, the rate and the amount of duty per pound and ad valorem, and the total amount of duty levied under the compound rate, and also the per cent. which the total duty is of the price per yard at the factory in England.

Price per yard of Leeds (England) woolen and mixed goods, duties, etc.

| Name. | Description. | | Duty. | | | | | | Per cent. of price at factory. | Cost in New York, not including packing, cartage to port, ocean freight, and insurance. |
|--|-----------------|------------------|-------------------|------------|------------------------|------------|-------------|---------|--------------------------------|---|
| | Width (inches). | Weight (ounces). | Price at factory. | Rate. | | Amount. | | | | |
| | | | | Per pound. | Ad valorem (per cent.) | Per pound. | Ad valorem. | Total. | | |
| West of England broadcloth | 60 | 17 | \$3.60 | \$0.35 | 40 | \$0.372 | \$1.440 | \$1.812 | 50.3 | \$5.412 |
| Fine worsted trousering | 28 | 11 | 1.62 | .35 | 40 | .241 | .648 | .889 | 54.9 | 2.509 |
| Imitation sealskin (mohair and cotton) | 50 | 31 | 4.50 | .35 | 40 | .678 | 1.800 | 2.478 | 55.0 | 6.978 |
| West of England beaver | 58 | 25 | 3.36 | .35 | 40 | .547 | 1.344 | 1.891 | 56.3 | 5.251 |
| West of England all-wool Moscow | 58 | 29 | 3.60 | .35 | 40 | .631 | 1.440 | 2.074 | 57.6 | 5.674 |
| Fine worsted coating | 56 | 24 | 2.88 | .35 | 40 | .525 | 1.152 | 1.677 | 58.2 | 4.557 |
| Fine worsted trousering | 28 | 12 | 1.42 | .35 | 40 | .263 | .568 | .831 | 58.5 | 2.251 |
| Indigo-blue Cheviot coating | 58 | 28 | 2.40 | .35 | 40 | .612 | .960 | 1.572 | 65.5 | 3.972 |
| Low worsted coating (worsted face, woolen back, cotton warp) | 50 | 24 | .82 | .18 | 35 | .270 | .287 | .557 | 60.0 | 1.377 |
| Low worsted trousering (woolen back) | 28 | 11 | .48 | .24 | 35 | .165 | .168 | .333 | 69.4 | .813 |
| Ottoman (worsted face, woolen back, cotton warp) | 50 | 27 | .82 | .18 | 35 | .304 | .287 | .591 | 72.0 | 1.411 |
| Matchasse (worsted face, woolen back, cotton warp) | 50 | 28 | .84 | .18 | 35 | .315 | .294 | .609 | 72.5 | 1.449 |
| Mantle cloth (worsted face, woolen back, cotton warp) | 50 | 24 | .68 | .18 | 35 | .270 | .238 | .508 | 74.7 | 1.188 |
| Wool, fancy suiting | 54 | 25 | .94 | .35 | 35 | .547 | .329 | .876 | 93.2 | 1.816 |
| Cotton-warp cloth | 50 | 15 | .54 | .35 | 35 | .328 | .189 | .517 | 95.7 | 1.057 |
| Fancy coating | 54 | 23 | .78 | .35 | 35 | .563 | .273 | .776 | 99.5 | 1.556 |
| Fancy Cheviot | 54 | 25 | .82 | .35 | 35 | .547 | .287 | .834 | 101.7 | 1.654 |
| Wool, fancy suiting | 54 | 22 | .70 | .35 | 35 | .481 | .245 | .726 | 103.7 | 1.426 |
| Diagonal Cheviot | 54 | 25 | .76 | .35 | 35 | .547 | .266 | .813 | 107.0 | 1.573 |
| Common blue Cheviot coating | 52 | 25 | .72 | .35 | 35 | .547 | .252 | .799 | 111.0 | 1.519 |
| Cotton-warp Moscow | 52 | 25 | .96 | .35 | 35 | .766 | .336 | 1.102 | 114.8 | 2.062 |
| Cotton-warp cloth | 52 | 25 | .64 | .35 | 35 | .547 | .224 | .771 | 120.5 | 1.411 |
| Cotton-warp twilled Melton | 50 | 16 | .42 | .35 | 35 | .361 | .147 | .508 | 121.0 | .928 |
| Cotton-warp Moscow | 52 | 30 | .74 | .35 | 35 | .656 | .259 | .915 | 123.6 | 1.655 |
| Cotton-warp cloth | 50 | 13 | .32 | .35 | 35 | .284 | .112 | .396 | 123.7 | .716 |
| Fancy overcoating (cotton warp) | 50 | 34 | .82 | .35 | 35 | .744 | .287 | 1.031 | 125.7 | 1.851 |
| Cotton-warp reversible | 50 | 31 | .74 | .35 | 35 | .678 | .259 | .937 | 126.6 | 1.677 |
| Fancy overcoating (cotton warp) | 50 | 32 | .76 | .35 | 35 | .700 | .266 | .966 | 127.0 | 1.726 |
| Cotton-warp coating | 50 | 17 | .40 | .35 | 35 | .372 | .140 | .512 | 128.0 | .912 |
| Imitation sealskin (calf hair mixed with wool, cotton warp) | 50 | 28 | .56 | .35 | 35 | .612 | .196 | .808 | 144.3 | 1.368 |
| Cotton-warp coating | 50 | 23 | .46 | .35 | 35 | .503 | .161 | .664 | 144.3 | 1.124 |
| Cotton-warp Melton | 50 | 13 | .24 | .35 | 35 | .284 | .084 | .368 | 153.3 | .668 |
| Cotton-warp serge Melton | 50 | 15 | .26 | .35 | 35 | .339 | .091 | .430 | 155.4 | .690 |
| Reversible diagonal (cotton warp) | 50 | 29 | .48 | .35 | 35 | .634 | .168 | .802 | 167.1 | 1.282 |
| Reversible nap (cotton warp) | 50 | 29 | .44 | .35 | 35 | .634 | .154 | .788 | 179.1 | 1.228 |
| Cotton-warp reversible | 50 | 30 | .45 | .35 | 35 | .656 | .157 | .813 | 180.7 | 1.263 |

This table is well worthy of careful study. In examining the figures given in the column headed "price at factory" and the column headed "per cent. of price at factory," which the total duty amounts to, the startling inequalities in the rate of duty to be paid in this country becomes apparent. The highest-priced goods named in the table is West of England broadcloth, worth \$3.60 per yard in Leeds, the specific duty being 35 cents per pound and the ad valorem duty 40 per cent., making a total of duty of 59.3 per cent. on the value at the factory. This is on a high grade of goods. In looking at the bottom of the table the last entry is for cotton-warp reversible cloth, made in imitation of a better kind. It is worth but 45 cents per yard at the factory. The specific duty is the same as on the West of England broadcloth, 35 cents per pound, the ad valorem duty is 35 per cent., but the specific duty and the ad valorem duty together make the rate on the price at the factory 180.7 per cent. That is to say, the cheaper the goods at the factory the greater is the proportional increment of duty. The column headed "per cent. of price at factory," which shows the percentage that the duty is of the factory price, brings this out clearly.

By looking at this table it will be seen that this per cent. steadily increases from 50.3, on high-priced goods, to 180.7 on low-priced goods.

Had it not been for the richness of our soil and the pluck and intelligence of our people they must long since have been overcome in the unequal contest. That they could hold their own under such circumstances was not possible. That they have not held their own is shown by the following graphic statement, cut from the St. Louis Republican (quoted a few days ago by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. LANDES] in his speech on this question):

ILLINOIS AND MASSACHUSETTS.

Illinois is a farming State, the richest and most productive one in the Union. Massachusetts is a manufacturing State, one of the most wealthy and prosperous in the industrial group of nine States that are the seat of the protected vocations and the chief beneficiaries of the high-tariff policy.

The fertile soil of Illinois, its enormous crops of grain and other farm produce, its admirable railroad systems—the largest possessed by any State in the Union—and the intelligence and thrifty habits of its people make it the true representative agricultural State of the West; and in like manner, the intelligence and superior ingenuity of the Massachusetts people, their judiciously diversified industries, their thriving manufacturing towns, and their great wealth make it the proper representative of the industrial group. Illinois has an area of 56,650 square miles; Massachusetts, 8,310. At the last census Illinois had a population of 3,077,000; Massachusetts, 1,783,000. Illinois is more than six times as large in area as Massachusetts, and has nearly twice as great a population.

In 1880 Illinois had 255,741 farms, 436,371 persons engaged in farming pursuits, and \$1,175,000,000 capital invested in agriculture, this being the estimated value of the farms, with the buildings, live-stock, and implements on them. Massachusetts had 14,352 manufacturing establishments with \$303,808,000 invested in them, and employing 352,200 persons. It will be observed that Illinois has nearly four times as much capital invested in farming as Massachusetts has invested in manufacturing, and also that it has 84,000 more persons employed on farms than Massachusetts has employed in factories.

The value of all farm products in Illinois, both sold and consumed on the farms, in 1880 was \$204,000,000, while the value of all the products of manufacture in Massachusetts was \$631,000,000, from which must be deducted the value of the raw materials used, \$387,000,000, leaving \$244,000,000 as the net product. It ap-

pears, then, that Massachusetts, with one-fourth as much capital as Illinois, and 81,000 fewer persons employed, made \$40,000,000 more in manufacturing than Illinois made in farming.

Again, it takes \$1,175,000,000 capital invested in farming in Illinois to produce \$204,000,000 worth of produce, but in Massachusetts \$303,808,000 invested in manufacturing produces \$244,000,000.

It appears, also, that it takes 436,371 persons engaged in farming in Illinois to produce \$204,000,000 worth of crops, but in Massachusetts 352,200 persons engaged in manufacturing produce \$244,000,000 worth of goods. In Illinois the average product per capita in farming is \$42; in Massachusetts the average product per capita in manufacturing is nearly \$700.

The assessed valuation of taxable property in Illinois for 1887 was \$798,000,000, which, for a population of 3,077,000, is about \$266 per capita. The assessed valuation in Massachusetts for 1887 was \$2,100,000,000, which, for a population of 1,789,000 is about \$1,120. So that not only is there more than twice as much assessed valuation in the small manufacturing State of Massachusetts as in the large farming State of Illinois, but an average person in Massachusetts is worth more than four times as much as an average person in Illinois.

These estimates are based on the assumption that all the wealth in Illinois is owned by its people. But it is notorious that this is not the case. All the railroads and telegraph lines are owned outside the State—in the industrial States of the East—and are assessed at \$70,000,000, but actually worth \$300,000,000.

This article does not state the whole truth. Not only do the wealthy citizens of the manufacturing States own a large percentage of the stock of our telegraphs and railroad companies, but they also own millions upon millions of mortgages upon the farms of our people, as is shown by a table which I also append:

Table showing assessed value under census of 1880, net State debt under census of 1880, net local debt under census of 1880, per cent. of total debt to assessed value, and estimated amount of farm mortgages.

| States. | Assessed value of real estate, census 1880. | Net State debt, census 1880. | Net local debt, census 1880. | Per cent. of total debt to assessed value. | Estimated amount of farm mortgages. |
|------------|---|------------------------------|------------------------------|--|-------------------------------------|
| Ohio | \$1,093,000,000 | \$5,735,000 | \$43,000,000 | 43 | \$330,000,000 |
| Indiana | 538,000,000 | 5,000,000 | 13,355,000 | 34 | 175,000,000 |
| Illinois | 575,000,000 | | 45,180,000 | 8 | 200,000,000 |
| Michigan | 432,000,000 | | 8,803,000 | 2 | 125,000,000 |
| Wisconsin | 344,000,000 | 2,252,000 | 9,623,000 | 34 | 100,000,000 |
| Iowa | \$297,000,000 | \$370,000 | \$7,562,000 | 3 | \$100,000,000 |
| Minnesota | 208,000,000 | 2,565,000 | 5,911,000 | 4 | 70,000,000 |
| Missouri | 381,000,000 | 16,259,000 | 40,692,000 | 15 | 103,000,000 |
| Kansas | 108,000,000 | 1,087,000 | 1,918,000 | 16 | 50,000,000 |
| Nebraska | 55,000,000 | 375,000 | 7,050,000 | 15 | 25,000,000 |
| Colorado | 35,000,000 | 212,000 | 3,381,000 | 10 | 15,000,000 |
| Nevada | 17,000,000 | | 1,024,000 | 6 | |
| Oregon | 32,000,000 | 511,000 | 337,000 | | 15,000,000 |
| California | 466,000,000 | 3,306,000 | 13,443,000 | 4 | 125,000,000 |

This table, taken from the National Review, was compiled for one of the leading banks in Chicago after a thorough investigation.

While, Mr. Chairman, it is not pleasant for our agriculturists to learn the lesson taught by these figures, it would not be wise to blink or disregard them. No sophistry can gainsay the fact that a good percentage of the profits of their labor is without any equivalent transferred to the pockets of certain favored classes.

It is not strange that after a consideration of the facts and a careful estimate, Joseph Medill, a very prominent Republican and the proprietor of the leading Republican journal of the Northwest (The Chicago Tribune), in a speech delivered before the American Agricultural Society in 1882, said:

I understate the truth when I say that the farmers of the West and the planters of the South are charged \$500,000,000 a year on their goods for the profit of protected Eastern manufacturers more than is fair or necessary on the principle of "live and let live."

But it is idle to disguise the fact that the monopolists are determined that there shall be no essential change in the tariff. They are determined to insist on a literal application of that Scripture:

Unto every one that hath shall be given, but from him that hath not shall be taken away even that which he hath.

Their representatives and advocates on this floor treat with derision our appeals for a modification of the tariff so as to lighten the burdens on our farmers. They are willing that the tax shall be abated on tobacco and whisky, as they were that it should be on bank stock, bank deposits, incomes from United States bonds, perfumery, playing cards, etc.; but they are not willing that it should be lessened on the shoes, the blankets, the clothing, the plow-shares, or any other of the necessities of the people.

The most important question now is, shall the wealthy classes be permitted to continue to levy tribute on the industrial classes; shall toil be guaranteed the fruits of its own labor? Between these two classes there is an irrepressible conflict. Sooner or later the people will succeed. It may not be at first. The power of concentrated capital is great. The practical politician, the lobbyist, and the place-seeker will be on that side until it is most clear that it can not succeed.

They always worship the golden calf.

But ultimately the people will say, as President Cleveland in his last message said:

The taxation of luxuries presents no feature of hardship; but the necessities of life used and consumed by all the people, the duty upon which adds to the cost of living in every home, should be greatly cheapened.

[Applause.]

During the delivery of the foregoing speech, the hour having expired, On motion of Mr. MACDONALD, by unanimous consent, the time of Mr. WILSON, of Minnesota, was extended for ten minutes.

Mr. CANNON. My friend from Minnesota, in the speech he has just concluded, made a statement about Illinois, comparing her with Massachusetts as to the assessed value of property in Illinois compared with the assessed value of property in Massachusetts. He also made a statement in which, making a comparison between manufacturing Massachusetts and agricultural Illinois, he ignored manufacturing Illinois and misleads as to agricultural Illinois. I do not know where the gentleman got his table—

Mr. WILSON, of Minnesota. I stated that it was taken from the St. Louis Republican. It purports to be, and I have no doubt it is, compiled from the census of 1880.

Mr. CANNON. Well, I have here the census of 1880 as compiled and tabulated, and instead of the condition of affairs which the gentlemen's tables show I find this fact: the true valuation of property in Illinois in 1880, as shown by the census, was \$3,092,000,000.

Mr. WILSON, of Minnesota. Mr. Chairman, I am ready to answer any question, but perhaps this is not just the time to inject a speech. Let me say to the gentleman [Mr. CANNON] that the comparison made is not a comparison of the whole of the property of Massachusetts with the whole of the property of Illinois, but a comparison of the value of the farms of Illinois with the value of the manufacturing property of Massachusetts.

Mr. CANNON. A partial statement always misleads.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. WILSON] has expired.

Mr. CANNON. I ask five minutes to complete my statement. I do not contemplate a speech.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is compelled to recognize the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. MCCOMAS], who is entitled to the floor.

Mr. MCCOMAS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CANNON] be allowed five minutes; not to come out of my time. [Laughter.]

There was no objection, and it was so ordered.

Mr. CANNON. To continue, Mr. Chairman, I call the attention of the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. WILSON] to the fact that the true valuation of all property in Illinois, real and personal, as shown by the census of 1880, was three thousand and ninety-two million dollars, while the true valuation of all the property in Massachusetts was two thousand seven hundred and ninety-five million.

Mr. WILSON, of Minnesota. Can you institute any fair comparison in that way? Is not the only proper way to make the comparison the way it was done by the St. Louis Republican, to wit, taking the value of the agricultural property in one State as compared with the value of the manufacturing property in the other?

Mr. CANNON. I will make the comparison of manufacturing in Illinois with manufacturing in Massachusetts, too, within my five minutes.

The aggregate wealth per capita in Illinois, as shown by the census of 1880, is \$1,005, not \$266, as stated and quoted with approval by the gentleman, as against \$1,568 per capita in Massachusetts; Illinois having a population far exceeding that of Massachusetts. The population of Illinois has nearly doubled within the last twenty years. More than that, Mr. Chairman, we will talk about the manufacturing interests of the two States for a moment. I speak now from the census of 1880. Massachusetts then had 14,352 manufacturing establishments; at the same time Illinois had 14,549. The value of the manufactured products of Massachusetts in 1880 was \$631,000,000; the value of the manufactured products of Illinois was \$415,000,000. This same census which shows Illinois to be first in agriculture also shows her to be fourth in manufactures, the States coming in this order: New York first, Pennsylvania second, Massachusetts third, and Illinois fourth. That is the census. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. WILSON, of Minnesota. Now, Mr. Chairman, my able friend from Illinois knows that that is not the comparison to which I was calling attention, and that his comparison only distracts attention from the issue that I presented.

Mr. CANNON. What I complain of is, that the statement which the St. Louis Republican made, and which the gentleman and other gentlemen on that side of the House have adopted, is deceptive; that figures, when you tell only part of the truth and conceal a part, do, in effect, tell a falsehood. That is what I complain of. I do not claim, of course, that the gentleman from Minnesota prevaricates; but I say such is always the effect when any one states only a part of the truth.

Mr. WILSON, of Minnesota. If nobody can make a better explanation than you have made, it is an admission of the truth of the St. Louis Republican's statement.

Mr. CANNON. Let me say one word further. The honorable gentleman from Missouri [Mr. DOCKERY]—and I see it in his published speech for the first time this morning—spoke of census reports of assessed values in the State of Illinois. Why, sir, everybody in Illinois, and everywhere else, who has given any attention to the subject knows that the assessed value of property in Illinois is not one-fourth of its real value. It is by artful statements, founded upon such figures, that the attempt is made to mislead the House and the country; and I sometimes think that some of these newspapers desire to have believed as truth that which is not the truth.

Mr. WILSON, of Minnesota. May I ask the gentleman from Illinois another question?

The CHAIRMAN. The five minutes allowed to the gentleman from Illinois have expired.

Mr. WILSON, of Minnesota. If the assessed values in both Massachusetts and Illinois are divided by four, what difference does it make in the gentleman's comparison?

Mr. HOPKINS, of Illinois. I want to say—and the statistics sustain the assertion—that the percentage of wealth per capita has increased as rapidly in Illinois as in Massachusetts.

Mr. MCCOMAS. Mr. Chairman, if any article of common use which our farmers can not profitably grow or our miners or workmen produce is not already on the free-list I will vote to put it on.

If any duty on any home product be higher than the conceded higher wages rate of my country I will vote to reduce it to the protective level, because I believe the tariff is simply a question of wages. If it be clear that any clause fosters only monopoly I will vote to strike it out. If you frame a revenue-reduction bill with an eye single to the relief of the Treasury and the people from a growing surplus I will vote with you.

If you who are the majority would suffer the Republican minority to deal for one day only with the problem of the surplus I believe we would in that single day reduce our annual revenues \$70,000,000, by repealing the internal-revenue tax on tobacco, a burden on the farms in sixteen hundred counties and fifteen States; by repealing the internal-revenue tax on alcohol used in the arts, manufactures, medicines and drugs, and by reducing the tariff on sugar to a minimum, yielding revenue enough to pay bounties to home producers of sugar from cane, sorghum, corn, and beets.

The reduction of the surplus is the pretext but not the motive of this bill.

Who, for instance, to reduce a surplus of \$55,000,000 would put "curled hair for beds or mattresses" on the free-list, which last year yielded a revenue of \$38.25?

It is not a surplus revenue, but a protective revenue; not a war tariff, but a protective tariff, you gentlemen of the majority assail. Mr. Cleveland's message and this founding now called the Mills bill have a common purpose. Both use the surplus as the fulcrum wherewith

to apply the free-trade lever to dislodge the protective system. Every free-trader applauds both. Every protectionist denounces both.

Why, in this debate, has every friend of the Mills bill lauded the English free-trade tariff system, which only levies duties on articles not produced at home?

Has any friend of this bill in this debate uttered one sentence in favor of the American tariff system, which discriminates in favor of the home producer and laborer?

I pause and will yield a half minute to any member on the Democratic side to name the sentence or the member's name who uttered it.

Mr. HOOKER. No. There was no one, and you won't hear any Democrat utter one.

Mr. McCOMAS. I have heard one eloquent Democrat [Mr. FORAN] defend the tariff and labor, but he will not vote for this bill. I am glad to hear the gentleman from Mississippi declare for his party that no Democrat has or can utter a word for protection of labor.

Your purpose is the enlargement of the free-list and final opening of our markets to the world. Why then discuss the revision of the protective tariff with this majority which would wipe it out as with a sponge? [Applause.]

The Democracy has under Cleveland after forty years renewed its allegiance to English free trade. This fight is not over the details of this bill but on the broad issue of free trade or protection. Your tariff of 1846, the contagion of Cobden's enthusiasm, resulted in the bankruptcy of all industries, wheat rotting in unthrashed stacks, and corn burned for fuel on the Western farms. Said Richard Cobden in 1844:

You have no more right to doubt that the sun will rise to-morrow than to doubt that in less than ten years from this time, when England inaugurates the glorious era of commercial freedom, every civilized nation will be free trade to the backbone.

It was to convert the world, and after forty years no nation has adopted it.

Enterprise was to be paralyzed and invention stifled where free trade did not prevail. It was to confer great benefits on its votaries, and impose evils on those who rejected it.

Free trade to-day comes with the broken promises, the disappointed hopes of its early supporters and founders.

Protective France and Belgium rival England, while Germany is surpassing her, and after five years of protection Bismarck says, "Germany fears nobody but God," while the United States has far outstripped England in enterprise and inventive industry. Thirty-nine-fourths of mankind repudiate free trade to-day.

Prophecy has been falsified by history. One year ago, outside of England, of all the wise and thoughtful men in Europe and America, no ruler or minister dared to propose free trade. After forty years of trial all statesmen outside of England have united in rejecting it as one of the "puerile doctrines and illusions of mankind." The modern statesmen we find all protectionists: Thiers, Gambetta, Clemenceaux, Grant, Garfield, Bismarck, Sherman, and Blaine.

Wherever there is universal suffrage the producers the world over have repudiated free trade. When free trade won in England the working people were excluded from the suffrage.

THE BRITISH TARIFF FOR REVENUE ONLY AND DIRECT TAXES.

We collect over two hundred millions from customs under a protective tariff.

England collects one hundred millions from customs under a free-trade tariff for revenue only.

The campaign this fall is designed to bring our tariff to the English model—a free-trade tariff for revenue only.

Great Britain has 2,220 customs officials. Her custom-houses are scattered everywhere.

On some imports Great Britain imposes a duty of 400 per cent. or 500 per cent.; on several a duty of 1,900 per cent.

By a tax of 6 pence per pound on tea and 2 pence per pound on coffee, Great Britain wrests from the breakfast table of her people \$22,000,000 annually.

She has a tariff on chicory, cocoa, cocoa husks, chocolate, currants, figs, raisins, plums, prunes, chloral, chloroform, collodion, tobacco, snuff, soap, ether, cordials, alcohol, spirits, and other articles, which in 1886 yielded her a customs revenue of \$99,086,435.

Besides, a free-trade tariff compels heavy direct taxation. While we collect our one hundred and eighteen millions from internal-revenue taxes, Great Britain in 1886 by internal taxes collected by licenses to auctioneers, pawnbrokers, and peddlers, by stamps on bankers' notes, on bills of exchange and promissory notes, on checks, drafts, and receipts, on deeds and instruments, by a tax on dogs and guns, by a house duty, by a tax on marine and life insurance, by a land tax, a tax on legacies, by liquor taxes and licenses, by a tax on patent medicines, on property, and licenses on refreshment houses, by a tax on dealers and manufacturers of tobacco and snuff, and by taxes on a hundred other vexatious items, from her people, the enormous sum of \$291,573,490.

DEPRESSION OF TRADE AND INDUSTRY IN ENGLAND UNDER FREE TRADE.

Dare you now go home and tell the people of our land how thirty

years of a free-trade tariff for revenue only has prospered Great Britain? Even after three years of Democratic incompetent administration we have nothing like the industrial distress existing in England. There is a wolf at the door of the English wage-earner and an enemy at his fireside. There is the figure of the laborer badly clad in his hovel, living in want and ignorance. England has a million paupers, and seven millions of people there to toe the line of pauperism. Wages all over England are low and decreasing. Her industries are depressed by a competition some of them can not survive. Eighty thousand people are out of employment in London alone. Women are selling their life-blood working at a half-penny an hour in making cheap clothes, and lately the countless army of the unemployed crowded Haymarket. Tens of thousands marched through London streets to Westminster Abbey calling for "bread or work."

ENGLISH FARMING HAS COLLAPSED UNDER FREE TRADE.

Learn from England, ye farmers of America, how free trade benefits agriculture.

There agriculture has reached a state of collapse. Every farmer is 40 per cent. poorer than he was twelve years ago. The tenant farmers are now paying their rent out of their capital. In ten years the loss of income to owners of land was 30 per cent. and to tenant farmers 60 per cent.

The farm laborer now works for 1 or, at most, for 2 shillings a day, a loss of 20 per cent. of his wages.

The land is rapidly going out of cultivation, and free trade has made wheat growing unprofitable to the English farmer. Within ten years 1,000,000 acres, one-fourth of the whole wheat area of Britain, has gone out of cultivation. Dairy farming is extinguished. The best of the farm population is crowding into the great cities, no longer customers, but competitors.

To the *doctrinaires* it is a pretty pastoral scene; free-trade England, a grass country without gates, cropped-tail horses, and foxes and hounds running on forever and ever.

The howling dervish of free trade, with his epileptic froth over the mortgages on Western farms, should remember that while mortgages on farms here are 20 per cent. of their value, the mortgages on English lands were over 58 per cent. of their value (says Mullhall) in 1876, and since then the value and income of these lands has fallen off from 30 to 50 per cent. The number of farming bankruptcies in Britain have increased six times in ten years. Bills of sale have multiplied ten times in five years.

I was born upon a farm; its fragrant fields, its meadows, and clover bloom are redolent of the memories of a happy boyhood. I live among farmers and represent largely a farming constituency. As I consider their wants, their burdens, their troubles, God forbid I should ever vote to add to their present evils by a dose of English free-trade tariff for revenue only, the loss of their home market, the farmer's main dependence for the sale of his surplus products. [Applause.]

Free trade may cheapen a few of the farmer's supplies; it will still more cheapen the value of his farm and its products, decrease manufactures, and increase farmers.

When our people are all employed they earn wages, and the more wages they earn the more of the farmer's products they buy. Free foreign trade may enrich the mugwump importers of New York or Boston, but it is home production and consumption that enriches the farmer. Foreign importation enriches the few at the expense of the many by gathering the profits in a few hands—the bankers, the merchants, the brokers, the agents, the shippers, those who deal in money and exchange. Home trade is tenfold more profitable than foreign trade. Foreign trade profits individuals; home trade profits the community, because the money turned over once in foreign trade is turned over ten times in home trade.

While foreign trade enriches many middlemen, home trade enriches the producer. In home trade both the buying and the selling are done at home, and both transactions bring profit to the community. In foreign trade one transaction is done abroad and does not benefit our country at all. Free foreign commerce is a curse if it only displaces so much home commerce.

For the farmer foreign goods in exchange for the farmer's grain and raw material are far-fetched and dear-bought. The farmer will not transfer prosperity from home manufacturers to Northern importers, for the manufacturer keeps the money at home, while the importer sends it abroad. He knows to-day that it is best to exchange his produce at his own door, to have his neighbor for his customer instead of his competitor, quite as well as when a century ago the American farmers created the American protective policy. He knows that the home market his foresight fostered consumes more than all of Britain's imports and exports combined. He hails the tendency to bring producers and consumers together by more rapid transit and fewer middlemen.

THE AMERICAN FARMER SACRIFICED TO FREE TRADE BY THE MILLS BILL.

Mr. Chairman, the American farmer has for years heard the Democratic leaders denounce the tariff as the bulwark of monopoly, the enricher of a favored few whose products ought to be on the free-list

He will read the Mills bill to find that the farmer is the Robber Baron whose products now go to the free-list. The raiser of sheep and the grower of wool is now the chief of sinners, and wool must be made free. Cultivators of hemp, flax, peas, beans, cabbage, potatoes, seeds, and vegetables are monopolists; so these go to the free-list.

More than one-third of the free-list in the Mills bill is composed of the yield of the field, forest, and mine to the damage of the lumberman, quarryman, farmer, and miner.

With demagogic zeal salt which costs us 6 cents per capita is hurried to the free-list, while sugar which costs us \$2.57 per capita escapes lightly.

But I will not vex the House with figures. Figures are good servants but bad masters. This bill and the tables in the majority report suggest that either ad valorem or percentage is the prince of liars.

THE PROBLEM TO-DAY—NOT CHEAPNESS, BUT EMPLOYMENT.

Mr. Chairman, the speeches for this bill are the extravagant speeches of forty years ago. The necessities and conveniences of life were never so plentiful or so cheap as to-day. The wages of labor were never so high in our country. The poor man's blanket never was so cheap as now, but the poor man's wages are the lowest in the States where most of the members who support the Mills bill hail from. During the past forty years all over the world mechanical and scientific appliances have transformed the transporting and producing of commodities. These have reduced and are still reducing the labor required for both.

When Cobden triumphed with the cry of "the cheap loaf" the trouble was the scarcity and dearthness of the necessities of life. To-day the struggle is for work enough to give the bulk of population money enough to buy these necessities of life now so cheap and abundant.

Without employment, increasing masses of people must pass a miserable existence in the midst of plenty. Industries must constantly grow and diversify to give full and well-paid employment. From the difficulty of supplying adequate employment in the midst of commodities cheap and plentiful has resulted the reconversion of the civilized world to protective tariffs.

Employment, not cheapness, is the mainspring of national contentment. Internal production and internal consumption are the best tests of national prosperity.

Cheap blankets and cheap salt are a mockery if labor is cheaper still. Free trade means untaxed foreign competition. It cheapens a few things the workman consumes, but cheapens everything that he produces. Protection raises the price of a few things the workman consumes, but raises the price of everything he produces, and higher wages for what he produces means a higher standard of life for home, wife, and children.

Free trade means cheapness to the few rich idlers with fixed incomes, but longer hours, lower wages, harder work to the workers, who are many. Goods are too cheap for us when they are cheaper than we can make them. Competition with long hours and low wages will bring us to long hours and low wages. "Competition for cheapness becomes competition in cheap labor, and competition in cheap labor means competition in flesh and blood."

To-day every old soul-driver of the South is a free-trader. Free trade is against the poor man and in favor of the rich man when it lets the rich man buy what he wants abroad and employ the foreign workers at lower wages in place of the American producer who stands ready with his capital, the workman's skill, his practical knowledge, his industry, his strength, his health. In this country to-day the workingman has the ballot to defend him against the competition of underpaid workmen and plethoric capital in Europe, and Coolie and Chinese labor in Asia, for all of them by cheap ocean freights are now brought near our door. [Applause.]

THE MARKET OF THE WORLD IS A DELUSION AND A SNARE FOR US.

When you tell the farmer if he will slaughter his sheep free wool will enable our manufacturers to control the foreign market, he retorts that cotton has always been free. Free cotton has not given our spinners control of the foreign market, but with free wool a million flockmasters must seek other employment.

Since all foreign countries save England have adopted the protective system, free trade for us can not open a single port or market not now open to us, but simply opens our market to all foreign wares. We would fall before the combined efforts of protective tariffs abroad and foreign competition at home.

The depressed and overcrowded market of England is already open to us, and all the markets of the continent of Europe are protected. How then will these markets give us continuing employment? Besides, if ten million workers in glass, woollens, cotton, and silk in Germany, France, and Belgium are working 72 hours a week, including Sunday, at 50 per cent. less wages, and send their products free to New York and Boston or Baltimore, at a lower rate of freight than it costs workmen working 48 hours a week here, then these ten million workmen are competing as if they were all here alongside of our workmen. Instead of free trade let us rather make more stringent our immigration laws. [Applause.]

THE SOUTH MOST NEEDS THE TARIFF.

Mr. Chairman, it amazes me to hear Mr. Mills, who hails from Texas,

claim that the tariff has nothing to do with wages, because wages are higher in some States than in others. The tariff wrought its best fruit in New England and the enterprising North and West. Wages are lower in Arkansas and Louisiana and South Carolina, because slavery condemned the black and poor white people to ignorance; and after the war under the inherited system it was too long disgraceful to labor.

The wages of her men and women are not much more than half the wages paid in New England. It is amazing to hear Representatives from the Southern States unite to denounce the tariff, when the South most needs protection. New England and Pennsylvania, rich with the fruits of a general system of manufactures, may well smile at the folly of these Southern leaders blinded by prejudice.

The United States Government was formed in part for the creation and promotion of manufactures. The Confederate States government was formed to stimulate agriculture alone and to import manufactures.

Will the old South never recant this clause of the Confederate constitution?

But no bounties shall be granted from the treasury, nor shall any duties or taxes on importations from foreign nations be laid to promote or foster any industry.

On this charter of free trade and slave labor the South based the fabric of a commercial alliance with England—the exchange of cheap manufactures from cheap foreign labor for unlimited cotton from cheap slave labor. The war cry of the old South was slave labor and free trade. Slavery has gone, but these leaders of the old South here on this floor fight for the English alliance and free trade once more. Free trade is still the dream of the old South, whose corner-stone was the plantation idea—wide lands, an accomplished few enriched by the ignorant many toiling for bare subsistence.

The old South, whose old master class can forget with magnanimity the bitterness of the war, but can not forget the enfranchisement of their slaves.

The old South, which, appalled at the rule of the ignorant majority, resorts in turn to violence or fraud, convinced that if ever the small white minority yields at the ballot-box to the growing black majority then will be the doom in the cotton States of public and private rights.

The old South, which, bewildered by the gravest problem of civilization, blindly keeps solid the black vote by outside pressure, by the denial of full citizenship, which excuses the fraudulent denial of a fair poll or count in communities where there is a black majority, by reason of color, ignorance, and poverty, convinced that fraud affords the only escape from the supremacy of the poor and ignorant mass.

The old South, which passionately forbids massed black ignorance to be counted against its own intelligent white minority, but with shameless inconsistency believes it right to count this uncounted black vote wherever the South needs an offset to as many intelligent workingmen's votes actually cast in the North and West, believes it right to thus quadruple the power of the white minority of the cotton States at an election for President and Congress.

This old South, whose old Confederate leaders on this floor now seek by free-trade and the English alliance to readjust the old plantation idea to raw products of mines and fields with cheap peasant labor.

The young men of the South begin to realize, though slowly, that when the white minority stoops to fraud upon the poll or count, it controls the massed majority at the cost of its own civic virtue and debasement of the moral sense of the community.

There is hope in the new South with her exultation in her new-found treasures, her inexhaustible mines of coal and iron, her mountains of iron and salt, her copper, lead, her granite, her fire-clay, her cement and lime rock, all imperiled by this bill. The new South, with its nascent industrial fire, its gleams of wealth through whirling spindles and looms and molten glass.

The new South, with its growing impatience with the plantation idea, the growing belief that the Northern township system will be potential, and that peasant labor can not sustain "Southern booms." The new South by slow degrees learning that the healthful growth of Southern towns and cities must be grounded upon the education of the whole mass of the people, by the free consent of all under a local self-government with equal civil rights as citizens. The new South, conscious of the value of its free black labor, beginning dimly to see that this labor robbed of its dues for two centuries must be educated if the South would rival Northern labor, if it wants the factory to raise the value of the farms, and around the shops to grow a village.

The new South, which believes it must lift its labor above the level of Europe, and that like the North it must eventually pay its skilled workers in metal, glass, wool, and cotton 50 per cent. more than the old world if it would transform its towns into cities and diffuse prosperity over countless small farms.

Upon this new South, thrilling with mighty enterprises, developing her mines, founding her cities, Mr. Cleveland's message against a protective tariff fell like some unwelcome bell knelling a departed friend. This cry of free raw materials is the device whereby to drive the new South back to free trade before her transformation weeds her to the tariff which made New England great. In this spirit John Randolph said he would go a mile out of his way to kick a sheep. He hated the animal which made the farmers protectionists.

Like another Tannhauser, the new South has just broken away from the toils of slavery. It has awakened to the industries of earth. Just as it has made paths in the trackless forest, just when it is exploring the seams of earth to extract its ores, just as it stands by the mouths of its new-made coal-pits, the President's message and the Mills bill summon the new South again to slumber, that the vines may cumber the forests, that bats and owls may inhabit the shafts of deserted mines, that spiders may weave their webs over the mouths of the coal-pits, that the grass may grow again in the village streets. [Applause.]

Like another Tannhauser, this last cry will break the illusion of free trade that so long has blinded the South.

Instead of Cleveland's curfew, we will set the morning school-bells ringing in the South. [Applause.]

Mr. HEMPHILL. Have you ever been South?

Mr. MCOMAS. I have, somewhat.

Mr. HEMPHILL. How many times?

Mr. MCOMAS. Many times. I was born and bred on the Potomac, in a slave State, and I live there yet.

Mr. HEMPHILL. Well, I do not live in that country either. I want to know whether the gentleman has ever been south of the Potomac.

Mr. MCOMAS. Oh, yes; lived South, and sometimes traveled South.

Mr. HEMPHILL. Recently?

Mr. MCOMAS. I have been there recently, and would be glad to go again to the gentleman's country; would be glad to meet my friend there; would be glad to observe the effect of protection still retained at 100 per cent. on rice in his State, and above all would be glad to go there next election day to look upon peaceful and fair elections and the eight ballot-boxes to deceive the illiterate voters; would be glad to see there such a state of sentiment as is represented on this side by seventeen men, friends of the American industrial system from the Southern States—six from Virginia, four of them gallant ex-Confederates as well as Republicans; two from Tennessee, one from West Virginia, one from Maryland, two from North Carolina, three from Kentucky, in spite of the deadly enmity of the whisky ring, the deadly foe of the protective tariff; my two neighbors yonder from Missouri, the whole seventeen, except the two brave soldier Republicans from Missouri, Republicans who are "native and to the manor born"—born and bred in the slave States, belonging there, and all of them the peers of any man from the South, on this floor as well as at their own homes and among their own constituents. [Applause.]

I lament that able and fair-minded men like my friend from South Carolina can be standing here against the best interests of my section as well as the grand interests of my country, while these Republican ex-Confederates and these Republican Union soldiers, these Republican native-born Representatives from the South, come here to cast 17 votes from the new South against this free-trade bill which would bring ruin to the South even more than to other portions of the Union. I hope the gentleman is satisfied with my answer.

Mr. HEMPHILL. The gentleman's eloquence, I will say, with proper respect to my friend, is only surpassed by his ignorance. One peculiarity of people who live North and are Republicans is that they not only want to regulate their own affairs but those of everybody else. Now, we from the South are supposed to know what are the interests of our section. We are sent here for the purpose of representing those interests by as intelligent constituents as any persons in this country. We have no feeling of opposition to the North; let its people make all the money they can—

Mr. MCOMAS. I can not yield for my friend to make a speech, though he is able to make a very good one; the time I have remaining is too short. He does not hesitate, by helping the Mills bill, to try to regulate and ruin the interests of my State—its coal, its glass, cement, and labor.

Mr. HOPKINS, of Illinois (to Mr. HEMPHILL). What do you pay your laborers?

Mr. HEMPHILL. We pay them all we can afford to pay them under this miserable protective system, which takes almost everything to satisfy the demands of oppressive taxation.

Mr. HOPKINS, of Illinois. In Illinois a farm hand gets \$20 to \$25 a month, because we have diversified industries. In South Carolina such laborers receive but \$6 to \$7 a month. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. HEMPHILL. In addition to their wages we give them a home. I guaranty that we pay our laborers as much, counting provisions and home, together with actual cash, as similar laborers are paid in Illinois.

Mr. HOPKINS, of Illinois. I will say—

Mr. MCOMAS. I can not yield further; I have something myself to say about that. In reply to the gentleman from South Carolina, who says Maryland is not a Southern State, I wish to say in 1861 your people, imbued with the poison of the subtle and able Calhoun, the virus from the fangs of secession, sent her commissioners who came to the people of Maryland and plead with her as a Southern State to go with them into secession, bankruptcy, and ruin. You called her then a Southern State. Although lying on the Potomac, and although a slave State, she vindicated her right to come farther North when she sent 46,000 Union soldiers to defend that flag which hangs over the

Speaker's chair upon the field of battle when your war cry was free trade and slave labor and ours was protection to white labor and freedom to slave labor in this country. [Great applause on the Republican side.]

The gentleman's own ignorance is narrow indeed when he restricts and limits the South to South Carolina. It was so once, but is no longer.

But when you say we are to be likened to the North and West, we in Maryland begin to rival their glowing activity. I thank thee, Jew, for that word. [Applause.]

ORGANIZED LABOR—BLAIR BILL—PROTECTIVE TARIFF.

Mr. Chairman, these three things affright the old Bourbon régime—organized labor, the Blair bill, and a protective tariff. Organized labor which in the freer States by manifold endeavors, through blunder and defeat, still is always groping upward toward the light, and destined under liberty and law to grandly help the uplifting of all mankind in this favored land. Organized labor, so blindly battled with by the leaders of the old South on this floor, will yet prevail, as in this modern world the strength of numbers ever ultimately prevails.

If these free-trade leaders are statesmen they should beware lest the black labor of the South, robbed of two centuries of education, of self-help, standing with its eyes blinded, may take hold of the middle pillars of our house, while our Philistines are sacrificing to their god Free Trade, and are making merry with our Southern people, and pull down our house upon us to avenge its two eyes.

The Blair bill, which is the surest remedy to ward off such awful calamity, whereby in separate schools the children of the slaves may be fitted for intelligent labor and citizenship which makes organized workers in contented homes the bulwark of the nation. The protective tariff which, linked with organized labor and national educational aid, will destroy proscription, prejudice, and sectionalism.

COAL AND IRON ON THE FREE-LIST.

The clamor of the Southern people, the stern protests from the mines and the towns disconcerted the plan to put coal and iron on the free-list, but these free-traders were not to be foiled. Anthracite coal is on the free-list and bituminous coal is not mentioned. They have put on the free-list "all mineral substances in a crude state and metals unwrought not specially enumerated or provided for. They do not specifically enumerate bituminous coal, which is a mineral substance in a crude state, nor iron which is metal unwrought, and the last section of the Mills bill repeals all laws or parts of laws in conflict therewith. They have openly put all the products of coal on the free-list.

The simple device of omitting to specify bituminous coal, repealing the law which did specify it, and putting it on the free-list as a "mineral substance in a crude state" will not long be hidden from the new South concerned for its coal and iron.

I now charge that since this bill was introduced here our free-trade Treasury chiefs have by a mere ruling repealed the tariff law which protected coal.

For a hundred years, since George Washington signed the first tariff act, bituminous and semi-bituminous coal of commerce have been protected. All the semi-bituminous coal of the Atlantic slope, the coal of Maryland, Virginia, West Virginia, much of the coal of Pennsylvania has been protected. Suddenly, in March, our Secretary declared that all coal with less than 20 per cent. of volatile combustible matter is anthracite, and therefore free. It matters not that anthracite averages less than 5 per cent. of volatile matter.

For the first time the Cumberland coal of my own State and the Pocahontas coal of Virginia are declared to be anthracite by the Treasury, though still called semi-bituminous by all mankind.

The bituminous coal of Swansea, Wales, and the bituminous coal of Canada are already coming into our ports and will not be stopped unless this House shall declare that a free-trade Secretary can not legislate and thus enlarge the free-list at will to give the railroad, the gas, and steam-ship monopolies free trade in coal before the Mills bill has passed. And I would vote to impeach the Secretary of the Treasury who has dared to usurp the functions of Congress, who has boldly put bituminous coal on the free-list in defiance of the law.

THE AMERICAN SYSTEM—ITS SPLENDID DEVELOPMENT.

Mr. Chairman, I have listened to the lamentations of the other side, who forget that for eleven years they have controlled this House, and for three years past ruled this country. If the plain people, the working people of my country, can be diverted, by these querulous complaints, from the greatness of the American protective system and the splendor of its development as fashioned by the national Republican party during the recent twenty-five years, they indeed are our people—

Like the people—

To borrow from an old philosopher—

who when they went to Olympia could only perceive that they were scorched by the sun, and pressed by the crowd, and wetted by the rain, and that life was full of disagreeable and troublesome things, and so they almost forgot the great colossus of ivory and gold, Phidias's statue of Zeus which they had come to see, and which stood in all its glory and power before their perturbed and foolish vision.

I believe rather that the vast majority of our people will, with our foremost statesman, again declare for that policy which inspires labor

with hope and crowns it with dignity, which gives safety to capital and protects its increase, which secures political power to every citizen, culture and comfort to every home. [Great applause.]

Mr. HEMPHILL. I wish to say, Mr. Chairman, simply, if the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. Mccomas] will give me his attention for a moment, that in my remarks a few moments ago I desired to express my understanding of his lack of information as to the condition of things in the Southern States. My remark had reference exclusively to that, and was intended in no sense to be offensive.

Mr. Mccomas. I appreciate that. I could not understand the gentleman from South Carolina as intending to give or myself as desiring to take offense at what he has said.

Mr. HEMPHILL. It was only that I did not think the gentleman had sufficient personal knowledge of the subject upon which he was then speaking to enable him to advance opinions of that character.

Mr. Mccomas. I hope to have the opportunity of witnessing in person, at no distant date, the condition of affairs there, and especially would I like to see an election held.

Mr. HEMPHILL. I will be delighted to see the gentleman there on such an occasion, and promise to show him an election where there is a voter for every vote.

Mr. HOUK. But counted differently from the way they are cast.

Mr. HEMPHILL. No, sir; counted just as they are cast.

Mr. PERKINS. That would undoubtedly be a rare sight, which a man might be justified in going so many miles to see.

Mr. HEMPHILL. Very well; we will be very glad to show it to gentlemen who choose to favor us with their presence there.

Mr. LANHAM. Mr. Chairman, I claim no superior knowledge as an expert in the "dismal science." I can not assume to be as well informed on the tariff question as the learned gentlemen who have heretofore spoken upon the subject, nor do I hope for one moment that what I may say will afford any specially valuable contribution to the economic thought or literary excellence of this discussion. But believing as I do, that the subject under consideration is one of supreme importance, and of the utmost interest to every section of our common country, I have felt constrained to record my convictions and express some reasons for the faith within me.

During the brief period of my Congressional service I have witnessed two occasions in this House which impressed themselves in an extraordinary degree upon my observation. They attracted great public attention and will not soon pass from the memory of those who were then present. I allude to what occurred on May 6, 1884, and June 17, 1886. On the first of these dates the enacting clause of the tariff bill as then proposed was stricken out by a vote of 159 yeas to 155 nays; on the last the House refused to enter upon the consideration of a kindred measure by a vote of 140 yeas to 157 nays. The results of these votes, the political complexion of which is well known, were greeted with applause by the protectionists, and the country was given to understand that the burdens of war taxation, indefensible as they are in times of peace, should continue to oppress the people. In the face of Executive recommendation, in spite of popular clamor for tax reduction, and the consensus of the best political economists of all parties as to the absolute necessity for legislative action, in the presence of a constantly accumulating revenue beyond the requirement for an economical administration of the Government, and the inevitable consequence of an abnormal and prodigious surplus in the Federal Treasury, aside from the palpable injustice and obvious impolicy of perpetuating the existing system of taxation, there could not then be found in this great House of the people a sufficient number of their chosen Representatives who would even allow time and opportunity to investigate or reform apparent abuses, or in any manner relieve the tax-payers from confessed oppression.

When, however, on the 17th of April of this good year, the motion was made by the chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means to begin the consideration of the bill now before us, no voice was heard in opposition. High-tariff men, Republicans and Democrats, "opened not their mouths." It seemed to be realized on all sides that remedial action could not longer be delayed, that the last continuance had been granted, and the time for trial had arrived.

What the fate of the pending bill shall be no one can safely prognosticate. It is within the power of the protectionists to defeat it—to strangle and destroy it ere final consideration is reached; to obstruct and wear it out. But whatever may be the result, I sincerely hope that no Convert will be found on this side of the Chamber to take the initiative in its decapitation, that no man who calls himself a Democrat will draw the first dagger or deal the first blow. In view of the conditions that surround us, and the intrepid stand taken by the President, I can not perceive how any Democrat can afford to antagonize the general proposition now submitted in the direction of reducing taxation and simplifying the processes of its collection. It is possible, as intimated, for the opposition to prevent the passage of the bill in its present shape, or as it may be amended, to prevent any relief contemplated by its provisions, and thereby maintain the present status of the tariff schedules. If any bill of the sort shall pass, it will be the result of Democratic persistency and aggression, and by the grace and

permission of the Republican party both in the House and in the Senate.

If there be no tariff legislation the Republican party will be responsible for the failure. One thing is certain: the Democrats are inflexibly determined to crowd and press this great issue before Congress and the country. The fight has been going on for years. The agitation will not cease until something is accomplished. The people in the factory and in the field, in the shop and at the shambles, whether they live by the expenditure of brain or brawn, at the North or in the South, everywhere throughout this great country, expect and require some certain and definite action, some decision and settlement of the question. They can not and will not brook further suspense. The Armageddon of American politics is at hand. The lines are being drawn. Choose you this day whom you will serve. He that is not for us is against us. If a Democrat favor a continuation of war taxes, let him go to the camp of the enemy; if a Republican love country better than partisanship, let him join the ranks of reform; if any patriot prefer the general good to special advantage and class benefit, now is the time to show his colors. Listen to the authoritative declaration of your respective parties four years ago:

The Democratic party has failed completely to relieve the people of the burden of unnecessary taxation by a wise reduction of the surplus. The Republican party pledges itself to correct the inequalities of the tariff and to reduce the surplus.—*Republican Platform of 1884.*

That change is necessary is proved by an existing surplus of more than \$100,000,000 which has yearly been collected from a suffering people. Unnecessary taxation is unjust taxation. * * * The Democratic party is pledged to revise the tariff in a spirit of fairness to all interests.—*Democratic Platform of 1884.*

Read the message of the Union's Executive, who is charged with conserving the public weal, at the beginning of this Congress. He emphasizes the gravity of the situation. Look at it as you will, it sounds the note of alarm and can not be disregarded. He has hoisted the danger-signal and the world has seen it. Our safety and prosperity depend upon heeding the warning and putting into practical operation the plain behests of representative duty.

Gentlemen of the House, after all, the great body of our constituents are homogeneous. Tax-payers have kindred interests and cognate sympathies. Political parties, it is true, are necessary factors in republican institutions. Party alignments were formed in the very infancy of our Government, and will and ought always to exist. I believe there always have been and ever will be conscientious citizens of the American Union who entertain different views and conflicting sentiments on questions of public policy. I do not believe that any party has now or ever will have a monopoly of all the virtue and purity, or all the vice and profligacy, which adorn on the one side, or degrade on the other, the administration of governmental affairs. There are good men and bad men alike in every human association. Evil communications will corrupt the good manners of all the sons of Adam.

But in the presence of a common danger, in the blazing light which unmistakably reveals the absolute necessity for a conservation of the best interests of the Republic, there must and will be found sufficient unity of purpose and concentration of effort to meet, in some measure, the demands of the situation. Selfishness must be made to yield to the paramount requirement of the general good and public welfare.

Mr. Chairman, it seems to me unnecessary to repeat the current platitudes and generic postulates which ever attend a tariff discussion. The diverse constructions of constitutional power and purpose are known of all men. The infinite variety of transformation and verbal adjustment of old statement, the artistic modern formulation of ancient *dicta*, however ingeniously constructed, can make no substantial addition to what has so often been announced. What I said in the Forty-eighth Congress in this connection is perhaps equally applicable to the present time:

It were practically impossible, at this day, for any man to suggest anything new or essentially different from the manifold thought and treatment which the subject of Federal taxation has received in this country from time to time. It has engaged the attention and inspired the research of governmental philosophers for more than a century, and statesmen and essayists have in turn given it their current contributions. It has been so often discussed, critically considered, and profoundly explored that the very language employed is generic, the platitudes identical, the illustrations parallel, the methods threadbare. With a very slight adjustment of transposition, and the elimination of modern data, it will be discovered upon close inspection that much of our recent literature upon this subject is but the adroit reproduction of what was said scores of years ago.

It is not assumed by the majority of the Committee on Ways and Means, nor any one else, that the bill reported is perfect, nor is it expected that it shall be exempt from legitimate criticism. There are, perhaps, many objections which may be urged against it, but it will serve at least as the ground-plan for the interchange of representative opinion and the foundation for legislative judgment. It seems to me that we ought to discuss its defects and commend its merits in the spirit of fairness and concession, and strive to meet on some common ground. I am for the bill, with some amendments. If they can not be had, I will take it as it is and give it an earnest support as the best that can now be accomplished. My most serious general objection to the bill is that it is too protective. It leaves the duties on many articles far too high, which at earlier periods in our history would have been regarded as monstrous. Its chief reductions, amounting to \$46,645,112.48, are made

by additions to the free-list and subtractions from excise or internal-revenue sources. I am not sure that the importation of articles upon which imposts are lessened will not be stimulated to such an extent as to increase the revenues now derived therefrom. In that event, however, some benefit would result in favor of the mass of consumers. There is more required of us than merely stopping an inflow of surplus. That, of course, is an important desideratum, but a thorough revision and adjustment of the entire tariff law is absolutely needed.

Mr. Chairman, it is my purpose to discuss specially only one feature of the bill, and that is section 3, which relates to wool and the manufactures thereof, to be found on pages 27 to 29. By its terms all wools are placed upon the free-list, while articles made from wool are taxed upon an average of 39.87 per cent., ad valorem. Wool contributes to the proposed reduction its present average ad valorem of 29.60 per cent., while its manufactures are only made to surrender 29.05 per cent. This, in my judgment, is disproportionate, and I give notice that at the proper time I shall either move or support an amendment which will reduce the duties on woolen manufactures to an average ad valorem of 25 per cent. Just here I beg to reproduce a portion of my former speech, submitted April 22, 1884, bearing upon this subject:

I may fail to convince the opposition, and may not satisfy the sheepmen of the country, that the proposed reduction in the tariff on wool will not injuriously affect the wool business; that it will not measurably embarrass that interest and depress prices. I might content myself by saying—what ought to be a conclusive reason—that it is unjust and unconstitutional to tax the great body of the people to protect that or any other interest; that protection to one sheep-raiser, if it increases the cost of the consumer's necessities, means oppression and injustice to fifty other good citizens engaged in other pursuits, and that the conscientious discharge of apparent duty is infinitely above and beyond any consideration of the mere consequences involved.

But I do not believe, in the presence of living facts and the truth of history, that high tariffs on wools necessarily bring high prices to the wool-grower. I am not prepared to state the exact extent to which the character of wools produced in Texas enters into competition with that imported from foreign countries; but feel warranted in the statement that it is limited.

Mr. Hurd, in his recent admirable speech, said: "There are three grades or classes of wool in the market—first, the superfine or the Silesian wool; second, the intermediary or combing wool; and third, the coarse carpet wool. Of these America does not produce the superfine wool or the carpet wool, and it can not produce them. Therefore no duty on them can be of any benefit to the farmer of this country. He does not grow them.

"As to the intermediary grade this is the situation: The wools of the foreign countries have a fiber and texture which our wools do not possess, and the American manufacturer needs them to mix with American wool to produce the best results. No man can make a good suit of clothes made from American goods alone. From England, from France, and other parts of the world we want the wool with their fiber to make the best product for our manufacturer in his work of supplying the home demand.

"I believe every pound of American wool of intermediary grade that comes into this country will make more valuable every pound of wool raised here. The basis of my proposition on this point is that the foreign wool does not come into America in competition with American wool, but to supplement its deficiencies. This is no idle theory of mine."

As to the general effect of the tariff on the prices of wool in this country I take the liberty to quote in addition the following extract from a very able published letter of Senator J. H. Slater to the secretary of the wool-growers' convention of Oregon, of date December 30, 1883:

"It has been demonstrated over and over again from the statistics of wool prices in this country, covering a period of many years, during which time wool has been subjected to varying duties, sometimes practically prohibitory, at other times letting in the lower grades entirely free, with a moderate duty upon the higher and firmer grades, that the domestic product has always borne better prices under low tariffs or when wool was free than during periods of high duties. This fact has been reiterated in this country and elsewhere many times by publicists of the highest character.

In corroboration of this statement I invite attention to the following quotations from the forcible speech of Hon. WILLIAM M. SPRINGER in the last Congress:

"In 1867 the wool-growers of the country and the manufacturers of woolen goods succeeded in inducing Congress to impose protective duties on the importation of foreign wools, and also to impose such additional duties upon importations of foreign woolen goods as would compensate them for the loss they would sustain by reason of the duties on the raw material. The tariff upon wool prior to 1867 had been fluctuating under various acts of Congress from 1824 to 1865. Some of these acts place the duties very low. From 1858 to 1861 wool costing 20 cents per pound or less was on the free-list, and all other wools paid a duty of 24 per cent. ad valorem. From 1862 to 1864 the duty on wools costing 18 cents per pound and less was but 5 per cent. ad valorem; and over 18 cents and less than 24 cents it was 3 cents per pound; and over 24 cents per pound in price, 9 cents per pound in duty.

"Between 1865 and 1866 the tariff on wool costing 12 cents per pound and less was 3 cents per pound, and costing over 12 cents up to 24 cents per pound the duty was 6 cents per pound, and between 24 cents per pound and 32 cents per pound the duty was 10 cents per pound and 10 per cent. ad valorem; and on all wools costing over 32 cents per pound the duty was 12 cents per pound and 10 per cent. ad valorem. The act of August 22, 1866, slightly changed these duties, but they remained substantially the same until the taking effect of the act of March 2, 1867, the law now in force. I will not recapitulate the various tariffs imposed by the act of 1867. The classification prepared for Government experts embraces one hundred and sixty-eight different standard samples of wool to be taxed under this law. The duties, however, vary from 18 to 110 per cent.

"These burdens are very unequally distributed on the different classes of wool, carpet wools being taxed at the rate of from 18 to 39 per cent. ad valorem, while fine wool pays from 37 to 88 per cent. in the grease, and from 31 to 96 per cent. if washed, and from 73 to 110 per cent. if in scoured condition. It will be seen that the high tariff upon fine washed and scoured wools has had a marked effect upon the manufacture of woolen goods in this country, and has worked greatly to the injury of both the wool-growers and manufacturers, as will be seen as I proceed further.

"The wool-growers felicitated themselves after the passage of the act of 1867 upon the success which had attended their efforts in securing a protective tariff on their product; but we will see how far their expectations have been realized. Their object in securing tariff legislation was to prevent foreign wools from competing with their products. They desired to practically exclude many classes of wool from our markets in order that they might receive greater prices for all they might raise. I shall be able to prove that, so far from realizing their

expectations, the market has actually been depressed; that in the States east of the Mississippi and Missouri Rivers the number of sheep has vastly decreased, and that the price of wool has averaged less per pound since the high tariffs were imposed than prevailed previously under the low tariffs.

"I have stated that since the passage of the protective tariff act of 1867 up to the present time, a period of fifteen years, the price of wool in this country has been less than it was for the fifteen years next preceding that time. This proposition is not left to conjecture or speculation. Fortunately for the position which I assume, the most accurate and reliable data upon this subject have been preserved, and herewith I present for careful examination the following statement furnished by the Chief of the Bureau of Statistics of the Treasury Department.

Statement showing the average price of medium American washed clothing fleece wool from 1824 to 1881, inclusive.

[United States Economist and Dry Goods Reporter, January 31, 1880, data furnished by Mauger & Avery, 49 West Broadway, New York City.]

| Year. | Average price. | Year. | Average price. |
|-------|----------------|-------|----------------|
| 1824 | 44½ | 1853 | 53½ |
| 1825 | 42 | 1854 | 43 |
| 1826 | 39 | 1855 | 37½ |
| 1827 | 32½ | 1856 | 45 |
| 1828 | 36 | 1857 | 46½ |
| 1829 | 36½ | 1858 | 36½ |
| 1830 | 45½ | 1859 | 47 |
| 1831 | 61½ | 1860 | 47½ |
| 1832 | 47½ | 1861 | 38½ |
| 1833 | 50½ | 1862 | 50½ |
| 1834 | 54 | 1863 | 75½ |
| 1835 | 55½ | 1864 | 87½ |
| 1836 | 60½ | 1865 | 82 |
| 1837 | 50½ | 1866 | 63 |
| 1838 | 42 | 1867 | 50½ |
| 1839 | 49½ | 1868 | 46 |
| 1840 | 41½ | 1869 | 49 |
| 1841 | 41½ | 1870 | 46½ |
| 1842 | 37½ | 1871 | 55 |
| 1843 | 39 | 1872 | 70½ |
| 1844 | 35½ | 1873 | 55½ |
| 1845 | 37½ | 1874 | 54½ |
| 1846 | 32½ | 1875 | 51½ |
| 1847 | 40 | 1876 | 44 |
| 1848 | 34½ | 1877 | 42½ |
| 1849 | 34½ | 1878 | 40½ |
| 1850 | 38½ | 1879 | 37½ |
| 1851 | 41½ | 1880 | 46 |
| 1852 | 38½ | 1881 | 40 |

JOSEPH NIMMO, JR., Chief of Bureau, TREASURY DEPARTMENT, BUREAU OF STATISTICS, February 3, 1882.

The average price for the fifteen years preceding 1867 was 58.8 cents per pound. The average price for the fifteen years succeeding 1867 was 48.6 cents per pound.

These statements, supported as they are by facts and figures, are exceedingly cogent and to my mind unanswerable. But be that as it may, with me the solution of the matter, as before intimated, does not depend upon the possible results to one class of business enterprise, but upon doing what is right. I can not, as a public representative, sworn to support the Constitution, seeking general justice, economic administration, and fair dealing to the entire people, ask that wool be protected, if it has to be done at the expense of all other interests and thereby lay the foundation for the protection of everything else which clamors for class legislation. I consent to and shall vote for the reduction on wool as proposed by the bill under consideration, as well as for all other reductions contemplated, as far as they go, believing that to the extent of such reductions the general well-being of the people will be promoted. But while this is the case I wish to contend that an average reduction of 15.06 per cent. on wool is not met by an average reduction of only 19.99 per cent. on the manufactures of wool, as estimated under this bill.

The following statistical statement, prepared at my request by the Chief of the Bureau of Statistics, shows the operations of the tariff upon wool and the manufactures thereof, and the relative difference in the results of the old law and the act of March 3, 1883:

Value of imports of wool entered for consumption in the United States and the ad valorem rate of duty collected during the following periods:

| Articles. | During the six months ended December 31— | | | | | |
|-----------------------|--|------------------------------------|--------------------|------------------------------------|---------------------|----------------|
| | 1882. | | 1883. | | Increase+ Decrease— | |
| | Value. | Ad valorem rate of duty collected. | Value. | Ad valorem rate of duty collected. | Value. | Ad valorem. |
| Clothing wool..... | Dollars. 1,210,689 | Per ct. 55.46 | Dollars. 2,399,515 | Per ct. 44.73 | Dollars. +1,188,826 | Per ct. -10.73 |
| Combing wool..... | 135,123 | 50.19 | 615,677 | 43.48 | + 480,554 | - 6.71 |
| Carpet wool..... | 3,505,980 | 27.79 | 4,345,385 | 25.02 | + 839,405 | - 2.77 |
| Manufactures of wool. | 22,400,387 | 66.71 | 22,064,512 | 68.90 | - 335,875 | + 2.19 |

JOS. NIMMO, JR., Chief of Bureau.

TREASURY DEPARTMENT, Bureau of Statistics, March 7, 1884.

From this it appears that the duty on the character of wools therein stated was decreased, while that upon woolen manufactures was increased as indicated, under the act of the Forty-seventh Congress. The inequality was glaring enough under the old law. The reasonable proportion and adjustment of rates

would have demanded under that a very considerable reduction on the manufactures of wool to have equalized them with those upon the raw materials. And now while the present bill limits the maximum rate of duty on wools and woollens at 60 per cent. ad valorem, and is *pro tanto* a relief to the people, yet I think it preserves and perpetuates, to a greater or less extent, many of the original vices, and in addition provides:

"That nothing in this act shall operate to reduce the duty above imposed on any article below the rate at which said article was dutiable under 'An act to provide for the payment of outstanding Treasury notes, to authorize a loan, to regulate and fix the duties on imports, and for other purposes,' approved March 2, 1861, commonly called the 'Morrill tariff.'"

This clause prevents, it is true, a 20 per cent. reduction on some characters of wool, but comes, I think, materially to the aid of certain woolen manufactures, and allows the duties thereon to remain too high. I do not favor any indorsement of the maladjustment or cabalistic features of the existing tariff law. In my judgment the pruning ought to be thorough and the reformation radical. "What is worth doing at all is worth doing well." If existing conditions are condemned, it seems to me that "the ax ought to be laid to the root of the tree;" if the tares are to be separated from the wheat, why not collect them all, and apply the fire? I believe in an intrepid policy and a heroic treatment of this national disease. If it be wise and proper to agitate the tariff question—and that it is I entertain no doubt—the agitation, it seems to me, should be comprehensive, and the work of reformation extend all along the line.

No skirmishing, no half-way measure, no temporizing expedient will elicit popular commendation or endure the test of enlightened criticism. If the desired and necessary legislation can not be accomplished—and under the present composition of Congress I fear it is hopeless—a courageous assertion of principle, an exhibition of the faith within us can be made. Now, I have no adverse criticism to make upon the pending bill, save the propriety of eliminating therefrom the defects and inequalities which characterize the past enactments; if they are to furnish the model, if it were left to me, I would lop off their excrescences, heal their deformities, and eschew their vices. But if in the judgment of wiser men it will be now impracticable to obviate these imperfections, I shall support the bill in its present shape in the interest of harmony and concert of action. For one, I am willing to lay upon the altar of the common country every selfish consideration, and that my people shall rely upon their natural resources, their own protective energies, the legitimate profits of their own pursuits, unaided by any tribute to be extracted at the toil and expense of their fellow-men.

It is neither impolitic nor improper to demand an equivalent concession at the hands of others. The humblest shepherd, who in the solitude of the Western prairies attends his flock and listens to the bleating of his lambs, is the peer of the grandest millionaire in the crowded city, whose music comes from the hum of his spindles and the clang of his machinery. The one is just as good, just as nobly born, just as American, just as much entitled to consideration as the others. Equal rights is the transcript of the paternal mind, planted in the corner-stone of our republican edifice, and when by ruthless hand removed, the stately structure will be in ruins.

Mr. Chairman, I ask indulgence to discuss this clause of the bill from a Texas standpoint.

I have before me the report of the Comptroller of Public Accounts of the State of Texas for the year ending August 31, 1887, which contains statements showing the assessment of property for taxation in that State for the year 1887, as taken from the official rolls of the different counties. In it I find the number and value of sheep rendered for taxes for the years 1886 and 1887. It shows for the year 1886 4,543,765 sheep, valued at \$5,232,814; for the year 1887, 4,275,394 sheep, valued at \$5,016,674. The number of decrease from that of 1886 is 268,371, valued at \$266,140. Mr. Dodge, the Statistician of the Department of Agriculture, estimates the number of sheep in Texas in January, 1888, at 4,523,739, with an average value of \$1.52 per head, amounting in the aggregate to \$6,864,744. I quote from him the following estimate of the number, average price, and total value of sheep in all the States and Territories of the United States.

| States and Territories. | Sheep. | | |
|-------------------------|-----------|----------------|-------------|
| | Number. | Average price. | Value. |
| Maine..... | 547,725 | \$3.01 | \$1,645,914 |
| New Hampshire..... | 208,023 | 2.98 | 610,968 |
| Vermont..... | 393,301 | 2.85 | 1,120,279 |
| Massachusetts..... | 62,667 | 3.30 | 206,702 |
| Rhode Island..... | 20,852 | 3.81 | 79,498 |
| Connecticut..... | 49,199 | 3.81 | 187,517 |
| New York..... | 1,564,067 | 3.46 | 5,415,582 |
| New Jersey..... | 105,276 | 3.70 | 389,109 |
| Pennsylvania..... | 984,891 | 2.80 | 2,756,119 |
| Delaware..... | 22,294 | 3.27 | 72,790 |
| Maryland..... | 160,254 | 3.35 | 537,171 |
| Virginia..... | 444,741 | 2.42 | 1,078,063 |
| North Carolina..... | 427,500 | 1.36 | 581,054 |
| South Carolina..... | 107,334 | 1.72 | 184,400 |
| Georgia..... | 442,274 | 1.50 | 664,225 |
| Florida..... | 92,888 | 1.96 | 182,061 |
| Alabama..... | 310,622 | 1.46 | 453,135 |
| Mississippi..... | 247,830 | 1.67 | 393,832 |
| Louisiana..... | 113,965 | 1.64 | 186,891 |
| Texas..... | 4,523,739 | 1.52 | 6,864,744 |
| Arkansas..... | 220,167 | 1.41 | 310,127 |
| Tennessee..... | 516,594 | 1.61 | 832,440 |
| West Virginia..... | 474,933 | 2.26 | 1,073,824 |
| Kentucky..... | 797,998 | 2.43 | 1,936,741 |
| Ohio..... | 4,106,622 | 2.61 | 10,714,177 |
| Michigan..... | 2,113,004 | 2.72 | 5,743,900 |
| Indiana..... | 1,003,068 | 2.55 | 2,553,611 |
| Illinois..... | 814,177 | 2.49 | 2,026,894 |
| Wisconsin..... | 911,662 | 2.15 | 1,962,261 |
| Minnesota..... | 283,725 | 2.38 | 674,698 |
| Iowa..... | 408,478 | 2.41 | 985,249 |
| Missouri..... | 1,087,690 | 1.74 | 1,894,973 |
| Kansas..... | 830,139 | 1.76 | 1,457,558 |
| Nebraska..... | 422,112 | 2.02 | 852,456 |
| California..... | 5,462,728 | 1.88 | 10,291,779 |
| Oregon..... | 2,830,123 | 1.70 | 4,807,069 |
| Nevada..... | 660,996 | 1.91 | 1,259,660 |

| States and Territories. | Sheep. | | |
|-------------------------|------------|----------------|-------------|
| | Number. | Average price. | Value. |
| Colorado..... | 1,137,686 | \$1.98 | \$2,257,169 |
| Arizona..... | 658,561 | 1.75 | 1,152,482 |
| Dakota..... | 269,019 | 2.60 | 700,526 |
| Idaho..... | 312,408 | 2.05 | 640,436 |
| Montana..... | 1,265,000 | 2.10 | 2,658,398 |
| New Mexico..... | 3,623,168 | 1.09 | 3,953,239 |
| Utah..... | 1,335,000 | 1.94 | 2,594,172 |
| Washington..... | 549,885 | 1.94 | 1,068,976 |
| Wyoming..... | 523,340 | 2.08 | 1,089,855 |
| Indian Territory..... | | | |
| Total..... | 43,544,755 | 2.05 | 89,279,926 |

It is, I think, worthy of note that while the average value of sheep per head for the whole country is placed at \$2.05, the lowest average, where sheep-raising is of special importance, is given to Texas and New Mexico. The fleeces of this quality of sheep, however, would, it is believed, be in greater demand for purposes of manufacturing admixture with the finer wools that would be imported, as a result of the removal of the present duties on wools. The average value of sheep per head in Texas, as shown by the Comptroller's report, is only \$1.13. This, however, is from the standpoint of taxable valuation and rendition.

Mr. Chairman, I have taken the pains to make a careful computation of the number and value of sheep in the counties which compose the Congressional district which I have the honor to represent in this body, and I discover that the number, as shown from the most authentic sources at my command, is 1,035,396, valued at \$1,196,932, a greater number than that found in the entire State of Indiana, and almost equal to that of Missouri or Colorado. There are but ten of the States and Territories which contain more sheep than the Eleventh Congressional district of Texas; and yet I shall vote for free wool without any fear of injuring the people of my district or retarding the well-being and prosperity of my State.

Let us examine and see if the wool-growers of Texas have any just grounds for opposing the free-wool clause of the bill, and whether their complaints and resolutions against their delegation in Congress are well founded. Of course we deem it impossible to either convince or conciliate our Republican constituents, and such Democrats as cling irremovably to the tenets of protection. But there are those who do not believe that the mere owning of sheep or investment in wool-growing are adequate causes for a transfer of party allegiance, and it is not every sheep-raiser in Texas that will vote the Republican ticket. Some, yea, many, of them are Democrats, and will continue to be Democrats, "in whom there is no guile."

In January, 1883, as shown by the Comptroller's report, there were 4,491,600 sheep in Texas. This was during the high-tariff period, and before the duties on wool were reduced by the act of March 3, 1883. The number appears to be slightly greater in 1886 and less in 1887; and it is not improbable, I think, that the official assessment for taxation may show some falling off for 1888. Much, if not all, of the decrease may be attributed to disease, the severity of recent winters, insufficient shelter, and the fact, as stated in the late report of Mr. Dodge, that "some of the flock-masters in Texas have sent considerable numbers to New Mexico." There has been no greater, and I think far less decline in the profits of this industry than has attended other business pursuits and avocations; nor do I believe that the tariff duties before or since the act of March 3, 1883, have been of any appreciable advantage to the Texas wool-grower, nor specially augmented the prices of the quality of wool grown by him.

In the rush for purchase and investment a few years ago, owing to the profitable utilization of our cheap lands and the supposed fortunes that sheep-raising would yield, there was much of improvident speculation by many persons not experts in sheep values, and having no practical experience in their necessary treatment and preservation. Poor management, the scab, cold weather, and want of proper knowledge and attention will produce their own consequences, whether there be high tariffs, low tariffs, or no tariffs at all. In Texas we have cheap pastoral lands in great abundance at \$2 to \$3 per acre, indigenous and nutritious grasses, and ordinarily mild climatic conditions. Herding expenses are comparatively inconsiderable, and when the methods of sheep-growing are properly understood and observed, it must and always will be, as a rule, reasonably profitable. Waiving the point as to whether a tariff on wool is necessary in other States, where lands are worth from \$50 to \$150 per acre, where sheep require artificial and cultivated food, where expenses are heavy, where only fine wools are produced, I can not perceive why there should come any wool from the Texas sheep-pen at the prospect of free wool, or that it shall ever be said of our shepherd in any event—

He left his crook, he left his flocks.

May it not be presumed that should the wool industry through any possibility deteriorate elsewhere, it would find its appropriate transfer and diversion of its energies to our inviting region? The selfishness involved precludes further pursuit of this proposition. It is not un-

likely, I think, that some high-tariff advocates dread Texas competition as much as foreign importation.

There has been for several years—

Says Mr. Dodge—

a deportation of sheep from Pennsylvania to the cheaper grasses of the far West.

There are less sheep now in the whole State of Pennsylvania by 51,041 than in my Congressional district. I commend this statement to the careful consideration of my friends from Pennsylvania.

Mr. ROWELL. Will the gentleman yield to me for a question?

Mr. LANHAM. Certainly, if it be pertinent to this branch of the subject.

Mr. ROWELL. Do you believe that the price of wool will go down by the amount of tariff tax taken off?

Mr. LANHAM. I can show you, sir, from the reports of the fifteen years preceding and succeeding the protective tariff act of 1867 that the prices of wool absolutely were higher under a low tariff than under a high tariff. I can establish that, I think, by authentic data.

Mr. ROWELL. Then you believe that clothing will cost more under free wool than with wool protected?

Mr. LANHAM. No, sir; I do not believe it will, for reasons which I will endeavor to explain.

Paradoxical as it may appear to my friend from Illinois, I believe that with the repeal of the duties on wool, higher grades of wool grown abroad would be imported for admixture with American wool. The effect of the tariff has been to give to foreign manufacturers a practical monopoly of such wools of Australasia and South America, and they have been able to manufacture and sell to us large quantities of manufactures, notwithstanding our high duty on woolen goods. Our woolen mills by reason of this fact have been seriously crippled, and consequently the market for American wool greatly depressed. By giving our domestic manufacturers foreign wools at the same prices paid by their British competitors to mix with native wools, they will be able to pay as good or better prices for the home product, and yet furnish cheaper and better goods to the consumer. Be this as it may, I would remove all possible doubt, by reducing the duties on woolen manufactures to an average ad valorem of 25 per cent., as before stated.

Mr. Chairman, I desire for the purpose of comparison, and to show that the wool industry has suffered no greater reverses in the shrinkage of values, or from other causes than those which have befallen other enterprises, to allude again to the report of the Comptroller of the State of Texas. I find that in 1886 there were rendered for taxes 6,955,248 cattle, valued at \$60,852,938; in 1887, 7,081,976, valued at \$51,008,550, an increase in number for 1887 of 126,728, but a decrease in value of \$9,844,338, and the average value of cattle per head is placed at \$7.20. From the same report I ascertain that there were 2,317,396 cattle in my district, valued at \$19,596,380. In view of these statements, is there any valid reason why the cattleman should be forced to pay any tribute to the sheepman?

I regret that I am not prepared to show to what extent the business of the farmer went down during the same period.

They were years of unprecedented drought, dearth, and desolation. There was scarcely sufficient bread for the eater or seed for the sower. The distress which obtained in the agricultural counties of my district is simply indescribable. They appealed to the State Legislature and to Congress for relief, and private charity was dispensed with a liberal hand. Congress passed a bill providing for a distribution of seeds in these drought-stricken counties through the Commissioner of Agriculture. The President vetoed it, and told us that it was the duty of the people to support the Government, and not the duty of the Government to support the people. I am glad to say that there is now a splendid prospect for abundant harvests in this afflicted region; but what bounties of Government, what protective tariffs will enhance the value of the farmer's products? What will his wheat and corn be worth per bushel and his cotton per pound? He must work "day in and day out," "from weary chime to chime," live on frugal fare, and study the hard problem of how to "make buckle and tongue meet," looking alone to his own strong arm and the blessing of Providence. Talk about factory hands, and operatives in machinery, and corporations' servants, and Government employes, and eight-hours-a-day-law laborers, and bestow all deserved sympathy upon them; but there are none of them who, in my opinion, are not better paid in proportion to the amount of labor performed than the average tiller of the soil, and none of them who would exchange places with him. The fact is there are too many of the American people who have a distaste for sweat and solar exposure. Is there any reasonable excuse that I could offer to the farmers of my district should I vote to keep a tax on wool for the supposed benefit of the sheep-raiser, for them to pay?

I, for one, am not prepared to return to my constituency without aiding, as far as I can, in removing the oppression of the unnecessary and unjust taxation they are now compelled to bear. They are too sensible to believe that the yoke of war taxes is easy and its burden is light. The wool-grower is just as good as the farmer, the mechanic, the blacksmith, the professional man, but he is no better. He has no special claim for legislative favoritism beyond that enjoyed by the humblest consumer in the land.

But is the tariff now imposed or any tariff on wool in reality beneficial

to the wool-growers? I answer this question by quoting the conclusion of the report of Mr. Morrison, chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means in the last Congress, upon a resolution providing for the restoration of the tariff of 1867 upon wool. He says:

In conclusion, your committee submit that the duty upon imported wool is proved, by testimony derived both from argument and experience, to be injurious to all classes and beneficial to none.

It drives from our markets many kinds of wool not raised here, but which are indispensable to a successful manufacture of woolen goods.

It gives to European manufacturers the exclusive use of these wools, and therefore a monopoly of the manufacture of goods made of them, and consequently of the markets of the world.

It confines American manufactures to a restricted choice of materials and so to the production of a limited class of goods, with which the home market is periodically glutted.

It makes it impossible for our manufacturers to export woolen goods, and by confining them to the home market leads to ruinous fluctuations of prices, resulting in frequent closing of the mills and their sale at disastrous sacrifices.

It cripples the only customers of our wool-growers so seriously that the market for wool is periodically in an unhealthy condition.

It prevents the home manufacturers from buying the foreign wools which could be used in mixture with American wools, and thus lessens the demand for American wools, instead of increasing it, as intended.

It has given the European manufacturer control of all foreign wools; it has thus caused the importation of foreign wool to come in the manufactured form; and the more the duty has been raised, the more disastrous have been the results to the American wool-grower.

It has furnished a good excuse for heaping heavy taxes upon the clothing of the people, and it has thus taxed every wool-grower to an amount far exceeding the whole benefit which he has ever imagined that he would derive from the tariff, without giving him that imaginary benefit.

It has reduced the wages of workmen in the woolen manufacture; it has ruined numerous investors, who were enticed into this manufacture by the delusive promises of a high tariff; it has greatly hindered our trade with our natural customers in South America; it has made clothing dearer in America and cheaper in Europe; it has injured all classes and helped none.

Your committee therefore recommend that the resolutions lie on the table, but that the prayer of the convention of textile workers in Philadelphia should be granted, that the duties on wool should be repealed, and the duties on woolen manufactures reduced to at least an equal extent.

If the logic of these statements be unsound, and if the facts do not warrant the conclusions reached, then the only reason for insisting upon a tariff on wool is that it is of benefit to a particular class, and comes to the aid of those engaged in a particular business, and the wool man is placed in the position of asking that the great body of the people be taxed in his behalf. He must say the tariff will bring him higher prices and a better paying business, and that he wants tribute extracted at the expense of his fellow-man to sustain his private enterprise. If the tariff give him personal bounty at public expense, it is unjust, unwarranted by constitutional authority, and at war with the essential principles of republican institutions; and he has no right to demand or expect it; if it does not have this effect, he can invent no reason for its imposition.

Mr. Chairman, we have heard much during this discussion of pauper labor in Europe, Cobden clubs, and free-trade England. I deem it not inappropriate to invite brief attention to two of England's greatest men, and what they have said of American institutions and American policy. It seems to me that some useful instruction may be derived from their respective declarations. John Bright, one of the best and purest of English statesmen, in reply to a letter from the editor of the North American Review, asking whether England would return to protection, after making some historical statements as to English policy in the past and giving his opinion as to its future course, said:

It is a grief to me that your people do not yet see their way to a more moderate tariff.

Not to free trade, but a more moderate tariff. Do not the conditions which surround us demand a more moderate tariff? Who can successfully gainsay the proposition?

They are doing wonders, unequalled in the world's history, in paying off your national debt.

That is true, and greater wonders in this respect have been since accomplished.

A more moderate tariff I should think would give you a better revenue, and by degrees you might approach a more civilized system. What can be more strange than for your great free country to build barriers against that commerce which is everywhere the handmaid of freedom and of civilization?

I should despair of the prospects of mankind if I did not believe that before long the intelligence of your people would revolt against the barbarism of your tariff. It seems now your one great humiliation; the world looks to you for example in all forms of freedom. As to commerce, the great civilizer, shall it look in vain?

This letter was written on the 25th day of April, 1879. These are the words that came from the author of the repeal of the Corn Laws; from that grand man who devoted his magnificent energies to opening up a foreign market for American breadstuffs and the products of American farmers. To the ears of some they may sound "quite English, you know," but I firmly believe they involve a just criticism and express the living truth. Shall we respond to the suggestions for a "moderate tariff," or shall we in this day and generation continue in force the grievous exactions levied for purposes of war? Shall we not answer his question, unmoor our commerce, and send it forth to the uttermost parts of the earth with the joyous speeding—

Bear it on, thou restless ocean;
Let thy winds its canvas swell!
Heaves our heart with proud emotion,
As it goes far hence to dwell!

[Applause.]

Under the "moderate tariff" of 1846 to 1861, in the halcyon days of the Republic, long before this letter was written, our country had prospered in an extraordinary degree; there was steady and substantial progress in all the elements of national growth and greatness. Is it any wonder that our people, having experienced the beneficence of this "moderate tariff" in years gone by, and which, but for the war, would in every human probability have remained undisturbed, should now, when peace has resumed her wonted sway, "revolt" against the harshness and severity of that system, unexcused and inexcusable only as a temporary measure, and solely instituted for purposes of war? The revolt has come, and it is here to stay until all the just cause of complaint shall be fully and finally removed.

I have given you one English view of our situation since the war, and dating back less than a decade.

I desire now to invite your attention to another perhaps less inviting English opinion of American institutions as entertained by an equally eminent man. It is full of admonition and worthy of the most careful consideration at the hands of every thoughtful and patriotic citizen of this country. I believe that I do a public service by recalling it to your notice. On May 23, 1857, Lord Macaulay wrote a letter to Henry S. Randall, the author of *The Life of Thomas Jefferson*. It is not found in *The Life and Letters of Macaulay*, and hence may have escaped that general observation it would have otherwise received. From it I quote the following:

I am certain that I never * * * uttered a word indicating an opinion that the supreme authority in a State ought to be intrusted to the majority of citizens told by the head; in other words, to the poorest and most ignorant part of society. I have long been convinced that institutions purely democratic must sooner or later destroy liberty, or civilization, or both.

In Europe, where the population is dense, the effect of such institutions would be almost instantaneous. What happened lately in France is an example. In 1848 a pure democracy was established there. During a short time there was reason to expect a general spoliation, a national bankruptcy, a new partition of the soil, a maximum of prices, a ruinous load of taxation laid on the rich for the purpose of supporting the poor in idleness. Such a system would in twenty years have made France as poor and barbarous as the France of the Caravignans.

Happily the danger was averted; and now there is a despotism, a silent tribune, and enslaved press. Liberty is gone; but civilization has been saved. I have not the smallest doubt that if we had a purely democratic government here the effect would be the same. Either the poor would plunder the rich and civilization would perish, or order and property would be saved by a strong military government and liberty would perish. You may think that your country enjoys an exemption from these evils. I will frankly own to you that I am of a different opinion. Your fate I believe to be certain, though it is deferred by a physical cause. As long as you have a boundless extent of fertile and unoccupied land, your laboring population will be far more at ease than the laboring population of the Old World, and while this is the case, the Jeffersonian polity may continue to exist without causing any fatal calamity.

But the time will come when New England will be as thickly peopled as Old England. Wages will be as low and will fluctuate as much with you as with us. You will have your Manchesters and Birmingham, and in those Manchesters and Birmingham hundreds of thousands of artisans will assuredly be sometimes out of work. Then your institutions will be fairly brought to the test. Distress everywhere makes the laborer mutinous and discontented, and inclines him to listen with eagerness to agitators, who tell him that it is a monstrous iniquity that one man should have a million while another can not get a full meal.

In bad years there is plenty of grumbling here, and sometimes a little rioting. But it matters little. For here the sufferers are not the rulers. The supreme power is in the hands of a class, numerous indeed, but select; of an educated class, of a class which is, and knows itself to be, deeply interested in the security of property and the maintenance of order. Accordingly, the malcontents are firmly yet gently restrained. The bad time is got over without robbing the wealthy to relieve the indigent. The springs of national prosperity soon begin to flow again; work is plentiful, wages rise, and all is tranquility and cheerfulness. I have seen England pass three or four times through such critical seasons as I have described. Through such seasons the United States will have to pass, in the course of the next century, if not in this. How will you pass through them? I heartily wish you a good deliverance. But my reason and my wishes are at war, and I can not help foreboding the worst. It is quite plain that your Government will never be able to restrain a distressed and discontented majority. For with you the majority is the Government, and has the rich, who are always a minority, absolutely at its mercy.

The day will come when in the State of New York a multitude of people, none of whom has had more than half a breakfast, or expects to have more than half a dinner, will choose a legislature. Is it possible to doubt what sort of legislature will be chosen? On one side is a statesman preaching patience, respect for vested rights, strict observance of public faith. On the other is a demagogue ranting about the tyranny of capitalists and usurers, and asking why anybody should be permitted to drink champagne and ride in a carriage while thousands of honest folk are in want of necessities. Which of the two candidates is likely to be preferred by a workingman who hears his children cry for more bread? I seriously apprehend that you will, in some such season of adversity as I have described, do things which will prevent prosperity from returning; that you will act like a people who should in a year of scarcity devour all the seed-corn, and thus make the next year a year not of scarcity, but of absolute famine. There will be, I fear, spoliation. The spoliation will increase the distress. The distress will produce fresh spoliation.

There is nothing to stop you. Your Constitution is all sail and no anchor. As I said before, when a society has entered on this downward progress, either civilization or liberty must perish. Either some Caesar or Napoleon will seize the reins of government with a strong hand, or your Republic will be as fearfully plundered and laid waste by barbarians in the twentieth century as the Roman Empire was in the fifth, with this difference, that the Huns and Vandals who ravaged the Roman Empire came from without, and that your Huns and Vandals will have been engendered within your own country by your own institutions. * * *

Did the "sunset of life give him mystical lore?" Have these gloomy forebodings, these dark and pessimistic predictions been in any measure fulfilled? Have our boasted high wages to the laborer brought him content? Have our Manchesters and Birmingham been moved by love and consideration of their employes or instigated by their own greed?

Let strikes and lockouts and riots answer. Let "pools" and "trusts" and combinations reflect.

In England the supreme power is in the hands of a class. The sufferers are not the rulers.

Majorities do not rule.

Mr. Chairman, far be it from me to widen the breach between the rich and poor, or play the rôle of the ranting demagogue described by Macaulay. I would not have the poor to despise the rich nor the rich to oppress the poor. I hate the spirit of envy and condemn the methods of the mere agitator who seeks to stir up strife among a people of the same country, bound by the same laws, and among whom sentiments or sympathy and community of feeling should be encouraged. The avenues of wealth should be open to all; but no man or set of men has the right in this country to be legislated into wealth. I firmly believe that class legislation has had the inevitable effect of building up monopolies, resulting in colossal fortunes and concentrating in the hands of a few of our citizens a rulership as antagonistic to the genius of our institutions as would be that of crowned heads.

The logical tendency of high tariffs is, to use the trite and familiar statement, to make the rich richer and the poor poorer, thereby intensifying the discontent of the people. A continuation of such a system of legislation may hasten on the conditions which may still further sustain the apprehensions and prophecies of Macaulay.

Here all our citizens, unrestrained by accident of birth and unfettered by caste, participate in the exercise of political power, and I believe that through their virtue and intelligence our institutions can be made to withstand every test and overcome every shock they may receive, and the government of the people, by the people, and for the people preserved. May the day never come when it shall pass from the earth. Fortunately our death-strifes are over and our war-dissevered sections are reunited, and I trust we are fully prepared to combine our hearts and hands in the grand movement for greater and more glorious national attainments.

Mr. Chairman, I listened with unusual interest to the splendid peroration of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BURROWS] a few days ago, wherein he spoke of the South. It was graceful in diction, beautiful in imagery, and elegant in delivery. I thank him for his intended compliment to that section of the country from whence I hail; but, sir, I do not agree with him when he says that "this measure bodes no good to the South." On the contrary, I think it comes to her as a "glory-beaming star" from the dark clouds of misrule and class legislation; it gives her joyful assurance of the dawn of a better day. It tells her of a grander development and greater industrial freedom. It sets before "her uplifted brow" the rainbow of commercial promise, "with its wing on the earth and its wing on the sea." It speaks to her of a new and happier era in which the strings of her harp, long silent, shall be attuned to the music of progress and prosperity. It tells her the raw materials which lie at her feet in rich profusion will invite and welcome the idle and dormant capital which seeks investment; it tells her that the mighty possibilities she possesses shall have ample opportunities for culture and expansion; it assures her of equal privileges and a fair show in every aspiration; it tells her the distinctions and partialities in the blessings of Judah and Issachar shall be leveled, and that no longer shall her sons crouch between burdens, bow their shoulders to bear, and become servants unto tribute.

Improve and pass this great measure of reform, expunge from the statute-books the barbarism of war taxation, reduce the burdens of the Government to a peace basis, take no more money from the people than is absolutely required for economic public use, stay the hand of monopoly, insure equal and exact justice to all and exclusive privileges to none, and then indeed, will the South be rehabilitated and her people inspired with a loftier patriotism, a purer devotion to this glorious Union, and a stronger affection for her brethren of the North. Join with her in the declaration that the war is over and its temporary exactions no longer required, that good-will and national fellowship shall prevail, and all her sons will shout for joy:

Alleluiah! Peace omnipotent reigneth!

[Great applause.]

At the conclusion of the remarks of Mr. LANHAM the following dialogue occurred:

Mr. ALLEN, of Michigan. I believe the gentleman from Texas has not fully occupied his time, and I desire to ask him a favor in the shape of a question. Will the gentleman allow me to do so?

Mr. LANHAM. I will hear the gentleman's question.

Mr. ALLEN, of Michigan. I am not certain but what I shall desire to circulate the gentleman's speech in my district.

Mr. LANHAM. Allow me to say that I shall be glad to present the gentleman with as many copies as he may desire.

Mr. ALLEN, of Michigan. I shall pay for the copies which I may circulate. That will make them more valued. But I ask the gentleman if he will be so kind as to insert in his speech, after what the Englishman, John Bright, said, the resolutions that have been passed by one or more gatherings of Texan Americans since the agitation of this bill commenced, so that we may know what Americans in Texas think as against what John Bright, of England, thinks.

Mr. LANHAM. In the revision of my speech I will endeavor to give

due reflection to the gentleman's suggestion. Doubtless I have already referred to what the gentleman alludes to.

Mr. ALLEN, of Michigan. Unless that is done I will decline to circulate the document.

Mr. LANHAM. I am much obliged to the gentleman, but I do not desire that he shall make my speech for me or select for me matter in addition to what I have submitted. Have I any time left?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman has seven minutes of his time remaining.

Mr. LANHAM. I reserve that time.

Mr. ALLEN, of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I suppose if Massachusetts was to divide to-day upon the question of protection or free trade the number of people in favor of protection would outnumber its opponents by a vast majority not easily computed in figures, and I am sure in my own Congressional district such a division would result in a majority of more than 10,000 in favor of the champion of the protective side of the argument, and I dare say that even such an estimate would fall below the actual figures. So far as I am personally concerned, therefore, having been born among a people devoted to the principle of protection, I do not feel it at all necessary to define my position upon that question, and I am therefore averse to occupying the time of this House in traveling along the well-beaten thoroughfare of general tariff discussion. Much has been well said upon that subject, and more will be submitted in the line of general discussion, but there are several byways still to be explored, not in the way of any new discoveries but simply in developing certain well-understood principles which every one must admit, but which have not perhaps been as fully analyzed as to make their simple logic clearly brought out in support of the general theory, just as we all come to realize the absolute truth of certain physical laws, the existence of which we all understand and firmly believe, but which are so commonplace in our daily experience that we have never taken the particular time to examine into them and make the simple application.

We live in an age of great physical and mental activity. Wonderful inventions of mind and matter are crowding each other so fast that in the hurried race we hardly see whence they come or where they lead. Theories and isms of all sorts seize upon the people and rush them into great extremes, disorganizing and disarranging old-established rules, and leading us into a way of discarding what is old and tried for experiment and theory. Just now the medical profession finds itself antagonized by a new and strange psychical force, which, overturning facts and argument, seems to have worked its way into the imagination of the people, that all disease is a pure fancy of the imagination; that one is never sick—we sometimes think we are—but the evidence of the sickness is but the warning of a violation of the divine will and the setting up of our own finite will against the infinite; that if we could only follow closely enough to the way marked out by infinite wisdom we should all preserve the perfect body and entire immunity from disease and dissolution; that if it were possible for man to follow out with unvarying exactness the divine guidance there is no reason why we should not live forever, and our span of life is but to be measured by the closeness with which we guide our existence to the divine standard. Such, in a word, is the theory of the Christian scientist of the day, whose strange fancy has pervaded the homes of the people, has found a place among the musty folios of the literary man, has disturbed the professional man in his studies, and by the very force of its inertia seems to have passed within the closed doors of the Committee on Ways and Means and dominated the deliberations of that great committee. So that it may be truthfully said, if no other credit is to be given, that these learned gentlemen have evolved a new school of Christian-science political economy. Is not the analogy complete?

To them facts have seemed entirely unimportant. No diagnosis required, no expert knowledge of symptoms; simply the existence of a diseased condition of the mind. Has not the chairman of the committee repeatedly demanded of the country only a hopeful state of mind and all will be well?

Only recently in his speeches at Providence and elsewhere he assures the wool-grower that with free wool the increased consumption will be so great that better prices will surely come to them, while to the wool manufacturer he turns with the cheering assurance that under this bill he will pay so much less for his wool that in spite of all other circumstances prosperity will be thrust upon him. Thus it is that again we find the Administration ever in advance, and with a progression which is certainly remarkable, applying the soothing balm of the "faith cure" to the inflamed and feverish condition of our trade and national commerce.

But this "Mills bill" is in other respects a most remarkable document. Regarded simply as a device for reducing revenue, without acknowledging the principle of protection, this bill is entirely inadequate. It should go much farther, for under the most liberal construction of its most ardent admirers too small an amount will be saved to the country to give it credit as a revenue bill. Yet it is quite susceptible of proof that it would not only not reduce the revenue, but under its operation, should it become a law, it would increase the revenues by more than

\$11,000,000 over the present receipts, so that as a bill to reduce the revenue it is an utter and complete failure.

But if it be said, on the other hand, that its purpose is to recognize some protection to certain industrial enterprises which have grown up under protection, then the fault of this bill is that its framers—who in the nature of things could have no expert knowledge whatever of the industries affected—have persistently refused to take the testimony of interests involved, where such testimony has been offered, but with a persistency, unique in such matters, have seemed to seek the advice of those who from their prejudices or the nature of their business are entirely opposed to the application of the protective principle to any of our industries so far as they are able.

Let me illustrate this point. Suppose you write to me for the best formula for making the most palatable and nutritious bread? If I really desired to give you the best information I could secure, which would be really of advantage to you, I should not apply to a person who had some patent device by which he was able to substitute for the true ingredient of that article a certain compound which would apparently answer the purpose. Not at all. I should first apply to my cook, if I had a good one, for information, and then I would supplement that evidence by inquiring of the cook of my neighbor, if he had one with a bread-making record, and if their two stories corresponded I should be willing to submit that consolidated information for your benefit, with a firm belief that I was giving you what you wanted; or, better still, if there was a national association of cooks, and that association had met in convention and had carefully considered the bread question, and had expressed their opinion as the best wisdom they had on that subject, then I would cheerfully give you that information, with the firm conviction that you were getting the best possible expert opinion on the subject of bread-making, which, if carefully followed, would insure you peace in your domestic circle and good digestion.

Precisely in this way this committee might have worked. For there is hardly a protected industry in this land which is not able in some way to present the testimony of experts upon the exact condition and needs of such industry, and all such information would be entirely reliable and trustworthy, for I am sure no one is willing to say that the name of Barabas is written upon the foreheads of the manufacturers of this country.

Having failed then to take expert testimony upon these great questions, the majority of this committee have utterly failed to encourage the slightest support in favor of the theory that this bill has for its purpose the encouragement of our vested enterprise, built up upon the principle of protection. But more than all this, when the majority of this committee have thus obviously failed in their duty in this respect and have insisted upon reporting to this House a bill clearly the result of their application of the "faith cure" principle to industrial enterprises, and have sat with closed doors refusing to recognize the authority of this House in its purpose of forming committees that they should sit as a court in judgment of all cases coming before them, and after patient and exhaustive hearings of all evidence submitted, upon that evidence, in the light of its bearing upon the "general welfare" of the country, shall make up their judgment upon the preponderance of evidence submitted.

When such a committee have reported to the House a measure upon which they have not taken expert evidence, and have placed that measure before the House, where of course such expert evidence can not properly make itself heard, except in way of amendment or substitution, then such a committee has utterly failed in its duty to this House, to the people, and to the industries assailed, and such a bill ought in perfect fairness to be recommitted to that committee with instructions to take advantage of such avenues of expert information, so close at hand and available. If this committee have taken such evidence, and if this bill is a deliberate judgment based upon such evidence, then perhaps this charge can not lie against it; but if the charge is not proved to be absolutely unfounded, then I dare say the propriety of such action by the House will not be disputed.

But I wish to leave this particular bill for the present, and in a temperate manner, without rhetoric, to undertake in a hasty way the development of a fact which I think must be patent to all—that a protective tariff, so adjusted as to meet the wants of the people, is a most powerful stimulant to the intelligence of mankind, and indirectly adds to the comfort, the happiness, and the prosperity of man, not alone in this country, but throughout the entire breadth of the civilized world.

If, while watching a balloon ascension in the presence of some person who was unfamiliar with physical theories, one should say to him that the force of gravity compelled all material objects, of whatever kind, to fall toward the center of the earth, one would expect him to say in reply: "But all things do not fall to the earth. I have just seen that balloon shooting up into the sky; and the rising smoke from every chimney in the world contradicts your theory. The law of gravitation must be made very plain to me before I can be induced to go contrary to the evidence of my own senses."

This person's position is a fair illustration of the attitude of the free-traders toward the theory of protection as applied in and for this country. They insist that the tariff is a tax upon the whole people for the

benefit of a favored class, and that a tariff upon any article enhances the cost of that article to the consumer by exactly the amount of the tax.

Let me quote from the message of the President upon that point:

But our present tariff laws, the vicious, inequitable, and illogical source of unnecessary taxation, ought to be at once revised and amended. These laws, as their primary and plain effect, raise the price to consumers of all articles imported and subject to duty, by precisely the sum paid for such duties. Thus the amount of the duty measures the tax paid by those who purchase for use these imported articles. Many of these things, however, are raised or manufactured in our own country, and the duties now levied upon foreign goods and products are called protection to these home manufactures, because they render it possible for those of our own people who are manufacturers to make these taxed articles and sell them for a price equal to that demanded for the imported goods that have paid customs duty.

So it happens that while comparatively a few use the imported articles, millions of our people, who never used and never saw any of the foreign products, purchase and use things of the same kind made in this country, and pay therefor nearly or quite the same enhanced price which the duty adds to the imported articles. Those who buy imports pay the duty charged thereon into the public Treasury, but the great majority of our citizens, who buy domestic articles of the same class, pay a sum at least approximately equal to this duty to the home manufacturer. This reference to the operation of our tariff laws is not made by way of instruction, but in order that we may be constantly reminded of the manner in which they impose a burden upon those who consume domestic products as well as those who consume imported articles, and thus create a tax upon all our people.

The protectionist insists that a protective tariff is not laid, and could not be laid for the benefit of a class, but rather for the general welfare of the country, and that the inevitable result of a protective tariff has been to eventually bring down the cost of the article taxed to a figure which is lower than that article sold for before a duty was laid upon it, and the result of such competition has been abundantly shown, not alone in this country, but in Great Britain, and upon the Continent even, in the improved quality of the clothing of the people, the excellence in design, and the general additions of comforts and even luxuries, comparatively unknown before the imposition of the tariff of 1861.

Let me mention, right in this connection, one or two striking illustrations upon this point, not, of course, in the way of presenting anything new, but simply in the way of driving in a little deeper the nail already started. During the last nine years of the famous Walker "revenue-reform" tariff, and previous to 1861, the average production of the useful commodity of pig-iron was but 798,488 tons, and during that period the output was about the same, at all events it showed no increase. But in 1863, as soon as the industry had begun to feel the stimulating effect of the tariff of 1861, then the production began to increase in a most astonishing ratio, while the prices decreased, until, during the year 1863, the output increased to 947,604 tons, and in 1886 the industry had become so well settled, the workmen so skillful, and the plant in such good condition, that what was less than 800,000 tons as the annual production in 1861 had increased to more than 6,000,000 tons, and during this period the price had steadily decreased, so that the country was receiving the benefit of this enormous production, and at much less money per pound.

Who can estimate the advantage to the country at large in increased comfort, in the development of industrial skill, in inventive genius which came to the people in the sections of country immediately affected? Why, under the "revenue-reform" tariff it was impossible to successfully establish the industry of making steel in this country. Time and time again the experiment was attempted. Experts were brought here from abroad, the most skilled labor employed, with the invariable result that foreign competition could come in, and did come in, and force the courageous experimenters into bankruptcy, and thousands and hundreds of thousands of dollars were swept away, like the early mists, in the vain endeavor to establish a new industry upon our shores in competition with outside manufactures.

But when the tariff of 1861 came, opportunities once more arose, and the growing demands of our country, as the most promising and hopeful market of the whole world, stimulated internal industries as they had external. The market was not yielded by the outsider without a struggle, but under the tariff just alluded to we did succeed, and not only saved our own market practically for ourselves, but by the spirit of competition thus aroused, in a way to which I shall allude further on, we succeeded in reducing prices in a most unheard of degree and to a most remarkable extent.

In 1868 we made in this country of all kinds of steel 30,000 tons; in 1878, 819,814 tons; in 1886, 2,870,003 tons; while during that period we have reduced the price of steel rails in America, which was \$158 per ton in 1868 to \$26 per ton in 1886, while the price in England, by means of this protective tariff of ours, was reduced from \$61.50 in 1868 to \$18 in 1886, though it must be said in fairness, however, that this reduction is not wholly due to the influence of competition under the tariff of 1861, since, during that period, the royalties on Bessemer steel ran out. But the decline without that is ample to point the moral. So that I am confident that whenever you make the application of this general rule with reference to any of our industries you will find the same result—an enormous lowering of prices, increased competition, better goods, and a round advantage in a thousand ways to the people at large.

Particularly is this so with reference to any commodity the manufacture of which was not attempted in this country prior to 1861, and

which was really created by the tariff of 1861. I have at this moment in mind the carpet industry in its finer grades, almost entirely developed in this country within twenty-five years. The statistics of the carpet industry are not as complete as in many other industries, yet we have no difficulty in noting the great development since 1871, when many of the patents expired. Previous to that time the number of looms on Brussels and Wilton carpets did not exceed one hundred looms (power) and the market was controlled by English makers who regulated the prices. To-day there are 1,225 looms running on Brussels and Wilton and the importation of carpets has almost ceased; the import last year being 190,118 yards Brussels. Body Brussels sold within the recollection of all before me but a few years ago in crude colors and wretched designs for \$2.75 to \$3.50 per yard, while to-day you can buy the best Brussels from the finest looms, with the most delicate colors, the most original and charming designs, for \$1.25 per yard at retail; while for those who do not buy Brussels, but prefer the tasty ingrain, there has been the same advantage, and they buy to-day at 75 cents per yard what they paid \$1.35 to \$1.50 for but a few years ago.

I quote the wholesale prices in the New York market:

NEW YORK, March 17, 1888.

| New York wholesale carpetings during the years— | 1871. | 1880. | 1888. |
|---|-------|-------|------------|
| Crossley's tapestry | 1.45 | 1.08 | .75 |
| Five-frame Crossley's brussels..... | 2.30 | 1.67 | 1.22½ |
| Five-frame Rigelow brussels..... | 2.15 | 1.50 | 1.07½-1.10 |
| Smith's tapestry..... | | .97½ | .67½ |
| Lowell ingrain..... | 1.30 | .90 | .57½ |

Thus it is domestic competition has cut down prices to the lowest margin of profit. Let me show you how naturally this all comes about through perfectly simple methods. Suppose a man wishes to start the manufacture of some commodity not hitherto made in this country, say woolen cloth? He borrows money with which to build his mill, to supply it with the requisite machinery, and to carry on his business until he begins to get returns from his sales.

Suppose he produces 100,000 yards of cloth in a year, that being, we may say, as large a product as might be safely attempted by any one until his operatives and himself had acquired a sufficient technical experience, and that it cost him \$1 a yard, and that he sells it at \$1.10 per yard? His profit will be 10 cents a yard, or \$10,000. In figuring his cost of production two classes of expenses appear:

First. Those which depend directly upon the amount of work produced, such as the cost of wool, of labor, of coal, etc.

Second. Those expenses which remain are very nearly fixed in amount, no matter what the amount of his product may be. These fixed expenses would consist of the interest upon his capital and such items of general expense of management, taxes, insurance, etc. Suppose that his fixed expenses have been 10 per cent. of the total cost of production, or 10 cents for each yard of cloth produced? If, now, at the end of the year his operatives have become skilled and his business is so well established that he may venture to increase his product, he takes steps with that end in view. He finds that by crowding his machinery together he can make room for some more, and by increasing their speed and making use perhaps of recent inventions he can produce just twice as many yards of cloth as he formerly made in the same mill. Practically he is under no greater charge in respect of the fixed expenses now, that he is making 200,000 yards a year, than he was formerly, when he could make but half that quantity; and as the cost of this item was formerly 10 cents a yard, now that he produces twice as many yards for the same sum total, the cost of fixed expenses is but 5 cents a yard.

The cost of his fabric will now be 95 cents a yard. If he can still sell at \$1.10 he will be making 15 cents a yard profit, instead of 10 cents a yard as formerly; and observe that he not only has an increased profit, per yard, but he has twice as many yards to sell, so that by doubling his production he has raised his profits from \$10,000 to \$30,000. What will be his position now with regard to a competitor who is just entering the field? We have seen that a product of 100,000 yards is all that this latter can venture upon at the start, and that therefore his cloth will cost him \$1 a yard to make, whereas our larger manufacturer is making 200,000 yards at a cost of 95 cents a yard. The latter can now sell his entire product at the cost price of his smaller rival and still make his original profit of \$10,000; or better yet, if he can sell 100,000 yards at \$1.10 he may offer the other 100,000 yards to the customers of his rival at 90 cents a yard, or 10 cents below the cost price of the latter, and still make his profit of \$10,000. Or if he desires to ruin his competitor, he can sell the other 100,000 yards at 80 cents per yard, and still without a loss on his year's business. In the latter case the small man would find that whereas every yard of cloth he made cost him \$1 a yard, he could only sell it for 80 cents per yard.

Now, then, coming back to the question, "How can putting a tax on an article lower its cost to us?" let us suppose that in 1861 we imported from England, say, all the woolen cloth which we used, and at that date there was no mill in this country which produced woolen cloth, because for various reasons it could not be manufactured so

cheaply here as in England. In 1861 a tariff is passed which lays a tax on all woolen cloth coming to this country, and the price of these cloths is for a time, enhanced by exactly the amount of the tax. At the increased price which the cloth is now sold for, an American, whom we will designate as A, thinks he can manufacture it and sell it at a profit. Naturally his early attempts are made upon the cheapest and coarsest varieties, because they offer fewer obstacles to his unskillful laborers.

He succeeds in producing an article which is crude and cheap, but he is able to sell it at a price just a little below the cost of a similar imported article, with the tax added, and he makes a profit. Meantime another ambitious American, B, has been attempting to produce the same cloth. He offers his production to the same purchasers who have bought from A. They inspect his cloth, and they tell him they have bought as good cloth and as cheaply elsewhere, and there is no object in changing. B has now the alternative of making a better cloth to sell at the same price A is receiving, or of making his price lower than A's. B shrinks from the attempt of making a better cloth, and prefers to sacrifice some of his profits. He lowers his price, therefore, and undersells A.

But by this time other enterprising Americans have been watching this business development, and, attracted by the profitable industry A and B have succeeded in establishing, at once enter into the manufacture of the same class of goods, and presently the shops are flooded with cheap cloths, made by all these competitors; and since there are now more of these cloths offered than are needed at the price, these makers are obliged to lower their prices considerably. They accordingly reduce prices to the lowest possible margin, and they continue to sell their wares.

The original maker, A, by this time finds that whereas a short time previously he could command a price for his cheap cloth which was equal to the English price with the tax added, now he is compelled by the competition of B and others to sell it at a price very much lower than that; so low, in fact, as to make his venture hardly a profitable one. But by this time his operatives have become more skillful, and he decides to attempt the manufacture of a higher grade of cloth, which so far has not been made here, and upon which the tax offers him a new and profitable field. He thus again escapes competition for awhile, but not for long; the energetic manufacturers have also become skillful, and they follow wherever A leads, so that the old story of reduction in price by competition to the lowest possible terms is repeated over and over.

In the mean time B has been studying the lesson of greater production. He increases the capacity of his factory again and again. He is on the alert for every labor-saving device. Some of these are invented by his own employes, perhaps, who have become alive to the needs of the occasion.

B remains a manufacturer of cheap cloth, but his mills are on a scale which is hardly to be found elsewhere in the world, and his needs form the great incentive to that branch of invention which has, during the last twenty-five years, so increased the producing power of all machinery. He has thus been of immeasurable service to his countrymen in a twofold manner, by reducing the cost of the cloths he has made, but more than that, in inspiring the inventive genius of all about him, who, catching the spirit of his work, have found themselves pressing forward to the greatest possible success in every direction of industrial activity.

It is in this manner that every field of possible industry has been explored by American manufacturers since the tariff of 1861 was passed, and no new field has been enjoyed by any one alone for more than a brief season. A reduction of prices has been effected which can only be measured by the keen enterprise of the American character; but the tariff has had a twofold effect in lowering the price of any taxed article which has been manufactured in this country. While we have been watching the course of the American manufacturer, what has been happening to his foreign competitor? He has not been idle, we may be sure. Up to the tariff of 1861 we have supposed that he held all the trade of this country in woolen cloths. His market is removed by more than 3,000 miles from his workshop, and such competition as he has from other European manufacturers is remote and not very active. We are obliged to buy of him, for we can go nowhere else.

He is rich, and his operators are skillful. He can manufacture cheaply, and he sells almost at his own price. By virtue of his size and skill he can defeat all attempts at competition in this country, and he is not obliged to make his cloths very tasteful or attractive, as any one who can remember our woolen fabrics of twenty-five years ago will testify. Our tariff comes, and he soon discovers that he has competition here upon the cheaper of his fabrics. He lowers his prices (observe the first effect of the tariff), and we have seen that he can afford to lower them a great deal, so low indeed that if it were not for the tariff no American enterprise could stand against him; but he only lowers them upon the cheap cloths, for as yet there is no occasion to change them upon his better fabrics. Later on, when our manufacturer, A, begins to make the higher grades, he lowers his prices on them also.

But this does not avail him, for, thanks to protection, though he may push them hard, he can not undersell them to their ruin. He, too, resorts to increased production and improved machinery, hoping that in

that way he may still export at least the surplus of his increased output, which, as we know, he can afford to sell relatively low.

It is in vain, for his American competitors have now acquired considerable skill; they understand the advantage of great production better than he, and their own internal competition has already so lowered prices that it is almost hopeless for him, handicapped with the tariff tax on his cloths, to attempt to place them in competition with those of American makes.

He is driven, therefore, to improve the quality of his cloth and to devise new and tasteful combinations, for his only hope for American trade now being to offer to it a fabric which the American manufacturers (lacking in technical experience) have not ventured to attempt. This he is doing to-day. Constantly inventing new goods and fanciful designs, sending them to this country at large prices, turning a part of his looms to such manufacture for sale in this country to our wealthy people, at a fancy price, while this increased value to him upon this American output enables him to run his regular styles for his home trade and to undersell his home competitors and still have his entire business yield him a profit.

Every season the "novelties" sent by foreign manufacturers are sold at wholesale in this country at prices perhaps ruling at \$1 per yard, which our manufacturers would gladly produce at 37 cents; but because they are "novelties" and are fashionable, our wealthy people will buy them, and before our manufacturers can commence the manufacture the season is over, and new "novelties" in dress goods take their place. Such "novelties," as a rule, are not serviceable, and are largely bought by people who can afford to pay larger prices to be in fashion. Thus, for the sake of clearness, and to make my argument consistent, I have spoken entirely of woolen goods in the illustration of the great benefit of the tariff, in stimulating the ambition of our people, and of lowering prices both in this country and elsewhere; but it will be apparent that the illustration applies to every article the manufacture of which has obtained a foothold in this country. So bright a man as Mr. Watterson, it is to be expected, should notice this wonderful lowering of prices, for in his recent article in the Atlantic Monthly he says:

It is assuredly true that in the last twenty-five years there has been a decline in prices. There have been causes operating universally which have lowered to a remarkable degree the price of most manufactured articles.

And again:

Perhaps the most striking fact of recent industrial history is the improvement in the manufacture of steel rails, by which the price in England has fallen from \$61.50 in 1868 to \$18 in 1886. In the same time the price in America, which was \$153 in depreciated currency, declined to \$26 in 1886. It is customary for the protectionists to point to this steel-rail industry as convincing proof of the value of the tariff in decreasing prices, but as the price has fallen in England far below the American level, the cause can not be local. It must be general; it must be due to an influence that works effectively elsewhere as here. This influence is the inventive genius of the age.

I have pointed out what this influence has been, how stimulated, and how its power has been exercised. In the case of steel rails especially, for which America is the largest market in the world, it will readily be seen that both American and English manufacturers would use every device of vast production and improved methods to effect and maintain their sales. The inevitable result of such herculean efforts throughout twenty years is told in the figures quoted by Mr. Watterson. It will be seen that our tariff has had a profound influence upon the industrial situation of the world at large. It gave birth to the keen and potent element of American competition with which European industries found themselves confronted in the American market—a market which was of the highest importance to them, even in 1861, but which has grown enormously in purchasing power since that date, and toward which today their eyes are turned with an eager longing.

It has not only brought down prices throughout the world, but it has added improvements in utility, in quality, in variety and taste. And if it has imposed unwonted anxiety upon the foreign manufacturer, at least the foreign consumer may thank it for carrying down their prices simultaneously with our own. I spoke in the beginning of the astonishment of the unbeliever when he was told of the law of gravity and its universal application in the presence of the balloon ascension. We see a little clearer now what the illustration meant. If a law of nature so eternal and absolute in its action as the law of gravity, and which deals with but a single physical property of matter, shows such a seeming contradiction in its manifestation as this of the balloon flight, we may expect to encounter many apparent anomalies, many matters which will require the explanation of an expert, when we come to consider the effects of an economic force such as the protective policy in this country.

For this economic device is in no way akin to a law of nature or an "eternal principle." It is a mere tool of civilization, to be used at the proper time and in the right place, and to be laid aside when its usefulness has passed. It is like a carriage which is invaluable when traveling upon the land, but preposterous as a means of conveyance upon the ocean. It may be serviceable in one country and worse than useless in another, or its use may be wise at one period of a nation's existence and folly at another. It may be safely said to be applicable in those countries which possess natural advantages not fully devel-

oped, of climate, of mineral wealth, and of territory, and whose inhabitants are suited by temperament and by intelligence for the pursuit of industrial enterprises. And since it has to do not with such simple elements as the force of gravity, with which we have compared it, but with the daily lives of 60,000,000 people; since it has not only modified our national habits and characteristics, but has also been modified in its action by them, we need not be surprised if its aspects are many and confusing, and if the channels in which it runs are often intricate and obscure, nor that equally able and honest men should hold such directly contradictory opinions upon it, as are daily expressed.

Without doubt the controlling objection in the minds of those who oppose a protective tariff is the belief that they are being taxed for the benefit of the manufacturing classes, and that the cost to them of everything they purchase is enhanced by the amount of the duty which would be levied upon such articles were they imported. These statements are constantly being made by free-traders and are the burden of Mr. Cleveland's tariff message.

The protectionist, on the other hand, asserts that the invariable result of protection has been to lower the price of the protected article, for the reasons already stated. Here we have the free-trader asserting that the balloon goes up, and the protectionist protesting that its eventual fall is inevitable.

Of course it is impossible in a practical way to lay a tax with mathematical exactness. It not unfrequently happens, in practice, that taxes are laid where slight immediate benefit seems to accrue to those who pay the largest share of the tax. A conspicuous instance of this is seen in the postal service of the country, where the people are taxed to sustain post-routes which are not yet self-sustaining. Yet all admit the wisdom of the course pursued, nor do they regard the pioneer who, leaving the comforts and luxuries of civilized life, starts into the unknown country, there to build up cities and add to our habitable territory, as receiving undue benefit from the taxation of the many, though here we may appear to be "taxing the many for the favored few," but which is in fact for the "general welfare" of the United States.

Either the tariff has been conducive to the "general welfare" of this country—or it has been harmless, in which case it deserves no attack—or it has been injurious. And since we have had it in full operation for twenty-five years, those who assert that its protective features are inimical to the general welfare should by this time be able, and should be required to point out definitely just where and when this loss has been sustained. Collective wisdom upon any subject is what gives strength and positiveness, and upon the subject of a protective tariff we have the collective wisdom of work-people who, while interrogated singly upon some subject which concerns their material prosperity, may be vague and hesitating in their replies, yet when they have had time to arrive at a tolerably unanimous judgment, that judgment may be relied upon as the correct decision for them.

By some inscrutable process of reasoning, perhaps not far removed from instinct, they reach the wise conclusion as surely as the herd, caught in the storm, finds the most strategic point of shelter in the field. This, of course, amounts to saying that the wisdom of individuals, however gifted, is not so great as the wisdom of a multitude of individuals.

In the immense influx of working-people to our shores, aggregating in the last year 518,592 souls, we have the testimony of a multitude of individuals from all nations, to the general welfare of our country under a protective tariff. And the objection that these people are attracted by other inducements, such as "republican institutions, free schools, free land, good soil, genial climate," is not a sound one, for all these attractions existed long before the tariff of 1861, and, so far as they could attract, their drawing power was much greater at that time, yet we find that during the twenty years before that tariff but 4,756,398 came to our shores, while from 1866 to 1886, after our tariff had begun to show the fruits of such a policy, immigration increased to the astonishing figures of 8,129,553.

And this naturally leads me to say that after all we are a nation of plain people. We make our greatest advances, witness our best prosperity as we keep closer to the simple, plain teachings of our fathers. As a nation we are toilers, we work for our daily bread, we legislate for ourselves and our country, and we want no interference in legislative matters to turn us from our simple ways.

The protective tariff is for the people. There can be no doubt upon that point in the mind of any one who carefully considers the question in its widest bearings. So far as there is any inequality in the workings of the tariff, they fall most heavily where they should, upon the rich, who can bear them, and it is significant that the enemies of protection are almost always found in the wealthier classes, and almost never among the poor.

If I desired to inflict tables of figures upon you, I could show you conclusively that under this system our working people are better paid and live almost as cheaply as in other countries even as it is, while the immense advantage they derive in their dress, their habits of life, the education of their children, their little homes, their accumulated savings in our banks all over the land, tells a story of richness, happiness, contentment which figures would not begin to express. It is the rich who complain. They are not content with American-made articles, and

their luxurious tastes lead them to desire articles for which the total demand in this country is not sufficient to induce their manufacture here. They are forced to make their purchases abroad, or have them made for them; and the prices of all imported articles whose manufacture is not attempted in this country are necessarily enhanced by the amount of the duties. Thus it is that our protective tariff, for obvious reasons, exercises its effective work in lowering prices along the lines of goods in which the poor are more interested than the rich. It is true the rich can live better abroad. The luxuries they crave, the imported cloths for their garments, their fine hats, gloves, shoes, umbrellas; their elegant carriages, their superb harnesses, the thousand and one articles deemed essential to their comfort, must pay a duty if they are brought into this country; but in all things conducive to the comfort and happiness of the plain people, America is indeed the sought-for land.

We may spend our time here attempting to pass labor bills and labor legislation for the benefit of the working people, and so far as we strive for that interest we do well; but we can do more for these people, and therefore more for the general prosperity of our country, by wisely looking into the results of the protective tariff in this country and shaping our action in a line with the result of that investigation, than by all the purely labor legislation we shall be able to accomplish.

When I read the speech of my colleague from Massachusetts, with its wealth of imagery and its exuberance of statement, the temptation was great to make a particular refutation of many of his extravagances, from authentic figures, readily at hand; but as he himself allowed but one night for reflection to pass over his head before coming before the House to correct certain glaring misstatements, I think it may be safely left to his good judgment to thoroughly purge his speech of many other inconsistencies, before this debate is exhausted.

The cotton, the flax, hosiery, and woolen industry in my section of the country are deeply interested in the defeat of this bill, and when the proper times comes I shall hope to be heard upon each of them.

In the mean time, I leave this question for the present, save only calling your attention for one moment to the peaceful contentment of our manufacturing people. When men put their money, their brains, and their ambition at stake, and start out as pioneers in any new industrial development, it is the duty of the Government, under the Constitution, if such development will conduce to the general welfare of the country, to protect and defend them from ruinous competition abroad. This question of a tariff is the one great topic of conversation to-day among the people in all the industrial sections of the country. These men know their own interests, as only experts can, and they are watching the course of their Representatives upon this issue.

I have tried to express the feelings of my own people upon this question, and I should be remiss in my duty to them, if I failed in any degree to do my utmost to preserve for them, and by this I mean for the whole country, the continuance of a policy of legislative protection under which they have prospered, and which, if we can judge anything from past experience, offers such bright promise in the future.

I wish I could take this body of men to the heights opposite the city of Lowell, Mass., where, with one glance of the eye sweeping up and down the stream, would be literally seen miles of cotton mills, perhaps the finest in the world, equipped with the most ingenious labor-saving machinery known to this wonder-working age, and filled from basement to roof with a thinking, throbbing army of intelligent and skillful men and women.

Standing upon this spot in the early evening as the sun goes down, you would see first from one and then another of the thousands of windows the lights flashing out; twinkling and flashing as they are reflected from the bosom of the flowing river, they rival in brilliancy the stars of an October night. Listen, and the bells ring out their peal, the gates fly open, and from them issue thousands of working men and women, well clothed, well fed, well housed, pleasant to look upon, happy and contented, moving quietly to their own homes in many cases—the ideal laboring wage-earners of a New England manufacturing city.

I draw for your imagination no fancy picture, but one to be seen at any time, in hundreds of our manufacturing towns, varying in degree but rarely in quality. These people to-day are watching the result of the deliberation upon this bill, and anxious to know whether, face to face with a true knowledge of their condition and their desires, with the picture of their progress and prosperity in colors which must appeal to the honest sense of justice which prevails in every American, you will in the slightest degree turn from the principle of a policy which has done so much to make this country great and powerful.

Every man looks upon legislative matters more or less prejudiced by his own surroundings and environment. For that reason I come to this question with a deeper interest, perhaps, than to any other measure presented or likely to be presented at this session of Congress.

I see the fortunes of my own people in this measure, and my interest is natural and intense. [Applause.]

Mr. CARUTH. Mr. Chairman, if I properly understand the derivation of the word "tariff," its origin is not such as to commend it to the admiration of man. At Tarifa the Moors levied their duty and collected their customs from those whose ships, driven by adverse winds, were forced, in order to escape destruction at sea, to suffer a robbery on shore.

If, as has been charged, this "bantling" brought forth in secrecy and darkness which has been carried into this House in the arms of the majority of the Committee on Ways and Means, is of unknown parentage, it can be said in its favor that it can not have so base an origin nor be of so foul an extraction as the robber-born idol which our protectionist friends on the other side of the House hug to their breasts and worship with a devotion like that which the sin-cursed Israelites fell down to and adored, the golden calf their hands had made.

This tariff is a most insidious enemy. It works in silence and under cover; and whilst it pretends to be giving us "protection" it is really stealing our substance and destroying our lives. It is not the highwayman who boldly gallops up on the public road and demands "your money or your life," but the sneak-thief who in an unconscious moment filches your purse or the burglar who robs you of your possessions in sleep's unconscious hour. It holds to the false doctrine of Othello—

He that is robb'd, not wanting what is stolen,
Let him not know it and he is not robb'd at all.

Under pretense of receiving a benefit the American people are now yielding to its exactions and paying its demands. In buying a hat one does not stop to think that he is buying and paying for not only the cost of making, the reasonable due of the manufacturer and the dealer, but that he is paying besides, as his tribute, his duty, his tariff to the maker of that hat, 54 per cent. of its entire cost.

In arraying himself in his ordinary apparel one does not stop to think that he has not only paid for the material of which it is made, its reasonable market value, for the skill and labor of the tailor who fashioned it, but he has also paid a tribute of 50 per cent. of the cost to the manufacturer for patriotically engaging in the business! When one lays himself down upon his couch at night, to court the company of "tired nature's sweet restorer, balmy sleep," in the present comforts of his surroundings he does not let his thoughts dwell upon the fact that he has not only purchased the wool of which the blanket which covers him was made, at a fair price in the open market, that he has not only given to the labor employed in its making its just wage, but he has also paid as a gratuity to the individual, or, more likely, the corporation, who furnished it almost as much as the entire cost of material and production.

In supplying almost all the wants of life, to almost all trades and callings, "the butcher, the baker, and the candlestick-maker," the tariff requires that dues shall be paid. We are told that this mighty freebooter, this pirate who has robbed us on the sea, this thief who has stolen our substance on land, is not our enemy, but the cause of national prosperity, the promoter of our best interests, our truest friend and our staunchest ally.

I do not pretend, Mr. Chairman, to that profound knowledge of the tariff which some of my colleagues on this floor possess; I have not made that the study of my life. I have been employing my brain with legal questions rather than with economic problems. But, sir, there are certain facts, which come to every person of observation, so plain that a wayfaring man can not err therein. They are connected with the subject of this debate, and to their consideration it is my purpose to address myself. I think it does not require a student of political economy to know that a "tariff" is a tax, and when we strip the question of the useless garments of show in which it is clad; when we take off the purple and the fine linen, the silks and the satins; when we strip it of the domino in which it has been masquerading, there is seen the horrid features which we have been taught to tolerate only on the ground of necessity, but which we can never be taught to court or adore.

I said it was a tax, because I had no better word with which to describe it; but I am unjust to the word, and crave its pardon, for a tax is a rate or duty laid by government on the property of an individual, and with that the citizen purchases the sheltering care of the government—the aid of its army in war, the care of its police in peace, for the protection and preservation of the rights of citizenship. But a tariff, such as we now discuss, which raises money that the government does not need and cannot legitimately spend, is not a tax, but a tribute paid by the weak to the strong—to the individual for personal advantage, not to the government for the public good.

That government, Mr. Chairman, is the best government, those laws are the wisest laws, which contribute to the benefit of the most people, which bless the many and not the few. It is in recognition of this fact that those who hold to "protection for protection's sake" cry aloud, whilst with one hand they filch the gold from the purse of the citizen, and with the other blind his eyes to the act. "It is for the public good." It has ever been thus from the foundation of the world. Deceived into security by the false promises of the serpent, man fell, and from then till now—

Falsehood puts on the face of simple truth
And masks in the habit of plain honesty
When she in heart intends most villainy.

If I believed for one moment that it was for the public good, would promote the general welfare to maintain in this country a system of protection in order that manufacturing interests might be fostered, the people employed, labor rewarded, and the general welfare secured, I would not here and now lift my voice in favor of a measure looking to

the reduction of a duty and a lessening of the tributes of the tariff. I hold it my duty, in the administration of the trust confided to me, not to be restricted, as a member of the law-making body, simply to that which will benefit the people who constitute the special constituency by whom I am here accredited, but to look to the common good, the general welfare of the whole country; to know no North, no South, no East, or no West, but to regard these only as the component parts of a great country, united under one Government, owing allegiance to one flag, which, thank God, now waves in triumph "over the land of the free and the home of the brave."

I find the people constituting that country in this condition: That of the 17,392,099 persons engaged in all industrial pursuits in the United States, according to the census of 1880, there were employed in mechanical, manufacturing, and mining occupations 3,837,112; in trade and transportation, 1,810,256; in personal and professional callings, 4,174,238; and in agriculture, 7,670,493. When I come to apply the rule laid down that "wise laws are those which confer the greatest good on the greatest number," I find that under the exaction of the present tariff system about four-fifths of the people are paying tribute to about one-fifth; in other words, that under the exactions of this tariff four men are suffering that one may live. When I find one man made happy and prosperous under the existing law, I find that happiness and prosperity purchased at the expense of the misery and destitution of four of his fellow-citizens. I stop and ask myself, "Can this be fair, honest, and right?"

A tax is only justifiable under the plea of necessity. It is an exaction from the citizen enforced by the sovereign power, and the justification is that it is levied to meet the needs of the Government. When that need ceases the tax should cease, unless its continuance shall be shown to be for the purpose of conferring some benefit on the body of the people. What benefit do these taxes, levied originally to maintain an army and a navy, to carry on a war to preserve the integrity of the Union, confer? Why in time of peace should these taxes still be collected and the unneeded excess be buried like the "unused talent?" To this our friends on the other side answer that it is necessary for the protection of the American toiler; that it is to clothe and feed the struggling masses; that it is to maintain the dignity of American labor. If, Mr. Chairman, this were true, I would hesitate long before I would yield my support to the principle embodied in the pending bill. But the plea, Mr. Chairman, comes to us from a suspicious source; it must be investigated. Republicans present it, and their party has never been the friend of the laborer.

The Democratic party has ever won the allegiance of the working classes. It is the people's party. Not much individual wealth has been found within its ranks, and it has ever fought the battles of the people against restrictions and monopolies. It has ever battled for the enlarged liberties of the citizen and contended for the reserved rights of the States and the people. On the contrary the Republican party has ever advanced with stealthy but steady step towards the enlargement of the powers of the Government and the restrictions of the rights of State and citizen, and when the cry comes from the throats of the Republican party that it is urging protection in the interest of the American workmen, that cry is to be heard with caution.

The distinguished gentleman who has the honor to be the chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means, and who opened this discussion, has, I think, demonstrated by indisputable facts and figures the fallacy of the position that the tariff affects the wages of the workingmen. And a leader of the working classes, who gathered around him recently in the city of New York such a number of supporters from the toiling masses, has gone further in the direction of unfettered trade than either the Democratic platform or the chosen representative of the party, the bold and thoughtful President of the United States. That labor leader, Henry George, said:

The cry of "protection for American labor" comes most vociferously from newspapers that lie under the ban of the printers' unions; from coal and iron lords, who, importing "pauper labor" by wholesale, have bitterly fought every effort of their men to claim anything like decent wages; and from factory owners who claim the right to dictate the votes of men. The whole spirit of protection is against the rights of labor.

We thus see from theory that protection can not raise wages. That it does not, facts show conclusively. This has been seen in Spain, in France, in Mexico, in England, during protection times, and everywhere that protection has been tried. In countries where the working classes have little or no influence upon government it is never even pretended that protection raises wages. It is only in countries like the United States, where it is necessary to cajole the working classes, that such a preposterous plea is made, and here the failure of protection to raise wages is shown by the most evident facts.

To discover whether protection has or has not benefited the working classes of the United States it is not necessary to array tables of figures which only an expert can verify and examine. The determining facts are notorious. It is a matter of common knowledge that those to whom we have given power to tax the American people "for the protection of American industry," pay their employes as little as they can, and make no scruple of importing the very foreign labor against whose products the tariff is maintained. It is notorious that wages in the protected industries are, if anything, lower than in the unprotected industries, and that though the protected industries do not employ more than a twentieth of the working population of the United States there occur in them more strikes, more lookouts, more attempts to reduce wages than in all other countries.

In the highly protected industries of Massachusetts official reports declare that the operative can not gain a living without the work of wife and children. In

the highly protected industries of New Jersey many of the "protected" laborers are children whose parents are driven by their necessities to find employment for them by misrepresenting their age so as to evade the State law. In the highly protected industries of Pennsylvania, laborers, for whose sake we are told this high protection is imposed, are working for 65 cents a day, and half-clad women are feeding furnace fires. "Pluck-me stores," company tenements and boarding houses, Pinkerton detectives and mercenaries, and all the forms and evidences of the oppression and degradation of labor are, throughout the country, characteristic of the protected industries.

So when a protectionist claims that a war tariff must be maintained in order that we may protect the dignity and honor of American labor and save it from competition with the pauper labor of Europe, tell him his position is untrue. If protection benefits the wages of labor, why do the statistics of the country show that higher wages are paid by unprotected industries than by protected industries? Do you deny it? Why then do the figures show that the annual average wages of all persons employed in manufactories in this country was but \$346 per annum, much less than the average of those who give their attention and their labor to unprotected occupation, and why is it that the record shows that in many instances the highest wages were paid the workmen during the period of low tariffs? I cast my eyes over this House and my glance falls upon the intelligent features of those who are the accredited representatives on this floor of the working-people, and I ask, how stand these men upon this question? Surely they know the needs of the people who sent them here; they have worked in shop and factory and gained a place in the National Council by their devotion and zeal in the cause of labor, and desiring myself to be found with the friends of honest toil I ask the question, how do they stand on this great contest which agitates this House and the country? I find them in favor of the reduction of these war taxes.

With many of my colleagues I was in the city of Philadelphia the other day to witness the new movement on the part of our Government to place its Navy on a respectable footing on the high seas. Whilst in that metropolis of protection, Pennsylvania, I saw in the Philadelphia Record the following article:

The five Congressmen from Philadelphia whose hearts yearn for the interests of workmen may find profitable reading in the resolutions adopted last week by Philadelphia workmen, at a meeting called by workmen, officered by workmen, and managed by workmen according to their own notions. These two resolutions are particularly noteworthy:

"Resolved, That we especially request that wool be made free in the interest of the 60,000 textile workers of our city, who, with free wool, would compete with the world and obtain the privilege of making the finer grades of goods from which the present tariff excludes them.

"Resolved, That we emphatically protest against petitions to Congress that have been or are being signed in the mills and factories, either under the direction of the foreman or otherwise, being accepted as the free expression of the sentiments of workmen, as the manner in which these signatures are procured is but a species of slavery."

Observing these things what could I say to our protection friends who claim that this high tariff was in the interest of labor? I could but reply that experience and history both proclaim in unmistakable voice that they are endeavoring to delude the American people with false statements, frighten them from the enjoyment of the fruits that lie before them by a wretched scarecrow. But protection has added, it is true, to the number of our millionaires; it has built up vast business concerns in which are invested large sums of money. It has congregated the wealth of the country until in America it is accepted as axiomatic, "the rich have grown richer and the poor poorer." The lines of demarcation in the United States between wealth and poverty have become wider and more distinct. It is the wealth and not the talent of the country that is dominating in governmental affairs.

It has not been long since, Mr. Chairman, that an illustrated paper, whose mission is ridicule and laughter, pictured the highest branch of the law-making power in America as so many money-bags holding various large amounts and crowned with the head of the particular legislator; and it is because wealth has with the power of its dollars purchased position, defied the courts of justice, and held undisputed and unchecked sway in the land, that there have been combinations made and societies formed, looking to the leveling of these inequalities, and in their frenzy endangering the peace and safety of the Republic. A great danger to this country is threatened by the aristocracy of wealth. Let us heed the warning of the poet—

Ill fares the land, to hastening ills a prey,
Where wealth accumulates, and men decay.

By the aggregation of wealth represented in these manufacturing enterprises, these corporations, grown gigantic because they monopolize the field of some particular industry, "trusts," "combines," combinations, and conspiracies against the money of the people, have been formed, to add other dollars to the pile they have already wrung by the hand of extortion from the purse of the defenseless citizen. Greed and avarice hold their sway in the land, and gold—

The yellow slave,
Will knit and break religions; bless the accurs'd;
Make the hoar leprosy ador'd; place thieves,
And give them title, knee, and approbation
With senators on the bench.

It is the power of this wealth that labor fears. It is the "combine" of this capital that labor fights. It is this hated system which has augmented wealth and chained labor that wise statesmanship demands shall be abrogated. It is argued that, relying upon the faith of the Govern-

ment, capital has made investments and "plants;" that it has been encouraged by the prevalent tariff laws which have been maintained in peace as well as in war, and that it would be a governmental wrong to take from these industries the aid which has been given them, at the expense of the consumers of their manufactured articles.

But it is claimed that if we remove the governmental support they will fall; that destruction and ruin would follow the enactment of a revenue-tariff law. I thought as I listened to the glowing and deserved tribute paid to the "New South" the other day by the distinguished and eloquent Representative from the State of Michigan [Mr. BURROWS] of that time, within the memory of many gentlemen upon this floor, when it was contended by the Representatives of the South in the American Congress that the abolition of slave labor would mean the destruction of their wealth, the irretrievable ruin of their section, that their homes would rot to the ground, their fields lie idle, their lands be waste. No argument could convince them of their error; no eloquence could convert them from this belief. It took a horrible war; it took shot and canister and shell. It took the blood of valued lives to remove the peculiar institution of the South, to alter the nature and condition of its labor. Not a quarter of a century has passed since then, and what is the result? Let the answer be made in the language of the eloquent Representative from Michigan [Mr. BURROWS]:

I rejoice that there is a new South, a new industrial South, born of the throes of war, but full of hope and full of courage. She stands to-day with uplifted brow facing the dawn of a mighty future. Her loins are girt for a new race. With unfettered hands she smites the earth, and fountains of unmeasured wealth gush forth. Beneath her feet she feels the stir of a marvelous life. Her pathway is already illumined with the light of blazing furnaces. Her heavens are aglow with the break of a new day. All hail its on-coming!

"Aid its dawning, tongue and pen;
Aid it, hopes of honest men;
Aid it, paper; aid it, type;
Aid it, for the hour is ripe,
And our earnest must not slacken into play;
Men of thought and men of action clear the way."

The entire people of the South thank God that slavery has been abolished and none but freemen live within the borders of our country. Owing its origin to a revolt against a trivial but unjust tax, and holding to the maxim of "millions for defense, but not one cent for tribute," the United States has forever cherished a repugnancy to the tax-gatherer. The South has ever murmured against the unjust tribute exacted from her people to enrich citizens of the North and the East. As the South contended that without slave labor she could not exist, so now the North contends that protection is her only safety. As the South found that the liberation of her slaves was the commencement of her greatness, so the North will find that the adoption of a wise and just system of taxation will awaken her every energy, and, desiring to excel in the race for wealth and power, new impetus will be given to her enterprise, and competition—

Will lend to every power a double power
Above its functions and its offices.

To reach the desired end there should not be and will not be a recourse to arms. That industrial revolution in the North is to be brought about not at the expense of the blood and treasure of the nation, not by a revolt of those who have no protection against those who are protected, but by wise counsel in the legislative bodies, by mutual concession and conciliation, by a gradual emancipation, if you will, of the American people from this slavery to monopoly. The President of the United States, as wise as he is courageous, tells us:

Our progress toward a wise conclusion will not be improved by dwelling upon the theories of protection and free trade. This savors too much of bandying epithets. It is a condition which confronts us—not a theory. Relief from this condition may involve a slight reduction of the advantages which we award our home productions, but the entire withdrawal of such advantages should not be contemplated. The question of free trade is absolutely irrelevant; and the persistent claim made in certain quarters, that all efforts to relieve the people from unjust and unnecessary taxation are schemes of so-called free-traders, is mischievous and far removed from any consideration for the public good.

The simple and plain duty which we owe the people is to reduce taxation to the necessary expenses of an economical operation of the Government, and to restore to the business of the country the money which we hold in the Treasury through the perversion of governmental powers. These things can and should be done with safety to all our industries, without danger to the opportunity for remunerative labor which our workmen need, and with benefit to them and all our people, by cheapening their means of subsistence and increasing the measure of their comforts.

The distinguished gentleman who now presides with so much dignity, impartiality, and wisdom over the deliberations of this House, and who the State from which I am accredited in this body proudly calls her son, in assuming for the third time the position of Speaker of the House of Representatives, said:

Investments made and labor employed in the numerous and valuable industries which have grown up under our present system of taxation ought not to be rudely disturbed by sudden and radical changes in the policy to which they have adjusted themselves, but the just demands of an overtaxed people and the obvious requirements of the financial situation can not be entirely ignored without seriously imperiling much greater and more widely extended interests than any that could possibly be injuriously affected by a moderate and reasonable reduction of duties.

It is with that spirit that we should approach the final action upon the pending bill. I favor the independence of these States; I believe this country capable of producing from her fertile soil all that is necessary to supply the wants of her people. I know her capable of calling

into being by her mechanical skill every instrument necessary to till her soil or gather her fertile harvest; I know her genius can invent and supply all the comforts and needs of life; I know the songs of her poets fall with sweetest melody, and that the productions of her pen give food to human thought and impetus to human action; I know that her gallant sons fear no enemy on tented field. These are indeed free and independent States. I favor with heart and soul a home supply and a home market. I would be proud to see our products carried in our ships, sailing under that star-spangled banner, with our trade ruling the markets of the world.

America, thank God, fears no competition with any country on the globe. With a government where the accident of descent does not give position, where each of her sons is by birth "a peer of the realm and a prince of the blood," where high station may be attained by honest exertions, and where wealth bows at the feet of genius and surrenders her possessions at the bidding of industry—when we remember that not four centuries have passed since the eye of the white man first saw through the mists of ocean the outlines of this hitherto unknown country; that not three centuries have passed since the smoke of the first white settlement on these shores sought the skies; that but little more than a century ago, rebelling at an unjust tax, in the infancy of her power, she proclaimed to a wondering world that her colonies "were and of right ought to be free and independent States," and that we are soon to celebrate the one hundredth anniversary of her constitutional government—we stand amazed at her rapid growth and at the mighty achievements of her arm and brain, and cry:

Who shall place
A limit to the giant's unchained strength,
Or curb his swiftness in the forward race.

I look forward to the time when, freed from unjust and restrictive laws, fearing none in the competition of skill and talent and power, these States of ours, this grand Republic, shall conquer all opposition, and, fulfilling the prophecy, show herself to be "the queen of the world and the child of the skies."

I could not, Mr. Chairman, close these remarks without referring to the opening speech of the gentleman from Pennsylvania, the "father of the House." In the conclusion of his address he took occasion to pay his respects with a sharp but, he says, not unfriendly tongue to the State I have the honor in part to represent upon this floor. Although I honor and respect the venerable gentleman who gave utterance to the sentiment, I can not let his statement go unchallenged to the world. I shall say nothing of complaint at the fact that, made our guest, feasted upon the best our hospitality could afford, he has seen fit to complain like Justice Shallow:

I wished your venison better; it was ill-killed.

Whilst I thank him for the tribute paid to that unmeasured wealth which lies within her bosom, whilst I thank him for the encomiums passed upon her stout sons and fair daughters, I do resent the statement that Kentucky is a laggard; that she is behind her sister States. I do repel the charge that to "speak of her as a leading State, a progressive State, or even a prosperous State, would be to indulge in bitter irony."

The gentleman told us the other day that, like all old men, he lived in the past. He seems to have forgotten the past of Kentucky. Living on the border-land which separated North from South, she saw the war cloud gathering and tried to arrest the storm; she saw the troubled waters and spoke, "Peace, be still!" But the angry waves heard her not. On the floor of this House her revered Crittenden, parting the lips of age and experience, spoke the words of conciliation, but hatred and passion heeded them not.

Torn by conflicting sentiments, on the one hand, revering the Government of her fathers and loving the flag of her country, on the other, bound by kindred institutions, by ties of association and blood, to her sister States of the South, Kentucky hesitated. She endeavored to make her soil neutral ground, where in peace and unarmed the men of the North and the sons of the South might meet in safety. But that was not to be. Two of her sons were high in authority; the people of the South had made one Kentuckian their leader and the Union had inaugurated as its President another of her sons, the grand martyred and immortal Lincoln. The tocsin of war sounded; the martial spirit of her people could not be restrained. Some rushed with her Morgan, her Buckner, her Breckinridge to the South, whilst others seized the Stars and Stripes and followed her Whittaker, her Rousseau, her Nelson, and her Buell to the field. How well Kentucky bore herself on the tented field, in charging the cannon's mouth, let history the record tell. Her purest blood stained the battle plain; her best loved gave up their lives to the cause they had espoused. When the end came, when the banner of the Confederacy was trailed in the dust of defeat, back to the Kentucky home they loved so well came the survivors of the war, wearing the victorious blue or clad in the conquered gray.

What greeted them? Their State had been the scene of border and guerrilla warfare; blackened ruins marked the path of the departed armies. Untilled fields, deserted homes, silent forges, spoke the desolation war had made. These soldiers of the North and South saw that the future of that great State depended upon their exertions. The motto of the grand old Commonwealth is "United we stand, divided we fall;" and forgetting that they had faced one the other in the deadly

hate of battle the blue and the gray joined hands and marched forward to a grand destiny. What have been the proud achievements of twenty-three years? Kentucky has taken into the equality of citizenship those who formerly owned themselves her property. She has opened for them schools of instruction which challenge comparison with those of any people in the world; and notwithstanding the poverty of that race Kentucky to-day, when she spends a dollar for the education of a white child, gives a dollar for the education of the negro. I find her increase in population from 1870 to 1880 to be 22.98 per cent., while the increase in boasting Pennsylvania was but 21.60 per cent. I find her the eighth State in the Federal Union in point of population. I find, too, that the great Commonwealth of Kentucky is free of debt, but that the State of Pennsylvania is cursed with a debt over and above its available assets of ten and a half million dollars.

But why enlarge on that subject? You listened, gentlemen, to the noble and eloquent defense made by my distinguished colleague who has had the honor in the past to preside over the destinies of that great Commonwealth as its governor, and you must know and feel now that Kentucky needs no defender, and you ask the question, why does the gentleman from Pennsylvania complain that Kentucky is a laggard? because, forsooth, she has not produced as much pig-iron in the past year as the gentleman thinks she should. With her vast forests which timber her lands, with the untold wealth which lies buried in her bosom, with her fertile soil, Kentucky has ever held wide her hospitable arms to all who seek a home within her borders. She fears no comparison. Conquering her territory foot by foot from the savage red men, she earned then the title of "the dark and bloody ground." But for the preservation of the public peace, for the obedience to law, for the love of order, her sons fear no comparison. It is only in some portions of that State where they forget that the war is ended, and where they vote the Republican ticket "with readiness and dispatch," that the law is at times ignored and defied.

But Kentucky, gazing not back on the past, but living in the present and working for the future, looks forward to a career full of the promises of prosperity and wealth under just enactments wisely administered, and she is here to-day to lift her voice and cast her vote in favor of the people of the whole country and against the greed of monopoly. [Great applause.]

Mr. MILLS. I move that the committee rise.

The motion was agreed to.

The committee accordingly rose; and Mr. McMILLIN having taken the chair as Speaker *pro tempore*, Mr. SPRINGER reported that the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union had had under consideration the bill (H. R. 9051) to reduce taxation and simplify the laws in relation to the collection of the revenue, and had come to no resolution thereon.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE.

A message from the Senate, by Mr. McCook, its Secretary, informed the House that the Senate had passed bills of the following titles; in which the concurrence of the House was requested:

A bill (S. 1062) to increase the appropriation for the erection of the public building at Wilmington, Del.;

A bill (S. 1726) to provide for the erection of a public building for the use of the post-office and the Government offices at the city of Atchison, Kans.;

A bill (S. 2198) to provide for the building of a railroad bridge at Little Rock, Ark.; and

A bill (S. 2624) to provide for the enlargement of the dimensions of the wharf at Fortress Monroe.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed with amendments, in which the concurrence of the House was requested, the bill (H. R. 1325) providing for the purchase of additional ground in the city of Indianapolis, Ind., adjoining the post-office site, and for the improvement of the building thereon, and appropriating \$125,000 therefor.

BRIDGE AT OMAHA, NEBR.

Mr. McSHANE. I ask unanimous consent that the Committee of the Whole House be discharged from the consideration of the bill which I send to the desk, and that it be now considered.

The Clerk read the title of the bill, as follows:

A bill (H. R. 6140) to authorize the construction of a bridge over the Missouri River at or near Omaha, Nebr.

Mr. LYMAN. I feel obliged to object to the consideration of that bill at this time.

DUTY ON LIME.

Mr. MOFFITT. I ask unanimous consent to present a short memorial from certain lime manufacturers of my district and adjoining counties. I desire that it shall be printed in the RECORD, and that it be referred to the Committee on Ways and Means.

There was no objection, and it was so ordered.

The memorial is as follows:

To the honorable the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States:

We, the undersigned, manufacturers of lime in the counties of Warren, Washington, and Saratoga, State of New York, do most respectfully and earnestly call your attention to the following facts affecting the interest of the people of this and other border and coast States, and particularly said counties:

The large beds of limestone in these counties have caused an industry in the

manufacture of lime, which has existed for many years, gradually increasing to upward of forty kilns, with daily capacity of 4,000 barrels, and representing a large capital invested in quarries, lime-kilns, store-houses, boats for transportation, etc.

The entire cost of this article, other than the value of the rock in the bed and the wood and timber in the tree for burning the lime and stock for barrels, is made up of labor, to wit:

The shoving of hoops and sawing and dressing of stock for and the making of barrels or casks, quarrying, preparing, and delivering the rock to kilns, burning, drawing, and barreling the lime, chopping and gathering wood for fuel, and delivering the lime to boat or cars when ready for shipment, thus giving employment to many and benefiting, directly or indirectly, the whole community.

Some years ago a large amount of lime was annually shipped from the States into Canada, but later the duty imposed by the government encouraged the building of kilns at various places near our border, thus providing not only for home consumption, but with the advantage of cheap fuel, barrel stock, and labor they are now shipping a large amount into our markets. It is claimed that these advantages amount to more than 20 cents per barrel in their favor, thus producing so cheap that the basis of duty is but 30 cents per barrel, exclusive of cask, the cask when so filled being admitted duty free.

The present duty, *i. e.*, 10 per cent ad valorem, therefore costs them but 3 cents per barrel, or but little in comparison to the difference in the cost of labor there and here.

We therefore most respectfully petition your honorable body to not only remove lime from the free-list but to impose a specific duty corresponding to that of the Dominion Government.

KEENAN LIME COMPANY,
JOINTA LIME COMPANY,
By WAIT,
SHERMAN LIME COMPANY,
By H. G. LAPHAM,
MORGAN LIME COMPANY,
BALD MOUNTAIN LIME COMPANY,
GLENS FALLS COMPANY,
GLENS FALLS TRANSPORTATION COMPANY,
Per J. WOODRUFF HUNTING, Secretary,
J. W. FINCH,
WM. E. SPIER,
T. S. COOLIDGE,
S. B. GOODMAN,
F. W. WAIT,
SAM'L PRUYN.

S. B. WEST.

Mr. JOHNSTON, of North Carolina. I ask unanimous consent to discharge the Committee of the Whole House from the further consideration of the bill (H. R. 8956) for the relief of S. B. West, administrator of Thomas Becton, deceased, and that it be now considered. This bill was objected to the other day by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. KERR]. He now withdraws his objection.

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 S. B. West, administrator of Thomas Becton, deceased, of Lenoir County, North Carolina, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of \$1,585, being for stores and supplies taken and used by the Army of the United States during the late war, as found by the Court of Claims.

Mr. SOWDEN. Reserving the right to object, I call for the reading of the report.

Mr. JOHNSTON, of North Carolina. It was read the other evening. The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. The Clerk will read the report.

The report (by Mr. STONE, of Kentucky) was read, as follows:

The Committee on War Claims, to whom was referred miscellaneous document—claim of S. B. West, administrator of Thomas Becton, deceased—have examined the same, and report as follows:

The Committee on War Claims of the Forty-ninth Congress, not being clearly and fully advised of all the facts in the case, referred it to the Court of Claims for a finding of facts, under the provisions of the Bowman act. Said claim has been returned to the committee with a report that the claimant was loyal to the Government of the United States throughout the war, and that stores and supplies of the value of \$1,585 were taken from the decedent by the Army of the United States.

Your committee report herewith a bill for the relief of S. B. West, administrator of the estate, and recommend its passage, and ask that the miscellaneous document be printed as a part of this report.

[Court of Claims. Congressional case No. 1263. S. B. West, administrator of Thomas Becton, deceased, vs. The United States.]

FINDINGS OF FACT.

At a Court of Claims, held in the city of Washington on the 19th day of March, A. D. 1888, the court filed the following findings of fact, to wit:

The claim in the above-entitled case for supplies or stores, alleged to have been taken by or furnished to the military forces of the United States for their use during the late war for the suppression of the rebellion, was transmitted to the court by the Committee on War Claims of the House of Representatives on the 24th day of January, 1887.

G. W. Z. Black, esq., appeared for claimant, and the Attorney-General, by Lewis Cochran, esq., his assistant, and under his direction, appeared for the defense and protection of the interests of the United States.

On a preliminary inquiry the court, on the 5th day of December, 1887, found that the person alleged to have furnished the supplies or stores, or from whom they were alleged to have been taken, was loyal to the Government of the United States throughout the said war.

The case having been brought to a hearing on its merits on the 27th day of February, 1888, the court upon the evidence, and after considering the briefs and the arguments of counsel on both sides, find the facts to be as follows:

I.

The said decedent during the late war was a farmer, and resided in the county of Lenoir, in the State of North Carolina.

II.

It is alleged by claimant that during said war, at the place aforesaid, there

was taken from the said decedent by the military forces of the United States, for their use, stores and supplies of the kind and value, to wit:

| | |
|---|------------|
| 8,000 pounds of pork, 20 cents..... | \$1,600.00 |
| 2 beef cattle, \$25..... | 50.00 |
| 400 bushels of sweet potatoes, \$1..... | 400.00 |
| 1 mule..... | 150.00 |
| 100 barrels of corn, \$5 per barrel..... | 500.00 |
| 12,000 pounds of fodder..... | 180.00 |
| 100 cords of wood, \$2..... | 200.00 |
| 100 bushels of potatoes, \$1..... | 100.00 |
| 2,500 pounds of bacon, 25 cents..... | 625.00 |
| 10 barrels of pork, \$30 per barrel..... | 300.00 |
| 20 bushels of potatoes, \$1 per bushel..... | 20.00 |

Total..... 4,125.00

III.

The court upon the evidence finds that during said time, at said place, the said forces for their use took from the said decedent stores and supplies of the aggregate value of \$1,585.

IV.

It does not appear that any payment has been made for said property.

Filed March 19, 1888.

By the court.

A true copy.

Test, this 21st day of March, A. D. 1888.

[SEAL.]

JOHN RANDOLPH,
Assistant Clerk Court of Claims.

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

Mr. SOWDEN. I will have to object.

The objection was subsequently withdrawn.

There being no further objection, the bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time; and being engrossed, it was accordingly read the third time, and passed.

Mr. JOHNSTON, of North Carolina, moved to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed; and also moved that the motion to reconsider be laid on the table.

The latter motion was agreed to.

BRIDGE AT DULUTH, MINN.

Mr. NELSON. I ask for the present consideration of the bill (H. R. 5191) for the construction of a bridge across the canal entrance to the harbor of Duluth, Minn.

Mr. HAUGEN. I object to the consideration of that bill at this time.

MAIL ROUTE 30100.

Mr. WILKINSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask, by unanimous consent, that the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union be discharged from the further consideration of the bill (H. R. 8965) to authorize the Postmaster-General to cancel mail contract on route No. 30100, and for other purposes, and the bill be now put upon its passage. The bill was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Postmaster-General be, and he is hereby, authorized to terminate the mail contract on route No. 30100, with Charles P. Truslow, and to place the mails at legal rates for transportation, and cause the same to be carried on and by the New Orleans and Gulf Railroad from New Orleans to Bohemia, supplying all intermediate offices along said route, and to advertise and contract with the lowest responsible bidder for carrying the mails over the balance of said route from Bohemia to Port Eads, with weekly side supply to Pilot Town, for and during the unexpired time of said Truslow's contract: *Provided*, That said Postmaster-General shall not terminate said Truslow's contract, nor place the mails on said railroad for transportation, nor contract for its carriage from Bohemia to Port Eads, with supply to Pilot Town, unless he first receives a bid for the latter service, and has let the contract for the performance thereof at a price which, when added to the cost of carrying the mail by railroad from New Orleans to Bohemia and supplying the intermediate offices, does not exceed the amount now paid to said Truslow for the same service under his contract.

The report (by Mr. MONTGOMERY) was read as follows:

The Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads, to whom was referred House bill 5148, submit the following report:

The original bill proposes to cancel the contract of Charles P. Truslow to carry the mails on steam-boat route No. 30100, from New Orleans to Port Eads, La., which contract extends to June 30, 1890.

Your committee, on the facts fully presented in a communication from the Acting Second Assistant Postmaster-General, which is appended and made part of this report, think that the contractor, Charles P. Truslow, ought to be relieved from the hardships which a change in the methods of transportation over this route have brought about. But, in order that the Government may lose nothing by this change, we recommend that the original bill do lie on the table, and that the substitute therefor submitted with this report do pass.

POST-OFFICE DEPARTMENT,
OFFICE OF THE SECOND ASSISTANT POSTMASTER-GENERAL,
Washington, D. C., March 9, 1888.

SIR: I have the honor to acknowledge the receipt of House bill 5148, forwarded by you to this office, being a bill for the relief of Charles P. Truslow, mail contractor on steam-boat route No. 30100, from New Orleans to Port Eads, La., and in reply to submit the following statement:

Prior to December 20, 1885, the service on said route was performed under a contract with N. L. McGinnis, at a compensation of \$22,719.16 per annum.

On December 18, 1885, the Postmaster-General, deeming it for the good of the postal service, exercised the authority conferred on him by the act of Congress dated May 4, 1882 (22 Statutes at Large, 53), and annulled the contract of McGinnis from December 20, 1885, entering into contract with The Red River and Coast Line, Charles P. Truslow, president, for exactly the same service for the balance of the regular contract term, namely, from December 20, 1885, to June 30, 1886, at the rate of \$12,000 per annum.

For the next succeeding contract term, from July 1, 1886, to June 30, 1890, the same service was advertised in the regular quadrennial advertisement, under

which but two proposals for carrying the mails on this route were received, namely:

| | Per annum. |
|-------------------------|------------|
| Louis A. Jung..... | \$9,973 |
| Charles P. Truslow..... | 7,600 |

The latter proposal was accepted, and Mr. Truslow is now under contract to perform the service until June 30, 1890.

The service required is as follows:
Six round trips per week between New Orleans and Burns, 83 miles,
Three round trips per week between Burns and Port Eads, 41 miles.
One round trip per week between Head of Jetties and Pilot Town, 12 miles.
Offices to be supplied, 25.

The mails to be carried in safe and suitable steam-boats.
It is represented that Mr. Truslow took the contract for carrying the mails at a very low rate because he had several steam-boats engaged in the passenger and freight traffic between New Orleans and Port Eads, and had practically a monopoly of the river trade below New Orleans; but that since he began service under the contract a railroad has been constructed from New Orleans down the eastern bank of the river for a distance of 50 miles, to a point called Bohemia (5 miles below the post-office of P ointe à la Hâche), and that the said railroad has secured so large a part of the river trade along its line as to amount to a monopoly.

It is further represented that were it not for his mail contract, which compels him to run his steam-boats at a very great loss, Mr. Truslow would withdraw them from the trade entirely.

If Mr. Truslow's representations are true (which the Department has no reason to doubt), he will undoubtedly suffer a great hardship if he is required to continue service under his contract to the end of the contract term.

The present contract pay is only about one-third of the pay prior to December 20, 1885, and there is no question but that the service can not be performed for the amount now paid, in the absence of other business to be done in connection therewith.

Application is now pending in the Department for the establishment of mail service on the New Orleans and Gulf Railroad between New-Orleans and Bohemia. If, in order to secure superior service, this application should be granted, it would then be necessary, and under the contract the Department has the right to curtail the steamboat service so as to require six trips per week between Bohemia and Burns, three trips per week between Burns and Port Eads, and one trip per week between Head of Jetties and Pilot Town. This curtailment would reduce the contract pay (a pro rata deduction for all service dispensed with being required by law and by the contract) to \$3,277.73 per annum, and in all probability would not only not improve his present position but would subject him to still greater loss. In the opinion of this office, the service below Bohemia, if relet, would cost fully as much as the present contract pay for the entire route.

Mr. Truslow has applied to the Department to be released from his contract, but the Department, although convinced that to require him to fulfill the contract would cause him great hardship and involve him in large pecuniary loss, can not grant him the desired relief.

The facts in the case are submitted for your consideration.

Very respectfully,

D. HAGERTY,

Acting Second Assistant Postmaster-General.

Hon. J. H. BLOUNT,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

Mr. WILKINSON. I would state, Mr. Speaker, that this bill does not involve the expenditure of a dollar by the Government. The contract can not be changed until a mail contractor is found who will step into the other contractor's shoes and do the work for the same price.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time; and being engrossed, it was accordingly read the third time, and passed.

Mr. WILKINSON moved to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed; and also moved that the motion to reconsider be laid on the table.

The latter motion was agreed to.

P. A. LEATHERBURY.

Mr. THOMAS H. B. BROWNE. Mr. Speaker, I ask, by unanimous consent, that the Committee of the Whole House be discharged from the further consideration of the bill (H. R. 3008) for the relief of P. A. Leatherbury, and that the same be put upon its passage.

There was no objection, and the motion was agreed to.

The bill was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and empowered to pay P. A. Leatherbury, of Accomack County, Virginia, the sum of \$601.27, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, that being the amount paid by him to Lucy Roberts, on pension-checks numbered 6863 and 6864, which were afterward recalled and canceled, and returned to the Treasury.

SEC. 2. That this act shall be in force from its passage.

The report by (Mr. BOWDEN) was read, as follows:

The Committee on Claims, to whom was referred House bill 3008, beg leave to submit the following report:

That Perry A. Leatherbury became a bona fide purchaser of a check of the amount of \$1,301.27 from Lucy Roberts, said check having been issued by the United States in payment to the said Lucy Roberts, widow of Nelson Roberts, for pension.

The committee find also that the Department discovered, after the issuing of the check, that the claim for pension was fraudulent, but not until after the purchase, in the ordinary course of business, by Mr. Leatherbury, paying \$601.27 therefor, and giving his due-bill for the balance, which balance he refused to pay after ascertaining that the check was repudiated by the Government.

The committee, therefore, believing the claim for reimbursement of the amount paid on said check a just one, recommend the passage of the bill.

On motion of Mr. THOMAS H. B. BROWNE, the second section was struck out.

The bill as amended was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time; and being engrossed, it was accordingly read the third time and passed.

Mr. THOMAS H. B. BROWNE moved to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed; and also moved that the motion to reconsider be laid on the table.

The latter motion was agreed to.

ADDITIONAL LAND DISTRICT, OREGON.

Mr. HERMANN. Mr. Speaker, I ask by unanimous consent to report at this time from the Committee on Public Lands for present consideration Senate bill 555, to establish an additional land district in the State of Oregon.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. The bill will be read, after which the Chair will ask for objections.

Mr. SOWDEN. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the right to object.

The bill was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That so much of the districts of lands subject to sale under existing laws at Lakeview, La Grande, and The Dalles land districts, in the State of Oregon, as are contained in the following boundaries shall constitute a new land district, to be called the Harney land district, bounded as follows: Commencing at Snake River, in the State of Oregon, on township line between townships 12 and 13 south of second standard parallel; thence west to northwest corner of township 13 south, of range 24 east of Willamette meridian; thence due south to the southwest corner of township 23 south, of range 23 east of Willamette meridian; thence due east to the boundary line of the State of Oregon; thence north on said boundary line to the place of beginning.

SEC. 2. That the location of the office of said district shall be designated by the President of the United States, and may be changed from time to time by him as the public convenience may seem to require.

SEC. 3. That there shall be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, a register and a receiver for said land district, who shall respectively be required to reside at the site of the office, and be subject to the same laws and entitled to the same compensation as is or may be prescribed by law in relation to other land offices in said State.

Mr. SPRINGER. Has this bill been reported from the Committee on Public Lands at this session?

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. The gentleman from Oregon asks unanimous consent to report the bill at this time, and it is read, the right to object being reserved.

Mr. SOWDEN. I call for the reading of the report.

The report (by Mr. HERMANN) was read, as follows:

Your committee, to whom was referred Senate bill 555, establishing a land district in the State of Oregon, beg to say that this is a duplicate of H. R. 1762, already favorably reported by this committee, except that in the Senate bill there is a clerical error in this, that words "twenty-three" (number of range) should be "twenty-four," so as to read, "of range 24 east." We recommend that said words "twenty-three" be stricken out and that said words "twenty-four" be substituted, and, as thus amended, that the Senate bill pass instead of House bill 1762; and as to the urgent necessity of this land district we append a report (No. 180) made by us on the House bill heretofore reported by us:

"The Committee on Public Lands, to whom was referred H. R. 1762, beg leave to report that they have carefully examined the facts necessitating the establishment of an additional land district in the State of Oregon, and find that—Oregon embraces a land area of 60,973,390 acres, or greater than New York and Pennsylvania combined.

"About two-thirds are now fully surveyed and capable of settlement, and the remainder are arable, grazing, and timber lands.

"The present land districts in that State are all very large and each contributes an excess over the maximum land business, and yields to its officers the maximum salaries and commissions allowed by law.

"The proposed new district is located in Eastern Oregon, until in late years in the occupancy of Indian tribes, and the necessity for the present establishment is occasioned by the rapid settlements which are induced there by the large area of vacant agricultural lands subject to homestead and pre-emption.

"The proposed boundaries embrace about 9,308,160 acres and are 150 miles distant from the east to the west and 102 miles from north to south. The nearest land offices at present by the usually traveled route to the settlers in the center of the new district are Lakeview, distant 160 miles, and La Grande 180 miles; and the communication is only by wagon-roads. These great distances impose much cost and inconvenience to every settler who makes a home on the public domain, and greatly retards the growth and development of the country. The creation of this district will reduce the three districts from which it is taken, bringing their outer boundaries within easier access to the local offices, while not disturbing their present earnings much, if any, below the maximum limited by law. The least district in area of those from which the new district is taken will still be in excess of 8,000,000 acres.

"This committee reported the necessity for this new district in the last session of the Forty-ninth Congress, and the Senate passed a bill similar to the present, but it failed to pass the House for want of consideration. The Department then and now recommends the establishment of this additional district, the Commissioner of the General Land Office reporting to the committee that it will serve the convenience of a great number of settlers and be in the interest of the public service; and therefore is approved.

"We accordingly report said bill back to the House with the recommendation that it do pass, with the following amendment: Substitute the word 'four' in line 13, page 1, for the word 'three'; and strike out, in line 14, the words on said parallel line."

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oregon?

There was no objection.

The amendments recommended by the Committee on the Public Lands were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time; and it was accordingly read the third time, and passed.

Mr. HERMANN moved to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed; and also moved that the motion to reconsider be laid on the table.

The latter motion was agreed to.

JOHN McFALL.

Mr. O'NEILL, of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee of the Whole House be discharged from the further consideration of the bill (H. R. 5591) for the relief of John McFall.

The bill was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to John McFall, of St. Louis, Mo., the sum of \$350, being value of two horses, the property of said McFall, and used by him while lieutenant-colonel of the Twenty-sixth Missouri Volunteer Infantry, and by the quartermaster of said regiment turned over to the Government while the said John McFall was ab-

sent from said regiment on detailed duty as a member of a court-martial convened for the trial of Brigadier-General Sweeney, in 1864.

The report (by Mr. STONE, of Kentucky) was read, as follows:

The Committee on War Claims, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. 5591) for the relief of John McFall, report as follows:

That this is a claim for two horses turned over to the Government in 1864 by Col. John McFall, late of the Twenty-sixth Regiment Missouri Volunteer Infantry. Claim stated at \$350.

The proof shows that John McFall was lieutenant-colonel of said regiment, and was the owner of two horses; that some time in 1864 the claimant was detailed as a member of a general court-martial, and whilst in the performance of his duties as a member of the court-martial his regiment moved to Savannah, Ga., and the horses turned over to Lieut. J. M. Berry, the quartermaster of said regiment; that the said regiment was mustered out in January, 1865; that the horses were turned over to the Quartermaster's Department, and the claimant never recovered them.

Your committee are of opinion that the claim is a just one, and report back the bill and recommend its passage.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time; and being engrossed, it was accordingly read the third time, and passed.

Mr. O'NEILL, of Missouri, moved to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed; and also moved that the motion to reconsider be laid on the table.

The latter motion was agreed to.

YORK HARBOR AND BEACH RAILROAD.

Mr. REED. Mr. Speaker, I ask to have the Committee of the Whole House discharged from the further consideration of the bill (H. R. 7509) granting to the York Harbor and Beach Railroad Company a right of way.

The bill was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the right of way, 4 rods in width, across the military reservation at Fort McClary, in the town of Kittery, in the State of Maine, be, and the same hereby is, granted to the York Harbor and Beach Railroad Company, a corporation created by the laws of the said State of Maine, and said company is authorized to construct, maintain, and operate its railroad on said right of way, according to the location thereof, as recorded in the office of the commissioners of the county of York, in the State of Maine, and described in the license issued by the War Department to said company on the 10th day of June, 1887.

The report (by Mr. MAISH) was read, as follows:

The memorial of the York Harbor and Beach Railroad Company, asking for the passage of this bill, explains so fully its objects that your committee adopts it as a part of this report, and recommends the passage of the bill with the following amendments:

Insert between the words "the" and "license," in line 11, the words "temporary revocable;" also add, after the words "eighty-seven:"

"Provided, That the Government may, at any time, terminate the aforesaid right of way whenever it may be deemed necessary for military purposes or the sale of the property."

The letter of the Secretary of War accompanies this also as a part of the report.

WAR DEPARTMENT, Washington City, March 23, 1888.

SIR: In reply to the request of your committee, dated the 16th instant, for the views of the Department upon House bill No. 7509, Fiftieth Congress, first session, granting to the York Harbor and Beach Railroad Company a right of way across the military reservation at Fort McClary, Maine, I have the honor to state that no objection exists to the adoption of the measure. I beg to suggest, however, that in line 11 of the bill, before the word "license," the words "temporary revocable" should be inserted.

Very respectfully, your obedient servant.

WILLIAM C. ENDICOTT,
Secretary of War.

Hon. R. W. TOWNSEND,
Chairman Committee on Military Affairs, House of Representatives.

MEMORIAL.

To the honorable Senate and House of Representatives in Congress assembled:

The undersigned, York Harbor and Beach Railroad Company, a corporation created by charter from the State of Maine, respectfully represents:

That by virtue of its charter it has constructed a railroad from a point in Kittery, on the Portland, Saco, and Portsmouth Railroad, through the villages of Kittery, Kittery Point, and the town of York, and Union Bluffs, so called, in the town of York.

That the military reservation at Fort McClary, in said town of Kittery, extends from the ocean back to the high-water line of a body of water known as Barter's Creek Cove.

That it was necessary to construct said railroad between the ocean and said cove, and that it was impracticable to construct the same wholly below the line of high water on said cove, and said company has located and constructed its railroad partly over lands parcel of said military reservation.

That the land included in said location is not used, and is of such character that it can not be used for any purpose in connection with said fort.

That said location does not divide said reservation to any appreciable extent, but is upon the edge thereof, next to said Barter's Creek.

That the construction and maintenance of said railroad will be of great benefit to said fort and all persons who may occupy it.

That upon application, duly made to the honorable Secretary of War, permission was granted to said company to construct its railroad over and across the military reservation at Fort McClary aforesaid, and to maintain the same until the adjournment of the next session of Congress.

Said railroad company therefore prays that permission to maintain its said railroad over said premises as now located, and as described in said license from the War Department, may be granted to it.

Dated this 2d day of December, A. D. 1887.

THE YORK HARBOR AND BEACH RAILROAD COMPANY,
By DRUMMOND & DRUMMOND,
Its Attorneys.

There was no objection, and the Committee of the Whole House was discharged from the further consideration of the bill and amendments.

The amendments recommended by the Committee on Military Affairs were agreed to.

The bill was amended was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time; and being engrossed, it was accordingly read the third time, and passed.

Mr. REED moved to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed; and also moved that the motion to reconsider be laid on the table.

The latter motion was agreed to.

The hour of 5.30 p. m. having arrived, the House, under the order, took a recess until 8 o'clock p. m.

EVENING SESSION.

The recess having expired, the House reassembled at 8 o'clock p. m., and was called to order by Mr. McMILLIN as Speaker *pro tempore*, who directed the Clerk to read the following:

SPEAKER'S ROOM, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, May 2, 1888.

I hereby designate Hon. BOSTON McMILLIN to preside at the session of the House this evening.

JNO. G. CARLISLE, Speaker.

Hon. JOHN B. CLARK,
Clerk House of Representatives.

TARIFF.

Mr. MILLS. I move that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole on the state of the Union.

The motion was agreed to.

The House accordingly resolved itself into Committee of the Whole on the state of the Union (Mr. SPRINGER in the chair), and resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 9051) to reduce taxation and simplify the laws in relation to the collection of the revenue.

Mr. STEWART, of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, taxation is not a sentiment, but a stern, cold fact, a burden upon the people. Excessive taxation imposed in any manner and called by any name is odious to the American people.

From the time when King George imposed an oppressive tax on the subjects of the infant colonies down to this good hour the American mind and heart have always detested oppressive taxation. It is a well-settled rule of political economy that no more taxes should be collected than the actual needs of the Government demand. President Jackson on this subject declared the safest and simplest mode of obviating all difficulties which have been mentioned is to collect only revenue enough to meet the wants of Government and let the people keep the balance of their property in their own hands, to be used for their own profit.

We have arrived at that period in our country's history when the circumstances demand that we collect only what is absolutely necessary to support the Government, for the actual expenses of the Government were never so great as now, as the estimated expense of the Government for the year 1888 amounts to \$316,817,785.48; and in this connection I submit a table prepared by the Secretary of the Treasury, showing the receipts and expenditures for the year ending June, 1888.

FISCAL YEAR 1888.

For the present fiscal year the revenues, actual and estimated, are as follows:

| Source. | Quarter ended September 30, 1887. | Remaining three-fourths of the year. | Total. |
|--|-----------------------------------|--------------------------------------|------------------|
| | Actual. | Estimated. | |
| Customs..... | \$62,588,115.92 | \$165,411,884.08 | \$228,000,000.00 |
| Internal revenue..... | 31,442,039.49 | 88,577,960.51 | 120,000,000.00 |
| Sales of public lands..... | 2,620,890.23 | 7,379,109.77 | 10,000,000.00 |
| Tax on national banks..... | 912,411.69 | 1,087,588.31 | 2,000,000.00 |
| Interest and sinking fund, Pacific railways..... | 446,090.81 | 1,553,909.19 | 2,000,000.00 |
| Customs fees, fines, penalties, etc..... | 273,201.10 | 876,798.90 | 1,150,000.00 |
| Fees—consular, letters-patent, and lands..... | 1,007,660.36 | 2,492,339.64 | 3,500,000.00 |
| Sales of Government property..... | 84,926.87 | 215,073.13 | 300,000.00 |
| Profits on coinage, assays, etc..... | 1,113,855.90 | 7,886,144.10 | 9,000,000.00 |
| Deposits for surveying public lands..... | 40,450.32 | 109,549.68 | 150,000.00 |
| Revenues of the District of Columbia..... | 356,400.11 | 2,043,599.89 | 2,400,000.00 |
| Miscellaneous sources..... | 1,462,355.02 | 3,037,644.98 | 4,500,000.00 |
| Total receipts..... | 102,328,897.82 | 280,671,602.18 | 383,000,000.00 |

The expenditures for the same period, actual and estimated, are as follows:

| Object. | Quarter ended September 30, 1887. | Remaining three-fourths of the year. | Total. |
|---|-----------------------------------|--------------------------------------|-----------------|
| | Actual. | Estimated. | |
| Civil and miscellaneous expenses, including public buildings, light-houses, and collecting the revenue..... | \$17,286,572.63 | \$62,713,427.37 | \$80,000,000.00 |
| Indians..... | 1,913,585.65 | 4,336,414.35 | 6,250,000.00 |
| Pensions..... | 29,156,832.17 | 59,843,617.83 | 80,000,000.00 |
| Military establishment, including fortifications, river and harbor improvements, and arsenals..... | 12,368,225.87 | 26,631,774.13 | 39,000,000.00 |
| Naval establishment, including vessels and machinery, and improvements at navy-yards..... | 8,735,240.89 | 12,264,759.11 | 16,000,000.00 |

| Object. | Quarter ended September 30, 1887. | Remaining three-fourths of the year. | Total. |
|---|---|--|-----------------|
| | Actual. | Estimated. | |
| Expenditures for District of Columbia..... | \$ 1,474,685.28 | \$ 2,775,314.72 | \$ 4,250,000.00 |
| Interest on the public debt..... | 12,162,181.68 | 32,837,818.32 | 44,500,000.00 |
| Sinking fund, including pre- mium..... | 43,024,277.84 | 3,793,507.64 | 46,817,785.48 |
| Total expenditures..... | 121,121,152.01 | 195,696,633.47 | 316,817,785.48 |

| | |
|---|------------------|
| Total receipts, actual and estimated..... | \$383,000,000.00 |
| Total expenditures, including sinking fund..... | 316,817,785.48 |
| Estimated surplus..... | 66,182,214.52 |

Now, this vast sum of money has to be gathered from the hard earnings of the people, and it is all the same to them, as I hope to show, whether paid by direct taxation or collected from import duties. In addition to this, the farm lands of the country are involved to an amount which is alarming.

It is estimated that the lands in the following States are mortgaged as follows:

| | | | |
|----------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|
| Indiana..... | \$175,000,000 | Iowa..... | \$120,000,000 |
| Ohio..... | 350,000,000 | Nebraska..... | 25,000,000 |
| Michigan..... | 125,000,000 | Kansas..... | 100,000,000 |
| Wisconsin..... | 100,000,000 | Illinois..... | 200,000,000 |
| Missouri..... | 100,000,000 | Total..... | 1,365,000,000 |
| Minnesota..... | 70,000,000 | | |

The South also is largely indebted by mortgage on farms, but not to so large an amount as the Western States named above. Pending this discussion it has been admitted on this floor that the farms of the South and West are mortgaged to an amount between two and three billions of dollars. These loans were principally from Eastern capitalists; money which they had accumulated being the fruits of a high protective tariff, and to continue this system another quarter of a century will result in the South and West becoming laborers, if not the slaves, of these Eastern monopolies. The interest on this large sum of money has to be paid by the people, as well as the taxes to defray the expenses of the Government. Is not this of itself a potential reason why no more money should be collected, either by direct taxation or by way of customs duties, than is necessary for an economical administration of the Government? But, Mr. Speaker, by a system of high protective tariff we are not only raising revenue sufficient to defray the necessary expenses of the Government, but about \$65,000,000 annually in addition thereto. This vast sum of money is accumulating in the Treasury of the United States, gathered from the hard earnings of the people, and strange as it may seem, when the Democratic members of this House make an effort to change this condition of things, to take this burden from the shoulders of the people, they are met by most persistent and stubborn opposition. The Republican members of this House are working with might and main to defeat all attempts to reduce taxation, especially on the necessities of life. Let us for a time inquire, what does all this mean?

The Ways and Means Committee have offered to the House a measure which proposes to reduce taxation on the necessities of life. In a word, they say to the toiling people of this country, "We will reduce the surplus in the Treasury by a reduction of the duty on imported articles, so they shall have cheaper clothing, blankets, woolen goods, salt, sugar, cotton-ties, coal, and many articles in common use and of absolute necessity." To this reasonable demand the Republicans reply that by thus reducing the tariff on these articles you will injuriously affect the industrial interests of the East: "We are and have been the favorites of the Government, and under a system of high protective tariff, which has in a large measure broken down all competition and allowed our industries to control the markets of the country, our people have grown rich and strong, and we must not be disturbed."

This argument is equivalent to insisting that two or three millions of people engaged in manufacturing, for some cause deserve better treatment than the seven millions who rise early and toil late through the heat of the day in the fields to earn a living. For the Government to participate in such favoritism and invidious distinction between its citizens is to deserve censure, and for a particular class to grow rich under the fostering hand of the Government from the sweat and toil of the more unfortunate is not only wanting in fair dealing, but is a species of tyranny and intolerance that will not forever be borne by the great majority of the burden-bearing people of this country. It might not be improper to inquire in this connection what principle of constitutional law, of natural equity, or of administrative justice can be found in our Government which authorizes it to build up one industry at the expense of another; and is not the maintenance of such a principle contrary to the very genius of our free institutions? In the case of Loan Associations vs. Topeka, 20 Wallace's Reports, Justice Miller has said:

To lay with one hand the power of the government on the property of the citizen, and with the other to bestow it upon favored individuals to aid private enterprise and build up private fortunes, is none the less a robbery because it is done under the forms of law and is called taxation. This is not legislation,

it is a decree under legislative forms. Nor is it taxation. A "tax," says Webster's Dictionary, "is a rate or sum of money assessed on the person or property of a citizen by governments for the use of the nation or state."

Taxes are burdens or charges imposed by the legislature upon persons or property to raise money for public purposes. Cooley on Constitutional Limitations, uses the following language:

Taxes are defined to be burdens or charges imposed by the legislative power upon persons or property to raise money for public purposes.

And I would emphasize "public purposes." But our protective friends insist, and it is the burthen of their song, that if we change our tariff system we will affect the price of labor, and they hold up their hands in holy horror, and pretend that they are the true friends of the workingman. Pending this discussion, this argument has been so repeatedly and successfully replied to it would seem now entirely unnecessary to reply to it again. An investigation of this matter clearly demonstrates that the price of labor is not regulated by a protective tariff. It is not, as a rule, true that high tariff makes high wages and that low tariff reduces wages. In a large measure, wages are regulated by supply and demand.

The tariff is uniform throughout the United States, but wages are not, differing much in different localities. Workers in iron-furnaces in Alabama, Pennsylvania, and Rhode Island do not receive the same wages, yet the tariff on steel rails is the same; the wages of those engaged in the manufacture of cotton goods in Georgia and Massachusetts are not the same, yet the tariff on those goods imported into this country is the same. The tariff on coal is uniform, yet the wages paid those engaged in the coal business in Pennsylvania, Tennessee, and Alabama are not the same. The wages of farm hands are not uniform throughout the United States.

This proposition that tariff does not regulate the price of labor is clearly demonstrated by laborers' wages in England as compared with other countries. England is a free-trade country, while Austria, Germany, Italy, and France have high tariff, and what does an investigation of the question of wages show? Senator FRYE said, in a speech delivered in Boston, on what he saw in Europe:

From all my observations made, and they were made as carefully as I could make them, and in all honesty of purpose, there is only one country in Europe that comes within half of our wages, and that is Great Britain; that in Germany, France, Belgium, and Switzerland they are not one-third our wages, and in Italy one-quarter.

Is not the Senator good authority with our Republican friends? All of this shows most clearly that cost of living, density of population, and other things beside tariff regulate wages.

In this connection I append a table showing the prices of labor in certain countries where high tariff is maintained, and these wages refute the claim of high-tariff advocates—that high tariff insures high wages.

Table showing average weekly wages paid in the enumerated occupations in different European countries.

[Furnished by Bureau of Labor, Washington, D. C.]

| Occupation. | Austria. | Belgium. | France. | Germany. | Great Britain. | Holland. | Switzerland. |
|-----------------------------------|----------|----------|---------|----------|----------------|----------|--------------|
| Blacksmiths..... | \$3.18 | \$5.38 | \$5.81 | \$4.00 | \$7.37 | \$4.80 | \$5.20 |
| Bricklayers..... | 3.55 | 4.56 | 5.74 | 4.21 | 7.56 | 4.80 | 5.21 |
| Hod-carriers..... | 2.60 | 3.22 | 3.13 | 2.92 | 4.94 | 3.60 | 2.99 |
| Carpenters and joiners..... | 5.10 | 4.07 | 6.20 | 4.11 | 7.65 | 4.80 | 4.74 |
| Coopers..... | 3.64 | 5.17 | 5.58 | 3.97 | 7.50 | 4.80 | 4.78 |
| Harness and saddle makers..... | 3.60 | 5.51 | 5.70 | 3.69 | 6.63 | | 5.20 |
| Masons..... | 3.40 | 5.22 | 5.33 | 4.67 | 7.68 | 4.80 | 5.27 |
| Painters..... | | | | 4.82 | | | |
| Plasterers..... | 4.01 | 4.65 | 6.34 | 4.43 | 7.80 | 4.00 | 5.03 |
| Plumbers..... | 4.11 | 5.46 | 6.10 | 4.26 | 7.90 | 4.80 | 5.18 |
| Tailors..... | 4.03 | 5.58 | 5.02 | 3.41 | 7.40 | 5.00 | 6.35 |
| Tinsmiths..... | 3.70 | 4.40 | 5.46 | 3.55 | 6.56 | 4.00 | 4.40 |
| Servants (domestic)..... | 7.00 | | | 3.34 | | 3.75 | 3.90 |
| Farm laborers..... | 3.50 | 2.72 | 3.10 | 3.06 | 4.02 | 3.24 | |

Facts relating to foreign countries are taken from the report on foreign labor published by the Department of State, 1885.

COST OF LIVING—MASSACHUSETTS AND GREAT BRITAIN.

Rents are 89.62 per cent. higher in Massachusetts than in Great Britain.
Board and lodging is 39.01 per cent. higher in Massachusetts than in Great Britain.
Fuel is 104.96 per cent. higher in Massachusetts than in Great Britain.
Clothing is 45.06 per cent. higher in Massachusetts than in Great Britain.
Dry goods are 13.26 per cent. higher in Massachusetts than in Great Britain.
Boots and shoes are 62.59 per cent. higher in Massachusetts than in Great Britain.
Groceries are 16.18 per cent. higher in Massachusetts than in Great Britain.
Provisions are 23.08 per cent. higher in Great Britain than in Massachusetts.
The above facts are taken from the report of the Massachusetts bureau of labor statistics for 1884.

In this connection I desire especially to call the attention of the seven millions of people in this country who are engaged in farming to the manner and extent that protective tariff affects their interest, and I

here submit a table showing the rate of tariff duty imposed by the law as it now exists upon articles which are most in common use by the farmers of this country.

| | Per cent. |
|---|-----------|
| The iron the stove is made of..... | 45 |
| Hollow ware, pots, and kettles..... | 53 |
| Copper and brass utensils, if any..... | 45 |
| Crockery of the commonest kind..... | 55 |
| Glassware of the cheapest kind..... | 45 |
| Table cutlery and spoons..... | 45 |
| Pickled or salted fish..... | 25 |
| Salt..... | 36 |
| Sugar..... | 48 |
| Vinegar..... | 36 |
| Pickles..... | 35 |
| Rice..... | 123 |
| Oranges and other foreign fruit, about..... | 20 |

TAXES ON THE PARLOR.

| | |
|-----------------------------------|----|
| Carpets, if made of druggets..... | 74 |
| Carpets, if made of tapestry..... | 68 |
| Furniture..... | 35 |
| Wall-paper..... | 25 |
| Window-curtains..... | 45 |
| Looking-glass..... | 60 |
| Ornaments or knickknacks..... | 35 |

TAXES ON THE WARDROBE.

| | Per cent. |
|-------------------------------------|-----------|
| Men's clothing, of wool..... | 48 |
| Woolen hosiery and undershirts..... | 75 |
| Cotton hosiery and undershirts..... | 45 |
| Woolen hats and caps..... | 75 |
| Gloves..... | 60 |
| Blankets..... | 60 |
| Alpaca dresses..... | 63 |
| Any other woolen dresses..... | 70 |
| A pair of scissors..... | 45 |
| Brass pins..... | 30 |
| Hair-pins..... | 45 |
| Penknives..... | 50 |
| Needles..... | 25 |
| Steel pins..... | 45 |
| Ink..... | 20 |
| Paper..... | 25 |
| Razors..... | 45 |

TAXES ON SUNDRIES

| | |
|--|-----|
| Castor-oil..... | 102 |
| Castile soap..... | 50 |
| A dose of Epsom salts..... | 30 |
| Insect powder..... | 20 |
| Salad oil..... | 34 |
| Commonest window-glass for houses..... | 80 |
| Paint (white lead) for the farm-house..... | 54 |
| Brick..... | 35 |
| Roofing slates..... | 30 |
| Horseshoe nails..... | 31 |
| Trace-chains..... | 53 |
| A hand-saw..... | 40 |
| Files..... | 40 |
| Spool-thread..... | 60 |
| Bag and bagging for grain..... | 40 |
| A burr-stone..... | 20 |
| Combs and brushes..... | 30 |
| A wooden pipe..... | 80 |
| An alpaca umbrella..... | 50 |
| Any iron or steel a farmer may need, average of..... | 45 |
| Tin cups, skimmers, dippers, and all tinware..... | 42 |
| Tin-plate for canning meats and fruits..... | 34 |
| Fencing boards, \$2 per thousand..... | 20 |
| Pine boards for building, about..... | 20 |
| If planed..... | 33 |
| Fencing posts, about..... | 30 |
| Shingles for roof..... | 25 |
| Lath for house building..... | 20 |
| Barbed wire for fencing..... | 55 |

Schedule under act of 1883—present law.

I insist that the farmers of this country, although in numbers the largest, are not benefited by a high tariff, but, on the contrary, are shamefully discriminated against, and it is not so strange that their farms are heavily mortgaged when we come to understand how the tariff affects them.

Under the present law let us see what an ordinary family on a farm has to contribute to the Government. I submit a schedule of articles mostly used by a family as an illustration, and the duty on them, and also showing the reduction proposed under the Mills bill.

| | Value. | Duty. | Net Saving. |
|---------------------------------|---------|---------------------------------------|-------------|
| One cook-stove..... | \$35.00 | Per cent. 47= \$16.45 31= 10.85 | \$5.60 |
| By Mills bill..... | | | |
| One set crockery..... | 12.00 | 55= 6.60 35= 4.20 | 2.40 |
| By Mills bill..... | | | |
| One set cheap glass-ware..... | 4.00 | 56= 2.24 41= 1.64 | .60 |
| By Mills bill..... | | | |
| One set cheap cutlery..... | 2.00 | 50= 1.00 35= .70 | .30 |
| By Mills bill..... | | | |
| Two carpets, \$12 and \$15..... | 27.00 | 47= 12.00 30= 8.00 | 4.00 |
| By Mills bill..... | | | |
| Sugar..... | 20.00 | 60= 12.00 50= 10.00 | 2.00 |
| By Mills bill..... | | | |

| | Value. | Duty. | Net Saving. |
|--|---------|-------------------------------------|-------------|
| Molasses..... | \$10.00 | Per cent. 47= \$4.70 35= 3.50 | \$1.20 |
| By Mills bill..... | | | |
| Salt..... | 3.00 | 40= 1.20 | 1.20 |
| By Mills bill..... | | Free list | |
| Two suits each for father and two sons, six suits, \$14..... | 84.00 | 54= 45.36 45= 37.80 | 7.56 |
| By Mills bill..... | | | |
| Two suits each for mother and two daughters, six suits, \$14..... | 84.00 | 82= 68.88 40= 33.60 | 35.28 |
| By Mills bill..... | | | |
| Twelve pair shoes, \$2.50 each..... | 30.00 | 30= 9.00 15= 4.50 | 4.50 |
| By Mills bill..... | | | |
| Six wool hats, \$1 each..... | 6.00 | 73= 4.38 40= 2.40 | 1.98 |
| By Mills bill..... | | | |
| Six fur hats, \$2.50 each..... | 15.00 | 52= 7.80 40= 6.20 | 1.60 |
| By Mills bill..... | | | |
| Six ladies' hats, \$3 each..... | 18.00 | 70= 12.60 40= 7.20 | 5.40 |
| By Mills bill..... | | | |
| Six bonnets for ladies, \$3 each..... | \$18.00 | 70= \$12.60 40= 7.20 | 5.40 |
| By Mills bill..... | | | |
| Farming tools, including plows, gear, hand-saw, ax, draw-knife, chains, etc..... | 60.00 | 47= 28.20 34= 13.60 | 14.60 |
| By Mills bill..... | | | |
| Medicines..... | 20.00 | *48= 9.80 30= 6.00 | 3.80 |
| By Mills bill..... | | | |
| Thread, needles, thimbles, scissors, etc..... | 12.00 | 35= 4.20 20= 2.40 | 1.80 |
| By Mills bill..... | | | |
| Four pairs blankets, \$3 each..... | 12.00 | 70= 8.40 40= 4.80 | 3.60 |
| By Mills bill..... | | | |
| Two umbrellas, \$2.50 each..... | 5.00 | 40= 2.00 30= 1.50 | .50 |
| By Mills bill..... | | | |
| Cotton hosiery, undershirts, etc..... | 8.00 | 45= 3.60 30= 2.40 | 1.20 |
| By Mills bill..... | | | |
| Window-glass..... | 2.00 | 60= 1.20 43= .86 | .34 |
| By Mills bill..... | | | |
| Starch..... | 4.00 | 94= 3.70 47= 1.88 | 1.82 |
| By Mills bill..... | | | |
| Rice..... | 10.00 | 113= 11.30 100= 10.00 | 1.30 |
| By Mills bill..... | | | |
| Total cost under present tariff..... | 501.00 | 189.27 | 84.29 |
| Under Mills bill..... | | 104.98 | |

*Average.

From the foregoing calculation it will be seen that the entire amount of goods purchased at the prices named amounts to \$501, that the present duty on these articles amounts to \$189.27, and the duty as proposed by the Mills bill would amount to \$104.98, which deducted from the rate of duty under the present law would be a net gain of \$84.29.

I have been induced to make this calculation as a basis upon which all consumers of such articles can find data upon which they can make an actual calculation (knowing what they consume and prices of same) and determine for themselves what benefit would accrue to them if the Mills bill should be enacted into law.

With the farmers of the South, if the present bill should become a law, much would be saved by putting hoop-iron for baling cotton on the free-list and by reducing the tariff on bagging from about 3 cents to about 1½ cents per yard. In marketing six million bales of cotton it will amount to many hundreds of thousand of dollars. Each farmer can make a calculation for himself, dependent upon the amount of cotton that he raises.

As 7 yards are used to the bale, at 10 cents per yard, including the present tariff—3 cents per yard—the cost of the bagging is 70 cents; but under the present bill, at 1½ cents duty per yard, the amount for a bale will be reduced to 59½ cents, a reduction of 10½ cents per bale. With ties on the free-list, at a saving of about 12 cents per bale, the two would make a reduction to the farmer on each bale of 22½ cents, and this on six millions of bales would amount to \$1,350,000. This alone should commend this measure to the favorable consideration of the farmers of this country. While it can not be done in a cursory discussion, yet an analysis of the bill would present many other features as favorable to the farmers of the country as this.

Mr. Chairman, what is the bill that we present for your consideration? It is a bill which proposes to take \$878,000 off of chemicals; \$1,756,000 off of earthen and glass ware; \$11,480,000 off of sugar; \$11,000 off of tobacco; \$331,000 off of provisions; \$227,000 off of cotton goods; \$2,042,000 off of hemp, jute, and flax goods; \$12,330,000 off of woollens; \$3,000 off of books and papers, and \$1,079,000 off of sundries. It

is also proposed to add to your free-list flax, hemp, jute, chemicals, and salt, tin-plate, wool, and other things, amounting to \$22,189,000, making in all a tariff reduction of \$53,720,000. It proposes to make reductions in the internal revenue of \$24,455,000, or a grand total of tax reduction from tariff and internal-revenue sources of \$78,176,000—more than a dollar and a quarter to every individual, or \$6 for every family in the United States. And the plain, simple question presented here to-day is: Will we take this burden off or will we leave it on? Will we free commerce by leaving it unshackled or will we keep it hampered? Will we continue to hoard up a corrupting surplus or will we leave the money in the pockets of the people, where it justly belongs? These are the grave questions which confront us, and these are the subjects upon which we are to act:

| | Per cent. |
|---|-----------|
| Present rate on dutiable goods..... | 47.10 |
| Proposed rate on dutiable goods..... | 40.00 |
| Present rate on articles affected by bill..... | 54.16 |
| Proposed rate on articles affected by bill..... | 33.36 |

Several of the schedules of the more luxurious articles are not touched. It would seem that it ought to demand the consideration as well as meet the approval of every true patriot in this country. It is based upon the principle that the necessities of life should bear lightly the burdens of Government and that luxuries are the proper subjects of taxation. It will also be observed that many articles are put on the free-list which the poor and unfortunate are compelled to have, and it will be further observed that it places on the free-list many articles of raw material which will demand the labor of our working people to prepare them for use and consumption.

While in a short speech but little can be said as to what the present bill contains, yet I herewith submit a statement of some articles in common use which are placed on the free-list, and many more might be included:

Lumber, planks, sawed, etc.; hubs for wheels, laths and shingles; salt; wool, unmanufactured; flax, straw, and hemp; soap, potash, soda; log-wood and dye stuffs, spirits of turpentine, tin-plates, bricks, vegetables, needles, etc., figs, eggs, rough marble, tallow, feathers, and human hair.

If this bill is not constructed upon proper principles of political economy—if it is not so constructed our Republican friends should offer something better; but they offer nothing; "they object." While they are confronted with the accumulation of surplus in the Treasury—a policy which if continued will break down the great business interests of the country—yet our Republican friends content themselves by rising to the high plane of dignified patriotism and with emphasis say, "We object." It might be well for them to bear in mind that an outraged and oppressed people will hold them to an account, and by their votes hurl them from place and power. With a view, doubtless, to bring the bill under consideration in derision before the people, our Republican friends cry out "free trade." No one on this side of the House has contended for free trade, for we all know full well that it is the policy of the Government to raise revenue by import duties, and it will be well for our Republican friends to bear in mind that the people of this country are wiser than they think, and the cry of "free trade" will not shield them before the bar of the American people. If they defeat the purpose to reduce the surplus by a reduction on the necessities of life, the consequences of such a defeat will lie at their own door.

The surplus as shown by the receipts and expenditures of the Government will appear by the following table:

Statement showing the expenditures of the Government from July 1, 1887, to March 31, 1888; the estimated expenditures for April, May, and June, 1888; the available balance in the Treasury March 31, 1888, and the estimated available balance for June 30, 1888.

| | |
|---|-----------------------|
| Expenditures from July 1, 1887, to March 31, 1888..... | \$244,068,137.00 |
| Estimated expenditure for April, May, and June, 1888..... | 64,931,863.00 |
| Total for twelve months ending June 30, 1888..... | 309,000,000.00 |
| Available balance in the Treasury March 31, 1888..... | \$104,573,930.34 |
| Add estimated receipts for— | |
| April..... | 32,597,661.13 |
| May..... | 34,788,626.66 |
| June..... | 33,709,624.62 |
| | 101,095,912.31 |
| Less estimated expenditure for April, May, and June..... | 64,931,863.00 |
| | 36,164,049.31 |
| Estimated available balance June 30, 1888..... | 140,737,979.65 |

Deducting the expenditures from the receipts, we find that there will have been collected from the people, for public purposes, during the fiscal year ending the 30th day of June, 1888, \$75,156,611.31 more than was necessary to meet the demands of the Government. But there was on the 31st day of last month an available balance, a portion of which came over from preceding years, of \$104,573,930.34, and, if the estimated receipts for April, May, and June, less the estimated ex-

penditures for the same months be added, we should have in the Treasury on the 30th day of next June an available balance of \$140,737,979.65.

So great is the surplus, and so strongly it threatens the business interest of the country, that the President deemed it proper to devote his entire message, at the opening session of Congress, to this subject. And the country is to be congratulated that we have a President who is alive to the business interest of the country, and notwithstanding the severe criticisms of speakers and papers, who bow their neck to the dogma of high tariff, the President possesses the courage of his convictions, and, unmoved by flattery and undaunted by fear, maintains the rights of the people.

He has placed the success of his administration upon an issue, and the outlook will well justify the prediction that in the coming election from the North to the South and from the East to the West the people will say "Well done, faithful servant; continue longer in the high office to labor for the maintenance of free government."

One of the fruits or evil consequences of high protective tariff is the formation of trusts, which to-day seeks to control the material interests of this great country in its "Briarean arms."

The following is a list of a few of the trusts, together with the amount of bounty the present tariff seeks to allow them to collect from the people, also their expense for labor, and the excess of tariff bounty over the amount they pay in wages. Not one of these trusts could live were it not for the war tariff:

| Name of trust. | Protected by duties averaging, per cent. | Adjusted to guaranty a bonus in each \$100 of product amounting to— | Their whole expense for labor in \$100 worth of product being— |
|---------------------------|--|---|--|
| Salt trust..... | 50 | \$33 | \$25 |
| Earthenware trust..... | 56 | 36 | 40 |
| Bessemer-steel trust..... | 84 | 46 | 9 |
| Plow-steel trust..... | 45 | 33 | 29 |
| General steel trust..... | 45 | 33 | 29 |
| Nail trust..... | 45 | 33 | 29 |
| General iron trust..... | 45 | 33 | 25 |
| Copper trust..... | 24 | 22 | 22 |
| Zinc trust..... | 52 | 23 | 25 |
| Tin trust..... | 32 | 24 | 21 |
| Lead trust..... | 74 | 43 | 65 |
| Glass trust..... | 55 | 36 | 45 |
| Soap trust..... | 26 | 19 | 8 |
| Linseed-oil trust..... | 54 | 35 | 5 |
| Rubber-shoe trust..... | 25 | 20 | 24 |
| Envelope trust..... | 25 | 20 | 11 |
| Paper-bag trust..... | 35 | 26 | 15 |
| Cordage trust..... | 25 | 20 | 12 |
| Average..... | | 30 | 24 |

The above table, which is taken from a pamphlet entitled *Tariff Chats*, by Henry J. Philpot, of Des Moines, Iowa, well illustrates the glaring hypocrisy of the claim that the war tariff must be kept up so that these trusts and combines may receive protection against the labor of Europe. The average bonus which the tariff allows these eighteen trusts to exact from the people is \$30 upon every \$100 of their product, while their whole expense for labor amounts to only \$24 upon every \$100 produced, leaving \$6 tariff bonus over and above the entire labor cost. I would like to inquire how long the war tariff must be kept above the entire cost of labor in order, as they say, to offset the difference between the cost of labor in this country and the cost of labor in Europe. In this connection it should be borne in mind by our Republican friends that the reduction of taxation heretofore made was in the interest of wealth. Incomes were taxed, and brought to the Treasury \$72,000,000. This affected manufactures and was repealed. We laid a tax on the receipts of railroad companies, insurance companies, express companies, bank capital, bank deposits, and bank checks. These were all denounced as war taxes. They affected the rich and strong, and were repealed. Now, with a surplus in the Treasury, is it not high time that the burdens imposed upon the toiling millions who are not rich, who are not strong, who are carrying a heavy burden of tariff taxation, shall be lightened? And these millions who constitute the stay and support of the country feel that they are as much the favorites of the Government as those who with hoarded wealth by combines and trusts seek to crush them; and I now here declare in this warfare I am for the weak against the strong, for the oppressed against the oppressor, for the people against trusts, combines, and combinations, let them come from whatever source they may. [Applause.]

Mr. KERR. Will the gentleman allow a question?

Mr. STEWART, of Georgia. Yes, sir.

Mr. KERR. Notwithstanding those "trusts" of which the gentleman speaks, is there a single article the price of which is as high to-day as it was before the tariff?

Mr. STEWART, of Georgia. What does the gentleman mean when he says "before the tariff?"

Mr. KERR. Before the tariff of 1861. Notwithstanding the "trusts," is there a single article which to-day is as high as it was before that act went into effect?

Mr. STEWART, of Georgia. I will say to my friend that the vacillations or changes of prices of commodities are all relative. Before the war—at the time to which the gentleman doubtless refers—prices were largely affected by supply and demand, and were largely affected by the price of cotton.

Mr. KERR. That is your theory; but the fact is otherwise.

Mr. STEWART, of Georgia. Well, my theory or my opinion is based upon facts. Now I want to ask you a question.

Mr. KERR. Yes, sir.

Mr. STEWART, of Georgia. I want to know whether you expect to stand here and insist that the present tariff shall be maintained on account of the fact that these "trusts" exist and are making fortunes for the persons who take part in them? Are you willing to aid these "trusts?"

Mr. KERR. No, sir; I am opposed to "trusts;" and that is why I am in favor of the tariff—because if you take it away you will have no protection at all against foreign "trusts;" you can not control them because they are not within the operation of your law.

A MEMBER. Are there any foreign "trusts?"

Mr. KERR. There always have been and always will be.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Georgia [Mr. STEWART] is entitled to the floor.

Mr. STEWART, of Georgia. These interruptions do not disconcert me at all.

The morning papers contain a statement, worthy of consideration in this connection, concerning the formation of trusts. It is as follows:

IRON MANUFACTURERS ORGANIZED.

PITTSBURGH, PA., May 1.

The iron manufacturers of Pittsburgh and the Ohio Valley are hereafter to be more closely allied. An association has been formed and a commissioner appointed who will have full power, the same as a railroad commissioner, to settle all points of dispute. The association will deal with the prices and production, and will also have a committee to look after freight rates. A meeting will be held in Youngstown to-morrow and arrangements completed.

The country has witnessed with more or less alarm the details of "strikes," in many instances destroying property and sometimes human life; but so long as capital, under the name of trust, seeks by strong hand to oppress the people, what hope have we that strikes will not be continued?

Our Republican friends on the other side of this Chamber insist that it would be proper to reduce the surplus in the Treasury by a repeal of the internal-revenue laws, and if current rumor can be relied on our Republican friends are not agreed on that question, and I shall watch with anxiety their conduct when this part of the bill shall have been reached for consideration. Some of them say, "Let the States tax whisky and derive a revenue from it."

I have taken some pains to look into this question, and I find that out of the thirty-eight States, twenty-seven by their constitutions provide in terms that taxes shall be ad valorem and uniform. Now, I desire my friend who is to follow me to-night [Mr. DAVIS] to tell me, if taxes are to be ad valorem and uniform, how can we tax a dollar's worth of whisky in Georgia or Tennessee 50 cents, and a dollar's worth of corn or a dollar's worth of wheat only one-half of 1 per cent? I want him to answer according to the rules of law, and according to constitutional principles, how he can do that.

Mr. DAVIS. Will the gentleman allow me to interrupt him a moment?

Mr. STEWART, of Georgia. Certainly.

Mr. DAVIS. I will, shortly after I commence my remarks, refer the gentleman to the views of the last Democratic President on that subject.

Mr. STEWART, of Georgia. I am asking you the question—not any Democratic President. I want you to answer according to the principles of law.

Mr. DAVIS. I agree with the Democratic President on that point; he states the matter much better than I can.

Mr. STEWART, of Georgia. If I am right, the gentleman will follow the Democratic President in his views on this question.

Now, I answer, Mr. Chairman, if we repeal these laws we will create a deficiency; and if we create a deficiency of \$60,000,000 I want to see the Representative, I want to look squarely in his face, who is willing here on this floor to create a deficiency in this way—to take the tax off whisky, to make free whisky, to make more orphans, more criminals, to fill our jails and our penitentiaries, and by so doing put a higher rate of duty on the necessities of life. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. KERR. With the permission of the gentleman, I will ask him another question. Is it not a fact that there are more ardent spirits consumed in this country to-day, notwithstanding the high tax, than ever before?

Mr. STEWART, of Georgia. I do not know. Thank God, I do not drink the article; I do not buy it. I have no feeling akin to it in any way. But I do know that there are more people in the country than at

any previous time, so that there are more consumers than there ever were before. [Applause.]

Mr. KERR. Yes; and there is more ardent spirits consumed in proportion to the population than ever before.

Mr. SPRINGER. That is so in Iowa, no doubt, where they have a prohibitory law. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. KERR. There is not any of it consumed in Iowa; and so far as I am concerned I never drank a drop of it in my life.

Mr. STEWART, of Georgia. Well, I say amen to that. May the Lord keep you in the good pathway of sobriety.

Now, I want to say that I have in my feeble way held court for five years in the State of Georgia; and of the eight counties in my district six were prohibition counties, and the others non-prohibition or free-whisky counties. I want to say as a witness on this subject that in the counties where the sale of intoxicating liquor was absolutely prohibited my duties in disposing of the criminal docket would occupy sometimes one or two days, sometimes half a day, while in the counties where there was free whisky I have scarcely ever cleared the criminal docket in less than three to five days. While it is no part of my argument to-night, I want to say that in our part of the country where there is prohibition it has added to the uprightness of conduct and the integrity of the people; yea, it has tended to promote a higher civilization; and for one my heart and my soul approve that policy.

Mr. KERR. Amen.

Mr. STEWART, of Georgia. Now, Mr. Chairman, turning aside from the argument I had prepared, I wish to say that if our Republican friends have discovered that the taxation on spirits is a proper source of income for the States, there is nothing to prohibit the States from levying such a tax, notwithstanding our Federal legislation. If there is no constitutional inhibition against State taxation on spirits, although the Federal taxation may be continued, this will not prevent the States from acting as the laws of the States may allow.

It will be remembered that at first the tax imposed by the Government on whisky was \$2 a gallon. The tax is now 90 cents; and I see that a bill which has been distributed here, and which possibly reflects the views of somebody on the other side, proposes to reduce the tax to 50 cents a gallon.

Well, then, if it has been already reduced from \$2 a gallon to 90 cents, why not, without changing this law, let the States tax it now if they want to, and if they have the constitutional authority to do so? The point I wish to make is this: That in those States where the authority now exists to tax it, where the law now authorizes a tax upon it, this bill does not prohibit them, nor does the bill stand in the way of their taxing it. This bill does not stand as a preventive of such legislation. That being so, let the States continue to tax it. But let us analyze that for a moment.

Let us say that the State of Georgia taxes it at the rate of 50 cents a gallon. My friend over there in Tennessee and his friends probably will not tax it but half that amount, or perhaps 10 cents on the gallon. What will be the result? Georgia must levy the tax in order to get the revenue in order to help out State institutions, to carry on the State government. The inevitable result of such a state of things would be that Georgia money would go into the other State because whisky is cheaper there. It would go to buy whisky in that State and yet have all the evil fruits and consequences to Georgia that do attend the use and consumption of whisky, and not make one solitary cent to pay any portion of the State expenditures. Mr. Chairman, the simple statement of the proposition, the simple suggestion of the question, is to argue it. There is nothing in it. Another argument in favor of the continuation of the internal-revenue tax for the present is this: Of the \$118,000,000 raised, the North and West pay about \$111,000,000, and the South about \$7,000,000. This money is needed to pay pension claims and the interest on the public debt. Of the \$80,000,000 paid to pensioners, most of that sum goes to the people of the North and West, and the same may be said of the \$44,000,000 paid as interest on the public debt, as our Northern friends own most of the bonds. Is there not equity in requiring those who reap the benefit of a tax to raise and pay it? Take as an illustration Georgia and Illinois. The first pays about \$300,000 and the latter about \$23,000,000 internal taxes. What reply can be made to this argument; and is not this a matter worthy of consideration by those who are urging a repeal of the internal-revenue laws?

But, Mr. Chairman, the argument that the internal-revenue tax was a war tax and that the war is over is most fallacious, for the results of the war are still with us. While the war has already cost more than \$6,000,000,000, yet it is quite probable that we are not more than half finished paying for the war. The annual expenditures for pensions will likely reach \$100,000,000 at no distant day, and how long the Government will be called upon to extend its beneficence in this direction no one can foretell.

I sometimes have been made to rejoice in my heart of hearts, though not especially wedded to this system of taxation (but, sir, if my friends on the other side could only realize that down in my part of the country, where the colored population largely dominates in numbers, and realize the fact that with free whisky, or with whisky at 25 cents a gallon, any man, be he white or colored, could set up from three to five

stills to every district in that State, and with a peck of corn buy a gallon of whisky, which in its inevitable results would be to strike down our form of civilization); I say sometimes I have thought that it was the work of Providence that this state of things, though having its objectionable features, had been visited upon us so that society there might be made tolerable, and so that the races might live with each other in peace and harmony.

But, sir, I desire, and I repeat now, I want to know where is the philanthropist, where is the believer in eternal truth, who loves his home and his country, who has a mind to think and a heart to feel, and who is in favor of Christian civilization, who is capable of rising to the plane of patriotism, that can say, "I want free whisky, more of it, whether better or meaner, and in order to get it will favor a higher tariff on the necessities of life?" [Applause on the Democratic side.] God pity such a man! But, sir, I want to say that this is the only argument that I have heard for the reduction of this tax by our Republican friends.

Why, Mr. Chairman, it seems to me that he who loves his race and loves his kind, the man who loves his home, who loves his wife and loves his children and his country, would rather look into their faces and say, "Cheaper food, cheaper blankets, cheaper dry goods, cheaper necessities of life for you, cheaper coal, when the shivering cold winds of the winter's blast come, cheaper books, cheaper the things that maintain human existence; aye, all of these rather than cheaper whisky." That is my view of patriotism and love of country and love of home. [Applause.]

And, sir, as the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania advertises on the other side of the House, that he will at the proper time offer an amendment and put us to the test and see whether or not we will vote to repeal these laws, while I am willing, and say it now, to vote a repeal of the tobacco tax, as it is an article in common use and of merchandise, for one, I would if it digs my political grave, if it forces me to walk the path of political death, I shall vote, God giving me strength of mind to think and a heart to feel and an arm to strike, I shall vote for the cheaper necessities of life and let whisky stay under the ban it is under to-day. [Applause.]

But, say my friends on the other side, we have heard even in the Senate and in the House that this law is oppressive. Why is it oppressive? Why, Mr. Chairman, do we not all remember; is it not fresh in our minds that we brought in a bill here early in the session making it the duty of the courts to appoint a commission in each county, making it the duty of the marshal to carry arrested parties to the commissioner in his own county; making it the duty of the party making the arrest to issue a warrant and in everything, as far as human thought and ability could do it, placing the administration of this law just as the State laws are administered? And do not all remember that this bill passed this House without a dissenting voice?

But to day, Mr. Chairman, in the other end of this Capitol, at the other end of this Hall, that bill is ready for consideration; and in addition to that the Mills bill contains almost similar provisions which, if enacted into law, will break down the hardships which have been endured under this law and the brutal manner which has been exercised in the enforcement of this law. Then, sir, if the law, as has been suggested, is not perfect, why not come forward like lawyers, as statesmen, as wise legislators and make it what it ought to be? Why stand stubbornly in the path of legislation and say only, in response to every appeal for relief from the suffering masses, "I object!" "I object!"

Now, sir, I wish to state that in my opinion it will not be the part of wisdom or the part of statesmanship, nor would it be our duty to our constituents and to the people of this great country to repeal this tax rather than give them cheaper clothing, cheaper food, cheaper shelter, to lighten the taxes bearing so heavily upon their shoulders. Will we refuse these demands and say, "No, we will give you free whisky?" But our Republican friends need not take encouragement from such a situation, for in my opinion there is a constituency behind them, should they vote for such a measure, that will by any by rise in its majesty and go forth like the storm, like the cyclone, and by its votes and patriotic endeavors sweep from place and power those who dare to vote against the relief they demand.

But I will not pursue the argument upon this point further; only to repeat and say, let the States tax it now as they need it, but simply see that it is uniform. Whisky is a luxury that men can live without. God has given man the power and capacity that will enable him to live without whisky, but he can not live without food; he can not live without raiment.

Let us, then, rather say cheaper food and raiment, and let this tax remain as it is. I want to say here and now, I would I had the voice to make the country feel and know that on this side of the Chamber, with all our force of hand, of mind, of purpose, as Democrats, I trust as patriots, I trust as men of thought, we will never cease until we see to it that the shoulders of the toiling millions of this grand and great country of ours shall be free of this iniquitous, oppressive taxation called high tariff. And, Mr. Chairman, while I do not say it in any partisan spirit, I feel that this is a great economic question. I feel that it is a question that from one end of this great country to the other largely, deeply, seriously affects every heart and every home. And, sir, I would

appeal in the spirit of love and affection to all on the other side of the Chamber, and say to them, let us rise to a higher plane of patriotism, let us rise above partisan spirit, let us rise above individual passion, let us seek to consult our country's good, let us be inspired by love of home and love of country, and taking charge of this question, let us settle it as business men in a way which will scatter peace, joy, brightness, and sunshine all over this country.

Let us see to it when we reduce the surplus in the Treasury that we reduce it not by making the rich richer and the poor poorer; let us see to it that we reduce it not by bowing the neck to monopoly; that we reduce it not by yielding to the aggressiveness of capital; that we reduce it standing in the broad daylight as patriots; that we reduce it so as to carry the hallowed effect of our action to every hearthstone, and to every heart; that we reduce it in the name of eternal justice and right, by lifting the burdens of aggressive, wicked taxation from the shoulders of the people of this country, and especially from the mother's heart, from the father's strong arm, and the people will say "Yea, amen," when we pass that act. [Applause.]

Mr. Chairman, there is possibly more truth than poetry in the words of Pope when he said:

As for forms of government, let fools contest—
That which is administered best is best.

To continue the surplus now in the Treasury can not be a proof of good government; it is not justified either by law or precedent; it is a menace against the peace and prosperity of the country; its tendencies are evil. It tends to reckless if not to corrupt legislation; to correct this evil calls for the exercise of good judgment, influenced alone by patriotic motives. Let us remember that we are American citizens, born to a common heritage and destined to a grander triumph than has ever marked the civilization of any age or people.

If we do this we will but do our duty; if we fail to do this the historian of to-day should hand us down to coming ages as both wanting in wisdom and too cowardly to do right. [Applause.]

Mr. DAVIS. Mr. Chairman, I do not rise to make a tariff speech. The subject has already been ably discussed, and I could only traverse ground previously covered. My purpose is to correct certain erroneous impressions regarding the industries of Massachusetts.

I confess to some surprise in seeing free trade so boldly advocated. In former time the Democratic party has not been so pronounced. Its last President, preceded by an unbroken line of predecessors, advocated discriminating duties for the protection of our industries, and urged specific instead of ad valorem duties for the purpose.

In my deliberate judgment, specific duties are the best, if not the only, means of securing the revenue against false and fraudulent invoices, and such has been the practice adopted for this purpose by other commercial nations. Besides, specific duties would afford to the American manufacturer the incidental advantages to which he is fairly entitled under a revenue tariff. The present system is a sliding scale to his disadvantage. Under it, when prices are high and business prosperous, the duties rise in amount when he least requires their aid. On the contrary, when prices fall and he is struggling against adversity, the duties are diminished in the same proportion, greatly to his injury.

Northern Democrats up to a recent date have advocated protection and claimed that the party favored it. Indeed, incidental protection has been advocated by both parties North and South, except that extreme element which has always wanted the cheapest possible labor and cared nothing for diversified industries. The Republican party still maintains this policy, believing it to be a beneficent one for every class, interest, and section of our country.

Certainly the statistics, which are so familiar to you and which I will not quote, show the matchless progress of our country under the influence of a protective tariff. Indeed, the story of its vast increase in population, the development of its myriad industries, and enormous accumulation of wealth during the present generation reads more like an Arabian tale than a sober statement of fact. And this notwithstanding the country was desolated during the same period by the greatest war of modern times.

At the very acme of this prosperity, when everything bears witness to the benign influence of the protective policy, when even the Southern States, cursed by slavery first, then by war, and now by a malign and fatal policy which proceeds upon the false and wicked assumption that to prostrate another section is the way to elevate itself—I say when even the South is beginning to respond to this new influence, when manufactures are being established, her mines are being opened, her limitless resources are being developed, and Northern capital is pouring in to make her waste places blossom like the rose—when we are using our own products at home and extending our market every twenty years by an increase of population to the extent of an average European nation, and when our manufactures already equal in value those of Great Britain and in addition two-thirds of France, it is at this moment that the Democratic party, under the lead of the South, pronounces for free trade, denounces the protective tariff as an injustice, and attacks the Middle and Eastern States, which it claims are rolling in wealth through this robbery of other States, and draining the life-blood from the South and West. And still this tariff, were it not for an exceptional war tax levied in time of peace upon our domestic products, would not meet by many millions the ordinary expenses of the Government economically administered.

And this internal-revenue system is to be preserved with its army of office-holders, in order that the tariff may cease to be protective, and that free trade and unrestricted commerce shall prevail and British manufactures shall displace the products of our own labor on our own soil. When that day comes the American laborer will know whose hand has dealt the blow which has destroyed his occupation or reduced his wages to the lowest living point.

One might respect a straightforward assault which carried a theory to its logical conclusion, but it is difficult to entertain that sentiment for the policy which thinks free trade good enough for one's neighbor but protection better for one's self. The leaders in this free trade crusade insist upon free raw material when produced in the North, but they want a protective duty upon the coal and iron ore of Tennessee, Alabama, and Virginia and Maryland, and they also insist upon retaining the most obnoxious feature of the protective system—the duty only slightly reduced upon sugar, which will compel our people to pay \$36,000,000 annually to protect the Louisiana sugar planters, who do not produce one-ninth of the sugar consumed in the country.

The gentleman from South Carolina strikes sturdy blows for free trade and denounces the iniquity of a protective tariff with a bag of protected rice upon each shoulder. It is understood that the gentleman from Michigan, who is also indignant at the injustice of a protective tariff, will at the proper moment move to restore the duty upon salt and lumber because free trade in those articles will not suit the voters of the Saginaw district. Am I wrong in the impression that my free-trade colleague will also try to secure a larger degree of protection to card clothing than is now given by the Mills bill, and that he has a pretty good prospect of success? All these gentlemen appear to be willing to sacrifice other interests upon the altar of free trade, but they have a reluctance to subject those of their own constituents to a like fate. These gentlemen deserve to rank with Artemus Ward's patriot, who was willing to send all his wife's relations to the war but preferred himself to stay at home.

Verily, consistency, thou art a jewel—in this case one of the largest size and purest water, which coruscates and blazes on the forehead of their argument like the head-light of a locomotive as they make their onslaught on the protective system.

But I do not wish to be betrayed into an argument on the general subject of the tariff, however tempting the theme.

My purpose in rising was to meet the charge that the manufacturing States, and especially Massachusetts, had grown rich at the expense of the agricultural States of the West and South, and that meantime the manufacturer, while accumulating wealth (and this charge was pointedly applied to Massachusetts), was paying the laborer wages which were slightly if at all above the European standard. Now, sir, I admit that Massachusetts has been fairly prosperous. She is an old State, and her prosperity has been fairly achieved by the industry, energy, thrift, and intelligence of her people exerted through many generations.

Through her long history she has had many vicissitudes, and it is to her credit that she has triumphed over them all, and occupies to-day a position which I need not describe or eulogize, for it is known to the people of this country and to mankind. In the early part of the century her people were engaged in commercial pursuits, but the embargo and the war of 1812-15 greatly impaired and nearly destroyed her commerce. But she did not despair or rail at her sister States or persistently denounce the policy which caused her stately ships to rot in port and reduced her seamen to poverty.

She adapted herself to the new conditions which had been created, and which were alternately fostered and discouraged by the National Government. But on the whole she has prospered, and is a striking example of the benefits of a protective system. What she has done other States have done and are doing to their own advantage and to that of the general welfare of the country, and to the disadvantage of no State or section. Massachusetts is the third manufacturing State in the value of her industrial products. The great manufacturing as well as agricultural State of Illinois is the fourth, and Ohio the fifth. And these and other Western States are rapidly forging ahead, and will soon rival the Eastern and Middle States in the extent and variety of their manufactures.

It has, however, been so often charged upon this floor that Massachusetts was accumulating ill-gotten wealth, and that the Western States were suffering from the results of an unjust protective system, that I desire to make a comparison in order to test its truth. I will take the total valuation of Massachusetts and of Michigan, Wisconsin, Minnesota, and Iowa, as shown by the official returns in 1880 and 1887. This is done in order to bring the results, as nearly as may be, to the present time, and show the relative progress and wealth during the first seven years of the present decade.

During this period Massachusetts has increased her total valuation \$262,774,620, or 161 per cent.; Iowa, \$202,698,493, being 50 per cent.—about 200 per cent. more than Massachusetts; Wisconsin, \$142,292,998, 32 per cent.; Michigan, \$332,254,704, or 62 per cent., and Minnesota the extraordinary increase of \$211,551,035, being 77 per cent.—more than four times that of Massachusetts. I hope my friend from Minnesota will not hereafter be so much alarmed at the wretched condi-

tion of his State or so indignant at the robberies which have been practiced upon her by the Eastern and Middle States.

I apprehend that these States have been benefited fully as much by the East as the East has derived advantage from them. The Eastern and Middle States have not only furnished a market for Western products, but it has poured its money and its manhood into the lap of the mighty West, building its railroads and cities, developing its mineral resources, and contributing effectively to its unparalleled increase in wealth and population. What the manufacturing States have done for the West they have done, and are now doing, in still larger measure to develop the resources of the South.

It will not be denied that the railroad system of the South, now rapidly extending, and the establishment of manufacturing and mining enterprises to so large an extent, and all of which are destined to work a revolution in her industrial condition, are due to the investment of Northern capital, and largely from New England and the Middle States. All this teaches the lesson that the prosperity of one section is not necessarily the adversity of another, but that, on the contrary, it sustains and benefits all. It encourages emulation and not envy, a fraternal and noble rivalry in the march of progress, and the cultivation of the arts of peace, and it discourages and condemns that bitter and destructive antagonism of feeling, policy, and supposed interest so baneful to the welfare and safety of our common country.

Mr. Chairman, before closing I wish to accomplish my chief purpose of disproving the charge that the laborers in the various industries of Massachusetts are but little better paid than those of Great Britain, and that they derive substantially no advantage from a protective tariff. To do this I shall quote from the most eminent statistician of our country, the Commissioner of Labor.

In 1883, while chief of the bureau of statistics of Massachusetts (and I may add that he still occupies that position), he instituted a very careful and extended inquiry into the rates of wages paid in that State and Great Britain.

He employed personal agents of the bureau to make the necessary investigations, and after considerable difficulty in securing information in Great Britain, while he had none in Massachusetts, he secured reliable data upon which his comparison is based.

He gives the rate of wages paid in twenty-four industries which are common to Great Britain and Massachusetts. He states that they cover 74.9 per cent. of the total products of the manufacturing industries of Massachusetts and establish the complete representative character of these statistics.

He states that he has sought to determine with mathematical accuracy the percentage of difference in the rates of wages paid in Massachusetts and Great Britain in industries common to each. The industries referred to are as follows:

- | | |
|-----------------------------|---|
| 1. Agricultural implements. | 14. Hats: Fur, wool, and silk. |
| 2. Artisans' tools. | 15. Hosiery. |
| 3. Boots and shoes. | 16. Liquors: Malt and distilled. |
| 4. Brick. | 17. Machines and machinery. |
| 5. Building trades. | 18. Metals and metallic goods. |
| 6. Carpetings. | 19. Printing and publishing. |
| 7. Carriages and wagons. | 20. Printing, dyeing, bleaching, and finishing cotton textiles. |
| 8. Clothing. | 21. Stone. |
| 9. Cotton goods. | 22. Wooden goods. |
| 10. Flax and jute goods. | 23. Woolen goods. |
| 11. Food preparations. | 24. Worsteds goods. |
| 12. Furniture. | |
| 13. Glass. | |

He first gives the highest average weekly wages of men, women, young persons, and children, and the percentage of difference, and a summary of the average highest weekly wages; then a similar statement of the lowest average weekly wages, and of the average weekly wages.

As the result of his extremely careful analysis and classification of the tables of figures which he has prepared, he arrives at the following conclusion:

GRAND RESULT.

1. If Massachusetts is credited with the average wages paid and Great Britain is credited with the high wages paid—the Massachusetts wages are higher in twenty-three out of the twenty-four industries considered, the percentage in favor of Massachusetts, in all the industries, being 48.28.
2. If both Massachusetts and Great Britain are credited with the average wages paid—the wages in Massachusetts are higher in each of the twenty-four industries considered, the percentage in favor of Massachusetts, in all industries, being 75.94.
3. On an industry basis, the average percentage in favor of Massachusetts, in 23 industries, is 65.05.
4. Taking the wages paid per hour as the basis, the average in Massachusetts is higher in each of the 24 industries, the percentage in favor of Massachusetts, in all the industries, being 70.88.
5. On the basis of establishment pay-rolls, the percentage in favor of Massachusetts is 97.39.

The percentage that will truly and fairly indicate the higher rate of wages paid in Massachusetts in the industries considered, as compared with the wages paid in the same industries in Great Britain, must be found somewhere between the extremes here given, namely: 48.28 per cent. and 97.39 per cent. The results shown in sections 4 and 5 are not based upon as complete data as those shown in sections 1, 2, and 3, and neither percentage can be fairly used in determining the grand result.

The mean of 48.28 per cent. and 75.94 per cent., as we have previously shown, is 62.11 per cent., and this approximates so closely to the general average 65.05, as shown in section 3, that we state as the grand result of the comparative

weekly wages investigation in Massachusetts and Great Britain for the year 1883:

That the general average weekly wage of the employes in twenty-four industries in Massachusetts is 62 plus per cent. higher than the general average weekly wage of the employes in the same industries in Great Britain.

He also finds—

That wages by the hour in Massachusetts exceed those of Great Britain by 70.88 per cent., and the excess is shown to exist in every industry considered.

He then compares the wages paid in Massachusetts and Great Britain from 1860 to 1883, with the following result:

In the ninety industries, in Massachusetts and Great Britain, supplying statistics of average weekly wages for the period between the years 1860 and 1883 the wages of at least one and a quarter millions (1,250,000) of employes are represented.

In the ninety industries considered, from 1860 to 1883, the general average weekly wage was 75.40 per cent. higher in Massachusetts than in Great Britain.

If we examine the manufacturing and mechanical industries by themselves, 84 in Massachusetts and 35 in Great Britain, we find, in these industries, that the general average weekly wage, from 1860 to 1883, was 73.02 per cent. higher in Massachusetts than in Great Britain. If we confine our comparison to the 37 industries which supply an exact comparison, that is, an average figure in both countries for the same industry, we discover that the general average weekly wage in these 37 industries in Massachusetts, from 1860 to 1883, was \$10.17, while in Great Britain it was \$5.57, or, the general average weekly wage was 82.59 per cent. higher in Massachusetts than in Great Britain. A further examination of these 37 fully comparative industries shows that in 8 the percentage in favor of Massachusetts was less than 60, in 7 from 60 to 80, in 11 from 80 to 100, and in 11 over 100 per cent., reaching as high as 191.6 per cent.

By the industry presentation, the percentage in favor of Massachusetts in ninety industries from 1860 to 1883 was shown to be 75.40 per cent.; by the yearly consolidation (on nine yearly bases instead of ninety industry bases) we find it to result in 79.57 per cent. in favor of Massachusetts. The mean of these two percentages is 77.49 per cent. The result of the comparative wages investigation from 1860 to 1883 is—

That the general average weekly wage of the employes in the industries considered was 77.49 per cent. higher in Massachusetts than in Great Britain.

GRAND RESULT.

1. The number of employes whose average weekly wages are represented in the comparisons from 1860 to 1883 is at least one and a quarter millions.

2. In the comparisons, 84 industries in Massachusetts and 39 in Great Britain were represented. The Massachusetts wages were higher in all the industries compared, the percentage in favor of Massachusetts, on an industry basis, being 75.40.

3. The purely manufacturing industries entering into this comparison numbered 84 in Massachusetts and 37 in Great Britain. In these industries the percentage in favor of Massachusetts was 73.02.

4. Complete comparisons were possible in the case of 37 industries having wage statistics for both countries. In these industries the percentage in favor of Massachusetts was 82.59.

5. On the yearly basis, Massachusetts from 1860 to 1883, and Great Britain from 1872 to 1883, the percentage in favor of Massachusetts is 79.57.

6. Wages in Massachusetts are 28.36 per cent. higher than they were in 1860.

7. Wages in Great Britain are 9.74 per cent. higher than they were in 1872.

The mean of the percentages shown on the industry basis in section 2 (75.40) and on the yearly basis in section 5 (79.57) is 77.49, which figure is the result of the comparisons from 1860 to 1883. This result not only verifies beyond question the result obtained in Part II, namely, 62+ per cent., but it also shows that the extreme figure, for 1883 alone, found in Part II, namely, 75.94 per cent. (see page 119) is less than the average per cent. in favor of Massachusetts from 1860 to 1883.

The grand result of the comparative wages investigation in Massachusetts and Great Britain for the years 1860 to 1883 is, that the general average weekly wage of the employes in the industries considered in Massachusetts was 77+ per cent. higher than the general average weekly wage of the employes in the industries considered in Great Britain.

He then makes a careful comparison of the cost of living, and arrives at the following results:

Comparisons for 1883 between Massachusetts and Great Britain enable us to secure the following results: Groceries were 16.18 per cent. higher in Massachusetts; provisions were 23.08 per cent. higher in Great Britain, while fuel was 104.96 per cent. higher in Massachusetts.

Dry goods.—From the high, medium high, medium, medium low, and low prices for dry goods, we secure two percentages, both in favor of Great Britain. If all goods in all grades are compared we find that dry goods were 13.26 per cent. higher in Massachusetts in 1883 than in Great Britain. If the comparison is made on the basis of all goods in the medium, medium low, and low grades, from which workmen obtain their supplies, the figure in favor of Great Britain is .9, or less than 1 per cent.

Boots, shoes, and slippers.—In 1883, if all goods in all grades are included, boots, shoes, and slippers were 62.89 per cent. higher in Massachusetts than in Great Britain. If the comparison is confined to the medium, medium low, and low grades, then these articles were 42.75 per cent. higher in Massachusetts than in Great Britain.

Clothing.—If all goods in all grades are considered, the specified articles of clothing were 45.06 per cent. higher in Massachusetts in 1883 than in Great Britain. If the comparison covers only the medium, medium low, and low grades, then the articles considered were 27.36 per cent. higher in Massachusetts. The low grade alone shows that prices in Massachusetts were 18 per cent. higher, while the high and medium high grades indicate that prices in Massachusetts were 56.57 per cent. higher.

Rents.—A very full showing of rents for Massachusetts and Great Britain in 1883 supplies the following result: Rents were, on the average, 89.62 per cent. higher in Massachusetts than in Great Britain. The average rent of one room in Massachusetts was 85 cents per week, \$2.85 per month, and \$34.38 per year. The average rent for various sized tenements can be easily computed on this basis. In Great Britain the average rent for one room was 35 cents per week, \$1.51 per month, and \$18.02 per year. Computations for tenements can be made as in the case of Massachusetts.

I give his conclusions:

That on any basis of yearly expenditure the prices of articles entering into the cost of living were on the average 17.29 per cent. higher in Massachusetts in 1883 than in Great Britain, that of this figure 11.49 per cent. was due to higher rents in Massachusetts, leaving 5.80 per cent. as indicative of the higher cost of living in Massachusetts, as compared with Great Britain, as regards the remaining elements of expense.

We have seen, on page 151, *ante*, that the Massachusetts workman expends 48.41 per cent. more for the support of his family than the workman in Great Britain. (The average families referred to (page 151) are virtually of the same size, for the slightly increased size of the average Great Britain family is compensated for by a greater proportion at work in Great Britain, and this propor-

tion is the same as the ratio between Massachusetts and Great Britain as regards size of family and persons at work.)

Of this 48.41 per cent. 5.80 per cent. is paid extra for articles which could be purchased 5.80 per cent. cheaper in Great Britain; 11.49 per cent. is paid extra to secure more and larger rooms and more air space than the workman in Great Britain enjoys, while the remainder, 31.12 per cent., indicates also an extra amount expended by the Massachusetts workman to secure better home surroundings and to maintain the same higher standard of living, as shown for rent, as regards other expenses, which standard is higher than that secured by the workman in Great Britain.

Distinguishing the figures indicating the greater expenditure for living in Massachusetts (48.41 per cent.) from those indicating the higher cost of living (17.29 per cent.), we find, as a grand result, that the higher prices in Massachusetts are represented by 5.80 per cent.; that increased accommodations in housing and the general higher standard of living maintained by Massachusetts workmen as compared with the standard of living of workmen in Great Britain is represented by 42.61 (11.49 + 31.12) per cent. out of the total greater cost of 48.41 per cent.; or, stated as a direct ratio, the standard of living of Massachusetts workmen is to that of the workmen of Great Britain, as 1.42 is to 1.

I will also quote from House Executive Document No. 54, 1884-'85, the report of Consul Lathrop on factory labor in the west of England:

Consul Lathrop selects Trowbridge, a factory town of 12,000 inhabitants in his district, as a place which shows factory life in England in its most favorable light. It is entirely a manufacturing town, in the middle of a fertile agricultural country. It has given many operatives to American mills, and in all its labor conditions may be considered representative of the best phases of English factory life.

The average wages of the men in the Trowbridge woolen factories are estimated at \$5.44 per week. The average wages paid to 418 women in one leading factory are given as \$2.66 per week, and in another at \$3.02 per week. These wages, adds the consul, would not support life unaided; but, generally, these women are the wives or daughters of the male operatives; neither could the male wages alone sustain the average English families, and so the children in their turn contribute to the general fund by also working in the factories. Boys and girls, when employed, earn from \$2.25 to \$2.40 per week. Thus, to enable a Trowbridge family to live, every member—husband, wife, and children—works in the mills.

It will, therefore, be seen that the conditions which surround labor in this representative factory town are not much different from the conditions which prevail in similar towns in France and Germany. "Notwithstanding the favorable agricultural conditions which surround Trowbridge," adds the consul, "giving the working-people cheap and wholesome food products, aided by flourishing co-operative stores, the combined earnings of the family are barely sufficient for its support." The operatives are steady and law-abiding, and drunkenness is rare.

In reporting thirteen interviews with Trowbridge operatives, purposely selected for their steadiness and trustworthiness, representing the best element of factory life, Consul Lathrop says that only two were able to save anything. One of these has a weekly income, earned by himself and three children, of \$8.03 per week, the other a weekly income, earned by himself and wife, of \$7.29. Without the labor of the wife the family resources are insufficient, and when the husband and wife both work the home suffers and the children are neglected.

Consul Lathrop concludes his report with the following comparisons between labor in his district and in the United States:

"1. No class of laborer is as intelligent as the corresponding class in the United States.

"2. In consequence of this the laborer here is not so valuable to his employer as in the United States. He is less receptive and retentive of ideas, requires more oversight and direction, and accomplishes less in a day.

"3. His wages are less than in the United States.

"4. There is not a corresponding cheapness in the price of commodities. Rent is cheaper, but if the laborer spends less here in other directions it is because he does without or buys inferior articles, and not because the general necessities of life are cheaper here than in the United States.

"5. The employment of women is more general than in the United States. There is some female member contributing towards the support of almost every laborer's family.

"6. The laboring classes are not so self-respecting or respected here as in the United States."

Consul Shaw writes respecting the manner of living in Manchester, as follows:

American work-people, as a whole, would not live under the conditions in force here among operatives, nor could they be induced to adopt the English system. Here whole families live in the mills and are satisfied to do so. Here the children are compelled to help pay the family expense.

Great numbers of houses visited by me contained each only one living room, and this served as kitchen, dining-room, sitting-room, and in some instances also bed-room. Into some of these small houses large families are crowded, and the manner of life is almost necessarily demoralizing and unfortunate.

I will now read a statement just received showing the average rate of wages now paid in a Fall River mill, and for the accuracy of which I vouch, and would add that the same wages are paid in all the mills of the city, and I have no doubt represent fairly the rate of wages paid elsewhere in the State.

| Average pay per week of— | |
|-------------------------------|---------|
| Mule spinners..... | \$11.00 |
| Weavers..... | 7.75 |
| Carders (men)..... | 7.50 |
| Carders (women)..... | 7.00 |
| Slasher tenders..... | 10.00 |
| Children (ring spinning)..... | 4.25 |

These wages, as shown by data in my possession, are 50 per cent. higher than in 1860, before the passage of the Morrill bill.

Mr. SPRINGER. I hope the gentleman will explain also the difference between the wages of labor in free-trade England and protective Germany.

Mr. DAVIS. I have confined my statement strictly to Great Britain.

Mr. SPRINGER. What is the object of citing these statistics?

Mr. DAVIS. My object is simply to show the difference between Massachusetts and Great Britain; Great Britain being a free-trade country and Massachusetts a protective State. Now, if the gentleman [Mr. SPRINGER] has an argument on the other side, of course he can make it, but not in my time.

Mr. SPRINGER. But do not you know that in Germany, which is a protective country, the difference is just as great the other way?

Mr. DAVIS. There may be other causes affecting wages there, but I can not go into that question now. The statement has been made here repeatedly that the workingman in Massachusetts receives little if any higher wages and is in no better condition than the workingman in Great Britain, and it is to show the error of that statement that I have produced these figures.

Mr. SPRINGER. If it were true—

Mr. DAVIS. I can not permit further interruption, because my remarks will occupy the whole of my time.

Mr. SPRINGER. We will give you all the time you want.

Mr. DAVIS. I will say, however, in passing, that I believe it is well understood that since the protective tariff has been increased in Germany her laborers are getting better wages and their condition is improving, and the same is true of France. That may go some distance toward answering the gentleman's question.

Mr. SPRINGER. But in all the protective countries of the world, except the United States, labor is cheaper than in Great Britain.

Mr. DAVIS. I wish also to correct the impression that enormous profits have been made in cotton manufacturing in Massachusetts, and will read the following statements giving the dividends of mills which include the bulk of the business in New England for a series of years, and also a statement giving the dividends of the Fall River mills for a number of years:

Dividends paid by fifty-two corporations, having \$53,182,000 capital stock, manufacturing cotton goods in Maine, New Hampshire, and Massachusetts have averaged during fourteen years, 1874 to 1887, inclusive, 6.149 per cent. per annum.

Dividends paid by seventy-five corporations, having \$70,681,000 capital stock, manufacturing cotton goods in Maine, New Hampshire, and Massachusetts, have averaged during six years, 1882 to 1887, inclusive, 5.952 per cent. per annum.

Mills in Fall River, having a capital stock of \$13,361,330, have paid annual dividends averaging during fourteen years, since 1873, 5.23 per cent.

I think these statements will disabuse the minds of gentlemen of the error that large profits have been made in the cotton business of Massachusetts. The average profits have been moderate, and the cost to the consumer has been reduced to a minimum. It may fairly be said that in this industry protection has done its perfect work, and no better argument can be urged in its behalf than the history of the cotton-manufacturing industry of Massachusetts. It furnishes a product to the American people far cheaper than they could otherwise have obtained it, and it has built up flourishing communities, which have furnished the best of markets for the products of other industries in every portion of our country.

There are in my own district two cities numbering 100,000 people and employing more than 2,000,000 of spindles in this industry, and consuming one-twentieth of the entire cotton product of the South. I need hardly suggest the importance of these communities as consumers of the various products of all the sections of our country. Let me also say that in the city of my residence, the Manchester of America, nine-tenths of whose industries have sprung up since 1860, we have, according to the popular standard of this day, no rich men and no grasping monopolies.

Our industries are organized under the corporation laws of the State, by which the moderate subscriptions of individual stockholders are aggregated into the capital stock of the corporations, many of which have hundreds of stockholders.

But we are a fairly prosperous community, and the eleven millions and a half of deposits in our savings banks prove that our workingmen have their full share in our prosperity. Sir, I have listened with some impatience to the attacks which have repeatedly been made upon the State which I have the honor to represent in part here, but I know that she needs no defense from me or any one.

For two hundred and fifty years her career has been luminous in the pathway of history, and would grace and illustrate a distinct nationality of a thousand years. Within her limits are the historic spots which the stranger visits to renew his love of liberty, and to awaken inspiring recollections of an heroic epoch. The simple shaft which rises from Bunker's Height tells its mute but glorious story of courage, devotion, and patriotism to every coming generation. The world knows by heart the names of the patriots and statesmen which Massachusetts has given to the service of their country and humanity.

Her orators and men of letters grace the literature of our age, and her system of education, her institutions of learning and charity, and her wise and liberal legislation are the pride of her children and the example of her sister States. And, sir, all that she is or has been is not hers alone, and she does not seek to appropriate it. It is an inseparable part of the common heritage and the common glory of the nation, and as such should be valued and cherished by every American. But, sir, this theme is too lofty to treat here and now, and I would not have ventured to utter a word relating to it were I a native son of Massachusetts, but I owe something to the noble Commonwealth which has sheltered me from infancy and granted me favors and honors far beyond my deserts. [Applause.]

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Chairman, I move that the committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

The committee accordingly rose; and Mr. McMILLIN having resumed

the Chair as Speaker *pro tempore*, Mr. ALLEN, of Michigan, from the Committee of the Whole, reported that they had had under consideration a bill (H. R. 9051) to reduce taxation and simplify the laws in relation to the collection of revenues and had come to no resolution thereon.

Mr. MILLS. I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; and the House accordingly (at 9 o'clock and 43 minutes p. m.) adjourned.

PRIVATE BILLS INTRODUCED AND REFERRED.

Under the rule private bills of the following titles were introduced and referred as indicated below:

By Mr. ANDERSON, of Iowa: A bill (H. R. 9789) for the relief of E. J. Sankey—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BANKHEAD: A bill (H. R. 9790) granting to the corporate authorities of the city of Tuscaloosa, in the State of Alabama, all the right, title, and interest of the United States to fractional sections 22 and 15 lying south of the Warrior River, in township 21 and range 10 west—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. BARRY: A bill (H. R. 9791) for the relief of Charles W. Geddes—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. LAIDLAW: A bill (H. R. 9792) to increase the pension of Charles S. Baker—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LONG: A bill (H. R. 9793) authorizing a loan of arms and equipments to the Ancient and Honorable Artillery Company—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. LYMAN: A bill (H. R. 9794) for the relief of Daniel J. Ockerson—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. SHIVELY: A bill (H. R. 9795) granting a pension to Nathaniel Francis—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. VOORHEES: A bill (H. R. 9796) to correct an error in the Government survey of the quarter-section corner on the west boundary of section 30, township 20 north, range 3 east, Willamette meridian, in the county of Pierce, Washington Territory—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9797) authorizing the President to appoint and retire James Weir Graydon, of Indianapolis, Ind., with the rank and grade of lieutenant in the United States Navy—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. WALKER: A bill (H. R. 9798) for the relief of John W. Holleck—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. WHEELER: A bill (H. R. 9799) for the relief of Thomas W. Townsend—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9800) to refer the claim against the United States of L. H. Walker to the Court of Claims—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9801) to refer the claim against the United States of F. Varin to the Court of Claims—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9802) to refer the claim against the United States of Mary E. Reed to the Court of Claims—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. BUTTERWORTH (by request): A bill (H. R. 9803) to amend the tenth section of the act approved March 3, 1863, entitled "An act to establish a court for the investigation of claims against the United States," etc.—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

The following petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk, under the rule, and referred as follows:

By Mr. BARRY: Petition of citizens of Kemper County, Mississippi, for pure food—to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition of G. W. S. Davidson, of Yalobusha County, Mississippi, for reference of claim to the Court of Claims—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. C. R. BRECKINRIDGE: Petition of Lizzie Lanford, heir at law of Jesse Martin, deceased, of Monroe County, Arkansas, for reference of claim to the Court of Claims—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. T. H. B. BROWNE: Petition of William H. Vaughan, of Caroline County, Virginia, for relief—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. BUTTERWORTH: Petition of C. Parker, of Harveysburgh, Warren County, Ohio, asking for \$100 to enable him to go to Florida—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CLARDY: Petition of J. T. Bugg and 40 others, citizens of Washington County, Missouri, asking that the duty on barytes be retained—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CONGER: Memorial and concurrent resolution of the General Assembly of Iowa, for the passage of House bill 6897—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. FULLER: Resolution of the General Assembly of Iowa, for the passage of House bill 6897—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. GEAR: Resolution of the General Assembly of Iowa, for the passage of House bill 6897 in regard to indemnity swamp lands—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, petition of Gravewig & Scharcey, of Council Bluffs, Iowa, for reduction of duty on rice—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HAYDEN: Petition of the Worsteds Operatives' Protective Association in favor of protecting worsted-yarn mills—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HEMPHILL: Petition of the Cheraw Lyceum, for reference of its claim to the Court of Claims—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. D. B. HENDERSON: Petition of Assembly No. 4192, Knights of Labor, of Dubuque, Iowa, favoring House bill 8716—to the Committee on Labor.

Also, concurrent resolution of the General Assembly of Iowa, in relation to swamp-land indemnity—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. HOLMES: Petition of the railroad commissioners of Iowa for legislation relative to coupling and uncoupling cars, etc.—to the Committee on Commerce.

By Mr. HOUK: Petition in favor of House bill 7389—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

Also, petition of Ann A. Trundle, of Sevier County, Tennessee, for reference of her claim to the Court of Claims—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, evidence in favor of Isaac Diehl, of Tennessee—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. McCULLOGH: Petition of John Jones and others, and of T. J. Crage and others, ex-soldiers and sailors of Greene County, Pennsylvania—to the Committee on _____.

By Mr. MCKINLEY: Petition of citizens of Trenton, N. J., against reduction of duty on pottery—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MAISH: Petition of estate of John Group and William Patterson, of Adams County, Pennsylvania, for reference of their claims to the Court of Claims—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, petition of estate of Franklin Swisher, of Adams County, Pennsylvania, for reference of claim to the Court of Claims—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. PEEL: Petition of William H. Bohannon, for correction of his army record—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. PERKINS: Petition of B. F. Prather and others, ex-soldiers of Montgomery County, Kansas—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. STOCKDALE: Petition of heirs of John R. Williams, of Amite County, Mississippi, for reference of his claim to the Court of Claims—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. STRUBLE: Concurrent resolutions of the General Assembly of Iowa, for the passage of House bill 6897—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. TAULBEE: For the relief of Benjamin F. Young—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. J. D. TAYLOR: Petition of J. H. Furman and others, of Sarahsville, Ohio, for the passage of the dependent pension bill—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. VOORHEES: Affidavit and other papers of C. O. Bean, city surveyor of Tacoma, Wash., correcting errors of the United States surveyor-general—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. WICKHAM: Petition to accompany bill No. 8829, for the relief of Charlotte W. Boalt—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

The following petitions for the repeal or modification of the internal-revenue tax of \$25 levied on druggists were received and severally referred to the Committee on Ways and Means:

By Mr. DAVIS: Of S. T. Davis, M. D., and 22 others, citizens of Orleans; of Bradford Dunbar, of Fall River, and of Davis & Chase, of Orleans, Mass.

By Mr. FUNSTON: Of Topping & Son, of Pomona, Kans.

By Mr. LODGE: Of J. D. Mansfield, M. D., of Wakefield, Mass.

By Mr. LONG: Of A. G. Dargin, of Quincy, Mass.

By Mr. OATES: Of Dr. A. C. Crymes, of Midway, Ala.

By Mr. YARDLEY: Of L. L. Hoguet and 13 others, druggists, of Bucks County, Pennsylvania.

The following petitions for the proper protection of the Yellowstone National Park, as proposed in Senate bill 283, were received and severally referred to the Committee on the Public Lands:

By Mr. PETERS: Of A. T. Livingston and 17 others, citizens of Barton and Rush Counties, Kansas.

By Mr. RICE: Of 70 citizens of St. Paul, Minn.

By Mr. VOORHEES: Of 14 citizens of Washington Territory.

The following petitions for the more effectual protection of agriculture, by the means of certain import duties, were received and severally referred to the Committee on Ways and Means:

By Mr. CROUSE: Of Krumroy, Summit County, Ohio.

By Mr. FUNSTON: Of citizens of Richmond, Kans.

By Mr. GROUT: Of E. W. Whitford and 27 others, of Chimney Point, Vt.

By Mr. NUTTING: Of citizens of Owasco, N. Y.

By Mr. VANDEVER: Of citizens of Lodi, Cal.

The following petition, praying for the enactment of a law to establish a system of telegraphy, to be owned and controlled by the Government of the United States, and operated in connection with the Post-Office Department, was referred to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads:

By Mr. VOORHEES: Of 57 citizens of Washington Territory.

The following petitions, indorsing the per diem rated service-pension bill, based on the principle of paying all soldiers, sailors, and marines of the late war a monthly pension of 1 cent a day for each day they were in the service, were severally referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions:

By Mr. BELDEN: Of Thomas Saile and 20 others, and of Richard Dunn and 24 others, soldiers and sailors, of Syracuse, N. Y.

By Mr. GOFF: Of J. J. Monday and others, of West Virginia.

By Mr. KENNEDY: Of W. K. Hill and 100 others, of C. W. Clarke and 60 others, of C. T. Jamison and 125 others, and of Samuel Hedges and 50 others, citizens of Ohio.

By Mr. LYMAN: Of Freeman & Co., of Gray, Iowa.

By Mr. OSBORNE: Of Andrew Campbell and 13 others, citizens of Shamokin, Pa.

The following petitions, praying for the enactment of a law providing temporary aid for common schools, to be disbursed on the basis of illiteracy, were severally referred to the Committee on Education:

By Mr. HIRE: Of 98 citizens of Salem County, New Jersey.

By Mr. KETCHAM: Of 140 citizens of Putnam and Columbia Counties, New York.

By Mr. SCULL: Of 236 citizens of Blair County, Pennsylvania.

By Mr. TOWNSHEND: Of 157 citizens of Marion, Saline, and Gallatin Counties, Illinois.

By Mr. YARDLEY: Of 121 citizens of Montgomery County, Pennsylvania.

The following petition for an increase of compensation of fourth-class postmasters was referred to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads:

By Mr. CLARDY: Of James H. George and 20 others, citizens of the Tenth district of Missouri.

SENATE.

THURSDAY, May 3, 1888.

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

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

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATION.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore* laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a report of the Commissioner of Indian Affairs in relation to the claim of Rollins & Presbrey for legal services rendered to the Eastern band of Cherokee Indians, on which the Court of Claims find that the claimants are entitled to the sum of \$10,176.77 beyond what has been paid to them, and recommending that the claim be paid by the Government and not by the Indians; which, on motion of Mr. DAWES, was, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore* presented a petition of ex-Union soldiers and sailors, citizens of Kansas, praying for the passage of the per diem rated service-pension bill; which was referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also presented a petition of the Grand Army of the Republic of Kings County, New York, Department of New York, praying for the passage of the House bill appropriating \$50,000 for the erection of a monument at Fort Greene, in Brooklyn, N. Y., to the memory of the prison-ship martyrs; which was referred to the Committee on the Library.

Mr. GORMAN presented the petition of L. J. Bell and other citizens of the Sixth Congressional district of Maryland, praying for prohibition in the District of Columbia; which was referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

He also presented the petition of J. M. Green and other citizens of Washington, D. C., praying for the passage of Senate bill 283, for the better protection of the Yellowstone National Park; which was ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. BOWEN presented a petition of a convention of citizens of Colorado, signed by John L. Routt, president, Henri R. Foster and F. M. Clarke, secretaries, and Alvin Marsh, E. S. Nettleton, Alva Adams, Henry Lee, and H. A. W. Tabor, committee, praying Government aid in the construction of reservoirs in that State; which was referred to the Committee on Public Lands.